

THE
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1889.

ART. I.—THE THEOLOGY OF BISHOP ANDREWES.

WE all know too well the tendency which there is, in the heats of theological controversy, to magnify the differences between the contending parties. We have had sad experience of this tendency in our own days. But at no period, perhaps, in the history of the Christian Church has this tendency been more grievously exhibited than in the contentions between the Church and the Puritan parties in England during parts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The differences between them, indeed, were not altogether inconsiderable, but they were certainly not so great as they have sometimes been represented, and never were sufficient to justify such language as was often used—at least, on one side of the controversy.

It can scarcely be wondered at, if the fierceness of the opposition with which Churchmen were assailed, and the readiness with which they were branded as Papists, may sometimes have had the effect of inclining them the rather to something like assimilations of language and practice—when these could be well justified,—to those of the pre-Reformation period.

Moreover, in the matter of the controversy with Rome, there was much that tended to make the attitude of the English Churchman to be (as a rule) defensive rather than aggressive. Charged as he was, by the Romish assailant of heretical pravity, of steadfastly denying the faith of the Church, he felt himself in an impregnable position when he maintained—and in maintaining this he felt he was maintaining enough—that the belief which he held was all that was contained in the Scriptures of truth, all that was of the faith of the primitive Church; and that, therefore, if more were required of him by the Church of Rome *now*, it must be because the Papacy had

made additions of her own to the faith which had once for all been delivered unto the Saints. In all that was really *of the faith*, he claimed, and rightly claimed, to be at one with the Church and the faith of his forefathers. Now from all this it resulted that, to those ignorant of the true theological positions of the contending parties, it might seem as if, on the side of the English Church, there was something like a readiness to bridge over the gulf which separated us from the communion of Rome. And then, as a further result, it came to pass, that designing men on the Romish side of that gulf, taking advantage of the language used (and, in a true sense, rightly used) by English divines, aimed at making a real bridge across, an easy way from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, desiring to make it appear that some of the most learned theologians of the Church of England really supported Romish doctrines, and to this end quoting language culled from the writings of men of eminent names, and claiming it as language which pertained to their own faith.

Those who care to read the history of some such attempts made in years past, may be referred to a pamphlet of Dean Goode's, entitled "Rome's Tactics," a publication which may be very profitably studied at the present time.

It will be found, we believe, that scarcely any of the divines of the Church of England were more freely quoted by Romanists for this purpose than the justly esteemed Bishop Andrewes.

But it concerns us especially to observe that, in our own time, a similar effort has been made from our own side of the separating boundary. Romanizers in the English Church have continually shielded themselves for the teaching of really Romish doctrines, under the shelter of language used by faithful sons of the Church of England. And it must be added with regret, that historians of high repute—ignorant apparently of the theological language which was demanded by the controversial position of Protestant writers—have so far misunderstood the teaching of some of our best divines as to justify (in part) the use which has been made of their words by these Romanizers, and by those whom we may call ultra-Church innovators.

There is no English theologian, we are inclined to think, who has suffered so severely from this process, none whose writings have been racked with so cruel a torture, as the great and good Bishop Andrewes.

Probably the use which has been made of his language has done far more than is commonly supposed to deceive and mislead those unacquainted with the controversial history and the theological language of the period.

At any rate, we think the time has come which demands

that these prevalent misconceptions as to the true character of our old Anglican theology should be swept away. And we are persuaded that a not unimportant service will be rendered to the cause of the true doctrine of the English Church, if, taking from the list of great English divines the name which has been so signally made their shelter by our modern teachers, we are enabled to show clearly that on the points in question Bishop Andrewes was distinctly on the Reformed, as distinguished from the Romish, side of the controversy.

To this object, accordingly, we purpose to devote the present article.

Statements on this matter have been (as we are persuaded) so often erroneous, and misleading deductions have so often been made, and consequent misconceptions have been so widely diffused, and have taken such firm hold on many minds, that we think it important that special attention should be directed to the subject. We are not, of course, questioning the right of Bishop Andrewes to be regarded as a High Churchman, and even a Churchman of rather an extreme type, with a high regard for the externals of order and ritual; but we are questioning, and more than questioning, the right of that ultra-Church party, who would fain be regarded as exclusively the Churchmen of this day, to identify themselves with that historical party in the Reformed Church of England of which Andrewes may fairly, perhaps, be taken as the Coryphæus.

It might be well, in approaching the subject, just to take account of the attitude of Bishop Andrewes towards the Puritans generally. Without desiring to make too much of this, it is certainly not without its value as indicating his view of the comparative importance of the points of difference which stood between the Church of England and the Puritans on the one side, and between the Churches of England and Rome on the other side.

It is, of course, needless to say that the good Bishop's sympathies were altogether and strongly on the side which was not the Puritan side of the disputes which were raging in and around the English Church. And he did not spare what he regarded as the errors and the follies of those who were opposed to him. He could, on occasion, be severe upon the undue prominence which was given in their scheme of doctrine to certain aspects of Christian truth. Nevertheless, in matters of fundamental doctrine, he knows of no severance between his own position and that of the Puritans.¹ Such an assertion

¹ Writing on behalf of those "qui reformatam Religionem profitemur," Bishop Andrewes declares: "Fidem autem unam retinere nos tamen, Confessionum nostrarum Harmonia satis ipsa per se loquitur" (Adv.

may sound startling. To some it will, perhaps, seem hardly credible. Yet it is certainly no more than he is himself responsible for declaring. He speaks distinctly to the point when he says :

Distinguat itidem, inter *res fidei*, in quibus ne ii quidem hic, quos Puritanos appellat (nisi plus etiam quam Puritani sint) a nobis, nec nos ab illis dissentimus ; et *disciplinæ res* ; quam aliam ab Ecclesiæ præcæ formâ commenti sunt ("Ad. Bell. Resp.," pp. 290, 291 ; Ox., 1851).

Let those who know what the attitude of the Puritans was towards the doctrines of the Church of Rome, towards the decrees of the Council of Trent, towards the whole mediæval religious system which had encrusted the faith of the Christian Church—let these judge whether the words of Bishop Andrewes could have been used by one whose doctrines were in accord with those who now would fain be regarded as his disciples. They are certainly not the words of one who regards the question of episcopacy as a question altogether apart from the question of Church government. They are assuredly not the words of one who questions the possibility of reformed Presbyterian churches having a valid Eucharist.¹

It would have been well if Churchmen of succeeding generations had followed the example of Bishop Andrewes in the moderation of his language as regards the Puritans. Thus he writes in his "Responsio ad Bellarminum" :

Puritanorum ea religio non est, quorum nulla est religio sua atque propria : disciplina est. Quod ipsum tamen de Puritanis generatim dictum volo, deque iis inter eos, qui præterquam quod disciplinæ suæ

Bellar., cap. 1, p. 36, A.C.L.). Those who are familiar with the "Harmonia Confessionum" will not lightly estimate the value of this declaration.

Of Europe he says : "Cujus media prope pars in *nostram* Reformationem consensit" ("Ad. Bell. Resp.," p. 33, A.C.L. See also p. 448).

Those who have studied Jewel's "Apology" might infer something as to the true character of Bishop Andrewes' theology from his saying : "En ecclesiæ nostræ Apologiam vere Gemmeam" ("Opuscula," p. 91, A.C.L.).

¹ On the subject of Episcopacy Andrewes says : "If our form be of Divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is not salvation without it, or that a church cannot stand without it" ("Opuscula," p. 191). He adds : "Cæcus sit, qui not videat stantes sine ea Ecclesias. Ferreus sit, qui salutem eis neget."

When Bishop Andrewes preached before the Count Palatine, he included in the bidding prayer "the churches in Great Britain and Ireland, and the two Palatinates" (see Russell, p. 371, and "Opuscula," p. 80, A.C.L.).

According to Spottiswoode, Andrewes acquiesced—after stating his own difficulties—in the view of Archbishop Bancroft, that where there were no bishops, ordination by presbyters must be esteemed valid ; that otherwise "it might be doubted whether there was any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches" ("Church and State of Scotland," p. 514. London, 1677).

paulò magis addicti sunt, cætera sobrie satis sapiunt; qui quantumvis formam illam perditè depereant, in reliquâ tamen doctrinâ satis orthodoxi sunt. Nec enim nescius sum, censeri, adeoque esse, eo in numero (non minus quam in societate vestrâ) cerebrosos quosdam, pronos in schisma nimis. Etiam non deesse, qui quoad religionis capita quædam, vix per omnia sani sint. Quos ego hic, quos ubique exclusos volo. Mihi ab exteriori regiminis formâ Puritani sunt, non autem à religione, quæ eadem et est et esse potest, nbi facies regiminis externa non eadem ("Ad. Bell. Resp.," pp. 161, 162, A.C.L.).

It is surely needless to say that such words concerning the Puritans could never have been written by those who, on doctrinal matters of controversy between Rome and the Puritans, held the views of the Unreformed Church. And so, as regards the Bishop's general view of the Church of Rome,¹ it will perhaps surprise some of our readers to learn that he is to be classed with that long list of able and learned divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who regarded Rome as the Babylon of the Apocalypse, an anti-Christian power, whose practice is the practice of idolatry, whose teaching, supported by untrue allegations, is upheld by men to whom God has sent a strong delusion that they should believe lies (see "Tortura Torti," pp. 151-153). He quotes Irenæus in regarding *Lateinus* as the name of Antichrist, and finds the number of the beast in PaVLo V. VICe Deo ("Tortura

¹ Nothing is said, and nothing needs to be said, concerning the eastward position. Bishop Andrewes, as far as we are aware, was never charged with adopting it. Indeed, we question whether any satisfactory evidence can be adduced of its being adopted anywhere (after the Reformation settlement) before the accusation of Bishop Wren, who (by his own showing) used it only on occasion in the Consecration Prayer, because of the smallness of his stature. The plan of Bishop Andrewes' chapel shows that the practice was for the ministering clergy (as with the deacon and subdeacon in part of the Ambrosian rite formerly used in Milan Cathedral) to stand at the north and south ends of the Communion Table, facing one another (see *Minor Works*, A.C.L., p. xcviij).

As to the Bishop's use of the mixed chalice, he may doubtless have committed an error of judgment as to what was by the law of the Church of England permitted. But we may, perhaps, with all submission to authority, be allowed to think that the maxim "de minimis non curat lex" might possibly have been allowed to cover a practice (not as a ceremony) so ancient and (the Armenian Church notwithstanding) so catholic; one, too, derived, in all probability, from the original institution, and one, the symbolism of which (as often interpreted by Christian antiquity) bears so strong a witness against (so-called) "Real Objective" doctrine.

Bishop Andrewes says: "We hold it a matter not worth standing on: so all else were agreed, we would not stick with them to put as much *water* in as the priests use to do" (*Minor Works*, A.C.L., p. 25).

On the subject of reservation of the Sacrament Bishop Andrewes, granting what all allow, that in early times it was sent home to the sick, and against the time of extremity *reserved*, adds: "But neither doth this touch us, who at the desire of any that is in that case, may not refuse,

Torti," p. 361). The converts of the Jesuits in Japan he regards as only hypocrites made two-fold more the children of hell than the Jesuits themselves ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 35, A.C.L.).

But to come now to particulars. It is impossible to omit mention of the great vital doctrine of justification, though perhaps, on this point, the teaching of Bishop Andrewes is too well known to need any commendation of ours. Those who would have a clear and distinct view of this most important subject—those who would have before them the reformed doctrine in its purity, not in its extravagancies, and in the distinctness of its opposition to the post-Tridentine doctrines of Rome—those who would understand its cardinal position in the scheme of Protestant theology, can hardly do better than make themselves masters of the famous sermon on "The Lord our Righteousness." It must suffice here to make the following extract:

I know St. Paul saith much : that our Saviour Christ shed His blood "to show His righteousness, that He might not only be just, but a justifier" of those which are of His faith. And much more, again, in that when he should have so said, To him that believeth in God, He chooseth thus to set it down, "To him that believeth in Him that justifieth the ungodly;" making these two to be all one, God and the Justifier of sinners. Though this be very much, yet certainly this is most forcible, that "He is made unto us by God" very "righteousness" itself. And that yet more, that He is made "righteousness to us, that we be made the righteousness of God in Him." . . . What can be further said, what can be conceived more comfortable? To have Him ours, not to make us righteous, but to make us "righteousness," and that not any other but "the righteousness of God;" the wit of man can devise no more ("Sermons," vol. v., pp. 112, 113, A.C.L.).

Would that subsequent generations had seen no falling away from such faithful Scriptural teaching as this! Would that those who in this day would fain be regarded as admirers of Bishop Andrewes might learn from him to let their trumpet give a sound no less certain than his!

But it is especially on the doctrine of the Eucharist that our modern teachers are ever ready to plead the authority of Bishop Andrewes, as of one whose language will shelter all their innovations. And therefore it is on this subject especially that we are desirous of showing that his doctrine has been so generally misrepresented and misunderstood. And we believe that the mistake will be evident to all impartial readers if we are enabled to show—*first*—that the language

but go to him and minister it him. So that *reservation* needeth not; the intent is had without it" (Minor Works, A.C.L., p. 19).

"*Circumgestare hoc vestrum præcepto Christi contrarium, nec ei usquam Scriptura favet. Contrarium et instituto. . . . Extra Sacramenti finem, extra præcepti vim, usus haud ullus*" (Resp. ad Bell., p. 267).

quoted from Bishop Andrewes is language which he uses in common with divines of his day most distinctly opposed to the Eucharistic doctrines which our modern teachers are seeking to introduce; and *secondly*, that other sayings *may* be quoted from Bishop Andrewes which clearly indicate his own position as also distinctly opposed to the doctrines now advocated by ultra-Churchmen among us.

I. First, then, let us look at the language of Bishop Andrewes, which has been so often quoted as unquestionably supporting the doctrine of our new teachers. We have here to do with his words concerning (1) The Eucharistic Presence; (2) The Eucharistic Sacrifice; (3) Eucharistic Adoration.

(1) We take the subject of the Presence first. Here we are face to face with what will, at first sight, seem to many a most serious difficulty. We have to meet the fact that the Bishop not only declares his belief in the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but acknowledges nothing less than identity of faith, so far as the Presence is concerned, with the Church of Rome.

Thus he writes: "Præsentiam (inquam) credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram. De modo præsentiae nil temere definimus"¹ ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 13, A.C.L.).

Language could not speak more distinctly. Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that our great theologian recognises no difference whatever as regards the truth of the Presence between the Church of England and the Church of Rome?

It is quite impossible. But the crucial question remains: What did the Bishop mean by the Presence? To suppose that he must have meant to commit the Church of England to the belief that the Body and Blood of Christ are really present *in the Elements* on the Table, is impossible for those who have any acquaintance with the Eucharistic controversies of that date. It is necessary, in view of the language, not of Andrewes only, but of the body of Reformed theologians of this period as a whole, to take into account the fact that Christendom was now divided on the question—"What is it that is of the essence of the Real Presence?" On one side, the side of Romanists and Lutherans, the question was answered by saying, "The essence of the Real Presence is its being in the elements, or under the forms of the consecrated bread and wine. The Presence *is not* if it is not *there*." On the other

¹ The Bishop had just said: "Nobis autem vobiscum de objecto convenit; de modo, lis omnis est. De, *Hoc est*, Fide firma tenemus, quod sit. De, *Hoc modo est* (nempe Transubstantiato in corpus pane) de modo, quo fiat ut sit (per, sive *In*, sive *Con*, sive *Sub*, sive *Trans*), nullum inibi verbum est. Et quia verbum nullum, merito a fide ablegamus procul: inter *Scita Scholæ* fortasse, inter *Fidei Articulos* non ponimus."

side, the side of the Reformed, it was answered by saying, "The essence of the Real Presence is in its being in the heart of the receiver. The question of its being in, or with, or under the elements, is nothing more than a question of the *mode* of the presence to the soul of the communicant."

The language of Hooker on this subject is well known. None now dare to question that his great name stands up as a pillar, supporting in this particular the doctrine of the Reformed. But then an attempt has been made to isolate the teaching of Hooker. And some may be ready to ask: "Has not Hooker been set before us—and may we not believe rightly set before us?—as herein standing in a manner alone, the peculiarity of his too subjective theology standing as a warning to future generations against such a conception of the Eucharistic Presence?" It is true that Hooker's example has been so set before us. But that there was here any peculiarity in Hooker's teaching, any standing alone and apart from the teaching of other great English divines, is altogether a mistake.¹

¹ The attempt to isolate the teaching of Hooker will be found to break down completely under examination. Not only was Hooker's teaching—as to its substance—nowise *new*, but even the language in which he clothed it varies little from the expression of (1) Cranmer—"the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body . . . and of His blood . . . be" (he had said just before, "not corporally in the outward visible signs") "really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments" ("Answer to Gardiner," Preface, P.S. edit., p. 3); which, again, had been almost repeated by (2) Ridley, speaking of the "spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, not to bread and wine, but to them which worthily do receive the Sacrament" (Works, P.S. edit., p. 240); and, again, by (3) Bradford, confessing "a presence of whole Christ, God and man, to the faith of the receiver," but refusing to "include Christ's Real Presence in the Sacrament, or tie Him to it otherwise than to the faith of the receiver" ("Sermons," etc., P.S. edit., pp. 510, 511), and declaring, "I never denied nor taught, but that to faith whole Christ's body and blood was as present as bread and wine to the due receiver" (*Ibid.*, p. 488); and, again, by (4) Philpot confessing "the presence of Christ wholly to be, with all the fruits of His passion, unto the said worthy receiver" ("Examinations," P.S. edit., p. 68), and acknowledging "a Real Presence . . . to the worthy receivers by the Spirit of God," while denying "in the Sacrament by transubstantiation any Real Presence" (*Ibid.*, pp. 132, 133). And it may be worth observing how Hooker's saying on this subject seems to be as something like a keynote to succeeding English divines. It is adopted verbatim by (1) Bishop Field as from "that exact divine Master Hooker" ("Parasceve Paschæ," edit. 1624, pp. 136, 137). It is almost repeated by (2) Dr. Mayer—"not . . . that His body is in, under, or about the bread . . . but faith making Him present unto the worthy receiver" ("Catechism Explained," 1623, p. 527). It may be said to be condensed in the famous dictum of (3) Bishop Jeremy Taylor—"present to our spirits only" ("Real Presence," i. § 8; Works, edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 17), and to be expanded by (4) Dean Jackson when he says, "The sacramental bread is called His body, and the sacramental wine His blood, as

Hooker was simply speaking the language and teaching the doctrine of the Reformed—as distinct from the doctrine of Romanists and Lutherans alike. On behalf of the Church of

for other reasons, so especially for this, that the virtue or influence of His bloody sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from heaven unto the worthy receivers of the Eucharist" ("On Creed," xi., § 5, edit. Oxford, 1844, vol. x., p. 41). (5) The same note is struck by Bishop Bayly, saying, "Christ is verily present in the Sacrament by a double union; whereof the first is spiritual, 'twixt Christ and the worthy receiver; the second is sacramental, 'twixt the body and blood of Christ and the outward signs in the Sacrament" ("Practice of Piety," p. 442, edit. 1668); and again, "The Sacramental bread and wine, therefore, are not bare signifying signs, but such as wherewith Christ doth indeed exhibit and give to every worthy receiver not only His Divine virtue and efficacy, but also His very body and blood" (which he had just spoken of as "absent from us in place"), "as verily, etc." (*Ibid.*, p. 445); and also by (6) Bishop Cosin expressing (as his matured views) that "the body and blood is neither sensibly present, nor otherwise at all present, but only to those who are duly prepared to receive them" (in Nicholl's "Additional Notes," p. 49a); and again, that "Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, *cannot* be kept and preserved, to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants" (Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 174); and again, that "indeed the body of Christ is given in the Eucharist, but to the faithful only" ("Hist. of Trans.," A.C.L., p. 193). His view is commended by (7) Bishop Nicholson as "Hooker's very pious judgment" ("Exposition of Catechism," A.C.L., p. 215). His saying is quoted by (8) Bishop Patrick, who makes it his own, "according as learned Hooker speaks" ("Mensa Mystica," § i., chap. 5; in Works, edit. Oxford, 1858, p. 151). See also p. 150: "This is all that is meant by the Real Presence of Christ in this Sacrament, which the Church speaks of and believes." It may probably have suggested the language of (9) Bishop Ken, "present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver," which he substituted in the revised edition of his "Exposition of the Catechism" as the correction or true explanation of the less guarded expression "present on the altar," as used in the first edition (see Ken's Prose Works, edit. Round, 1838, pp. 212 and 325). It may also have suggested the language of (10) Dean Comber, "We desire they may be made the Body and Blood of Christ to us; that although they remain in substance what they were, yet to the worthy receiver they may be something far more excellent . . . that we may become partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood" ("Companion to Temple," edit. Oxford, 1841, vol. iii., p. 260). It is quoted (11) by Archbishop Wake as from "the venerable Hooker . . . whose judgment, having been so deservedly esteemed by all sorts of men, ought not to be lightly accounted of by us" (in Gibson's "Preservative," edit. 1848, vol. x., p. 68). It is virtually declared by (12) Archdeacon Waterland (as by Bishop Patrick) to be the doctrine of the English Church, saying, "The force, the grace, the virtue of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed—that is, of His passion—are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the Real Presence that our Church teaches" (Works, edit. Oxford, vol. iv., p. 42):

We are not aware that a single example can be adduced of any eminent divine (before the Oxford Movement) claiming to represent the doctrine of the Church of England, who condemned the doctrine of Hooker as falling short of the true doctrine of the Real Presence.

England he was taking the side, defending and maintaining the cause of that great body of Protestant Christians who rejected alike the doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation.

It would be easy to multiply quotations to show the consensus of English divines in support of the assertion of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, that our presence (the presence that is, which we of the Church of England believe) is "presence to our spirits only." Over and over again (we are tempted to say, even, *usque ad nauseam*) in the writings of our divines, we meet with the assertion that all more than this, all teaching of *trans*, or *con*, or *sub*, or *in*, has to do with questions, not for faith, but for the schools—questions not of *the presence*, but of *the mode*.¹

¹ It must not be supposed that these divines in insisting that the question of *trans*, *con*, *sub*, etc., was only a question "de modo" were thus making light of the errors contained in the *trans* and the *con*. To relegate these from questions of *the faith* to questions of *the mode* was to exclude them from belief altogether. Once admitted as a true explanation of the *mode*, they had naturally and consistently demanded to be placed in the position of things to be held *de fide*, and then had brought in with them their concomitant superstitions. To treat them as mere questions "de modo" was to degrade them to a position in which their power for evil was crippled indeed, but also one which they could never be content to occupy, one in which they could not live. It was well said by Bishop Morton: "It would be a wonder to us, to hear any of our own profession to be so extremely indifferent concerning the different opinions of the manner of the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, as to think the Romish sect, therefore, either tolerable or reconcilable, upon pretence that the question is only *de modo* (that is) of the manner of Being, and that consequently all controversy about this is but vain jangling" ("On Eucharist," iv., chap. i., § 1, pp. 210, 211, edit. 1635). Thus Archbishop Bramhall's somewhat unguarded statement, "We determine not," which is objected to by Dean Goode ("On Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 370), is really equivalent to the condemnation of both transubstantiation and consubstantiation.

Hooker wrote: "Sith we all agree that by the Sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform His promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation the Sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ or no?" And this saying gave occasion to the objection ("Chr. Letters," 34), "In which words you seem to make light of the doctrine of transubstantiation, as a matter not to be stood upon, or to be contended for, cared for, or inquired into." On which Hooker's MS. note is very valuable: "Not to be stood upon or contended for by them, because it is not a thing necessary, although because it is false, as long as they do persist to maintain and urge it, there is no man so gross as to think in that case we may neglect it." He quotes Frith, who, in answer to the question, "Dost thou not think that His very natural Body, flesh, blood and bone is contained under the Sacrament, and there present, without all figure or similitude?" said, "No, I do not so think. Notwithstanding I would not that any should count that I make my saying, which is the negative, any article of faith" (see Keble's "Hooker," vol. ii., pp. 353, 354).

And so Andrewes, while maintaining "de modo quo fiat, ut sit *per*, sive

And it was perfectly consistent for these divines to maintain that, as regards the real doctrine of the Presence, they believed it as firmly as their Romish opponents: that so far as the truth of the Presence was concerned, there was actually no difference between the belief of the Church of England and that of the Church of Rome. And it was perfectly natural for Bishop Andrewes, as a defender of the faith—the Reformed faith of the Church of England—to declare “Præsentiam credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram.”¹

But it may be asked: What evidence can you bring that such language as this was ever used by those who took their stand decidedly on the side of the Reformed? Can such an assertion be matched from the words of any divine whose name will clearly be recognised as the name of one who was an upholder of the faith of the Reformed? There are, we suppose, very few names which would more satisfactorily meet these requirements than the name of William Perkins. A strenuous defender of Puritan doctrines in England, his writings were so highly esteemed among the Reformed Churches on the Continent, that edition after edition was published abroad of a Latin translation of the most important of his works, many of which were also published in French, Dutch and Spanish. And can, then, the language of Bishop Andrewes, concerning the Presence, be matched from the writings of Perkins? Let us see. Thus Perkins writes:

in, sive con, sive sub, sive trans, nullum inibi verbum est. Et, quia verbum nullum, merito a fide ablegamas procul,” has a section of his answer to Cardinal Du Perron’s “Reply” against “the belief of Christ in the Sacrament *sub speciebus*” (see *Minor Works, A.C.L.*, p. 13; see also p. 35).

¹ The Bishop adds, “De modo præsentiae nil temere definimus, nec anxie inquirimus non magis, quam, in baptismo nostro, quomodo abluat nos sanguis Christi;” on which Archbishop Wake wrote, “He plainly insinuates that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was much the same as in baptism; the very allusion which the holy Fathers were wont to make to express His presence by, in this holy Sacrament” (“Discourse of the Holy Eucharist in Gibson’s Preservation,” vol. x., p. 69).

It must not, however, be supposed that in the earlier stages of the controversy the term “Real Presence” (a comparatively modern expression) was always so readily accepted by the Reformed. In the sense in which their opponents presented it, it was always, of course, rejected with aversion. Cranmer wrote, “The very body of the tree, or, rather, the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the *Real Presence* of Christ’s flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord’s Vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable that no Christian heart can willingly bear them” (“On Lord’s Supper,” pref. to edit. 1550, P.S., p. 6).

We hold and believe a Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that no feigned, but a true and real Presence (Works, vol. i., pp. 589, 590, edit. 1616).

God the Father, according to the tenor of the Evangelical covenant, gives Christ in His Sacrament as really and truly as anything can be given unto man (p. 590).

There must needs be such a kind of presence, wherein Christ is really and truly present to the heart of him that receives the sacrament in faith. And *thus far do we consent with the Romish Church touching Real Presence* (Works, vol. i., p. 590).

We differ not touching *the Presence* itself, but only in *the manner* of the Presence¹ (*Ibid.*).

¹ The following quotations from the Latin translation of the "Reformed Catholic" ("Honov.," MDCI.) will serve perhaps to make still more striking the correspondence of language with that of Andrewes: "Credimus ac docemus *realem presentiam* Corporis et sanguinis Christi in sacramento (cenæ) eamque non confictam, sed *veram*, sed *realem*" (p. 225).

"Necesse omnino est, esse etiam talem quendam *modum* presentiæ, quo Christus verè et realiter præsens sit cordibus eorum, qui recipiunt sacramentum. Et hactenus consentimus cum Ecclesiâ Romanâ, quod ad *realem presentiam* attinet" (p. 230).

"Diximus nos *non differre* ab illis, quoad *ipsam presentiam*, sed saltem quoad *modum* presentiæ (p. 230).

So Grindal had written: "Christi *presentiam* in suâ sacrâ cenâ, eamque *veram* et *salvificam* omnes fatemur; de *modo* tantum est disceptatio" ("Remains," P.S. edit., p. 248).

Foxe, speaking of the difference between the Lutherans and the Sacramentaries, says: "They both . . . do confess the *Presence* of Christ, and disagree only upon the *manner* of the *Presence*" ("Acts and Mn.," vol. v., p. 11).

And the *Declaratio Thoruniensis* declares, "Nequaquam negamus *veram* corporis et sanguinis Christi in Cenâ *Præsentiam*, sed tantum localem et corporalem *Præsentiam modum*" (In Niemeyer, p. 682).

Calvin wrote, "Falso jactant, quicquid docemus de spirituali manducatione, verè et reali (ut loquuntur) opponi; quandoquidem non nisi *ad modum* respicimus" ("Inst.," iv., cap. xvii., § 33).

And, again, "Longe falluntur qui nullam carnis Christi *presentiam* in Cœna concipiunt nisi in pane sistatur . . . Tantum de *modo* quæstio est" (*Ibid.*, § 31).

And, again, "Ubi quæcunque cena peragitur, *præsens* esse ejus corpus modo presentiam *modum* quem exposui amplectatur, non dissentio" ("Secunda Def. contra Westphalum").

Compare the following from Bishop Cosin: "We know well . . . that Christ said, 'This is My Body,' not that *after this manner* it was His Body; we believe verily that it is so. But, that it is after *this manner* so (that is to say, by annihilating and transubstantiating the bread into His Body), or after any other manner, *whether in, or with, or under the bread*, we are not tied to believe at all. . . . We believe, I say, the Real Presence no less than they do; of the *manner how* we dare not (as they do) so rashly define that which we can never understand" (Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 283).

"Can anyone persuade himself that our Blessed Saviour would have appointed that His most holy Body should be present in His Church, in *such a manner* as that it should come into the hands of His greatest enemies" (Works, vol. iv., pp. 226, 227).

Now, we ask, Can the reader discover any really important differences in the statements of the two divines? Is Perkins

Again, Bishop Cosin says: "De reali (id est, vera et non imaginaria) *præsentiæ* Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, Protestantium *Ecclesiæ* nullæ dubitant" ("Hist. Trans.," cap. ii., § 1, vol. iv., p. 18).

"*Modum* vero *præsentiæ* Corporis Sanguinisque Domini in S. Eucharistia, nos, qui protestantes sumus, et ad normam *prisæ* ac *Catholicæ* *Ecclesiæ* reformati, anxie non scrutamur" (*Ibid.*, cap. i., § 7, p. 18).

And Rodolph Gualter in his Preface (see "Hospinian," op. iv., 623) to the "Consensus Orthodoxus" (Tiguri, 1605), says, "Itaque neque *præsentiæ* neque manducationem Corporis Christi in cœna negamus, sed de *solo modo* *præsentiæ* atque manducationis inter nos et adversarios est controversia."

Moreover, in the "Consensus" itself (said to be written by J. Herdesian), the language of Ecolampadius (in his "Dialogus") is quoted with approval, "Dissidium majis est de *modo* *præsentiæ* vel *absentiæ*, quam de ipsa *præsentiæ*, vel *absentiæ*" (p. 344, edit. Tiguri, 1605; see also p. 33). And the sixth chapter of this important work is "De vero *præsentiæ* Corporis Christi in cœna modo." And in p. 259 it is said, "Etsi . . . hæc *præsentiæ* Christi non sit corporalis, rectè tamen dici potest esse *realis*, quia non est imaginaria . . . quamvis alio *modo* exhibeatur et realiter in cœna *præsens* sit panis."

And again, "Talis est vera *realis* Christi in hoc mysterio cœnæ *præsentiæ* . . . quod tamen non alio *modo*, quam per fidem . . . fieri posse est intelligendum" (p. 259).

So Bucer declared that "the controversy was rather about the *manner* of the Presence or absence, than about the Presence or absence itself" (see Cosin's Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 164).

So Bishop Morton declares, "The question is not absolutely concerning a *Real Presence*, which Protestants (as their own Jesuites witness) do also profess. . . . Our difference is not about the truth or reality of Presence, but about the true *manner* of the being, and receiving thereof" ("Catholic Appeal," i., chap. ii., § 1, p. 93).

So Heylin writes, "It seems it is agreed on both sides (that is to say, the Church of England and the Church of Rome) that there is a *true* and *real* Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; the disagreement being only in the *modus præsentiæ*" ("Cyprianus Anglicus," p. 25).

Albertinus declares, "Non quæritur, utrum Corpus et Sanguis Christi fidei nostræ *præsentiæ* sint; id enim fatemur et nos" ("De Sac. Euch.," cap. xxiv., edit. 1654, p. 149; see also p. 151).

And so Turretin, "Non quæritur, an Corpus Christi sit *præsens* animo fidelium in Eucharistia, et an uniatum arcte cum ipsis? Sed an uniatum cum signis sacramentalibus, et *præsens* sit localiter cum ipsis" ("Inst. Theol. Elenct.," part iii., quæst. xxviii., p. 568, Genev., 1686). Again, "Aliud est *præsentiæ* *veritas*, aliud *perceptionis* *modus*" (*Ibid.*, p. 579).

Another most unexceptional witness is Bishop Reynolds, who was one of the Assembly of Divines, and took the covenant. His language may also be well set beside that of Bishop Andrewes, "A real presence of Christ we acknowledge, but not a local or physical; for presence real (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance; but is opposed to a false, imaginary, fantastic presence" (Works, 1826, vol. iii., p. 72).

Again, he says, "As, by faith, we have the evidence, so, by the Sacrament, we have the presence of things farthest distant and absent from us" (p. 68). "In this Sacrament we do most willingly acknowledge a real, true and perfect presence of Christ—not in, with, or under the

less emphatic than the Bishop in his statement of the truth and reality of the Presence? Is he more unwilling than Andrewes to recognise *so far* a full agreement with the doctrine of the Church of Rome?

But how, it will be asked, are we to account for the fact of such a divine as Perkins making use of such language as this? We answer without the least hesitation—It needs not to be accounted for at all. He is teaching the common doctrine of Reformed divines—the doctrine of all the old divines of the Church of England, because our great divines have all taken their stand with the doctrine of the Reformed (as distinguished from the Roman and Lutheran doctrine) on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence.¹ If their opponents have constantly

elements, considered absolutely in themselves, but with that habitude and respect, which they have unto the immediate use, whereunto they are consecrated" (p. 68). And he quotes in a note from St. Augustine, "Secundum quendam modum Sacramentum Corporis Christi Corpus est, et Sacramentum Sanguinis sanguis est" (Ep. 23).

With this language of Bishop Reynolds (which closely resembles that of Bishop Cosin) may be compared the words of Maresius, who—commenting on the declaration of the Belgic Confession, "Nos fide (quæ animæ nostræ et manus et os est) in animis nostris recipere verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi unici Servatoris nostri"—says, "Videntur hac in parte confessionis nostræ primi Scriptores alluisse ad id quod dixisse aliquando fertur Durandus, laudente et referente ex Episcopo Eliensi Casaubono in Responsione factâ ad Epist. Card. Perronii pro Rege Angliæ, *Verbum audimus, motum sentimus, modum nescimus, præsentiam credimus*. Quidni enim Christus quamvis absens loco et corpore, præsens nobis fieret spiritu et fide, quandoquidem hæc est fidei veræ indoles, haud absimilis tubis opticus per quos remotissima objecta accedere et præsentia se nobis facere videntur, ut menti præsentia reddat quæ alias vel loco vel tempore absentia ac dissita sunt?" ("Exegesis," p. 531; Gronin, 1652).

¹ In the "Harmonia Confessionum" it is distinctly declared: "Omnes veram veri corporis, et veri sanguinis domini nostri Jesu Christi communicationem credimus. In *modo* communicandi hæret controversia" (Præf).

Even Ecolampadius said: "Dissidium majis est de *modo* præsentia vel absentia quam de ipsa præsentia vel absentia."

(See Bucer in "Retractatio in Scripta Angl.," p. 644.)

And John Alasco expressed much the same. Peter Martyr said, "Discrimen est in *modo* et ratione manducationis . . . verum corpus, et verus sanguis exhibetur, quia fides non amplectitur ficta, sed vera" ("Loc. Com." vol. i., p. 1594).

So Calvin, "*Modi tantum definitio quæritur*" ("Admonitio ultima et Westphalum," Op. tom. viii., p. 720), and again he declares, "The controversy is simply on the *mode* of eating" ("De vera part.," Op. tom. viii., p. 743.)

And Ursinus says that the controversy is "not whether the flesh of Christ be eaten, for this none of us deny, but *how* it is eaten" (see Nevin's "Mystical Presence," p. 91.)

And so Cranmer had said, "The contention is *only* in the *manner* and form *how* we receive it" ("On Lord's Supper," p. 370, P.S. edit.).

contended that the Real Presence in its essence is presence only in or under the form of the sacramental signs—must *they*, therefore, who are persuaded that the Real Presence in its essence is presence to our spirits only, must they concede that they are unbelievers in Real Presence altogether? Nay, rather, shall they not earnestly contend that, as regards the truth of the Presence, they believe not less than their opponents? This is just what our Anglican Bishop Andrewes has done. But this is just what the Puritan Perkins had done before.²

(2) We come next to the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Bishop Andrewes has written: "The Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice."³ And in a sermon preached in 1612, he declared

John Owen declared, "One of the greatest engines that ever the devil made use of to overthrow the faith of the Church, was by forging such a *Presence* of Christ as is *not truly* in this ordinance to drive us off from looking after that great *Presence* which *is true*" (Works, edit. Goold., vol. ix., p. 572).

¹ When Bellarmine teaches that the Real Presence (*i.e.*, under the form of the elements) is needed for the purposes of the sacrifice, but is needless for sacramental purposes—he may be said to be virtually conceding what our divines have contended for, *viz.*, that in view of communion the essence of the Real Presence is presence to our spirits only (see Bellarmine "De Sac. Euch.," lib. i., cap. i., c. 452; Ingold., 1601).

² Beza wrote: "Negat Beza se negare *veram* et illis immotis principiis, ac proinde analogiæ fidei consentientem veri corporis et sanguinis Christi in Cœnâ præsentiam atque *κοινωνίαν*" ("Ad. Hold. Conv. Responsio." Op. tom. iii., p. 102, edit. 1582).

And he had said (with explanation): "Nos in Cœna Christi carnem præsentissimam statuimus" (tom. ii., p. 245).

In perfect consistency, therefore, at the colloquy at Poissy, Beza declared (with the other Reformed delegates), "Quoniam fides innixa Verbo Dei, res perceptas præsentis facit: per istam vero fidem, recipimus vere et efficaciter verum et naturale corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi, virtute Spiritus Sancti: hoc respectu fatemur præsentiam corporis et sanguinis ipsius in Cœna" (see Hospinian, "Hist. Sac.," par. ii., Op. tom. iv., pp. 520, 521; Genev., 1681).

Bishop Reynolds declares, "By the Sacrament we have the presence of things farthest distant and absent from us" (Works, vol. iii., p. 68, edit. 1826).

And there need be no stumbling-block to faith in this and such like sayings.

When Œcolampadius wrote: "Per fidem absentissimum corpus Christi, animo præsentissimum est"—("Epist. Doct. Virorum," 1548, fol. 129b)—he was not attributing to faith any function which had not been given to it by more ancient authorities. To St. Augustine's "Quomodo tenebo absentem? Fidem mitte et tenuisti," may be added the saying of Rupertus Tuitiensis: "Ut fidei, cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita, ejus passio memoriter representetur" ("De Trin. in Gen." lib. vi., cap. xxxii., Op. edit. Migne, tom. i., c. 431).

³ Yet elsewhere Andrewes asserts distinctly that in strictness of divinity Christ's death is the only sacrifice. "This is it in the Eucharist that

that the Apostle (1 Cor. x.) matcheth the Eucharist with the sacrifice of the Jews, and that, "by the rule of comparisons, they must be ejusdem generis."¹

Can language such as this be matched from the writings of any divine whose name will carry with it a guarantee of supporting the doctrines of the Reformed? No exception; we presume, will be taken to the name of Theodore Beza, who, on the same subject, has thus expressed himself:

Cœna Domini sacrificii rationem habet, idque triplici respectu : 1. Quatenus in ea aliquid Deo offerimus, solemnem videlicet gratiarum actionem, ex illo Christi præscripto (1 Cor. xi. 26). 2. Deinde, quod in ea conferrentur eleemosynæ, ex instituto fortassis Apostoli (1 Cor. xvi. 2). Quæ eleemosynæ vocantur *προσφορὰι*, ex illo Christi sermone (Matt. xxv. 20). 3. Quod mortis Domini sacrificium, ob oculos quodammodo in illis mysteriis positum, veluti renovetur ("Quæstiones et Respons.," p. 105).

On these two quotations it is needless to say more than this, that Andrewes and Beza both belonged to that class of Reformed divines who, rejecting what Waterland calls the "new definitions," preferred to give that wider sense to the

answereth to the sacrifice in the Passover . . . By the same rule that theirs was, by the same may ours be termed a sacrifice. In rigour of speech neither of them, for to speak after the exact manner of divinity, there is but one only sacrifice *veri nominis*, properly so called : that is, Christ's death. And that sacrifice but once actually performed, at His death : but ever before represented in figure from the beginning, and ever since represented in memory to the world's end ("Sermons," vol. ii., p. 300, A.C.L.).

In this matter Andrewes seems to have followed the example of Perkins, who wrote, "Cœna Domini est sacrificium, et potest bene, et certe sic dici, ut et olim a Patribus appellatum est" (Cath. Ref. Cont. xi., cap. ii., p. 251. Hanov., MDCI.). "Sacrificii vocabulum sumitur dupliciter, proprie et improprie" (p. 250). "In hâc porro controversiâ vocabulum sacrificii, nunc proprie, nunc improprie, et per similitudinem accipio" (p. 250).

We may willingly acknowledge the Bishop's mistaken interpretation of Heb. xiii. 10 (Minor Works, A.C.L., p. 21), and regret his admission of the word *altar*. But the very language in which he defends this term shows clearly the *sense* in which he admits the sacrifice. "The holy Eucharist being considered as a *sacrifice* (in the representation of the breaking the bread, and pouring forth the cup), the same is fitly called an altar ; which, again, is as fitly called a table, the *Eucharist* being considered as a *sacrament*, which is nothing else but a distribution and an application of the *sacrifice* to the several receivers" (Minor Works, A.C.L., p. 20. See also "Respon. ad Bell.," p. 250 ; "Sermons," vol. ii., p. 299, and vol. v., pp. 66, 67).

¹ The Bishop's language here must not be misunderstood. Waterland says : "He did not mean, as some have widely mistaken him, that both must be the same kind of sacrifice, but that both must be of the sacrificial kind, agreeing in the same common genus of sacrifice ; for he said it in opposition to those who pretended that the Eucharist was an ordinance merely of the sacramental kind, and not at all of the sacrificial" ("Christian Sacrifice Explained," p. 430 ; Works, vol. v., p. 137).

word *sacrifice*, in which it no longer possesses any strictly propitiatory meaning, but extends itself to comprehend the offering of any religious service and sacred action in the worship of God.

(3) It remains to deal with the subject of Eucharistic adoration. Bishop Andrewes wrote: "Christus ipse, Sacramenti res, in et cum sacramento; extra, et sine sacramento ubi ubi est, adorandus est" ("Resp. ad Bell.," p. 266, A.C.L.).¹ "Nos vero *et in mysteriis carnem Christi* adoramus, cum Ambrosio" (*Ibid.*, p. 267). Very much has been made of this language of the Bishop. And very much the same might be made of the following language of Theodore Beza, which we quote at length, because it may be said not only to match the words of Andrewes, but also to indicate clearly the very obvious, but only true, explanation of the use of such words by Andrewes and Beza alike:

Adorari ubique Deum, ac presertim in sacris mysteriis oportere dubium non est. Neque ullam esse Ecclesiam arbitror, in qua non adhibeatur solemnis quædam ut gratiarum actio, ita etiam et interior et exterior adoratio quum hæc mysteria tremenda, quasi in cælis potius quam in terris, celebrantur ("Tract. Theol.," vol. iii., p. 364; Geneva, 1582).

Here we must leave our subject to be concluded in the following CHURCHMAN.

N. DIMOCK.

¹ These words of Bishop Andrewes were quoted by a Romanist as a support of Romish doctrines while Andrewes was yet alive. And, in 1617 (Andrewes still living), the Romanist was answered by Dr. Collins ("Defence of the Lord Bishop of Ely"): "The Bishop grants that Christ is to be worshipped, and that He is to be worshipped in the Sacrament, which He infallibly accompanieth and effectually assisteth: *ergo*, with you he is a Pontifician, and maintaineth your cause, and betrayeth his own. No such thing, gentle sir. To make him yours, more goes to it than so. Especially these two, Corporal Presence and transubstantiation, or conversion. These are the two main badges, or rather buttresses, of your Cyclops, neither of which is to be found in the Bishop's writing, and, God knows, is far from his belief." (See "Russell's Memoirs," p. 448.)

It is scarcely possible to read the Bishop's "Answer to Cardinal Perron's Reply on 'The External Adoration of the Sacrament'" (Minor Works, A.C.L., p. 15 *sqq.*) without seeing how abhorrent from his views are the Romish adoration and the Romish doctrine of the Presence.

