

any truth it might possess. Yet, with all the breadth of view, a profound belief in the God-given character of Scripture, and the consequent priceless value of the gift, permeated him through and through. He once said to me: "I do not think you could alter any word in Scripture for any other without incurring some loss." Again: "Behind and above all our controversies there is the Life. . . . However the Old Testament came to be, it was the Book of the Lord and of His Apostles."

For many years there existed in Cambridge a society of graduates which met in term-time for the critical study of the Old Testament. This society—now, alas! defunct—was successively presided over by Dr. Phillips, Dr. Lightfoot, and Dr. Westcott. Under Dr. Lightfoot's presidency some good work was done in revising the translation of some of the Minor Prophets, in days when as yet the Revised Version was unheard of. When Dr. Westcott became president, he suggested that we should devote ourselves to the later chapters of Ezekiel (chap. xl. *et seq.*), which perhaps have not their equal for difficulty in the Old Testament, and yet are of engrossing importance in their bearing on Pentateuchal criticism. He threw himself heartily into the difficulties, as if it were here that his highest interests were seated.

How ungrudging he was in all cases of affording help in difficulties of study to those who consulted him! I can speak very gratefully myself of two occasions when, having asked questions which I supposed might mean the expenditure of five minutes, he gave, in spite of some deprecation on my part, two or three hours' careful examination and discussion of the points at issue. It is outside the scope of the few reminiscences which I have tried to note down, yet no reference to Dr. Westcott's Cambridge life should ignore the warm interest—the interest recalling the keen, apostolic zeal of an earlier day—he at all times showed in the cause of Foreign Missions, notably, of course, that of Delhi, but extending to all efforts for the cause of Christ.

R. SINKER.

ART. II.—THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE AND CANON GORE'S BOOK.—II.

IN criticising the three statements—those of Dr. Moule, Lord Halifax, and Canon Gore—I would say that while Dr. Moule hits the mark with exactness when he says that Christ is present, "not on the holy table, but *at it*"—that is, at the ordinance, not in the elements—he yet expresses himself, I think, too rhetorically. Were our eyes opened, he says, we

should see our Lord bless the elements and distribute them with the words He originally used and should worship Him there present. This seems to me to be going too far. Christ is present at our morning and evening prayer likewise, for He has promised it; but we do not picture Him as saying the prayers in the place of the officiating minister, nor as being, through His presence, a special object of prayer there, but rather as "joying and beholding" our "order and the steadfastness of our faith" (Col. ii. 5), rejoicing in the congregation's devotion, sanctifying the meeting by making one of it, and helping the prayers of His brethren. So, I think, we should regard His presence at the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, not invisibly officiating, not being an object of devotion, which even the liturgies of the sixth and seventh centuries never represent Him to be, but blessing, comforting, helping and lifting the hearts of His brethren to heaven when they strive to lift them up unto the Lord. In other respects we can thankfully accept Dr. Moule's statement.

Lord Halifax's statement we cannot accept at all. He holds that the bread and wine "become the Body and Blood of Christ," or "are sacramentally identified" with them, meaning apparently by "sacramentally" "in a sphere outside the cognizance of our senses," or supernaturally. This does not exclude the theory of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation, as every believer in Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation must acknowledge that the change, effected, as they suppose, by consecration, is supernatural. Nor is his addition of the word "spiritually," when he describes the nature of the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, such as to enable us to accept his doctrine of Christ's presence in it. For he explains that by "spiritually" he means "after the manner of a spirit"—that is, that Christ's body is present in the bread after the manner of a spirit or angel. And this is the very point which Jeremy Taylor selects as constituting the difference between the Popish and Protestant acceptation of the word "spiritually." "Where now," he says, "is the difference? Here. By 'spiritually' they mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by 'spiritually' we mean 'present to our spirits only.' Their way makes His body to be present no way but that which is impossible, and implies a contradiction—a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit, a body without a body . . . not after the manner of all (bodies) or any body, but after the manner of being as an angel is in a place—that is *their* 'spirituality.'" ["If souls and spirits could be present, as here Bellarmine teacheth," says Bishop Cosin ("Hist. Trans.," iii. 1), "yet it would be absurd to say that bodies could be likewise, it being incon-

sistent with their nature."] "But we," continues Taylor, "by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace" ("Real Presence," i. 8).

Canon Gore's statement is based on Irenæus's saying, that "the bread which is of the earth receiving the invocation of God is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly." By this expression Irenæus probably meant no more than we mean when we say that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is an outward and an inward part. Canon Gore accepts Lord Halifax's term "sacramentally identified" as expressing the relation between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ. How that sacramental identification according to him takes place, he has since explained at greater length than he could do in the Conference.

It may be said, then, that no agreement was come to by the Conference, except that the ordinance is a means of grace. Was it, then, fruitless? I do not think so. It led fifteen men honestly to try to understand each other's position, and it is not without its results beyond itself. The two most evident of these results are: (1) A series of articles on the Conference which have appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* by Mr. Dimock, in the first of which he explains in what sense English Churchmen may, and in what sense they may not, hold the doctrine of the Real Presence. (2) A more elaborate work has been published by Canon Gore, called "The Body of Christ." This was written with reference to the Conference, and a chapter is given to the question of the Divine gift in Holy Communion, and another to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, as in the Conference. Canon Gore maintains the gift to be the living Body, and therefore Person of Christ, sent down from heaven after the bread and wine have been mystically conveyed from the earthly altars to a heavenly altar, and there converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, which are then replaced on the altars at which the priests are officiating instead of the bread and wine.

The theory of a heavenly altar, and the consecration at it of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, is the resource of thinkers who are shocked at the coarse materialism of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation effected by a priestly formula, and yet are resolved to maintain the doctrine of the Objective Presence in the elements, which underlies and is best expressed by Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation. The idea of there being a heavenly altar finds itself on an expression of Irenæus, which a careful inspection of the passage in which it occurs would show at once to be

metaphorical. Irenæus is urging that God has no need of our alms and offerings, but that He desires that we should present them to Him for our own sakes, and therefore Christ has ordered us to make offerings frequently and constantly "at the altar." Then he proceeds: "The altar is in heaven, for towards that place our prayers and offerings are addressed; the temple likewise, as John says in the Apocalypse: 'And the temple of God was opened in heaven' (Rev. xi. 19); the tabernacle also, 'for behold,' he says, 'the tabernacle of God in which He will dwell with men'" (Rev. xv. 5; John i. 14. "Adv. Hær.," iv. 18). Can any man believe that Irenæus supposed that there is a material altar, temple, ark of the testament, and tabernacle in heaven, at and in which Christians are to offer their prayers and alms? Is it not plainly, a spiritualizing of the Jewish worship offered in Jerusalem and in the wilderness? And is not its purpose to show that our prayers and alms are not to be addressed and offered to a local spot, like those of the Jews, but to God in heaven? Canon Gore translates: "There is therefore an altar in heaven, for it is thither," etc., instead of "The altar" (which has just been mentioned) "is in heaven," and he says that "Irenæus asserts the existence of the heavenly altar as necessarily presupposed in Eucharistic worship, and says: 'Thither our prayers and offerings are directed.'" But Irenæus is not confining himself to Eucharistic worship and offerings in the passage under consideration, but is speaking of the prayers and alms of Christians in general; and had Canon Gore quoted the rest of the sentence which he has indicated by the "etc.," it would have been made clear that Irenæus no more teaches that there is an altar in heaven than he teaches that there is a tabernacle in heaven and a temple in heaven, where St. John specially says there is no temple, "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it" (Rev. xxi. 22).

We have higher authority for the existence of the temple, the ark, and the tabernacle in heaven than of an altar, whether the altar of sacrifice, as Mr. Gore's argument requires, or the golden altar of incense, as he afterwards suggests.

It is probable that the idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice taking place in heaven arose, not so much from Irenæus' words, which everyone would recognise as metaphorical, as from the efforts made by liturgical commentators to explain a prayer introduced into the Roman Mass by Gregory I., it would seem, at the end of the sixth century, which still retains its place there. It is as follows: "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, to command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angel to Thine altar on high in sight of

the divine Majesty, so that all of us who by communion at this altar receive the holy Body and Blood of Thy Son may be fulfilled with heavenly benediction and grace, through the same Christ our Lord." Whether by the Holy Angel is meant the Lord Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost, or an angel, or some other spiritual conveyance, is acrimoniously disputed down to the present day, nor is there any more agreement as to what the altar on high (*sublime*) means, or what "these things" signify. Is it not altogether irrational and irreverent, as well as unscriptural and unprimitive, to believe that whenever a priest says a Mass, angels, or more than angels, carry the bread and wine to heaven in mystery, that the Holy Ghost there makes them the Body and Blood of Christ, that, thus converted, they are brought down again by the same agency that took them up, and laid upon the altar at which the priest is officiating, no longer bread and wine, but the Person of Christ, which may therefore be worshipped? There are several ways in which the transaction is said to be performed. Paschasius Radbert, the first promulgator of the theory which four centuries after his time received the name of Transubstantiation, represents the manner in which it takes place as follows: "The priest sends up the gifts of the people by the hand of an angel to God, and receives them back again made effectual by the Body and the Blood, and distributes them to one and all, not as being what the outward vision suggests, but what faith apprehends" "De Corp. et Sang.," viii., quoted by Mr. Gore, p. 191). Mr. Gore's theory, less gross than some, is that the Church, having besought God "by the consecrating power of the Holy Ghost to fill the sacrifice with a Divine power by accepting the earthly elements at the heavenly altar, He by His Spirit consecrates the gifts, to be, in the midst of the worshipping Church, the Body and Blood of the Lord" (p. 212). "In the midst of the worshipping Church" might probably be otherwise expressed "as an object of worship in the Church." Is not the ordinary theory of Transubstantiation more simple and more credible than this elaborate imagination, which, springing from a misunderstanding of a metaphor of Irenæus and of a prayer of Pope Gregory, contains within it the very doctrine that Transubstantiation was invented to justify and explain?

We may gladly allow that Mr. Gore's view is more spiritual than that of many Ritualist and Roman writers, and we may note with satisfaction some acknowledgments and concessions that he has made. We may be glad that he discountenances the use of separate wafers (p. 44); that he shrinks from Cardinal Vaughan's formula of "Christ made present on the altar under the forms of bread and wine" (p. 91); that he

apparently deprecates "the worship of Christ as in virtue of consecration made present upon the altar as upon a throne," and as "coming" before consecration and "having come" after consecration (p. 99), and the conception that Christ's indwelling ceases when the host is digested (p. 122); and that he rejects Transubstantiation, seeing in it a monophysite tendency (p. 113); and deprecates non-communicating attendance (p. 136), and reservation for worship (p. 137), and allows that the presence is "to certain persons" only—"that is, the sons and daughters of faith" (p. 142); and that a Christian Eucharist in the first age must have frequently resembled a modern harvest thanksgiving (p. 172); and that Christ's death is not repeated or renewed (p. 175); and that the sacrifices of the new law were sacrifices of persons (p. 208); and that "in the self-oblation of the Church is the culmination of the sacrifice" (p. 213); and that we are not bound by medieval authority (p. 265); and that Communion in one kind is wrong (p. 280).

But when we find that, according to Canon Gore, "the elements become sacramentally identified with the Body and Blood of Christ," and that "this"—not Christ's presence at the ordinance—"is what is called the doctrine of an objectively Real Presence in the Eucharist" (p. 73), "expressing the belief that, prior to reception and independently of the faith of the individual, the Body and Blood of Christ are made present 'under the forms of' bread and wine, or in some real, though undefined, way identified with them" (p. 74); and that "the Flesh and Blood are quite inseparable from the living Person of Christ Himself" (p. 94); and that "a Divine Presence is bestowed upon the earthly elements at the altar" (p. 98); and that "what consecration brings about" is "Christ's adoption of the Church's gifts to become His Body and Blood," and that then "worship is more or less focussed upon these holy symbols and instruments" (p. 105); and that "spiritual" does not mean "to our spirits," as Jeremy Taylor taught, but "after the manner of a spirit," which Jeremy Taylor called the Popish view, and was consistently maintained by Dr. Newman (pp. 124, 297); and that "the Spirit consecrates the gifts at the heavenly altar to be in the midst of the worshipping Church the Body and Blood of the Lord" (p. 212); and that "the bread and wine are consecrated to be, prior to reception, spiritually and really the Body and Blood of Christ" (p. 231); and that it is assumed that "an objective presence, previous to the act of reception and independent of it," is "the accepted doctrine of the ancient Church" (p. 234); and that "'not discerning the Body' means not discerning Christ's own personal manhood given us

in the Sacrament," instead of not distinguishing the sacred from the common elements of the social feast (p. 245); and that the "Church's earthly sacrifice becomes identified with Christ's heavenly offering" (p. 250); and that the meaning of "we have an altar" is that the altar "is something in heaven corresponding" (not now to the sacrificial altar, but) "to the 'golden altar,' which belonged," says Mr. Gore, "to the Jewish Holy of Holies" (*sic*, p. 261); and that "the unseen reality of the Eucharist is Christ as He is in heaven" (p. 309)—when we consider the cumulative force of all these statements, we do not find much advance on the position occupied by Lord Halifax. For the point to which we attach importance is not whether the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ takes place on an altar in a church or on a supposed altar in heaven, but whether the change takes place at all in such a sense that He is not only present at the ordinance, which we all allow, but is contained or enclosed within the consecrated bread and wine, which, with Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, and the consentient line of Anglican divines, we deny for ourselves and for our Church.

If it were not seen before, I think that the Conference, with the publications consequent upon it, has made it clear that the point of cleavage between those called Ritualists and other members of the Church of England is the doctrine of the objective presence of Christ *in the elements*, as distinguished from His presence (objective, if you will) *at the ordinance* of the Lord's Supper.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. III.—MESSAGES FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

VI.—HEBREWS IX.

THE Epistle has exhibited to us the glory of the eternal Priest, and the wealth and grandeur of the new Covenant. It advances now towards the Sanctuary and the Sacrifice wherein we see that Covenant sanctified and sealed, under the auspices of our great "Priest upon His throne."

The great Teacher first dilates to "the Hebrews" upon the outstanding features of the Type. He enumerates the main features of that "Sanctuary, adapted to (this visible) world" (*τὸ ἄγιον, κοσμικόν*), which was attached to the first Covenant (ver. 1).¹ Particularly, he emphasizes its double structure,

¹ Assuredly we must delete *σκηνή* from the text in this verse, and understand *διαθήκη* (see viii. 13) after *ἡ πρώτη*.