

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>

THE DOCTRINE OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

Two Lectures

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE AUGMENTATION THEORY

BY

THE REV. N. DIMOCK, M.A.

MEMORIAL EDITION

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY

THE RT. REV. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.
BISHOP OF DURHAM

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1910

*First Published in 1894 by Mr. Elliot Stock.
New Edition, published by Messrs. Longmans,
Green & Co., in April, 1910.*

AUCKLAND CASTLE,

BISHOP AUCKLAND.

December 21st, 1909.

THIS Memorial Edition is inscribed to the memory of the Reverend Nathaniel Dimock, M.A., by friends and disciples to whom his name is at once dear and venerable. In him the grace of God combined in perfect harmony a noble force and range of mental power, an unshaken fidelity to conscience and Revelation, and a spirit beautiful with humility, peace, and love.

“Remember your guides, who spoke unto you the Word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their walk of life.”

H. DUNELM.

THE first of these lectures was delivered in Christ Church, Folkestone, on March 1st of the present year.

The second was read at the Islington Clerical Meeting of the present year. It is now reprinted from the *Churchman* of June and July.

I venture to hope that these Lectures may be useful to the theological student. And I shall be thankful also if they may be found helpful to others, whose minds may have been disturbed and perplexed by novel teachings.

The dissertation which follows as an appendix is humbly submitted to the judgment of those who are competent to form an opinion of its argument.

I am not conscious of any intentional misrepresentation. My desire is that it may be a contribution to a truthful investigation of an important and somewhat difficult subject. If in any particular I may unhappily have been leading the way to any misconception, I shall be thankful to have my error corrected.

May the GREAT TEACHER guide into the whole TRUTH for CHRIST'S sake !

N. D.

TRIBERG, SCHWARZWALD.

July, 1894.

LECTURE I

SYLLABUS

	PAGE
Name of " Lord's Supper " not a Mistake, and not unsuitable, Indicating—	
I. The Saviour's Real Personal Presence, as Lord of the Feast, welcoming and providing for the Guests - -	6
II. The Feasting of the Communicants by Faith on the Atoning, Peace-making Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, which is their Spiritual Food and Sustenance in this Holy Sacrament, corresponding to the Paschal Lamb of the Passover Supper - - - - -	8
The Term " Real Presence " unknown to Antiquity	8
Primitive Christianity spoke of the Consecrated Elements as <i>Images, Types, Figures</i> , etc., of the Body and Blood of Christ - - - - -	8
These Terms rejected by Damascenus and the Augmentation Theory - - - - -	10
Which Rejection was followed by the Paschasian Doctrine - - - - -	11
Out of which was developed the Mediæval Transubstantiation - - - - -	12
This Tower, built up of Human Thoughts, must fall before Two Truths—	
(1) The <i>Res Sacramenti</i> is not simply the Body of Christ, but the Body and Blood of Christ separated in Sacrificial Death - - - - -	13
(2) The <i>Res Sacramenti</i> is Spiritual Food, <i>i.e.</i> , food for our Spirits only - - - - -	14
III. The Living Communion with the Risen Christ, which follows consequently upon their being made Partakers of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ - - - - -	16

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

LECTURE I

WHEN St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Christians, would rebuke those who came together as to a supper of their own, he says : " This is not to eat the Lord's Supper " (1 Cor. xi. 20, part). What, then, did he mean by this Supper of the Lord?

An attempt was made by a learned Jesuit in the latter part of the sixteenth century to show that what the Apostle is speaking of here was not what we now mean by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Other Romish divines took the same ground. They abhorred the name, which they regarded as an heretical novelty. And there are those in our own days who would fain maintain a similar position. Indeed, it may be readily admitted that St. Paul may have had in view something more than the Eucharistic service. In early Apostolic days the agape, or love-feast, was a supper—a feast of Christian brotherhood, a Christian communion of brotherly love—which had as an adjunct that which we now rightly call the Supper of the Lord. This agape was probably as a commemoration of that Last Passover to which Christ added the Eucharistic memorial of His great redemption. But that what the Apostle is thinking of, and speaking of, *included* the sacred sacramental feast of the Christian Church, and that *this* it was which was occupying the prominent place

in his view, ought hardly in fairness to be regarded as doubtful.¹ How else is it possible to account for the fact that St. Paul, rebuking the irreverence manifested by those who came together not for the better but for the worse, sets before them (for the correction of their prophanity) what he had received of the Lord—the narrative of the institution of the Holy Communion of the body and blood of Christ to be received in perpetual remembrance of Him, for the showing of His death till He comes?

And, indeed, we find early Christian writers insisting on the truth that in their own days those who came together to *do this in remembrance of Him* were coming together to partake of that very same feast which the Lord administered to His Apostles that same night in which He was betrayed. That feast is to faith always the same.² Shall

¹ See Is. Casaubon, "Exercit. ad Bar.," xvi., §§ xxxi., xxxii., pp. 511-515; Bullinger's "Decades," v., p. 402, P.S.; Albertinus, "De Euch.," pp. 1-3; Waterland's "Works," vol. iv., pp. 474, 475; Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," pp. 4, 5, second edit.

See also T. Aquinas, "Sum.," par. iii., vol. ii., quæst. lxxvii., art. vi., "loquens de hoc sacramento." Quotations from the Fathers bearing on the subject will be found in Hebert's "Lord's Supper," pp. 229 (Pelagius), 250 (Hilary D.), 261 (Augustine), 406 (Theodoret), 254 (Isidore of Seville), 529 (*ibid.*), 599 (Paschasius), 622 (Walafrid Strabo from Hilary D.).

The name "mystical supper" is used by Hippolytus (A.D. 220) and Dionysius the Great (A.D. 254). See Scudamore's "Not. Euch.," p. 5. Also by Cyril Alex. and Nilus (*ibid.*).

² So Chrysostom: *Λέγων, οὐκ ἔστι κυριακὸν δείπνον φαγεῖν, ἐκέλευη παραπέμπων αὐτοὺς ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη τῇ ἐσπέρᾳ, καθ' ἣν τὰ φρικτὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ δείπνον τὸ ἄριστον ἐκάλεσε* (in Ep. I. ad Cor., hom. xxvii., § 2, Op., tom. x., p. 243, edit. Montfaucon, Paris, 1732. Compare p. 247. See also tom. vii., pp. 517, 789).

So Augustin: "Cœnam manibus suis consecratam discipulis dedit: sed nos in illo convivio non discubimus; et tamen ipsam cœnam fide quotidie manducamus" (Sermo. cxii., § 4, Op., tom. v., par. i., edit. Ben., Paris, 1683).

Jerome had said: "Ascendamus cum Domino cœnaculum magnum stratum atque mundatum et accipiamus ab eo sursum calicem novi testamenti; ibique cum eo pascha celebrantes inebriemur ab eo vino sobrietatis" (Epist. cxx., Ad Hedibiam, ii., Op., tom. i., c. 824, edit. Vallarsius, Venice, 1766).

And so Theodoret: *Διδάσκει δὲ ὡς αἰεὶ τῶν τῆς νυκτὸς ἐκείνης ἀγαθῶν δυνάτων ἀπολαύειν* (on 1 Cor. xi. 20, Op., tom. iii., p. 238, Halæ, 1771).

Other examples might be added.

we wonder that it has carried through ages past, and still carries with it, the same name—a significant name, a name full of significant teaching, a name which may be said to have risen as from the grave at the time of the Reformation—witnessing to the resurrection of the true doctrine which had so long been buried under a mass of superstition, but which then came forth into the light—the old doctrine bearing again the old name—the same name as of old—the sacred name of the Lord's Supper?¹

It is of this Supper of the Lord that I am asked to speak to you this evening. And I shall endeavour to set before you three reasons why this holy feast should fitly bear the name which is given to it by St. Paul in the text.

But, first of all, bear with me for a moment while I stand on the threshold before entering on the subject, to say that, as in an earthly feast of good things we need a natural hunger and thirst, so, and much more, in coming to the feast of the Saviour's love we need a gracious hunger and a spiritual thirst—a thirst which comes only of the work of God's Spirit in our hearts.² The true understanding of the truth of the Lord's Supper is simple and

¹ "I chanced in our communication to name the Lord's Supper. 'Tush!' saith the bishop. 'What do ye call the Lord's Supper? What new term is that?' . . . I made answer that I would rather follow Paul in using his terms than them, though they had all the doctors on their side" (Latimer's "Sermons," p. 121, P.S.). See Latimer's "Remains," pp. 262, 263, P.S.

"Tu, pie Lector judicabis, quo spiritu ferretur Maldonatus, cum odio Protestantium adductus, adeo asseveranter affirmavit, Patres nefas duxisse sacramentum Communionis vocare *Cœnam*. Baronius longe modestior, qui fatetur nomen *Cœnæ* usurpatum fuisse pro Eucharistia: *licet*, inquit, *ea voce ut aliis abuti soleant Novatores*. At nos illis non patrociniatur, si qui sunt, qui abutantur. . . . Sed si verbum Apostolicum revocasse in usum, alicujus novitatis suspicionem movet: obsecro, cujus criminis debent esse suspecti, quos tædet cum Apostolis loqui?" (Is. Casaubon, "Exercitationes ad Card. Bar.," Proleg., xvi., § xxxii., p. 516; London, 1614).

² "Quemadmodum cibus et potio famelicum corpus sustentant et fovant, ita Corporis Christi mors et sanguinis effusio animam levant et pascunt, cum suo modo esurit et sitit. Quid est quod miserum et exhaustum corpus reficit? Cibus et potio. Quibus igitur nominibus appellabimus carnem et sanguinem Christi, quæ reficiunt et sustentant mentem, nisi cibi et potionis? Atque hæc similitudo Christum

easy to the soul which has been taught to know its need—its great need—the sinner's great need of a Saviour—a Saviour from the condemnation and death and curse of the Law. Without this we may learn to be vehement, and perhaps violent, in denunciation of certain errors of our day; but we shall know nothing of the spiritual truth of the Lord's Supper, with its exceeding joy and peace for the believer. Oh, let us very earnestly pray God that His Spirit may convince our souls of sin, and then may take of the things of Christ and show them unto us, that we may indeed realise the blessedness of the Saviour's word of invitation: "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink."

I. But now to proceed. The first reason why this Sacrament should be called the Lord's Supper is a very obvious one. Are we not called to it by Him who made it, and who Himself still ministers at it as a present Saviour? "A certain man," says the parable, "made a great supper, and bade many." That man who made the feast and bade the many, and doubtless came in to see the guests, shall we hesitate to call that supper *his* supper? And shall we doubt to call *that* the Lord's Supper at which He, and only He, is the Lord of the feast—the present, living, loving Saviour, who is present in His living person, with His loving heart to receive and welcome all who truly come to Him?

A frail, mortal man may, by sickness or death, be hindered from being present with the guests whom he has called to his board. But what shall ever hinder Him from being really present with us, who has risen from the dead for us—risen to die no more? We know, indeed, that the risen Saviour is Divinely present everywhere. But we

Servatorem induxit, ut dicerit: 'Caro mea est revera cibus, et sanguis meus est revera potus.' Nullum enim cibi genus jucundum animo esse potest, nisi Mors Christi: neque ullum potionis genus æstuantis animi sitim restinguere queat, nisi sanguis Christi pro peccatis in cruce profusus" (Cranmer, "De vero usu Cænæ Domini," lib. i., cap. x., "Works," P.S. edit., vol. i., app., p. 19).

are sure that it is not for nothing that He has promised a special Presence with His faithful people, not for nothing that He has taught our faith to rejoice in His word—"Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them."

And if we are asked what was the view of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper which was prominent in the thoughts of Christians in the ages which followed the times of the Apostles, we need not hesitate to say that *this* was their Real Presence—the Presence in the midst, not of Christ's body, which is now at God's right hand in heaven, but of Christ Himself, present in spirit—the Presence of the personal Saviour as Lord of the feast¹—the feast which is therefore fitly named the Supper of the Lord.

Then, first of all, let us seek, earnestly and yet more earnestly let us seek, to realize this true Real Presence—the very true Presence of Him who says that comfortable word, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

" ' Come unto Me, ye weary,
And I will give you rest.'
O blessèd voice of Jesus,
Which speaks to hearts oppressed ;
It tells of benediction,
Of pardon, grace, and peace,
Of love which hath no ending,
Of joy which cannot cease."

Oh, if we are convinced of sin by the Spirit of God, if we have been taught to know sin as real sin, then we do want to know the Presence, the Real Presence, of a real living Saviour—a Saviour able to give rest, real rest, present rest from the awful burden of sin.

And is it nothing to you that the great Burden-bearer has borne the terrible burden for you—borne it away Himself that He might give rest to your souls—and that

¹ See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 33-36; and Hooker, "Works," vol. ii., pp. 245, 357, edit. Keble.

He bids you come to Him to His feast—come to Him for His peace—come to Him for the riches of His grace—come to Him at His table—come to Him to realize His Presence and His love in that Sacrament which we love to call the Supper of the Lord?

II. But some will ask, Is this all the Real Presence you have to tell of? And is this all that goes to make this Sacrament to be the Lord's Supper?

I answer, There is another reason which makes this name a fitting name for our Christian feast. And this further reason has to do with another view of the Real Presence—a view which asks for serious thoughtful consideration, and which demands the grateful praise of all true Christian hearts. May God's Holy Spirit guide us into the whole truth of this matter for Jesus Christ's sake!

The term "Real Presence" is one which Christians of old time knew nothing of. It is not too much, I believe, to say that it was born of false doctrine. It had its origin not many centuries before the Reformation.¹ It seems to have been coined to express the fully-developed doctrine of the Dark Ages. It represented one aspect of the newly-proclaimed doctrine of transubstantiation. It was of the essence of the blasphemous sacrifice of the Mass.

No wonder, then, that when, through God's mercy, the light of His truth was made to shine in our land, this Real Presence was seen in its true connection with the mystery of iniquity, and was indeed an abomination in the eyes of our English reformers.

In the earlier ages of the Christian Church the habitual use of such terms as *images*, *types*, *figures*, and the like, as applied to the Eucharistic elements, affords good evidence² that at first the words of institution were understood in the only sense in which they naturally could be

¹ The phrase "vera existentia et Realis Corporis Christi in Sacramenta Altaris" was used by Joannes Parisiensis. See Allix's "Determinatio," p. 57, London, 1686. See also pp. 73, 85.

² See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 266-302. It is clear that the *figures* or *symbols* were not regarded as containing the Real Presence,

understood, as constituting those elements to be *effectual signs* of the body and blood of Christ as given and shed for the remission of sins, for the life of the world. Their delivery was understood as exhibiting and conveying to the soul the beneficial possession of those very things whose name in the delivery they bore.¹ They were outward signs in a sacramental transaction, bearing as proxies the title of the precious gift which they represented.

But in process of time, and earlier, perhaps, than has been commonly supposed, superstitious accretions began to gather round this simple truth, leading up to practices some of which (from the modern Romish point of view) must surely be regarded as little less than sacrilege. I allude to such practices as (1) applying the wine from the lips to sanctify the eyes and forehead, and organs of sense;² (2) wearing the bread on the person, for security from danger by land or by sea;³ and (3) using it medicin-

but were looked upon as distinguished from, and in contrast with, that Presence. Witness the following from Theodoret: Μετὰ γὰρ δὴ τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν, οὐκέτι χρεία τῶν συμβόλων τοῦ σώματος, αὐτοῦ φαινομένου τοῦ σώματος (in 1 Cor. xi., Op., tom. iii., p. 238, edit. Schulze).

¹ So Ambrose: "Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium species nominatur, post consecrationem Corpus Christi significatur . . . Ante consecrationem aliud dicitur, post consecrationem sanguis nuncupatur" (De initiandis, Cap. ult.). "Dici vobis quod ante verba Christi quod offertur panis dicitur; ubi Christi verba deprompta fuerint, jam non panis dicitur, sed Christi corpus appellatur" ("De Sacram.," lib. v., cap. iv., § 24, Op., tom. ii., c. 378, edit. Ben., Paris, 1690).

"By which words of St. Ambrose," says Cranmer, "it appeareth plainly, that the bread is called by the name of Christ's body after the consecration; and although it be still bread, yet after consecration it is dignified by the name of the thing which it representeth" ("On Lord's Supper," p. 178, P.S.). "Not that the bread and wine can be partakers of any holiness or godliness, or can be made the body and blood of Christ, but that they represent the very body and blood of Christ, and the holy food and nourishment which we have by Him. And so they be called by the names of the body and blood of Christ, as the sign, token, and figure is called by the name of the very thing which it showeth and signifieth" (*ibid.*, pp. 177, 178).

² Ἐπι δὲ τῆς νοτιδος ἐνούσης τοῖς χεῖλεσί σου, χερσίν ἐπαφώμενος καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ μέτωπον, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγίαζε αἰσθητήρια (Cyril Hieros., "Catech. Mystag.," v., § xxii., Op., p. 332, edit. Toutée, Paris, 1720. See also § xxi. Compare Damascenus, "De Orthod. Fid.," lib. iv., cap. xiv.).

³ See "Eucharistic Worship," p. 53, and Ambrose, "De Excessu

ally as a plaster or poultice, or otherwise;¹ and (4) putting it into the mouth of the dead;² and (5) burying it with the corpse;³ and (6) laying it up in default of relics, or with relics, within the altar at the dedication of a church;⁴ and (7), later on, mixing the wine with ink, for subscribing to a solemn document.⁵

In such matters as these we have evidence of growing tendencies to error, which (while they show that mediæval doctrine had not yet been dreamt of) were doubtless preparing the way for serious misconceptions, until, in the latter half of the eighth century, a doctrine was propounded, with the authority of a great name, which quickly took deep root in a soil already prepared for its reception. We find it most distinctly enunciated in the writings of Joannes Damascenus, whose teaching soon became as the voice of an oracle for the Eastern Church. He rejects altogether the terms *images* and *types* as applied to the consecrated elements; he repudiates them as the expression of false teaching; and the second Nicene Council—apparently following his lead, and adopting his language⁶—does just the same, alleging that it is impossible that the elements should be the *images* or *types* of the body and blood of Christ, and at the same time the very body and blood themselves, and insisting that the Saviour did not say, "This is an image of My body, or a type of My blood," but "This is My body," and "This is My blood." So that at first sight it might seem almost

fratris sui Satyri," ii. 43, Op., tom. ii., c. 1125, edit. Ben., Paris, 1690.

¹ See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 211, 212; also Prosper Acquit., as quoted in Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. i., p. 452.

² This practice was censured by St. Chrysostom, and condemned in the Councils of Carthage III., Auxerre, and in Trullo. See Bingham, "Antiq." bk. xxiii., § xiv., vol. v., pp. 432, 433, edit. 1844. See also Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. i., pp. 469, 470, and 634.

³ See "Eucharistic Worship," p. 53.

⁴ See Rock's "Church of our Fathers," vol. i., pp. 41, 42.

⁵ See Carranza, tom. ii., p. 493; and Hospinian's "Works," vol. iii., pp. 244, 245.

⁶ See "Curiosities of Patristic and Mediæval Literature" (Elliot Stock), No. II., pp. 5, 7, 9.

as if we had here the full-grown doctrine of the Romish Church. But in truth we have here an evidence, a clear evidence—indeed, a clearer evidence we could hardly have, or desire to have—that transubstantiation was as yet a thing not conceived, and not accounted conceivable. For these innovators, thus utterly rejecting the habitual language of the earlier Fathers, and building their new doctrine on the most literal interpretation of our Lord's words which they thought admissible, could never have rested in what is called the augmentation theory if the doctrine of the Romish Real Presence had then been held to be possible. That augmentation theory, as unfolded by Damascenus and others, may be briefly stated thus: As the substance of a man's natural body is renewed and augmented by the eating and assimilation of bread taken as food (which thus becomes changed into that man's *one* body), so Christ's body is continually being augmented by the sacramental bread, which He (in a manner) adopts and incorporates into His one body, the elements, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, being thus changed into the body and blood of Christ through union with that one and the same body of Christ.¹ And in virtue of this adoption and incorporation making the sacrament to be really a part of His body, it is to be thought of, not as a type of Christ's body, but to be regarded as what it is called—the body of Christ. I need hardly say that such an interpretation of our Lord's words, "This is My body," would be rejected as heretical by all who from this point climbed afterwards to the higher ground of mediæval doctrine. It is plain that as yet faith had not been taught to win by its merits its great reward through believing in spite of the evidence of sight, believing what was contradicted by reason and common sense.

But the next century saw a further development lift up its head on high—a development the result of the working of human thoughts, a much nearer approach (at least) to

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

the doctrine of an inherent change in the elements, with a presence under the signs. And though the Paschasian doctrine found at first many opponents among the more learned, and did not readily obtain anything like general acceptance, it eventually triumphed over opposition, and gradually paved the way for the advent of the fuller doctrine of transubstantiation, on which was built at length, by the addition of the theory of concomitance, the teaching that whole Christ, body, soul and Divinity, is really present, and to be adored, in every separate particle of the consecrated Host, and in every separate drop of the consecrated wine.¹ Thus, men were taught to believe that they had not the body merely, but the very Person of Christ, multiplied every day by the number of altars at which Mass is said, and *this* while Christ Himself in His true human body remains seated at the right hand of God. Men were not to doubt that they had the body, soul and Divinity of Christ contained under the form of a wafer, and in that form swallowed daily by thousands of priests. This doctrine it is which then put on for its clothing the name of the Real Presence, and this doctrine it is which, under that name, was so strongly opposed by our English reformers.

But was there no truth underlying this strange—should I not say this *monstrous*—conception? We must reject the conception itself as fable, and nothing but fable—a high tower of false doctrine, built up of human thoughts, and bedaubed with the untempered mortar of dialectic subtleties and scholastic argumentations. That tower had its foundation laid on misconceptions, on a grievous misunderstanding of a portion of God's Word, the literalism of which was relied upon, to the neglect of revealed truths, which should have governed its interpretation. And so this tower must fall before the teaching of two most important fundamental truths, which are clearly revealed and plainly taught in Holy Scripture.

¹ See Hagenbach, "History of Doctrines" (Clark), vol. ii., p. 102.

(1) The first of these truths needs to be over and over again strongly and earnestly insisted on. It is this: that which we are to feed upon in the Lord's Supper is not simply the body of Christ, but the body and blood of Christ, as separated one from another in sacrificial death¹—the death which Christ died for our sins. What is in faith's view here is not the incarnation merely, but that which we are taught to regard as the purpose of the incarnation—the atonement made by the Son of God, dying our death, putting away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; therefore, when our Lord speaks of Himself as the Bread of Life, He adds, "And the bread which I give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." And so when He instituted His Supper—His Supper for a perpetual memory of Himself and of His death—He does not say merely, "Take, eat; this is My body." It has been a fruitful source of error to read His words as if they stopped there; but His words bear, of necessity, a very different aspect when we read them aright, and read them together as a whole, "This is My body, which is given for you," and "This is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." Therefore some of the ancient Fathers did not hesitate to speak of *the remission of sins*,² or the word of Christ, as that which is the food of our souls. Coming to Christ in faith, we are made partakers of the remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. We feed upon Christ's body and blood, because out of them, as given and shed for our sins, we have our peace with God. Oh, yes! we feed indeed upon the very death of Christ; we feed upon Christ in His death for us. We feed upon the feast of the very sacrifice which the incarnate Son of God came into the world, and took upon Him our flesh, that He might offer unto God for us—the one perfect and sufficient

¹ See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 303-316. This truth is largely insisted upon by Anglican divines.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 328-330.

sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast. Oh, yes! for so He has said, "My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed."

(2) But now to turn to the other truth, a truth most important in this connection. What we have to feed upon is spiritual food. And mark well what we mean by spiritual food. We must be careful to make no mistake here. We do *not* mean that the body and blood of Christ are reduced to spirit, or present after the manner of spirits; but we mean that what we feed upon—that sacrifice of Christ—is food for our spirits, not for our bodies. If that which is the true Bread of Life could be held in our hands or received in our mouths, it would not avail, it would not help or profit us for this purpose. The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received, but not with the hand of the body, nor with the natural mouth, but "by the faithful." It is their faith which is their hand to take, and faith which is their mouth to receive. This is of the nature of a sacrament: the sign for the body and its organs, the thing signified for the soul and its organs of faith.¹ While the natural eye sees the earthly minister delivering earthly elements available for the strengthening and refreshing of our bodies, our faith looks to the present Saviour, the Lord of the feast, pointing our faith to His sacrificed body and blood (present only to faith's apprehension), and delivering all over for the full possession of our souls, for the present hunger and thirst of our spirits.

"Come," says Cranmer, "to our Redeemer and Saviour Christ, who refresheth all that come to Him, be their anguish and heaviness never so great. . . . He it is that feedeth continually all that belong unto Him, with His own flesh that hanged upon the Cross, and giveth them drink of the blood flowing out of His own side" (P. S., p. 7).

¹ See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 332, 333, 336, 120, 121, 253, 257 *sqq.*, 276.

Oh, men and brethren! what can we want more than this? What rest and peace and joy there is in this gracious gift and this rich possession! Surely the present Saviour vouchsafes to feed us with this spiritual food, that each believing soul may be satisfied with the ordained remembrance and the sealed assurance—the assurance divinely signed and sealed—that Christ died for him, and so may feed on Him in his heart by faith with thanksgiving. So St. Augustine, expounding the words of Christ which speak of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, says: "He seems to command a disgraceful thing, or a crime; therefore it is figurative, commanding us to communicate in the Passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to treasure up in our memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us" ("De Doctr. Christ.," lib. iii., cap. xvi).¹

And now, with these two truths before us, what shall we say of the Real Presence? Have we the real Presence, or have we not? And we will answer that what we have may indeed be fitly named "the Real Presence." All that belongs to the truth of that Real Presence which is needed for our spiritual hunger, and for the satisfying of our spiritual thirst, we have; all that belongs to the gross mediæval conception of the Real Presence we have cast away. If it were true, it would not profit; it would not be of the essence of the Real Presence as rightly understood, for the essence of the Real Presence has to do with our spirits only. It is the presence to our faith of the sacrifice of Christ's death, that it may be given, taken and received, to the peace, to the comfort, to the assurance, to the strengthening and refreshing of our souls. This is what we want, and this is what we have; and even in the mediæval Real Presence, and even according to the teaching of some of its best and ablest advocates, all that is

¹ See Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," pp. 115, 117, 118, P.S. edit., for an answer to Romish evasions of this teaching of St. Augustine. See also "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 80, 81, and Bishop Hall's "Works," vol. ix., p. 370, London, 1808.

really needful, all that is available for real spiritual Communion, is here.

Oh, let us thank God, my brethren, that thus the bread which we break is the Communion of the body of Christ, and the cup which we bless is indeed the Communion of the blood of Christ.

We will praise God for the Real Presence which belongs to this real spiritual Communion. This Real Presence has been plainly taught by great divines, pillars of the truth, at home and abroad. This Real Presence was upheld and firmly maintained by the martyrs of our English Reformation.¹ And because of this Real Presence to our souls of this one perfect sacrifice for our sins, thus given to us by Christ Himself, to be the very meat and drink of our souls—because of this we will thankfully follow the example of St. Paul, and name this holy ordinance the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

III. It remains yet to touch for a few moments (it must be very briefly) on another aspect—a further view of the blessedness which belongs to this holy Sacrament, and belongs to it specially as the Lord's Supper. When the Son of God took upon Him our human nature, He took upon Him a nature which can be perfected only in union with the Divine nature. What we very often speak of as human nature is not true human nature, not the true nature of man, but the disease of man's nature, the leprosy of humanity. How is man's nature to be renewed? It can only be by the bringing of man home again to God, that the human may be made the habitation of the Divine. But there is a great and awful separation between God and man. That separation, that terrible gulf, is made by sin, and God's condemnation of sin. How is this separation removed? how is this gulf bridged over? Not by Christ's

¹ See Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," p. 87, P.S. edit.; Ridley's "Works," p. 196, P.S.; Bradford, "Sermons," etc., 488, 489; Hooker, "Ec. Pol.," bk. v., ch. lv., § 1; Bishop Hall's "Works," vol. ix., p. 368; Papers on "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 47, 55, 76 sqq., 80, 83, 84, 270, 271.

incarnation, but by His atoning death. When, by faith in Christ's death, we come across that gulf, arising to return to our Father, then immediately there is a restoration, a passing from death to life, a new creation in our spirits by the power of the Divine Spirit. Apart from this, the soul of man may awake to know the storm, but it can find no peace. The wicked, the unconverted, heart is like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." But Christ has made peace by the blood of His Cross, and in that peace is man's health, in that peace is the life of man's soul. And Christ comes and preaches peace to them that are afar off, and to them that are nigh. "Peace, peace, to him that is afar off, and to him that is nigh, saith the Lord, and I will heal him." Mark, I pray you—mark this well, my brethren: There is health only in peace; there is peace only in the blood, in the blood of the Cross, in the sacrifice of the death of Christ. And so it comes to pass, through the death of Christ, we pass into the resurrection life of Christ. By being made partakers of the sacrifice of Christ, we are by consequence made partakers of the risen Christ, of the living Saviour.

And there is a fulness of meaning in this being made partakers of the living Christ which our faith should be taught to realise continually. It means a union with Christ as real and true as though our very flesh and bones were made continue with His.¹ It has nothing, indeed, to do with bodily contact of flesh with flesh, or blood with blood. But though the bond of union is spiritual, not carnal (as the Apostle says, "He that is joined to the Lord is"—not "one flesh," but—"one spirit"), yet it makes our very bodies to be His. "No man," says the Apostle, "ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it even as the Lord the Church, for we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones"—a true native

¹ See Hooker, "Ec. Pol.," bk. v., ch. lvi., §§ 7, 13; and "Eucharistic Worship," p. 51.

extract from His own body.¹ Oh, brethren, never doubt the reality of this conjunction. Never question, but live in faith of the truth that God has knit together His elect in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of His Son Christ our Lord.

Oh, blessed communion and fellowship, in which we are to know and believe that in Christ we are beloved of God, called to be saints—yea, beloved in Christ with the very love wherewith Christ is loved of the Father—beloved by Christ as very parts of Himself, beloved by the Father as very members of His dear Son!² Wonderful truth! wonderful love! Oh, that day by day we might be learning to enter with fuller apprehension into the meaning of the Apostle's words, "We have known and believed the love which God hath to us"!

But what has all this to do with the Supper of the Lord? Let us desire to see clearly how much it has to do with it. As by and through the atoning death of Christ we enter into the fellowship of His life, so the Sacrament which you may call the great memorial of Christ's death for us, just because in it we feed upon His sacrifice, becomes to us the means whereby we are made to be one with Christ and Christ with us, we are made to dwell in Christ and Christ in us. "God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And His Church (to use the words of Hooker) He frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of man. His body crucified and His blood shed for the life of the world are the true elements of that heavenly being, which maketh us such as Himself is of whom we come" ("Ec. Pol.," bk. v., ch. lvi. 7; "Works," vol. iii., p. 250, edit. Keble). Oh, that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith, that we may be rooted and grounded in reconciling love, and so able to comprehend with all saints what is the length and breadth and depth and height, that we know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, and be filled with

¹ See Hooker, "Ec. Pol.," bk. v., ch. lvi., § 7.

² See Hooker, "Ec. Pol.," bk. v., ch. lvi., §§ 6, 7.

all the fulness of God! Hear the word of Christ: "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him." Indeed, we must *first* be members of Christ before we come to the Supper of our Lord. But we should desire that every time of our coming to the feast of our Saviour's love we should not only be satisfied with the riches of His pardoning, justifying grace, but also by partaking of that grace have the bond of our union with Him made closer and firmer and stronger, that so our human nature may be more and more perfected by our union with Him, and in Him with the Father.

The heathen, in their idols' temples, sacrificed to devils, and ate of the table of devils, and had fellowship with devils. Oh miserable degradation of human nature! The heathen, the idolater—he feedeth on ashes; he cannot deliver his soul and say, Is there not a lie in my right hand? Fellowship with demons! Oh awful word!

But Christians at the Table of their Lord, at the Lord's Supper (and for this alone it might fitly be called the Supper of the Lord), *they* are made to have fellowship in ineffable communion with the living and life-giving Lord of the feast. They being many are one bread and one body, even as they are all made partakers of that one bread. Oh wonderful exaltation of human nature—sinners, worms taken from the dunghill, now made partakers of the Divine nature, now raised up together with Christ, and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the ages to come God might show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness towards us through Christ Jesus!

Only one brief word more. Did I not say well that the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper is to the faithful, in some sense, simple and clear, even though it be also sublimely high and Divinely deep? How different that which has been added by man's device! I marvel not that some would fain be rid of the name of the Lord's Supper. Is it possible to be present at some grand High Mass in some magnificent cathedral abroad, to behold the gorgeous

ceremonial, to see men bowing down before the elevated Host, and not to ask, "Is this the obedience to the word of Him who said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me' ? Is this the Lord's Supper ?" Let us be sure, my brethren, that the name of the Lord's Supper is not, as it has been lately called, "a misnomer which has much to answer for," but is an inspired word, a divinely-given name, which in its significance may teach us much as to what we should reject and what we should hold fast in our faith of this holy Sacrament. Let us reject vain human additions ; but let us never cease to hold fast to the truth—the truth in its blessedness and its power, the truth which makes it the Lord's Supper, the truth of a present Saviour, feeding us with the reality of His atoning, peace-giving sacrifice, and so uniting us anew to Himself as branches of the true Vine, as very members incorporate in His mystical body. It is the spirit of error which has forged the Real Presence of the sacrifice of the Mass. It is Divine love which has made for us a heavenly banquet—a feast which calls forth the deepest adoration of our hearts, demands from us, indeed, our highest sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Oh yes, it is Divine truth and love which, at such a cost—at the cost of the Passion and Death of Christ—has made for us the spiritual feast of the Lord's Supper.

LECTURE II

SYLLABUS

OBSERVATIONS	PAGE
I. The Controversy is between Real Absence and Real Presence, <i>sub speciebus</i> - - - - -	23
II. Between which is no Standing-place - - - - -	24
III. And between which is necessary Antagonism - - - - -	24
IV. In this Controversy the Position of the Church of England may be gathered from the History of the Book of Common Prayer - - - - -	25
Corollary—Our Ordination Vows lay upon us an obligation in respect of this Controversy - - - - -	25
In respect of which Obligation the following Cautions may be suggested—	
I. We have to deal with <i>Roots</i> of False Doctrine - - - - -	27
As witness the Testimonies, <i>e.g.</i> , of	
(1) Cranmer - - - - -	27
(2) Hooker - - - - -	28
(3) Brevint - - - - -	28
II. As to the <i>Language</i> of the Controversy, it is important to note its Ambiguities; and this in respect of	
(1) The Teaching of the Fathers, whose Doctrine	
(a) Was gradually corrupted - - - - -	28
(b) Till, in connection with a Teaching of <i>the Merits of Faith</i> - - - - -	29
(c) The corruption culminated in 'Transubstantiation' - - - - -	33
(2) The Doctrine of the Reformed - - - - -	36
III. As to the Positive Doctrine of the Eucharist—	
(1) Reformed Theology does not minimise the Blessing - - - - -	37
(a) The Case of the Swiss - - - - -	37
(b) The Reality of giving, taking, and receiving not evacuated by its being all spiritual - - - - -	38
(c) A certain Real Presence must be maintained, as witness, <i>e.g.</i> (1) John Owen, (2) Perkins, (3) Œcolampadius - - - - -	40
(2) Even in Mediæval Doctrine the Truth was not lost that <i>Cibus est non carnis sed animæ</i> - - - - -	45
(3) The Teaching (misunderstood) of	
(a) The Church Catechism - - - - -	48
(b) Church of England Divines - - - - -	48

LECTURE II.

I WASTE no time in prefatory words. I am to deal briefly with a most important subject in view of present difficulties and dangers and consequent duties. I must begin with submitting for consideration four observations which demand, I am sure, most careful attention, and which will endure, as I believe, the strictest investigation.

I. The first observation is that the main line of demarcation, or (I would rather say) THE GREAT CHASM OF CLEAVAGE, DEEP AND BROAD, IN THE MATTER OF EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE, AS WE HAVE NOW TO DO WITH IT, IS THAT WHICH SEPARATES BETWEEN THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL ABSENCE AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN OR UNDER THE FORM OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS CONSIDERED IN THEMSELVES.

This does not mean that there are not shades of difference of view on what I may call the other side of the chasm; still less that there may not be variations of teaching and certain erroneous views to be avoided on our side. But it does mean that the separating dykes or dividing lines of these varying schools of thought are comparatively narrow, and thin, and shallow.

I use the word "Real Absence" advisedly though reluctantly. I am not for a moment questioning the true "Unio Sacramentalis" taught by Reformed divines. But I am speaking of the elements simply as "considered in themselves."¹ And I am purposely using language to express quite clearly what I mean quite distinctly.

¹ Following the example of Bishop Reynolds, I add the words, "considered in themselves," as a needful limitation of the sense, because the sacramental elements may very well be considered "with that relative habitude and respect which they have unto the immediate use whereunto they are consecrated." And in this view the "Res Sacramenti" may well be spoken of as received "in" the "Sacramentum," and even "under the form of bread and wine."—See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 484, 485, and also pp. 230-264.

II. My second observation is, that THERE IS NO CONSISTENT STANDING-PLACE BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES OF THIS CHASM.

This does not mean that none have ever attempted to stand between the two. The feet of some have sunk in the quicksands below. It does mean that there are, and can be, no planks across. It does mean that it is nothing but a delusion to represent the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as shading off by little and little, gradually and imperceptibly, from one extreme to the other, so that it is impossible anywhere to draw a line between the higher and the lower—between this side and that. The separation is clear. The line is distinct. The division is a chasm. The chasm can never be bridged.

III. The next observation is, that FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF EITHER SIDE THE TEACHING OF THE OTHER SIDE MUST BE—OUGHT IN TRUTH TO BE—SEEN AS A THING TO BE DISTINCTLY AND STRONGLY OPPOSED.

From our side the teaching of the other side can only rightly be viewed as the natural parent of idolatry. From the other side our teaching is rightly regarded as heresy.

This does not mean that we are bound to accuse any of formal idolatry. Many may, in inconsistency, stop quite short of material idolatry. We do not suppose for a moment that any mean to be idolaters. But it does mean that the doctrine on the other side in its legitimate results leads to a worship which Romish divines have acknowledged to be idolatrous, except on the hypothesis of that doctrine being true which we are persuaded to be untrue.

Again, this does not mean that those on the other side will be led uncharitably to denounce us as heretics. In the kindness of their hearts, and in the charitable hope that we are misled by insuperable prejudices, they may shrink from using any such language. But it does mean that the doctrine which they hold is such in its very nature that it must in consistency be held as *de fide*, and that therefore its impugnors ought of necessity, in charity not less than in

truth, to be viewed as, unwittingly and unwillingly though it may be, teachers of heresy.¹

IV. I have yet a fourth observation to make. It is this : THE HISTORY OF OUR ENGLISH BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (NOT EXCEPTING, BUT INCLUDING, THAT OF THE LAST REVIEW) MAKES IT UNMISTAKABLY CLEAR THAT THE REFORMED CHURCH OF ENGLAND TAKES ITS STAND ON THIS SIDE OF THIS BROAD DOCTRINAL CHASM.

This is a most interesting and a very important subject. I could wish I had time to enter upon it. I commend it to your study. It will be found to yield most unquestionable evidence of extreme care, and caution which may sometimes have even run to excess—care and caution to eliminate that which might even by mistake have seemed to make our Church's position to be doubtful.²

But I must hasten to state a corollary which must be obvious to all who, after due weighing of their import, have given assent to these observations, viz., that THE TEACHING ON THE OTHER SIDE MUST ASSUREDLY BE INCLUDED AMONG THE ERRONEOUS AND STRANGE DOCTRINES, CONTRARY TO GOD'S WORD, WHICH THIS CHURCH OF ENGLAND REQUIRES US AND BINDS US BY OUR SOLEMN ORDINATION VOWS TO BE READY WITH ALL FAITHFUL DILIGENCE TO BANISH AND DRIVE AWAY.

It is impossible from our side of the separating chasm to view the doctrine of our opponents as merely distinguishing one of those varying schools of thought which it is the glory of the English Church to include in her ministry.

Of course I do not mean that we are to treat our opponents as if they had no "zeal of God," and as if we had no bowels of compassion for the difficulties and perplexities through which many of them have to pass. If the innovators sometimes assume for themselves a position

¹ See "Eucharistic Worship," p. 44; and "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," p. 687.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 431 *et seq.* Much, however, may be added to the evidence there adduced.

which makes them offensive, it is for us to show them a more excellent way, remembering the words of St. Paul: "In meekness instructing those which oppose themselves, if God peradventure may give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth."

Other deductions may be left—must be left—to be drawn by each of us in view of what may be to each of us the calling of our own duty, the duty of each in the position in which each has been placed by God. Only let me be bold to say that for all, as it seems to me, it must be a duty to give some real study to this controversy, and not to close our eyes to the serious position in which we now find ourselves. And this all the more because the controversy is one which, as an internal controversy, is new in this Reformed Church of England. We have here to seek weapons of our warfare not in any records of earlier contention between parties in our Church. We shall find them only in the cogent arguments of our great divines, directed against opponents not from within the Church of England, but only from within the Church of Rome. In defence of what Puritans were wont to regard as the "nocent" ceremonies allowed by our Liturgy (one of which was our kneeling reception), Churchmen used to plead that it was unjust and ungenerous to regard them as dangerous, seeing the Reformed doctrine of our Church was too plainly and obviously stamped on her character to make possible the admission of Romish doctrine and superstition.¹ Alas! if anything could justify the apprehensions which we once thought so unfounded and unfair, it would be the fact that now those who have inherited the fears of their forefathers can with justice point to spectacles to be seen in some of our prominent places of worship, and ask, "Where now are your assurances that all approaches to the doctrine of

¹ For evidence of this see "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 571-578. See also Bishop Hall's "Works," vol. ix., p. 440, London, 1808; and especially Durel, "Vind. Ecc. Angl.," pp. 226, 227, London, 1669.

the Mass were for ever barred for the Church of England? ” In his day, Bishop Morton could boldly make an appeal, and say, “ I may ask any ingenuous man whether he ever heard (I do not say our Church, but) any approved Doctor therein teach that we do, or ought to, kneel before the Sacrament, that by it, or in it, we may personally worship Christ as if He were really present. ”¹ Would that in our day we could, with the same confidence, ask the same question !

And now, my reverend brethren, if I have carried you with me thus far, I venture to hope that you will follow me yet a little further while I desire to indicate certain cautions which seem to me important in the conduct of this controversy.

I. First, we must bear in mind that in this matter we have to do with roots of false doctrine, not with twigs of error or parasites of superstition. On the other side of the chasm they may be concerned with lopping and pruning. Nay, we may willingly and gladly acknowledge that they have seen and desired to put away some of the grosser abuses of the Mass. But what we have to do with is the very root of the Mass doctrine itself. Well did Dean Brevint declare that we are to look into what Rome is by what Mass is. Full well did he warn us concerning the Mass, that it is no leaf or branch, but the main stem and bulk of that tree.² But above all we shall do well to remember the words of Archbishop Cranmer, who not hastily, but cautiously, and carefully, and slowly, after much painful and diligent study, arrived at length at his conviction. His words might well be written with a pen of iron, and graven in the rock before us. We may do

¹ See Bishop Morton's "Defence of the Ceremonies," p. 285, London, 1619: "Published by authority." The Bishop adds: "The Papists' adoration is somewhat *inhæsiue in objecto*, or *adhæsiue per objectum*; but ours is *abstractiue ab objecto*" (p. 286).—The whole section, Part II., chap. iii., § 31, is very important; see also p. 291.

² See Brevint's "Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," pp. 243, 244, third edit., Oxford, 1673.

well, at any rate, to have them graven on our memories, as I think they must have been graven in the memory of Dean Brevint. "The rest," he says, "is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but 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."¹ And I suppose these words of Cranmer were also in the memory of Hooker when he said, "He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart . . . which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition . . . ministers and Massing-priests" ("Works," vol. iii., p. 666, edit. Keble).

II. But I wish more particularly to draw attention to two other cautions having relation, one (*a*) to the language, the other (*b*) to a real point of doctrine pertaining to this controversy.

(*a*) Of the expressions used by our opponents on the other side of the chasm to signify their doctrine, there are comparatively few which cannot be used in a certain sense, and have not been used and defended by those who have stood on our side of the separating gulf. This is important in view of the language used both by the ancient Fathers and by our Reformed divines. (i.) As to the Fathers. On which side do they stand of the chasm of cleavage? I, for one, am not prepared to deny that superstitious views began early to connect themselves with the Sacramental

¹ See Cranmer's "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament," Preface to edition of 1550, in P. S. edition, p. 6.

elements.¹ But I am prepared to maintain that the early Fathers did stand on our side—not the Romish side—of the great doctrinal division.

But it will be asked, Did they not believe, did they not speak and write as men who certainly believed, that what was given was indeed the body and blood of Christ? Without doubt they did. Nay, they used not seldom language too hyperbolic to admit (even by the teaching of Romish divines) any interpretation which is literal. They believed that the elements were just that which they were named, in the fullest sense in which one thing can be another thing—*i. e.*, as an effectual and sufficient proxy for a defined and limited purpose. But that their understanding of the words of institution was limited by the true faith of Christ's human nature² as well as by the intuitions of common sense (as they must have been naturally limited by the intuitions of the disciples who first heard them pronounced in the upper chamber) is evident by such sayings as this—that our Lord did not hesitate to say, "This My body," when He delivered the sign of His body, as well as by the well-known declarations of Theodoret, and by the many interpretative *dicta* of St. Augustin.³ Any one of these interpretative sayings suffices—like a drop of acid in a glass of turbid liquid—to hold in solution the ambiguities of any number of quotations which may before have seemed to be misty with materialism or dark with error.

(b) Indeed, the sayings of the Fathers are not few which (however cruelly racked and tortured by some to yield a Romish sense) do really assume (and assume as unquestioned and unquestionable) such an interpretation of our

¹ It may, perhaps, also be found that certain approaches to the *augmentation theory* were earlier and more prevalent than has sometimes been supposed. See Appendix below.

² See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 143-153. There seems, however, to have been a certain exceptional uncertainty or inconsistency (perhaps more) in the teaching (on this point) of Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria.—See Schaff's "History of Creeds," p. 286.

³ See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 64 *et seq.*, 253 *et seq.*

Lord's words as never could have lived in the atmosphere of Romish doctrine, and clearly ought to bring the weight of patristic testimony to our side of the doctrinal gulf. This assertion may very well be illustrated by the fact that the *ipsissima verba* of St. Augustin (in ignorance, no doubt, of their authorship) had the brand-mark of heresy stamped on them by one who (early in the seventeenth century) stood forward as a champion of Roman orthodoxy.¹ We have but to mark how thus the teaching of the Fathers is brought to witness on this side of the separating boundary, and we can see how such words as they habitually spake might quite safely be used before the coming in of the doctrine which did violence to the natural interpretation of language. We can trace pretty clearly some of the prominent steps by which their language afterwards became perverted and their doctrine corrupted, until at length our Lord's words were understood to teach the strange theory of transubstantiation. But this doctrine, in its full proportions, was only reached by trampling on the intuitions of common sense in connection (as I believe) with the development of a mistaken teaching concerning the merits of faith.² Faith was held to be meritorious in exact proportion to the difficulties which it had to surmount and

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 83-88.

² It is not meant, of course, that the increasing of the difficulties of faith was a recognised cause for insisting on the literal interpretation of the words of institution. But it is meant that, in the maintenance of the materialistic doctrine, the mediæval doctors were led to regard it, and to teach it, as one of the main purposes of the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood being instituted in the form of bread and wine that in believing Christ's Word, in spite of the report of the senses (*i.e.*, in other words, as I understand it, in accepting the literal as against the natural sense of His Words), faith might find its exercise in wrestling with a stupendous difficulty, and so might gain for itself a great victory, and win for itself a corresponding reward.

It is obvious to observe how this teaching must have been as a kindred soil, which would encourage the deep-rooting of a doctrine which did violence to the dictates of the human understanding. Gregory the Great had written: "Sciendum nobis est, quod divina operatio si ratione comprehenditur, non est admirabilis: nec fides habet meritum, cui humana ratio præbet experimentum" (S. Gregorii in "Evang.," lib. ii., Hom. xxvi., Op., tom. i., c. 1552; edit., Ben. Venice, 1744).

overpass. The higher the difficulty the greater the merit. Hence the gain of magnified difficulties to faith. Hence the advantage of setting the task of subduing and bringing to naught every dictate of reason and sense, of triumphing

But this saying of his had no relation to the Eucharistic Presence. It applied to the entrance of Christ's body within closed doors.

As applied to the faith of the Eucharist, I am not aware that this idea anywhere finds expression before the introduction of the doctrine of a Corporal Presence in the elements.

The following is from Haymo, of Halberstadt, who appears to have anticipated Paschasius in his view of the Eucharist. He died before the middle of the ninth century: "Sensus carnis nihil aliud renuntiare possunt quam sentiunt; intellectus autem mentis et fides veram Christi carnem et sanguinem renuntiat et confitetur: ut tanto magis coronam suæ fidei recipiat, et meritum, quanto magis credit ex integro, quod animo remotum est a sensibus carnis." He had said before: "Hoc sacramentum Corporis sui et Sanguinis ad salutem fidelium animarum in terris relinquere voluit, ut fidei integritas propensius roboretur, et credentium merita cumulatus augeantur" (in D'Achery's "Spicilegium," tom. i., p. 42).

The following is from Paschasius: "Visu corporeo et gustu propterea non demutantur, quatenus fides exerceatur ad justitiam, et ob meritum fidei merces in eo justitiæ consequatur" ("De Corpore et Sang. D.," cap. i., Op., c. 1557; Paris, 1618).

Later on, as the materialistic doctrine gains the ascendancy, and becomes, first, the prevalent, then the recognised, and then the authorized faith, examples of its connection with this idea of the merits of faith will be found to be multiplied. The following may be taken as samples: "Tribus ex causis sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis sui sub aliâ specie sumendum instituit, ad augendum meritum, ad fovendum sensum, et ad vitandum ridiculum: ad augendum meritum, quia aliud ibi cernitur, et aliud creditur" . . . (Peter Damiani, "Expos. Can. Missæ," § 7; in Mai's "Scriptorum Vet. nova Collectio," tom. vi., par. 2, p. 216).

"Si autem credit, hoc quod videt esse Corpus Domini . . . ut . . . aut certe fidei ejus soliditas copiosius remuneranda comprobetur, qui contra id etiam quod oculis cernit de verbis ac potentiâ Domini, et communi ecclesiæ fide non dubitaverit" (Guitmundus, "De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi," lib. ii., fol. 27; Frib. B., 1530).

"Credimus terrenas substantias . . . converti in essentiam Dominici Corporis . . . ut credentes fidei præmia ampliora perciperent" (Lanfranc, "De Corp. et Sang. Dom.," cap. xviii., Op., p. 179; Venet., 1745).

"Cur sub aliâ specie et non sub propriâ hoc sacramentum dederit? Solutio. Ut fides haberet meritum, quæ est de invisilibus" (Hugo de Sancto Victore, in 1 Cor. xi., Op., tom. i., p. 530).

"Sub aliâ specie . . . carnem et sanguinem tradidit Christus . . . ut fides haberet meritum . . . quia fides non habet meritum, ubi humana ratio præbet experimentum" (Lombard, "Sent.," lib. iv., distinct. xi., fol. 312; Paris, 1558).

over the natural intuitions of the human understanding. How complete was the victory, how full the merit of faith, when it learned to believe that the utterance of Christ's words caused sight to be deceived and man's senses to be

"Minuit utilitatem meriti, quia ponendo quod accidentia non possunt esse sine subjecto, innitendo rationibus humanis, meritum fidei immittitur. . . . In hoc sacramento non est attendendum iudicium sensuum sed potius fidei meritum. . . . Plus autem meretur homo fide hujus sacramenti, quam si essent (accidentia) in subjecto" (Alexander de Hales, "Comment. in Sent.," par. iii.; "De Off. Missæ," art. iii., § 1; quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 149).

"Respondeo dicendum, quod sensu apparet, facta consecratione, omnia accidentia panis et vini remanere. Quod quidem rationabiliter per divinam providentiam fit. . . . Tertio, ut dum invisibiliter corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri sumimus, hoc proficiat ad meritum fidei" (T. Aquinas, "Summa," par. iii., vol. ii.; Quæst., lxxv., art. v., Lugd., 1663, viii., p. 211).

"Quinque autem ex causis sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis sui Christus sub aliâ specie sumendum instituit. Prima est ad augendum meritum, quoniam aliud ibi cernitur, et aliud esse creditur, ut fides habeat meritum, cui humana ratio non præbet experimentum" (Durandus, "Rationale," lib. iv., cap. xli., § 30, p. 259; Naples, 1859).

"Sub aliâ specie tradidit, et deinceps a fidelibus sumendum instituit, quia fides non habet meritum, cui humana ratio præbet experimentum" (Nicolas de Lyra, "Comment.," vol. vi., p. 50; 1 Cor. xi.; quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 190).

So Peter de Alliaco: "Hoc est voluntate Dei volentis quod aliquid contra communem cursum naturæ appareat sensui ut magis sit meritum fidei. Unde multi Catholici ponunt in sacramento multa fieri a solo Deo ne evacuetur fidei meritum" ("Quarti Sententiarum, Quæstio Quinta," II., fol. B. ii.; Wolff, 1500).

"Ut augeatur meritum fidei, quæ in hoc sacramento maxime meretur" (Gerson, "Compendium Theol.," tract iii.; "De Sacramentis," Op., tom. i., c. 270, 271, Antwerp, 1706).

So Thomas Waldensis: "Quid igitur mirum, si de carne salvatoris in sacramento valde occulta propter meritum fidei aspicientes non clare dicant ad singula?" ("De Sacr. Euch.," cap. lv., Op., tom. i., f. 93, Venice, 1571).

"What merit should our faith have for the belief of the said Sacrament if we, by the corporal senses of our body and by our natural wit, did attain and have the knowledge and plain experience therein?" (Smythe's "Assertion and Defence," fol. 224; quoted from Scudamore's "Notitia Eucharistica," p. 966, 2nd edition).

Note that all this teaching may be said to be crowned by the Tridentine Catechism: "Dum Corpus et sanguinem Domini ita sumimus, ut tamen, quod vere sit, sensibus percipi non possit, hoc ad fidem in animis nostris augendam plurimum valet: quæ fides, ut Sancti Gregorii sententiâ pervulgatum est, ibi non habet meritum, ubi humana ratio præbet experimentum" (pars ii., § 46).

Well had Wyclif argued against the notion that "ad augendum

a deceiver, and that in spite of the report of our very perceptions, the *individuum vagum* expressed by "this" was now bread no more, but only the glorified body of Christ clothed with the accidents of bread—accidents now existing by miracle without their substance, and forming only a "species" by which sight¹ must needs be misled, but misled only that it might have its misleading corrected by the triumphant exercise of faith—of faith herein supremely meritorious by reason of its striking down and riding roughshod over the contradictions, not of man's intellectual pride, but of the senses and reason with which God has endowed us that they may be used in His service!² There were those, indeed, who strongly opposed such teaching, and insisted that, where two interpretations were possible, the easier, not the more difficult, was rather to be chosen. But the merits of faith gained the day.

(c) Before I pass on, I must ask you to observe that this

nostram meritoriam credendi difficultatem sunt talia ardua ac difficilia credenda de hostia" ("De Eucharistia," Wyclif Society, p. 124; see also Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," p. 966, 2nd edition).

Such sayings might well be answered in the words of Durandus: "Non oportet difficultates fidei difficultatibus superaddere" (In iv. Sent., dist. xi., qu. 3; see J. Forbes, of Corse, "Inst. Hist. Theol.," lib. xi., cap. vi., Op., tom. ii., p. 504; Amstel., 1702); and by the teaching of Scotus: "The fewest miracles are to be assumed, which may be. . . . A mode is not to be fixed upon which is most difficult to understand, and which is attended by most inconveniences. . . . To lay down any way of understanding it, which is above measure difficult, and which evidently involves inconveniences, becomes an occasion of repelling from the faith all philosophers, nay, almost all who follow natural reason" (In IV. dist. xi., qu. 3, n. 3; see Pusey's "Real Presence from the Fathers," pp. 18, 19).

¹ It may be well to contrast with the hymn, "Visus, tactus, gustus in te fallitur, Sed auditu solo tuto creditur," the following saying of Tertullian: "Non licet, non licet nobis in dubium sensus istos devocare, ne et in Christo de fide eorum deliberetur. . . Fidelis fuit et visus et auditus in monte: fidelis et gustus vini illius, licet aquæ ante, in nuptiis Galilææ: fidelis et tactus, exinde creduli Thomæ. Recita Joannis testationem: Quod vidimus, inquit, quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostræ contrectaverunt de Sermone vitæ. Falsa utique testatio, si oculorum et aurium et manuum sensus natura mentitur" ("De Anima," cap. xvii., Op., p. 276, edit. Rigalt, 1689; see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 24, 25).

² See Scudamore's "Notitia Eucharistica," pp. 964 *et seq.*, 2nd edit.

is not at all a question of believing or doubting that what God has promised (however divinely marvellous), He is able also to perform. It is simply and strictly a question of the interpretation of words—a question of choosing to understand our Saviour's language in a most unnatural (however literal) sense—a sense in which it involves contradictions to sight and sense and reason¹—in preference

¹ "As if faith," to use the words of Jeremy Taylor, "were more faith for being against reason" ("Works," edit. Eden., vol. vi., p. 98).

Well has this good bishop said: "A sense that cannot be true without a miracle to make it so, it is a miracle if it be true; and, therefore let the literal sense in any place be presumed and have the advantage of the first offer or presumption; yet if it be ordinarily impossible to be so, and without a miracle cannot be so, and the miracle nowhere affirmed, then to affirm the literal sense is the hugest folly that can be in the interpretation of any Scriptures" ("Real Presence," Sect. xi., § 6, "Works," edit. Eden., vol. vi., p. 102).

The following words, addressed by the Jesuit Fisher to King James I., are very valuable as a brief summary of the faith to which the human mind in the Dark Ages was being led on. He speaks of the doctrine of transubstantiation as "accompanied with many seeming absurdities and repugnances against sense, particularly these four:

"First, that a body as big as our Saviour's, remaining still truly corpulent in itself, should be contained within the compass of a round host, scarce an inch long and broad.

"Secondly, that a body so glorious should be combined unto corruptible elements, and so made subject unto the indignities and obscenities that may befall unto them.

"Thirdly, that the same body may be in heaven and on earth in innumerable places at once.

"Fourthly, that the substance of bread being converted into Christ's body, the sole accidents remain by themselves, performing the whole office of substance, even to the nutrition of man's body."

And then he adds: "To give full satisfaction in this point, I set down this proposition: That these seeming absurdities should not avert, but *rather incline a true Christian mind to believe this mystery*" (see White's "Reply to Fisher," p. 437; London, 1624).

Such teaching is not to be spoken of as above the finite understanding of man. It is distinctly repugnant to the reason which God has given to us, and contradictory to common sense. It is the contradiction of what we naturally apprehend to be the truth concerning the nature of things.

Bellarmino wrote: "*Qui dicit, inter ea, quæ potest Deus, esse etiam, ponere unum Corpus in pluribus locis, hic Deum exultat, et hominem deprimit, cum fateatur plura posse facere, quam nos intelligamus: qui autem id negat, Deum deprimit, et hominem exultat, cum dicat, Deum non posse facere, quod homo non potest capere*"

to a natural sense, a sense in which Christ is trusted to make good His own word to our souls, and that in a way which He Himself (we believe) has taught us to know as the only way in which His gift can be profitable to our

("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. iii., cap. iii.; "De Contr.," tom. iii., c. 662, Ingol., 1601).

So the "Fortalium Fidei" had said: "Manifestum est quod plus potest Deus in operando quam intellectus in apprehendendo" (lib. iii.; "Consid.," vi.; "Impos.," xvi.).

But this is no question of accepting truth which we are unable to understand, but of rejecting fables which we can understand to be false, or of interpreting words in a sense which they never could have conveyed to ordinary understandings (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 166-175).

Christian faith, bowing reverently before the revelation of God, may not be asked to submit itself to absurdities which come of teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

It is the part, not of well-instructed faith, but of superstitious credulity, to allow itself to be imposed upon by such strange additions to the teaching of primitive Christianity. These are as spectres walking in darkness, whereas the religion of Christ is the religion of light. Childlike faith is one thing. Childish folly is another thing. An inspired Psalmist has said: "My soul is even as a weaned child." An inspired Apostle has taught us: "In understanding be men."

"It is a strange affection," wrote Archbishop Wake, "that some men have got of late for *contradictions*; they are so in love with them that they have almost brought it to be the definition of a mystery, to be the revelation of something to be believed in *opposition to sense and reason*" (in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 80).

And so Archbishop Secker declared: "They must not say this doctrine is a mystery, for there is no mystery, no obscurity in it; but it is as plainly seen to be an error as anything else is seen to be a truth. And the more so because it relates, not to an infinite nature, as God, but entirely to what is finite, a bit of bread and a human body" ("Lectures on Catechism," vol. ii., p. 246, edit. 1769; see also Abbott's "Essays," pp. 88 *et seq.*).

"The doctrine of the Trinity," says Dean Aldridge, "*transcends* natural reason; transubstantiation *contradicts* it in its own sphere" ("Reply to Two Discourses," pp. 21, 22; Oxford, 1687).

So Bishop Stillingfleet had written: "In the Trinity we considered an infinite being, to which no bounds can be set without destroying its nature; but in transubstantiation we suppose a true finite body, which hath its natural bounds and limits to one certain place, and yet you will and must suppose this body to be equally present in many thousand distant places at the same time, which implies so great a repugnancy to the very nature of a body, that I can by no means give my assent to it" (Stillingfleet's "Works," vol. vi., p. 612).

Mr. G. S. Faber, indeed, dislikes and mistrusts arguments against transubstantiation from natural impossibilities and contradictions ("Christ's Discourse at Capernaum," *Introd.*, p. xxxiii.). But so long

souls, and the way in which His words have been interpreted for us by His inspired Apostle.¹

2. It remains to turn for a moment to the language of Reformed theology. Its standing of this side of the separation being known and notorious, we may well bear with sayings which on the other side would certainly mean dangerous error. Accordingly, we need not be startled to find in the Directory of the Westminster Assembly, as well as in Baxter's service, the minister instructed to deliver the bread with these words, "Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you," nor to hear the martyr Bradford declare that he would rather the consecrated bread should be called the body of Christ than otherwise,² nor to read the saying of Brooks the Puritan, that he would rather give his life to a murderer than Christ's body to an unworthy receiver.³ And accordingly, although when the religious atmosphere is charged with false doctrine greater carefulness is required, we may err, when our standing on this side has been sufficiently proclaimed, in being over-cautious in avoiding all language which has been used to express the teaching of the other side. For we may be surrendering expressions which belong to our side not less than to the other, and virtually conceding that they can fairly mean only the doctrine for which our opponents would claim them as exclusively their own. In strange ignorance or forgetfulness of the

as we possess the faculties of intuition and common-sense, it is incredible that—according to God's will and purpose—these should be ordered out of court, when they are fully conscious that they can give important or conclusive evidence on a controverted question (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 172-175). And it will be found that the truth of this principle is fully recognised by Mr. Faber himself in pp. 51, 52, and 60 of the same treatise.

Even T. Aquinas maintains: "In hoc sacramento veritatis, sensus non decipitur circa ea, quorum iudicium ad ipsum pertinet, inter quæ est fractio" ("Sum.," par. iii., vol. ii.; Quæst. lxxvii., art. vii.).

¹ See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 177, 178.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 435, 436.

³ See Bradford's "Sermons," P.S. edit., pp. 94, 95.

⁴ See Appendix to Memoir in Brooks's "Works," vol. i., pp. 49, 50, Nichol's edition.

need of this word of caution, how many quotations have been made from the writings of Reformed divines as if in support of errors—errors of the other side—but errors which it is certain these writers never meant to defend, but were ready to banish and drive away as earnest maintainers of the truth on our side!

III. But now my remaining caution has to do with what may be called, not a matter of language, but a real and not unimportant point of doctrine pertaining to this controversy. Let me bespeak for it a very careful consideration. I will state my caution thus: WE ARE DILIGENTLY TO AVOID BEING MISUNDERSTOOD AND MISREPRESENTED AS MINIMISERS IN RESPECT OF THE TRUE DOCTRINE AND THE REAL GRACE AND BLESSING OF THE EUCHARISTIC FEAST. In rejecting what used to be known as “the Corporal Presence,” we lose nothing of that which is food for our spiritual hunger, for the strengthening and refreshing, not of our bodies, but of our souls. We claim, as Reformed theology has always claimed, that the real giving and taking and receiving of the *Res Sacramenti* belongs to the teaching of our side quite as truly as to that of the other side.

It is true, indeed, that in the earlier stages of the controversy the Swiss school of divines, in their desire to avoid ambiguities and to separate themselves altogether from anything that could sound like the Romish Real Presence, gave less prominence to this teaching, and, emphasising chiefly the *significant* aspect of the words of institution, gave cause for uneasiness—as tending to reduce the ordinance to bare signs and naked figures. “This,” says Hooker, “was it that some did exceedingly fear, lest Zuinglius and Œcolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of this Sacrament, but only as of a shadow, destitute, empty, and void of Christ.”¹ But, though the tendency may even afterwards have shown signs of revival, the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549 (many years after

¹ See “Eccles. Pol.,” book v., chap. lxvii., § 2; “Works,” vol. ii., p. 349, edit. Keble.

Zwingle's death), and the influence of wiser theologians brought about a sound agreement as to the true giving, receiving, and eating which pertain to the faith of the Eucharist. "By opening the several opinions which have been held," says Hooker again, "they are grown, for aught I can see, on all sides at the length, to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely, the real participation of Christ and of life in His body and blood by means of this Sacrament." Accordingly the later Helvetic Confession (of 1566) is clear and strong in the expression of the doctrine which, in the former Helvetic Confession of 1536, had been, not indeed omitted, but somewhat less strongly and distinctly enunciated, and which in the Confession of Basle of 1532 had hardly received a full recognition. I must not be taking up time by quotations, but it may be truly said that evidence abounds to the fact that the doctrine of the Reformed does fully meet all the requirements of the Scriptural teaching—of the faith once delivered to the Saints—as to the real partaking, the real giving and taking and eating, of the body and blood of Christ, and that verily and indeed, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.¹ And this being so, it must surely be obvious that a great and serious mistake is made when our opponents seek to represent the chasm of cleavage as surrounding only a doctrine of merely significant and not effectual signs, and then desire to claim as all their own the witness to true giving and receiving which can be brought forward so abundantly from the writings of the Fathers, from the liturgies of antiquity, as well as from the works of our great English divines, and from our English Book of Common Prayer.

But then our contention is that this giving and receiving is only after a heavenly and spiritual manner—that the giver is not the presbyter who ministers to us the sign, but the true Lord of the Feast who gives to our souls the thing signified by the sign. We maintain that the thing signified

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 388-410, 725-744.

and really given is not really *in* the sign. In strictness of speech it is a thing distant not in place only but in time. It is the Lord's body crucified and His blood outpoured for the sin of the world; it is the real beneficial possession of His very death and sacrifice; it is "remission of our sins and all the benefits of His passion" which is here made over to us. And our taking, receiving, and eating is all spiritual. For this is the "verily and indeed" of all our taking and receiving. The means whereby the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the Supper is faith. Faith is the hand, and faith is the mouth of the soul. And the taking and receiving verily and indeed is the privilege of "the faithful." The expression "spiritually by faith," so often in the mouths of our Reforming divines,¹ is the key to the interpretation of all teaching concerning the reality of receiving and taking in the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. And it must not be forgotten that faith comes to Christ, to be satisfied with the spiritual food of His most precious body and blood, not only in the Ordinance of the Eucharist, but also (and not less really, as the Fathers testify²) in the learning and inwardly digesting of the Word of truth, the oracles of God, the doctrine of the Gospel, the promises of the New Covenant.

While, however, giving and receiving require (of necessity) no real presence at all—for (to use an illustration very familiar to Anglican divines) estates far away are constantly given and received by signing and sealing deeds of conveyance, and (to use the illustration of St. Bernard, for which he was blamed by Aquinas)³ abbacies were conferred by the delivery of a staff—it is obvious that eating and drinking do require a certain presence of that which is eaten and drunken. We cannot possibly feed upon, nor be nourished by, that which is really, and in every sense of

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 722-725; also pp. 86, 93, 109, 128, 129, 147, 149, 151, 153, 194, 195, 201, 202, 215.

² See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 330 *et seq.*

³ See "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 49, 50.

the word, afar off. But here again we have to remember the word "spiritually by faith." As the eating and drinking is all by faith, so the only presence required is presence "to faith," or, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor expresses it, presence "to our spirits only." And what question can there be that the cross of the Redeemer, the death of the Son of God, the separated body and blood of Christ, are really present to faith? Dr. John Owen, the learned Independent divine, 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," vol. ix., p. 572, edit. Gould). And Perkins, the celebrated Puritan, wrote: "There must 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 we consent with the Romish Church touching Real Presence. We differ not touching the Presence itself, but only in the manner of the Presence" ("Works," vol. i., p. 590, edit. Cambridge, 1616). Faith in its exercise finds no impediment in distance. Or, rather, to faith distance is not absence.² When Cœcolampadius wrote "Per fidem

¹ Taylor's "Real Presence," sec. i., § 8.

² So Bishop Cosin: "Præsentia Corporis Christi in hoc mysterio, non distantia sed absentia opponitur; et quidem ista, non illa, usum et fruitionem objecti intercipit" ("Hist. Transubs.," cap. iv., § 4; "Works, A. C. L.," vol. iv., p. 48).

Let it be noted how, in the following extract, Turretin adopts the very words of Cosin: "Patet rerum creaturarum præsentiam non esse metiendam locorum vel propinquitate vel longinquitate, sed ex relatione illa æstimandam, quâ fit ut is cui res præsens est, eâ commode frui queat; nam presentia, non distantia, sed absentia opponitur; ista non illa usum et fruitionem objecti intercipit" ("Instit. Theol. Elenc." iii., p. 567, Geneva, 1686).

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

And again: "A Real Presence of Christ we acknowledge, but not 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" ("Meditations on H. Sac.," "Works," vol. iii., p. 72, edit. 1826).

absentissimum Corpus Christi, animo præsentissimum est," he was attributing to faith nothing more than had been given to it not only by St. Augustin, but still more

So Peter Martyr had taught in his "Confessio de Cæna Domini" appended to some editions of his "Locis Communes": "A multis non existimatur Corpus Christi vere posse communicari, nisi realiter et corporaliter . . . præsens fuerit. . . . *Li meo iudicio vim fidei non satis perceptam habent. Non animadvertunt per eam præsentia nobis fieri quæ alioqui longissime distant*" (quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 366).

"Locali intervallo non obstante ipse Christus intime et realiter præsens est dignis communicantibus; præsentia tamen non corporali, sed spirituali" (J. Forbes, of Corse, "Works," vol. ii., p. 502, b. Amst., 1702). See also Sadeel's "Works," pp. 236 *et seq.*, 378, 382, Off. Sanct., 1593.

Maresius, in his Commentary on the Belgic Confession, says: "Quidni Christus quamvis absens loco et corpore, præsens nobis fieret spiritu et fide, quando quidem hæc est fidei veræ indoles, haud absimilis tubis opticis, 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).

"The believing apprehension and the assurance of faith make in some sense present to the believing mind the past transactions of our soul's redemption" (Wahrh. Bek. der D. de K. in Zurich, 1545. See Winer's "Confessions of Christendom," p. 272, Clark).

The teaching of Pareus on this point is specially worthy of attention. He allows the force of the argument, "Quod nullo modo præsens est in Eucharistia, nullo modo potest manducari. Præterea: panis dicitur *κοινωνία* Corporis Christi. At simpliciter absentis nulla datur *κοινωνία*." He concludes: "Dicendum igitur primo, quod . . . non omnis præsentia corporis et sanguinis Christi sit nobis neganda. . . . Nec rationes negantes in contrarium sunt validæ. Tantum enim valent contra præsentiam realem corporis in pane, vel in loco panis. . . . Sacramentalem vero et spiritualem præsentiam nihil lædunt, quia utraque ex verbis Domini, et Pauli, et Patrum haberi potest. . . . *Sensus animi* sunt vel naturales; ut mens, ratio, cogitatio, voluntas, memoria: vel supernaturales; ut fides, spes. Secundum hos sane Corpus Christi, fidelibus dicitur præsentissimum. . . . *Hominem pie fidelem non est dubitandum cum Christo esse per fidem*, inquit Augustinus. *Κοινωνία* spiritualis fidelium cum Christi corpore et sanguine in sacra cæna non est neganda, sed firmiter credenda. At *κοινωνία* talis est vera præsentia spiritualis corporis et sanguinis Christi in cæna. Hæc præsentia igitur spiritualis recte asseritur et creditur. . . . A phrasi spiritualis præsentia nulli orthodoxi theologi nostri seculi abhorruerunt, sed . . . omnes confessi sunt. . . . Christum vere adesse, et præsentem esse in suâ cæna fidelibus: adeo ut absque corpore et sanguine Christi nulla cæna Domini esse possit" (Comment. in 1 Cor. xi., "Op. Theol. Exeg.," par. iv., p. 140, Frankfort, 1647).

¹ See "D. D. Œcolampadii et Zwinglii Epistolæ," fol. 129, Basil, 1536.

clearly by Pope Leo the Great, and after him scarcely less distinctly by Rupert of Duyts, who says that to faith "præsentia sunt omnia præterita."¹ And we are not to suppose that this teaching of Presence to the soul by faith had been altogether lost in the ages of darkness. Even Innocent III., who himself set the crown of Papal authority (it was the work of the Pope rather than of the Council)

¹ "Respondent, Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cælum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte et tenuisti. . . Tu tene Corde" (Augustin, in "Johan. Ev.," chap. xi., tract I., § 4, Op., tom. iii., par. ii., c. 630, Paris, 1680).

"Secundum præsentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum: secundum præsentiam Carnis, recte dictum est discipulis, *Me autem non semper habebitis*. Habuit enim illum Ecclesia secundum præsentiam Carnis paucis diebus: modo fide tenet, oculis non videt" (*ibid.*, § 13, c. 634).

"Habet Christum . . . in præsentia per fidem, in præsentia per signum, in præsentia per baptismatis sacramentum, in præsentia per altaris cibum et potum" (*ibid.*, § 12, c. 633).

"Cœnam manibus suis consecratam discipulis dedit: sed nos in illo convivio non discubimus; et tamen ipsam cœnam fide quotidie manducamus. . . . Noli parare fauces, sed cor. Inde commendata est ista cœna, Ecce credimus in Christum, cum fide accipimus. . . . Modicum accipimus, et in corde saginamur. Non enim quod videtur, sed quod creditur, percipit" (*ibid.*, sermo cxii., § 4, 5, Op., tom. v., par. i., cc. 565, 566).

"Habet enim hanc potentiam fides vera, ut ab iis mente non desit, quibus corporalis præsentia interesse non potuit, et sive in præteritum redeat, sive in futurum se cor credentis extendat, nullas sentiat moras temporis cognitio veritatis" (D. Leonis Papæ, Sermo xix. in "Heptas Præsulum," p. 67, Paris, 1661).

"Totus adest, totus sancto incumbit altari, non ut iterum patiat, sed ut fidei, cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita, Ejus passio memoriter repræsentetur" (Rupertus Tuitiensis, de Trin., lib. xlii.; in Gen., lib. vi., cap. xxvii., Op., tom. i., c. 431, edit. Migne).

So the teaching of Cyril of Jerusalem has been interpreted as making the presence and the sacrifice "due to the action of the Holy Ghost . . . making the past contemporary with the present in its application" (Ffoulkes, "Primitive Consecration," p. 75).

² See the assertion of the editor of his works (Colon., 1575, in tom. i., p. 460). The statement is disputed by Bellarmine, but is confirmed by the wording of chap. xxix. and chap. xxxiii. Du Pin declares: "Matthew Paris says that those Canons seemed tolerable to some of the prelates, but grievous to others. . . . Let the case be how it will, 'tis certain that these canons were not made by the council, but by Innocent III., who presented them to the Council ready drawn up, and ordered them to be read, and that the prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, but that their silence was taken for approbation" (vol. xi., p. 95, London, 1699). See also "Translator to

on the new-born doctrine of Transubstantiation, would not allow the *Res Sacramenti* to go further than the mouth of the communicant. "Christus de ore," he taught, "transit ad cor." It is true that his teaching herein was

Reader," p. 2; and Cosin's Works, "A. C. L.," vol. iv., pp. 222, 473, 477, 482. The subject is discussed in Greenwood's "Cathedra Petri," book xiii., c. ix., pp. 637-639. See also "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 71, 72.

¹ These words of Innocent should be read in connection with their context:—

"Si vero præsentia quæritur corporalis, in cælo quæatur, ubi Christus est in dextrâ Dei sedens. Ad tempus tamen præsentiam exhibuit corporalem, ut ad spiritualem præsentiam invitaret. Cum sacramentum tenetur, comeditur et gustatur, Christus corporaliter adest in visu, in tactu, et in sapore. Quamdiu corporalis sensus officitur, corporalis præsentia non aufertur. Postquam autem in percipiendo sensus deficit corporalis, deinceps non est quærenda corporalis præsentia sed spiritualis est retinenda. Dispensatione completa, *Christus de ore transit ad cor. Melius est enim ut procedat in mentem, quam ut descendat in ventrem. Cibus est non carnis sed animæ. Venit ut comedatur, non ut consumatur: ut gustetur, non ut incorporetur. Ore comeditur, sed stomacho non digeritur. Reficit animum, sed non effluit in secessum*" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xv., Op., tom. i., p. 383, Colon., 1575).

It should be observed that while the whole of this quotation will be found (with certain varieties of expression) in Hugo de Santo Victore, lib. ii., par. viii., cap. xiii. (Op., tom. iii., fol. 290, Ven., 1588), the part printed in italics is found almost verbatim in the "Expositio Canonis Missæ Secundum Petrum Damiani," as printed in Mai's "Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio," tom. vi., par. ii., p. 215. If this treatise is indeed the work of the writer whose name it bears, which Mai seems not to doubt (see "Præf.," p. xxxiii., and par. ii., note, p. 211), it is interesting to observe that we have here the earliest known instance of the use of the word "transubstantiatio" (see § 7, p. 215). [The claim of Stephanus Eduensis must give way if we accept the correction of Bellarmine's error as to his date (see "Bibliotheca Maxima," tom. xx., p. 1872 and p. 1879).] And then the fact that Innocent made use of this treatise (see also cap. xvi. compared with "Damiani," § 6) will make it probable that he derived from Damiani the term which he inserted in the Lateran Decree, though it may probably have become, to some extent, a recognised form of expression before this.

It is still more important to note that Damiani, when writing this work, appears to have had before him the writing of Florus Magister (see Mai's note, p. 219), and that Florus had strongly insisted on the truth (to which the earlier fathers had abundantly borne witness) that the *Res Sacramenti* is food only for the soul (see "Eucharistic Worship," app., note ii., p. 329). See his letter concerning the Council of Chiersy (A.D. 837) in "Mansi," tom. xiv., c. 743, 744, especially c. 744, where, following the teaching of St. Augustin, he says: "Qui

afterwards contradicted and virtually condemned by Pope Gregory XI. (towards the close of the following century), who insisted on the glorified body of Christ being conveyed as far as the stomach, requiring it (under pain of excommunication for the recalcitrant) to be followed by the faith of believers even into the belly of a mouse—"adeo

manducat intus, non foris; qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente. Credere enim in Eum hoc est manducare panem vivum, qui credit manducat. . . . Manet ergo in mente fidelium incorrupta venerabilis mysterii virtus, et efficacissima potentia."

But the words of Damiani, as adopted by Innocent, will be found to be almost an echo of the following words of Florus: "Mentis ergo est cibus ille, non ventris; non corrumpitur, sed permanet in vitam æternam, quoniam pie sumentibus confert vitam æternam" ("Adv. Amalarium," cap. i., § 9, Op., edit. Migne, c. 73). Compare the following from the same Council of Chiersy: "Panis et vinum efficitur spiritualiter corpus Christi, etc. Mentis ergo est cibus iste, non ventris; nec corrumpitur, sed permanet in vitam æternam" (Synod Caris., "MS. apud N. Ranchinum, in senatu Tolesano regium Consiliarium," as quoted by Archbishop Ussher, "Works," vol. iii., p. 82).

Compare the following:—

"Cibus ille cordis et animæ est" (Rufinus, Com. in Ps. xxi. (xxii.), 26, Op., tom. ii., fol. 48, Lugd., 1570).

"Meus cibus est qui non corpus impinguat, sed confirmat cor hominis" (Ambrose, in Ps. cxviii. (cxix.), serm. xviii., § 26, Op., tom. i., p. 1202, edit. Bened., Paris, 1690).

"Non corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est. . . . Cor nostrum esca ista confirmat, et potus iste lætificat cor hominis" (Ambrose, "De Mysteriis," cap. ix., § 58, Op., tom. ii., p. 341, edit. Bened., Paris, 1690).

"Qui manducat intus, non foris, qui manducat in corde" (Augustine, tract xxvi. in "Evang. Joh.," c. vi.).

"Corporali ore corporaliter manducamus et bibimus, quotiens de altari Dominico Dominicum corpus per manum sacerdotis accipimus: spirituali vero ore cordis spiritualiter comeditur et hauritur, quando suaviter et utiliter, ut dicit beatus Augustinus, in memoriâ reconditur quod unigenitus Dei Filius pro salute mundi carnem accepit, in cruce pendit, resurrexit," etc. (Lanfranc, "L. de Corp. et Sang. Dom.," cap. xvii., Op., p. 179, Venice, 1745).

"Spiritualis refectio spiritualis omnino. . . . Veritatis insinuatio ut credatur quod sit tantum cibus animæ—communio spiritualis non corporalis" (Alexander de Hales, "Comment. in Sent.," par. ii., "De Off. Missæ," art. iii., § 1; quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 149).

"Ut significaretur quod iste cibus non est corporis sed animæ" (Albertus Magnus, Op., vol. xxi., dist. i. L. V., tract iii., c. xxiii., p. 134, Lugduni, 1602; quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 158).

ut" (to use the language of Bishop Cosin) "dubitare illis non liceat, quin res sit de fide, quæ a fide maxime abhorret" ("Works," A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 97).¹ But the concurrent *dictum* (which had been handed down from earlier ages), "Cibus est non carnis sed animæ," still held its own, and strongly influenced a current of teaching which flowed on and kept its course through the stream of pre-Tridentine doctrine.² I do not mean that this current of doctrine was

"Corpus Christi non convertitur in corpus hominis, sed reficit mentem ejus" (T. Aquinas, "Sum.," par. iii., vol. ii.; Quæst., lxxvii., art. vi.).

Durandus teaches that the "Res sacramenti" passes immediately from the closed mouth to heaven.

"Sumptum a sacerdote et quolibet alio, ore clauso in cælum rapitur" (Durandus, "Rationale," lib. iv., cap. xli., § 23, p. 258, Naples, 1859). But further on (§ 41, p. 262) Durandus adopts the language of Damiani and Innocent III.

The following is the judgment of Gerson: "Utrum in ventrem vadat? Dicitur secundum quosdam quod dum est in ore, adhuc præsens est sub illis speciebus, sed statim cum glutitur Corpus Christi, transit in mentem, et species illæ panis et vini in ventrem. Alii, quibus magis credendum est, dicunt, quod intrat in ventrem, et ibi tamdiu remanet, quamdiu species illæ sunt incorruptæ, et cum species desinunt esse panis et vini, desinunt etiam esse Caro et Sanguis Christi. . . . Nec obstat verbum Augustini quod videtur movere eos qui sunt in priore opinione, scilicet *quod quamdiu est in ore, tamdiu est in mente*" ("Compendium Theologiæ," tract iii.; "De Sacr. Euch.," Op., tom. i., c. 275, Antwerp, 1706).

¹ In this the Pope was following the teaching of Aquinas and others among the scholastics, who regarded the matter as a crucial test of the true faith in the integrity of the Sacrament. Brentius and others of the stricter Lutherans favoured the same opinion. And we are assured that "the Lutherans in Ansbach disputed about the question whether the body of Christ were actually swallowed, like other food, and digested in the stomach." It is hard to believe the extent to which this superstition was carried in some parts of Lutheran Germany. The following may serve as an example: "When the Rev. John Musculus, in Frankfort-on-the-Oder, inadvertently spilled a little wine at the Communion, he was summoned before a synod, and Elector John Joachim, of Brandenburg, declared that deposition, prison, and exile were too mild a punishment for such a crime, and that the offender, who had not spared the blood of Christ, must suffer bloody punishment, and have two or three fingers cut off" (Schaff, "Creeds of Ch.," pp. 284-285).

² See, eg., the "Fortalium Fidei," lib. iii., Cosid. vi., Imposs. xxiii., fol. lxxiv., Nuremberg, 1485, where the writer, quoting from Hugo de Santo Victore, says: "Corporalis præsentia quærenda non est, sed spiritualis retinenda. Dispensatio completa est. Sacramentum intus manet. Christus de ore ad cor transit. Melius est tibi ut eat in

identical with the faith of the "Reformed." We may probably think that in consistency it should have been so. But there were few who were ready, like Wyclif in his old age, to follow their own teaching up to the point to which consistency might have led them. The voice of the Pope had been heard. The Pope had said "Yea." Who, then, should venture to say "Nay"?

Anyhow, our Reformers and subsequent divines were continually appealing to a catena of mediæval and later doctors who taught that, but for the authority which had defined the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the meaning of the words of the Institution, and therefore all that belonged to the faith of the Eucharistic Presence, could very well have been held without it. One of these, Fisher (Bishop of Rochester), declared there was not a word in the Institution by which the true Presence in the Mass could be established. And it is well known that Cardinal Cajetan, though an upholder of Transubstantiation, used words on this subject which, by order of Pope Pius V., were expunged from the Roman edition of his works.¹ Indeed, Bellarmine himself professes that the Real Presence in the elements is needless (though not useless) for purposes of Communion.² The Presence is necessary, in his view, for the purpose of the sacrifice, but for Communion (for Sacramental purposes) effectual signs ("signa

mentem tuam quam in ventrem tuum. Cibus iste animæ non corporis est" (see Hugo de S. Vict., "De Sacramentis Fidei," lib. ii., par. viii., cap. xiii.; further evidence may be seen in "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 331-333).

See also Bonaventure, "In Sent," lib. iv., dist. xii., par. i., dub. iii.; also dist. xii., art. ii., quæst i., concl. § 4 ("tantum cibus mentis, non ventris"). But this opinion could not make headway against the force of growing superstitions. "Dominicus Soto in 4 dist. 12 q. 1, art. iii., ait Hugonem Victorinum et Innocentium III. *stupenda de hac re dixisset, et si quis eadem nunc diceret, ab ecclesia fore condemnandum; sic nimirum error, instar fluvii, vires acquirit eundo.*" (Allix, Præf. historica in "Determ. Joannis Parisiensis," London, 1686.)

¹ See Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 362.

² See Bellarmine, "De Missâ," lib. i., cap. xxii., c. 1021; and "De Sac. Euch.," lib. iii., cap. ix., fol. 705-708. See also "Romish Mass and English Church," p. 89.

visibilia continentia virtualiter gratiam sanctificationis") would avail—herein running, it would seem, in the very teeth of Pope Innocent III., whose famous decree which established the doctrine of Transubstantiation proclaimed it as for the purpose of Communion, "ut ad proficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro" (Op., tom. i., p. 461, Colon, 1575).¹

Full well were Reformed divines, English and foreign, justified in contending that this presence to the faith of the soul is all that belongs to the essence of the Real Presence,

¹ It will be found also that Innocent III. was far from regarding the Real Presence of Christ's person, body, soul, and divinity, as a necessary consequence of transubstantiation. Thus he wrote: "Porro quum panis transubstantietur in corpus, et utique rationali spiritu animatum, videtur quod panis transubstantietur in hominem: pari ratione in Christum transubstantiatur, et ita in Creatorem. Sic ergo creatura quotidie fit Creator. . . Ego tamen sicut in aliis, ita pariter in hoc, divina sacramenta magis veneranda, quam discutienda profiteor. Scriptum est enim: Non comedetis ex eo crudum quid, nec coctum aqua, sed assum igni. Etsi secundum vim inferentiæ non sequatur: Quod si panis transubstantiatur in corpus humanum, ideo panis transubstantiatur in hominem, quia non homo, sed hominis pars est corpus" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xix., Op., tom. i., pp. 384, 385, Colon., 1575).

Yet it would be a mistake to infer that all idea of Christ's Personal Presence, or of concomitance, was either absent from his mind or rejected by his judgment. In chap. xvii. he had said: "Alii vero dicunt, et bene, quod licet ad prolationem præcedentium panis a natura mutetur in corpus, et ad prolationem sequentium vinum præterea mutetur in sanguinem, nunquam tamen est corpus sine sanguine, vel sanguis est sine corpore, sicut neutrum est sine anima, sed sub forma panis sanguis existat in corpore per mutationem panis in corpus, et converso. Non quod panis in sanguinem, vel vinum mutetur in corpus, sed quia neutrum potest existere sine reliquo. Est ergo sanguis sub speciebus panis, non ex vi sacramenti, sed ex naturali concomitantia" (pp. 383, 384).

It would appear that what subsequently took distinct shape, and became hardened into (at last) an article of faith, was in Innocent's time a floating opinion, which was commending itself as a probable outcome of the newly-developed doctrine.

Hagenbach must have overlooked this passage when he wrote that Aquinas was the first to make use of the term *concomitantia* (see his "Hist. of Doctrines," vol. ii., p. 106, Clark).

The opinion of concomitance has been attributed to Robert Pulleyn (see Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 146). But in truth the *doctrine* will be found stated by Anselm, Epist., Lib. iv., Ep. cvii., Op., p. 453. Paris, 1721.

and that all questions of its relation to the elements could therefore only be questions, not of faith but for the schools, not of the Presence but of the mode.¹ But mark the consequence. Writers, ignorant apparently of Reformation theology, have assumed that by "Real Presence" our divines could only mean Real Presence under the form of the elements, and that by the "mode" they meant only the manner of its existence there on the altar. Nor has this been all. The words of our Catechism, because they assume a Real Presence to the faith of the faithful receiver, have been appealed to in support of the doctrine of a Real Presence in the elements considered in themselves—a doctrine which by a curious mistake has been attributed to Bishop Overall, but which (as far as I know) no esteemed divine of the Church of England ever taught.² And what a record of misunderstandings and misrepresentations has followed this ignorance of the true teaching of Reformed theology!

To mention but a few examples. Ridley, I believe, has now been given up, but Ridley used to be claimed as the teacher of a teaching which he was burnt for denying. Archbishop Parker was sometimes confidently claimed as the patron of a doctrine, for the more distinct exclusion of which he secured the insertion of our Twenty-ninth Article of religion. How many times has Bishop Andrewes been quoted in support of a doctrine of the Real Presence which quite certainly was none of his!³ Bishop Cosin has been cited as teaching a mode of the Real Presence which, in terms most distinct, he clearly rejected. Bishop Morton has been appealed to in support of a doctrine of Real Presence which he was strongly opposing and effectually laying low. Bishop Jeremy Taylor has been quoted largely as teaching that which his doctrine of the Real Presence certainly condemned.

¹ See "Theology of Bishop Andrewes," pp. 12-17.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 295-305.

³ See "The Theology of Bishop Andrewes" (Elliot Stock), reprinted from *THE CHURCHMAN* of July and August, 1889.

The "Real Presence" of Laud and Bramhall and other divines of that school (so, at least, I am fully persuaded) was not the "Real Presence" of the teaching which belongs to the other side of the doctrinal chasm.¹ The Real Presence of Church of England divines is presence only to faith.² But then, it is surely a misrepresentation to stigmatize this Presence as having no truth or reality in any region outside, beyond, or above the subjective. Indeed this Presence, though separated so widely from what is now called "the Real Objective Presence," may nevertheless be truly said to be an objective Presence. For what can a merely subjective Presence be? Faith is not imagination. And faith has no creative power. Faith believes only what is true—objectively true. Faith can only realize that which is objectively real. And faith can

¹ In the "Real Presence of the Laudian Theology" (Macintosh) some crucial tests are applied to the teaching of these divines.

² It will be found, however, I believe, that the term "Real Presence" followed after the doctrine of the Council of Constance, which made a material addition to the decree of the fourth Lateran Council.

Thus it has been truly said, that "The term 'Real Presence' was begotten of false doctrine, and is expressive of it" (Vogan, "True Doctrine," p. 165; see also p. 91).

Ridley objected to the "diversity and newness of the phrase" (Works, p. 195).

And if it be true that "new and unauthorized words imply new and unauthorized conceptions," the Romish conception of "Real Presence" must stand condemned with that of "transubstantiation" (see Vogan's "True Doctrine," p. 91).

It is a phrase which has not received the sanction of any of the authorized formularies of the Church of England.

Nevertheless, its common use by English and other reformed divines in a sense altogether divested of new and unauthorized conceptions may be regarded as illustrating the principles of reformed theology, which desired to make manifest that in throwing down the false teachings which had been built on a basis of truth, it was parting with nothing that belonged to the underlying foundation of scriptural teaching.

The materialistic notion of the Real Presence was rejected because, though Romanists would allow no Real Presence without it, some of them confessed that the aim and purpose of the Real Presence were independent of it; and the reformed saw clearly that the essence of the presence was *only* that which pertains to our feeding on Christ in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving—i.e., presence to the soul, presence only to faith.

receive only what is given—truly and objectively given.¹ And the *Res Sacramenti* is equally offered with the sign to those who by unbelief reject and refuse—to their condemnation eating and drinking the sign or sacrament of so great a thing—and to those who by faith verily and indeed take and receive the Heavenly Gift to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls. This is nothing more than the theology of the “reformed” has consistently and strongly insisted on.²

Time will not allow me now to follow up this subject into the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Our modern teachers, like the Romish Doctors, make the Sacrifice of the Altar to rest for its basis on the Real Presence in the

¹ “*Dicimus hoc spiritualiter fieri, non ut efficaciam et veritatis loco imaginationem aut cogitationem supponamus*” (“*Conf. Gall.*,” art. 36).

Bishop Cosin says: “*De reali (id est, verâ et non imaginariâ) præsentia Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, Protestantium Ecclesiæ nullæ dubitant*” (“*Hist. Trans.*,” cap. ii., § 1, “*Works*,” A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 18).

Again: “*Fides non facit res præsentem, quæ promittuntur; fides enim, ut constat, magis proprie dicitur accipere et apprehendere, quam vel polliceri, vel præstare: Sed Verbum Dei et promissio cui fides innitur (non vero fides hominum) præsentia reddit quæ promittit: quemadmodum inter reformatos et pontificios aliquot consensus est in Collatione Sangermani habita. Male enim a multis Romanensibus nobis objicitur, quasi crederemus hanc Christi præsentiam et communicationem in sacramento, per nudam fidem tantum effici*” (“*Hist. Trans.*,” cap. ii., § viii., “*Works*,” A.C.L., vol. iv., pp. 30, 31; see Bishop Thirlwall, “*Charge*,” 1869, p. 56; and “*Real Presence of Laudian Theology*,” pp. 45, 46).

It should be well observed how strongly this is insisted on by our reformers. Witness the following: “*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. . . . I believe Christ is present there to the faith of the due receiver. . . . The receiving maketh not the presence, as your lordship would affirm; but God's grace, truth, and power is the cause of the presence, the which the wicked that lacketh faith cannot receive*” (Writings of Bradford, “*Sermons*,” etc., P.S. edit., pp. 488, 489; see also “*Papers on Eucharistic Presence*,” pp. 485-488).

² See “*Papers on Eucharistic Presence*,” pp. 689-698; also pp. 268 *et seq.* See also “*Real Presence of Laudian Theology*,” pp. 45, 46. See also Hall's “*Harmony*,” p. 327 (note); Turretin, “*Inst. Theol. Elencl.*,” iii., p. 380, edit. 1686; “*Ursinus*,” Op., tom. ii., p. 1164, Heid., 1612; and Sadeel, Op., p. 290, Off. Sanct., 1593.

elements. As a consequence, the *ἀνάμνησις* in their teaching directs faith's view to the sacrificing or memorialising act of the priest in the chancel, and only as behind that (though doubtless as the source of its efficacy) to the commemorated act of Christ upon the cross.

But consistently with our view of the Real Presence only in the heart and not in the hand, only in the heart and not on an altar, our Communion Service takes our faith back to the one oblation once offered, which then and there made a full and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. And with this sacrifice in the full view of our faith, with this as the object of our remembrance, we want no more. Nay, we can see that there is room for nothing more. Where remission of sins is, there is no more offering for sin. Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and His blood is drink indeed. It is meat and drink indeed, because it satisfies the true hunger and the true thirst of the soul. And it is this true hunger and thirst, wakened within us by the Holy Spirit of God, which, bringing us to the feast of the one perfect sacrifice, and there really but spiritually (I would rather say "really, because spiritually only") feeding by faith on the crucified body and the outpoured blood of Atonement, learns to render the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the spiritual food and sustenance vouchsafed to us in this Holy Sacrament.

Oh! what a true *sursum corda* springs out from the true view of this holy ordinance seen in its subservient but consecrated relation to the living Word of the living God, to the truth and power of the Gospel of Christ! Here is rest from the strife of tongues, and the soul's hiding-place is stillness from the danger and din of controversy. Oh! the comfort and support which comes of the sure and certain evidence which this Sacrament affords to the hard facts which lie at the very centre of our Christian faith—to the life, and death, and resurrection of our Blessed Lord! What a witness is here to the present justification, the perfect redemption, the full salvation, freely given to

sinner justly condemned to the outcasting of death! What a testimony to the blessed truth of the everlasting Gospel, when, in faith's true view of these holy mysteries, the Holy Spirit of truth takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us! And, oh! the blessed assurance which comes of the true faith of the mercy and love which has made such provision for each hungering and thirsting soul to open its mouth wide and be filled with the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, and then to depart in peace, saying to itself, "Now all is mine. Christ is mine. Now Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

APPENDIX ON THE AUGMENTATION THEORY

IF we may assume as the essential basis of the augmentation theory the persuasion that the consecrated elements are what they are named, by virtue of their being, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, united in some sort (*extra usum*), or added in some sort, to the body of Christ in heaven, or adopted (in some sort) by the person of the Logos, while continuing to be in nature and substance bread and wine still,¹ then the more this subject is studied historically, the more clearly (as I am persuaded) will it appear: (1) That the theory (understood in its widest sense) is much older than the eighth century, and owes to Damascenus not very much more than a certain consistency and distinctness of form; (2) that this theory largely influenced prevalent ecclesiastical thought in the West as well as in the East; (3) that this theory struggled for life, and had its survivals, and died hard after transubstantiation had become (in some sense) established as the faith of the Roman Church.

I. I will endeavour as briefly as possible to show some of the points of contact between the doctrine of Damascenus, and the teaching of some of the esteemed and

¹ In the case, however, of some of the later writers, it might perhaps almost seem as if we had the superadded idea of the consecrated elements being (in virtue of this union) *supernaturally* assimilated to the flesh and blood of the glorified body of Christ in heaven, before being *naturally* assimilated to the flesh and blood of the communicants on earth. Perhaps this may be regarded as a natural further step of transition to the doctrine of the Real Presence. But perhaps also the ambiguous language may not be intended to convey such a notion. In any case, the argument against the Romish "Real Presence" retains its force.

influential doctors in the earlier ages of the Church's history.

Let me begin with citing a few passages from (1) Justin Martyr, (2) Irenæus, (3) Origen.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

“Ὁν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι (Justin Martyr, Apol. I., § 1xvi., Op., p. 83, Hag. Com., 1742).

IRENÆUS.

Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ποτήριον, αἷμα ἴδιον ὠμολόγησε, ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἡμέτερον δεύει αἷμα, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ἄρτον, ἴδιον σῶμα διεβεβαιώσατο, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ ἡμέτερα αὔξει σώματα. Ὅποτε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγωνὸς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἐκ τούτων δὲ αὔξει καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις· πῶς δεκτικὴν μὴ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου τρεφομένην, καὶ μέλος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν; (Irenæus, “Contra Hæreses,” lib. v., cap. ii., §§ ii., iii., Op., p. 294. In edit. Migne, cc. 1125, 1126)

Ἦτις [οἰκονομία] καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, τρέφεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, αὔξεται. Καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον τὸ ζύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου . . . καὶ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου . . . προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὕτω καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα ἐξ αὐτῆς τρεφόμενα, καὶ τεθέντα εἰς τὴν γῆν . . . ἀναστήσεται κ.τ.λ. (ibid., cc. 1126, 1127).

ORIGEN.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς Δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθιόμεν, σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίον τι καὶ

ἀγιάζον τοὺς μετὰ ἡγίουῦς προθέσεως αὐτῷ χρωμένους (Origen, "Contra Celsum," lib. viii., § xxxiii., p. 766, Op., tom. i., c. 1566, edit. Migne).

I need hardly say that the language here quoted has been the subject of much controversy. The reader must judge for himself whether it can fairly be interpreted in the sense of the Romish or Lutheran doctrine. That it *may* admit of being conformed to the doctrine of the Reformed, I do not desire to question. By the body *may* be understood the symbolical body; and this the rather, because similar language used by Tertullian must (so it would seem, if Tertullian is consistent with himself) admit of this interpretation. Nevertheless, it must be allowed by all that the words are not unnaturally suggestive of something like the augmentation theory. And whether they were intended to convey such a notion or not, they might very well be understood in a sense which may be said to contain the germ of the doctrine which was developed in the clearer expressions of subsequent Fathers, and which took definite shape in the writings of Joannes Damascenus.

Viewed by themselves, they might be more easily understood in a sense altogether free from superstition. Viewed in connection with later teachings, and with a certain observable process of doctrinal evolution, to read *out of* them that which apparently has affinity with some theory of assumption, is not a matter altogether free from difficulties.

The reader may be glad to have before him, in considering this subject, the following words of Waterland: "Irenæus asserts over and over that Christ's body and blood are eaten and drunk in the Eucharist, and our bodies thereby fed; and not only so, but insured thereby for a happy resurrection. And the reason he gives is, that our bodies are thereby made or continued members of Christ's body, flesh and bones; and his conclusion is built upon this principle, that members follow the head, or that the parts

go with the whole; which reasoning supposes that the sacred symbols, though not literally, are yet interpretatively or constructionally the body and blood. . . . One thing only I conceive our author to be inaccurate in (though perhaps more in expression than real meaning), in superinducing the *Logos* upon the symbols themselves rather than upon the recipients, which would have been better. But in a popular way of speaking, and with respect to the main thing, they may amount to the same; and it was not needful to distinguish critically about a mode of speech, while there was no suspicion of wrong notions being grafted upon it, as hath since happened" (Waterland, "On Sacramental or Symbolical Feeding in the Euch.," ch. vii., "Works," vol. iv., p. 586, Oxford, 1843).

If in this Waterland may have shown a disposition to minimize the error which seems latent in these writings, it may perhaps be thought by some that Bishop Bull has rather shown a tendency in the opposite direction. It may be well that his words should also be submitted for the reader's consideration :

"Some of the most ancient doctors of the Church, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion, that by or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a Divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are, the body and blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is hypostatically united to the body of Christ in heaven, being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine on earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient liturgies, in which it is prayed, 'that God would send down His Spirit upon the bread and wine in the Eucharist.' And this doubtless is the meaning of Origen in his eighth book against Celsus" (Bishop Bull, "Corruptions of the Church of Rome," § iii., "Works," vol. ii., pp. 255, 256, Oxford, 1846).

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.

I proceed to quote from the celebrated Cyril of Jerusalem :

Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Χριστοφόροι γινόμεθα, τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα ἀναδιδόμενου μέλη (Cyril Hieros. "Catech.," xxii., "Mystag.," iv., § iii., Op., edit. Toustée, p. 320).

Ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ, ἄρτος οὐράνιος καὶ ποτήριον σωτηρίου, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀγιάζοντα· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος σώματι κατάλληλος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Λόγος τῇ ψυχῇ ἀρμόδιος (*ibid.*, § v., p. 321).

Οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος οὐκ εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, ἀλλ' εἰς πᾶσαν σου τὴν σύστασιν ἀναδίδεται, εἰς ὠφέλειαν σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς (*ibid.*, "Catech.," xxiii., "Mystag.," v., § xv., p. 329).

These quotations should be read together. And read together, they seem to admit of only one *natural* interpretation.¹

GREGORY OF NYSSA.

My next quotation bears the name of a writer of the latter half of the fourth century—Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia.

The thirty-seventh chapter of his "Oratio Catechetica" deals with the subject of the salvation of the *body* of the

¹ Hagenbach has said, "The doctrine of the consubstantiality of Christ's body and blood with the visible elements was generally held during this period both by the Greek and Latin Churches" ("Hist. of Doctrines," vol. i., p. 393, Clark). And his language may admit of a true sense. But, to avoid misunderstanding, it should be added that the idea conveyed by the writers to whom he refers cannot be identified with that of the Real Presence in or under the substance of the consecrated elements. In proportion as the idea is seen assuming anything like distinctness of form, it is seen to be the idea of a spiritual union of the elements with the body and blood of Christ; the very substance of the bread thus becoming by incorporation the body of Christ, which thus again, by commingling and incorporation with our bodies, makes us to be, even in respect of our flesh and blood, one body with Him.

Thus Hagenbach truly says of Cyril, that he "undoubtedly supposed a real union of the communicants with Christ, and thought that we participate in the nature of Christ by the assimilation of His body and blood to our members" (p. 395).

believer by the body of Christ. It is very important in studying the chapter to bear this in mind. He begins by teaching that the soul has its saving contact with Christ by faith, but the body by a different manner.

Ἡ ψυχὴ μὲν διὰ πίστεως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνακραθεῖσα τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἐντεῦθεν τῆς ζωῆς ἔχει· ἡ γὰρ πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν ἔνωσις τὴν τῆς ζωῆς κοινωνίαν ἔχει. Τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἕτερον τρόπον ἐν μετουσίᾳ τε καὶ ἀνακράσει τοῦ σώζοντος γίνεται (Op., tom. ii., c. 93, edit. Migne). He goes on to ask what it is which is as the antidote (ἐντὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων σπλάγχχνων) to the poison which is in man. He answers: Οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα, ὃ τοῦ τε θανάτου κρείττον ἐδείχθη, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν κατήρξατο. Of this he says, that as a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, so the body, which has passed through death by God's appointment, *when it is within our body*, transmakes and transfers the whole to itself (Οὕτως τὸ θανατωθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἡμέτερῳ γενόμενον ὄλον πρὸς ἑαυτὸ μεταποιεῖ καὶ μετατίθησιν), which he further explains thus: τὸ ἀθάνατον σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἀναλαβόντι αὐτὸ γενόμενον, πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν μετεποίησεν. Then, concerning this *being within* our body, he declares: Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλως ἐντὸς τι γίγνεσθαι τοῦ σώματος, μὴ διὰ βρώσεως καὶ πόσεως τοῖς σπλάγχχνοις καταμιγνύμενον.

Next, addressing himself to the question *how* the body of Christ can thus be *in* our bodies, he makes a digression to touch on the nature and nourishment of our bodies by bread, and believes that the analogy will bring us near to a probable solution of the difficulty (Ἐζητεῖτο γὰρ, πῶς τὸ ἐν ἐκείνῳ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ πᾶσαν ζωοποιεῖ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν, ἐν ὅσοις ἡ πίστις ἐστὶ, πρὸς πάντας μεριζόμενον, καὶ αὐτὸ οὐ μειούμενον. Τάχα τοίνυν ἐγγὺς τοῦ εἰκότος λόγου γινόμεθα).

The human body of the Incarnate Word had its subsistence, like other bodies, by meat and drink. And its meat was bread. And as in our case, when we look on bread, we may be said to be looking on a human body, because the bread, when received in the body, will become that body (in the sense, evidently, of being a constituent part of it); so in the case of Christ's body, in receiving food

of bread it became, in some sense, one and the same thing with the bread, the food passing into the nature of the body, even of that body of Divine dignity. And we may believe the same now of the consecrated bread. It is not indeed now *eaten* and so changed into the Lord's body, but it is *immediately* changed into the body of the Word (οὐ διὰ βρώσεως καὶ πόσεως προὐὼν εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Λόγου, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Λόγου μεταποιούμενος). Thus the flesh of the Incarnate Word is as a seed, which becomes united and mingled with the bodies of believers. And thus man becomes partaker of immortality by union with that which is immortal.

I am sensible that this abbreviated paraphrase very inadequately represents the teaching of this chapter. But no one (I think) who carefully reads the words of the original will accuse me of misrepresenting the natural and obvious meaning of his language as to the fact of the union he insists on being by the actual commingling of Christ's flesh with our flesh. And unless his illustrations and explanations are altogether inapplicable and misleading, this commingling of Christ's flesh with our flesh is through our partaking of the bread which is made (or changed into) His body, no otherwise than by being in some way united to by commingling, and so made one with His one body.

Attempts have been made to bring this teaching into conformity with reformed theology (see Albertinus, "De Euch.," pp. 487 *sqq.*). But though the force of particular expressions may be melted away, the drift of the argument as a whole presents an insoluble difficulty.

But the witness of this chapter presents a still more insuperable difficulty to the Romish controversialist. It is impossible to reconcile it with the theory of transubstantiation. Therefore, says Vasques, "benigne interpretandus est" (see Albertinus, p. 493). But no favourable interpretation will avail that does not interpret away the whole gist of Gregory's doctrine.

Why, then, should we hesitate to acknowledge that we have here an early evidence of a tendency to fall away from the primitive faith of the Eucharist? And *that* in connection with the mistake of cutting off from the words of institution all but the "Hoc est corpus meum"?

Let anyone who has studied the language and doctrine of Damascenus give some diligent attention to this chapter of Nyssenus, and mark the correspondence of thought and expression, and I can hardly doubt that he will be brought to acknowledge that we have here a tentative and conjectural approach to the augmentation theory; in fact, that the writer has given us the rough sketch of the doctrine which was afterwards filled in and worked up by the master hand of John of Damascus.

It is true that this "Oratio Catechetica" has fallen under suspicion. But though there is evidence of one interpolation, Albertinus has argued that the reasons for regarding it as not a genuine work of Gregory have little force ("De Sacr. Euch.," p. 486).

Waterland has said, "If Nyssen really held any such notions, or used any such expressions, they were *affected* and *singular* (vol. v., p. 200).

And doubtless it is true that this is the only example, at anything like so early a date, of anything like so near an approach to the more distinct augmentation view in open expression, though, if I mistake not, there are other sayings of the Fathers which naturally (perhaps I might say "most naturally") adapt themselves to some such a theory.

It should be observed, however, that elsewhere Gregory does not hesitate to apply to the consecrated elements the term *symbols*,¹ and that his theory (if indeed it is his) is propounded not as any part of the faith of the Christian Church, but rather as a doubtful suggestion for a more literal understanding of our Lord's words. It is a suggestion which may very well have been as the sowing of

¹ See Pusey's "Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 107.

a seed to bring forth fruit in succeeding ages. But if it should be thought that the augmentation notion assumes in this writing a form too distinct for so early a period, let it be remembered that it is not essential to my argument that the writing should be assigned to the name of Gregory as its author, nor to the fourth century as its date.

AMBROSE OF MILAN.

The following is from St. Ambrose, following on the narrative of his brother's preservation from shipwreck through having the consecrated element in a handkerchief as a collar round his neck: "Referebat igitur gratiam, deferebat fidem. Nam qui tantum mysterii cœlestis involuti in orario præsidium fuisset expertus, quantum arbitrabatur si ore sumeret, et toto pectoris hauriret arcano! Quam majus putabat fustum in viscera, quod tantum sibi tectum orario profuisset!" ("De excessu fratris sui Satyri, ii. 46, Op., tom. ii., c. 1126, edit. Ben., Paris, 1690).

This extract has a somewhat suspicious likeness to some less ambiguous statements. I have, therefore, though not without some doubt, thought it right to submit it to the reader's consideration. Let it stand for what it is worth. Viewed by itself, it is quite possible to regard it as indicating nothing more than a superstitious regard for the mere "sign or sacrament of so great a thing," quite apart from any notion of the consecrated element becoming the body of Christ by assumption. And in favour of such an interpretation may be cited the following from a treatise commonly ascribed to St. Ambrose, but which, if his, has probably suffered interpolation:

"Non iste panis est, qui vadit in corpus: sed ille panis vitæ æternæ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit" (Ambrose, "De Sacramentis," lib. v., cap. iv., § xxiv., Op., tom. ii., c. 378, edit. Ben., Paris, 1690).

Other extracts from the treatise "de initiandis mysteriis" (commonly, but perhaps erroneously, ascribed to St. Ambrose) may be seen in Hagenbach's "History of

Doctrines," vol. i., pp. 395, 396, where the statement is made (p. 396) that "his views are most nearly allied to those of Cyril." But other quotations also may be given (see above, pp. 9, 44) which seem inconsistent with the materialistic notion expressed above. Perfect consistency, however, is hardly to be looked for in Patristic writings in the matter of floating opinions which have not yet attained to distinctness of form or solidity of substance.

CHRYSOSTOM.

Ἀναφέρει ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐ τῇ πίστει μόνον, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τῷ πράγματι σῶμα ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ κατασκευάζει (Chrysost., Hom. lxxxiii. in Matt., § v., Op., tom. vii., p. 788, edit. Montfaucon, Paris, 1727).

Αὐτὸς δε ἑαυτὸν σοι δίδωσι, οὐκ ἰδεῖν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄψασθαι καὶ φαγεῖν, καὶ λαβεῖν ἔνδον (*ibid.*, § 4, p. 787).

Ἐνὶ γὰρ ἐκάστῳ τῶν πιστῶν ἀναμίγνυσιν ἑαυτὸν διὰ τῶν μυστηρίων (*ibid.*, § v., p. 788).

Τούτῳ ἡμεῖς τρεφόμεθα, τούτῳ ἀναφυρόμεθα, καὶ γεγόναμεν ἡμεῖς Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἐν καὶ σὰρξ μιά . . . τίς ποιμὴν τοῖς οἰκείοις μέλεσι τρέφει τὰ πρόβατα . . . ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς τρέφει οἰκείῳ αἵματι, καὶ διὰ πάντων ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ συμπλέκει (*ibid.*, § v.).

Viewed together, these passages will probably leave on the reader's mind the impression that St. Chrysostom was not entirely free from a notion approximating to some form of the assumption theory. But allowance must, of course, be made for his tendency to incautious language and rhetorical exaggeration. And other quotations might be made tending to deduct somewhat from the force of these sayings.

GELASIUS.

It is not without hesitation that I introduce here the name of Pope Gelasius. The writing of his which bears on the subject is well known. It has constantly been adduced as destructive of the Romish doctrine. Of course it is easy to reply that by the remaining of substance the Pope meant only the remaining of the accidents. And such an argument is doubtless quite unanswerable. But, then, also it

needs no answer. Still, the language of Gelasius teaches clearly that the consecrated elements are much more than effectual signs or antitypes. He seems certainly to regard them in a decidedly different view from that of St. Augustine. They are still, indeed, in substance and nature, bread and wine, but yet, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, they have passed into a Divine substance, in such sort that we, in receiving them, are made partakers of the Divine nature.

There is nothing, indeed, here to differentiate the mode of this transition. But in view of the fact (which ought to be acknowledged) that the Romish "Real Presence" was a doctrine of a much later date, the passage as a whole seems to me to be naturally suggestive of some form of, or of some approach to, the assumption or augmentation theory, especially since we have evidence that such a theory was already in the air.

Still, I do not wish to insist upon this. If I am in error, let his example be left out of account. Apart from other examples, it cannot in itself carry much weight. I only add his words that the reader may judge for himself. I give the passage as it appears in Routh's "Opuscula," vol. ii., p. 139, including the learned editor's conjectural emendations: "Certe sacramenta, quæ sumimus, corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod, et per eadem Divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, et tamen non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in Ejus imagine profitemur celebramus, et sumimus; ut, sicut in hanc, scilicet in Divinam transeunt, Sancto, Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, permante (*for. legendum est, permanentia*) tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ, sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repræsentant, ex (*for. his ex, vid. notam*) quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum

Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere demonstrant."

It may perhaps be worth observing, that in comparing this with the similar argument of Theodoret, we find in him nothing corresponding with "in Divinam transeunt . . . substantiam," but instead—*Μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας . . . νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο, καὶ πιστεύεται, καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκείνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται* (Op. tom. iv., p. 126, edit. Schulze). Theodoret's language adapts itself to the theory of effectual symbolism, Gelasius's language more naturally to the theory of some kind of spiritual union or augmentation.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA.

The following quotation from Cyril of Alexandria, while it may well be admitted to be capable of a more favourable interpretation (see cc. 564, 565), is naturally suggestive of an approach at least to the same augmentation theory: "Ὡσπερ γὰρ εἴ τις κηρὸν ἐτέρῳ συνάψει κηρῷ, πάντως δῆπου καὶ ἕτερον ἐν ἐτέρῳ γεγονότα κατόψεται τὸν αὐτὸν, οἶμαι, τρόπον καὶ ὁ τὴν σάρκα δεχόμενος τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, καὶ πίνων αὐτοῦ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα, καθά φησιν αὐτὸς, ἐν ὧς πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐρίσκεται συνακρανιάμενος ὡσπερ καὶ ἀναμιγνύμενος αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς μεταλήψεως . . ." "Ὡσπερ οὖν ὁ Παῦλος φησιν, ὅτι Μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον το φύραμα ζυμοῖ, οὕτως ὀλιγίστη πάλιν εὐλογία σύμπαν ἡμῶν εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἀναφέρει τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἐνεργείας ἀναπληροῖ, οὕτω τε ἐν ἡμῖν γίνεται Χριστὸς, καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτὸ πάλιν ἐν αὐτῷ (In Joannis Evan., vi. 57, lib. iv., p. 365, Op., tom. vi., c. 584, edit. Migne).

But this passage does not stand alone. Compare the following: "Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὴν κατὰ σῶμα νοουμένην ἔνωσιν, φημὶ δὴ τὴν πρὸς Χριστὸν, οἱ τῆς ἀγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς ἐν μεθέξει γεγονότες ἀποκερδαίνομεν, μαρτυρήσει πάλιν ὁ Παῦλος, κ.τ.λ. (In Joannis Evan., xvii. 20, 21, lib. xi., p. 999, Op., tom. vii., c. 560, edit. Migne).

And specially weigh the following: "Ὡσπερ γὰρ τῆς ἀγίας σαρκὸς ἡ δύναμις σισσώμους ἀποτελεῖ τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο, τὸν αὐτὸν, οἶμαι, τρόπον, ἐν τῷ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμέριστον ἐνοικῆσαν Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ πρὸς ἐνότητα τὴν πνευματικὴν συνάγει τοὺς πάντας

(In Joannis Evan., xvii. 20, 21, lib. xi., p. 999, Op., tom. vii., c. 561, edit. Migne).

EUTYCHIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

Perhaps we may be able to trace some likeness between the seed sown by Gregory Nyssen and its fruit, if we turn to the writings of Eutychius of Constantinople. Gregory had written: "Ὅτε παρέσχε τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐμφαγεῖν τοῦ σώματος, καὶ τοῦ αἵματος ἐμπιεῖν, ἤδη κατὰ τὸ θελητὸν τῆ ἕξουσία τοῦ τὸ μυστήριον οἰκονομοῦντος ἀρρήτως τε καὶ ἀοράτως τὸ σῶμα ἐτέθητο (in "Ch. Resur.," Orat. I., Op., tom. iii., c. 611, edit. Migne). No wonder some have thought this a strange saying. The simple explanation of Albertinus will be found in his "De Sac. Euch.," p. 487. Our only concern with it now is to mark how it seems to be a connecting link with the following extract from Eutychius; Μυστικῶς οὖν ἑαυτὸν ἔθυσσε, ὅτε ταῖς οἰκείαις χερσὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσας, ἀνέδειξε καὶ ἔκλασεν ἐμμίξας ἑαυτὸν τῷ ἀντιτύπῳ. . . . Ὅλον οὖν ἅπας τὸ ἅγιον σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου δέχεται, κἂν εἰ μέρος τούτων δέξηται· μεμέρισται γὰρ ἀμερίστως ἐν ἅπασι, διὰ τὴν ἔμμixιν. . . . Οὕτως ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ. . . . ἑαυτὸν θύσας μυστικῶς καὶ προληπτικῶς, καὶ ἐμμίξας τῷ ἀντιτύπῳ φαίνεται (edit. Migne, p. 2391, quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. i., pp. 500, 501).

It may or may not be that Eutychius was directly influenced by the writings of Gregory, though the two points of similarity and connection—(1) the anticipated sacrifice, and (2) the commingling with the antitype in order to our participation—seem to point in that direction. But in any case, it is, to say the least, impossible to ignore a certain correspondence of thought and speculation, which brings Eutychius within the borders of the augmentation theory.

ANASTASIUS OF MOUNT SINAI.

Eutychius was only a little earlier than Anastasius of Mount Sinai. It is the less necessary to adduce much evidence from his writings, because he has pretty generally

been acknowledged to be an upholder of (at least) a very similar doctrine.

In his writings we find an anticipation of the argument, and, indeed, of the language, of Damascenus and the second Nicene Council of 787: οὕτω πιστεύομεν, καὶ οὕτως ὁμολογοῦμεν, κατὰ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ—τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα—οὐκ εἶπε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἀντίτυπον σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματός μου (Hodeg., c. xxiii., p. 349, 350). And though his language is so obscure and his reasoning so confused that it is very difficult to say what he meant, Albertinus is probably right in gathering ("De Sacr. Euch.," p. 906) that he conceived the consecrated elements to become the *very body*, because the same Spirit was imparted to them as to the *natural* body of Christ (thus making them by spiritual union to be one with it), a notion (as Waterland observes after Albertinus) "not falling in with transubstantiation or consubstantiation, but amounting to some kind of impanation" (Waterland's "Works," vol. v., p. 195). So far as his doctrine can be seen in the mist with which he has surrounded it, it seems to approximate to nothing so much as the theory of Damascenus. Waterland speaks of him as "the *first*, or among the *first*, that threw off the old distinctions between the *symbolical* and *true* body, thereby destroying in a great measure the very idea of a *sacrament*" (p. 197).

COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 754.

I must next quote from the Council of Constantinople, called by Constantine Copronymus for the condemnation of image-worship.

Ὡσπερ οὖν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἅγιον, ὡς θεωθὲν οὕτως δῆλον καὶ το θέσει, ἤτοι ἢ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ ἅγια, ὡς διὰ τινος ἁγιασμοῦ χάριτι θεουμένη· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐπραγματεύσατο, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς, ὅπως καθάπερ τὴν σάρκα, ἣν ἀνέλαβε, τῷ οἰκείῳ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐνώσεως ἐθέωσεν, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐυχαραστίας ἄρτον, ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκὸς διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον σῶμα εὐδόκησε γίνεσθαι (Conc. Const., In

Actis Conc. Nic. 2, Actio vi. ; In Mansi, tom. xiii., c. 264).

Claude observes: "All this plainly favours the *composition* of the modern Greeks. Now, this testimony is the more considerable, in that the second Nicene Council having been held on purpose to overthrow whatsoever had been determined in that of Constantinople touching the point of images, they censured the name of *image*, which their adversaries had given the Eucharist, but left untouched the other clauses I now mentioned. Which shows that these kind of expressions were received by both parties, and that this was the common doctrine of the whole Greek Church" ("Cath. Doct.," bk. iii., ch. xiii., p. 219 (see also p. 340), London, 1684).

JOANNES DAMASCENUS.

Of the doctrine of Damascenus himself I have given sufficient evidence and illustrations in my "Curiosities of Patristic and Mediæval Literature," No. II. (Elliot Stock), which first appeared in THE CHURCHMAN of November, 1892. For an answer to evasions of his meaning, I may refer to Claude's "Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist," part i., p. 222 *sqq.*

It must suffice here to give a few extracts from the able and impartial review of Waterland: "He pretended that the ancients had called the elements *types* or *figures*, only *before* consecration, never *after*. A plea notoriously false in fact, as all learned men know" ("Works," vol. v., pp. 197, 198). He "proceeded further to affirm that our Lord *makes* the elements *His* body and blood by joining *His Divinity* with them" (p. 199). The "pretended previous *change* could resolve only into a previous sanctification by the *Spirit* upon his own principles: the *Logos* was to do the rest, by assuming those sanctified elements, and *making* them the body and blood of Christ" (*ibid.*). But "the elements were to be made the very *deified body* of Christ, like as the *personal* body in the womb had been made. How could this be without the like *personal* union

of the elements with the divinity? Here Damascen was plunged, and attempted not to get out at that time or in that work. But in another work, in the way of a private letter, he did endeavour to surmount the difficulty, by suggesting a new piece of subtilty, that like as a man's body takes in daily *additional* matter, and all becomes one and the same body, so our Lord's personal body takes in all the *new-made* bodies of the Eucharist; and thus by a kind of *growth* or *augmentation*, all become one and the same *personal* body of Christ" (pp. 199, 200). See further quotation from his "De Fide Orthodoxâ" in "Curiosities of P. and M. Lit," p. 11.

SECOND COUNCIL OF NICÆA.

The Second Nicene Council, A.D. 787, following apparently the lead of Damascenus, was not satisfied to say "that by or with the elements we do verily and indeed receive Christ's body and blood, but the elements themselves must literally be the *very body* and the *very blood* of Christ, and not types or pledges only of it. Not, indeed, in the sense of Papal transubstantiation (which was not then thought on), but in some such sense as Anastasius or Damascen had before recommended" (Waterland, v., pp. 202, 203).

II. It is not to be wondered at, that from this date the oracular authority of Damascenus and the determinations of the Nicene Council gave a new start to these strange views in the Eastern Church. It is generally allowed that such was the case. It will suffice to give some brief extracts from some of the later Greek writers. My desire is rather to show how the influence of these views was felt also in the West.

NICEPHORUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

(1) Ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο ὃ ἔφη Χριστὸς σῶμα τι γίνεται, αὐτῷ τῷ Λόγῳ οἰκειούμενον, πάντως που διωμολόγει ταῦτὸν ἐκείνῳ ἀποτελεῖσθαι τῆ σῶματι, ὅπερ ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας Παρθένου πεφόρεκε

(Nicephorus Constant., Migne's "Patr. Gr.," tom. c., c. 332).

(2) Τοῦ δε λέγειν τὸ αὐτὸ κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς σῶμα εἶναι, καὶ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ εἶναι, τί ἂν εἴη καταγελαστότερον καὶ ἀνοητότερον. . . Ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὔτε εἰκόνα οὔτε τύπον τοῦ σώματος ἐκείνου ταῦτα λέγομεν, εἰ καὶ συμβολικῶς ἐπιτελεῖται, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τεθεωμένον. . . Ὡς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας Παρθένου τὴν σάρκα διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀγίου ἑαυτῷ ὑπεστήσατο· εἰ χρῆ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῦτο δηλῶσαι, ὥσπερ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, φυσικῶς εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα του ἐσθίουτος καὶ πίνοντος μεταβάλλεται, καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμεν ἕτερον σῶμα γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὸ πρότερον· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ταῦτα ὑπερφυῶς ἐπικλήσει τοῦ ἱερέυοντος, ἐπιφοιτήσει τε του ἀγίου Πνεύματος, εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεταβάλλεται. Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἱερέως αἵτησις ἔχει. Καὶ οὐ δύο ταῦτα νοοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πιστεύομεν γίνεσθαι· Ἀντίτυπα δὲ εἴ που λεχθείη, οὐ μετὰ τὸν ἀγιασμὸν τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ ἀγιασθῆναι ἐκλήθησαν (Nicephorus Const., Antirrheticus II. adv. Const. Copron.; in Migne's "Patr. Gr.," tom. c., c. 336).

Let the reader compare this with Damascenus, "De Fide Orthodoxâ," lib. iv., cap. xiii., as quoted in "Curiosities of P. and M. Lit.," No. II., p. 11, and he will hardly, we believe, find it possible not to see from what school the influential Patriarch of Constantinople had derived his Eucharistic doctrine.

A learned Romish divine has written—rejoicing in this witness against the doctrine of the reformed: "En certe et alium propugnatorem dogmatis patriarcham Nicephorum, qui totius Græcæ Ecclesiæ personam gerit" (Harduin, "De Sacram. Altaris," cap. v., as quoted in Migne, "Patr. Gr.," tom. c., c. 337, note 77).

But though the *language* of Rome could be made to appear as the very echo (in part) of the words of Nicephorus, what a testimony is here against the *doctrine* of Rome! Can transubstantiation be brought to accept in loving embrace the augmentation theory of this noted Patriarch, "Qui totius Græcæ Ecclesiæ personam gerit"?

THEODORUS GRAPTUS.

“ As bread, wine, and water do naturally change themselves into the body and blood of him that eats and drinks them, so by the prayers of the priest and descent of the Holy Spirit these things are supernaturally changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ ” (Theodorus Graptus, ninth century, quoted from Claude's “ Cath. Doctrine,” bk. iii., chap. xiii., p. 229, London, 1684).

THEODORUS ABDUCARA.

“ Th . . . Ita pueri infantis in virum accretio, mutato illi pane in corpus, et potione in sanguinem.

“ Sarr. Ita videtur.

“ Th. Eodem modo cogita mihi fieri mysterium nostrum : ponit sacerdos panem super sanctam mensam, similiter et vinum, et precante eo precationem sanctam descendit Spiritus Sanctus in ea, quæ proposita sunt ; et Divinitate suâ panem et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Christi mutat non minus quam hepar cibum in corpus alicujus hominis : an amice non das, ut possit Spiritus S. perficere, quod hepar tuum potest ? ” (Theodori Abducarae Opuscula, xxii., “ Turriano interprete ” ; in “ Bibl. Max.,” tom. xvi., p. 744).

NICHOLAUS OF METHONE.

“ Itaque rebus naturæ consuetis hoc fieri voluit, iis suam Divinitatem conjungens, cum dixit : *Hoc est corpus meum* ” (Nicholaus Methonensis, “ De Corp. et Sang. Christi,” in “ Bibl. Max.,” tom. xxiii., p. 635).

Arnaud contended that when Nicholas Methoniensis wrote this, he meant that God has joined His Divinity to the bread, “ not to conserve it in the substance of bread, but to transform it internally into His body.”

The words are an answer to those who doubted, because they saw not flesh and blood, but bread and wine.

And Claude argues that Arnaud's contention is absurd. “ And,” he says, “ if we suppose Nicholas Methoniensis spake sense, it must be granted that his meaning is, that

the bread and wine remaining bread and wine, are yet, notwithstanding, made the body and blood of Christ, by reason of their union to the Divinity, and not otherwise. Whence it follows, that it must not be expected they should appear to be flesh and blood, because they are not so in respect of their matter or substance, but only by their union to the Divinity, which makes them in some sort to be the same thing with the body and blood."

A somewhat similar answer was doubtless not unfrequently given by writers of a later date in defence of a substantial change. But the language of Nicholas does not seem naturally to suggest more than is found in Claude's interpretation, and does rather seem to be exclusive of more.

THEOPHYLACT.

Πρόσχες δὲ, ὅτι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐσθιόμενος, οὐκ ἀντίτυπὸν ἐστὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου σαρκὸς, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου σὰρξ· οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, ὅτι ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἀντίτυπὸν ἐστὶ τῆς σαρκὸς μου, ἀλλ' ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶ· μεταποιεῖται γὰρ ἀπορρήτοις λόγοις ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος διὰ τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας, καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, εἰς σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου. Καὶ μὴ τινα θροεῖτω τὸ τὸν ἄρτον σάρκα πιστεύεσθαι, καὶ γὰρ τοὶ καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ περιπατοῦντος τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἄρτου τροφὴν προσιεμένον, ὁ ἄρτος ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐσθιόμενος εἰς σῶμα αὐτοῦ μετεβάλλετο καὶ συνεξομοιοῦτο τῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ σαρκὶ, καὶ εἰς αὐξήσιν καὶ σύστασιν συνεβάλλετο κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον. Καὶ νῦν οὖν ὁ ἄρτος εἰς σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου μεταβάλλεται (Theophylacti, "In Johan. Comment.," cap. vi.; "Com. in Quatuor Evangelia," pp. 651, 652, Paris, 1631).

The above may suffice for evidence from the Eastern Church.

Let the following bear witness for the influence of the same theory on the theology of the West :

PSEUDO-ISIDORE.

"Nunquam possumus in Ejus corpus transire nisi his Sacramentis imbuamur. . . . Hoc ergo mysterium . . .

ecclesia celebrat . . . ut per visibilem sacerdotum oblationem et invisibilem sancti Spiritus consecrationem, panis et vinum in corporis et sanguinis Domini transeant dignitatem" (Pseudo-Isidore, "Liber de Ordine Baptismi," edit. Migne, p. 259, quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. i., p. 591).

PSEUDO-ALCUIN.

"Sicut Divinitas Verbi Dei una est, quæ totum implet mundum: ita licet multis locis et innumerabilibus diebus illud corpus consecretur, non sunt tamen multa corpora Christi, neque multi calices, sed unum corpus Christi, et unus sanguis cum eo, quod sumpsit in utero Virginis, et quod dedit Apostolis. Divinitas enim verbi replet illud quod ubique est, et conjungit, ac facit, ut sicut ipsa una est, ita conjungatur corpori Christi, et unum corpus Ejus sit in veritate" ("De Div. Officiis," in Op. Alcuini, cc. 1111, 1112, Paris, 1617).

REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE.

"Caro quam Verbum Dei patris assumpsit in utero virginali in unitate suæ personæ, et panis qui consecratur in ecclesiâ, unum corpus Christi sunt. Sicut enim illa caro corpus Christi est, ita iste panis transit in corpus Christi, nec sunt duo corpora sed unum corpus. Divinitatis enim plenitudo, quæ fuit in illo, replet istum panem; et ipsa Divinitas verbi, quæ implet cælum et terram, et omnia quæ in eis sunt, ipsa replet corpus Christi quod a multis sacerdotibus per universum orbem sanctificatur, et facit unum corpus Christi esse. Et sicut ille panis et sanguis in corpus Christi transeunt, ita omnis qui in ecclesiâ digne comedit illud, unum corpus Christi est" (Remigius Antiss. in "Bibl. Max.," tom. viii., pp. 967, 968).

This quotation seems sufficient. But further extracts from Remigius may be seen in Claude's "Catholic Doc. of Euch.," part ii., p. 234.

FULBERT OF CHARTRES.

“ Ne sublati corporis præsentis fraudaremur munimene corporis nihilominus et sanguinis sui pignus salutare nobis reliquit, non inanis mysterii symbolum, sed compaginante Spiritu Sancto corpus Christi verum ” (Fulbertus Carnotensis, “ Epist. ad Adeodatum,” in Migne’s “ Patrol. Lat.,” tom. cxli., c. 202).

Any doubt as to the meaning of this seems to be removed by the quotations he makes from Remigius. See “ Eucharistic Worship,” pp. 294, 295.

ASCELINUS.

“ Neque vero mirari, vel diffidere debemus Deum facere posse ut hoc quod in altari consecratur virtute Spiritus Sancti, et ministerio sacerdotis, uniat corpori illi quod ex Maria Virgine Redemptor noster assumpsit ” (Ascelinus, “ Epist. ad Berengarium,” in “ Notis D’Acheri in Vitam Lanfr.” Quoted from Claude, “ Cath. Doct.,” part ii., bk. vi., chap. x., p. 235, London, 1684).

OTHER ADVERSARIES OF BERENGARIUS.

It would appear, from the language of Lanfranc in his treatise “ De Corpore et Sanguine Domini,” that a doctrine of augmentation (of some sort) was prevalent among those who opposed Berengarius. Claude has drawn this inference: “ It is likewise,” he says, “ very likely that in the eleventh century, during the greatest heats of the dispute of Lanfranc against Berenger, there were several adversaries of Berenger who followed this opinion. Which may be manifestly collected from an argument which Lanfranc attributes to the Berengarians in these terms: *If the bread be changed into the true flesh of Jesus Christ, either the bread must be carried to heaven to be changed there into the flesh of Christ, or the flesh of Jesus Christ must descend on the earth, to the end that the bread may be changed into it. Now, neither of these is done.* This argument necessarily supposes that the Berengarians did set themselves against persons who

thought the bread was changed into the body of Jesus Christ by way of union or conjunction, or, as speaks Damascen, by way of *addition*, as the food is changed into our body " (part ii., p. 235, London, 1684).

RUPERT OF DEUTZ.

" Sicut naturam hominum non destruit, cum illam operatione suâ ex utero virginis Deus verbo in unitatem personæ conjunxit, sic substantiam panis et vini secundum exteriorem speciem quinque sensibus subactam, non mutat aut destruit, cum eidem verbo in unitatem corporis ejusdem quod in cruce pependit et sanguinis ejusdem quod de latere suo fudit, ista conjungit " (Rupertus Tuitiensis, " De Trinitate," " In Exod.," lib. ii., c. x., Op., tom. i., cc. 617, 618, edit. Migne).

" Unitas enim verbi unum efficit corpus Christi, ut illud quod tunc in cruce pependit, et istud quod nunc ecclesiæ fides ore sacro conficit, unum corpus sit, una inquam caro, et unus sanguis sit " (*ibid.*, " In Joannem," lib. vi., p. 206, Op., tom. iii., c. 469, edit. Migne).

" Licet panis iste visibilis cum invisibili Filio Dei unum factus sit, aries autem ille cum Isaac, pro quo eidem aræ impositus est, unum esse vel fieri non poterit; nam Dei Filius, id est Deus et homo, habet in se virtutem effectivam, quâ sibi uniat panem istum visibilem. Isaac autem illum sibi incorporare, salvâ utraque substantiâ, non poterat arietem. Proinde illic in figurâ immolatus est Isaac in ariete, hic in pane et vino immolatur Dei Filius in carnis et sanguinis sui veritate " (*ibid.*, " In Joan.," lib. vii., p. 210, Op., tom. iii., c. 491, edit. Migne).

" Quia revera sicut Deus et homo unus est Christus, sic et iste panis visibilis consecratus, cum illa carne quæ pependit in cruce, una caro est, unum est Christi corpus " (*ibid.*, " In Joan.," lib. vii., p. 211, Op., tom. iii., c. 495, edit. Migne).

" Nec duo corpora dicuntur aut sunt, hoc quod de altari, et illud quod acceptum est de utero virginis, quia videlicet

unum idemque Verbum, unus idemque Deus, sursum est in carne, hic in pane. Alioquin et ille panis, quem heri sacrificavimus, et ille quem hodie vel cras sacrificabimus, plura sunt corpora, nec recte dicimus offerri ab ecclesia corpus Domini, meliusque diceremus corpora, quia quotidie pene tot offeruntur panes, quot habentur in ecclesia sacerdotes, sed hoc prohibet causa, convincit ratio, religio respuet. Unitas enim verbi unitatem efficit sacrificii. Similiter enim unum verbum, et olim carnem de Maria virgine sumpsit, et nunc de altari salutarem hostiam accipit; igitur unum corpus est, et quod de Mariâ genitum in cruce pependit, et in sancto altari oblatum, quotidie nobis ipsam innovat passionem Domini" (*ibid.*, "De Divinis Officiis," lib. ii., cap. iii., Op., tom. iv., c. 35, edit. Migne).

"Verbum quod humanam acceperat naturam, id est in carne manens, panis et vini accipiebat substantiam vitâ media, panem sum sua carne, vinum cum suo jungebat sanguine" (*ibid.*, cap. ix., c. 40).

"Sic verbum patris, carni et sanguini, quem de utero virginis assumpserat, et pani ac vino, quod de altari assumpsit, medium interveniens unum sacrificium efficit, quod cum in ora fidelium sacerdos distribuit, panis et vinum absumitur et transit" (*ibid.*, cap. ix., c. 40).

"Magnum hoc sacramentum est. Caro Christi, quæ ante passionem solius erat caro verbi Dei, per passionem ita crevit, adeo dilatata est, ita mundum universum implevit, ut omnes electos, qui fuerunt ab initio mundi, vel futuri sunt usque ad ultimum electum in fine sæculi, novâ conspersione hujus sacramenti, in unam ecclesiam faciat Deum et homines æternaliter copulari. Caro illa unum erat granum frumenti, quod antequam cadens in terram mortuum fuisset, nunc postquam mortuum est, crescit in altari, fructificat in manibus et corporibus nostris, et ascendente magno et divite domino messis, terram fructiferam, in quâ crevit, secum vehit in horrea cœli" (*ibid.*, cap. xi., c. 43).

It seemed desirable to give these numerous quotations in full, because laboured efforts have been made to vindicate the teaching of so great a name from the heresy imputed to him by Bellarmine and others, and to claim his authority as in support of the Real Objective Presence.

I cannot but think that a careful study of the extracts here given will convince the unprejudiced reader that Dr. Pusey's effort has been labour in vain ("Real Presence from the Fathers," pp. 5 *sqq.*). Dr. Pusey (p. 6) regards it as "incredible that he should have thought" what his words seem to express. But his meaning is expressed clearly, repeatedly, and in a variety of forms, so as to give a remarkable solidity to our view of his conception.

But this is not all. Special attention may be directed to the second quotation given above. It should be viewed in connection with the preceding context. And let it be observed (1) that the faith which believes in the change of the bread and wine, is also expected to believe that water taken from the Rhine or Tiber, or any fountain, when consecrated for the purpose of baptism ("crucis et passionis Christi sacramento signata"), is the very water which flowed from the pierced side of the Saviour. Thus Rupert writes, "Cum igitur, undequaquam [aqua] sumpta sit, crucifixi Domini sacramento admota fuerit, rationi fidelium nulla dubietas subest, quin ipsa eadem sit, quam ut supra dictum est, Dominus noster de latere suo profudit. Quid autem secundum substantiam nisi aqua est?" (c. 462).

And (2) that Rupert is here evidently bent on magnifying to the uttermost the doctrine of the Eucharist, insisting on giving to the words of institution the utmost fulness of meaning (c. 463, 465, 466), dealing hard blows against the *significance* which he finds in the interpretation of earlier doctors (c. 464-466), and specially warning his readers against the authority of St. Augustin ("Proinde non ita simus incauti adultores beati Augusti, ut cum dicat ille," etc., c. 469), and declaring concerning the teaching that

the Fathers did eat the same spiritual meat with us.—
 “ Si inquam, etiam angelus de cœlo hæc evangelizet, non illum tanquam lucis angelum, non in hâc sententiâ, tanquam Christi audiemus Apostolum ” (c. 465). And yet, when we come to the exposition of his own doctrine, we find him writing : “ Quod si quis a nobis quærat. Quomodo panis, qui hoc anno de terra creatur, corpus Christi sit, quod in cruce pependit, et vinum, quod præsentibus expressum est acinis, ille sanguis ejus sit, quem de latere suo fudit? Interrogemus eum, quomodo filius hominis, qui utique de femina conceptus, et de terra natus est, de cœlo descenderit? Vel quomodo antequam in cœlum ascenderet, jam in cœlo esse potuerit? . . . Hoc profecto, si quid sapit, respondere poterit, quod propter unitatem personæ Dei et hominis, illud rectissime dictum sit. . . . Ergo verbis paululum demutatis dicamus ei: ‘ Nemo te sublevat in cœlum,’ nisi ‘ hic panis, qui descendit de cœlo,’ hoc corpus Domini quod pependit in ligno, et hic sanguis ejus qui effusus est pro omni mundo. Nempe, si priorem sententiam videt, de isto non video quid dubitet. Unitas enim Verbi, unum efficit corpus Christi, ut illud quod tunc in cruce pependit, et illud quod nunc ecclesiæ fides ore sacro conficit, unum corpus sit: una, inquam, caro, et unus sanguis sit ” (c. 468, 469).

III. It only remains to give indications of the tendency of this theory to revive, and lift up its head in the Western Church, even after the decree of Innocent III. had defined the doctrine of transubstantiation.

JOANNES PARISIENSIS.

“ Videndum est quod antiqui sancti et doctores moderni adhuc omnes huic opinioni attestantur, unde Dionysius 3 cap. Eccl. Hierarchiæ vocat hoc sacramentum, *Sacramentum Assumptionis*; et Damasc., lib. iv., cap. v., dicit panem assumi. . . . Ecce aperte dicit Deitatem uniri pani et vino, quod non potest esse aut intelligi nisi per assumptionem et communicationem ” (“ Determinatio,” p. 94, London, 1686).

"Ista confessio Berengarii paneitatem remanere et assumi confirmat" (*ibid.*, p. 96).

"Dico quod imo fit festum de impanatione, sicut in die cœnæ, et quotiescunque hoc mysterium celebratur, et si dies cœnæ esset tempore Paschali, posset cantari, *corpus panis factum est, Alleluja*, sicut cantatur, Verbum caro factum est, Alleluja" (*ibid.*, p. 106).

This John of Paris is to be distinguished from another Dominican of the same name (surnamed *Pungens Asinum* of earlier date.

I need hardly say that very much more might be added from this distinguished writer. But the above seems sufficient to indicate clearly his opinion. And few, I believe, have questioned, or are likely to question, that he maintained what may be called one form of the augmentation theory as understood in its wider meaning.

Being forbidden to preach in Paris, he appealed to the Court of Rome, but died, before the decision of the matter, in 1306.

GUYDO CLUNIACENSIS.

It is not to be supposed that in his day Joannes Parisiensis stood altogether alone in his opinion. Allix says: "Certè exertè docet Joannes Parisiensis in determinatione suâ, alios sibi magni nominis viros consentisse. Nominatim designat Guydonem Cluniacensem, qui assumptionem panis æque ac ille determinasset, in quodlibetis suis, et qui professus fuerit se, si papa foret, illam viam determinaturum" ("Præf. Historica," p. 62, see p. 97).

HERVEUS NATALIS.

Herveus, not long after the death of Joannes Parisiensis, while himself maintaining the doctrine of transubstantiation, declares: "Quidam dicunt, quod corpus Christi, non est in altari per conversionem panis in ipsum: sed magis per assumptionem paneitatis ad suppositum Divinum, ita quod sicut filius Dei assumpsit humanam naturam, ita

assumpsit paneitatem; et propter unitatem suppositi, sicut verum est quod *Deus est homo*, et *homo est Deus*, ita verum est tunc, quod *Deus est panis*, et *panis est Deus*” (4 Dist. 10, art. 1, quoted from Allix, “Præf. Historica,” p. 63).

DURANDUS DE SANCTO PORCIANO.

Durandus (4 Dist. 11, q. 9) having referred distinctly to the opinion of Damascenus, adds: “Non tamen oportet, propter hoc corpus Domini in aliquo mutari substantialiter, quia nec per adventum alimenti mutatur corpus nutriti substantialiter in aliquo; ut visum est, lib. ii., dist. xxx. Et si videatur alicui mirum quod materia de novo adveniat corpori saltem glorioso, attendat hanc esse intentionem August. 13 de Civitat. Dei, ubi dicit, *Non potestas, sed egestas edendi corporibus resurgentium auferetur*. . . . Potest ergo secundum hanc viam probabiliter teneri, quod conversio substantiæ panis in corpus Christi est miraculosa, quantum ad modum faciendi, sed non quantum ad substantiam facti. Quia per virtutem naturæ fit similis conversio alimenti in naturam animalis. . . . Prædictus autem modus conversionis substantiæ panis in corpus Christi constat, quod est possibilis. Alius autem modus qui communius tenetur, est intelligibilis, nec unus istorum est magis per ecclesiam approbatus, vel reprobatus quam alius. Nec oportet difficultates fidei difficultatibus superaddere, quin potius juxta documentum Scripturæ conandum est obscuritates elucidare. Et idio ex quo unus modus est clare possibilis et intelligibilis: alius autem non est intelligibilis, videretur probabiliter quod ille qui est possibilis et intelligibilis esset eligendus et tenendus” (quoted from Allix, “Præf. Hist., in Determinatio Joannes Parisiensis,” pp. 36, 37, London, 1686).

This writer was surnamed *Doctor resolutissimus*. His commentary on the Sentences of Lombard was highly esteemed by Gerson. He became Bishop of Meaux in 1326. Du Pin says, “He departs from the opinions of St. Thomas and Scotus, and taught several doctrines very particular

and bold" ("Eccles. Hist.," vol. xii., p. 63, London, 1699).

MATTHIAS AQUARIUS.

Matthias Aquarius makes mention of two current opinions (among four), both of which would seem to come under the augmentation theory understood in a wide sense: "Prima, Durandi affirmantis panem converti in corpus Christi, ut in nutritione cibus convertitur in substantiam aliti, et ut in nutritione materia cibi formâ aliti informatur; ita hic materia panis animâ rationali Christi informatur, quibus verbis videtur tollere transubstantiationem. Secunda est opinio Henrici volentis terminum adquem hujus conversionis non esse corpus Christi absolutè, sed hoc scilicet quod erat panis est de novo corpus Christi, unde hæc opinio videtur concedere rem, quæ erat panis manere, et esse corpus Christi" ("Controv. ad Capreolum," in 4 dist., quoted from Allix, "Præf. Historica," p. 71).

I trust it will be acknowledged that I have given quite sufficient evidence to claim the attention of those who are competent to examine this subject. I do not, of course, contend that the views of all the writers quoted were exactly identical. They may doubtless admit of being divided and classified as Waterland has divided them (see "Curiosities of P. and M. Lit.," No. II., p. 13). Some may with more propriety, and some with less propriety, be included under the general designation of the augmentation theory.¹ Some, indeed, by a distinctly forward

¹ If it should be thought that I have taken an undue liberty with a name in giving so wide a sense to the "Augmentation theory," my apology must be that the varying views I have included seem to me to be naturally grouped under one family, and that all may not unsuitably be covered by a (perhaps) somewhat elastic use of the term "augmentation."

But, to avoid misunderstanding, I think it desirable to add a word of caution—caution against attributing to my argument more than can fairly be laid upon it, and more than it is intended to bear. In

movement in error, are seen to be approaching more than perilously near the idea of a hypostatic union with bread.

But I believe that, as a whole, they bear witness to an interpretation of the words of institution, which furnishes the strongest possible evidence of the novelty of the mediæval doctrine. The conviction has been growing upon me for years that the influence of this theory has not yet generally received full recognition, and that in consequence much misinterpretation and much serious misunderstanding has been introduced into recent controversy upon the doctrine of the Eucharist.

As regards the mass of Patristic authorities alleged as supporting the real objective teaching of our day, a sufficient answer may doubtless be found in the numerous interpretative dicta of St. Augustin and others (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 253-266), which seem so clearly to testify that the language according to which the consecrated elements are spoken of as the body and blood is to be understood with the natural limitation which results from intuitive perceptions of what is possible and impossible.

But in the case of those quotations which still may seem to present a difficulty, I submit that an effectual solvent will be found in the view of the widely-extended influence of the augmentation theory before the time of Paschasius.

I venture to ask to have this matter carefully looked into and fairly considered by those on both sides of our present controversy. If my argument holds, then it will follow that the present Romish doctrine was reached by means of a ladder, which, though now thrown down and utterly rejected, and condemned as dark heresy, is yet in its very rejection witnessing most effectually to the truth that the doctrine of transubstantiation and the real objective

arguing that this theory had an earlier origin and a wider influence than has commonly (as I think) been allowed, it is no part of my contention that this theory (even in its most modified form) was the received doctrine of the earlier ages of the Church, nor that it was, at any later period, universally held or accepted.

presence is no part of the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.

It will be found (I believe) that the various stages of progress in the development of Eucharistic doctrine were reached by a mistaken tendency (which may doubtless have had a pious intention) to interpret our Lord's words of institution in a literal, as in opposition to a natural, sense. It was thought that Christ was honoured in thus subjugating the natural to the literal—as if this were the true bringing of the thoughts of man into subjection to the truth of God.

Thus the arguments of those who maintained the augmentation sense, as well as of those who afterwards maintained the transubstantiation sense, are not found (as a rule) to claim as their foundation a consensus of earlier teaching (though earlier Fathers may sometimes be quoted as in agreement) or an acknowledged Church tradition. On the contrary, these writers are found, sometimes ignorantly (see above, p. 30), sometimes confessedly (see p. 78), to be condemning the language and teaching of those who had gone before them (and even of those previously in highest esteem), and relying simply on their own understanding of the "*Hoc est corpus meum.*" And thus, as a process of interpretation, there was a continual progress from one degree of difficulty or absurdity to another (the merit of faith being thereby increased, see above, pp. 30-33), till at last no higher point could be reached. And then this highest point of attainment became of necessity an article of the faith, and all the previous steps which had led up to it were then to be viewed as grades of heresy.

And so the augmentation theory was condemned to be outcast. But, nevertheless, in its outcasting it stood, and in its condemnation it still stands, to bear witness that the Romish "real presence" was, and is, a novelty—a novelty which has come of the working of human thoughts in the darkness of the Middle Ages.