Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review

Band: 10 (1902)

Heft: 37

Artikel: The body of Christ

Autor: Lias, J.J.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403528

THE BODY OF CHRIST.

An Enquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of Holy Communion. By CHARLES GORE, M. A., D. D. of the Community of the Resurrection, Canon of Westminster. London, John Murray, 1901 [1]).

If I ask for somewhat more of your space for a review of this book than is usually given to reviews, I must plead in my defence that it is what it is the fashion in these days to call an "epoch-making book" in the history of the Church of England. It is important both from the position and from the history of the writer. He is a Canon of Westminster, and therefore holds a position as influential and responsible as any in our Church. He was at one time the leading spirit in the "Pusey House", an institution established to perpetuate the memory of the greatest theologian our country has produced during the century just past. And as editor of *Lux Mundi* he took the lead in an effort to reconcile what are termed among us "High Church" doctrines with modern thought, somewhat analogous to attempts which have frequently been made in the same direction on the Continent by members of the Church of Rome. His latest publication is therefore one which ought to be brought to the notice of those who wish to be informed on the present position of the Church of England, and on the course of religious thought within her pale. It must be understood that for the views I express I am alone responsible. Many in our Church will be inclined to contest them. But as one who has watched ecclesiastical affairs in England with more or less intelligent appreciation for the space of half a century, I may claim a right to say what I think, and may

[1]) Since this article has been written, Canon Gore has been elected Bishop of Worcester.

even venture to hope that I am not altogether wrong in the opinions I have formed.

The book in question, so the author tells us in his preface, was written to "clear his brain" in view of a "Round Table Conference" appointed to be held in the autumn of stet, at which men of eminence connected with various sections of opinion in our Church were present. This conference followed close upon another in which leading Church of England theologians met certain well-known Nonconformist Divines to discuss the doctrine of Sacrifice. These "Round Table Conferences", I may remark in passing, are among the most encouraging features of modern ecclesiastical life in England. Canon Gore, as he has stated, has had to "clear his brain" in order to take part in them. That is an effect such Conferences are destined to have on many brains beside his. When once divines of various schools abandon their isolation from one another, and escape, though it be but for a moment, from the party environments with which they have long been surrounded, there is hope of a general "clearing of brains" all round. We may not unreasonably expect a more satisfactory definition of terms, and a removal of the mutual misconceptions which prevent men from understanding one another's position.

I do not propose to criticize Canon Gore's utterances, save on one or two points to which—as it appears to me—he has hardly given sufficient consideration. My object is rather to make your readers acquainted with the position taken up by a typical English divine, who has a following greater than that of any living theologian amongst us, on a question which for centuries has been very hotly debated, and which certainly has been more hotly debated in England since the rise of the Tractarian Movement in 1833, than any other theological question whatsoever. It may be well to explain at the outset that the view of the Eucharist maintained by the leaders of the Tractarian school went a little further in the direction of Transubstantiation than that espoused by the majority of divines of the High Anglican school since the Reformation. It emphasized, more strongly than has been usual among us, the "objective" character of the Presence in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. In other words it laid stress on the proposition that the Divine Presence in that Sacrament is not dependent on its reception

by the faithful. The Tractarian divines were not content with the language of the Catechism of the Church of England that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper". They preferred to declare that Christ was present in the Sacrament in, with, or under the form of bread and wine. And though Transubstantiation was distinctly and repeatedly repudiated by the leaders of the Tractarian school, many of the less philosophical minds among the clergy conceived of the Presence as locally centred in the elements—a view which Dr Pusey, the great Tractarian leader, himself emphatically disavowed. In the course of what has been termed the "Ritual Movement" among us, the localizing view deprecated by the Tractarian divines has found more and more favour among the clergy in general, as distinguished from those who have received a thorough philosophical and metaphysical training. This brief explanation may help my readers to understand the significance of the utterances of Canon Gore in the volume before us, and the influence they are likely to have on the future of our Church.

The treatise commences with a chapter on the root-idea of the Christian Sacrament. Canon Gore accepts, and rightly accepts, the late Professor Robertson Smith's *dictum* "that throughout the Semitic field the fundamental idea of sacrifice is not that of a sacred tribute, but of communion between the God and his worshippers by joint participation in the living flesh and blood of a sacred victim". This view, though sound as far as it goes, seems to me, I confess, to be not a little incomplete. Canon Gore is perhaps not altogether free from the tendency to hero-worship into which many recent English theologians have been inclined to fall. There is a disposition at present to accept unconditionally the *dicta* of a teacher whom the age delights to honour, and to regard the latest theory of such a scholar as the last word of scientific research. This is not altogether satisfactory. There were brave men before Agamemnon. Lasaulx and others in the past have contended that the victim symbolically represents the offerer, and represents him as thus symbolically offering himself as a sacrifice to God. In Jewish sacrifice there is not only, as Canon Gore rightly puts it, "the idea of communion or common sharing of a life

believed to be divine", but beside the identification of the offerer with that life, there is the presentation of the sacrifice to God as representing the mind and aims of him who sacrifices. Instead, again, of saying that "the development of the sacrificial system among the Jews tended to bring to the front the idea of giving to God in homage and recognition, and propitiating Him by victims, at the expense of the idea of communion with him", it is a question whether it would not be more correct to say that there was all along a tendency in the Jewish mind, against which the long line of prophets and psalmists consistently protested, to revert to the degradation of the idea of sacrifice current among the heathen, and to lose sight of the fundamental idea of the Mosaic teaching that the virtue of sacrifice to God consisted in the homage offered to Him, the sense of fellowship and union with Him, and the moral and spiritual attitude which flowed from such a recognition of Him.

In accordance, however, with the idea of sacrifice to which Canon Gore has given his adhesion, he rightly declares "the fundamental idea" of the Eucharist to be that "in some sense *the Manhood of Christ is to be imparted to those that believe in Him, and fed upon as a principle of new and eternal life*" (the Italics are his[1]). "By His flesh", he continues, "we understand the spiritual principle or essence of His Manhood", and "by His Blood the human life of Jesus of Nazareth in His Glory"[2]). I cannot, I must confess, admit the reservation contained in these last three words. It is the life of the *whole Christ*, I believe, as born, living on earth, suffering, dying, and risen again, and ascended into heaven, and not any particular phase of that life, which the faithful receiver is ultimately, and with which is meant by Christ's Blood identified. But we will return to this point presently. He proceeds[3]) "what makes it morally possible that Christ should have acted and offered Himself vicariously for us once for all, is the fact that He Who thus offered Himself as man was to become the head of a new race, and those for whom He offered Himself were to belong to His manhood and share its power and motive". Not merely "its power and motive", Canon

---

[1]) Pag. 24. — [2]) Pag. 25. — [3]) Pag. 31.

Gore might have said, but *itself*. The "new man" in us is the life derived through the agency of the Holy Spirit, from Christ Himself. This language, expressing as it does the great fundamental principle of the Christian faith, he further remarks, remains very difficult language to a great many Englishmen. He deplores "the lack", on their part, of "this fundamental conception of the life of the Son of Man imparted to His people by the Spirit". But the reason for their feeble hold on this great truth is that for centuries it has been obscured in Western Christendom by the undue prominence given to the doctrine of Propitiation for sin, which has been generally represented as the end for which Christ came, instead of as an important and even necessary step towards the attainment of that end. Canon Gore is once more right in lamenting the "somewhat sluggish imagination" of the majority of "us Englishmen", a defect in our national character which lands us in many difficulties, practical as well as intellectual, and which prevents a great many of us from understanding the real pivot on which Eucharistic teaching should revolve.

The chapter on the Sacramental Principle calls for no special remark, save that Canon Gore, in common with many members of the school in which he was brought up, appears to speak somewhat slightingly of the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, a treatise which witnesses for a broader conception of the Eucharist than those which that particular school has been accustomed to favour. The second chapter is on "the Gift and Presence in Holy Communion". In this he first of all shews how even so purely common-sense an Anglican as Waterland, writing in an age when Christianity had been, for most men, divested of all its higher spiritual aspects, and reduced to the level of a cold combination of rationalism and naturalism, speaks of the Holy Communion as "a mystical union with Christ in His whole person". He regards, and rightly regards this as the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, though he refers to three tendencies which may be found in some of the earliest and most distinguished of the Fathers which to a certain extent run counter to it. The first, as is well known, is to be found in Clement of Alexandria, who is inclined to refine the whole doctrine of the Eucharist into a symbolic idea. The second distinguishes between the

Eucharistic and mystical, and the real Body of Christ, a confusion of thought into which many Anglican divines since the Reformation have fallen. The third—I think Canon Gore has perhaps a little exaggerated the extent to which it is carried in Irenæus—regards the Eucharist as nourishing our *bodies,* and imparting to them the seed of immortality. In the face of such passages as, for example, Rom. VIII, 10; 1 Cor. XV, 42—53; 2 Cor. V, 1—5, no one can deny that this view is true, though of course it is not the *whole* truth. Canon Gore goes on to say [1]) that the eating of Christ's Flesh and Blood "does not mean a consuming of any material atoms or elements of Christ's body: it means the absorbing the spiritual force of His Humanity", or rather, perhaps, the participation in His regenerated and perfected human nature, just as natural eating and drinking preserves and maintains in us the imperfect and corrupted human nature we receive, by purely natural processes, from our first forefather.

It is, perhaps, a little surprising that so clear a thinker as Canon Gore usually is should become a little confused in dealing with the relation between Baptism and the Eucharist, as he appears to be in this portion of his work, especially when our most representative theologian, Richard Hooker, has explained to us that "the grace which we have by the holy Eucharist doth not begin, but continue life" [2]). It is precisely the same gift, the regenerated and perfected manhood of Jesus Christ, which is given us in each Sacrament. But Baptism is the initial stage of the process. In the Eucharist the life first imparted in Baptism is nourished and sustained.

The next point dealt with in this chapter is the important and crucial one of "the objective Presence". It is important to bear in mind that at the recent "Round Table Conference" Canon Dimock, the most learned of what we may term the "Evangelical" or "Protestant" party, allowed that there was a sense in which these words might be predicated of the Presence in the Eucharist. This is a very great step indeed towards a mutual understanding, for this is the point on which, during the last fifty years, the fiercest controversy has raged among us. It is here, too—and the fact is full of promise for the future

---

[1]) Pag. 67. — [2]) Eccl. Pol. V, xvii, 1.

—that Canon Gore makes the most significant admissions. The "Ritualistic" party, as it is called, embracing as it does the less learned of the followers of the Tractarians, has been accustomed to speak of "carrying the Presence round the Church", as a cersain Mr Linklater has done in a recent letter. Other members of that party have recently stated that even if Reservation for purposes of worship be forbidden, "Catholics"—it should perhaps be explained that this party in our Church has practically attempted to monopolize for itself the title—cannot be deprived of their privilege of worshipping Christ on the altar during the celebration of Holy Communion. But Canon Gore points out that the leaders of the Tractarian party have condemned this localization of worship. He does not tell his readers that, as has already been stated, Dr Pusey, in his utterances on the Eucharistic question, emphatically disclaimed any idea of localizing the Objective Presence for which he so strongly contended. But he does quote Cardinal Newman as saying in his *Via Media* that "our Lord neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession" [1]). How our Lord can be "carried in procession" if He does not "move" Canon Gore does not attempt to explain. If the Cardinal is correctly quoted—and I have not his works at hand to verify the quotation—it is only one additional instance among many of the loose language on points of the highest importance in which great minds have unfortunately permitted themselves to indulge. But the fact emerges clearly enough that men acquainted with metaphysics and philosophy deliberately and carefully refrain from using expressions which the rank and file among their followers regard as the most obvious consequences of their teaching. Canon Gore, having "cleared his brain" on the subject, has now refused to admit these conclusions. Among the Greek Fathers, he tells us, "the special purpose for which the sacred presence [in the Eucharist] is given—sacramental communion—is always full in view" [2]). In other words, the favourite formula of "advanced Ritualists", that the Eucharist was given "to provide the Church with an object of worship", is mediæval or modern Roman, not Patristic, theology. "These fathers", he goes on to say,

---

[1]) Pag. 93. — [2]) Pag. 87.

"would have shrunk from any formulated teaching of 'Christ made present on the altar under the forms of bread and wine'"[1]), such as has been now for a long time been authoritatively delivered to those who frequent our "Ritualistic" Churches as a first principle of Catholic doctrine and worship. The "worship of Christ in the Sacrament", contained "in modern books of popular devotion", he continues, "is absent from the [ancient] Liturgies, almost entirely"[2]). These assertions, as may be imagined, have not a little fluttered the dovecots of the congregations which have made mediæval views of the presence in the Eucharist a test of catholicity. But at least they are the conclusions of a trained and candid theologian, and, though they may be repudiated by party organs and organizations, will receive the careful attention of those with whom truth is the primary object. "Catholics", says Canon Gore—but we in England sadly need a clear definition of this much misused word—"with one consent still believe that Christ is in some special sense present in the whole Eucharistic service." Nevertheless "His coming and presence" cannot "be represented to the imagination as merely the result of consecration"[3]). Nay, Dr Hort is even right, in Canon Gore's view, when he asserts that "Jesus-worship", i. e. "the separate and distinctive worship of Jesus in His Manhood", though "a distinctive feature alike of Protestant Evangelicalism and Catholic Sacramentalism, is not at all prominent in the theology of the first five or six centuries"[4]), and "has belonged to the emotional and devotional part of our manhood, rather than to the moral or rational". "Transubstantiation in its first form", moreover, that in which "the weak and unhappy Berengar was forced by the dominant power in the Church to subscribe to it, was indeed a gross and horrible doctrine", arising out of "an almost brutally superstitious disposition in a very dark age of the West"[5]). Yet it is precisely this period of the Church's history which Lord Halifax and his followers have selected as presenting the *beau idéal* of Catholic thought and Catholic practice[6]). And its teaching has

---

[1]) Pag. 91. — [2]) Pag. 100. — [3]) Pag. 106. — [4]) Pag. 106, 107. — [5]) Pag. 116, 117.

[6]) The condemnation of Berengar, it may be said, took place in the eleventh, not in the thirteenth century. It is the latter century in which

led naturally to so "materialistic a way of conceiving of the relation of the spiritual gift to the outward part of the Sacrament", that "the coming of Christ to the Christian in Roman theology and books of devotion is spoken of as a temporary visit which, though temporary fruits may remain, is yet in its primary sense, as an indwelling of Christ, over when the digestion of the material food begins—it is suggested after a quarter of an hour"![1]) Well may Canon Gore conclude this section with the words "Enough has probably been said" —enough at least to overthrow the pretensions of one particular section of English Churchmen to claim exclusively for themselves the title of Catholic.

The third chapter inquires in what sense the Eucharist may be considered as a sacrifice. First of all, we are told, the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a commemoration of the Passion of Christ. Secondly, that commemoration is united with "the everliving sacrifice of the great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary"[2]). "Then, thirdly, the Church in that Sacrament offers herself, one with Christ as a body with its head." "The sacrifice is the sacrifice of the whole body, and the communion is the communion of the whole body"[3]). But, while "the celebrating priest is indeed the necessary organ of the body's action", "the sacrifice is the Church's sacrifice". "'We offer', 'we do sacrifice', is the language of the liturgies. 'No priest', says Peter Lombard, 'says I offer, but we offer, in the person of the whole Church'"[4]). But the "purpose" of the sacrifice is "that we may [in Gœthe's words] partake of a heavenly under the form of an earthly nourishment"[5]). Canon Gore denies that it can be inferred from the doctrine of the Objective Presence that this presence "abides till we have reason to believe it is removed"[6]). The custom of reservation, originally intended only for absent sick persons, becomes a practice "quite unknown to the ancients and remains alien to the customs of the orthodox East" when intended to furnish the Church with "a permanent

---

the followers of Lord Halifax consider the Western Church to have reached the highest ideal of faith and doctrine. But in this matter of Eucharistic doctrine there is little difference between the one century and the other.

[1]) Pag. 121, 122. — [2]) Pag. 212. — [3]) Pag. 212, 213. — [4]) Pag. 213. — [5]) Pag. 134. — [6]) Pag. 132.

external presence of Christ in the midst of her [i. e. the Church, in the sense of the assembled congregation] in a particular spot in the Church" [1]). The view here emphatically condemned has been making considerable progress among us of late, through the action of energetic but imperfectly informed partisans, imbued with the materialistic and superficial spirit of the age, which prefers the visible to the invisible, simple and easy propositions, even if wrong, to complex and mysterious ones, though they may happen to be right. Canon Gore's condemnation of men of this school has both irritated and dismayed those who prefer the cheap and easy theories of an age of ignorance to the more careful, elaborate, and balanced utterances of ages of freedom and intellectual enlightenment. Even "the Roman theologians", however, Canon Gore tells us, "have had an uneasy conscience about these developments" [2]). This uneasiness cannot be predicated of their Anglican sympathizers, whose confidence in their assertions has usually been in inverse ratio to their acquaintance with the difficult subject of the origin and development of doctrine. It is to be hoped that their unquestionable respect for Canon Gore's character and authority may cause them to give careful study to his treatise. Thenceforth we may hope that they will speak with breath somewhat bated on mysteries so deep as the sacramental presence of Christ. They may profitably be reminded, in the words of one whom they have delighted to honour, that "the easiest sort of Christian devotion is not always the truest", and that "nearness to Christ, or remoteness from Him, is a matter of faith and holiness, and not of place" [3]).

There is much more in this treatise, which though those trained up in Anglican theology are, and always have been, perfectly familiar with it, will be found extremely profitable to members of the somewhat self-satisfied section of our Church whom it has lately become the fashion to term the "neo-Catholics". But we cannot dwell on these utterances. I may venture, however, to express my regret that Canon Gore has dismissed so cavalierly the views of those of our theologians who incline to the opinion that the presence in the Eucharist is that of Christ's Body and Blood as at the moment of death.

---

[1]) Pag 137. — [2]) Pag. 138. -- [3]) Pag. 141.

He has hardly given sufficient consideration to the view of those persons. He overlooks the fact that this view is strongly supported by the words of institution, that it is held by S[t] Athanasius, S[t] Chrysostom[1]) and other Fathers of repute. He takes fright at the use of the word "corpse" (cadaver) by Bishop Andrewes, and jumps to the conclusion that such a view is wholly unintelligible. He therefore claims the right to "dismiss" it, as a "painful mistake", and to have "got rid of" it as "a great misapprehension". Had Canon Gore thought out the matter more carefully, he would have seen that the view in question corresponds precisely with the doctrine taught by S[t] Paul on baptism in the Epistles to the Romans and the Colossians. It is by being baptized into Christ's Death that we are made partakers of His Resurrection. We are "buried with Him in our baptism", and are by this means, and through faith in a Divine working, united with Him in His Resurrection. Is it altogether unreasonable to suppose that the other Sacrament follows a similar law in its operation, and that only by first identifying ourselves through faith with Him in His humiliation and His Passion, can we become partakers of His risen and glorified Life? It is not my desire to lay down theories about the presence in the Eucharist. The Church of Christ has had far too much of such theorizing. But I may be allowed to enter a protest against this summary dismissal of a view which has much to recommend it; which has so far never been adequately unfolded; and which may ultimately be found to be the pathway to a reconciliation of the divergent opinions which have so long perplexed the Christian world.

I have not space for all Canon Gore's significant statements and admissions. Some of these, however, contained in Chap. IV, on "Our Authorities", are too important to be passed over. He cannot, he says, "rest in the mediæval opinions" which, it must once more be explained, have long been almost the exclusive test of Catholicity with men of our "Ritualistic" school of theology. "Both with regard to the doctrine of the gift given to us by God in Holy Communion", he goes on to say, "and to that of the sacrifice there offered, some specially characteristic elements in the teaching of the West in the middle

---

[1]) As in the passage cited by Canon Gore on pag. 196.

ages and later period will have to be abandoned" [1]). When "a seriously monophysite tendency", he continues, "coloured the early mediæval development of eucharistic teaching in the East", and "reached the West", "it coalesced with a markedly superstitious and irrational spirit in the Church" [2]). He challenges the proposition current "even among Anglicans", which maintains that "the authority of the Church in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries is identical with its authority in the fourth or third" [3]). He even admits, and supports his view by the authority of John Keble [4]), that the doctrine of the Objective Presence itself is an open question in the Church of England [5]), and thereby dissociates himself from those who have so long been struggling to make that doctrine an *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ* among us.

The question of the authority of Scripture seems to me to be rather lightly passed over in the volume before us. But as its purpose was rather to deal with modern aspects of the controversy rather than to write an exhaustive treatise on the Eucharist, this was perhaps to be expected. In his final chapter Canon Gore deals with some points which of late have been much debated among us. He decides that, in view of the variety of practice which has existed in various ages, our own branch of the Church Catholic is perfectly within its rights in forbidding Eucharists without communicants. He protests against a practice which, in my judgement, has been most unfortunately revived among us during the last half century, of "encouraging those who are not occasional communicants, nor preparing to become so, to be present at the Eucharist" [6]). He means, of course, their presence during the *missa fidelium*. He condemns, and not altogether without reason, some of the departures from the practice of the fourth and fifth centuries to be found in our present service book. But though that book owes its present form to a somewhat violent reaction from the superstitions of the middle ages, it must be remembered that the earliest antiquity, to which the English Reformers uniformly made their

---

[1]) Pag. 216. — [2]) Pag. 217, 218. — [3]) Pag. 219.

[4]) It will be remembered that Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy" is fixed upon by Newman as the starting-point of the Tractarian movement.

[5]) Pag. 234. — [6]) Pag. 277.

appeal, is silent on the points to which Canon Gore alludes, and it may therefore be a question whether a Liturgy intended for Catholics—a Liturgy which should therefore take nothing for granted which the Church has not formally decreed in her Œcumenical Councils—ought not to be silent also.

I have thus endeavoured to give the Continental readers of this review an opportunity of estimating a pronouncement which, from the position of its author, is certain to have a profound effect on the future of the English Church. The knowledge of that Church on the Continent is certainly by no means extensive. But some progress has been made since the *Revue internationale de Théologie* has been established. It has been my endeavour more than once to explain in its pages the reasons why our Church has fallen into its present condition of disorder. I trust the explanation has done something to make our position clearer. The legislation of 1829, changing as it did the character of our Parliament by the admission of those who were not members of the Church of England, revolutionized the relations between Church and State. The great mass of Englishmen, unaccustomed to and ever impatient of abstract thought, have, even up to the present moment, failed to realize the fact that such a revolution has occurred. The endeavour to adjust the relations of Church and State, the original object of the Tractarian movement, was, most unfortunately, I must believe, diverted by Newman into a struggle to bring about a change in the Anglican stand-point. The fear of Erastianism caused Pusey and Keble, and other of the Tractarian leaders at a later period to cast their *ægis* over men who carried the tendency towards mediævalism too far. They could not, it was felt, afford to dispense with the help of these men in the struggle against the overweening power of the State in matters ecclesiastical. In endeavouring to suppress the extravagances of the mediævalists, Archbishop Tait, once more most unfortunately, relied, not on the authority of the Church, but on the power of the State. Englishmen, by nature tolerant and intensely concerned for "the liberty of the subject", recoiled in disgust from the spectacle of conscientious, if ill-informed clergymen in prison. Hence the confusion and anarchy in which, for years past, we have been plunged. Mediævalism has flourished under the shelter of those who were fighting to

maintain the spiritual character of the Church. But the end of these troubles is at hand. The mediævalist reaction in the Anglican Church has evidently reached its highest point. It is already, I am convinced, on the ebb. It has never produced any first-rate theologians. Its abandonment by a divine who was once its rising hope will prove a heavy blow to it. His acceptance, clearly shown in the extracts above made, of the views of the High Anglicans since the Reformation, at least in all their main features, will do a vast deal towards the restoration of order. And our Continental brethren will be brought at last to acknowledge that the Anglican Church throughout the world is no incoherent combination of jarring atoms, but a branch of Christ's Catholic Church, which has gone through a process of trial and sifting during the century now past, and will in the end be found all the stronger and better for the trial from which she has emerged.

East Bergholt, August 17, 1901.

J. J. Lias.