

the Canticles sung in our Churches exercise a kind of oblique restraint, attuning devout minds to reverence and lowliness, and to that grave and tender reserve which suggests more than it utters, and chastens holy joy in order to exalt it. Thus, through all the variations of feeling incidental to place, to time, and to individual temper, the strain of Christian song is kept in tune with the voices which lead it, among which was heard first, and is heard still, "The Magnificat, or Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary."

T. D. BERNARD.

NOTE.—To these observations on the Magnificat, I will venture to append the expression of a wish that we had an authorised selection and collection of the scriptural and chief ecclesiastical Canticles, with some greater liberty for variation and interchange in their liturgical use. Such a collection is found in the famous Utrecht Psalter. A beautiful MS. volume of a late date (1514), in the Cathedral Library at Wells, contains, I think, the same selection and in the same order, only that the Psalms, instead of being illustrated, as in the Utrecht Psalter, by curious pictures, are accompanied throughout by explanatory glosses and many admirable Collects.

The contents are as follows:—

1. The whole Psalter, with the additions mentioned.
2. Canticum Esaie, Is. xii.
3. Scriptura Ezekie Regis, Is. xxxviii. 9-21.
4. Canticum Anne, 1 Sam. ii. 1-11.
Oratio Abacce pro ignorationibus, Hab. iii.
6. Canticum Moysi, Exod. xv. 1-19.
7. Canticum Moysi, Deut. xxxii. 1-44.
8. Ambrosii et Augustini. Te Deum.
9. Canticum trium puerorum. Benedicite.
10. Canticum Zacharie. Benedictus.
11. Canticum dive Marie Virginis. Magnificat.
12. Canticum Symeonis. Nunc dimittis.
13. Symbolum Athanasii. Quicumque vult.

It is interesting to see how entirely the "Athanasian Creed" was reckoned, not as a Creed properly so-called, but as a hymn or Canticle in expansion of the Creed, or a song of defence against assaults of heresy.

ART. VII.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Eucharistic controversy, as waged between the different sections of the Church of England, has long been in a state eminently unsatisfactory. The question at issue turns in this, as probably it does in all other cases, on matters of fact. The ultimate authority is admitted by all parties to lie in the intention of Christ, and in the words by which the Sacrament was

first instituted. Protestants do not admit that there is the least ambiguity in these words, or, taking the whole teaching of our Lord together, any difficulty whatever in definitely fixing their meaning. They are quite prepared to abide by the literal form of our Lord's words. It has been acutely pointed out by that eminent dialectician, the late Dr. Vogan, in his work on the Eucharist, that the literal meaning of the words of institution is fatal to the modern doctrine that the natural Body and Blood of Christ are to be found in, with, or under the elements by virtue of their consecration. The natural element cannot contain that with which it is itself identical. But however this may be, Protestants do not admit that the words of institution are doubtful in such a sense, that they themselves have any doubt of their meaning; but in the sense that different people put different interpretations upon them, they are bound to admit it. Appeal to the words themselves fails therefore to furnish an end to controversy, so long as they are thus variously interpreted. The Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian, and the Calvinist, the Ritualist and the Evangelical, all appeal to the same words, but are separated *toto cælo* in the sense which they put upon them.

In this state of things the interpretation put upon the words of institution by the Christians of the early centuries, and the views they consequently entertained of the nature and effects of the Lord's Supper, become a very important element in the controversy. Those who decline to accept the Fathers as authorities may yet value them highly as witnesses to the belief of their day. If those who conversed with the Apostles, and the generations immediately subsequent to them, are found to have understood the words of institution in one uniform and unvarying sense, the fact can scarcely be regarded otherwise than as raising a strong presumption that this particular sense is the true one. But is it a fact, that the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the consecrated elements did form part of the faith of Christians from the first? The Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England confidently affirms the assertion to be true and reiterates it with the utmost emphasis and confidence. For instance, we have recently been told that "it is as clear as day that S. Ignatius understood S. John vi. 51—of the bread of the holy Eucharist;" that "not only in the age of S. Ignatius and afterwards, but in the very earliest times, in the days of S. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Eucharistic table was a *Θυσιαστήριον*. And of course, if so, that which was offered upon it, and eaten off it, was *θυσία*, a sacrifice, and he who celebrated it was *λείτουργός*, a priest;"—that Ignatius considered the consecrated elements to be "the medicine of immortality, the union of his flesh to that of Christ," and that this mode of speaking

was not peculiar to him : that it was the teaching of the early Church that " the Eucharist (that is, the consecrated elements) is the flesh and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ," which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again ; " that the doctrine of S. Iræneus is perfectly clear and conclusive for the Real Presence."¹ Such assertions may carry little weight with those who are accustomed to examine the authorities for themselves, but at all events they bear witness to the strong and confident convictions of the party represented by the writer. Yet Protestants speak with equal decision on the other side, and unhesitatingly affirm that such statements, as have been quoted, do not justly represent the teaching of the early Fathers, and are only made plausible either by mistaking rhetorical language for dogmatic statement, or by misapprehension of the real issue which has been raised in the course of discussion, or by careless and defective quotation. They have shown their confidence in this view by reiterated attempts to bring the question to the test of public examination. Thus the matter has stood pretty much since the Reformation. For the present no more is necessary than to refer, in proof, to the language of Bishop Jewell, in his celebrated sermon at St. Paul's Cross, repeatedly renewed as the challenge has subsequently been ; as, for instance, by Archbishop Usher, in his " answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit."

And yet the disputed fact is one which, in its own nature, should admit of ready determination. The passages from the early Fathers, at all events, are very few in number. It is true that their language in many instances is exceedingly loose and inaccurate, and almost entirely devoid of that precision which the controversies of succeeding ages have compelled more modern writers to adopt, as theology has been reduced more and more to an exact and scientific form. Nevertheless, inaccurate and rhetorical as is the language of the early Fathers, the difficulty of clearly determining their views on the subject of the Lord's Supper cannot be insuperable. Why, then, have things remained in this unsatisfactory state ? It is because High Church writers on this subject have up to the month of October last steadily refused to face the question, or to enter on any thorough vindication of their statements.

That the state of the case may be clearly seen, it is desirable that the facts should be more precisely recapitulated. In no religious controversy can all the members of a school be expected to examine for themselves the authorities on which their case rests ; this must be the duty of the few, who have time and inclination for so laborious an inquiry. It is no disrespect, there-

¹ " Doctrine of the Fathers on the Real Presence." : *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1879.

fore, to the High Sacramentalists, with whom we are in conflict on this subject, to express the belief that their views have been mainly founded on the writings of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Archdeacon Denison, on the array of authors contained in the elaborate judgment of Sir Robert Phillimore in *Sheppard v. Bennett*, and above all in the catena furnished by Dr. Pusey. Not only has the high reputation of this last-named divine served to justify the confidence placed in his authority, but his own strong assertions have naturally increased the feeling. Thus, he writes :—

The following evidence that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first, is more than enough to convince one who is willing to be convinced. If this convinces not, neither would any other. There is no flaw, no doubt, I might almost say no loophole, except that man always finds one to escape what he is unwilling to accept.

I have now . . . gone through every writer who in his extant works speaks of the Holy Eucharist, from the time when St. John the Evangelist was translated to his Lord to the date of the Fourth General Council, A.D. 451, a period of three centuries and a half. I have suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly omitted anything; I have given every passage, as far as in me lay, with so much of the context as was necessary for the clear exhibition of the meaning.—“*Doctrine of the Real Presence*,” pp. 316, 317, 715.

The immense influence which Dr. Pusey's works have exercised is proved by the testimony of his own friends. Rev. W. E. Bennett addresses Dr. Pusey thus—“I have gradually learned from yourself, and from other doctors of the Church, to whom in your writings you have referred, the essential necessity of these great truths.” The devout John Keble speaks yet more positively, in the preface to his work on Eucharistical adoration—“This I do not profess to demonstrate, but accept it as demonstrated by Dr. Pusey.”

His own competence for the task he asserts, gently indeed, but very firmly, affirming that he had lived with the Fathers for the last twenty years, as “in his home.” How, in the face of such assertions, it can be possible for any writer to use such language as the following, we are at a loss to conceive :—“Dr. Pusey is not responsible for the penning of the patristic passages; he is not responsible, except to a limited extent, for their selection. They are the common-places of the subject, found in a long extent of theological treatises and manuals.” The last clause may perhaps explain a good deal of what appears otherwise to be utterly inexplicable.

It must be remembered that not one writer, but many, have emphatically denied the truth of Dr. Pusey's conclusions, and questioned the accuracy of his quotations. The learned work of

the late Dean Goode on the Eucharist is one long bill of indictment against them. This work was, indeed, already passing through the press when the volume on "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," &c., was published, but Dr. Pusey's views had already been made known. In regard to him Dean Goode uses the following language:—"How, as respects a large proportion of these passages, Dr. Pusey himself could suppose that they convey any proof that their authors held this doctrine, it is difficult to imagine. The whole evidence in the case of almost all of them seems to lie in the fact that in speaking of the consecrated elements they apply to them the terms 'the Holy Blood of Christ.' But, as I shall show presently, this fact proves nothing." In his subsequent volume on "The Real Presence," &c., Dr. Pusey has referred more than once to Dean Goode's arguments, and expressed his hope of replying to them, if health should permit. But the intention has never been carried into effect. The Dean of Ripon has not stood alone. He was promptly supported by no less a person than the acute and learned Bishop Thirlwall, who in his charge, delivered October, 1857, discussed the doctrine of the Eucharist, and expressed himself thus:—

I believe, however, that the so-called Catholic teaching, understood as I have said, is no less repugnant both to Scripture and to the whole stream of genuine primitive tradition, though, by means of compilations, which are bringing the name of a catena into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to an engine of polemical delusion, it may be made to appear to have a great mass of patristic evidence in its favour. —"Remains of Bishop Thirlwall," vol. i. p. 266.

A foot-note to the same page adds:—

A very large part of the passages collected by Dr. Pusey in his notes on his sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," would be deprived of all even seeming relevancy and argumentative value by the simple insertion of the words sacramental and sacramentally.

In 1869 the learned Dr. H. Burgess, formerly editor of the *Clerical Journal*, published his work on "The Reformed Church of England, in its Principles and their Legitimate Development." The fourth chapter is devoted to the subject of the Lord's Supper. Among the page headings occurs the following:—"Use of Justin, by Dr. Pusey." He closes his discussion on the evidence of antiquity in the following words:—

We think we have proved that, unless we are to extend that tradition (primitive tradition) far into mediæval times, it is utterly unable to lend its countenance to any of the mysterious doctrines and ceremonies made to cluster round the Lord's Supper by the Church of Rome, and its imitators, the Anglican-Catholic party.—P. 196.

The charge was subsequently renewed by Dr. Vogan in his

great work on the "True Doctrine of the Eucharist," originally issued in 1849, but republished in an enlarged form in 1871. He too appeals to the Fathers, and after quoting a passage from Hilary, says: "This part of Dr. Pusey's work is largely made up, I think, of passages as little pertinent to the purpose. In fact, I find that fully one half in number, and much more in bulk, of the passages he has cited to prove 'that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first' are quite inapplicable, and consequently that the number of the Fathers he has called in evidence must be considerably reduced." (page 148). He subsequently points out, as, for instance, in Chapters xii. and xiii., causes which have led to the misunderstanding of the Fathers who are quoted, and concludes the discussion thus:—

Let the reader . . . place this brief statement of the doctrine of the Real Presence side by side with the extracts which have been or may be produced from the Fathers; he will see that these venerable authorities give no sanction to this doctrine; and that, for well nigh a thousand years, they proclaim with one voice their belief in our Lord's words, when He said of the bread, "This—is—my body which is given for you! This—is—my blood which is shed for you;" a belief which Dr. Pusey again and again states and acknowledges, but strangely converts into the belief of his own very different and self-contradictory doctrine.—P. 161.

Then followed the works of Dr. Harrison. "Whose are the Fathers?" was published in 1867, and the author states his thesis thus: "Our serious charge against these Anglo-Catholics is that the extracts given from the Fathers are often garbled, and many passages, though not garbled, have been quoted apart from the context, which, if it had been given with the extracts, would have made them useless for the purpose for which they were adduced." This charge was reiterated with further evidences and illustrations in the "Answer to Dr. Pusey's Challenge respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence," published in 1871, in which he formally renews his accusation of "garbled extracts, unfair translations, and unaccountable omissions."

It thus appears that it is not Dr. Harrison alone who has impugned the quotations adduced by Dr. Pusey to prove that the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first. He is but the last of a considerable succession of writers, some of whom have been men of the highest reputation and position in the Church, to say nothing of many minor publications of the same general kind which have reiterated the same complaint. Yet of these charges no serious notice whatever has ever been taken.

The *Church Quarterly* states the fact with evident self-

congratulation. It quietly ignores all the other writers named, and mentions Dr. Harrison alone.

It had been anticipated that this bold attempt to claim the Fathers for the Protestant side, and to refute Dr. Pusey, would raise a perfect storm in the Ritualistic and High Church camp. Instead of that there was perfect silence even of the good-natured kind. Not even the majestic challenge of the *Christian Observer* could elicit a single word.

There must be some one among them, writes that editor, although there may probably not be many, who has sufficient acquaintance with patristic learning to rebut the crushing exposure, if indeed the assertions of Dr. Harrison can be met. As it is, Dr. Pusey is arraigned before the world on charges which amount to mendacity—no less!—of the most shameful and disingenuous character. The system of Rome, it is true, is a system of forgery and lies; but he never has professed that he is a Romanist. We shall wait with much anxiety to see what answer can be made by him or for him.

And he has waited ever since January, 1864.

The complacent satisfaction breathed throughout this extract is singularly misplaced. Men are so naturally identified with the principles they profess, that the character of the one cannot be called into question without injuring the influence of the other. Public writers have no right to sit down contentedly under the grave accusation of misleading the Church of Christ. Either the accusation is false, or true; if false, it is a duty to repel it; if true, it is a yet higher duty to submit to it. Every conceivable motive might have been supposed to suggest an indignant, immediate, and complete refutation of charges so discreditable to those that made them, if they are false; so discreditable to those against whom they were alleged, if they are true. Yet a serious attempt at vindication has never been made. The silence of assumed contempt has been maintained, not only from 1874, but from the publication of Dean Goode's work in 1856, down to October, 1879. For three-and-twenty years the party has been content to lie under the gravest suspicions which can possibly be alleged against public writers, and above all against theologians.

But at last the silence has been broken. Dr. Harrison condensed his previous works into one small readable volume, under the title of the "Fathers against Dr. Pusey." He subsequently issued a yet smaller publication, of which he has circulated 20,000 copies throughout the country. It can be readily understood that this measure was too formidable to be overlooked. Hence the Article in the *Church Quarterly* of last October. Its appearance should be a matter of most sincere congratulation, for it admits the gravity of the accusations made against the catenas of Dr. Pusey, and of others of his school. It moves the controversy one step forward, and opens a prospect, at

last, of bringing the opposing facts alleged on either side to a final and conclusive settlement. It does more. The writer, in order to vindicate in certain selected crucial instances the sense put upon the language of the Fathers, is compelled in his own defence to explain the canons by which it has been interpreted. The wonder of the fact, as well as the fact itself, is thus shifted onward. No one can be surprised that with such canons of interpretation as are now maintained, the teaching of the Fathers should be supposed to support the doctrine of the Real Presence, for the whole question is really begged beforehand. The only subject of surprise is, that such canons should ever have been adopted. If they can be sustained, the allegations of Dr. Pusey will be justified. But if no one of them will bear examination, the entire argument founded upon them falls at once to the ground.

Here, therefore, the personal questions with which the main issue has been encumbered may all be dropped. No further allusion will be made, for instance, to Dr. Pusey. Had it not been necessary for a full statement of the case, his name would not have been used at all. Christian courtesy may be allowed to distinguish between the theologian and the man. Not but that, even as a theologian, Dr. Pusey has rendered noble service to the Church of Christ. His work on Daniel and his commentary on the minor Prophets, for instance, will ever remain a *κτῆμα εἰς αἰ.* Would that it were possible, in the recollection of services like these, to forget the incalculable evils that have resulted to the Church of England, and to the interests of God's truth at large, from the system which first sprang into activity under the shelter of his name. It is no little misfortune that the respect due to the undisputed learning and unquestioned personal piety of one who has filled so large a place in the recent history of the Church of England as to have been called "The Great Anglican Doctor," should be clouded by such a recollection, or that indignant protest should be mingled with the sympathy with which all parties in the Church will regard the domestic afflictions of an aged Christian. May it be with him as it was with Bellarmine in his last hours, that he may find during the closing years of life the strength and consolation of his soul in Christ, and Christ alone. It is no unfaithfulness to truth to express the hope that the hard tones of controversy may be gently tempered to the ears on which are beginning to break the everlasting harmonies of the better world.

Here also may be dropped for the most part the personal discussion between the *Church Quarterly* and Dr. Harrison. It has been shown that he is not the only antagonist with whom the maintainers of the Real Presence, as part of the faith of Christians from the first, have to do. He is but the latest of

a series of writers who have maintained the same accusations against ultra Church catenas as himself, and whose reputation stands as far above the reach of any supercilious indifference, as their arguments stand above the reach of loose reasoning and unproved assumptions. Dr. Harrison is well able to defend himself, and may be assured that contemptuous references to "Edinburgh Theology" and hard words of reproof will alike be brushed aside by any independent reader, as equally irrelevant and unbecoming. The personal discussion is altogether overshadowed by the grave issue at stake. We do not care so much to know in what points any particular writer is right and in which points he is wrong, as we care to know whether the early Church did, or did not, believe in the Real Presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper. On this question attention must now be concentrated by the critical examination of the four canons laid down by the *Church Quarterly* as rules for interpreting the language of the Fathers. For on these canons the whole question will be found to turn. There are, however, some points on which it is desirable to dwell for a short time, before the personal side of the controversy is entirely dismissed.

Great fault is found with the assertion that "the doctrine of the Real Presence was unknown to the Christian Church till it was invented by Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century." The words do not, be it observed, refer to transubstantiation. On the mode in which the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the elements they say nothing. It is on the fact of their alleged presence that stress is justly laid. "If Dr. Harrison errs in his estimate of the doctrine of Paschasius, he errs, it must be admitted, in good company. "About A.D. 831, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards Abbot of Corbie, maintained the corporal presence. Whether even he taught the full-grown doctrine of transubstantiation, or only consubstantiation, our divines have questioned." So has written no less competent a witness than Dr. Harold Browne, the present Bishop of Winchester ("Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 696). Hagenbach, whose authority is admitted to be "considerable," makes the same assertion. "Gerbert, whose reputation was great in those days, endeavoured to illustrate the doctrine propounded by Paschasius of a real change of the bread into the Body of Christ" ("History of Doctrines," pp. 11, 84). Gieseler, in a passage containing several points well worthy of attention, says:—

The ecclesiastical mode of speaking, that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper became by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ, may have been frequently understood of a transformation of substance by the uneducated; but among the theologians of the West, this

misconception could not so readily find acceptance, in consequence of the clear explanations given by the celebrated Augustine. When, therefore, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and Abbot of Corbie from 844-851, expressly taught such a transformation, he met with considerable opposition.—“*Ecclesiastical History*,” vol. ii. p. 284.

This passage is the more noticeable because an attempt has been made to create confusion as to the teaching of Paschasius, by quoting certain phrases which, taken by themselves, apart from their context, appear to bear an Evangelical meaning. The attempt is more ingenious than it is ingenuous. It is scarcely accurate to state that the sentiment of Paschasius is expressed in the words “*Christum vorari fas dentibus non est.*” In his letter to Trudegard he ascribes the sentiment to Augustine. “If I could believe,” he says, “that it was the body our Lord took from the Virgin Mary, his mother, yet, on the other side, even the illustrious doctor Augustine declares this to be a great sin; which wise saying seems to excite too much horror in the recipients, unless they believe that to be present in the sacrament which the truth testifies to exist in reality (in aperto). And if they shall have believed that this is so, as some believe, nevertheless they incur that sin, inasmuch as they believe falsely, because it is thus spoken, that it may be lawful that Christ should be eaten with the teeth (*quia sic dictum est, ut fas sit eum dentibus vorari.*)” But he proceeds to allege that Augustine had contradicted himself in this matter, and draws a distinction between two concurrent acts, implying that Augustine was partly right and partly wrong. “Thus partly (ex parte) all do not eat with the mouth, but with the heart, and by faith we believe that it is the Body and Blood of Christ.” He is writing, it must be remembered, to one whose mind had been disturbed by the language of Augustine (“*eujste commoveri sententia dixisti*”). (*Migne Patrologia*, vol. cxx. pp. 1551, 2). He allows a considerable place to faith in his argument, but the province he gives to faith is very different to what Augustine gives to it; it is faith in the fact that the bread and wine become after consecration the actual Body and Blood of Christ, “the flesh in which He was born in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and which hung upon the cross, and the blood which was shed upon the cross, and which was then in His own body” (*Ibid.*). In his great treatise, “*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,” he explains his own meaning thus: “*Sub eorum specie visibili quæ videtur, secretius virtute divina caro consecratur, ut hæc sint interius veritate, quod exterius creduntur virtute fidei.*” under the visible form of Sacraments by the inward power of God, is consecrated flesh, so that they are inwardly and in truth what they are outwardly believed to be by faith. Here we see the meaning attached by Paschasius to such words as “*potentialiter, efficaciter,*” and so forth, when used

by Paschasius. The object of faith is the actuality of the flesh and blood present in the Sacrament. It is not easy to define the precise doctrine of this writer, and hence the wise caution with which Bishop Harold Browne speaks in the passage already quoted. That has happened to Paschasius Radbert which has happened to well nigh every teacher of a new doctrine, that its logical results have been carried out by his followers to extremes which he himself never contemplated.

There is nothing in all this to throw a shadow of suspicion on the trustworthiness and consistency of Dr. Harrison. Nor is the attempt to damage his authority more successful which is founded on his quotations from Augustine. He has been accused of picking out particular passages, without either considering their context or inquiring as to their consistency with other passages from the same writer. No doubt Dr. Harrison would reply, that this is the very thing which he himself has done, and which he charges his opponents with not doing. Indeed, here again he is in most excellent company:—

We must now proceed to Augustine, whom all agree to honour. He has so much to the purpose, that how to choose is difficult. "Prepare not thy teeth, but thy heart." "Why make ready thy teeth and thy belly? Believe and thou hast eaten. Our Lord hesitated not to say, *This is my Body*, when He gave the sign of His Body." "Spiritually understand what I have spoken to you. You are not to eat that Body which you see, and drink that Blood which they will shed who will crucify Me. I have commended to you a Sacrament. Spiritually understood, it will quicken you. Though it must be visibly celebrated, it must be invisibly understood." "What you see is bread and the cup. But as your faith requires, the bread is Christ's Body, the cup is His Blood. How is the bread His Body, and the wine His Blood? These things, brethren, are therefore called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood. What appears is a bodily form: What is understood has a spiritual point." "The Body and Blood of Christ will then be life to each, if what is visibly received in the Sacrament be in actual verity spiritually eaten, spiritually drunk."—"Bishop of Winchester Exp.," pp. 693-4.

One more subject must be noticed before the way is clear. There is no part of this controversy which has been pushed into such subtleties, or made the occasion of such contradictions, as that which surrounds the phrase "spiritual body." The Church of England asserts, in language as precise as it seems possible to use, that "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one"—(Post Communion Rubric). Yes, it is replied, that is undoubtedly true. But it is not the "natural body" of which we speak, but the spiritual body. This spiritual body is that in which the Lord

now sits in heaven, and it possesses capacities and attributes altogether unknown to the natural body. This spiritual, glorified body we believe, in some mode or other, which we do not presume to scrutinise, and which is the proper object of faith, to be really and actually present in the consecrated bread and the consecrated wine in the Lord's Supper; and this, at one and the same time, in the countless thousands of spots in which the Sacrament may be administered. What the Rubric says, it says only of the natural body of Christ, and not of the spiritual, glorified body, in which we believe. Such an argument implies either that Christ's risen body ceased to be a corporal body when it became spiritual; or else that Christ has two bodies, one a natural body, subject to the ordinary conditions of time and place to which the natural body is liable, and also a spiritual body gifted with omnipresence, and containing in itself the eternal life of the Lord Jesus Christ. Would it be at all rash to say that this doctrine of two bodies is a rank heresy? It is certain that the Apostles' Creed, the creed of the undivided Church, attests the unity of the Lord's body throughout, from the conception in the womb of the Virgin onward, till the judgment day. "I believe in Jesus Christ," who was "conceived," "born," "suffered," "was crucified," "descended," "rose again," "ascended," "sitteth," "will come to judge"—one and the same Jesus Christ all through. The language of the Athanasian Creed is not less precise: "One Christ; one not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by the taking of manhood into God." Just as positive is the Third Article, "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again *His* body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; *wherewith* He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day." In this matter, Paschasius may be allowed to speak, who says, "No sane man believes that Jesus had any other flesh or any other blood than that which was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered on the cross."

Not only do Anglo-Catholic writers accept this fiction of a spiritual body of Christ as well as a natural one, but they appear to argue that the same thing is true of us all. What other meaning can be put upon the words, "Had they (the Apostles) no idea of a pneumatic or spiritual body? Had they no idea of a body, underlying the visible, tangible body, which at death casts off its mortal garment, and wends its way to regions invisible?" Are we to believe in two coexisting bodies that make up each man's one personality? or is there merely a play upon words, and do they refer that to the body, which is true only of the soul? No doubt the soul, exactly speaking, may be termed a body; that is, the soul is finite; for else it would be divine, not human; for the divine essence alone can be infinite. But if it is finite it must occupy

a definite space, and be capable of being circumscribed. In that sense the soul may be a body; but if it be so, it proves nothing whatever towards the object of the ultra-Church writer. If the soul be an immaterial body because it occupies space and can conceivably be circumscribed by lines, this does not prove that our Lord's glorified body has ceased to occupy a definite space, and to be amenable to the laws of bodies. This is what it is sought to establish; the object is to show that it is possible for the Lord's body to be in ten thousand places at the same time, wherever the bread and wine are consecrated in the Lord's Supper. But if our Lord's body has become immaterial and spiritual, like the soul of man, it would not also become ubiquitous, for the soul of man is not ubiquitous. The analogy may prove that our Lord's body would be invisible if it were present; but it would not in the slightest degree prove the possibility of its being present in more than one place in one time. It would disprove it, if there be any worth in the analogy at all. But such specious subtleties only darken counsel. There is not the slightest ground for supposing that our Lord's glorified body is an immaterial body. All the evidence points the other way. If it were immaterial, it would not be the body which our risen Lord bade His Apostles touch and handle. It would not have flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection and completeness of man's nature, as the Articles assert. It would not be the body that rose into heaven, and of which it was announced that "that same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."

All this special pleading has been made possible by the unfortunate use of the word "natural" in the Post Communion Rubric—unfortunate, because it is evidently used for material. But it is used in 1 Cor. xv. as the opposite to "spiritual;" and if "natural" means material, spiritual would seem to mean "immaterial." That it does not mean "immaterial" has been decided by the Church, for she declares our Lord's risen body to be material—that is, to have flesh and bones; and indisputably she is right. To become spiritual is not to be converted into spirit, or else the adjective itself would be absurd. As the regenerated man of 1 Cor. ii. is spiritual, *πνευματικός*, just as we speak of a spiritual mind, as opposed to natural, *ψυχικός*, so the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* of 1 Cor. xv. is the body under the condition of sin and controlled by its influence, in which sense Scripture frequently uses the phrase of "flesh and blood" as equivalent to the sin-stained nature with which we are born into the world; and the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* is the same body, freed from its mortal weaknesses and brought under the control of the Spirit of God. Does any one dream that the human body after the resurrection will become ubiquitous? Yet we are

taught that such as the body of Christ is now in heaven, such our bodies will be hereafter. If, therefore, Christ's glorified body is omnipresent, the risen bodies of the saints will be omnipresent likewise—that is, they will be Divine, not human. If all this only means that the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ is everywhere even in the bread and wine, why should it not be clearly stated? But this is not what is meant.

It is much to be regretted that a controversy so important as that concerning the nature of the Lord's Supper should be obscured by subtleties which can only deceive ordinary readers, and which, it must be believed, deceive the writers themselves. Why should they use plain fallacies, unless they are themselves deluded by them? Because it is inconceivable that the natural body of the Lord Jesus Christ should be in, with, or under the consecrated elements, does it therefore really follow that we must give up our belief in the resurrection and the future life? ("Doctrine of the Fathers," p. 60). Because the writers of "The Unseen Universe" have proved that "if we possess nothing else than that which is visible and tangible, in that case our mortality, our utter extinction at death, is a demonstrable thing," does it follow that every living man must have two bodies, one visible and tangible, the other invisible and intangible? (Ibid.) Because Jesus could not give His actual organic human body to eat, and His blood, as yet flowing in His veins, His genuine human blood, to drink, does it follow that we have no need to concern ourselves "about such matters as right and wrong, truth and justice, virtue, heroism, nobility of soul, self-denial, or indeed about anything else except what will minister comfort and satisfaction to each man's own selfish self?" (Ibid. p. 207). Because our blessed Lord did really come out of the unseen world to take flesh, and after His death went back to the right hand of the Father, does it follow that His glorified Body descends from heaven at every administration of the Lord's Supper, and is held in the hand, and pressed by the teeth, even of the unworthy recipient? What possible dependence propositions so utterly unlike can have upon each other is beyond all the realm of reason and the comprehension of ordinary men.

One lucid thinker, to whose definitions the Church of England will ever be deeply indebted, has been removed from amongst us, almost while these lines are being written. A few words of grateful remembrance may be permitted. Dr. A. J. Stephens, the greatest ecclesiastical lawyer of his day, has been taken to his rest; but will never be forgotten by any one who had the privilege of knowing him. The tall, powerful frame, with the massive face, the eagle eye, the firm lip, and the all-pervading intelligence, were but the outward signs of his strong individuality. The masculine intellect and the firm grasp of truth,

the broad comprehension, the lofty impatience of all that is little, the disdain for the petty trivialities of verbal criticism, the insight that went at once to the very heart of his subject, the directness of his character, and the steadiness of his convictions, all fitted him to walk with unfaltering step amid, to the minds of other men, the complexities of the Eucharistic controversy, and to unfold with singular lucidity of order and a most happy command of words, what was as clear as daylight to his own convictions. What his genial frankness and kindness of heart made him to his personal friends, belongs to another sphere than that in which this article moves. He is gone, and his like will not soon be seen again.

EDWARD GARBETT.

Review.

Sunshine and Storm in the East: Cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople.

By Mrs. BRASSEY, Author of "A Voyage in the *Sunbeam*." With upwards of 100 Illustrations, chiefly from Drawings by the Hon. A. Y. BINGHAM. Pp. 450. Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

A JOURNAL kept while cruising in the Mediterranean, though less novel than the story of a family yachting-voyage round the world, may yet be almost as attractive. Certainly, by the readers of that charming book "A Voyage in the *Sunbeam*, our Home on the Ocean for Eleven Months," Mrs. Brassey's letters from the shores of the Mediterranean will be eagerly welcomed. The letters, indeed, have many points of interest. In some respects, perhaps, the journal of the cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople possesses, at the present time, an interest even greater than that of the voyage round the world. Mrs. Brassey's style, graceful and unaffected, is well known. In a literary point of view, her letters, chatty, graphic, agreeable, and full of information, deserve unstinted praise.

The first cruise was undertaken in 1874, and it included a visit to the Ionian Islands. Four years later came the second cruise, and this included a visit to Cyprus, and a second visit to Constantinople. "Melancholy, indeed, seemed the change in the Turkish capital during the four years since our last visit—a change from all that was bright and glittering to all that was dark, and miserable, and wretched."

Two or three extracts from Mrs. Brassey's journal, without comment, will show the character of the book. First, of a narrow escape, while the *Sunbeam* was lying moored to a Government buoy in Portsmouth Harbour. Mrs. Brassey, recovering from a severe illness, was lying in bed: it was 8.30 in the morning, and the children were at breakfast:—

I heard some of the men shout, or rather scream, "She is into us! We shall be sunk! Fetch the children! Lower the boats! Get the missus on