Gesenius's classification, which it will be necessary to examine carefully.

The term "Samaritan Pentateuch," which is also used for the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch,[1] is a doubly misleading expression. For the future I shall venture generally to call it what it is proved from Scripture to be—the Israelitish Codex of the Five Books, in contradistinction to the Jewish Codex, which we possess in our Hebrew Bible as corrected and punctuated by the Masorites; but as the one has passed through the hands of the Masorites, and the other through that of the Samaritans, the terms Masoretic Codex and Samaritan Codex have also their use.

On the importance of this double transmission of the five Books of Moses from the time of Jeroboam it is hardly necessary to say a word. If we have a Codex which has been in continuous existence from the time of Jeroboam, whether better or worse than that in Jewish synagogues, more or less grammatical, improved or debased, unchanged from that time or altered here and there to suit the circumstances of different ages, matters comparatively little. If that is true—and I venture to say that Kennicott was quite justified in considering the proof complete—there is an end to all notion of one part of the Pentateuch having been written in Josiah's time, and another part near the time of the Exile, or later. Solomon had it before the division of the kingdom, and David had it, and his words about the law of the Lord refer to it; and no one who admits this much will doubt that it is still earlier in its origin, or, in words which ought by themselves to have been sufficient to carry conviction, "that the law was given by Moses."

SAMUEL GARRATT.

ART. IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

PART II.

THEN (ii.) as to the language of Reformed theology. Its standing of this side of the separation being known and notorious, we may well bear with sayings which on the other side would certainly mean dangerous error. Accordingly, we need not be startled to find in the Directory of the West-

[1] Petermann's "Pentateuchus Samaritanus" is a reprint of the translation; "De Pentateucho Samaritano," by Kohn, is the monograph already referred to with respect to the Codex.

minster Assembly, as well as in Baxter's service, the minister instructed to deliver the bread with these words, "Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you,"[1] nor to hear the martyr Bradford declare that he would rather the consecrated bread should be called the body of Christ than otherwise,[2] nor to read the saying of Brooks the Puritan, that he would rather give his life to a murderer than Christ's body to an unworthy receiver.[3] And accordingly, although when the religious atmosphere is charged with false doctrine greater carefulness is required, we may err, when our standing on this side has been sufficiently proclaimed, in being over-cautious in avoiding all language which has been used to express the teaching of the other side. For we may be surrendering expressions which belong to our side not less than to the other, and virtually conceding that they can fairly mean only the doctrine for which our opponents would claim them as exclusively their own. In strange ignorance or forgetfulness of the need of this word of caution, how many quotations have been made from the writings of Reformed divines as if in support of errors—errors of the other side—but errors which it is certain these writers never meant to defend, but were ready to banish and drive away as earnest maintainers of the truth on our side!

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

It is true, indeed, that in the earlier stages of the controversy the Swiss school of divines, in their desire to avoid ambiguities and to separate themselves altogether from anything that could sound like the Romish Real Presence, gave less prominence to this teaching, and, emphasizing chiefly the

[1] See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 435, 436.
[2] See Bradford's "Sermons," P. S. edit., pp. 94, 95.
[3] See Appendix to Memoir in Brooks's "Works," vol. i., pp. 49, 50, Nichol's edition.

significant aspect of the words of institution, gave cause for uneasiness—as tending to reduce the ordinance to bare signs and naked figures. "This," says Hooker, "was it that some did exceedingly fear, lest Zuinglius and Œcolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of this Sacrament, but only as of a shadow, destitute, empty, and void of Christ."[1] But, though the tendency may even afterwards have shown signs of revival, the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549 (many years after Zwingle's death), and the influence of wiser theologians brought about a sound agreement as to the true giving, receiving, and eating which pertain to the faith of the Eucharist. "By opening the several opinions which have been held," says Hooker again, "they are grown, for aught I can see, on all sides at the length, to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely, the real participation of Christ and of life in His body and blood by means of this Sacrament." Accordingly the later Helvetic Confession (of 1566) is clear and strong in the expression of the doctrine which, in the former Helvetic Confession of 1536, had been, not indeed omitted, but somewhat less strongly and distinctly enunciated, and which in the Confession of Basle of 1532 had hardly received a full recognition. I must not be taking up time by quotations, but it may be truly said that evidence abounds to the fact that the doctrine of the Reformed does fully meet all the requirements of the Scriptural teaching —of the faith once delivered to the Saints—as to the real partaking, the real giving and taking and eating, of the body and blood of Christ, and that verily and indeed, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[2] And this being so, it must surely be obvious that a great and serious mistake is made when our opponents seek to represent the chasm of cleavage as surrounding only a doctrine of merely significant and not effectual signs, and then desire to claim as all their own the witness to true giving and receiving which can be brought forward so abundantly from the writings of the Fathers, from the liturgies of antiquity, as well as from the works of our great English divines, and from our English Book of Common Prayer.

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

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

[2] See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 388-410, 725-744.

given is not really *in* the sign. In strictness of speech it is a thing distant not in place only but in time. It is the Lord's body crucified and His blood outpoured for the sin of the world; it is the real beneficial possession of His very death and sacrifice; it is "remission of our sins and all the benefits of His passion" which is here made over to us. And our taking, receiving, and eating is all spiritual. For this is the "verily and indeed" of all our taking and receiving. The mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the Supper is faith. Faith is the hand, and faith is the mouth of the soul. And the taking and receiving verily and indeed is the privilege of "the faithful." The expression "spiritually by faith," so often in the mouths of our Reforming divines,[1] is the key to the interpretation of all teaching concerning the reality of receiving and taking in the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. And it must not be forgotten that faith comes to Christ, to be satisfied with the spiritual food of His most precious body and blood, not only in the Ordinance of the Eucharist, but also (and not less really, as the Fathers testify[2]) in the learning and inwardly digesting of the Word of truth, the oracles of God, the doctrine of the Gospel, the promises of the New Covenant.

While, however, giving and receiving require (of necessity) no real presence at all—for (to use an illustration very familiar to Anglican divines) estates far away are constantly given and received by signing and sealing deeds of conveyance, and (to use the illustration of St. Bernard, for which he was blamed by Aquinas)[3] abbacies were conferred by the delivery of a staff—it is obvious that eating and drinking do require a certain presence of that which is eaten and drunken. We cannot possibly feed upon, nor be nourished by, that which is really, and in every sense of the word, afar off. But here again we have to remember the word "spiritually by faith." As the eating and drinking is all by faith, so the only presence required is presence "to faith," or, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor expresses it, presence "to our spirits only."[4] And what question can there be that the cross of the Redeemer, the death of the Son of God, the separated body and blood of Christ, are really present to faith? Dr. John Owen, the learned Independent divine, declared: "One of the greatest engines that ever the devil made use of to overthrow the faith of the Church was by forging such a presence of Christ

[1] See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 722-725; also pp. 86, 93, 109, 128, 129, 147, 149, 151, 153, 194, 195, 201, 202, 215.
[2] See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 330 *et seq.*
[3] See "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 49, 50.
[4] Taylor's "Real Presence," sec. i., § 8.

as is not truly in this ordinance to drive us off from looking after that great presence which is true" ("Works," vol. ix., p. 572, edit. Goold). And Perkins, the celebrated Puritan, wrote: "There must be such a kind of Presence wherein Christ is really and truly present to the heart of him that receives the Sacrament in faith. And thus far we consent with the Romish Church touching Real Presence. We differ not touching the Presence itself, but only in the manner of the Presence" ("Works," vol. i., p. 590, edit. Cambridge, 1616). Faith in its exercise finds no impediment in distance. Or, rather, to faith distance is not absence.[1] When Œcolampadius wrote "Per

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

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

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

And again: "A Real Presence of Christ we acknowledge, but not local or physical; for Presence Real (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance, but is opposed to a false, imaginary, fantastic presence" ("Meditations on H. Sac."; "Works," vol. iii., p. 72, edit. 1826).

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

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

Maresius, in his Commentary on the Belgic Confession, says: "Quidni Christus quamvis absens loco et corpore, præsens nobis fieret spiritu et fide, quando quidem hæc est fidei veræ indoles, haud absimilis tubis opticis, per quos remotissima objecta accedere et præsentia se nobis facere videntur, ut menti præsentia reddat quæ alias vel loco vel tempore absentia ac dissita sunt?" ("Exegesis," p. 531, Gronin., 1652).

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

The teaching of Pareus on this point is specially worthy of attention. He allows the force of the argument, "Quod nullo modo præsens

fidem absentissimum Corpus Christi, animo præsentissimum est,"[1] he was attributing to faith nothing more than had been given to it not only by St. Augustin, but still more clearly by Pope Leo the Great, and after him scarcely less distinctly by Rupert of Duyts, who says that to faith "præsentia sunt omnia præterita." And we are not to suppose that this teach-

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Totus adest, totus sancto incumbit altari, non ut iterum patiatur, sed ut fidei, cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita, Ejus passio memoriter

ing of Presence to the soul by faith had been altogether lost in the ages of darkness. Even Innocent III., who himself set the crown of Papal authority (it was the work of the Pope rather than of the Council[1]) on the new-born doctrine of Transubstantiation, would not allow the *Res Sacramenti* to go further than the mouth of the communicant. "Christus de ore," he taught, "transit ad cor."[2] It is true that his teach-

---

repræsentetur" (Rupertus Tuitiensis, De Trin., lib. xlii.; in Gen., lib. vi. cap. xxvii., Op., tom. i., c. 431, edit. Migne).

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

[1] See the assertion of the editor of his works (Colon., 1575), in tom. i., p. 460. The statement is disputed by Bellarmine, but is confirmed by the wording of chap. xxix. and chap. xxxiii. Du Pin declares: "Matthew Paris says that those canons seemed tolerable to some of the prelates, but grievous to others. . . . Let the case be how it will, 'tis certain that these canons were not made by the council, but by Innocent III., who presented them to the council ready drawn up, and ordered them to be read, and that the prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, but that their silence was taken for approbation" (vol. xi., p. 95, London, 1699). See also "Translator to Reader," p. 2; and Cosin's Works, "A. C. L.," vol. iv., pp. 222, 473, 477, 482. The subject is discussed in Greenwood's "Cathedra Petri," book xiii., c. ix., pp. 637-639. See also "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 71, 72.

[2] These words of Innocent should be read in connection with their context:

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

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

ing herein was afterwards contradicted and virtually condemned by Pope Gregory XI. (towards the close of the following century), who insisted on the glorified body of Christ

---

probable that he derived from Damiani the term which he inserted in the Lateran Decree, though it may probably have become, to some extent, a recognised form of expression before this.

It is still more important to note that Damiani, when writing this work, appears to have had before him the writing of Florus Magister (see Mai's note, p. 219), and that Florus had strongly insisted on the truth (to which the earlier fathers had abundantly borne witness) that the *Res Sacramenti* is food *only for the soul* (see "Eucharistic Worship," app., note ii., p. 329). See his letter concerning the Council of Chiersy (A.D. 837) in "Mansi," tom. xiv. c. 743, 744, especially c. 744, where, following the teaching of St. Augustin, he says: "Qui manducat intus, non foris; qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente. Credere enim in Eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum, qui credit manducat. . . . Manet ergo in mente fidelium incorrupta venerabilis mysterii virtus, et efficacissima potentia."

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

Compare the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Corpus Christi non convertitur in corpus hominis, sed reficit

being conveyed as far as the stomach, requiring it (under pain of excommunication for the recalcitrant) to be followed by the faith of believers even into the belly of a mouse—"adeo ut" (to use the language of Bishop Cosin) "dubitare illis non liceat, quin res sit de fide, quæ a fide maxime abhorret" ("Works," A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 97).[1] But the concurrent *dictum* (which had been handed down from earlier ages), "Cibus est non carnis sed animæ," still held its own, and strongly influenced a current of teaching which flowed on and kept its course through the stream of pre-Tridentine doctrine.[2] I do not

---

mentem ejus" (T. Aquinas, "Sum.," par. iii., vol. ii.; Quæst., lxxvii., art. vi.).

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

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

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

[1] In this the Pope was following the teaching of Aquinas and others among the scholastics, who regarded the matter as a crucial test of the true faith in the integrity of the Sacrament. Brentius and others of the stricter Lutherans favoured the same opinion. And we are assured that "the Lutherans in Ansbach disputed about the question whether the body of Christ were actually swallowed, like other food, and digested in the stomach." It is hard to believe the extent to which this superstition was carried in some parts of Lutheran Germany. The following may serve as an example: "When the Rev. John Musculus, in Frankfort-on-the-Oder, inadvertently spilled a little wine at the Communion, he was summoned before a synod, and Elector John Joachim, of Brandenburg, declared that deposition, prison, and exile were too mild a punishment for such a crime, and that the offender, who had not spared the blood of Christ, must suffer bloody punishment, and have two or three fingers cut off" (Schaff, "Creeds of Ch.," pp. 284-5).

[2] See, *e.g.*, the "Fortalitium Fidei," lib. iii., Cosid. vi., Imposs. xxiii., fol. lxxiv., Nuremberg, 1485, where the writer, quoting from Hugo de Santo Victore, says: "Corporalis præsentia querenda non est, sed spiritualis retinenda. Dispensatio completa est. Sacramentum intus manet. Christus de ore ad cor transit. Melius est tibi ut eat in mentem tuam quam in ventrem tuum. Cibus iste animæ non corporis est" (see Hugo de S. Vict., "De Sacramentis Fidei," lib. ii., par. viii., cap. xiii.; further evidence may be seen in "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 331-333).

See also Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xii., par. i., dub. iii.;

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

Anyhow, our Reformers and subsequent divines were continually appealing to a catena of mediæval and later doctors who taught that, but for the authority which had defined the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the meaning of the words of the Institution, and therefore all that belonged to the faith of the Eucharistic Presence, could very well have been held without it. One of these, Fisher (Bishop of Rochester), declared there was not a word in the Institution by which the true Presence in the Mass could be established. And it is well known that Cardinal Cajetan, though an upholder of Transubstantiation, used words on this subject which, by order of Pope Pius V., were expunged from the Roman edition of his works.[1] Indeed, Bellarmine himself professes that the Real Presence in the elements is needless (though not useless) for purposes of Communion.[2] The Presence is necessary, in his view, for the purpose of the sacrifice, but for Communion (for Sacramental purposes) effectual signs ("signa visibilia continentia virtualiter gratiam sanctificationis") would avail—herein running, it would seem, in the very teeth of Pope Innocent III., whose famous decree which established the doctrine of Transubstantiation proclaimed it as for the purpose of Communion, "ut ad proficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro" (Op., tom. i., p. 461, Colon., 1575).[3]

---

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

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

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

[3] It will be found also that Innocent III. was far from regarding the Real Presence of Christ's person, body, soul, and divinity, as a necessary consequence of transubstantiation. Thus he wrote: "Porro quum panis transubstantietur in corpus, et utique rationali spiritu animatum, videtur quod panis transubstantietur in hominem: pari ratione in Christum transubstantiatur, et ita in Creatorem. Sic ergo creatura quotidie fit Creator. . . . Ego tamen sicut in aliis, ita pariter in hoc, divina

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

To mention but a few examples. Ridley, I believe, has now

---

sacramenta magis veneranda, quam discutienda profiteor. Scriptum est enim: Non comedetis ex eo crudum quid, nec coctum aqua, sed assum igni. Etsi secundum vim inferentiæ non sequatur: Quod si panis transubstantiatur in corpus humanum, ideo panis transubstantiatur in hominem, quia non homo, sed hominis pars est corpus" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xix., Op., tom. i., pp. 384, 385, Colon., 1575).

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

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

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

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

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

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

been given up, but Ridley used to be claimed as the teacher of a teaching which he was burnt for denying. Archbishop Parker was sometimes confidently claimed as the patron of a doctrine, for the more distinct exclusion of which he secured the insertion of our Twenty-ninth Article of religion. How many times has Bishop Andrewes been quoted in support of a doctrine of the Real Presence which quite certainly was none of his![1] Bishop Cosin has been cited as teaching a mode of the Real Presence which, in terms most distinct, he clearly rejected. Bishop Morton has been appealed to in support of a doctrine of Real Presence which he was strongly opposing and effectually laying low. Bishop Jeremy Taylor has been quoted largely as teaching that which his doctrine of the Real Presence certainly condemned.

The "Real Presence" of Laud and Bramhall and other divines of that school (so, at least, I am fully persuaded) was not the "Real Presence" of the teaching which belongs to the other side of the doctrinal chasm.[2] The Real Presence of Church of England divines is presence only to faith.[3] But then, it is surely a misrepresentation to stigmatize this Presence as having no truth or reality in any region outside, beyond, or

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

above the subjective. Indeed this Presence, though separated so widely from what is now called "the Real Objective Presence," may nevertheless be truly said to be an objective Presence. For what can a merely subjective Presence be? Faith is not imagination. And faith has no creative power. Faith believes only what is true—objectively true. Faith can only realize that which is objectively real. And faith can receive only what is given—truly and objectively given.[1] And the *Res Sacramenti* is equally offered with the sign to those who by unbelief reject and refuse—to their condemnation eating and drinking the sign or sacrament of so great a thing—and to those who by faith verily and indeed take and receive the Heavenly Gift to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls. This is nothing more than the theology of the "reformed" has consistently and strongly insisted on.[2]

Time will not allow me now to follow up this subject into the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Our modern teachers, like the Romish Doctors, make the Sacrifice of the Altar to rest for its basis on the Real Presence in the elements. As a consequence, the *ἀνάμνησις* in their teaching directs faith's view to the sacrificing or memorializing act of the priest in the

---

[1] "Dicimus hoc spiritualiter fieri, non ut efficaciæ et veritatis loco imaginationem aut cogitationem supponamus" ("Conf. Gall.," art. 36).

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

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

It should be well observed how strongly this is insisted on by our reformers. Witness the following: "I never denied nor taught, but that to faith whole Christ's body and blood was as present as bread and wine to the due receiver. . . . I believe Christ is present there to the faith of the due receiver. . . . The receiving maketh not the presence, as your lordship would affirm; but God's grace, truth, and power is the cause of the presence, the which the wicked that lacketh faith cannot receive" (Writings of Bradford, "Sermons," etc., P.S. edit., pp. 488, 489; see also "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 485-488).

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

chancel, and only as behind that (though doubtless as the source of its efficacy) to the commemorated act of Christ upon the cross.

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

Oh! what a true *sursum corda* springs out from the true view of this holy ordinance seen in its subservient but consecrated relation to the living Word of the living God, to the truth and power of the Gospel of Christ! Here is rest from the strife of tongues, and the soul's hiding-place is stillness from the danger and din of controversy. Oh! the comfort and support which comes of the sure and certain evidence which this Sacrament affords to the hard facts which lie at the very centre of our Christian faith—to the life, and death, and resurrection of our Blessed Lord! What a witness is here to the present justification, the perfect redemption, the full salvation, freely given to sinners justly condemned to the outcasting of death! What a testimony to the blessed truth of the everlasting Gospel, when, in faith's true view of these holy mysteries, the Holy Spirit of truth takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us! And, oh! the blessed assurance which comes of the true faith of the mercy and love which has made such provision for each hungering and thirsting soul to open its mouth wide and be filled with the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, and then to depart in peace, saying to itself, "Now all is mine. Christ is mine. Now Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

N. Dimock.