

THE  
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1901.

ART. I.—THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:  
II. THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE IN RELATION TO  
SACRIFICIAL DEATH (*continued*).

THE reader can hardly now fail to see the importance of the distinction of the two senses of "spiritual" as indicated in the *dictum* of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. It is presence "to our spirits only," which makes intelligible the spiritual manducation of that which, locally and corporally absent, is not the less really presented as food to our souls. And the Christian faith should be taught to realize that it does verily and indeed feed upon the true *Res Sacramenti*—not simply on its *fruits* or *benefits*, but on the very Body and Blood of Christ, the very sacrifice of His death upon the cross—the "meat indeed" and "drink indeed" whereby we dwell in Him and He in us.

I must be allowed once more to insist on this truth. Before going further, I desire again to urge its importance. It is an imperfect expression of the full truth of the Sacrament to say, "This is an effectual sign of the benefit which comes of the Thing signified." The meaning, indeed, of such a saying may be perfectly sound, but it should rather be said, "It is the actual conveyance of the beneficial<sup>1</sup> possession of the Thing signified, even the crucified Saviour Himself."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Thou hast received into thine own possession the everlasting verity, our Saviour Jesus Christ. . . . Thou hast received His Body, which was once broken, and His Blood, which was shed for the remission of thy sin" ("Homily of the Resurrection," p. 389).

So Hooker regards it as universally acknowledged to be true that "the efficacy of His Body and Blood is not all we receive in the Sacrament" (Works, vol. ii., p. 355; ed. Keble). See Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 600; also my "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 343-347.

<sup>2</sup> So Cranmer maintained: "That selfsame Body . . . visible and tangible . . . is eaten of Christian people at His Holy Supper. . . . The

Or some, perhaps, might think it preferable that the same truth should be simply expressed by saying that "it gives to our faith just that which is needed for our spiritual apprehension and beneficial appropriation of a past act, a finished work, a once-offered sacrifice, the salutary fruits of which are for the continual satisfying of our spiritual hunger, and for the continual strengthening and refreshing of our souls."

The true faith of the Christian Church can never forget the *ἐφάραξ*—the "once-for-all," the perfection in the past, of the sacrifice of the Cross. And it is needless to insist on the obvious truism that what is past, and abideth not, cannot be received or possessed any otherwise than in its abiding fruits. But the Christian faith (let it be said again) is ever to have before it the view of the *inseparable connection* of "the benefits which we receive thereby"—not with the representing Sacrament, but—with the represented Sacrifice. And so Christians, having ever Jesus Christ evidently set forth before their eyes *crucified*, and in this ordinance continually showing the Lord's death, have the view of this connection secured to them by the words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood"; that so, drinking, for their soul's thirst, of the "living waters," their faith may be assured that they are drinking of that once-smitten Rock which follows them

---

diversity is not in the Body, but in the eating thereof" ("Lord's Supper," p. 224, P.S. See also p. 232.)

Thus it was said by Robert Bruce: "Thus you see that the thing signified in the Lord's Supper is not the fruits so much, as the Body and Blood, and Christ Jesus, the fountain and substance, from Whom all these fruits do flow and proceed" ("Sermons on the Sacrament," p. 51; Laidlaw's translation).

This eminent Presbyterian divine, once in high favour with King James I., has admirably elucidated the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist. The following extract has a special value: "Will you know of us how the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is present? We will say that they are spiritually present, really present—that is, present in the Supper, and not in the bread. We will not say that His true Flesh is present to the hand or to the mouth of our bodies; but we say it is spiritually present—that is, present to thy spirit and believing soul; yea, even as present inwardly to thy soul as the bread and wine are present to thy body outwardly. Will you ask, then, if the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus be present in the Supper? We answer in a word: They are present in the Supper, but not in the bread and wine, nor in the accidents nor substance of bread and wine. And we make Christ to be present in the Supper, because He is present to my soul, to my spirit and faith. Also we make Him present in the Supper because I have Him in His promise, *This is My Body*, which promise is present to my faith; and the nature of faith is to make things that are absent in themselves yet present. And therefore, seeing that He is both present by faith in His promise and present by the virtue of His Holy Spirit, who can say but that He is present in the Supper?" (pp. 129, 130).

with its streams of life-giving blessing through the desert of their pilgrimage.

The Rock and its smiting, in the Old Covenant, may be said, in a sense, to have been in the river from which "all our fathers" drank, as it followed them in the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> And in the same sense Hooker says: "Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies, quickened to eternal life, are effects the cause whereof is the Person of Christ; His Body and Blood are the true well-spring out of which this life floweth" ("Ecc. Pol.," V., lxxvii., § 5; Works, vol. ii., p. 352, Ed. Keble). So we verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ (the cause in its effect) when our faith feeds on His once-offered sacrifice, and apprehends the benefits which we receive from the merits of His death and Passion.

And it should be clearly seen that the absence and distance in place and in time of this *Res Sacramenti* can be no hindrance whatever in the way of this spiritual feeding, so long as it cannot hinder the soul from realizing the truth: "That Saviour was crucified for me; that Blood was shed for the remission of my sins. Here I receive from my living Saviour the pledges of His love for me, and these for a continual remembrance of His death, to my great and endless comfort; here I receive from Him the assurance that His sacrifice on the cross was *for me*; here He verily gives to my hungry soul all that shall enable my heart to say, with the full assurance of faith: 'All—all is mine.' I take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for me, and I feed on Him in my heart by faith with thanksgiving. Henceforth I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

This is that "true Real Presence" which "no true son of the Church of England [nor Albertinus] did ever deny"—the Presence "to our spirits only" of that which is local and corporal, but which is locally and corporally absent.

So it has been well said: "The Body and Blood as they were on the Cross 'are,' literally as such, no more." They "are things historically past, not present, and so the literal eating and drinking of them must be, as to physical contact, impossible. They are, literally and historically, gone, and lips and throat therefore cannot touch them. But spiritually, in their Divine effects, in the blessings and glories they

<sup>1</sup> According to the interpretation of 1 Cor. x. 4, which is supported by Estius, Calvin, Lightfoot, Scott, and others, and which follows that of Theodore (of Mopsuestia?): ἀκολουθοῦσαν δὲ, ἐπειδὴ τὸ μὲν ἀπαξ ὕδωρ εἶπετε αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον. See Cramer's "Catenæ," tom. v., p. 185; Oxford, 1844.

have won, they *'are'* indeed. In that respect faith, which conquers time, sees them, touches them, takes them, feeds on them."<sup>1</sup>

Let me quote further from an old divine of Queen Elizabeth's days, who, contending faithfully that "the very Body and Blood of our Saviour are present in the Holy Mysteries to the communicants," thus explains the true Presence. He acknowledges that "If corporal substances cannot otherwise be present than corporally, than locally," then "we have not the Presence of our Saviour's Body and Blood in our Communion." But he urges "That which is absent to our bodies and outward man may yet be present to our faith and inward man." And he quotes St. Ambrose, saying, "By faith Christ is touched, by faith Christ is seen"; and from St. Chrysostom, "Such is the power of faith that it can behold and see things that be even far off." And then he adds, "And this is the Presence that we mean, when we say that the Body and Blood of our Saviour be present to us in the Holy Mysteries; that is, not any carnal or corporal Presence devised by our adversaries, but a Presence therefore called spiritual, because the substance present, though it be corporal, is yet by our spirit and faith made present unto us."<sup>2</sup>

If we have to meet the objections of those who would say that this view of "Real Presence" requires a good deal of explanation, and even then is difficult of apprehension, we may acknowledge indeed that it is not so plain (in some sense) as that of those who, taking (as they think) the words of institution strictly—"ut verba sonant"—have brought themselves to accept the human figment of transubstantiation, with all its stupendous difficulties; nor yet so plain as that of those who, on the other side, in spite of the clear words of Scripture, would reduce the Sacrament to bare signs and a mere commemoration of that which is really absent from body and soul, with no real giving, taking, or receiving of anything beyond bread and wine.

But we have been taught by a great divine to recognise that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is "more true than plain," and to beware of those who in error would make it "more plain than true" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," Book V., chap. lii., § 1); and the same caution may, in measure, be applied to the doctrine of the Christian Sacraments.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Professor Moule, in "Pledges of His Love," pp. 76, 77.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. H. Westfaling, "Treatise of Reformation," folios 108b, 110a and 110b; London, 1582.

<sup>3</sup> On this subject, see Bishop Cleaver's "Two Sermons," pp. 8, 9; Oxford, 1790.

And, further, we will venture to contend that the true doctrine ceases to be perplexing when it is seen how graciously it meets the spiritual hunger and thirst, and adapts itself to the spiritual understanding of those who have been taught by the Spirit to know their great need as sinners in God's sight, and have received into their hearts the word of Him who says "I am the Bread of Life"; and "The Bread which I give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The one grand and effectual solvent for all the difficulties of true Eucharistic doctrine is to be found in the conviction of sin as wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit of God. Let the sinner's guilty heart know the reality of sin and the truth of its condemnation, and know how the Son of God has died to take our sins away. Then the ordinance will be seen to be a merciful provision to meet human needs, ordained for us by Him who knows what is in man. And then the awakened and enlightened soul will find little difficulty in apprehending the true doctrine of the Sacrament in its simplicity and in its blessedness. Well was it said by Archbishop Cranmer: "The true doctrine of the first Catholic Christian faith is most plain, clear, and comfortable, without any difficulty, scruple, or doubt—that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although He be sitting in heaven in equality with His Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance, who by His death delivered us from death, and daily nourisheth and increaseth us to eternal life. And in token hereof He hath prepared bread to be eaten and wine to be drunken of us in His Holy Supper, to put us in remembrance of His said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby, which benefits through faith and the Holy Ghost are exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said Holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, and the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rock can remember and give thanks unto God for the same. This is the very doctrine of the Gospel, with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors" ("On Lord's Supper," Book II., against Transubstantiation, P.S. ed., p. 328).

Let it ever be remembered that in this matter we have to do with what pertains to our spirits. All is spiritual. The word "*spiritualiter per fidem*" is the key to the position—the doctrinal position of the Church of England. The Lord's Supper is a thing of spiritual understanding, spiritual perception, spiritual desire, spiritual satisfaction, spiritual receiving, spiritual eating, spiritual appropriation, spiritual digesting. All this is "spiritually by faith." All is spiritual—not "spiritual" in the sense which makes a corporal Body cease to be corporal

—a Body changed from Body to spirit—but “spiritual” in the sense in which the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, with all its spiritual efficacy for the forgiveness of sins, and all other benefits of His Passion, are spiritually presented to be the very Bread of Life for the hunger of our souls.

In the true use of these Holy Mysteries all our spiritual functions are exercised upon what may truly be called a Corporal reality—a stupendous reality which, in faith’s view, is inseparable from “the Body of His Flesh through death”; a reality which belongs to the “peace made by the Blood of His Cross”; a blessed reality which comes of His death who took our flesh that through death He might destroy Him that had the power of death.

And now the bread which He gives for our spiritual food is His Flesh which He has given for the life of the world.

What a testimony is here to the reality and efficacy, to the glory of that finished work, the great redeeming work of the Cross, which is to be the spiritual sustenance of His people “till He come!”

I had made a number of brief extracts—which might have been largely added to—from the writings of typical Churchmen in successive generations, desiring to show that the position maintained by a certain number at the Conference has the support of divines of name and estimation belonging to different schools of theology in the Reformed Church of England. But such a *catena* is found to occupy too much space, and to be hardly suitable for an article in the CHURCHMAN. These quotations, therefore, are reserved for a reprint.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

I thankfully recognise the candour of Canon Gore’s more recent acknowledgment (in a work which contains much that is valuable, and for which all should be thankful) that “a number of Anglicans have undoubtedly made themselves responsible” for a view “according to which there is postulated in the Eucharist some real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ as they were when He was dying or dead upon the cross” (“Body of Christ,” pp. 181, 182); for these words may very well be understood in the sense which gives, as I believe, the true view of English theology—the view which in this paper I have desired to maintain, and for which, as I conceive, we are bound to contend. I gladly also recognise the fairness with which Professor Moberly (in an article marked by Christian kindness and courtesy) also concedes that the view of the *Res Sacramenti* as “Christ’s Body and Blood as separated in Sacrificial Death for our sins,” “has

a long history, and many-sided support. It is no more partisan than it is new" (*Journal of Theol. Studies*, April, 1901, p. 322). And I fully appreciate his saying (p. 338): "I do not mean to deny that, as a whole, the writers quoted do certainly tend, with more or less distinctness, to shape their thought and language on the subject in the same direction as that of Bishop Andrewes." But when, as against what he regards as "these painful mistakes" of Bishop Andrewes and others, Canon Gore writes thus, "It seems wholly unintelligible how divines who in any sense believe in a real presence can speak of the Eucharistic body—one hesitates even to write the words—as 'the corpse' of Christ" (p. 183), I must venture to think that he is unintentionally importing into the language of English divines a sense of "Real Presence" which (as I am persuaded) they would have clearly rejected. Andrewes has no word to suggest the idea of "the corpse" of Christ as being either reproduced, or "sacrificed afresh," or being *carried forward* to be really present in the Eucharistic elements. The Anglican doctrine is that our faith *takes us back* to feed on the sacrifice of Christ once offered as verily as our bodies are fed with the visible and exhibitivè signs which in the delivery bear the names of His Body given and His Blood shed for us. The words of Andrewes are quite clear: "We are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*Sursum corda*), but we are also *carried back* to Christ as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering."

When Canon Gore speaks of Bishop Andrewes (and such as he) as using language "which is certainly highly misleading, unless they mean—which God forbid!—that there is in every Eucharist a Body sacrificed afresh and Blood shed anew in death" (p. 183), he can hardly, as it seems to me, have in view the possibility of Andrewes holding a "True Presence" except as a Presence *sub speciebus*, such a Presence as will find little support from the writings of Andrewes (see his *Minor Works*, A.C.L., pp. 13, 14, 16, 17, 35).

The very fact that the true *Res Sacramenti* is the Body and Blood as separate in death suffices in the Anglican view to dismiss any such idea of Real Presence as Canon Gore seems (I think) to regard as its only legitimate meaning (see, e.g., *Cosin's Works*, vol. iv., p. 17, A.C.L.). What we feed on as presented and exhibited to our faith (*i.e.*, "Corpus quâ crucifixum et mortuum") is that which actually has now no existence "*in rerum naturâ*." And we shall search in vain (I believe) to find any of our great English divines pleading the omnipotence of God as making credible a Real Presence on the altar of that which can have no actual presence any-

where, seeing it is a *non ens*. I believe it will be found that the Divine working which they often *do* speak of in the mysteries, is the spiritual drawing of the sin-convinced, hungering soul to be spiritually satisfied in feeding on the sacrifice of Christ, made present to our faith, and so being incorporated into the Death of Christ, and so into the Spiritual Union, whereby we dwell in Christ "the living One," and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us. Thus, to take an example: Bishop Morton speaks of the nourishment "which is spiritual, and soul's food," and "is the Body and Blood of the Lord (therefore called Spiritual, because it is the object of faith) by a Union wrought by God's Spirit and man's faith: which . . . is most real and ineffable" ("On Eucharist," Book V., ch. i., sect. 1, p. 308, ed. 1635). It is *thus* that "by the incomprehensible power of His Eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He as in the very act of His offering is made present to us." (See Moberly, p. 323.) And *this* presence requires and suggests no conception of the Blood "as stopping short and remaining in a state of death" (p. 337)—nor any "reproduction of a point in the past as present" (p. 323). Indeed, I venture to question whether, in the whole range of English theology (with the exception of one modern writer), any word can be found which, fairly interpreted, can be said to require such a conception of the Eucharistic Presence as that which, if I understand him aright (and I would gladly believe that I have misunderstood him), Canon Gore would make "a number of Anglicans" responsible for maintaining. But in saying this, I am not intending for a moment to suggest that Canon Gore has wilfully misrepresented their meaning.

I desire to express myself humbly. And I feel that I ought to write diffidently in controverting the views of two such learned divines as Professor Moberly and Canon Gore. I desire not to speak too confidently. I may be wrong. But I find it very difficult to speak honestly and at the same time to express myself doubtfully on this matter. Rather I find myself constrained to entertain something like a confident hope that Canon Gore, on further examination, will see that he has been looking through glasses which have tended to obscure rather than to clear his view of the teaching of our English divines. And I am sure that Canon Gore would not willingly do injustice to the memory of such men.

I cannot help thinking that the words of Andrewes, "If a host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve," contain in themselves the answer to all such conceptions of his meaning as seem to me (perhaps in error) to be involved in Professor Moberly's explanation of his language. I should be sorry to seem to magnify points of difference.



But it is not "the Lamb as it had been slain," but the Lamb "at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering," which the Bishop sets before us, as exhibited to us in the Eucharistic feast. He distinctly asserts (and Professor Moberly quotes the words to demur to them, p. 337) that Christ "as He now is, glorified, is not, cannot be, *immolatus*."<sup>1</sup> It is hard to believe that, for the sake of a "pungent epigram" (p. 337), the Bishop could have expressed so very clearly and distinctly what he did not regard as strictly sound and quite theologically true.

It was truly said by Archbishop Wake, "Whatever Real Presence, then, this Bishop [Andrewes] believed, it must be of His crucified Body, and as in the state of His death; and this, I think, cannot be otherwise *present* than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge—either *figuratively* in the *elements*, or *spiritually* in the souls of those who worthily receive them" ("Discourse of H. Euch.," p. 63, London, 1687).

It is true indeed, as was well said by that remarkable man and truly great divine, the martyr Bradford, that "Christ's Body is no dead carcase; he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit, which is not without grace, I ween" ("Sermons," etc., p. 512, P.S.). But the sin-convicted soul hungers with a hunger which can only be satisfied by feeding spiritually on the sacrificial feast—the Bread which "the Son of Man will give," and of which He says, "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 51).

And so elsewhere Bradford says: "It is not simply bread and wine, but rather Christ's Body, so-called of Christ, and so to be called and esteemed of us. But here let us mark what Body and Blood Christ called it. . . . Christ called it 'His Body which is broken,' 'His Blood which is shed' presently . . . so in the celebration of the Lord's Supper the very Passion of Christ should be as present, beholden with the eyes of faith; for which end Christ our Saviour did especially institute this supper" ("Sermons," etc., p. 102, P.S.).

Longing for life, and life more abundant, in the living Saviour, the believing soul knows (or should surely learn) that it can only be obtained through fellowship with Christ's

---


<sup>1</sup> No one, I imagine, doubts that the Bishop's "immolatus" is patient of the sense which Professor Moberly would fain give it (p. 337). But then, also, no one, I imagine, with the context before him, can believe that it is the sense which the Bishop meant it to bear (see p. 323).

death, through a spiritual partaking of His Body and Blood, as given and shed for our redemption.

The death of Christ is the only deliverance by which the soul can pass from the condemnation and death which belong to the leprosy disease and awful guilt and outcasting of human nature, into that spiritual life of loving communion and fellowship with God in Christ's risen manhood which belongs to the health and truth of human nature.

And, sorry as I am to differ from Canon Gore and Professor Moberly, I would fain hope and believe that in *this*, at least, we may be in substantial agreement.

N. DIMOCK.



## ART. II.—THE EXTENSION OF THE DIACONATE: A CLERICAL VIEW.

IT is an obvious piece of human wisdom that each man should make the best use possible of the materials he has to his hand, and should not waste time in sighing for things which are beyond his reach. The farmer must do the best he can with the land he has; the statesman must put to service the abilities which exist in the men of his country; and the same thing is true of the Church in its efforts to deal with the tasks which it has in hand. The more these tasks increase in quantity, and in the anxiety they cause, the more needs there is to keep well in sight all the material which exists for dealing with the tasks, and putting it to the utmost use.

1. The increase of the Church's task is readily represented by the fact that for some time past the population of England and Wales has been growing at about 300,000 a year. This, otherwise stated, is a growth day by day of nearly 1,000; or, stated once again with more accuracy, a growth of about 6,000 per week on an average. The Church's tasks in the face of this increase may be compared with the responsibilities resting upon the parents and elder children in any family. If in any family the standard of uprightness and religion is to be maintained, and the family is to avoid losing its character for right thought and action, it can only be by the elder ones being able to exert a sufficient influence over the younger ones as they are added to the family, to result in naughty tempers and inclinations of these young ones being checked, and desires being developed in favour of what is right, and against what is wrong. If this be not done, the good character of the family must be a declining quantity. The case with