

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

foreign stations, but home platforms; that tired workers from abroad should be allowed more rest; that, instead of their merely stimulating the home parish, the home parish should rather refresh them. These and many other thoughts arise; but enough has been written to point the fact that much magnificent work has been done, that many difficulties remain to be overcome, and that unique opportunities present themselves at the dawn of this twentieth century.

E. GRAHAM INGHAM (Bp.).



ART. II.—THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:  
II. THE EUCHARIST PRESENCE IN RELATION TO  
SACRIFICIAL DEATH.

IT appears that the distinction drawn by Bishop Jeremy Taylor (as alleged in the Fourth Session of the Conference, p. 70) between the two senses of "Spiritually" as applied to the Eucharistic Presence is regarded by some as little better than a quibble. In truth, the distinction is far-reaching and very important. The two senses are necessarily connected with two divergent and widely separate systems of doctrine. "By 'spiritually'" (says Taylor) "they [the Romanists] mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by 'spiritually' we mean present to our spirits only"—that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or spiritual susception" (Works, vol. vi., p. 17, ed. Eden).<sup>1</sup>

This distinction is intimately connected with a question which was much discussed in the Conference, and on which the Conference was divided with a division which on both sides, I think, was felt to be serious, viz., the question: "What is the true *Res Sacramenti* in the Eucharist? Is it the Body of Christ as now living and glorified in heaven? Or is it the Body of Christ as offered in sacrifice for our sins?" All present were agreed that in the Eucharist there is in a very true and real sense a giving, taking, and receiving of that which is signified by the outward and visible signs. And none, I think, were desirous of explaining away or watering down the "verily and indeed" of this taking and receiving. All were also of one mind as to the real union and

<sup>1</sup> For Patristic testimonies against the Romish view of a body present after the manner of spirits, see Dr. Patrick's "Full View of Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church," chap. v., in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. ix., p. 111 *et seq.*; London, 1848.

communion with the Risen Life of the ever-living Saviour—the sacramental grace whereby we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us. But there was a want of agreement as to what is that which is signified by the sacramental symbols.

Both sides, indeed, were so far in accord as to say that it was the Body and Blood of Christ. But while a portion of those present held that it must be the Body and Blood no otherwise than as separated in sacrificial death, and so making propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, it was urged on the other side that there seemed “an insuperable difficulty in speaking of two distinct bodies of our Lord, a crucified and a glorified one,” that we could hardly conceive of our partaking of the crucified Body except through being made partakers of the glorified Body—“the only Body now existing” (see pp. 50, 51).

Chancellor Smith met this objection by observing that the antithesis between the crucified and glorified Body of our Lord “was inevitable, and was actually exhibited in the original institution” (p. 52).

Indeed, the very words of our Saviour’s ordinance are so strong an evidence on this point, they so distinctly set before our faith’s view the Body as separate from the Blood, and the Blood in the condition of separation from the Body, even as actually “shed for the remission of sins,”<sup>1</sup> that some even

<sup>1</sup> See especially Waterland, Works, vol. iv., p. 614 *et seq.* For Patristic testimony to the *Res Sacramenti* as in the condition of death, see my “Eucharistic Worship,” pp. 303-316. See also Vogan’s “True Doctrine,” p. 108.

The testimony may be summed up, perhaps, in the words of Hesychius Hieros.: “Carnem Ejus, quæ ad comedendam inepta erat ante passionem (quis enim comedere cupiebat carnem Dei?) aptam cibo post passionem fecit. Si enim non fuisset crucifixus, sacrificium corporis Ejus minime comederemus” (“In Lev.,” Lib. I., cap. ii., quoted from “Bibli. Max.,” tom. xii., p. 59). And perhaps with equal force in the short saying of Chrysostom: *Μυστήριον ἐστὶ τὸ πάθος καὶ ὁ σταυρὸς*, given as the teaching of the words of Institution. See “In Mat.,” Hom. LXXXII. or LXXXIII., Op., tom. vii., p. 783; ed. Montfaucon.

It will be clearly seen, I think, that the view of Christ, “the Living One . . . alive for evermore,” bearing the wound-marks of His death, the Lamb “as it had been slain” (*ὡς ἐσφαγμένον*), fails to meet the requirements of this (and such like) Patristic language. The Resurrection should, indeed, be in view. But it is not the Saviour risen from the dead, but the Son of God in His death, which is, strictly speaking, the *Res Sacramenti* of the Lord’s Supper.

It should be observed, in estimating the value of these testimonies, that in cases where the application is made primarily to the Sacramental representation, we are not the less to see a witness to the truth in its application to that which is represented. The quasi-dramatic (see, e.g., the *Θύσον δέσποτα* in Goar, “Euch.,” p. 57; Venice, 1730) significance in

among the advocates of the Real Presence in the *Corporal* sense have felt themselves constrained to maintain a presence of the Body and Blood in the elements as there actually (in some sense) reproduced, or made there to exist, in the condition of death.

Some few Lutheran divines (as represented by Osiander) would have us regard such a view as presenting no insuperable difficulty to a faith which recognises the almighty power of God, to which nothing is impossible (see "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 540, 541).<sup>1</sup> And it is well known, I believe, that, in the view of Archdeacon Freeman, we are to see in the Eucharist the Presence of Christ's crucified Body as there dead, which is not to be adored because it does not include

the sign is a reflection of that which has its most real relation to the THING SIGNIFIED, and still testifies to the fact that the true Spiritual Food in the mysteries is the Body and Blood of Christ, to be beheld as present, and received by faith, as separate in sacrificial death for our sins. See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 307, 308, 311, 312; and Dr. J. Patrick's "Full View," pp. 84, 85; London, 1688.

Chrysostom says: Ἐπεὶ τὸν ἐν σταυρῷ προσηλωμένον μέλλοντα καὶ ἡμεῖς κατὰ τὴν ἐσπέραν ταύτην ἰδεῖν ὡς ἄμωρον ἐσφαγμένον καὶ τεθυμένον (tom. ii., p. 401). Again, speaking of the Sacramental donation: Ἐαυτὸν παρέθηκε τεθυμένον (tom. vii., c. 517).

Compare the following: "Unus pro omnibus mortuus est; et Idem . . . in mysterio panis ac vini, reficit immolatus. vivificat creditus" (Gaudentius Brix., "Sermones," p. 33; ed. Galeardus, 1757).

"Cenam suam dedit, passionem suam dedit" (Augustinus, Op., tom. iv., Par. I., c. 100; ed. Ben., 1688).

The following testimony is perhaps not less valuable because comparatively recent: "Hoc ipse Dominus ostendit in traditione sacramenti. Cum enim dixisset: Hoc est corpus meum; Hic est sanguis meus, non adjecit eis miracula, dicens, quod mortuos suscitavit, quod leprosos mandavit. Sed quid? Passionem solum et mortem? Quod pro vobis frangitur. Qui pro vobis effunditur. Et quænam est ratio, quod non miraculorum sed passionum meminit? Quoniam hæc sunt illis tanto magis necessaria, quod hæc quidem sunt nostræ salutis efficientes, et sine his minime possit homo resurgere" (Nicolaus Cabasilas, "Lit. Expositio," cap. vii., quoted from "Bibliol. Max.," tom. xxvi., p. 178).

Some of the Fathers held it to be doubtful whether the Resurrection Body is possessed of blood, which is an argument of force against the view of the *Res Sacramenti* being the glorified Body of our Lord. On this point see Dr. J. Patrick's "Full View," pp. 91, 92; London, 1688.

<sup>1</sup> "Deus igitur cum sit omnipotens corpus sine sanguine, et sanguinem sine corpore nobis præbere potest, vivo nihilominus Christo, et salvâ Corporis et sanguinis ejus substantiâ" ("Apologia Osiandri." See Cœlestini, "Hist. Com.," Aug. Cel., tom. iii., folio 86a; Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597). On such arguments, see Cranmer, "Lord's Supper," pp. 34, 35, 86, P.S.

It had also been maintained by some whose names are of high authority in the Romish Church, "Corpus posse per Divinam potentiam simul vivum et mortuum in diversis locis esse" (see Albertinus, "De Encharistia," p. 75; ed. 1654). Such a view, however, is rejected by Bellarmine ("De Euch.," I., cap. xii.).

the Presence of His Divine Person (*ibid.*, p. 473; see also pp. 565, 566; see also "The Church and the World," p. 325).

But such views were not represented at the Conference, and it is doubtful whether they ever have had, or are ever likely to have, any very widespread influence, because (if we believe that Christ died unto sin *once*) they seem to demand of us an assent to the statement which makes the past time to be really present time in after time, or (to use the words of Thorndike) would make "the present time to become the present time another time" (*ibid.*, p. 540).

In the Conference the section of the members before spoken of (unless I misrepresent any of them, in which case I shall hope to be corrected) firmly adhered to the doctrine so distinctly and emphatically stated by Bishop Andrewes, which has sometimes been stigmatized as "the *cadaver* theory," contending—as divines of the Reformed Church of England have constantly and, I believe, uniformly contended—that the true *Res Sacramenti* can only be fairly interpreted as being the Body and Blood of Christ viewed as in propitiatory sacrifice sundered by death,<sup>1</sup> the death which He died for our sins (see "Report of Conference," pp. 50, 74).

If we reject the idea of the event which belonged to a date nearly two thousand years past being made to belong also in its past reality to the reality of the present hour, it follows from this view that the true *Res Sacramenti* is to be regarded as that which is locally and corporally absent,<sup>2</sup> and not absent only but distant, and distant not in place only but in time. And then the question arises: How can that which is thus absent be given, taken, and received in the Sacrament? The answer to this difficulty as given by our divines (and by Reformed theologians generally) is substantially this: It is given by effectual signs, signs changed not in nature but in use,<sup>3</sup> being ordained by the Divine Giver to be signs exhibitiv

<sup>1</sup> Thus it is well said by Cajetan: "Non solum Ipse verbum est cibus et vita mundi, sed etiam Ipse Crucifixus, mortuus, etc., est panis et vita mundi. . . . Manifestissime explicat panem hunc fore passionem et mortem suam. . . . Separatio carnis et sanguinis manifeste mortem Christi in qua separatus est sanguis a carne explicat" ("In Joan," cap. vi., "Evang. Com.," folio 163b; edit. 1530). "Clare apparet quod non est ad literam sermo de manducare et bibere sacramentum Eucharistiae, sed de manducare et bibere mortem Jesu" (*ibid.*, folio 164b). "Transfert cibi nomen et rationem a cibo corporis ad cibum animæ" (*ibid.*).

<sup>2</sup> On the use of the terms *memoria*, *munus in memoriam*, *pignus*, etc., by ancient writers as testimonies of such Real Absence, see my "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 293-296.

<sup>3</sup> This change of use requires, of course, Divine appointment, and (in a certain true sense) Divine sanctification for its purpose. See Cranmer,

and donative of the things whose names they bear in the delivery. Thus, constantly, even in human transactions, estates, absent and distant, are conveyed by mere paper and ink and wax, changed in use to be made, by the act and deed and seal of the donor, to be effectual means for the donation of that which they describe and signify.<sup>1</sup>

But then comes in of necessity another question: Is not the true *Res Sacramenti* given, taken, and received that it may be eaten? Did not the Lord, who ordained the Sacrament, say: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you"? Does not the analogy of the donation of distant estates by effectual signs

---

"Lord's Supper," p. 308, P.S., who makes it "a great change" (p. 417). Bradford regards it as a "great miracle" ("Sermons," etc., p. 95, P.S.). Ridley regards it as effected by the "omnipotency of Christ's Word" (Works, p. 275, P.S.). Latimer speaks of it as "such a change as no power but the omnipotency of God can make" ("Remains," p. 286, P.S.). Bishop Bilson says: "This change is not the casting away of anything that was in the bread, either nature or substance, but the casting into it of an heavenly and invisible grace" ("Real Difference," p. 812; Oxford, 1585. See also pp. 711, 712). Our divines not unfrequently refer to the words of Theodoret: *Τὰ ὀρώμενα σύμβολα τῆ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγοῦν τετιμῆκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταλαβὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῆ φύσει προστεθεικώς* (Dial. I., "Immutabilis," Op., tom. iv., p. 26; ed. Schulze; Halæ, 1772).

On this subject see Bradford's "Sermons," etc., p. 498, note, P.S.; Bramhall's Works, vol. i., p. 10, A.C.L.; Ussher's Works, vol. ii., p. 429; London, 1613; Jeremy Taylor's Works, vol. vi., pp. 13-15; edit. Eden; Goode, "On Each," II., pp. 836, 924, 969, 970; Vogan's "True Doctrine," p. 186.

<sup>1</sup> See Archbishop Ussher, Works, vol. ii., p. 429. It is not to be wondered at if those who hold the Real Presence in the Corporal sense should feel a strong objection to such illustrations (see Archdeacon Chariton's Preface to Waterland's "Letters," p. 13). In their view they are consistently regarded as indicating an ignorance or denial of the true doctrine of the Eucharist, seeing they imply (in their view) a *real absence* instead of a Real Presence.

That this objection was not made by our great English divines is strong evidence that they did not hold the novel view of the "Real Objective Presence." And, indeed, it would be a mistake to suppose that the use of such illustrations was peculiar to our early Reformers or to the doctrinal Puritans. The teaching which they illustrate is expressed by no one more clearly than Bishop Cosin, by no one more forcibly than Dean Brevint, by no one more emphatically than Dr. Waterland.

Cosin compares the donation of the Body and Blood of Christ by the tradition of the Elements to the donation of an estate by "a testator" putting "deeds and title in the hand of his heir with these words, 'Take the house which I bequeath thee'" (see Works, vol. iv., p. 180; see also p. 219, A.C.L.).

Brevint says: "If a Father will part his estate amongst his children, delivering into their hands the Titles or Deeds of what he gives, he says, My Son, here is the Land which my Father left me; and this is the

altogether fail here? That which is given as food, must it not be (in some sort) really present to be eaten?<sup>1</sup>

And these questions are to be met by asking two other questions: "For what is this food given?" and "To what is this food given?"

1. First, "For what is this food given? Is it to satisfy the hunger of the body or the soul?" There will hardly be any doubt as to the answer to this question. It is to satisfy the hunger and thirst of the soul which hungers and thirsts to feed upon the remission of sins, the atonement of the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice made upon the Cross for the sins of the whole world. And for *this* there needs no local Presence, no Real Presence in the Corporal sense. The Real Presence to our spirits is certainly all that is needed here.

2. Again: "To what is this food given?" It is given not to our bodies, but to our souls—to satisfy that hunger and thirst which pertains not to our bodies, but to our souls. And to take, receive, and eat that which is food for our spirits requires only "presence to our spirits." And if it is objected, "Can that which is absent in place and in time be present to our spirits?" the answer is, "Certainly it can." The saying of Ecolampadius—of whom Bishop Jeremy Taylor testified that he was able to teach most men "in that question" (Works, vol. vi., p. 17<sup>2</sup>)—"Per fidem absentissimum Corpus Christi animo præsentissimum est" (In "Epistolæ Doctorum Virorum," folio 129*a*, 1548)—is but an echo of a sound which

House which I bought since, etc." ("Missale Romanum," p. 214; Oxford, 1673).

Waterland says: "A deed of conveyance, or any like instrument under hand and seal, is not a real estate, but it conveys one; and it is in effect the estate itself, as the estate goes along with it" ("Sacramental Feeding," chap. vii., Works, vol. iv., p. 572; Oxford, 1843).

The use of such illustrations is such a commonplace among English theologians that it would be a weariness to attempt a collection of examples. See Waterland, Works, vol. iv., pp. 571, 606; vol. v., pp. 208, 209; "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 87, 152, 262-264, 408-410, 428; Goode, "On Eucharist," II., p. 834.

It must not be supposed, however, that such illustrations express the whole truth in this matter. "This must not be dissembled by us, that Sacraments have a greater and more effectual force than any sealed charters can have" (Bullinger, Dec. V., 321, P.S.).

<sup>1</sup> "Hoc immotum est axioma: Quicquid manducatur, eo ipso quod manducatur, evincitur esse præsens" (J. Forbes of Corse, "Inst. Hist. Theol.," Lib. XI., cap. vi., p. 501; Amst., 1702).

<sup>2</sup> It is scarcely necessary to say that Bishop J. Taylor is not to be understood as endorsing all the earlier sayings of Ecolampadius. His maturer teachings—and those of Swiss theology generally—were free from the errors of what is commonly spoken of as Zwinglianism. See my "Lectures on the Lord's Supper," p. 35, and "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 742, 743.

has reached us from early days<sup>1</sup> of the Christian Church, and the sound of which was not altogether lost even in the bewildering speculations of medieval scholasticism, and a sound the echo of which has been constantly reverberating in the theology of the Reformation, and in the doctrine of our great Church of England divines. It may be objected that this view of the true Presence seems at first sight to reduce the giving, taking, and receiving to the bestowal and apprehension of *the benefits* which we receive from the sacrifice of the death of Christ. And the question is suggested, Would it not be more strictly accurate and less open to misapprehension to say that what is verily and indeed taken and received is the remission of sins as the immediate fruit of Christ's sacrifice, rather than the very sacrificed Body and Blood of Christ?

But this objection, however plausible, is really baseless; indeed, it will be found to be leading our thoughts up to a point from which the real truth of this matter—the eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood—will be more clearly seen. Further consideration will not only show that the objection is untenable, but in doing so will clear the atmosphere of prevailing mists of misapprehension.

When our Blessed Lord said, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life," was He speaking of oral manducation or of spiritual feeding? Again, when He declared "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," was the eating and drinking He had in view the work of the body or of the soul? St. Augustine's answer to this question is well known, but it can hardly be too often repeated; it is a saying of very far-reaching significance. These are his words: "Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter reconduendum in memoriâ, quod pro nobis Caro Ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit" ("De Doctrinâ Christianâ," Lib. iii., cap. xvi., Op., tom. iii., Part I., c. lii.; ed. Ben., Paris, 1680).

And is this indeed the true feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ? Then, however this feeding may be assisted by the symbol of a bodily action on sacramental figures or exhibitive signs, it is in its very truth an action of the soul, beholding,

---

<sup>1</sup> The saying of Augustine, "Quomodo tenebo absentem? . . . Fidem mitte, et tenuisti" ("In Johan. Evan.," cap. xi., Tract. L., § 4) is well-known. But it need not be supposed that Augustine stands alone in this testimony to the office and power of faith. See my "Lectures on the Lord's Supper," pp. 38, 39.

See also Bradford's writings, I., 97, P.S., with quotations there given in notes; and my "Real Presence of Laudian Theology," p. 47.

taking, receiving, apprehending, and appropriating the very crucified Body and Blood of Christ, and so feeding on Him in the heart spiritually by faith.<sup>1</sup> This is indeed partaking of the benefits of the atoning Sacrifice. But it is more: it is receiving the benefits by partaking of the very feast upon the very Sacrifice once for all offered on the Cross.

Indeed, there is no separating the benefits of the Sacrifice from the Sacrifice itself. Faith is to see the two things in inseparable connection. And so our faith is to recognise that it was not for nothing that Christ said, "This is [not a sign of the benefits which shall come from My crucified Body, but] My Body which is [given] for you." "This is [not the pledge of the remission of sins which you shall have by My Blood shed, but] My Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

There can be no sundering the *fruit* of the Atonement from the *Res Sacramenti* itself, even as there is no receiving and feeding upon the true *Res Sacramenti*—that is, "the sacrifice of the death of Christ"—apart from the living Saviour, the only Lord of His own sacrificial feast.

But this matter is so important that I must ask leave to revert to the subject in the *CHURCHMAN* for next month.

N. DIMOCK.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Patristic testimony to the *Res Sacramenti* being the object of spiritual senses and spiritual perception, see my "Eucharistic Worship," p. 329 *et seq.* It is not Augustine alone who bears witness: "Tunc vita unicuique erit Corpus et Sanguis Christi, si quod in Sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur, spiritualiter bibatur" (Op., tom. v., Par. i., c. 641; ed. Ben., 1680). "Credere in Eum, hoc est manducare Panem vivum. Qui credit, manducat" (tom. iii., Par. ii., c. 494).

To prevent misunderstanding, let it in fairness be added that it is not pretended that no quotations might be made having a different sound. It may even perhaps be said to add significance and force to such sayings (and there are many to be found, not only from Augustine, nor only from the West) that they are as lights shining in an atmosphere already becoming darkened in measure by growing superstitions, the influence of which was not altogether unfelt even among some of the writers who could thus clearly testify to the truth.

