

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 00077997 9

THE

REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

QUESTIONS

SUGGESTED BY THE

JUDGMENT

DELIVERED BY

THE RT. HON. SIR ROBERT PHILLIMORE, D.C.L.

Official Principal of the Arches Court of Canterbury,

IN THE CASE OF

THE OFFICE OF THE JUDGE PROMOTED BY

SHEPPARD *v.* BENNETT.

BY AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

Box 1A

Moore College
Library

LONDON:

WILLIAM MACINTOSH,

24, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.

Price Sixpence.

Box 1A

14527

THE following Paper, somewhat hastily put together to meet the wishes of friends, and written with every respect for the ability and learning displayed in the judgment of Sir R. Phillimore, has relation—not (as the judgment) to particular formal statements, but—to a definite *Doctrine*; and aims at supplying such materials as may be useful to those who are seeking to be guided aright in what may be called the great controversy of our day, rather than at suggesting answers to certain portions of the judgment, which the writer cannot but regard as capable of misleading.

Personal considerations, special explanations, and particular modes of expression are therefore (however necessarily and rightfully prominent in the judgment) here out of view; and the one great question (all others being subservient) within the field of investigation is this—Does the Church of England sanction the teaching by her ministers of that doctrine which is now known as “The Real Objective Presence”? And thus, apart from all legal aspects, the enquiry comes to be regarded from a strictly theological stand-point.

The writer wishes it to be clearly understood that he is concerned with the judgment only so far as the judgment is concerned with the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. The questions are intended to bear upon the judgment only so far as the judgment bears, or may not unnaturally seem to bear, on this doctrine.

The questions will undoubtedly indicate the results to which the writer's own investigations have led him; but his desire is that these questions may be fairly and thoroughly sifted.

It is very sincerely hoped that there is nothing in this Paper which may be understood as designed to be in the slightest degree offensive, either to the learned Judge himself, or to any of those whose doctrine is commonly thought to be shielded by his judgment.

To avoid multiplying quotations reference is constantly made to a series of “Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence,” (Macintosh), to which the present Paper may be regarded as an Appendix.

R1 x02

THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

THE subjects for investigation suggested by the judgment may be arranged under the following heads:—(a) The Historical Notice. (b) The use of the phrase "Under the form of bread and wine." (c) The teaching of the 29th Article. (d) The Authority of Hooker. (e) The teaching of the 28th Article. (f) Sacrificial language. (g) The Black Rubric. (h) The teaching of the Catechism. (i) The teaching of English Divines.*

(a)—QUESTIONS SUGGESTED BY THE HISTORICAL NOTICE.

I. Is it so that Bertram taught *unmistakeably* anything like the Real Objective Presence?†

* On the interpretation of the Rubrics in the office of the Communion for the Sick, and its relation to the direction in the Salisbury Missal, and to the teaching of the Reformation, see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 411—415.

† For the sense of "Real Objective Presence" in text, see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 6—11. It may, of course, very well (as apparently in the judgment) convey much less than this.

It may be permitted, perhaps, to observe that the phrases "Objective Presence," "Objectively Present," are not altogether new in the Eucharistic controversy; but they are now used in a *new sense*, inasmuch as formerly they stood rather in opposition to "real" and "really;" e.g., (1) The Saxon theologians in 1530, "Quod alie res, quia habeat loca dissita, tamen presentes sint corpori non realiter, sed objective. Ita disputat tantum imaginariam esse presentiam. Sed Bucerus decipitur hac imaginatione. Quia nunquam concedit *realem* et *veram* presentiam." (See Hospinian, Hist. Sacram. in Works, 1681, vol. iv., p. 183 b.) (2) Bishop Morton, "We say . . . the same body, as the same death; but it cannot be the same death, but *objectively only*. Ergo, can it not be the same body, but *only objectively*. Whereby it will be easy for us to discern the *subject* sacrifice of Christ from ours, His being the *real sacrifice* on the Cross, ours only the *Sacramental Representation*, Commemoration, and Application thereof." (On

It is true that there are some passages in Bertram which look rather like it.

But is it not so that the same method of interpretation which would make Bertram teach a Real Objective Presence of Christ's *body and blood* must make him also teach a Real Objective Presence of *the people* in the elements?

And are there not other passages which can scarcely be reconciled with anything like the Real Objective Presence?*

II. Was Bertram *universally understood* at the time of the Reformation as teaching anything like the Real Objective Presence?

If he was so understood—

(1.) How comes it that his book was regarded by Papists as a forgery of Ecolampadius?†

(2.) How comes it that it was appealed to in support of their views (without any indication of their regarding his views as

Eucharist, book vi., chap. 7, sect. 4, pp. 473, 474.) Compare p. 442, "The burial of Christ is not the *subject-matter* of baptism, but only the representative *object* thereof." Other examples might be adduced.

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 421, 422, and Waterland's Works, 1843, vol. v., p. 206, also pp. 203, 204.

† See references in Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 422; also Ridley's Works, (Parker Soc. Edit.), p. 159, and Cosin's Works, (A.C.L.), vol. iv., p. 199; also Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, vol. iii., p. 312; and Edgar's Variations of Popery, p. 372. Woodhead, the Romanist, classes together "Bertram, Scotus Erigena, Berengarius," saying that the Reformed revived their arguments. (Rational Account, 1673, p. 50.)

Longueue pronounces Bertram to be more Calvinistic than Calvin. (See Routh's Opuscula, vol. ii., p. 185); and Turrian, the Jesuit, asks, "Bertramum citare, quid aliud est, quam dicere, hæresim Calvini non esse novam?" (See Usher's Works, vol. iii., p. 84.)

Jeremy Taylor explains Bertram's language (with that of St. Jerome and St. Clemens Alexandrinus), "Calling it 'corpus spirituale,' the word 'spiritual' is not a substantial predication, but is an affirmation of the manner." (Real Presence, sect. i., § 11. Works, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 19.) See also especially J. E. Cox, Protestantism and Romanism, vol. ii., pp. 216, 217; and Dissertation in Dublin Edition of Bertram, p. 84.

Is it not to be specially observed that in Bertram's language "under veils" is equivalent to "figurative" (p. 146), and "veil" is explained by "figure" (p. 143) ?—that so also "mystery" is equivalent to "figure" (p. 143), and "in a mystery" is the opposite of "in truth" (p. 145) ?—and that these expressions are applied not only to sacramental signs but (in the same way) to figurative or tropical sayings! (pp. 146, 147.)

really erroneous) by Reformers whose views were unmistakably opposed to anything like the Real Objective Presence. See *e.g.*—

(a.) Bullinger "De Origine Erroris." Fol. 228—231. Zurich, 1539.*

(b.) Hooper. Early Writings. (Edit. Parker Soc.), p. 524. Later Writings, p. 405.

(c.) Archbishop Grindal. Remains. (Edit. Parker Soc.), pp. 73, 74.

(d.) Becon. Prayers, etc. (Edit. Parker Soc.), pp. 370, 371, 444—448, (where observe that the long extract from Bertramm is brought in evidence "That the words of the Lord's Supper, that is to say, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' are not properly, but figuratively to be understood," p. 435. See also pp. 449 and 469.) Catechism. (Edit. Parker Soc.), p. 295, (where observe the quotation from Bertramm is brought to confirm the assertion that "Faith is the mouth of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten.")

(e.) Jewel. Sermon and Harding. (Edit. Parker Soc.), p. 458, (where observe in answer to Harding's assertion that "Berengarius was the first that began to sow the seed of the sacramentary heresy," Jewel answers, "One Bertramus, as appeareth by his book, held and maintained the same doctrine," pp. 503, 546, (where observe Jewel argues from Bertramm's words "Thus, as the bread is Christ's body, even so was manna Christ's body." See also "Harding, Thess.," etc., p. 577, and "Apology and Defence," p. 503.) † See also Jelf's edition of Jewel, vol. ii., p. 343; vol. iii., p. 107; and vol. v., pp. 102, 103.

(3.) How comes it that it had been published at Cologne in 1532, and then sent by the Zurickers to Albert, Marquis of Brandenburg, to vindicate their doctrine from the charge of novelty? (See Gloucester Ridley's Life of Ridley, 1783, p. 165.)

(4.) Why, when this was refuted, did they say that it was

* See also R. Gualter, "Consensus Orthodoxus," 1605, pp. 120, 166, 260, 306. See also Hospinian, Works, 1681, vol. iii., pp. 251—269, especially p. 269 b. See also L'Aroque, History of Eucharist, Walker's translation, 1684, pp. 404—412.

† See also Abbot "On the true Church," p. 90, and Gauden's "Suspiria," 1659, p. 310.

written by a follower of Berengarius? (See Gloucester Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 170.)

(5.) Why, when it was shown to be Bertramm's, did they affirm that Bertramm at that time began to be mad, and that he first brought in question the Real Presence? (See Gloucester Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 171.)

(6.) Why did the Papist, Gardiner, (in disputation with Cranmer), speaking of Cranmer's new doctrine (as contrary to his Catechism, and opposed by Luther) say that "About seven hundred years ago, one Bertramm, if the book set forth in his name be his, enterprised secretly *the like*, as appeareth by the said book, and yet prevailed not"? (Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 42.)

(7.) Why again did Gardiner say that the truth of the mystery of the corporal eating "was never impugned openly and directly that we read of before Berengarius, five hundred years past, and secretly by one Bertramm before that"? (Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 269.)

(8.) Why again did Gardiner affirm that since Christ's time there was "no memory more than of six" that had affirmed the same doctrine as Cranmer, naming "Bertramm, then Berengarius, then Wycliffe, and in our time, Æcolampadius, Zwinglius, and Joachimus Vadianus." (Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 307.)

III. Can then Ridley's claim of Bertramm* afford any presumption of Ridley's holding anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Not, certainly, unless evidence is produced to shew that Ridley understood Bertramm in another sense than other English Reformers. †

* It is worth observing how Ridley's appeal to Bertramm (in Works, p. 159) is made on the very question between Æcolampadius and Melancthon, and in support of a doctrine which immediately before had been denounced by Fecknam (p. 158) as the doctrine of Berengarius, Wickliffe, Huss, Carolostadius and Æcolampadius. See also pp. 160, 161, 162.

† Is not a strong presumption against Ridley's so understanding Bertramm afforded by the fact, that on the very occasion of his declaring that he owed his views on the Lord's Supper to Bertramm, he alleges Bertramm's testimony in support of the pro-

Is there evidence of any one English Reformer understanding Bertramm in such a sense as to support the Real Objective Presence?

IV. Did Ridley hold anything like the Real Objective Presence?*

All passages from his writings adduced to prove that he did admit of an easy solution.

This solution Ridley himself requires to be applied to them. †

Can any such solution be applied to many other passages which stand directly opposed to the Real Objective Presence? ‡

position, that "A *figurative* sense and meaning is specially to be received in these words, 'This is my body.'" He says that of all the Fathers this appeareth *most plainly* in Bertramm. (See Ridley's Works, pp. 205, 206.)

* Ridley maintains that the words of Institution are to be understood figuratively, (see especially Works, pp. 22, 243); ridicules the idea of the body of Christ being contained in the vessels at the Lord's table, *not "as in a place, but as in a mystery,"* (Works, p. 33); argues from St. Augustine that we should "understand the manner of Christ's being here with us, which is by his grace, by his providence, and by his divine nature," adding, "he is absent by his natural body." (Page 43.)

Those who examine quotations made from Ridley in connection with their context will hardly wonder at Mr. H. B. Walton's speaking of Ridley as "traditionally reputed, *strange to say*, as the more Catholic among the Reforming Bishops." (Rubrical determination of Celebrant's Position. Masters, 1870, p. 49.) After such a concession further evidence of Ridley's repudiation of the Real Objective Presence seems needless.

† When Ridley spoke of evil men *receiving or eating* the body of Christ *sacramentally* he used no language but what was common to other Reformers, whose repudiation of the Real Objective doctrine is commonly admitted (as, *e.g.*, Bullinger, Decades, v., p. 466; Becon, ii., p. 294; Cranmer, on Lord's Supper, p. 205.) And that he meant by these words (as they did) the reception of the external sacrament only (to the exclusion of "the thing of the sacrament," or "the matter of the sacrament,"—the *res sacramenti*) is clear from his words, "Evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally*, but good men eat both the sacrament and the matter of the sacrament." (Works, pp. 247, 248.) Ridley insists that "the body" in language of St. Augustine, speaking of its reception by the wicked, means "the *sacrament* of the body." He explains such language by saying "The fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the matter of the sacrament." He adds, "This phrase to divines is well known, and used of the doctors; he tasted the flesh of the Lord 'insensibiliter,' 'insensibly,' that is, the *sacrament* of the Lord's flesh," (p. 247.) His rejection of the teaching of any *real* reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked is clear. See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 58. On the sense of *sacramental* and *sacramentally* see *Ibid*, pp. 95—101.

‡ See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 45—62; see also pp. 242, 243.

V. Can then Ridley's influence with Cranmer be adduced as evidence of Cranmer's holding anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Cranmer himself attributed his changed views to intercourse with Ridley.*

But is it to be supposed that (in the usual sense of the word) his "erudition" on the subject was derived from Ridley? †

VI. Did Cranmer hold anything like the Real Objective Presence? ‡

If he did, what did he mean by the "Error of the Real Presence" which he had formerly been in? §

If he did, what did he mean by saying that "Christ is not there

* Did Archbishop Laud's notion, of Ridley's recovering Cranmer from "Zwinglian" tendencies, arise from a mistake (his memory serving him as to Ridley's *influence* on Cranmer, but failing him as to the *direction*); or is there any evidence *anywhere* of any *such* change of view for which Cranmer was (at any time) indebted to Ridley? The only reference given is to Foxe. (See Laud's Conference with Fisher, Edit. Oxford, 1839, p. 249. See also G. Ridley's Life of Ridley, Edit. 1763, p. 173.) Or did Laud misunderstand Cranmer's words, being misled by the previous assertion of Martin? (See Cranmer's Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 218.)

† See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 160, 161, 162.

‡ Can any statements be more distinct against anything like the Real Objective Presence than those of the "Reformatio Legum" as carefully prepared by Cranmer? See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 176—182.

§ When A Lasco presented to Cranmer Bullinger's treatise *De Sacramentis*, the archbishop desired that it might be printed immediately, observing, that nothing of Bullinger's required to be read and examined previously." (Cardwell, Preface to Liturgies of Edward VI., p. xxx, note; see also p. xxix.)

So also Cranmer called Ecolampadius "that Godly and excellent learned man." (See Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 267.)

That Cranmer did not hold the Real Objective Presence is admitted by Dr. Pusey and the author of "The Kiss of Peace." See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 19—21.

¶ See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 287.

[under or in the form of bread and wine] neither corporally nor spiritually"? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 15.)

If he did, how came it that from the Second Book of Edward (in the framing of which his influence is acknowledged) the doctrine (as is acknowledged) was excluded?

If he did, what could he mean by saying that "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 dead; which roots, if they be suffered to grow again 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"? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 21.)

Again, what could he mean by saying "that Christ is present in His Sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word This speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, as He useth also His Sacraments, whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them"? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 485.)

Again, what did he mean by declaring "God's Word is clearly against you, not only in your doctrine of transubstantiation, but also in the *doctrine of the Real Presence*, of the eating and drinking, and of the sacrifice of Christ's flesh and blood"? (On Lord's Supper, pp. 333, 334.)

If he did, what did Ridley (who knew Cranmer and his writings well) mean, by repeatedly declaring that in England all learned men (as far as he knew) were agreed (in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of Melancthon,) that there is but one substance in the Sacrament?*

VII. Can then Cranmer's influence on our Formularies

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 163, 164.

be adduced as evidence of their teaching anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Is there not abundant evidence that the Formularies of the Church of England at the close of Edward's reign were regarded by the Reformed as purged of every thing like the doctrine of the Real Presence?*

(b)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF THE PHRASE "UNDER THE FORM OF BREAD AND WINE."

I. Is the phrase "Under the form of bread and wine" authorized (as a strict doctrinal utterance) by the Church of England?

It was used in the list of titles, by which the Second Book of Homilies was promised. Was not the doctrine of the Church of England at that date in a transition state?

When the promised Second Book of Homilies appeared was not the title of the Homily on the subject changed so as not to contain this phrase?

The Article authorizing the Homilies gives a list of the titles of the Homilies of the Second Book. Does the title of the Homily on the Lord's Supper there contain this phrase?

On behalf of the Communion Book of the Church of England did not Cranmer repudiate the phrase? †

II. Does the phrase "Under the form of bread and wine" necessarily imply the "Real Objective Presence"?

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 75, 160—163; also pp. 689, 690.

† See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 223—230.

Was it not approved and used by J. Foxe and many others (whose repudiation of the Real Objective Presence is unmistakable)—care being taken that it should not be misunderstood?*

(c)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE
29TH ARTICLE.

I. Does the 29th Article admit of being interpreted so as to deny only the “effectual” or “spiritual” reception and manducation of Christ’s body and blood?

(1) Was not the distinction between “Real” and “Effectual” Reception as urged by the Papists well known to our Reformers?

Was it not urged by Gardiner, repudiated by Crammer?†

Was it not urged by Harding, repudiated by Jewel?‡

Was it not urged by Campion, repudiated by Goode?§

Was it not urged by Harspsfield, repudiated by Bradford?||

(2) Has not the wording of the Article dealt with the passage from St. Augustine in a way which leaves no doubt of its intention?

Has it not *omitted* “spiritualiter”?

Has it not changed “nec manducat” into “nullo modo participes”?

Does it not explain “sacramentum” by “symbolum”?*

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 230—258, and 285—288, 390, 391, 733.

† The following is a brief extract from the words of Cranmer—“When this matter cometh in discussion among old writers, whether evil men eat Christ’s body or no, if the truth had been that evil men eat it, *the old writers* would not so precisely have defined the contrary, that they eat not, but would have said, they eat it, but not effectually, not fruitfully, not profitably. But now *the authors which I have alleged*, define plainly and absolutely, that evil men eat not Christ’s body, without any other addition.” (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 612.)

‡ See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 609.

§ See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 610.

|| See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 609.

(3) Is it not so that the sense of the Article depends not upon the sense of St. Augustine, but on the sense in which he was understood by the framers?†

St. Augustine has been understood by some to deny only spiritual and effectual reception.

Do not his sayings appealed to in support of this view admit of easy solution, which solution is supplied by his own words?

Do his sayings appealed to against this view admit of any such solution?

(4) Is it not so that St. Augustine‡ was certainly understood by our Reformers as denying (not only “*spiritual*” and “*effectual*” but) all real reception by unbelievers? §

(d)—QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY OF
HOOKER.

I. Is it not a mistake to regard what is called the Receptionist theory as anything like a peculiarity of Hooker?||

Is not what is called the Receptionist theory, as stated by Hooker, stated also in the words of our Article (viewed in connection with context),—“insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ?” (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 758, 759, 760. See also pp. 722, 723, 730, 731, 732, 736, 741, 742.) ¶

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 614, 759.

† See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 676—686, 753—759.

‡ See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 753—759.

§ On the subject of Jackson’s language, see Appendix, Note A; and on Thorndike, see Appendix, Note B.

|| See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 336—341, 381—387, 722—744. It is not implied that the judgment gives *authority* to this view.

¶ Is it not also clearly implied in the Black Rubric, inasmuch as the *highest* reason there given for kneeling is “for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the *benefits* of Christ therein given to all *worthy receivers*”?

Is there not rather a remarkable consensus on this point among Reformed Theologians, English and Foreign? (See *e.g.* Hall's *Harmony*, pp. 316, 322, 338.)

Not only was Hooker's teaching—as to its substance—no wise *new*,* but even the language in which he clothed it varies little from the expression of (1) Crammer “the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body . . . and of His blood . . . be [he had said just before “not corporally in the outward visible signs”] really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments.” (See *Papers on the doctrine of the English Church*, p. 15); which again had been almost repeated by (2) Ridley, speaking of the “Spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, not to bread and wine, but to them which worthily do receive the Sacrament.” (*Ibid.*, p. 47; see also p. 48) and again by (3) Bradford, confessing “a presence of whole Christ, God and man, to the faith of the receiver,” but refusing to “include Christ's Real Presence in the Sacrament, or tie Him to it otherwise than to the faith of the receiver,” (*Ibid.*, pp. 82, 83); and declaring “I never denied nor taught, but that to faith whole Christ's body and blood was as present as bread and wine to the due receiver.” (*Ibid.*, p. 79); and again by (4) Philpot confessing “the presence of Christ wholly to be, with all the fruits of His Passion, unto the said worthy receiver.” (*Ibid.*, p. 76) and acknowledging “a Real Presence . . . to the worthy receivers, by the Spirit of God” while denying “in the Sacrament by transubstantiation any Real Presence.” (*Ibid.*, p. 77).†

* The saying of Hooker will be found indeed to be substantially that which Gregory de Valentia states as the doctrine of the Protestants—“Although Christ be corporally in heaven, yet is He received of the faithful communicants in this sacrament truly, both spiritually by the mouth of the mind, through a most near conjunction of Christ with the soul of the receiver by faith, and also sacramentally with the bodily mouth, etc.” (see Jeremy Taylor, in *Works*, vol. vi., p. 14, also Morton's *Catholic Appeal*, p. 127), and still more exactly to correspond to what Bishop Hall states as the doctrine of the Eucharist, “so much as touches the foundation,” wherein “both parts do fully accord,” viz., “That the body and blood of Christ are so truly present in the administration of the Sacrament, as that they are truly received by the worthy communicants, etc.,” with which also agrees Bishop Davenant's statement, “*Fundamentale est*, Christi Corpus et sanguinem ita vere adesse in administratione Sacramenti ut participari possint ad vitam inde hauriendam a communicantibus, et damnari juste possint qui panem et vinum ita sumunt ut non una sumant Christi carnem et sanguinem ad salutem suarum animarum. *De hac nulla dissensio*” (*Ad Fraternam Communionem Adhortatio*. Edit. 1740, p. 132.)

† See also Latimer's *Remains*, p. 64.

Yet it may be worth observing how Hooker's saying on this subject seem to be as something like a key-note to succeeding English Divines. It is adopted verbatim by (1) Bishop Field as from “that exact Divine Master Hooker.” (*Parascere Paschæ*, Edit. 1624, pp. 136, 137.) It is almost repeated by (2) Dr. Mayer “not . . . that His body is in, under or about the bread . . . but faith making Him present unto the worthy receiver.” (*Catechism Explained*, 1623, p. 527.) It may be said to be condensed in the famous dictum of (3) Bishop Jeremy Taylor “present to our spirits only.”* (*Real Presence*, Sec. I., § 8, in *Works*, Edit. Eden, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 17—his interpretation of “*spiritually* present” in *our* sense); and to be expanded by (4) Dean Jackson when he says “The sacramental bread is called His body, and the sacramental wine His blood, as for other reasons, so especially for this, that the virtue or influence of His bloody sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from heaven unto the worthy receivers of the Eucharist.” (*On Creed*, Book xi., chap. 5, in *Works*, Edit. Oxford, 1844, vol. x., p. 41.) The same note is struck by (5) Bishop Bayly, saying “Christ is verily present in the Sacrament, by a double union: whereof the first is spiritual, 'twixt Christ and the worthy receiver; the second is sacramental, 'twixt the body and blood of Christ and the outward signs in the Sacrament.” (*Practice of Piety*, 1668, p. 442), and again, “The sacramental bread and wine, therefore, are not bare signifying signs, but such as wherewith Christ doth indeed exhibit and give to every worthy receiver not only His Divine virtue and efficacy, but also His very body and blood [which he had just spoken of as “absent from us in place”] as verily, etc.” (*Ibid.*, p. 445,); and also by (6) Bishop Cosin, expressing (as his matured views) that “the body and blood is neither sensibly present, nor otherwise at all present but only to those who are duly prepared to receive them.” (*In Nicholls's Additional Notes*, p. 49 a) and again, that “Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, *cannot* be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants”; (*Works*, Edit. Oxford, 1851, vol. iv. p. 174) and again that “indeed the body of Christ is given in the Eucharist, but to the faithful only.”

* The receptionist view was regarded by Bishop J. Taylor as “the doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the Protestants.” He says—“We, who best know our own minds, declare it to be so.” (See *Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church*, pp. 319, 320.) So it was clearly regarded by Bishop Morton also. (*Ibid.*, p. 724.)

(History of Transubstantiation, Works, Edit., Oxford, 1851, p. 193.) His view is commended by (7) Bishop Nicholson as Hooker's very pious judgment. (Exposition of Catechism, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr., p. 215.) His saying is quoted by (8) Bishop Patrick, who makes it his own ("according as learned Hooker speaks." Mensa Mystica, Sect. 1, chap. 5. In Works, Edit. Oxford, 1858, p. 151. See also, p. 150, "This is all that is meant by the real presence of Christ in this sacrament, which the Church speaks of and believes.") It may probably have suggested the language of (9) Bishop Ken "present throughout the whole sacramental action to every devout receiver" which he substituted in the revised edition of his Exposition of the Catechism, as the correction or true explanation of the less guarded expression "present on the altar" as used in the first edition. (See Ken's Prose Works, Edit. Round, 1838, pp. 325 and 212.) It may also have suggested the language of (10) Dean Comber "We desire they may be made the body and blood of Christ to us;* that although they remain in substance what they were, yet to the worthy receiver they may be something far more excellent . . . that we may become partakers of His most blessed body and blood." (Companion to Temple, Edit. Oxford, 1841, vol. iii., p. 260.) It is quoted (11) by Archbishop Wake, as from "the venerable Hooker . . . whose judgment having been so deservedly esteemed by all sorts of men, ought not to be lightly accounted of by us." (In Gibson's Preservative, Edit. 1848, vol. x., p. 68.) It is virtually declared by (12) Archdeacon Waterland (as by Bishop Patrick) to be the doctrine of the English Church, saying "The force, the grace, the virtue of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is, of His passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the Real Presence that our Church teaches."† (Works, Edit. Oxford, 1843, vol. iv. p. 42.)

* It may be observed, that Hooker's clear distinction (so far as it may be called Hooker's) between what the elements are "in themselves" and "to us" is found also (not to mention other names) in Laud and Thorndike. (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 518.)

† Compare also Bishop Morton's saying, "The spiritual *soul's* receiving of the body of Christ. Every faithful one indeed participating the same whole Christ." (On Eucharist, book iv., chap. 8, p. 280.) And Bishop Lake, "Our souls must 'take and eat and drink' the body and blood of Christ." (Sermons, "De Tempore," 1629, p. 173.) And especially

II. Is it so that it was certainly not Hooker's intention to maintain that no other mode of the Presence could be lawfully holden by Clerks of our Church*—or rather, Is it

Dean Aldrich, "When we say Christ is present, or adorable in the Sacrament, we do not mean in the elements, but in the celebration . . . We do not hold that we barely receive the effects and benefits of Christ's body; but we hold it *really present*, inasmuch as it is really received, and we actually put in possession of it, though locally absent from us . . . This, in short, is our meaning; and to this effect all true Church of England men declare it." (Reply to Two Discourses, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 40.)

* Is there any evidence for this (beyond Walton's account of Hooker's friendship with Saravia) but the fact of his arguing against the making any definition of the mode of the Eucharistic Presence into an Article of faith, or a needless occasion of "so fierce contentions"?

But was not this the true position to occupy in opposition to the exclusive doctrine of Lutherans and Papists? See Hooker's MS. note as given in Keble's Edit., vol. ii., pp. 353, 354, "Because it is *false*, as long as they do persist to maintain and urge it, there is no man so gross as to think in this case we may neglect it." (Page 354.)

And was it not the position taken up by the Reformed generally? as *e.g.*—

Frith—"Even as I say, that you ought not to make any necessary article of the faith of your part, (which is the affirmative); so I say again, that we make no necessary article of faith of our part." (In Foxe's Acts and Mon. Edit. 1858, vol. v., p. 12; see also p. 14.)

A. Lasco—"Illud tamen dicam, minorem mihi semper visam esse Sacramentarium hanc controversiam: quam ut propter illam, Ecclesie Evangelium Christi profitentes scindi, alique ab aliis judicari, et diris omnibus debuerint devoveri." (Brevis et dilucida de Sacramentis Tractatio. London, 1552. Præfatio. B. 8 a.)

J. Foxe—"What cause is there then of discord, when they both, as I said, do confess the presence of Christ, and disagree only upon the manner of the presence, which the one part do affirm to be real, and the other spiritual?" (Acts and Monuments, vol. v., p. 11.)

The authors of the Harmonia Confessionum—"Omnes veram veri corporis, et veri sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicationem credimus. In modo communicandi heret controversia. Sed quis propterea jure existimet Sacram Ecclesiarum Conjunctionem esse divellendam?" (Har. Confess. Geneva, 1581. Præfatio, i. j.)

Bishop Field, advising to "consider by itself, what cause there is, why the *rest* in question [beyond 'that wherein all sides—both Protestants, and Papists, and Lutherans—do agree and consent'] should not rather be *rejected* as superfluous, than urged as necessary." (Parasceve Paschæ, 1624, p. 116.)

So also Bishop Nicholson (Exposition of Catechism. Edit. Angl.-Cath. Libr., p. 215.)

So also Bishop Hall (Works. Edit. Pratt, 1808, vol. viii., pp. 54, 55.)

Is it not the very danger of making such definitions into articles of faith, and the fact that such definitions have given occasion to many superstitions, which warrants our Church in requiring of her clerics that they shall not teach or hold such false doctrines at all?

so that the Real Objective doctrine was, in his view, certainly not excluded from the teaching of the Church of England?*

The following extract may go some way in answer:—"Tell us not that . . . ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions; that if ye may have a mass by permission, we shall have a communion with good leave and liking; that ye will admit the things that are spoken of by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may have His ordinances observed, and His statutes kept. . . . He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart, which lendeth one ear to apostles, and another to false apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, light and darkness, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures." (Hooker, Edit. Keble, vol. iii., p. 666.)

(e)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE 28TH ARTICLE.

I. Is it so that the words "given, taken, and eaten," in the 28th Article, imply the Real Objective Presence?

The declarations of Articles 28 and 29 (understood in the natural sense) are no necessary barriers set up by our Church in the way of fraternal communion with foreign Lutheran churches, (except so far as *they* may make them so), still less are they fences to narrow the limits of our own Communion; they are simply safeguards against false and dangerous teaching being heard from her own pulpits.

* It will hardly, I suppose, be questioned, that Hooker's great work may be said to have been written (generally) in support of the views previously maintained by Archbishop Whitgift (see in Keble's Edit., vol. i., p. vi. 67. Vol. ii., pp. 1, 3.) But Archbishop Whitgift had distinctly declared (with the sanction of Archbishop Parker) that the Church of England *has refused* the doctrine of "the Real Presence." (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 33, 34.)

It is not, of course, intended to imply that Hooker must have agreed with all Whitgift's *obiter dicta*. But some presumption will arise that he did not differ from his statements in so material a point as this.

Are they not words of constant use in the language of the Reformation, applied to the same subject, and used by Divines most distinctly opposed to the Real Objective Presence?*

II. Is it so that the letter of Guest gives any real support to the claim of an objective sense for the words "given, taken, and eaten"?

Does not the history of Guest's *two* letters show without doubt, that Guest's view was designedly rejected?†

(f)—QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO SACRIFICIAL LANGUAGE.

I. Is it so that the sacrificial language used, or the sacrificial doctrine maintained, by some eminent English Theologians, gives any real support to *that* sacrificial doctrine which is taught as a necessary part of the Real Objective Presence?

See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 9, 10.

II. Is there not rather a remarkable *consensus* among Divines of the English Church (including those who have most strongly defended such sacrificial language) in repudiating anything like the sacrificial doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 372, 374, 542, 526—532, 535—541, 544, 545, 546, 548—551, 576.

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 381—387, 722—744.

† See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 664—674.

See also, pp. 31, 32, 44, 50, 68, 84, 89, 95, 105, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 122, 130, 144, 145, 147, 150, 153, 181, 196, 282, 285, 372.

See also Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice" (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.) vol. i., pp. 5, 251, 263, 266, 305, 306, 346, 347, 348, 350; vol. ii., pp. 13, 14, 15, 24, 25.

See also Hickes's Treatises (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.) vol. ii., pp. 107, 112, (note) 120, 128, 158, 160, 175, 182, 183.

See also Dodwell's "Discourse concerning the One Altar" (London, 1683) pp. 311, 312, 315, 357.

(g)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE BLACK RUBRIC.

I. Is it so that the change of the phrase "Real and Essential Presence" to "Corporal Presence" in the Black Rubric implies any change of doctrine?

Is it not so that the phrase "Corporal Presence" at the date of the re-insertion of the Rubric was commonly used to convey the same notion which at earlier date had been commonly conveyed by the phrase "Real Presence"?*

Is it not so that the phrase "Real and Essential," could not have been retained in Rubric without a verbal condemnation of Jeremy Taylor and others, who had used the phrase "Real Presence," to signify the doctrine of those who rejected the Real Objective Presence?

Is it not so that at the date of the re-insertion Protestants generally were agreed in maintaining a doctrine, which at that date was known as the "Real Presence"?†

* Thus Dean Aldrich declares, "The Protestants in King Henry VIII.'s time, that suffered upon the Six Articles, denied the *Real Presence*, (i.e., the Popish sense of it), but meant the same thing with us, who think we may lawfully use that term." (Reply to Two Discourses, quoted in Goode on Eucharist, i., p. 39.)

† See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 468, 578—586; and Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice," Edit. Anglo-Cath. Lib., vol. ii., p. 4.

II. Is it so that the adoration claimed as due to the Real Objective Presence is not denied by this Rubric?

Even supposing there were any real and important doctrinal distinction intended between what was before called a "Real and Essential Presence," and what is now called a "Corporal Presence," how would such a "Real and Essential" Presence be more adorable for not being "Corporal"?

See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 465—474, 578—586.

See also, pp. 587, 588.*

III. Is it so that such adoration receives countenance from the writings of any approved Divines of the English Church?

May it not rather be said that there has been a uniform denial of any such adoration by all Theological Schools among us, even those which have taught the highest Eucharistic doctrine?

See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 9, 55, 56, 96, 109, 113, 118, 121, 130, 131—136, 150, 465—474, 502, 562—566, 570—578.

See also Johnson's Works, (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.) vol. i., pp. 345—351.

See also Hickes's Treatises (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. ii., pp. 159, 160.

See also (as regards Laud) Bulley's Variations, p. 183.

See also (as regards Cosin) Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 571. See also especially Brevint as quoted pp. 564, 565.

(h)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEACHING OF THE CATECHISM.

I. Is it so that the Catechism teaches anything like the Real Objective Presence?

* See Appendix, Note C.

In the language of the Reformation does the Catechism teach anything more than was the general teaching of Reformed Churches and Divines?*

In the language of the Reformation does not the word "faithful" exclude the Real Objective doctrine?†

II. Was any attempt made by the Puritans at the last Review, to get any change made in the answer of the Catechism which is now alleged to teach the Real Objective Presence?

Did not the Puritans take several exceptions to words of the Catechism, but none to the words of this answer?‡

(i)—QUESTIONS AS TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
DIVINES.

I. Is it so that a long roll of illustrious divines from Ridley to Keble have taught in our Church the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

Have not such lists as have been given, been found (under examination) to afford very little support to the Real Objective Presence?

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 308—333.

† See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 362—370. As to argument derived from Overall's views, see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 296—305.

‡ See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 308—318, 376—380, 487. Does the change proposed in the reign of William and Mary weigh anything as evidence against this? At that date was there not a change beginning to come over the language (to say the least) of our English Theology?

AS TO THE CLAIM MADE FOR

Andrewes, see Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 814—822, and 960; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 581, 417; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, 1848, vol. x., pp. 68—70, 87, 88.

Bayly, see Goode, ii., pp. 919—923; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 382, 724, 726, 727.

Beveridge, see Goode, ii., pp. 856—859; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 155, 609.

Bilson, see Goode, ii., pp. 789—806; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 109—114, 307, 563, 537, 540, 548, 550.

Bramhall, see Goode, ii., pp. 867—871; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 374, 538, 563.

Brett, see Goode, ii., pp. 939—942; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 458.

Brevint, see Goode, ii., pp. 897—904; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 298, 409, 565, 356, 357, 419.

Bull, see Goode, ii., pp. 890—892; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 538, 549; and Waterland's Works, 1843, vol. v., pp. 190, 191.

Burnet, see Goode, ii., pp. 670—676, 717, 718; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 567, 574.

Comber, see Goode, ii., pp. 884—889; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 58.

Cosin, see Goode, ii., pp. 851—856; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 263, 297, 371, 372, 526, 539, 529, 540, 548—550, 571, 575; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 74.

Donne, see Goode, ii., pp. 879—883.

Field (Bishop), see Goode, ii., pp. 877—879; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 486, 487 and Parascève Paschæ, 1624, pp. 135, 136.

Field (Dean), see Goode, ii., pp. 839—841; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 268.

Gauden, see his *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Suspiria* (London, 1659), pp. 56, 86, 88, 302, 309, 310, 311.

Grabe, see Goode, ii., pp. 962, 963, 965; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 457.

Hammond, see Goode, ii., pp. 926—932; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 383, 426, 427, 508, 512, 581.

- Herbert, see Goode, ii., p. 883; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 571.
- Hooker, see Goode, ii., pp. 822—826; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 18, 20, 35, 136—146, 381—383, 416, 485, 573, 580, 758; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 68.
- Jackson, see Goode, ii., pp. 872—877; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 360, 382, 387, 425, 426.*
- Jewel, see Goode, ii., pp. 806—814; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 122—135, 158, 159, 166, 334, 372, 386, 425, 746; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 67.
- Johnson, see Goode, ii., pp. 942—945; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 576. See also Johnson's Works (Anglo-Cath. Lib. Edit.), vol. i., pp. 251, 263, 266, 305, 306, 346, 348, 350, vol. ii., pp. 24, 25; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 55.
- Ken, see Goode, ii., pp. 892—896; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 155.
- Lake, see Goode, ii., pp. 835—839; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 357, 360, 383, 385, 387, 418.
- Laud, see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 371, 372, 518, 581, 582; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 71.
- L'Estrange, see Goode, ii., pp. 938, 939; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 480, 571, 581.
- Mede, see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 519, 528, 530.
- Morton, see Goode, ii., pp. 831—835; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 261, 262, 425, 503, 538, 544, 545, 550, 562, 658, 677, 580, 724.
- Nelson, see Goode, ii., pp. 932—935; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 60.
- Nicholls, see Goode, ii., pp. 937, 938; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 501, 502; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, pp. 53, 57, 74.
- Nicholson, see Goode, ii., pp. 702—704; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 252, 253, 383, 384, 584; and espe-

* See Appendix, Note A.

- cially his Exposition of Catechism, (Engl. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), pp. 233, 234.
- Overall, see Goode, ii., pp. 927—930; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 295—306.
- Patrick, see Goode, ii., pp. 859—864; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 254, 255, 350, 418, 530, 531.
- Pelling, see Goode, ii., pp. 945—949.
- Ponet, see Goode, ii., pp. 777—787; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 69—71, 182—187.
- Ridley, see Goode, ii., pp. 765—768; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 45—63, 78, 97, 98, 164, 182, 242, 243, 579, 693, 754, 755, 497; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., pp. 63, 64.
- Secker, see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 344, 428, 524, 572, 573.
- Sharp, see Goode, ii., pp. 952—955; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 385, 424, 428, 520, 521, 539, 546; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 59.
- Sherlock, see Goode, ii., pp. 702, 864—867; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 258; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 77.
- Sparrow, see Goode, ii., pp. 838, 839; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 558.
- Sutton, see Goode, ii., pp. 923—926.
- Taylor, see Goode, ii., pp. 842—851, 914; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 100, 134, 135, 138, 160, 247, 248, 319, 320, 339, 360, 580, 678; and Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 88, 72, 73; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 52.
- Thorndike, see Goode, ii., pp. 904—908, 961, 962; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 518, 540, 699, 700.*
- Wake, see Goode, ii., pp. 910—916; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 409, 474, 504, 567, 568, 581; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 90.
- Warburton, see Goode, ii., pp. 949—952; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 740.
- Wheatly, see Goode, ii., pp. 938, 939; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 482.

* See Appendix, Note B.

Wilson, see Goode, ii., pp. 935—937; and Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 59.
Yardley, see Goode, ii., pp. 908—910.

Of a very small proportion of these, it is simply maintained, that their language, fairly examined, will be found to afford no sufficient evidence of *their holding the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

Of by far the larger number, it is believed that it may be very safely maintained, that their language will be found to afford satisfactory evidence that they did not hold anything like the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. Of these, it is not denied, that some held Eucharistic views differing from that of our Reformers, some (Non-jurors) † confessedly not that of the English Church. (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 939, 961, 965. Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 591, 545, 457.)

Saravia's name is omitted from the list. He was not an Englishman by birth or education. It is, however, admitted that his work on the Eucharist would have yielded some support to the Real Objective Doctrine, if it had ever been published with the *imprimatur* of an English Archbishop. † But if this be the *single* exceptional case,

* It is believed that if any exception has to be made it is the case of Thorndike. It is submitted, however, for consideration, whether the extracts given below (pp. 35—39) will not, at least, warrant a verdict of "not proven." Certainly Waterland did not understand his language to imply any such doctrine, as will be seen from the following extract:—

"I have omitted Mr. Thorndike, because his notion [of the Sacrifice] plainly resolves itself into the *passive* sense, viz., into the *grand sacrifice* itself, as contained in the Eucharist, because *represented, applied,* and participated in it. The Lutherans, generally, resolve it in the same way, only differing as to the point of *real or local* presence." (Waterland's Works, Edit. Oxford, 1843, vol. v., p. 139, note.)

As to Forbes (Bishop of Edinburgh) see Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative, 1848, vol. x., pp. 71, 89; and Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 871, 872.

† To these may be added Grabe, who (not an Englishman by birth or education) seems to have been quite sensible of the difference between his own Eucharistic doctrine, and the teaching of our English Liturgy. (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 457, 518; and Lathbury's History of Non-jurors, pp. 278 note, 301.)

It would appear also that Thorndike was quite sensible that the teaching of our Communion Service falls short of his own view, though he did not (as the Usagers) regard it as deficient in essentials. See Works (Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr.), vol. i., pp. 379, 380, 382; vol. v., pp. 53, 54, 241, 245, 246, 324; vol. vi., p. 218.

‡ Let it, however be submitted for consideration, where there has not been some little misunderstanding with reference to Saravia—whether it has been sufficiently noted that his work is not written so much in the interests of strict Lutheran views—or of the Real Presence of Luther in opposition to the Reformed—as of those views of pacification

the fact that the work, prepared for publication, was never published, must surely be acknowledged to throw no light weight into the opposite scale.

II. Might it not rather be said that among divines of the Reformed English Church from Cranmer and Ridley till the present century there has been (other differences notwithstanding) a remarkable *consensus* of separation from anything like the Real Objective Presence?

Did not Laudian Theology reject it? *

Did not Non-jurors repudiate it? †

which aimed at establishing a harmony between the views of the Swiss and the Saxons, (see Denison's Saravia, pp. 5, 15, 141, 143, 145) on the basis of the Concordia Witebergensis (see pp. 5, 6, 17, 123, 125, 127.) Does it not appear that Saravia was one of those who, believing that Zuingle and Ecolampadius (see pp. 131, 143, 145, 151) differed from Luther in words rather than in doctrine (see pp. 35, 120), in the use of language rather than in what was meant to be conveyed by that language (p. 120), desired to use and to defend the language alike of Lutherans and Reformed? (See pp. 17, 75, 151, 89.) May it not be said (though doubtless Saravia goes further than Bucer in the use of Lutheran language) that he is more nearly a follower of Bucer than of Luther? (See pp. 35, 121, 151.) Might not his views, possibly, be classed rather with those of Bp. Davenant, Bp. Bedell, and Bp. Hall, than with those of the Ritualists? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 748. See also p. 713, sqq., and 744, sqq.: and Bishop Hall's Works, Edit. Pratt, 1808, vol. viii., pp. 54, 55.)

His abomination of the idolatry of the Mass is plain, (p. 5) so also is his teaching that the *res sacramenti* is not the flesh of Christ "simpliciter," nor the flesh in glory, nor the blood that which belongs to the glorified body, but the flesh crucified, and the blood that which flowed from the wounds, (Pages 41, 43, 47, 51, 55.)

So also is his rejection of reservation and adoration (pp. 55, 123.) So also is his teaching of the same presence of Christ's blood in baptism (p. 105. See also, pp. 77 and 111). So also is his approval of the teaching that the Presence is only in the use and taking of the Sacrament (p. 123. See also p. 77.)

And may not very much the same be said of the Diallacon, which was certainly not Ponet's, and as certainly does not teach anything like the full doctrine of the Real Objective Presence? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 72, 73; and Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 779—782.)

Is it not also important to be remembered that even the strictest Lutheran theology would have been most strongly opposed to the (so-called) Catholic doctrines which are now taught as a part of the teaching of the Real Objective Presence? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 173, 174, 748, 750, 751, 752.)

* See References under names given above; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 371—375.

† See references above; also Lathbury's History of Non-jurors, pp. 316, 335, 436, 378, sqq.; and Williams's "Orthodox and Non-jurors," Introduction, p. xxxiii.; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 458, 576; and References to Johnson, Hickes, Dodwell, etc., as given above, in pp. 20, 21.

Passages indeed may (no doubt) be quoted from English divines, which (taken alone and unexplained) may, with some plausibility, admit of having such a sense given to them.*

Dr. George Hickes distinctly teaches that the bread and wine are made to be the body and blood of Christ, "by Divine fiction,"—"fictions in Divinity" being compared to legal fictions of the civil law. (See Treatises, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr., vol. ii., pp. 159, 160.)

* A very fruitful source of misunderstanding in such passages appears to be the ambiguity of the words "sacrament," "sacramental," "sacramentally." The following questions are suggested to assist in investigation—

(1) Did any of our Reformers or their successors ever deny that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten by the faithless *sacramentally*?

(2) Did any one of them ever maintain that by such they were received and eaten *really*?

(3) Did any of them ever deny the distinction between *sacramental* and *real* reception and eating? or maintain a distinction between real and effectual eating?

(4) Did any one of them ever maintain that the *sacramental reception* and *manducation* of the body of Christ by the faithless meant the *real* reception and manducation of anything more than the *outward sacrament* or *sign* of it?

(5) Did not our Reformers clearly maintain that the guilt of unworthy reception consisted not in the unworthy reception of the *res sacramenti*, but in the *not receiving* of the *res sacramenti* with the *sacramentum*, to which it is sacramentally united?

(6) Did any of our Reformers or their successors (not including under this name Gueste or Cheney) ever oppose this teaching, or maintain the contrary? (Not including also the Diallacticon which has so commonly, in error, been attributed to Ponet. See Goode, on Eucharist, ii., pp. 779—782.)

On this subject see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 96—101, 157—160, 238—240, 624, 625, 628, 629, 657—659, 677—680, 685, 753—758, 708, 709; and on the Sacramental Union see A Lasco, "De Sacramentis," 1552, fol. 14 b; Hall's Harmony, pp. 324, 337; Consensus Orthodoxus, 1605, p. 323; Hospinian, Works, 1681, vol. iv., pp. 265, 282; and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 485, 486.)

Hooker says—"If that be separated which is secret, and that considered alone which is seen, as of necessity it must be in all those speeches that make a distinction of sacraments from sacramental grace, the name of a sacrament in such speeches can imply no more than what the *outward substance* thereof doth comprehend." (Hooker, Eccl. Pol., book v., chap. lviii. 2; Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 260.)

Bishop Gauden says of the ancient Fathers and Councils, that "though highly and justly magnifying the great mystery, yea, and the elements consecrated, as related to and united with the body of Christ, as signs and seals of its reality, truth, use and merit to a sinner; yet generally they held them to be substantially and physically bread and wine, but sacramentally, relatively, or representatively (onely) the body and blood of Christ." (Suspiria, 1659, p. 310.)

But though, in such phrases as "sacramentally present," "sacramentally received," "received in a sacrament," and the like, (as distinguished from "really received") there remains in the meaning of *sacrament* nothing but *outward substance* or *symbol*, and in the meaning of such reception the real receiving of nothing but the outward sign, it must not be forgotten that (in the language of our Reformers) the

But may not the same be said also of the writings of the Puritan divines?*

And has it not been seriously maintained that a Hymn Book of the Independents teaches the Real Objective Presence with the utmost possible distinctness? †

words "sacrament" and "sacramental" and "sacramentally" never cease to connote that relationship (by Christ's institution) to the *unseen gift*, the *res sacramenti*, which must needs cause that the receiver cannot have *nothing to do with the res sacramenti*. In receiving the *sacrament* he must either by the reception of faith be *partaker* of the body and blood of Christ, or by the rejection of unbelief be *guilty* of the body and blood of Christ. (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 100, 158, 159, 160, 238, 239, 485, 486, 487, 721, 748, 756, 749; and Westminster Confession, ch. xxix., §. 5, Edit. 1658, p. 99.)

Is not this teaching consistently maintained by Reformed Theologians, as expressed by Bishop Davenant in the extract quoted above, p. 14?

And is there anything really beyond this taught, in the language (adapted, no doubt, to the prominent *virtualism* of his doctrine) quoted (in the judgment) from Dean Jackson, as candidly interpreted in connexion with the whole tenor of his doctrine? See below, pp. 30—34.

It must not be supposed that this distinction between *sacramental* and *Real* Presence and Reception has place only in some few of our earlier Reformers and their *immediate* successors. It is *very clearly* marked and strongly insisted on, e.g. in Bishop Morton. (On Eucharist, Book V., Ch. ii., Sect. i., 8 and 9, Edit., 1635, pp. 312, 322, 323, 324, 325. Papers on the doctrine of the English Church, p. 658) in Jeremy Taylor (see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 678.) It is clearly seen also in Bishop Field (see Parasceve Pasche, 1624, pp. 210, 212.) And it must be acknowledged to find place also in the writings of Dean Jackson. (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., pp. 873, 874, and below, pp. 30, 31), though, it may be, in a sense modified, to some extent, by the prominence of certain features characteristic of his teaching. It has place also in Bishop Nicholson. See his Exposition of Catechism, A.C.L., p. 216 b.) and in Mayer (on Cat. 1623, p. 527.)

With Thorndike also, is it not so, that his use of the expressions "sacramental," "sacramentally" "in the sacrament" ["sacramental Presence," "sacramentally present," "sacramentally the body and blood of Christ," "Body and blood of Christ sacramentally, that is to say, as in the Sacrament," "receive it in the Sacrament," "eating the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament," "Body and blood of the Eucharist"] imply an *abatement* in the meaning of that to which they are applied [as he says e.g. "cannot be said to eat . . . without that *abatement* which the premises have established, to wit, *in the Sacrament*"] which "abatement" (as it seems from his other teaching) must deduct all *that is real* in the sense of the Real Objective Presence? (See Goode on Eucharist, ii., 904—908, and Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 699, where I may have not quite accurately expressed myself.)

It is not, however, denied that Thorndike's language presents some difficulties peculiarly its own, and that such expressions in his writings have a sense which they acquire from the acknowledged peculiarity of his doctrine. (See below, p. 35—39.)

* See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 154, 329, 330, 332, 333, 336.

† See Ecclesia, pp. 352, 353.

APPENDIX.

(Note A.)

It is very willingly admitted that Dean Jackson has used language which is (to say the least) somewhat incautious, and (if viewed apart from the pervading character of the surrounding doctrine) quite capable of a less favourable interpretation. Yet it must not be too hastily inferred that there is any real contrariety between his Eucharistic doctrine and that of our earlier Reformed Divines. And in the examination of his teaching, with the view of enquiring whether or not his language will render any real support to the modern interpretation of our Article 29; the reader must be asked carefully to enquire—

(1) Whether he used the expression “*eating sacramentally*” and the like in the Real Objective, as opposed to the reformed sense (see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 97—100, and above, pp. 8, 28, 39), or in the reformed, as distinguished from the Real Objective sense—only with a marked prominence given to the idea of the consecrated relationship of the sign to the thing signified and exhibited by it, and of the virtue or influence—by reason of that relationship—accompanying the reception. (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 100, 485, 486, and above, p. 15.)

(2) Whether there be not a strong presumption afforded in favour of his using such expressions in the Reformed (as clearly distinguished, at least, from the Real Objective) sense, from

(a) His words “*all agree that there is a twofold eating of Christ's body . . . one merely sacramental, and another spiritual.*” (Works, Oxford Edit., 1844, vol. x., p. 51.)

It may be observed that the saying (exactly corresponding to those alleged from Jackson) “*Evil men eat the body of Christ, but sacramentally, and not spiritually,*” is set down among the “*Concessa*” gathered out of Gardiner's sayings (in Cranmer's Works, P. S. Edit., vol. i., p. 384.)

Compare Cranmer's own words, “*The good eating it [the body] both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, that is to say, figuratively.*” (Vol. i., P. S. Edit., pp. 224, 225.)

(b) His appeal to Beza's authority as to the relation of John vi. to “*sacramental eating.*” (Works, vol. x., p. 54.)

(c) His supporting his view by the authority of Calvin—“*As Calvin excellently observes . . . 'to eat Christ's body . . . sacramentally, is more than to believe in Christ, more than to have our faith awakened or quickened by the sacramental pledges.'*” (Ibid, pp. 62, 63.)

(3) Whether there is not good evidence of his using them in such a Reformed sense, in his words “*unless this virtue do as immediately reach our souls as it did her body—we do not really receive his body and blood with the elements of bread and wine; we do not so receive them as to have our sins remitted or dissolved by them.*” (Vol. ix., p. 610.)

(4) Whether there be not further evidence of this from the fact that the whole drift of his teaching shows that (while he thus distinguishes *real* and *sacramental* reception) he knows and allows no distinction between *real* reception (in his sense) and *effectual* reception, nor between *real* and *effectual* presence (in his sense) of the body and blood of Christ.

(5) Whether there be not yet further evidence of this from his saying—“*Faith is the mouth or organ by which we receive the medicine; but it is the virtual influence derived from the body and blood of Christ which properly or efficiently doth cure our souls, and dissolve the works of Satan in us.*” (Ibid, p. 611.)

(6) Whether there be not yet further evidence of this from his saying—“*Faith then is as the mouth or appetite by which we receive this food of life, and is a good sign of health; but it is the food itself received which must continue health, and strengthen spiritual life in us; and the food of life is no other than Christ's body and blood, and it is our High Priest Himself which must give us this food.*” (Vol. ix., p. 594.)

(7) Whether there be not yet further evidence in the same direction arising from the following words (interpreted by his other teachings, especially the quotation given above in p. 15). “*All that are partakers of this sacrament eat Christ's body and drink His blood sacramentally; that is, they eat that bread which sacramentally is His body, and drink that cup which sacramentally is His blood, whether they eat or drink faithfully or unfaithfully.*” (Vol. x., p. 51.)

(8) Whether this evidence be not confirmed by the clear opposition of his teaching to anything like the Real Objective Presence, as e.g.—

(a) His saying “*More than Calvin doth stiffly maintain against Zuinglius and other sacramentaries, cannot be inferred from any speeches of the truly orthodoxal or ancient fathers.*” (Vol. ix., p. 598.)

(b) His saying “*This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature, is that which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real presence, or of eating His very flesh, and drinking His very blood, in the Sacrament.*” (Vol. x., p. 41.)

(c) His saying—“*Now when we say that Christ is really present in*

the Sacrament, our meaning is, that as God He is present in an extraordinary manner, after such a manner as He was present (before His incarnation) in His sanctuary." (Ibid, pp. 52, 53.)

(d) His saying, "No man can spiritually eat Christ, but by believing in His death and passion." (Ibid, p. 63.)

(e) His saying, "Christ's body and blood are so present in the Sacrament, that we receive a more special influence from them in use of the sacrament," etc. (Ibid, p. 63.)

(f) His saying, "With whomsoever He is virtually present, that is, to whomsoever He communicates the influence of His body and blood by His Spirit, He is really present with them, though locally absent from them." (Vol. ix., p. 610.)

[It is to be observed that Jackson uses the expression "*local presence*," not at all as distinguished from a Presence "there" *under the form of bread and wine* after a supra-local manner, but as distinguished from that *virtual Presence*, which, in his view, is the true "Real Presence."]

(g) His saying, "the same virtual presence . . . only that sweet influence which daily issueth from this Sun of righteousness . . . This manner of Christ's presence, of His real presence in the Sacrament, to wit, by powerful influence from His humanity, our Church did never deny." (Vol. x., p. 261.)

(h) His saying, "We further add, 'For Christ's body, or whole Christ God and man, to be bodily present by this means [*i.e.* by God's creating the self-same body] in many places at once, or in all places at all times wherein that blessed Sacrament shall be celebrated, is one of those things, which, according to their rules as well as ours, cannot be done, as implying an evident contradiction in nature': it *may not be believed* nor imagined, because God did never bind any man to believe such an *impossibility* or *contradiction* as is involved in this doctrine. It is altogether without the compass of the most miraculous work which God hath at any time wrought, or ever promised to work." (Vol. x., p. 256.)

(i) His saying, "The Romish priests had made a gainful prey by transporting the native sense of our Saviour's words in the institution to justify the doctrine of transubstantiation. And since they have been pursued by Reformed writers, as cozeners and cheaters of God's people, some of them run one way, and some another; some of them seek to maintain Christ's *local presence*, or transubstantiation, by the former doctrine of God's Almighty power, which is able to create one and the same body, often: others seek to maintain the same doctrine, and carry away the prey by the manner of angelical motion from one place to another in an instant or moment of time. And if they could draw such as pursue them into these straits and subtilties, they hope to make their part good against such as are not much conversant in the Schoolmen's nice disputes concerning the nature or motions of angels, or know not the difference between the nature

and motions of spirits and spiritual bodies. Others seek to maintain the same doctrine by the infinity of divisible quantities, (as if it were possible for a fly's wing to overspread the whole earth, as a hen doth her chickens,) and that Christ's body may, by this kind of infinity, be in many places at once, in as many as God shall appoint: hoping by this means to cast a mist before the eyes of such readers as know not the difference betwixt real material or substantial, and a mathematical or imaginary quantity. But all these fictions or suppositions, they cast forth only to offer play unto their adversaries." (Vol. x., p. 258.)

(j) His saying, "To believe Christ's flesh and blood should be there present where it cannot be seen or felt, yea where we see and feel another body as perfectly as we can do aught, is to reason, without warrant of Scripture, but a senseless blind belief. But grant His body and blood were in the sacrament rightly administered, yet that out of the Sacrament either should be in the consecrated host whilst carried from town to town for solemn show more than for sacramental use, is to reason ruled by Scripture (to say no worse) more improbable. Now to worship that as God, which to our unerring senses is a creature, upon such blind supposals, that Christ's body, by one miracle may be there—by another, unseen—is worse than idolatry committed upon delusion of sense. So to adore a wafer, only a wafer in appearance, without strict examination, nay without infallible evidence of Scripture urged for the *real presence*, is more abominable than to worship every appearance of an angel of light, without trial what spirit it were—Satan or some other—that so appeared. And if we consider the old serpent's usual sleight to insinuate himself into every place, wherein inveterate custom or corrupt affection may suggest some likelihood of a Divine presence unto dreaming fancies, (as he did delude the old world in oracles and idols,) the probability is far greater his invisible substance (by nature not incompatible with any corporeal quantity) should be *annexed* to the supposed host, than *Christ's real body*, incapable for anything we know of joint existence in the same place with any other." (Vol. ii., pp. 207, 208.)

(k) His saying, "Sense doth witness that Christ is not, no scripture doth warrant us that He or any other living creature, unless perhaps worms, or such as spring of putrefaction, is present, in their processions. Notwithstanding all the express commandments of God brought by us against their practice, the Trent Council accurseth all that deny Christ's *real presence* in procession, or condemn the proposal of that consecrated substance to be publicly adored as God; not so much as intimating any tolerable exposition of that commandment, which forbids us to have any gods but one." (Vol. ii., p. 210.)

(l) His saying, "If my conjecture fail me not, the dreaming fancy of a daily propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass was first occasioned

from dunstical or drowsy apprehensions of the primitive dialect." (Vol. iii., p. 370.)

(m) His saying, "If . . . we should with Romanists admit of a sacrifice by succession or multiplication as everlasting as this transitory world, which shall not last for ever: besides the inconveniences which they multiply by this vain apology for their wicked practices, we must of necessity acknowledge Melchizedec to have been a type or figure not of Christ, or not of Christ only, or not so properly of Him, as of the whole generation of Mass priests; and his sacrifice to have been a truer type of the unbloody sacrifice which they daily offer, than of Christ's bloody everlasting sacrifice upon the cross." (Vol. viii., p. 243.)

(n) His saying, "Thus you may imagine any Jewish schoolboy . . . would oppose the greatest rabbins of the Romish Church. . . . 'Your priests (as you confess) stand daily ministering and offering the same sacrifice which your High Priest did offer; and therefore, by your apostle's argument against us, and by your own practice, this sacrifice can never take away sin: it is more the same sacrifice than the sacrifices of the law were, and yet it is offered oftener, and in more places, than any legal sacrifices were.'" (Vol. ix., pp. 582, 583.)

(o) His saying, "Now if this argument [in Heb.] be concludent (as no Christian can deny it to be) against the Jews which pleaded for the sufficiency of legal sacrifices, it will conclude *a fortiore*, or with a *πρόσθε μᾶλλον*, (Heb. ix. 14), against the absolute perfection or sufficiency of our Saviour's sacrifice of Himself (supposing that it should be as the Romanists teach.) Thus much it will inevitably infer, according to the peremptory canons of the Roman Church, which plainly teach—and under pain of damnation enjoin all Christians to believe—that Christ's body and blood, that very same body, that very same blood, which were once offered by Himself upon the cross, are daily offered by the Mass priest." (Vol. ix., p. 530.)

(Note B.)

Because (from the peculiarities of Thorndike's view) there is in his language so much of doubtful interpretation, (not to say of questionable tendency), because there is so much which may quite fairly be cited as seeming (when transported into the region of our present controversy) to afford real and solid support to the Real Objective doctrine; therefore the following quotations are here given, that they may assist in a candid enquiry into the question—

whether (however far Thorndike's views may have departed from those of our Reformers, and however near his language may sometimes have approached to that of the Real Objective Presence) his teaching can at all be identified with that with which we have now to do, whether his views will at all support the modern interpretation of Article 29, or whether there be not really a great doctrinal gulph between his own views (as cleared from obscurities of language) and those which really belong to the Real Objective doctrine as now taught.

I.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE SENSE OF "SACRAMENTAL," ETC.

(1) "I am persuaded that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist cannot be better expressed than by that term which the Council of Trent useth, calling it a 'Sacrament,' and saying that the flesh and blood of Christ is 'sacramentally' there; . . . nor do I think the term any less fit or serviceable, *because it serves THEM* to signify the *local presence of Christ's body and blood under the dimensions of the elements, the substance of them being gone." (Works, Edit. Anglo-Cath. Libr., vol. iv., part 1, p. 35.)

(2) "If the Church only pray, that the Spirit of God, coming down on the elements, may make them the body and blood of Christ, *so that they which received them* may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements in their bodily substance: because supposing them to remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit, to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His flesh and blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that, I suppose, is *reason enough to call it the body and blood of Christ sacramentally*, that is to say, *as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.*" (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 69.)

(3) "The flesh and blood of Christ by incarnation, the elements by consecration, being united to the Spirit, that is the *Godhead* of Christ, become both one *sacramentally*, by being *both one* with the Spirit or *Godhead* of Christ, to the conveying of God's Spirit to a Christian." (Vol. v., p. 173.)

(4) "If this were agreed upon, which *cannot be resisted but by Socinians and Fanatics*; that the body and blood of Christ become present in the Sacrament by the institution of our Lord, by celebrating the Sacrament, whereby His institution is executed by consecrating the elements to the purpose that the body and blood of Christ may be received: the whole dispute concerning the manner of the presence in the nature of the formal cause might be superseded. For then *all parties must agree*, that they are *present sacramentally*, as the *nature of a sacrament* requireth." (Vol. v., p. 544.)

* On the sense of "local," see Waterland as quoted above, p. 26. See also p. 32. See also extract below, p. 37, on the local limitations of Christ's body.

II.—EXTRACT BEARING ON RECEPTION BY FAITHLESS.

“Though *no man can receive* the body and blood of Christ that is not disposed *with a living faith* to receive the same, yet *on God's part* it is undoubtedly *tendered* to those that are not so disposed, otherwise how saith the Apostle that those that eat and drink unworthily are guilty of the body and blood of Christ, as not discerning the same?” (Vol. i., part 1, p. 343.)

III.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE PRESENCE.

(1) “If any man will think that the forms hitherto described import that the Ancient Church intended to consecrate the elements in the sense of the now Church of Rome, that is, to abolish the corporal *substance of them*, and *substitute* that of the *body and blood of Christ instead*, not in the true sense, to *depute* them to become *visible signs, tendering and exhibiting the invisible grace which they figure*, he shall much prejudice the truth which we profess.” (Vol. i., part 1, p. 350.)

(2) “When St. Ambrose saith that after consecration the body of the Lord and His blood only is named, and signified, and expressed, this also seems to import a *great abatement of the proper signification of the body and blood of Christ.*” (Vol. i., part 1, p. 351. See also vol. iv., part i., pp. 27, 28.)

(3) “Certainly, unless we believe the *spiritual grace* of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament of the Eucharist to *possess those dimensions which the elements hold* (and if so they are not there *sacramentally and mystically*, but *bodily and materially*), we can give no reason why the bodily presence of the elements should hinder it.” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 22.)

(4) “What shall we then say, when the name of Christ's body and blood is attributed to the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but that God would have us understand a supernatural *conjunction and union* between the body and blood of Christ and the said bread and wine, whereby they become *as truly the instrument of conveying God's Spirit* to them who receive as they ought, as the same Spirit was always in His natural body and blood?” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 25.)

(5) “If, by virtue of the hypostatical union, the omnipresence of the Godhead is communicated to the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, then is the flesh and blood of Christ there, not only *mystically, but bodily.*” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 26.)*

(6) “Is it any way pertinent to the *spiritual eating* of them [Christ's flesh and blood] that they are *bodily present*? Is it not far more proper to that which the Lord was about (tending, without question, to the *spiritual union* which He seeks with His Church); that He should be understood to promise the mystical, than the *bodily, presence of them in the Sacrament*, which is nothing else

* It is important to read extracts (3) and (5) in connexion.

than a mystery in the proper signification and intent of it?” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 27.)

(7) “How is it requisite, that they [Christ's flesh and blood] be there in *bodily substance*, as if the mystical presence of them were not a sufficient means to convey His Spirit, which we see is conveyed by the mere spiritual consideration and resolution of a lively and effectual faith?” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 32.)

(8) “Having proved the consecration of the Eucharist to be the *production of the body and blood of Christ crucified*, or the causing of them to be *mystically present* in the elements thereof, as in a sacrament representing them separated by the crucifying of Christ.” (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 116, 117.) [It is right to observe that “representing” here signifies “tendering to a man's possession.” See vol. iv., part 1, p. 20.]

IV.—EXTRACT BEARING ON THE PRESENCE IN RELATION TO THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST.

“If in the proper dimensions thereof [*i.e.*, of Christ's body] He ‘parted from’ His disciples, and ‘went,’ was ‘carried,’ or lifted and ‘taken up into heaven;’ . . . if ‘the heavens must receive Him till’ that time; . . . if to that purpose He ‘leave the world’ . . . ‘no more’ to be ‘in’ it . . . so that we shall have Him no more with us. . . . it behoveth us to understand how we are informed, *that the promise of His body and blood in the Eucharist imports an exception to so many declarations, before we believe it.* Indeed, there is no place of God's right hand, by sitting down at which we may say that our Lord's body becomes confined to the said place;* but seeing the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God's right hand (though, by His sitting down at God's right hand we understand the man Christ to be put into the exercise of that Divine power and command which His Mediator's office requires), yet His *body we must understand to be confined to that place*, where the majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne. Neither shall the appearing of Christ to St. Paul (Acts xxiii. 11) be any exception to this appointment.† He that would insist, indeed, that the body of Christ stood over Paul in the castle where then he lodged, *must say that it left heaven* for that purpose.” (Vol. iv., part 1, pp. 47, 48.)

V.—EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE PRESENCE, IN RELATION TO LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

(1) “Referring to judgment, whether the evidence for consubstantiation or transubstantiation be such as for the Holy Trinity out of the Scriptures; that is to say, whether the presence of the flesh and

* “The common argument of the Lutherans and Ubiquitarians.” (Thorndike's note.)

† “It is instanced as such an exception by Chemnitius, De Duab. Naturis, c. xxx., p. 188. Compare also Bellarm., De Sac. Euch.; lib. iii., c. 3; Controv., tom. ii., p. 672.” (Thorndike's note.)

blood of Christ in the Eucharist is so to be understood, as to void the confining of them to those dimensions, which the Scripture allows them in heaven (and this as necessarily, by the Scripture, as the Scripture necessarily obligeth to believe the Holy Trinity); when as it may be, more properly to the nature of the business, understood mystically, as in a sacrament, intended to convey the communion of His Spirit." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 50.)

(2) "Securing first that which the common salvation requireth in the Sacrament, to wit, the *receiving* of the flesh and blood of Christ *by it*, by imputing the presence of them to the consecration, not to the faith of him that receives; it [the doctrine of St. Gregory Nyssen] condemns the error of transubstantiation, making the change mystical and immediate upon the coming of God's Spirit to the elements, the nature of them remaining; but it condemns consubstantiation for no less; for what needs the flesh and blood of Christ fill the same dimensions, which the substance of the elements possesseth, being both united with His Spirit? And truly they, that invite the Lutherans to their communion, professing consubstantiation, must not make transubstantiation an error in the foundation of the faith." (Vol. v., pp. 173, 174.)

(3) "The petitioner no way doubts, that the manner of the presence is to be cleared, neither by transubstantiation, nor by consubstantiation, nor by those that derive it not from the consecration." (Vol. v., pp. 324, 325.)

VI. EXTRACTS BEARING ON THE PRESENCE, IN RELATION TO USE.

(1) "Nor would it have been a custom, in some places to burn the remains of the Sacrament; or at Constantinople to give them to school-boys: had they not conceived the change of the elements to be in order to the use of them, and that this use, and that which is done in order thereunto expireth, when the occasion of giving them to those for whom the Church intended them ceaseth." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 81.)

(2) "The liturgies themselves . . . do limit the being and presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements to the benefit of them that shall communicate." (Vol. iv., part 1, p. 126; see also part ii., p. 738.)

VII. EXTRACTS BEARING ON SACRIFICIAL DOCTRINE.

(1) "If the consecrated elements be the flesh and blood of Christ, then are they the sacrifice of Christ crucified upon the cross. For they are not the flesh and blood of Christ as in His body, while it was whole; but as separated by the passion of His cross. Not that Christ can be sacrificed again. For a sacrifice, being an action done in succession of time, cannot be done the second time, being once done; because then it would not have been done before. But

because the sacrifice of Christ crucified is represented, commemorated, and applied, by celebrating and receiving the Sacrament, which is that sacrifice. They of the Church of Rome, that would make the breach wider than it is, do but justify the Reformation, by forcing any other reason of a sacrifice and of the Scripture, expounded by the consent of God's Church." (Vol. v., pp. 174, 175.)

(2) "It is true, the properties and effects of things signified are in some sense truly attributed to the signs. But he that enlarges his language beyond that sense, may give, and he that understands the limitations requisite, may take offence, when there is no need. Otherwise, the reasons of these limitations are evident enough to save any sober or charitable men 'either from inflaming or taking up offences.' For common sense, which tells all men that what is once done can never be done again, oblige them to understand *an abatement* in the property of that language which attributes the sacrificing of Christ to a priest; because, once done upon the cross, it can never be done again." (Vol. iv., part 1, pp. 122, 123.)

(3) "The Council of Trent enjoineth to believe, that Christ 'instituted a new passover,' to be 'sacrificed,' as well as represented, commemorated, and offered, in the Eucharist . . . which is false. For the sacrifice of Christ's cross is commemorated, represented, and offered as ready to be slain, in and by the Eucharist; but not slain, and therefore not sacrificed, in it and in celebrating it." (Vol. v., p. 615.)

VIII. EXTRACT BEARING ON ADORATION.

"Though the Sacrament of the Eucharist may be the occasion to determine the circumstance of the worshipping of Christ, yet is it itself no way capable of any worship that may be counted religious, because religion enjoineth it. Cardinal Bellarmine . . . would have it said, that the sign is worshipped materially, but the body and blood of Christ formally, in the Eucharist; which are terms that signify nothing. . . . Therefore the sign in the Eucharist seems only to determine, why that worship which is always everywhere due, is here now tendered." (Vol. iv., part 2, p. 757.)

The reader may like to have before him the following words of Archbishop Wake concerning Thorndike: "But yet after all, I will not deny but that this learned person seems to have had a particular notion in this matter, and which is far enough from what our author would fix upon him. He thought that the Elements by consecration were united to the Godhead of Christ, much after the same manner as His natural body was by incarnation, and that so the very elements became after a sort His body." (Wake in Gibson's *Preservative*, Edit. 1848. Vol. x., p. 75.)

(Note C.)

The following extract from the Judgment may be thought to demand some special attention:—

“At the Savoy Conference in 1661, the Presbyterians desired the restoration of the declaration [*i.e.*, the Black Rubric], and the Bishops opposed it, but eventually consented to its restoration, with an alteration of the most material character—namely, the substitution of the words ‘Corporal Presence of Christ’s *natural* flesh and blood,’ for the words ‘real and essential presence there being,’ etc.,” [*i.e.*, “there being of Christ’s *natural* flesh and blood.” Black Rubric of 1552.”] (Judgment, p. 95; Rivingtons.)

The following questions, suggested by this passage, are submitted for careful investigation.

1. Were the Savoy Episcopal Commissioners, as such, the revisers of our Liturgy? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 556, 557.)

2. Can the *animus* of the Episcopal Commissioners be safely and certainly regarded as the *animus* which ruled the Revision?

3. Can the answers of the Episcopal Commissioners be relied upon as interpretative of the Revision and the changes effected?

Supposing an affirmative answer could be given to the above questions, the words of the bishops in reply to the Presbyterians would deserve careful attention. They are as follows:—“This rub. is not in the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there *any* GREAT NEED of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry. Besides the sense of it is declared sufficiently in the 28th Article of the Church of England.” (Cardwell’s Conferences, p. 354.)

And then the following questions would naturally be suggested:—

1. Did the Episcopal Commissioners object at all to the restoration of the Black Rubric, *as it stood*, on doctrinal grounds? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 570, 571, sqq.)

2. Does not their answer imply that—looking upon the Rubric unchanged—they had *no objection* to make to its doctrine?

3. Does it not even amount to a declaration that they *could desire* no change in its *sense*, and therefore no change in its *doctrine*?

4. Does it not also amount to a declaration that in their view, the adoration of “any real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” would have been “*idolatry*”?

5. Does it not also amount to a declaration that they understood the 28th Article to exclude “any real and essential Presence there being,” as well as any “Corporal Presence” of “Christ’s natural flesh and blood”?

The following further questions, therefore, must now be asked:—

1. Should we not have been led to the conclusion (even if the Revision had been ruled by the Episcopal Commissioners) that the

change must be interpreted as indicating a preference for a form of expression—with no change of sense or doctrine?

2. Must we not much rather be led to this conclusion, if we have evidence that the Revision was ruled by an *animus* which (to say the least) declined to adopt the most important suggestions bearing anything like the impress of Laudian Theology? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 555—559, 518, 482, 483; and Walton’s “Rubrical Determination,” pp. 25, 26, 35, 36.)

3. Does not this conclusion receive some confirmation from the fact that in the same Rubric several other changes were made in forms of expression?

4. Is not this conclusion further confirmed by the way in which the Revision has dealt with other parts of the Service?

5. Is it not inconceivable that, if the change had been designed to indicate such a change of doctrine as should admit the Real Objective Presence, the Revision should (1) have left the Consecration Prayer unchanged, (2) rejecting the proposals of Sancroft, etc., should have “ordered all in the old method,” (see Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 556; see also pp. 557, 558, also pp. 518, 545, 551, 455—459,) and (3) in this same Rubric, should have allowed the order for kneeling to stand accounted for as “well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue”?

Yet further it may be asked—

(1) Is there not evidence that the Black Rubric was regarded—after the change—by English Divines as a distinct and unquestionable denial of any such adoration as is held to be due to the Real Objective Presence? (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 572, 573, 576, 577; see also pp. 472, 473, and 571—575, and Archbishop Wake, as quoted in Garbett’s *Voices of the Church of England*, p. 189.)

(2) Is there any evidence that the change in the Black Rubric was regarded, by any English Divines, as making room for any such adoration?*

There *is* some evidence, indeed (though it is somewhat hard of belief), that one person (“D. P. G.,” probably Doctor Peter Gunning) did imagine that the change admitted of such a presence as “that by the virtue of the words of consecration, there was a *cylinder* of a *vacuum* made between the elements and Christ’s body in heaven; so that no body being between, it was both in heaven and in the

*L’Estrange and Kennett write as if quite unconscious of the Rubric’s having undergone any change to which any doctrinal significance could be attributed. (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, pp. 571, 581; and Perry on Declaration concerning Keeling, p. 309.) The same may be said of Collier (see *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. v., p. 486) though not of Burnet.

elements." (See Burnet's History of Reformation, Part iii., Preface, vol. i., p. 599, Edit. Orr, 1850; see also Perry on Declaration, pp. 70, 71.) But it is believed that very few people will think of attributing to the Revisers what Bishop Burnet calls "such a solemn piece of folly as this." And though Gunning may have been in some sense "the author" of the change, it must be interpreted not by "such a solemn piece of folly" as Burnet attributes to him, but by the sense in which it was adopted in the Revision. It must be added that, even supposing the change to have made room for Gunning's very extraordinary conception of *presence*, it would not follow that it made room for "any such adoration" as is held to be due to the "Real Objective Presence." For whatever may be thought of the *verbal* change in the statement of the *presence* denied, there was no change at all made (to which any significance can be attached) in the declaration of the *adoration* denied.

And it may well be questioned whether even Gunning would have regarded *such a presence* (perhaps some might prefer to call it *absence*) in the elements, as an object of adoration.

It will be observed that Burnet himself supplies evidence that the Rubric *as changed* was regarded in high quarters *at the time* as "an express declaration made against the *Real Presence*;" and that (when an explanation was required) no attempt was made by high ecclesiastical authority to suggest that any other interpretation might be given to it. (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 467.)

It may be added that in the MS. volume of the "History of his own time," (Harleian MSS., No. 6584,) Burnet has written:—"There were some small alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer, together with some additions, the most important was that concerning the kneeling in the Sacrament, which had been put in the Second Book of Common Prayer set out by Edward the 6th, but was left out by Queen Elizabeth, and was now by Bishop Gawden's means put in at the end of the Office of the Communion. Sheldon opposed it, but Gawden was seconded by Southampton and Morley. The Duke complained of this much to me, as a puritanical thing, and spake severely of Gawden, as a popular man, for his procuring it to be added (though I have been told that it was used in King James's time)." (See Perry on Declaration, p. 302.)

It appears that Gauden had taken "the solemn league and covenant," though he had published "certain doubts and scruples of conscience" about it, (see Baxter and Biog. Britannica, as quoted in Perry on Declaration, p. 302,) and had also been chosen one of the Westminster Assembly, though afterwards his name was "struck off the list, and Mr. Thomas Goodwin put into his room." (Ibid, p. 303.) Baxter says of him, "Bishop Gawden was our most constant helper." (Reliquiæ Baxterianæ, London, 1696, p. 363. See also pp. 217, 218. See also Perry on Declaration, p. 322.)

It is also worthy of special observation, that the change of expression in the rubric was but a return to the original language of the Latin Article (28) of 1553 ["*carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam.*"] So that (as Dr. Blakeney observes—on Common Prayer, 3rd Edit., p. 434) "the Revisers of 1661 in the word *corporal*, selected the very term which was chosen by our Reformers to express their meaning in the article from which the declaration is taken." (See Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church, p. 567.)

LONDON
WILLIAM MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER ROW.