

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1850.

---

VOL. II.—NO. V.

---

---

DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH ON THE  
LORD'S SUPPER.

The object of the following discussion is primarily altogether historical. It proposes simply to answer the question: What was the proper faith of the Reformed or Calvinistic branch of the Protestant Church in the beginning, as distinguished from Romanism and Lutheranism on the one side as well as from all Rationalism and false Spiritualism on the other? This in itself, it will be perceived, is no question of theology strictly taken, but a question purely and wholly of history. The answer to it carries with it no necessary authority for our own faith. To ascertain the fact of a system, is not to establish its truth. Still all must allow, that the historical inquiry here is of vast consequence for the proper settlement also of our theology. We profess to stand, as Protestants, on the theological and ecclesiastical platform of the Reformation. The question of the holy sacraments, their true nature and power, holds in this a central place; and is found, on close inspection, to be intimately interwoven with the whole scheme in its other parts. In this view of course, it challenges our solemn regard. Even to be indifferent to it only, to take no interest in it, is at once to betray an inward habit materially at variance with the faith we profess to venerate and follow; and if it should appear, on examination, that the sacra-

VOL. II.—NO. V. 27\*

mental doctrine itself, as it first stood, is no longer ours, it should serve still farther certainly to make us pause and consider. We have no right here to be either indifferent or dishonest. We should be willing to see the fact of any variation in our faith from that of the Reformers, as well as able also to give a reason for it in an open and manly way. We are under no obligation to follow slavishly and blindly the authority of the Past. But we do owe it to ourselves certainly, as well as to the cause of truth, not to swerve from it either, in so great a case, with blindfolded eyes, nor yet to pretend that we follow it when we have gone aside from it in fact. In every view, as a preliminary help at least for the right settlement of the sacramental interest, it must be allowed to be of the utmost consequence to know truly and fairly, as a matter of history, on what ground here the Reformed Church stood in the beginning as compared with the Lutheran. What doctrine in particular did it hold and teach with regard to the presence and power of Christ in the holy eucharist? This is the subject of our present inquiry.

In the way of order and method, we shall transcribe in the first place the general statement of this doctrine which is given in Chap. I. Sect. I. of the *Mystical Presence*, pp. 54-62. In the next place, we shall bring into view the counter statement of Dr. Hodge, as we find it in his article on the subject in the *Princeton Review* for April, 1848; the only respectable or tolerable attempt yet made to set aside the historical representation contained in the *Mystical Presence*. The way will then be open for our reply to this, taken mainly though not exclusively from the series of articles which appeared against Dr. Hodge in the *Weekly Messenger*, during the summer of 1848. This will cover the whole ground.

---

I.

STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

[*Myst. Pres. c. I. §. I.*]

To obtain a proper view of the original doctrine of the Reformed Church on the subject of the eucharist, we must have recourse in particular to Calvin. Not that he is to be considered the creator, properly speaking, of the doctrine. It grew evidently out of the general religious life of the church itself, in its antagonism to the Lutheran dogma on the one hand, and the low Socinian extreme on the other. Calvin however was the theological organ, by which it first came to that clear expression, under which it continued to be uttered subsequently in the sym-

bolical books. His profound, far-reaching, and deeply penetrating mind, drew forth the doctrine from the heart of the Church, exhibited it in its proper relations, proportions and distinctions, gave it form in this way for the understanding, and clothed it with authority as a settled article of faith in the general creed. He may be regarded then as the accredited interpreter and expounder of the article for all later times. A better interpreter in the case, we could not possibly possess. Happily, too, his instructions and explanations here are very full and explicit. He comes upon the subject from all sides, and handles it under all forms, didactically and controversially; so that we are left in no uncertainty whatever, with regard to his meaning, at a single point.

Any theory of the eucharist will be found to accord closely with the view that is taken, at the same time of the nature of the union generally between Christ and his people. Whatever the life of the believer may be as a whole in this relation, it must determine the form of his communion with the Saviour in the sacrament of the supper, as the central representation of its significance and power. Thus, the sacramental doctrine of the primitive Reformed Church stands inseparably connected with the idea of an inward living union between believers and Christ, in virtue of which they are incorporated into his very nature, and made to subsist with him by the power of a common life.<sup>1</sup> In full correspondence with this conception of the Christian salvation, as a process by which the believer is mystically inserted more and more into the person of Christ, till he becomes thus at last fully transformed into his image, it was held that nothing less than such a real participation of his living person is involved always in the right use of the Lord's supper. The following distinctions may serve to define and explain more fully, the nature of the communion which holds between Christ and his people, in the whole view now mentioned, as taught by Calvin and the Reformed Church generally, in the sixteenth century.

1. The union of *believers* with Christ is not simply that of a common humanity, as derived from *Adam*. In this view, all men partake of one and the same nature, and each may be said

<sup>1</sup> *Conjunctio igitur illa capitis et membrorum, habitatio Christi in cordibus nostris, mystica denique unio a nobis in summo gradu statuitur; ut Christus noster factus, donorum, quibus præditus est, nos faciat consortes. Non ergo extra nos procul speculamur, ut nobis imputetur ejus justitia: sed quia ipsum induimus, et insiti sumus in ejus corpus, unum denique nos secum efficere dignatus est; ideo justitiæ societatem nobis cum eo esse gloriamur.— Calvin. Inst. iii. 11, 10.*

to be in relation to his neighbor bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. So Christ took not on him the nature of angels, but of men. He was born of a woman, and appeared among us in the likeness and fashion of our own life, only without sin. But plainly our relation to his nature, and through this to his mediatorial work, as christians, is something quite different from this general consanguinity of the human race. Where we are said to be of the same life with him, "members of his body, of his flesh and his bones," it is not on the ground merely of a joint participation with him in the nature of Adam, but on the ground of our participation in his own nature as a higher order of life. Our relation to him is not circuitous and collateral only; it holds in a direct connection with his person.<sup>1</sup>

2. In this view, the relation is more again than simply a *moral* union. Such a union we have, where two or more persons are bound together by inward agreement, sympathy, and correspondence. Every common friendship is of this sort. It is the relation of the disciple to the master, whom he loves and reveres. It is the relation of the devout Jew to Moses, his venerated lawgiver and prophet. It holds also undoubtedly between the believer and Christ. The Saviour lives much in his thoughts and affections. He looks to him with an eye of faith, embraces him in his heart, commits himself to his guidance, walks in his steps, and endeavors to become clothed more and more with his very mind itself. In the end the correspondence will be found complete. We shall be like him in all respects, one with him morally, in the fullest sense. But Christianity includes more than such a moral union, separately considered. This union itself is only the result here of a relation more inward and deep. It has its ground in the force of a common life, in virtue of which Christ and his people are one even before they become thus assimilated to his character. So in the sacrament of the Lord's supper; it is not simply a moral approach that the true worshipper is permitted to make to the glorious object of his worship.

<sup>1</sup> *Carnis et sanguinis communicationem non tantum interpretor de communi natura, quod Christus homo factus jure fraternæ societatis nos Dei filios secum fecerit: sed distincte affirmo, quam a nobis sumpsit carnem, eam nobis esse vivificam, ut nobis sit materia spiritualis vitæ. Illamque Augustini sententiam libenter amplector, Sicut ex costa Adæ creata fuit Eva, sic ex Christi latere fluxisse nobis vitæ originem et principium. Calvin, De Vera Partic. Opp. Tom. ix. (Amst. Ed.) p. 726—Neque enim ossa sumus et ossibus et caro ex carne, quia ipse nobiscum est homo; sed quia Spiritus sui virtute nos in corpus suum inserit, ut vitam ex eo hauriamus. Id. Comm. on Eph. v. 30.*

His communion with Christ does not consist merely in the good exercises of his own mind, the actings of faith, and contrition, and hope, and love, the solemn recollections, the devotional feelings, the pious resolutions, of which he may be himself the subject, during the sacramental service.<sup>1</sup> Nor is the sacrament a sign only, by which the memory and heart may be assisted in calling up what is past or absent, for the purpose of devotion; as the picture of a friend is suited to recall his image and revive our interests in his person, when he is no longer in our sight.<sup>2</sup> Nor is it a pledge simply of our own consecration to the service of Christ, or of the faithfulness of God as engaged to make good to us in a general way the grace of the new covenant; as the rainbow serves still to ratify and confirm the promise given to Noah after the flood.<sup>3</sup> All this would bring with it in the end nothing more than a moral communication with Christ, so far as the sacrament itself might be concerned. It could carry with it no virtue or force, more than might be put into it in every case by the spirit of the worshipper himself. Such however is not the nature of the ordinance. It is not simply an occasion, by which the soul of the believer may be excited to pious feelings and desires; but it embodies the actual presence of the grace it represents in its own constitution; and this grace is not simply the promise of God on which we are encouraged to rely, but the very life of the Lord Jesus Christ himself. We communicate, in the Lord's supper not with the divine promise merely, not with the thought of

<sup>1</sup> Ubique resonant scripta mea, differre manducationem a fide, quia sit fidei effectus. Non a triduo ita loqui incepi, nos credendo manducare Christum, quia vere participes ejus facti in ejus corpus coalescimus, ut nobis communis sit cum eo vita. . . . Quam turpe igitur Westphalo fuit, quum diserte verba mea sonent, manducare aliud esse quam credere; quod ego fortiter nego, quasi a me profectum impudenter obrudere lectoribus! . . . Ejusdem farinae est quod mox atexit, edere corpus Christi tantundem valere, si verbis meis locus datur, quam promissionem fide recipere. Sed quomodo tam flagitiose se prostituere audet? Calvin. Adv. Westph. Opp. Tom. ix., p. 669.

<sup>2</sup> Ita panis non inanis est rei absentis pictura, sed verum ac fidele nostrae cum Christo unionis pignus. Dicit quispiam non aliter panis symbolo adumbrari corpus Christi, quam mortua statua Herculem vel Mercurium representat. Hoc certe commentum a doctrina nostra non minus remotum est, quam profanum a sacro. Calvin. Opp. T. ix., p. 667.—Christus neque pictor est, neque histrio, neque Archimides quispiam, qui inani tantum objecta imagine oculos pascit, sed vere et reipsa praestat quod externo symbolo promittit. Ib. p. 727.

<sup>3</sup> Panis ita corpus significat, ut vere, efficaciter, ac reipsa nos ad Christi communicationem invitet. Dicimus enim veritatem quam continet promissio, illic exhiberi, et effectum externo signo annexum esse. Tropus ergo signum minime evacuat, sed potius ostendit quomodo non sit vacuum. Calv. Opp. T. ix., p. 667.

Christ only, not with the recollection simply of what he has done and suffered for us, not with the lively present sense alone of his all-sufficient, all-glorious salvation; but with the living Saviour himself, in the fulness of his glorified person, made present to us for the purpose by the power of the Holy Ghost.

3. The relation of believers to Christ, then, is more again than that of a simply *legal* union. He is indeed the representative of his people, and what he has done and suffered on their behalf is counted to their benefit, as though it had been done by themselves. They have an interest in his merits, a title to all the advantages secured by his life and death. But this external imputation rests at last on an inward, real unity of life, without which it could have no reason or force. Our interest in Christ's merits and benefits can be based only upon a previous interest in his person; so in the Lord's supper, we are made to partake, not merely in the advantages secured by his mediatorial work, the rewards of his obedience, the fruits of his bitter passion, the virtue of his atonement, and the power of his priestly intercession, but also in his true and proper life itself. We partake of his merits and benefits only so far as we partake of his substance.<sup>1</sup>

4. Of course, once more, the communion in question is not simply with Christ in his *divine nature* separately taken, or with the *Holy Ghost* as the representative of his presence in the world. It does not hold in the influences of the Spirit merely, enlightening the soul and moving it to holy affections and purposes. It is by the Spirit indeed we are united to Christ. Our new life is comprehended in the Spirit as its element and medium. But it is always bound in this element to the person of the Lord Jesus Christ himself. Our fellowship is with the Father and with his son Jesus Christ, *through* the Holy Ghost. As such it is a real communion with the Word made flesh; not

<sup>1</sup> Neque enim tantum dico applicari *merita*, sed ex ipso Christi corpore alimentum percipere animas, non secus ac terreno pane corpus vescitur. *Calv. Opp. T. ix., p. 668.*—Sane non video, quomodo in cruce Christi redemptionem ac justitiam, in ejus morte vitam habere se quis confidat, nisi vera Christi ipsius communione imprimis fretus. Non enim ad nos bona illa pervenirent, nisi se prius nostrum Christus faceret. *Inst. iv. 17, 11.*—Satis sit monuisse lectores, Christum ubique a me vocari Baptismi Cœnæque *substantiam*. *Opp. T. ix., p. 671.*—Plus centies occurrit in scriptis meis, adeo me non rejicere *substantiæ* nomen, ut libenter et ingenue profitear spirituales vitam incomprehensibili Spiritus virtute *ex carnis Christi substantia in nos diffundi*. Ubique etiam admitto, *substantialiter* nos pasci Christi carne et sanguine; modo facessat crassum de locali permixtione commentum. *Ib. p. 725.* *Substantialis* communicatio ubique a me assertitur. *Ib. p. 732.*

simply with the divinity of Christ, but with his humanity also ; since both are inseparably joined together in his person, and a living union with him in the one view, implies necessarily a living union with him in the other view likewise. In the Lord's supper, accordingly, the believer communicates not only with the Spirit of Christ, or with his divine nature, but with Christ himself in his whole living person ; so that he may be said to be fed and nourished by his very flesh and blood. The communion is truly and fully with the *Man* Christ Jesus, and not simply with Jesus as the Son of God.<sup>1</sup>

These distinctions may serve to bound and define the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist on the side towards *Rationalism*. All pains were taken to guard it from the false tendency to which it stood exposed in this direction. The several conceptions of the believer's union and communion with Christ which have now been mentioned, were explicitly and earnestly rejected, as being too low and poor altogether for the majesty of this great mystery. In opposition to all such representations, it was constantly affirmed that Christ's people are inserted by faith into his very life ; and that the Lord's supper, forming as it does an epitome of the whole mystery, involves to the worthy communicant an actual participation in the substance of his person under this view. The participation is not simply in his Spirit, but in his flesh also and blood. It is not figurative merely and moral, but *real, substantial and essential*.<sup>2</sup>

But it is not enough to settle the boundaries of the doctrine on the side of Rationalism. To be understood properly, it must

<sup>1</sup> Neque illi præterea mihi satisfaciunt, qui nonnullam nobis esse cum Christo communionem agnoscentes, eam dum ostendere volunt, nos Spiritu modo participes faciunt, *præterita carnis et sanguinis mentione*. *Calvin. Inst.* iv. 17, 7.—Christum corpore absentem doceo nihilominus non tantum *Divina sua virtute*, quæ ubique diffusa est, nobis adesse, sed etiam facere ut nobis vivifica sit sua caro. . . . Neque simpliciter Spiritu suo Christum in nobis habitare trado, sed ita nos ad se attollere, ut vivificum carnis suæ vigorem in nos transfundat. *Opp. T.* ix., p. 669.—Hanc unitatem non ad *essentiam divinam restringo*, sed pertinere affirmo ad *carnem et sanguinem* : quia non simpliciter dictum sit, " Spiritus meus vere est cibus," sed *caro* ; nec simpliciter etiam dictum sit " Divinitas mea vere est potus," sed *sanguis*. *Ib.* p. 726.—Fatemur ergo corpus idem quod crucifixum est, nos in Cœna edere. *Ib.* p. 727.—Augustino assentior, in pane accipi quod pendit in erace. *Ib.* p. 729.

<sup>2</sup> Convenit etiam Christum *re ipsa* et efficaciter implere quicquid analogia signi et rei signatæ postulat ; ideoque vere nobis in Cœna offerri communionem cum ejus corpore et sanguine, vel (quod idem valet,) nobis arrham sub pane et vino proponi, quæ nos faciat corporis et sanguinis Christi participes. *Calv. Opp. T.* ix., p. 743.

be limited and defined, in like manner, on the side of *Romanism*.

1. In the first place then it excludes entirely the figment of *transubstantiation*. According to the Church of Rome, the elements of bread and wine in the sacrament are literally transmuted into the actual flesh and blood of Christ. The accidents, outward properties, sensible qualities only, remain the same; while the original substance is converted supernaturally into the true body of the glorified Saviour, which is thus exhibited and received in an outward way in the sacramental mystery. This transmutation too is not limited to the actual solemnity of the sacramental act itself, but is held to be of permanent force; so that the elements continue afterwards to be the true body of Christ, and are proper objects of veneration and worship accordingly. This theory was rejected as a gross superstition, even by the Lutheran Church, and of course found still less favor in the other section of the Protestant communion. The Reformed doctrine admits no change whatever in the elements. Bread remains bread, and wine remains wine.

2. The doctrine excludes, in the second place, the proper Lutheran hypothesis of the sacrament, technically distinguished by the title *consubstantiation*. According to this view, the body and blood of Christ are not actually substituted supernaturally for the elements; the bread and wine remain unchanged, in their essence as well as in their properties. But still the body and blood of Christ are in their very substance *present*, where the supper is administered. The presence is not indeed bound to the elements, apart from their sacramental use. It holds only in the moment and form of this use as such; a mystery in this respect, transcending all the common laws of reason and nature. It is however a true, corporal presence of the blessed Saviour. Hence his body is received by the worshipper *orally*, though not in the form and under the quality of common food; and so not by believers simply, but by unbelievers also, to their own condemnation. The dogma was allowed in the end to involve also, by necessary consequence, the ubiquity of Christ's glorified body. Bread and wine retain their own nature, but Christ, who is in virtue of the *communicatio idiomatum* present in his human nature in all places where he may please to be, imparts his true flesh and blood, *in, with and under* the outward signs to all communicants, whether with or without faith, by the inherent power of the ordinance itself.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Credimus, docemus et confitemur, quod in Cœna Domini corpus et sanguis Christi vere et substantialiter sint præsentiæ, et quod una cum pane et



In opposition to this view, the Reformed Church taught that the participation of Christ's flesh and blood in the Lord's supper is *spiritual* only, and in no sense corporal. The idea of a local presence in the case, was utterly rejected. The elements cannot be said to comprehend or include the body of the Saviour in any sense. It is not *there*, but remains constantly in heaven, according to the scriptures. It is not handled by the minister and taken into the mouth of the communicant. The manducation of it is not oral, but only by faith. It is present in fruition accordingly to believers only in the exercise of faith; the impenitent and unbelieving receive only the naked symbols, bread and wine, without any spiritual advantage to their own souls.<sup>1</sup>

Thus we have the doctrine defined and circumscribed on both sides; with proper distinction from all that may be considered a tendency to Rationalism in one direction, and from all that may be counted a tendency to Romanism in the other. It allows the *presence* of Christ's person in the sacrament, including even his flesh and blood, so far as the actual participation of the believer is concerned. Even the term *real presence*, Calvin tells us he was willing to employ, if it were to be understood as synonymous with *true presence*; by which he means a presence that brings Christ truly into communion with the believer in his human nature, as well as in his divine nature.<sup>2</sup> The word *real*,

vino vere distribuuntur atque sumantur.—Credimus, corpus et sanguinem Christi non tantum spiritualiter per fidem, sed etiam ore, non tamen Capernaitice, sed supernaturali et cœlesti modo, ratione sacramentalis unionis, cum pane et vino sumi.—Credimus, quod non tantum vere in Christum credentes, et qui digne ad Cœnam Domini accedunt, verum etiam indigni et infideles verum corpus et sanguinem Christi sumant. *Form. Conc. Art. vii. Hase, Lib. Symbol. p. 599, 600.*

<sup>1</sup> Ego Christum in cœlesti sua sede relinquens, arcana spiritus ejus influentia contentus sum, ut nos carne sua pascat.—Neque enim aliter Christum in Cœna statuo præsentem, nisi quia fidelium mentes, sicuti illa est cœlestis actio, fide supra mundum evehuntur, et Christus Spiritus sui virtute obstaculum, quod afferre poterat loci distantia, tollens, se membris suis conjungit.—Hæc nostra definitio est, spiritualiter a nobis manducari Christi carnem, quia non aliter animas vivificat, quam pane vegetatur corpus; tantum a nobis excluditur substantiæ transfusio. Westphalo non aliter caro vivifica est, quam si ejus substantia voretur. Hoc crimen est nostrum, obviis ulnis tale monstrum non amplecti. *Calv. Opp. T. ix., p. 668, 669.*

<sup>2</sup> Communicari nobis Christi corpus et sanguinem, nullus nostrum negat. Qualis autem sit corporis et sanguinis Domini communicatio, quæritur. Carnalem isti palam et simpliciter asserere quomodo audeant, miror. Spiritualem cum dicimus, fremunt, quasi hac voce realem, ut vulgo loquuntur, tollamus. Nos vero, si reale pro vero accipiant, et fallaci vel imaginario

however, was understood ordinarily to denote a local, corporal presence, and on this account was not approved. To guard against this, it may be qualified by the word *spiritual*; and the expression will then be quite suitable to the nature of the doctrine, as it has been now explained. A *real* presence, in opposition to the notion that Christ's flesh and blood are not made present to the communicant in *any* way. A *spiritual* real presence, in opposition to the idea that Christ's body is in the elements in a local or corporal manner. Not real simply, and not spiritual simply; but real, and yet spiritual at the same time. The body of Christ is in heaven, the believer on earth; but by the power of the Holy Ghost, nevertheless, the obstacle of such vast local distance is fully overcome, so that in the sacramental act, while the outward symbols are received in an outward way, the very body and blood of Christ are at the same time inwardly and supernaturally communicated to the worthy receiver, for the real nourishment of his new life. Not that the material particles of Christ's body are supposed to be carried over, by this supernatural process, into the believer's person.<sup>1</sup> The communion is spiritual, not material. It is a participation of the Saviour's life. Of his life, however, as human, subsisting in a true bodily form. The living energy, the vivific virtue, as Calvin styles it, of Christ's flesh, is made to flow over into the communicant, making him more and more one with Christ himself, and thus more and more an heir of the same immortality that is brought to light in his person.

Two points in particular, in the theory now exhibited, require to be held clearly in view.

The first is, that the sacrament is made to carry with it an ob-

opponent, barbare loqui mallems, quam pugnis materiam præbere. . . . Placidis et moderatis hoc testatum volo, ita secundum nos spiritualem esse communicationis modum, ut reipsa Christo fruamur. Hac modo ratione contenti simus, ultra quam nemo nisi valde litigiosus insurget, vivificam nobis esse Christi carnem, quia ex ea spiritualem in animas nostras vitam Christus instillat; eam quoque a nobis manducari, dum in corpus unum fide cum Christo coalescimus, ut noster factus nobiscum sua omnia communicet. *Calv. Opp. T. ix., p. 657, 658.*—Præsentiam carnis Christi in Cæna urget Westphalus: nos simpliciter non negamus, modo nobiscum fide sursum conscendat. *Ib. p. 668.*

<sup>1</sup> Ingenue interea confiteor, mixturam carnis Christi cum anima nostra, vel transfusionem, qualis ab ipsis docetur, me repudiare; quia nobis sufficit, Christum e carnis suæ substantia vitam in animas nostras spirare, imo propriam in nos vitam diffundere, quamvis in nos non ingrediatur ipsa Christi caro. *Calv. Inst. iv. 17, 32.*—Manet tamen integer homo Christus in cælo. *Ib. Opp. T. ix., p. 699.*

jective force, so far as its principal design is concerned. It is not simply suggestive, commemorative, or representational. It is not a sign, a picture, deriving its significance from the mind of the beholder. The virtue which it possesses is not put into it by the faith of the worshipper in the first place, to be taken out of it again by the same faith, in the same form. It is not imagined of course in the case that the ordinance can have any virtue *without* faith, that it can confer grace in a purely mechanical way. All thought of the *opus operatum*, in this sense, is utterly repudiated. Still faith does not properly clothe the sacrament with its power. It is the condition of its efficacy for the communicant, but not the principle of the power itself. This belongs to the institution in its own nature. The signs are bound to what they represent, not subjectively simply in the thought of the worshipper, but objectively, by the force of a divine appointment. The union indeed is not natural but sacramental. The grace is not comprehended *in* the elements, as its depository and vehicle outwardly considered. But the union is none the less real and firm, on this account. The grace goes inseparably along with the signs, and is truly present for all who are prepared to make it their own. The signs in this view are also *seals*; not simply as they attest the truth and reality of the grace in a general way, but as they authenticate also its presence under the sacramental exhibition itself. This is what we mean by the objective force of the institution; and this, we say, is one point that must always be kept in view, in looking at the doctrine that is now the subject of our attention.<sup>1</sup>

The other point to be steadily kept in sight is, that the invisible grace of the sacrament, according to the doctrine, is the substantial life of the Saviour himself, particularly in his human nature. He became flesh for the life of the world, and our communion with him involves a real participation in him, as the principle of life *under this form*. Hence in the mystery of the

<sup>1</sup> Obtendit (Westphalus) verbo fieri sacramentum, non fide nostra. Hoc ut concedam, nondum tamen obtinet promiscue Christum canibus et porcis ita prostitui, ut carne ejus vescantur. Neque enim desinit e cœlo pluisse Deus, licet pluvie liquorem saxa et rupes non concipiant. *Culv. Opp. T. ix., p. 674.*—Nos ita asserimus, omnibus offerri in sacramento Christi corpus et sanguinem, ut soli fideles inestimabili hoc thesauro fruantur: etsi autem incredulitas januam Christo claudit, ut priventur ejus beneficio qui ad Cœnam impure accedunt, negamus tamen quicquam decedere ex sacramenti natura; quia panis semper verum est pignus carnis Christi, et vinum sanguinis, veraque utriusque exhibitio semper constat ex parte Dei. Adversarii nostri corpus et sanguinem ita sub pane et vino includunt, ut sine ulla fide vorentur ab impiis. *Ib. p. 699.*

Supper, his flesh and blood are really exhibited always in their essential force and power, and really received by every worthy communicant.

Such is the proper sacramental doctrine of the Reformed Church as it stood in the sixteenth century. It is easy to show that it labors under serious difficulties. With these however at present, we have no concern. They can have no bearing one way or another, upon the simply historical inquiry in which we are now engaged. Our object has been thus far only to describe and define the doctrine itself. It remains now to show, that it was in fact, as thus described and defined, the accredited established doctrine of the Reformed Church, in the period to which the inquiry refers.

—

## II.

## COUNTER STATEMENT.

The foregoing statement of the original Reformed or Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's supper, is followed in the *Mystical Presence* by a series of extracts from proper authorities, in the way of confirmation and proof. These are taken from Calvin himself, who is found everywhere to agree with his own positions and definitions on which immediately the statement is made to rest; from the original standard confessions; from Farel, Beza, Peter Martyr, Hospinian, Hooker, and other witnesses of like weight. Then, to make the case still more clear, the reigning Puritan theory of the present time is exhibited, by another series of extracts from some of its more distinguished representatives, such as Ridgely, Hopkins, Bellamy, Dwight, Dick and Barnes; and pains are taken to show its points of material variation from the more ancient view. The contrast is reduced to five heads, all turning on a different conception in the two cases of the true and proper nature of a sacrament. In the old Reformed view, the eucharist is regarded as carrying in it a peculiar *specific* grace; as having a truly *mystical* character; as possessing an *objective* force; as including a real participation in Christ's *person*; as reaching this through the medium especially of his *flesh and blood*, that is, his true human life; all which points the modern Puritanism virtually repudiates and denies.—*Myst. Pres.* p. 117–126.

The review of the *Mystical Presence*, in the *Biblical Repository* for April 1848, undertakes to make out a different account of the original and proper Reformed doctrine of the holy eucharist; by which the variations of the modern Puritan theory

are virtually reduced to nothing, being taken in fact for the only fair and legitimate expression of what has been the true sense of the doctrine from the beginning.

This is not done however in the most direct manner; nor in such a way as to meet distinctly and set aside the precise allegations of the book reviewed, or the force of its quotations either from the older or the more modern authorities. Neither is it pretended by the writer, to enter into any extended or exact historical criticism in the case. He proposes simply to take up the whole subject in an *ex cathedra* general way, lumping the authorities to suit his own mind, and ruing their testimony thus to such results as the investigation in his judgment is felt to require. In this process, no essential new testimony of any sort is adduced. It is indeed insinuated that the historical evidence brought forward in the Mystical Presence, though entitled to scientific respect, is still one sided and defective; but no serious attempt is made after all to furnish any *other* proof, whether from Calvin or from other sources, for the purpose of correction and supplement. The only show of anything like this is the stress laid upon the *Consensus Tigurinus*, the memorable bond of agreement completed between the Zuinglian and Calvinistic sections of the Reformed Church in the year 1549; but this, as we shall see hereafter, adds nothing in reality to the amount or sense of the testimony as before given, and needs only to be interpreted from its own historical relations, instead of being violently forced into another tissue of thought altogether, that it may be found in clear and full consent with the very view, against which it is here paraded with so much triumphant assurance as a rebutting witness.

According to the Reviewer, the whole question concerning the eucharistic doctrine of the Reformed Church in the sixteenth century, is embarrassed with special difficulty. One source of this is found in the confessedly mysterious nature of the subject itself. Another is made to lie in the fact, "that almost all the Reformed confessions were framed for the express purpose of compromise;" an object which is supposed to have prevailed on this side especially so far, as in many cases to carry the confessional *language* quite into the orbit of Lutheranism, making it incapable in truth of any fair reconciliation with the true sense of the Reformed doctrine itself, as this fell into a more natural expression at a later day, when the pressure of that early antagonism was no longer felt. This suggests, we are told, a third source of difficulty, the ambiguity of the terms used in these early confessions. "The words, presence, real, true, flesh

and blood, substance, &c., are all employed, in many cases, out of their ordinary sense. We are said to receive the true body and blood, but nothing material; the substance, but not the essence; the natural body, but only by faith. It is not easy to unravel these conflicting statements and to determine what they really mean." Then again, to crown the embarrassment of the case, there is said to be no fixed rule by which to settle here the proper creed of the Reformed Church. "Shall we look to the private writings of the Reformers, or to the public confessions? If to the latter, shall we rely on those of Switzerland or on those of the Palatinate, France or Belgium? These, though they have a general coincidence, do not entirely agree. Some favor one interpretation, and some another." The writer has no sense, apparently, of anything like an inward unity or wholeness in the Reformed doctrine as such, over against either the Roman or the Lutheran, and recognizes accordingly no sort of historical necessity in its form one way or another. He takes it throughout for a sort of outward accident or loose appendage of the general system in which it appears, which circumstances were allowed to shape, very much at private pleasure, according to the wants of the time. It seems to be his wish, to reduce the question as much as possible to such confused and inorganic form, to rob it of every sort of objective immanent reason and law, for the very purpose of feeling himself more at liberty thus to construct from its chaotic material an answer to please his own taste. "The most satisfactory method of proceeding," he tells us, "will be to quote, in the first instance, those authorities which represent the Swiss views; secondly, those which present the views of Calvin; and thirdly, those symbols in which both parties concurred. Having done this, we propose to analyze these statements, and endeavor to determine their meaning."

According to this plan, we have then a course of extracts from the original authorities, for the most part repeating us before said, and in no case contradicting, the quotations presented in the *Mystical Presence*. Special weight is laid on the *Consensus Tigurinus* and the *Heidelberg Catechism*, as being supposed to show an amalgamation finally of the Calvinistic and Zuinglian views, under a form precisely answerable to the reigning Puritan faith of the present time.

Next follows a general analysis of this mass of authorities, with little or no regard to historical connections and relations, intended to bring out of them their *mean sense*, as we might call it, or wholesale average value, in favor of what the Reviewer holds to be the proper doctrine of the Reformed Church on the whole subject in debate.

Much of this argument however has in fact no bearing whatever on any question, really in controversy between this writer and the book he reviews; although it is made to carry through-out, (unfairly we think,) the show and form of a contradictory statement; covertly implying at least that the positions it sets aside, in each case, belong fairly and truly to the opposite cause. To make this fully evident, it will be enough simply to bring into view the several heads or topics, under which successively the material in hand is applied to the elucidation of the general subject.

1. *In what sense is Christ present in the Lord's Supper?*—In reply to this, we are informed that while the Reformed doctrine acknowledged Christ's actual presence in the sacrament, in some way, it carefully excluded the conception of his being present under a *corporal* or *local* form. This point, of course, it is found very easy to establish. Quotations for the purpose offer themselves from every quarter. But is it necessary to say, that it is wholly aside from the real issue in hand? There is not a word in the *Mystical Presence*, from beginning to end, which can be said to affirm what is here denied, or to deny what is here affirmed. On the contrary, the greatest pains are taken in the book to place the Reformed doctrine, as regards this point, in its true light. The *presence* it is made to assert in the eucharist, is always most carefully represented to be spiritual and not material, dynamic and not local, for the apprehension of faith and not for the apprehension of sense. This is sufficiently clear from the extract which goes before. The "statement" here given, is such as to shut out in regard to it all ambiguity or doubt. It is quite as clear, and quite as strong, to say the least, as any language employed by the Reviewer himself, in separating from the doctrine in question the notion of everything like a local or tactual presence, and restricting it to the idea of a presence brought to pass in a wholly different way by the power of the Holy Ghost.

2. *What is meant by feeding on the body and blood of Christ?*—This question regards the mode of receiving, in the sacrament, or the proper nature of what is sometimes styled sacramental manducation. "In reference to this point," we are told, "all the Reformed agreed, as to the following particulars: 1. This eating was not with the mouth, either after the manner of ordinary food, which the Lutherans themselves denied, or in any other manner. The mouth was not in this case the organ of reception. 2. It is only by the soul that the body and blood of Christ are received. 3. It is by faith, which is declared to

be the hand and the mouth of the soul. 4. It is by or through the power of the Holy Ghost. As to all these points there is a perfect agreement among the symbols of the Reformed Church." We find no difficulty of course in granting all this. The proof of it is clearly and largely presented in the Mystical Presence itself; every chapter and section of which is constructed on the assumption, that the Reformed doctrine of the eucharist excluded throughout the conception of an *oral* manducation, and resolved all into the activity of faith on the one side and the power of the Holy Ghost on the other.

3. *What is meant by the body and blood of Christ as received in the sacrament?*—The various expressions employed in answer to this question, the Reviewer informs us, do *not* mean with the Reformers "that we partake of the material particles of Christ's body, nor do they express any mixture or transfusion of substance." Here again there is no controversy. The very same representation reigns throughout the Mystical Presence. Most certainly the eucharistic doctrine of the Reformed Church, as we have it in Calvin and the early confessions, knows nothing of a Capernaitic translation of the material flesh of Christ over into the bodies of his people in any way; and there is not a single syllable in the book now mentioned which can be said to exhibit it, directly or indirectly, in any such monstrous sense.

So far then there might seem to be no strife at all between the Princeton Review and the work it seeks to oppose. It sets up a man of straw, and shows off a harmless sham battle in bringing him to the ground. And yet it would be a mistake, to suppose the two parties really of one and the same mind, even in regard to the points thus far brought into view. The agreement after all is more in sound than in actual sense. The issue which comes into view is indeed false; but behind that there lurks another which is most true and real, as well as vastly important, whose presence is more felt than expressed, through the counterfeit that is made to stand in its place. The agreement in the case is negative only, not positive.

Thus as regards the presence of Christ in the eucharist, it is allowed all round that the Reformed doctrine makes it to be not corporal or local, but spiritual. Such denial of an outward presence in space however, is not by any means at once the assertion of a presence merely in and through the human mind. Yet it is evidently taken in this sense by the Princeton Review. "Presence is nothing" it tells us, "but the application of an object to the faculty suited to the perception of it. Hence there is a two-fold presence, viz: of things sensible and of things spir-



itual. The former are present, as the word imports, when they are *præ sensibus*, so as to be perceived by the senses; the latter, when they are presented to the intelligence so as to be apprehended and enjoyed." So in the sacrament, "the presence is to the mind, the object is not presented to the senses, but apprehended by faith." The only alternative to a local presence, is taken to be a presence in the intelligence or a simple influence from abroad. But this is not allowed on the opposite side. 'The Calvinistic doctrine, we contend, knows nothing of any such bald alternative as this. It never opposes a simply intellectual presence to a gross sensible presence; but holds either of these, and the first full as much as the last, to be a presence in the sphere of mere nature or flesh.

On the mode of manducation, the false position of the Reviewer towards the doctrine, whose negative side he is so ready to acknowledge and honor, comes still farther into sight. The terms which exclude the idea of an oral participation, and resolve all into an act of the soul, he is ready to construe at once in favor of a purely subjective process; although by his own confession he is met here with something, which he finds it hard to understand, the question namely, whether any difference is to be made between eating and believing. Some of the authorities, he allows, insist on a distinction; while others directly declare them to be the same thing. The question however, we are informed, "is of no historical importance, and created no diversity of opinion in the Church." But this way of sliding over the subject is by no means satisfactory. Calvin was not a man to play with words on such a point, without sense; and it is not difficult to see what he is concerned here to save and secure. It is the objective power of the sacrament, as the real presence of Christ's life by the Holy Ghost, mystically brought into the soul of the worshipper through the receptivity of faith, as something different from the subjective working of this faith itself as well as from all its accompanying exercises. There is much more here, for the Reformed doctrine, than any mere relation of the believer's mind to the general truth of the gospel, viewed as an object of knowledge or belief or trust. Right or wrong, Calvin held and taught all his life, that we have in the Lord's supper something far beyond a mere occasion for the exercise of our faith; that it carries in itself, by the Holy Ghost, an objective mystical force, by which directly we are made to participate in the true mediatorial life of the blessed Redeemer, as the element of immortality as well as righteousness. And if this "created no diversity of opinion in the Church," it was

simply because the same view entered prevailingly into its creed as a whole.

It is however under the third question more particularly, relating to the sense in which we are said to receive the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, that the divergency now in consideration comes at last plainly into view. The negative side of the answer, as we have just seen, is free from all difficulty. The Reformed doctrine means *not*, that the flesh and blood of Christ materially considered are made to mix in any way with the bodies of his people. The affirmative side of the answer too is clear enough to a certain extent; and yet the Reviewer is evidently embarrassed from the start, to make out precisely the force of the terms in which it is given. The sacramental phraseology of the sixteenth century, when it speaks of "feeding on the substance, virtue or efficacy, of Christ's body and blood," goes quite beyond his system, and carries with it a sound of extravagance which he finds it hard to reconcile fully with the sober standard that reigns in his own mind. He is forced to admit in the first place generally, that this language means, in the old symbols, *more* than the common indwelling of the Spirit in our hearts; which of course contradicts his own assertion previously made, that the grace of the sacrament was not taken to be something special, in the judgment of the early Reformed Church, but was looked upon as of one kind simply with the life of religion in other forms and at other times. "There is one thing in which all parties agreed, viz: that our union with Christ was a real union, that we receive him and not his benefits merely; that he dwells in his people by his Spirit, whose presence is the presence of Christ." But, it is added, (and the concession deserves attention,) "though all mean this, this is not all that is intended by the expressions above cited." These, it is acknowledged "indicate the virtue, efficacy, life-giving power of *his body*." A strange and difficult conception truly. How is it to be put into rational sense and form? On this point, let the Reviewer be heard in full.

"There are two ways," he writes, "in which this was understood. Some intended by it, not the virtue of Christ's body and blood as flesh and blood, but their virtue as a body broken and of blood as shed, that is, their sacrificial, atoning efficacy. Others, however, insisted that besides this there was a vivifying efficacy imparted to the body of Christ by its union with the divine nature, and that by the power of the Holy Ghost, the believer in the Lord's supper and elsewhere, received into his soul and by faith this mysterious and supernatural influence. This was

clearly Calvin's idea, though he often contented himself with the expression of the former of these views. His doctrine is fully expressed in the following passages. 'We acknowledge, without any circumlocution that the flesh of Christ, is life-giving, not only because once in it our salvation was obtained; but because now, we being united to him in sacred union, it breathes life into us. Or, to use fewer words, because being by the power of the Spirit engrafted into the body of Christ, we have a common life with him; for from the hidden fountain of divinity life is, in a wonderfully way, infused into the flesh of Christ, and thence flows out to us.' Again: 'Christ is absent from us as to the body, by his Spirit, however, dwelling in us, he so lifts us to himself in heaven, that he transfuses the life-giving vigour of his flesh into us, as we grow by the vital heat of the sun.' From these and many similar passages, it is plain, Calvin meant by receiving the substance of Christ's body, receiving its virtue or vigour, not merely as a sacrifice, but also the power inherent in it from its union with the divine nature, and flowing from it as heat from the sun.

"The other explanation of this matter is that by receiving the substance of Christ's body, or by receiving his flesh and blood, was intended receiving their life-giving efficacy as a sacrifice once offered on the cross for us. This view is clearly expressed in the Zurich Confession of 1545. 'To eat the bread of Christ is to believe on him as crucified . . . His flesh once benefitted us on earth, now it benefits here no longer, and is no longer here.' The same view is expressed by Calvin himself in the Con. Tig. 1549. In the 19th article we are said to eat the flesh of Christ, 'because we derive our life from that flesh once offered in sacrifice for us, and from his blood shed as an expiation.' With equal clearness the same idea is presented in the Heidelberg Catechism, 1560. In question 79, it is his crucified body and shed blood which are declared to be the food of the soul. The same thing is still more plainly asserted in the Helv. Confession 1566, c. 21. In the first paragraph, it is said, 'Christ as delivered unto death for us and as a Saviour is the sum of this sacrament.' In the third paragraph this eating is explained as the application, by the Spirit, of the benefits of Christ's death. And lower down, the food of the soul is declared to be *caro Christi tradita pro nobis, et sanguis ejus effusus pro nobis*. Indeed as this confession was written by Bullinger, minister of Zurich, the great opponent of Calvin's peculiar view, it could not be expected to teach any other doctrine. In what is called the Anglican Confession, drawn up by Bishop Jewell

1562, the same view is presented. It is there said : ' We maintain that Christ exhibits himself truly present. . . that in the supper we feed upon him by faith and in the spirit (*fide et spiritu*) and that we have eternal life from his cross and blood.' To draw life from the cross is here the same as to draw it from his blood, and of course must refer to the sacrificial efficacy of his death.

"The question now arises which of the two views above stated is entitled to be regarded as the real doctrine of the Reformed? The whole church united in saying believers receive the body and blood of Christ. They agreed in explaining this to mean that they received the virtue, efficacy or vigour of his body and blood. But some understood, thereby, the virtue of his body as broken and of his blood as shed, that is, their sacrificial efficacy. Others said that besides this, there was a mysterious virtue in the body of Christ due to its union with the divine nature, which virtue was by the Holy Spirit conveyed to the believer. Which of these views is truly symbolical? The fairest answer to this question probably is, neither to the exclusion of the other. Those who held to the one, expressed their fellowship with those who held the other. Calvin and Bullinger united in the *Consensus Tigurinus* from which the latter view is excluded. Both views are expressed in the public confessions. Some have the one, some the other.

"But if a decision must be made between them, the higher authority is certainly due to the doctrine of sacrificial efficacy first mentioned. 1. It has high symbolical authority in its favour. Its being clearly expressed in the *Con. Tig.* the common platform of the church, on this whole subject, and in the *Second Helv. Con.* the most authoritative of all the symbols of the Reformed church, and even in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, outweighs the private authority of Calvin or the dubious expression of the *Gallican, Belgic, and some minor Confessions*. 2. What is perhaps of more real consequence, the sacrificial view, is the only one that harmonizes with the other doctrines of the church. The other is an uncongenial foreign element derived partly from the influence of previous modes of thought, partly from the dominant influence of the Lutherans and the desire of getting as near to them as possible, and partly, no doubt, from a too literal interpretation of certain passages of scripture, especially *John vi. 54—58*, and *Eph. v: 30*. It is difficult to reconcile the idea that a life-giving influence emanates from the glorified body of Christ, with the universally received doctrine of the Reformed Church, that we receive Christ as fully through the ministry of the word as in the Lord's supper. However

strongly some of the Reformed asserted that we partake of the true or natural body of Christ, and are fed by the substance of his flesh and blood, they all maintained that this was done whenever faith in him was exercised. Not to urge this point however. All the Reformed taught, Calvin perhaps more earnestly than most others, that our union with Christ since the incarnation is the same in nature as that enjoyed by the saints under the old dispensation. This is perfectly intelligible if the virtue of his flesh and blood, which we receive in the Lord's supper, is its virtue as a sacrifice, because he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. His sacrifice was as effectual for the salvation of Abraham as of Paul, and could be appropriated as fully by the faith of the one as by that of the other. But if the virtue in question is a mysterious power due to the hypostatical union, flowing from Christ's body in heaven, it must be a benefit peculiar to believers living since the incarnation. It is impossible that those living before the advent could partake of Christ's body, in this sense, because it did not then exist; it had not as yet been assumed into union with the divine nature. We find therefore that Romanists and nominal Protestants, make the greatest distinction as to the relation of the ancient saints to God and that of believers since the advent, between the sacraments of the one dispensation and those of the other. All this is consistent and necessary on their theory of the incarnation, of the church and of the sacraments, but it is all in the plainest contradiction to the doctrine of the Reformed Church. Here then is an element which does not accord with the other doctrines of that church; and this incongruity is one good reason for not regarding it as a genuine portion of its faith."—*P.* 249–252.

Another good reason for this conclusion is found in the fact, that the element here noticed gradually lost its power and died out of the Church. It had no root in the system we are told, and could not live. "It is of course admitted," the Reviewer goes on to say, "that a particular doctrine's dying out of the faith of a church, is, of itself, no sufficient evidence that it was not a genuine part of its original belief. This is too obvious to need remark. There is, however, a great difference between a doctrine's being lost by a process of decay and by the process of growth. It is very possible that a particular opinion may be engrafted into a system, without having any logical or vital union with it, and is the more certain to be ejected, the more vigorous the growth and healthful the life of that system. The fundamental principles of Protestantism are the exclusive normal authority of scripture, and justification

by faith alone. If that system lives and grows it must throw off every thing incompatible with those principles. It is the fact of this peculiar view of a mysterious influence of the glorified body of Christ, having ceased to live, taken in connection with its obvious incompatibility with other articles of the Reformed faith, that we urge as a collateral argument against its being a genuine portion of that system of doctrine. According to the most authoritative standards of the Reformed church, we receive the body and blood of Christ, as a sacrifice, just as Abraham and David received them, who ate of the same spiritual meat and drank of the same spiritual drink. The church is one, its life is one, its food is one, from Adam to the last of the redeemed." —P. 253-254.

All this deserves close attention; as it serves well to reveal the true beginning, and at the same time the deep inward significance, of the great doctrinal schism which we have now historically in hand. The Reformed doctrine, it is acknowledged, was *not* at first of one sort throughout with the common Puritan theory, so free from all mystery and easy to be understood, that has since come so generally to bear its name. It had two aspects or modes of representation. At times, all stress is laid on the *sacrificial efficacy* of Christ's death, as the great object appropriated in the sacrament; but it is not to be concealed, that equal stress is laid again, at other times, on the idea of a *life-giving power* to be received through it from the human side of Christ's life, that is from his body and blood, as the real source of immortality for the world. Some, we are informed, had only the first view, while others along with it held also the last. This was the case in particular, very clearly, with Calvin. Both views then are allowed to have been of symbolical authority and right. The Reformed doctrine, in the beginning, embraced both. And yet, strange to say, it showed itself a real Janus in doing so; for the faces looked quite opposite ways, and had no inward correspondence whatever. How such a man as Calvin could have failed to see and feel the contradiction, is indeed surpassingly strange; but it only goes to show how little regard was had to the logical unity of doctrines, in the theology of the sixteenth century. The symbolical dogma in this case, if such it might be called, was in truth two views outwardly joined together, which had no inward affinity or connection whatever, and whose union accordingly, as it was altogether nominal from the start, proved to be subsequently of very short duration. Only one of these views, according to the Reviewer, was really at home in the system to which it belonged, as being in harmo-

ny with the other doctrines of the Reformed church. "The other is an uncongenial foreign element," brought in by Calvin, and kept up for a time in some of the confessions, without due reflection. In the progress of time therefore it died out of the system altogether. The reigning modern doctrine of the eucharist, it is granted, no longer recognizes *this* view as of any force for the Reformed faith. It has outgrown it long ago most effectually; and this *development* must be taken at once as a clear argument, that what has thus been cast out historically from the life of Protestantism, should never have been suffered to have any place in it at the beginning.

We are now prepared to follow the Princeton Review, in its application of the testimony in hand to the decision of two other questions, belonging to a full view of the subject under discussion.

4. *What is the effect of receiving the body and blood of Christ?*—This question, we are told, is nearly allied to the one that goes before. "In general terms it is answered by saying, that union with Christ, and the consequent reception of his benefits, is the effect of the believing reception of the Lord's supper." This union, of course, involves no sort of corporeal contact or mixture in any way. Still the Reformed doctrine required always the idea of a real, and not simply an imaginary or moral union, in this case. "This is often expressed by saying we receive the substance of Christ, that is, as they explain it, Christ himself, or the Holy Spirit, by whom he dwells in his people." Thus far there is no room for controversy. But the language after all is ambiguous, and covers plainly enough a latent difference of thought, by not being urged fully out to its ultimate meaning. The reception of Christ by the Spirit, is taken to be exclusive of the true and proper life of Christ himself; and in this way a sense is put on the Reformed doctrine, which on the other side is held to be at war with the original constitution of the doctrine altogether. The general nature of the disagreement, is brought out to some extent in what follows.

"The only question is," says the Reviewer, "whether besides this union effected by the Holy Spirit, there is on our part any participation of Christ's human body or of his human nature as such. This takes us back to the question already considered, relating to the mode of reception and the thing received, when it is said in scripture, that we eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man. As to these questions, it will be remembered the Reformed agreed as to the following points: 1. That this reception is by the soul. 2. Through faith, not through the

mouth. 3. By the power of the Holy Ghost. 4. That this receiving Christ's body is not confined to the Lord's supper, but takes place whenever faith in him is exercised. 5. That it was common to believers before and after the coming of the Son of God in the flesh. We have here a complete estoppel of the claim of the authority of the Reformed church in behalf of the doctrine that our union with Christ involves a participation of his human body, nature, or life. If it be asked, however, in what sense that church teaches that we are flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of his bones? The answer is, in the same sense in which Paul says the same thing. And his meaning is very plain. He tells us that a husband should love his wife as his own body. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. His wife is himself, for the Scriptures say, they are one flesh. All this he adds, is true of Christ and his people. He loves the church as himself. She is his bride; flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. If the intimate relationship, the identification of feelings, affections and interests, between a man and his wife, if their spiritual union, justifies the assertion that they are one flesh, far more may the same thing be said of the spiritual relation between Christ and his people, which is much more intimate, sublime and mysterious, arising, as it does from the inhabitation of one and the same Spirit, and producing not only a union of feeling and affection, but of life. The same apostle tells us that believers are one body and members one of another, not in virtue of their common human nature, nor because they all partake of the humanity of Christ, but because they all have one Spirit. Such as we understand it is the doctrine of the Reformed church and of the Bible as to the mystical union."—*P.* 255-256.

According to this, the only union with Christ which the Reformed doctrine allows, is one that holds under a purely mental form between him and our souls, through the intervention of the Holy Ghost, exclusively altogether of his human life as such. Our relation to his body is at best remote and indirect. This is not in any way the bond and medium of our communication with his higher nature. When we are said to eat his flesh and drink his blood, the language must be taken as a violent catechesis; the meaning of which is simply, that we have a very close spiritual conjunction with him by being made to experience in ourselves the influences of the same Holy Ghost that dwells also gloriously in his person. The idea of any participation, in the case of believers, in Christ's human body, nature, or life, as such, is declared to be foreign entirely from the original faith of the Reformed church.



5. *What efficacy belongs to the Lord's Supper as a Sacrament?*—"On this point," according to the Princeton Review, "the Reformed, in the first place, reject the Romish doctrine that the sacraments contain the grace they signify, and that they convey that grace, by the mere administration, to all who do not oppose an obstacle. Secondly, the Lutheran doctrine, which attributes to the sacraments an inherent supernatural power, due indeed not to the signs, but the word of God connected with them, but which is nevertheless always operative, provided there be faith in the receiver. Thirdly, the doctrine of the Socinians and others, that the sacraments are mere badges of profession, or empty signs of Christ and his benefits. They are declared to be efficacious means of grace; but their efficacy, as such, is referred neither to any virtue in them nor in him that administers them, but solely to the attending operation or influence of the Holy Spirit, precisely as in the case of the word. It is the *virtus Spiritus Sancti extrinsecus accedens*, to which all their supernatural or saving efficacy is referred. They have, indeed, the moral objective power of significant emblems and seals of divine appointment, just as the word has its inherent moral power; but their efficacy as means of grace, their power, in other words, to convey grace depends entirely, as in the case of the word, on the co-operation of the Holy Ghost. Hence the power is in no way tied to the sacraments. It may be exerted without them. It does not always attend them, nor is it confined to the time, place or service. The favorite illustration of the Lutheran doctrine is drawn from the history of the woman who touched the hem of our Saviour's garment. As there was always supernatural virtue in him, which flowed out to all who applied to him in faith, so there is in the sacraments. The Reformed doctrine is illustrated by a reference to our Saviour's anointing the eyes of the blind man with the clay. There was no virtue in the clay to make the man see, the effect was due to the attending power of Christ. The modern rationalists smile at all these distinctions and say it all amounts to the same thing. These three views however are radically different in themselves, and have produced radically different effects, where they have severally prevailed."—P. 256-257.

There is no controversy in regard to what is here said, if it be taken to refer simply to the outward or earthly side of the sacramental transaction; only in that case no proper justice is shown towards either the Roman doctrine or the Lutheran, as set in opposition to the Reformed. It is easy enough to show, that the Reformed authorities agree in rejecting the notion of every-

thing like an *opus operatum* in the sacrament; that they dream of no magical virtue or force resting in the elements as such; that all saving power which belongs to them is referred continually to the accompanying agency of the Holy Ghost, without which they would be wholly destitute of any such grace. All this is most abundantly allowed in the Mystical Presence. But under cover of what thus amounts only to a theological truism, the passage just quoted brings in *another* view, which means a great deal more than this, and involves a most material divergency from the truth of the Reformed doctrine as set forth in the book now named. This is done, by taking advantage of the loose use of language in regard to the sacrament, so as to extend to the whole transaction what holds good in fact only of a part of it separately taken. The *idea* of the holy mystery is thus perverted and made to be false from the start; its divine side is divorced from its human side; the body of it is emptied of its living soul, as though this last were no part of its constitution whatever; and then it becomes an easy thing of course to make out that the *corpse* which is left behind, is in all respects intrinsically powerless and dead. The Reformed doctrine is wronged, however, in being made to rest in a theological mutilation here, which it never acknowledged in truth, but on the contrary took all pains continually to disown and disclaim.

"Such then, as we understand it," the Reviewer tells us in conclusion, "is the true doctrine of the Reformed church on the Lord's supper. By the Reformed church, we mean the Protestant churches of Switzerland, the Palatinate, France, Belgium, England, Scotland and elsewhere. According to the public standards of these churches: The Lord's supper is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, as a memorial of his death, wherein, under the symbols of bread and wine, his body as broken for us and his blood as shed for the remission of sins, are signified, and, by the power of the Holy Ghost, sealed and applied to believers; whereby their union with Christ and their mutual fellowship are set forth and confirmed, their faith strengthened, and their souls nourished unto eternal life.

"Christ is really present to his people, in this ordinance, not bodily, but by his Spirit; not in the sense of local nearness, but of efficacious operation. They receive him, not with the mouth, but by faith; they receive his flesh, not as flesh, not as material particles, nor its human life, but his body as broken and his blood as shed. The union thus signified and effected, between him and them is not a corporeal union, nor a mixture of substances, but spiritual and mystical, arising from the indwelling

of the Spirit. The efficacy of this sacrament, *as a means of grace*, is not in the signs, nor in the service, nor in the minister, nor in the word, but solely in the attending influence of the Holy Ghost. This we believe to be a fair statement of the doctrine of the Reformed church."—*P.* 258–259.

This is worthy certainly of the general historical inquiry, whose results it is made to embrace in the way of summary recapitulation; and may be taken as strikingly characteristic of the manner and tone, in which it is conducted throughout. The article affects to expound the Reformed doctrine of the eucharist historically *in opposition* to the view taken of it in the Mystical Presence; and here we have a flourish of results and conclusions, that are intended plainly to be passed off on the unwary reader as fully sustaining this magisterial pretension. And yet, strange to say, with the exception of the single clause, touching our participation in the *human life* of Christ, there is nothing here absolutely, which as far as it goes is not most fully and distinctly admitted and endorsed by the Mystical Presence itself. This any one may see with very little trouble, who has interest enough in the subject to examine the book with his own eyes. But still, with all this, the two representations, as already shown, come by no means at last to one and the same sense. The difficulty is only that the counterstatement of the Reviewer is not so carried out for the most part, as to set forth clearly where the divergency begins and to what it amounts; while it urges terms and propositions which are in truth of *common* acknowledgment, quietly filling them always with its own sense, as though they could admit no other, so as to make the impression that they are in conflict with what has been asserted on the opposite side, and that the whole question in debate turns thus on their negative signification simply and nothing more.

The real issue lies away beyond this, and is concerned with the proper *positive* import of the sacramental phraseology, in current use with the Reformed church of the sixteenth century.

It is agreed all round, that the Reformed doctrine allowed no local presence, no oral communication, no material contact, no physical intromission of Christ's flesh and blood into the bodies of his people, no mechanical virtue in the sacramental elements, no magical power belonging to them in any way to confer grace apart from the action of the Holy Ghost. Also, that it affirmed, as the contrary of this, a spiritual presence, a communication through the soul by faith, the power of the Holy Ghost as its necessary medium, union with Christ in this way as a supersensible fact in the case of believers, and the fruition thus of his

redemptional benefits, particularly the atoning efficacy of his death of which the sacrament is itself the perpetual picture and pledge. What these forms of speech signified, up to the extent of what they are employed to exclude and deny, is for all persons clear enough. But what were they designed to say and signify, on the other side of this limitation? Here is the question we are required to meet.

According to the Princeton Review, the only proper opposite of sense, in this case, is intelligence or thought; to deny a local presence is to affirm an actual absence; what is spiritual and accomplished by faith must be held to exclude all action from Christ's body; an efficacy which is from the Holy Ghost can not be at the same time bound to sacramental signs; and the intervention of this agency, as a connecting bridge between Christ and his people, serves only to show at the same time how fully he is parted from them in his own life, and particularly in his own life under its strictly human view.

We have seen where this scheme starts. Two phases of thought, it is admitted, come together to a certain extent in the early history of the Reformed doctrine; one which lays all stress on the *sacrifice* of Christ, as an atonement for sin; and another, specially insisted upon by Calvin, which carries back our salvation to the idea of Christ's *life*, as its necessary perpetual source and ground. This latter view, it is allowed also, made the *human* side of Christ's life to be in some mysterious way the depository and seat of the grace now mentioned, and so the medium of its communication to our souls. The sacramental manducation was held to bring into the soul of the true worshipper, a vivific power or virtue from the Saviour's *flesh*, once slain on Calvary, but now gloriously exalted at the right hand of God in heaven. This thought however, if we are to believe Princeton, though in the Reformed doctrine for a time, was never of it in any inward way; it was a relic only of the old traditional superstition, which it was found hard at once to lay entirely aside; it lingered accordingly, while it lasted, only as a foreign element in the system, with which it vainly sought assimilation; and so finally forsook the doctrine altogether, leaving it in the bald Puritanic form in which it has come to prevail generally in modern times. Calvin himself, it is argued, could not have seriously intended here what his language seems to mean; for he held constantly that the Old Testament saints had the same communion with Christ, which it is the privilege of believers to enjoy now; which could not have been the case, if his *flesh* and *blood* are to be taken as the medium of life in a real way;

since the incarnation had not then taken place. The notion of a life-giving virtue from Christ's body, then, must be given up, as no part of the Reformed faith. We have to do, in the sacrament, only with the value of his death as a propitiation for sin. This is set before us as a fact, under fit memorials and symbols; and by the help of these, we are required to embrace it with our intelligence or thought, in the exercise of faith, firmly believing that Christ's blood is sufficient to remove all guilt, and looking for righteousness and salvation only in his name. This grace is not lodged objectively even in the actual humanity of the Son of Man; much less in any mystical exhibition, to which this may be supposed to come in the holy eucharist; but only and wholly in the Divine Mind, from which the plan of salvation proceeds and which imparts to it at last all its efficacy and force. The object to be embraced thus is a truth simply of general force, based on a past event which the sacrament commemorates, but in no way necessarily bound now to any such representation. It is not in the transaction in any sense, but out of it and beyond it altogether; so that this serves only as a stepping stone, or ladder, by which the mind of the worshipper is engaged and assisted to enter into direct correspondence with it under another form. It turns of course then wholly on the worshipper's mind at last, whether the relation between the sign and the thing signified shall be of any force whatever in the transaction; if his faith be so exercised as to bring the general truth of the atonement into connection with what is going forward, the truth will be there; otherwise the institution will stand shorn of its celestial significance altogether. An objective force must be allowed indeed to attend the sacrament, where it is rightly used; but it is simply the influence of the Holy Ghost, as he is active also at other times in bringing the faith of the truly pious into felt communication with God's truth and grace. Where faith is at hand, it may be expected that this heavenly agency will fall in concurrently with the use of the sacrament; just as it has power to make itself felt, (to "blow where it listeth,") in connection with any other outward occasion or spectacle. The Spirit may work on men's minds, exciting pious thoughts or feelings of devotion, by the presence of a majestic cataract, or a whirlwind, or a smiling beautiful landscape; and why not then with equal ease through the graphic and affecting representation of the blessed eucharist? In one case however, as in the other, the relation between the earthly object and the grace thus made to go along with it, is wholly external. The sacrament, like the storm of the landscape, is in no sense an actual embodiment of

the presence of this last, but an *occasion* merely, in its own nature accidental though here of divine appointment, by which it is brought to reveal itself under an independent and wholly different form. No *specific* force is to be imagined in the institution as such; it serves only to bring to mind a general grace, which is always just as near at hand without it, where faith is prepared to embrace it, for the accomplishment of the same end. No peculiar *mystery* of course is to be regarded as entering into its constitution. The working of God's Spirit is indeed universally something mysterious, the action of a higher world on the sphere of our common natural life; but the grace of the sacrament in this respect is just like all other grace. To dream of it as mystically present at all in the sacraments themselves, is a superstition that ends legitimately at last in Rome.

Such in a general light, we say, is the shape given to the sacramental theory of the Reformed church in this Princeton analysis, by way of counter statement to the view taken of it in the Mystical Presence. It will be seen, that the two representations are indeed materially different, and that the difference regards points of no common interest and consequence. The statement and counter statement are fairly and completely at issue on the following particular heads, the one denying what is by the other affirmed.

1. The analysis before us grounds itself, as we have seen, in the assumption that the Calvinistic conception of a life-giving virtue extending itself from Christ's body to the souls of his people, never entered constitutionally into the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's supper, as distinguished from the Lutheran and Roman; that it is at war intrinsically with the general Protestant creed, and particularly with the doctrine of justification by faith; that Calvin himself, in his better moments, treated it as a practical nullity; that it was always only an outward and foreign element in the theology of the Reformed church generally, kept up to save appearances towards those without, rather than to satisfy the heart and soul of the church itself; and that it gradually fell away therefore from the doctrine altogether, died out of it, and thus left it in its proper pure original and distinctive form, as held by the Puritan world at the present day. All this we broadly and firmly deny. There is no inward contradiction between the two views of the christian salvation, which are here taken to stand in such relation. The life of Christ is the true and real basis of his sacrifice, and so the natural and necessary medium of communion with it for the remission of sins. This Calvin saw clearly, and urged ac-

cordingly the vivific side of the christian mystery always as the proper complement of the sacrificial. From this order of thought, he never swerved in the least; and so far was he from dropping it to please the Swiss, as here pretended, that we find this very order, and no other, settled with general consent, under his auspices, as a true and right expression of the Reformed faith universally. We meet it in all the standard confessions of this faith, in the latter part of the sixteenth century. It is distinctly recognized in the whole sacramental controversy of the same period, under such symbolical view. That a change has taken place in later times, is not denied. But this, we contend, has been for the worse and not for the better, so far as the idea of Christ's life in the sacrament has come to be divorced from the idea of his death. It is no growth, no development of the true sense and import of the doctrine as it stood in the beginning, but the distortion of it rather into a different import altogether. The two sides in question entered organically into the contents of the old doctrine. With their divorce, the idea of the sacrament itself is no longer the same. We have in truth under this name a different conception generally, from what it is made to be by the older view. Here is the root of all the other variations and issues, that enter into this historical controversy.

2. According to the same analysis again, the Reformed doctrine excluded the reality of Christ's presence from the sacrament, (save as he is everywhere present in his divine nature separately considered,) resolving it altogether into a simply mental presence, as distinguished from every sort of local or material contact. This we deny. The Reformed doctrine did indeed reject the last; but not in such a way as to make the other its only and necessary alternative. It asserted always a real presence, not simply as an object of thought or intelligence on the part of men, but in the way of actual communication on the part of Christ; a presence not conditioned by the relations of space, but transcending these altogether in a higher sphere of life; a presence, not material, but dynamic, like that of the root in its branches, and only the more intimate and deep by its distance from all that belongs to the experiment of sense.

3. The Reformed doctrine, we are told still farther, recognized especially no participation of believers in the human side of Christ's life; the reference to his flesh and blood has no significance in this view, but must be taken as a bold metaphor simply, setting forth the thought of our participation in the benefits procured by his bloody death upon the cross. This again we deny. The doctrine in question never set aside the true mean-

ing of the incarnation in any such Gnostic style. It made Christ to be a fountain of life for the world; and the immediate seat of this grace it represented always to be his human nature. Here it was regarded as coming to its primary revelation, for the use of the race at large; in which view, his flesh is taken to be the medium truly of life as well as righteousness, (life we may say in order to righteousness,) for all his people. They participate in the vivific virtue of his humanity; and in such high mysterious sense may be said actually to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, as the antidote of death and pabulum of immortality.

4. The Princeton analysis finds in the intervention of the Holy Ghost as constantly affirmed in the Reformed doctrine of the eucharist, a full exclusion of Christ's proper presence, especially of his presence under any human view; the stress laid on the agency of the Spirit is taken to mean clearly, that no communication is to be thought of in the case with the true and proper life of the Saviour himself. But this whole construction, we contend, is false and wrong. The intervention of the Spirit, in the old Reformed doctrine, stands opposed only to the idea of all action that falls within the sphere of mere nature, and was never designed to be set in this way over against the reality of Christ's presence. On the contrary, the mystery of the transaction is taken to lie especially in this, that in a mode transcending the experience of sense, by the mirific power of the Holy Ghost, the life-giving virtue of his flesh and blood is made to be dynamically at hand, in a real and true way, for the use of his people.

5. According to Princeton, the sacramental doctrine of the Reformed church knows nothing of an efficacious virtue in the holy sacraments themselves; the relation between them and the grace that may go along with them in another form, is taken to be altogether outward and loose; they point to it only like dead finger-boards, or as signs in algebra, giving notice of truth which is not in themselves, and that can have no presence save by the mind and will of those who are led to think of it in this way. We affirm on the contrary that the Reformers, with the whole ancient Church, acknowledge a real conjunction between the outward form of sacraments and their inward grace. The latter was taken to belong to their very constitution as truly as the first. That the union between them could not be regarded as physical or magical, was not felt to set aside at all its actual force. It was still held to be mystically sure and firm. The idea of a sacrament embraced both, the terrene side having its



necessary complement always in the celestial. Sacramental grace thus was no fiction. It lay with objective force in the solemnity itself; not of course in the outward elements or signs in themselves considered; but in the transaction taken as a whole. How far it might take effect on the subject, would depend still on the posture in which it should be received; but this posture was not to be confounded with the grace itself. This must be held to have an actual exhibition in the divine transaction, whether met with a right reception or not.

6. In robbing the Reformed doctrine of this conception of objective grace in the sacraments, the analysis before us finally strips it at the same time of all mystical character; since in such view no significance belongs to any institution of the sort, other than what the truth of the gospel carries with it in its general form. But this, we contend is to wrong the doctrine, as it comes before us in the sixteenth century. The faith of the Reformed church in the beginning, no less than the faith of the Lutheran church, saw in the Lord's supper the presence of a heavenly mystery; something more in this respect than the high nature of the truth here represented, under its general form; something different from the word, in no connection with such solemnity. An inward bond was acknowledged to hold, by the power of the Holy Ghost, between the visible and invisible sides of the holy transaction. It was allowed to carry in it thus a mystical force, a meaning above sense and natural reason, to which especially faith was encouraged and required to have regard in using it as a medium of worship.

We are now prepared to pass on to the trial of these points of controversy, at the bar of history. This will not require however an examination of evidence for each question separately taken. The several questions run more or less together, and gather themselves up at last to some extent in the first; so that in showing the true sense of the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's supper with regard to this, we in a great measure settle its meaning at the same time in regard to all the rest. Or rather the settlement of the first point is so connected with what is true in regard to the others, that it can be reached only by bringing this at the same time continually into view.

## III.

## HISTORICAL TRIAL.

Dr. Hodge is right in saying that the Reformed doctrine of the eucharist shows two phases, in the sixteenth century, as taking its complexion sometimes from the atoning efficacy of Christ's death, and at other times from the vivific power of his life. But he is wrong when he conceives of these two views as bearing at best only an outward and temporary alliance in the same system, and sinks the last into a character of merely accidental importance as compared with the first. The Reformed doctrine starts in Switzerland under the first aspect, but completes itself finally, through Calvin, under the second; not in such a way as to drop the old view, but so as to bring it to its full significance, by joining it to its proper basis in the other. *This union of the two views forms the true sacramental creed of the Reformed church, as it appears in all the later confessions.* It is the misery of our modern divinity, on the other hand, that it has so widely fallen away again from this divine synthesis, sundering the atonement of Christ from its necessary ground in his life, and then arraying the one against the other as though they were opposite and rival powers. For what less than this is it, when we hear it gravely asserted, that the doctrine of a life-giving power mysteriously flowing from Christ's person, as taught by Calvin, is incompatible with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, and on this account could not hold its place, as a foreign element, in the faith of the Reformed Church! Alas, for the memory of Luther, that *he* should not have understood better the sense of his own great article of a standing or falling Christianity.

The Princeton view, as we have seen, bases this representation not so much on history as on its own sense of theological propriety. It is first settled, that the two interests here distinguished are of contradictory character; that "the higher authority is certainly due to the doctrine of sacrificial efficacy;" that the other idea was a foreign element in the system, which never entered truly into its life, and *therefore* in the course of time died out of it altogether: and then the voice of history is construed in obedience simply to the demands of this hypothesis. It is assumed that no inward order requires to be acknowledged or considered in the case; and witnesses are brought up accordingly and questioned in the most promiscuous style, as though any testimony seeming to carry the right sound might be at once

weighed against any other, without regard to dates or any relations whatever. But we have no right to treat the subject in this way. There is a history here, which we may not thus make or unmake at our theological pleasure. In the *Mystical Presence*, we have endeavored at least to do some justice to the actual relations of the age, by tracing the progress of the Reformed doctrine, from its somewhat confused incipient form in Switzerland, onward through the architectonic agency of Calvin to the complete character in which it appears in the later confessions. No attempt has been made to examine or refute this analysis; it is simply nullified, on the side of the counter statement, by convenient silence. We have no mind however to acquiesce in any such nullification; especially not in favor of a method, which ignores from the start the whole conception of anything like historical order or connection, in the progress of the subject with which it is called to deal. What we have to do with in the case before us, is not a collection of isolated notices merely, picked up like shells from the sea-shore of past time, but the living sense of history itself as the very image and echo of that great and wide sea from which it comes. We insist that this shall be taken as a whole, that it shall be allowed to carry in it under such view an objective order and method of its own, and that all parts of it shall be interpreted in obedience to this as the necessary measure of their true meaning and force. If there be no such order here in the nature of the subject itself, or if it may not be ascertained and understood, the inquiry in hand might as well be dismissed at once and in full as altogether without rational object or aim.

We return again then to the general view before asserted, as the only right order to be followed in the present historical discussion. Providentially we are now assisted and supported, on this field, by a new and most powerful ally, in whose favor we may well feel authorised to bespeak a more than common measure of attention, and to whose voice on this subject especially all are bound to listen with respect. We refer to Professor Ebrard, formerly of Zurich in Switzerland, now of Erlangen in Germany; the second volume of whose great work entitled, *Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl und seine Geschichte*, a recent publication, is devoted especially to the history and criticism of the sacramental controversy, as it was agitated in the age of the Reformation. Favorable notice is taken of the first volume of the work in the *Mystical Presence*, and a regret expressed at the same time that the second had not then made its appearance; as it might have served to relieve and facilitate the

investigations of this book, by its resources and results turned with more than usual learning in the same direction. It is on the whole well, however, that this was not the case. Exhibiting as it now does the results of a wholly separate inquiry, it is of so much the more force in favor of the cause, which it comes in thus as auxiliary evidence to establish and confirm. We need not say that it has been highly gratifying to us, to find ourselves so ably backed, in such independent style, from so respectable a quarter. Dr. Ebrard is indeed a German, which some may count an objection to his theological credit; but his nationality can not alter the nature of his actual merits in other respects. He belongs by birth and education confessionally to the Reformed church, as distinguished from the Lutheran, and is known to make common cause with it both in doctrine and worship. His scholarship is acknowledged on all hands as of the very highest order. He has made it his business moreover to study the subject here in hand, in the most full and patient use of all the original sources of knowledge, not to see how things *should* have been, but to learn of history how they were in fact. The result is the volume just mentioned, (800 pp. 8 vo.,) reproducing the sacramental life of the sixteenth century, as we have it exhibited in no work besides; and tracing in particular the rise and progress of the Reformed doctrine, in its relation to the high Lutheran, in such a way as to leave almost nothing to be desired in regard to the whole subject. The work is of truly classical authority and weight, for the field it is found to occupy. There is no other that can at all pretend to come into competition or comparison with it, in this view. This seems to be quietly acknowledged on all sides in Germany itself; and so far as we have seen, it has not been pretended in any quarter to call in question, either the fact of its learning, or the general truth and fairness of its historical statements. Such a book, the fruit of long and laborious study on the part of one of the most accomplished theological scholars of the age, and passing thus with universally acknowledged credit in the world of letters to which it immediately belongs, is not of course to be ruled out of the way by the mere flourish of a contrary hypothesis, resting on no scientific examination whatever. It comes before us in the form of true manly science, and nothing less than such science can have a right to confront it in the way of contradiction. It deserves in such case, as it claims and demands, a learned answer.

Now this work of Ebrard, thus critically thorough and complete, we take pleasure in saying, corroborates and sustains, with unanswerable evidence, every material historical position affirmed

in the Mystical Presence; and just as clearly, of course, convicts the counter statement arrayed against it from Princeton of error and mistake.<sup>1</sup> It may be understood accordingly, that we look to it, and make use of its assistance continually, in the conduct of the present argument. It insists throughout on the same order in the history of the Reformed doctrine, assigns the same central position to Calvin, finds the same sense in the confessional settlement that grew out of his agency and influence, brings the whole investigation in a word to the same conclusions and results. His work has served greatly to strengthen the force of the convictions we had reached before we saw it; and under its shelter now, and in its name, we feel ourselves authorised to assert them with a tone of more positive determination, than we might have felt it proper to employ under other circumstances.

In any true historical study of the case, it must appear at once that we have no right to mix and confound authorities, in the style of the Princeton criticism. It is plain that the sacramental controversy of the sixteenth century, comprehended in itself a movement or process, to which regard must be had continual-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Ebrard himself, since the Mystical Presence came into his hands, has acknowledged this full agreement with it, first in the way of private correspondence, and recently in a more public manner by a very favorable review of the book in Ullmann's "*Studien und Kritiken*"—republished in this country in Dr. Schaff's *Kirchenfreund* for May and June.—It is curious to consider in this case the difference of theological relations, between Germany and America. The positions taken and maintained in the Mystical Presence and in Ebrard's *Dogma vom h. Abendmahl*, are in all material respects the same. In Germany however they appear throughout in polemical reference to Lutheranism, and on this side only are the object of suspicion; while here in America *this* antagonism is found to be the next thing to zero, and all weight falls on the antithesis from the contrary side. So completely has our predominant Puritanism destroyed all sense for the old confessional issue of the Reformation, that even the Lutheran church itself of this country, could see in the views in question, for the most part, only a powerful leaning towards Puseyism and Rome. "The author of the Mystical Presence, (Dr. Ebrard tells us,) defends the conception of the *unio mystica* as a continuous central life-communion of Christ with us, and of the holy supper as an act of *renewal* for this perpetual life-communion, in substance thus the Melancthonian view, especially against the 'Lutherans' of N. America, just as the writer, (Ebrard himself,) has endeavored to maintain the same view in scientific opposition to the 'Lutherans' of Germany. But strangely enough! not the view of Luther, but Zuingli's view, is held up against him by the North American Lutherans, and he himself is charged by them, not with Zuinglianism, but with crypto-poperly!" It is set down as a curiosity accordingly, with an eye to Dr. Kurtz and the Lutheran Observer, that in the United States the *Reformed* must vindicate the real presence of Christ in the sacrament against the *Lutherans*; and possibly it may be so remembered also in time to come.

ly, to understand and explain properly either its earlier or later phases. We must not jumble together the beginning and the end, and then arrange all wilfully after any measure we may happen to prefer; but are bound rather to follow the life of the movement as it actually went forward, with due respect throughout to all relations both of time and place. The earlier Swiss confessions can never be allowed to stand parallel with the later Reformed symbols, (much less to take precedence of them,) without such violence to history as may be said to kill it altogether. It is arbitrary, in the extreme, to exalt the Consensus Tigurinus to the rank of a supreme law for the entire creed of the church. No less arbitrary is it, to question the right of Calvin to be regarded as the great organ, by which this creed came to its full and final expression. All history has but one voice here. Beyond every sort of rational doubt, Calvin *does* form the medium of clear transition, from the older Helvetic faith to a higher power, as we may call it, of the same faith as presented in the later confessions; *all* of which express here his theory, with most remarkable agreement, and can be rightly interpreted in no other sense. The only proper classification of the confessions, is into those before Calvin and those that follow; and the only proper relation between the two classes, is that which subordinates the first entirely to the second, as the acknowledged consummation at last of the whole confessional process. The earlier symbols lost their authority in fact, with the appearance of the later, Gallic, Scotie, Belgic, Second Helvetic Confessions, and the Heidelberg Catechism.

According to this division, it is true that the older Swiss doctrine of the Lord's supper lays weight mainly, (though not exclusively,) on the sacrificial interest in Christ, whilst it is in the later confessions mainly that we find urged also the idea of a participation in his life. The second view might seem in this way to have supplanted the first, rather than to have been expelled by it as a foreign element from the system. The truth is however, the two views stand in no such hostile and mutually exclusive relation to each other, as is imagined by Dr. Hodge. That they should seem to do so in *his* theology, only shows that this itself is something different from the old Reformed creed. With Calvin, the idea of a life-union with Christ stood not at all in the way of the sacrificial interest, which it had been the great object of Zuingli and the first Swiss divines generally to assert. On the contrary, that interest for him could not be properly supported in any other view; and it was his zeal for all that is precious in the doctrine of the atonement, along

with his zeal for all that is precious in the believer's union with Christ, which engaged him to insist on this last so constantly as the indispensable basis of the first. The merit of Christ was not, in his view, as it might seem to be for the view here opposed to it, a mere thought in God's mind to be set over to the credit of sinners in an outward way; it was something real and concrete, which as such could never be sundered from the life to which it belonged; on which account this life itself must be made to reach over to all who are to have the benefit of it, as the necessary and only bearer of such high grace. Christ *first*, and *then* his merit; the life of the Son of Man made ours, in order to a true and full interest in the wealth of this life; such was the steady, unvarying order of Calvin's creed, a hundred times repeated, from the commencement of his ministry to its close. And in this form, it passed into all the later Reformed Confessions; not with the sacrifice certainly of the old Zuinglian way of looking at this subject; but so, at the same time, as to carry this forward to its full sense, by coupling it with the idea of the mystical union, completing thus the whole doctrine in the proper combination of its two different sides.

#### *Zuingli and Luther.*

Both of these great men were led to take their position in regard to the Lord's supper, in an independent way, and without any reference on either side to the other. The view of Zuingli was called out primarily, in opposition to the Roman doctrine of the mass, and had regard to the general act of the church in the sacramental solemnity, rather than to its power inwardly for the individual worshipper. Is the Lord's supper in itself a true sacrifice for sin, repeating perpetually the propitiatory act of Christ's death? To this question Zuingli answered, against the Romanists: No; it is simply a memorial or *sign* of the one christian sacrifice originally made on Calvary. In such reference, of course, the answer was correct. The eucharist does not repeat, but only commemorates, Christ's death. Zuingli was right too in referring the ordinance, as he did, to the idea of the atonement, as the great object to be apprehended in order to our salvation. The words: This is my body *broken*, and my blood *shed*, do look undoubtedly, in their direct sense, to Christ on the cross. We are saved by the merit of his death, made ours by faith. But the question still remains: *How* come we to have such part in Christ's death?

Luther, by his whole nature and inward history, had his mind

turned more to the question: What is the significance and value of the Lord's supper for the subjective life of the particular communicant? Hence his tendency was, from the start, to lay emphasis on the idea of a communion in it with Christ's life, rather than with his death. He made large account also, of course, of the sacrificial side of Christianity. But this was appropriate through the ordinary actings of faith in his view, as something purely objective, in opposition to all personal activity in the way of merit, as taught by Rome. In proportion, however, as objective and subjective were thus held asunder, faith coming to no real union with the life of its object, in the reception of Christ's righteousness, it became the more necessary with him to provide for this union, (*felt* to be indispensable to all true salvation,) in a different way; and hence he was led to resolve it into another order of grace altogether, secured through the mystery of the holy sacraments. The Lord's supper especially became for him the medium of a direct communication with what might be considered the outward person of Christ; and he was led to refer it accordingly, not to his death so much as to his life, and so of course to this only under its present glorified character. With such inward frame, he fell into collision first with the wretched rationalism of Carlstadt; a man, with whom, to their credit be it spoken, the Swiss divines never made common cause. Against his shallow destructional spirit, Luther stood forward, as against the whole tribe of the Anabaptists also, in an earnestly and severely conservative tone. The idea of a real life-union with Christ in the Lord's supper, as it had been held by the holy Catholic Church from the beginning, he made to be just as necessary to Christianity as the idea of justification by faith without works. In all this however, laudable as his zeal was in its own nature, he was naturally brought to overlook too much the other side of the sacramental transaction, its reference namely to the atonement. The idea of Christ's death here was thrust aside, to make room for the idea of his glorified life.

Thus differently conditioned by their different rise and growth, the Zuinglian and Lutheran views came at last, a. 1526, to a direct and open conflict. This went forward actively afterwards, with much more dignity on the side of Zuingli than on that of Luther, till the parties were brought finally to a personal meeting, a. 1529, in the memorable conference at Marburg.

This whole controversy was very important, as opening the way for a deeper apprehension of the sacramental question in a following period. It is easy to see, however, that in itself it did not bring this question to its true ground. Both Luther and



Zuingli were to a certain extent right in their different positions; while, on the other hand, both became wrong again, by refusing to see and acknowledge the truth that lay on the contrary side. Luther had good reason to insist on the idea of a real life-union with Christ in the sacrament; but he had no right to deny, at the same time, the direct reference it bears to the sacrificial value of his death. Here palpably Zuingli showed himself more sound than his opponent, by intoning as he did the commemorative relation of the ordinance to the broken body and shed blood of the Redeemer, and insisting on a metaphorical sense in the words of institution. But he had no right, on the other side, to press this view, at the cost of the mystical union. To such extreme antagonism, however, the controversy, as in all similar cases, naturally tended throughout; and we find both parties accordingly, at the Marburg conference, as also more or less before, firmly planted on their opposite portions of truth, in the way of abrupt contradiction, as though one must be necessarily all right and the other all wrong.

How far Zuingli may have had a correct apprehension of the life-union of believers with Christ, is not clear. Dr. Ebrard, who shows himself throughout his great admirer and zealous apologist, puts him in this respect on higher ground than we have assigned to him in the Mystical Presence.<sup>1</sup> His idea is that

<sup>1</sup> The view of Zuingli, with regard to the Lord's supper, is not always consistent with itself. At times, he appears to take the proper ground, as afterwards more clearly established in the Reformed church; and it may well be doubted whether he could have been deliberately satisfied at all with the poor, bald conception, which is too often made to pass under his name at the present time. Still it must be confessed, that his theory of the sacraments, altogether, was too low, as compared with the doctrine of Calvin for instance, or the Heidelberg Catechism; and in some cases he allows himself to speak of them in a way that sounds perfectly rationalistic. He tells us indeed: "Verum Christi corpus credimus in Cœna sacramentaliter et spiritualiter edi, a religiosa, fidei et sancta mente;" but in the same connection resolves all into the most common moral influence. For the sacraments have their value and efficacy, he says, in this, that they are venerable institutions of Christ,—that they are testimony to great facts,—that they are made to stand for the things they represent and to bear their names,—that these things are of vast worth, and reflect their own value on their signs, as a queen's wedding-ring, for instance, is more than all her other rings however precious besides,—that there is an analogy or resemblance between the signs and the things they signify,—that they serve as sensible helps to our faith,—and that they have, finally, the force of an oath. See his *Clava Expos. Fidei*, addressed to the king of France shortly before his death, and published afterwards in the year 1536; quoted by *Hospinian*, II, p. 239-241. "Credo, omnia sacramenta tam abesse, ut gratiam conferant, ut ne offerant quidem aut dispensent." *Ad Car. Imp. Fidei Ratio*—"Sunt sacra-

Zuingli all along regarded an inward union with Christ's life, as the necessary foundation of all the grace that is brought nigh to us in the Lord's supper, and that it was only his fear of losing the other interest that led him, in the pressure of controversy, to thrust it more and more out of sight. How precisely this may have been, we will not pretend to say; Ebrard brings forward some strong passages; it must be confessed, from his earlier writings, in support of what he supposes; and it would be a great satisfaction certainly to have the point fully established, in favor of a man whose memory has so many claims on our affectionate respect. There is much, however, in the case to create perplexity and doubt, and it is not easy to forget the unfavorable judgment given of him by Calvin. But so much in any view we owe to his great name, not to estimate his position from relations that come into view only after his death; but to take him as he stood, in the first stadium of the sacramental controversy, and entangled in the false antithesis or issue, (*Gegensatz*), which it carried in his controversy with Luther. As we have no right to burden a father of the third century, for instance, with christological consequences that hang on new issues created in the fourth, so also it is unbecoming to saddle Zuingli with sacramental consequences, that come fairly and fully into view, only under a wholly new phase of the controversy in the days of Calvin and Joachim Westphal. The Calvinistic issue was never clearly presented either to him or Luther. Had it been exhibited in full form at the conference at Marburg, it is by no means improbable that it would have brought both these patriarchs of the Reformation to join hands on the same ground; unless indeed the pride of *committal*, strong as we all know even in partially sanctified minds, might have stood in the way. Perhaps, however, the process of the controversy itself required that it should be otherwise. That first abrupt antagonism was itself needed, to make room for the deep irenic view that followed. Still it is consoling to know, that neither Zuingli nor Luther ever distinctly negated the sacramental doctrine of Calvin; for

menta signa vel ceremoniæ—quibus se homo *ecclesie* probat aut candidatum aut militem esse Christi, redduntque *ecclesiam* totam potius certiozem de tua fide, quam te."—*De Vera et Falsa Rel.* This is low enough, certainly, and in full contradiction to the true Reformed doctrine. Calvin went so far as to call it *profane*. See quotation from a letter to Viret in *Henry's Leben J. Calvin's*, vol. I., p. 271: Nunquam ejus (Zuinglii) omnia legi. Fortassis sub finem vitæ retractavit et correxit, quæ primum invito exciderant. Sed in scriptis prioribus memini, quam *profana* sit ejus de sacramentis sententia.—*Myst. Pres.* p. 64.

it was not properly at hand to them, for any such purpose. Zuingli, in this view, is no proper representative of the low rationalistic theory of the Lord's supper, which is now so widely prevalent in his name. It may indeed be questioned, whether he could ever have been satisfied to acknowledge it as his own. Our full persuasion is rather, that most of this modern thinking, as familiarly illustrated on all sides, finds its true historical type, not in genial faith of the great Swiss Reformer at all, but in the far less respectable spiritualism of Andrew Bodenstein Carlstadt.

### *Bucer and the Wittenberg Concord.*

The Marburg conference seemed, in one view, to be a failure. Luther and Zuingli parted, as they met, without agreement, each to appearance more firmly fixed than before in his own mind. In another view, however, the occasion was of vast importance. It made the parties better acquainted with each other than they had been previously. It brought the old controversy to its utmost tension; and in doing so opened the way for a salutary remission and pause, in which room was found for a new and better view of the whole question to take root extensively in the mind of the church. It is remarkable, that both Oecolampadius and Melancthon, from this time, seem to have modified considerably their previous theories, approaching each other on what was felt to be deeper ground. Evidently indeed, in different directions, both in Germany and Switzerland, a tendency was at work towards a conception of the sacrament, which promised finally to reconcile and unite the interests so long divided in this unhappy conflict. Even Luther himself showed signs of being at least wearied with the strife, and in the end carried his concessions in favor of union much farther, than could have been expected of him at an earlier day.

The divines of Strasburg, with the excellent Bucer at their head, were particularly active in seeking such a reconciliation. Placed by geographical position *between* Saxony and Switzerland, and in intimate friendly communication with both, they were led to assume also, almost from the start, a sort of middle ground in the sacramental controversy, on which it became their great interest and endeavor subsequently to effect a junction of the Lutheran and Zuinglian views. Unfortunately, however, they had no clear insight into the nature of the real point of difference between these views, and the true sense of their own position as including in fact a real advance of the whole question to new and higher ground. So instead of addressing them-

selves to the business of an *inward* settlement of the difficulty, as they should have done, by proper exposition and criticism, we find them throughout laboring rather for a merely external reconciliation, in which the difficulty was to be simply hushed; or treated as though it did not exist. Bucer tried to persuade himself that both sides in reality meant the same thing, and then toiled heroically to bring them to the same opinion. The effort of course could not be successful; but it formed notwithstanding a vastly important act, in the progress of the great theological drama to which it belonged.

In the year 1530, the *Augsburg Confession* was formed. On the subject of the Lord's supper, it affirmed, in the tenth article, that "the true body and blood of Christ are actually present, taken and received, under the form of bread and wine," (that is, under *both* forms, and not simply the form of bread as taught by the Romanists,) in the sacred ordinance. It did not assert a local inclusion of the body and blood in the elements; avoided thus in truth Luther's conceit of an *oral* manducation; while, at the same time, it proclaimed, with proper antithesis to Zuingli's tendency to resolve all into a simply monumental character, the fact of an actually present fruition of the Saviour's mediatorial life.

Southern Germany at the same time, under the guidance particularly of Bucer, presented a separate confession, (the so called *Tetrapolitan*;) in which Christ is said to give in the sacramental mystery his true body and blood, "to be truly eaten and drunk as the food and drink of souls, by which they may be nourished into everlasting life." This at once raises the mystery distinctly into the sphere of the spirit, and corresponds fully with the view of Calvin. It expressed, however, only the sense of the Augsburg Confession itself, as it stood at least in Melancthon's mind; and we find the "four cities" accordingly admitted, on this basis, to the general Lutheran confederation.

Zuingli's life was brought to an untimely end, soon after, a. 1531, on the bloody field of Cappel. Luther was so affected with the intelligence, as he tells us himself, that his sleep was turned into a night of weeping and tears. Alas that he had not wept sooner, when challenged by the streaming eyes of Zuingli at their only meeting in Marburg!

Now followed, through a series of years, the well meant, but badly conducted, negotiations of Bucer, to effect a general concord. These we have not room here, of course, to follow in detail. First, it was necessary to satisfy Luther, that the *Tetrapolitan* Confession itself involved no essential variation from that

of Augsburg. Next we have Bucer, on his first campaign, a. 1533, in Zurich, trying to persuade the Helvetic divines, that they might easily come to a similar pacification. They were too honest, however, to fall in with his imagination that the difference could be thus reduced to nothing; and charged him with being unfair either to them or Luther, in pretending to agree with both. After proper preliminary preparations, we find him, a. 1535, again on the field; negotiating now with Melancthon and Luther; coming to the result finally of the "Declaration of Cassel," in which the bread and wine were said to be *exhibitive* signs involving, by *sacramental* union, the simultaneous presence of Christ's flesh and blood. Then came the third and last campaign, a. 1536, resulting in the celebrated Concord of Wittenberg. The object was first to unite the Helvetic Church in the Cassel declaration. Switzerland, at this time, was not itself of one mind. Nearest to Strasburg stood Basel, whose First Confession, as drawn up by Oecolampadius, contained in truth the very view of Bucer. Zurich was more disposed to adhere to the Zuinglian conception, though favorably inclined also to the project of union. Bern for a time clung most stiffly of all to Zuingli's particular stand-point, under the influence especially of Megander; a zealot on the Swiss side, who may be taken as a fair counterpart to Westphal subsequently on the Lutheran side. A strong counter influence, however, gained ground here also, more and more. Finally, Bucer and Capito were empowered to represent the general Helvetic church, and to negotiate on its behalf articles of agreement with Luther and the Saxon divines, on the basis substantially of the First Helvetic Confession published a short time before. This negotiation led to the Wittenberg Concord; a contradictory formula, which first denies the local inclusion of the body of Christ in the bread, and then asserts that it is truly received with it by unbelievers as well as believers.

To *such* a concord, of course, Switzerland could not consent; and all pains were taken to let the fact be known. A delegation waited on Bucer from Basel, to protest. Eight days he labored to satisfy them; but in vain. Grynæus told him plainly, that he wrested the sense of Luther in trying to bring it into harmony with that of the Helvetic church. Then came new public transactions in Switzerland; in which Bucer labored still in vain to reconcile the Swiss to his construction of the Wittenberg Concord. At last, it was determined to write to Luther himself on the subject, and get his sense as it were directly from his own mouth. Honest Helvetians! How little evidence we

see in all these transactions of a disposition to "conciliate Luther," at the cost of truth and sincerity, or to bend and strain their own true creed, as much as possible, "to meet the views of the Lutherans," or to frame confessions "for the express purpose of compromise;" according to the general charge preferred by Dr. Hodge, against the whole Reformed church of this period. Clearly their great care was to avoid every sort of misunderstanding, as well to shun even the most remote implication in what they conceived to be the great error of Luther's doctrine, the idea namely of anything like a local presence or oral manducation in the mystery of the holy supper.

In the letter to Luther now mentioned, the Swiss divines laid before him a copy of Bucer's exposition of the Concord, and declared that if *this* were its true sense, they were ready to accept its articles. Then, to cut off all possible mistake, they state their general creed, and their view of the Lord's supper in particular. In this sacrament, they say, "the main thing is God's gift, namely the body and blood of Christ, yea *the body which has been delivered to death for us, and the blood which has been shed on the cross to wash away our sins.*"—"We deny not that the body and blood of Christ are eaten and enjoyed, in the supper, as the food of souls and unto eternal life. But this have we with our predecessors denied, and deny it still to *this* day, that the body of Christ is eaten in itself corporeally or as flesh, or that he is everywhere present with his body in a corporeal and natural way."

This letter was carried to Luther by Bucer himself. His answer came nine months afterward; respectful and friendly; and, strangely enough, acquiescing in their explanation and position.

Thus the old controversy came to at least a sort of outward pacification, which continued in force subsequently for fifteen years. During this calm, time and opportunity were allowed for the quiet development of what may be denominated the Melancthonian and Calvinistic theory, in opposition to crass Lutheranism on the one side and crass Zuinglianism on the other. The way was already open, in different directions, for this auspicious advance. There was indeed a portion of the Swiss church, represented by such men as Megander, which was disposed to cling to the separate stand-point of Zuingli, even when it was becoming clear that it needed to be made complete, by admitting the presence of Christ's *life* in the sacrament, though not in Luther's sense; but the other deeper view, as held by men like Oecolampadius, Myconius, Grynæus, and we will add Bullinger also, and as we have it exhibited in the First and Second

Confessions of Basel, was gradually unfolding itself, at the same time, more or less clearly also, on all sides, in the general consciousness.<sup>1</sup> The Helvetic church is exhibited to us under an aspect of confusion, (not without some contradiction,) in the process of an inward transition towards the true Reformed creed as subsequently spoken with clear full voice; not of course with the abandonment of Zuingli's doctrine as absolutely false, but so as to save its true force rather in a higher conception and definition.

This is *not* the period then to which we are to look primarily, for finally definitive testimony in regard to the sacramental doctrine of the Reformed church in the sixteenth century. To make it the measure of interpretation for the period immediately following, is to do violence to all history. The church gain-

<sup>1</sup> The *First Confession of Basel* was published January, 1534, in compliance with Bucer's request, to show the world that the Swiss were not fairly liable to the reproach of "having the supper without Christ. It is supposed to have been the production originally of Oecolampadius, revised and improved by his successor Oswald Myconius. On the subject of the Lord's supper, it uses the following language:

"In the Lord's supper, (in which with the bread and wine of the Lord are represented and offered to us by the minister of the church the true body and blood of Christ,) bread and wine remain unchanged. We firmly believe, however, that Christ himself (ipsismet Christum,) is the food of believing souls unto eternal life; and that our souls, by true faith upon Christ crucified, are made to eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ; so that we, members of his body as of our only head, live in him, as he also lives in us; whereby we shall at the last day, by him and in him, rise to everlasting joy and blessedness."—*Art. 6.*

The Second Confession of Basel, more commonly known as the *First Helvetic Confession*, was framed by Bullinger, Myconius and Grynæus, a. 1536, under the appointment of an ecclesiastical convention, which had assembled in the name of the different Protestant cantons at Basel for this purpose; by whose authority also it was afterwards ratified and made public. Its language on the Lord's supper is as follows:

"Concerning the mystical supper we thus judge, that the Lord in it truly offers to his people his own body and blood, that is himself, to the end that he may live more and more in them and they in him. Not that the body and blood of the Lord are naturally united with the bread and wine, or locally included in them, or are made carnally present in any way; but that the bread and wine are, by divine appointment, symbols under which, by the Lord himself, through the ministry of the church, the true communication of his body and blood is exhibited, not as perishable food for the belly, but as the aliment of eternal life."—*Art. 23.*

This Confession was submitted to Luther, on the occasion which led to the Wittemberg Concord. Strange to say, he pronounced it orthodox; although it contradicts palpably enough his own system, and falls short even of the full force of the Reformed doctrine, as afterwards more clearly and successfully stated.

ed a new stadium, by the ministry of Calvin. He did not indeed create or originate its faith; but he was beyond all controversy, the organ or medium, by which it came at last to its full expression.

“To learn the true character of the eucharistic doctrine of the Reformed church in the sixteenth century, we must have recourse to the time when the doctrine had become properly defined and settled in the church itself. The representations of this period are not to be ruled and interpreted by statements drawn from an earlier day, but on the contrary, these earlier statements, springing as they do from a comparatively rudimental state of Protestant theology, must be of right interpreted and ruled by the form in which the doctrine is made to appear afterwards, when the same theology had become more complete. This later form of the doctrine moreover, as developed and enforced especially by Calvin, is the same which it is found to carry in the symbolical books of the church generally, and in this view again must be regarded of course as of paramount and exclusive authority in the present inquiry.”—*Myst. Pres.* p. 64–65.

In assigning so central and prominent a place to Calvin here, we follow no arbitrary choice simply of our own mind; as little as we could be fairly charged with doing so, in making General Washington the central figure in the war of our American Revolution. The one case is full as clear in the light of history as the other, and just as little open to any sort of scientific contradiction or doubt. No other construction can be entitled to the least historical respect.

With such preparation we pass on now to the doctrine of the mystical or spiritual real presence, as we find it fully proclaimed in the end by the great reformer of Geneva.

#### *Oecolampadius and Melancthon.*

We have glanced rapidly over the *first* section of the sacramental history of the sixteenth century, extending from the birth of the Reformation to the formation of the Wittenberg Concord, in the year 1536. The whole controversy, through this period, turned on the antithesis or issue first joined between Zuingli and Luther. The first, in opposing the mass, had been led to press the simply monumental side of the holy mystery; the second, by his inward and outward relations, had his mind more turned towards its mystical, directly life-giving value for the individual worshipper. Zuingli insisted on the *sacrifice* of Christ as the great object of appropriation in the ordinance;



Luther on the presence of his glorified *life*. Both had right on their side, so far as their main positions were concerned; but each fell into wrong again, in refusing to recognize and admit the truth maintained by the other. To save his conception, Luther required a sort of *outward* entrance of Christ's life into ours; it must be by the mouth, and independently even of faith. This Zuingli, with good reason, rejected. Such a participation seemed to him carnal and useless. What we need in Christ is his sacrifice already made for sin; this we reach by faith; which is the only organ of communication with him in the Lord's supper, as well as in all other acts of worship. The words of institution he made accordingly to be figurative; and in this he was right; they do refer certainly to the power of his death immediately, and not to the idea of his glorified life. Luther's exegesis here was always pedantic and violent in the extreme. But was it necessary for the two views absolutely to exclude each other?

The controversy, in this first form, in due time spent its force. We find it lulled to rest finally in the Wittenberg Concord. Zuingli had gone to his reward. Luther never came to a clear sense of the precise defect of his own system; but evidently he had some misgivings in relation to it, which prevented him from taking any firm stand against the new tendency, that was silently at work on all sides, during the latter part of his life.

In the mean time a deeper and better view of the sacramental presence was quietly striking its roots into the consciousness of the Protestant world, and mounting upwards to mature strength. This was not confined to any one section of the church, but comes before us rather as the spontaneous product of its general life, starting forth at various points from the fermenting process which had gone before.<sup>1</sup> We find it widely

<sup>1</sup> "We find thus, between the one-sided views of Luther and Zuingli, at many points, without concert, under different forms and by different authors, the appearance of a third way of looking at the Lord's supper; which holds fast on one side the *reality*, on the other side the *centrality*, of the communication Christ makes of himself in the sacrament, and rejects alike his reception by mere thought and his reception by the bodily mouth. This view forms the higher unity of the other two; as the truth of both is fully saved by its means. On one side, it carries out the proper sense of what Zuingli aimed at; for it starts from the exegetical basis, that the Lord's supper is designed to confirm the christian in the new covenant founded in Christ's *broken body* and *shed blood*; but it goes on still farther to the full evolution of the truth of which we have only the germ with Zuingli, that this *covenant* with Christ is no covenant in thought, but a covenant that stands in union and perpetually renewed communion with Christ's life. So on the other

active in the German church, under the banner of the Augsburg Confession. Its main representative here was Melancthon himself, the author of the Confession; and one striking evidence of it, is exhibited to us in the alteration introduced into the tenth article of this symbol, by his own hand. The alteration simply expressed the sense of the article, as understood by himself, in its first form; and that he was not singular at all in such view, appears from the fact that the alteration was at once very generally accepted as fully right and valid. And yet the article, so defined, makes no account of a local presence or oral communication whatever. It simply affirms the *fact* of a real participation in Christ's mediatorial life, without determining the *mode*. It soon appeared, that a large part of the Lutheran church rested in this Melancthonian view as the only proper sense of the Augsburg Confession. In the Helvetic church, as we have seen, there was a parallel movement, that served to bring gradually a very material modification of the Zuinglian doctrine. The significance of the eucharist as a memorial of Christ's sacrifice was still insisted on as at first; but attention was now turned besides, more than in the beginning, to the idea of a real participation in his life, as the necessary condition and support of the other interest. The question came into view: Admitting our communion with Christ here to be, not by the mouth but only by faith, not in the flesh but only by the Spirit, does it not still involve in this way an actual appropriation of the life or substance of his person, as the bearer of his merit and righteousness? How Zuingli might have replied to this question, sundered entirely from the old Lutheran antithesis, is not clear; it was not properly the issue on which he was called to pronounce. We know, however, how it was answered by Oecolampadius, in the latter part of his life. We know too, that this view, as expressed for instance in the First Confession of Basel, became always more and more predominant as the true sense of the original Helvetic faith.

side, it is a purification also of the proper sense of Luther; for it takes the doctrinal ground, that for the appropriation of Christ's merits mere subjective faith is not enough, but that it requires also real union with Christ; while however it goes beyond the dualistic distinction still made by Luther between such faith apart from the sacrament and a corporeal union in the sacrament, to the idea of *one*, neither merely spiritual nor merely corporeal but *psychically central*, union with Christ (embracing at once both body and spirit,) which begins in regeneration, and is of continuous character, but receives in the holy supper new advances by renewed real communication on Christ's side."—*Ebrard, vol. II. p. 435-436.*

As in the Lutheran church we meet afterwards an interest, led on by such men as Westphal and Hesshuss, which violently refused to quit the old Lutheran stand-point, even after it had become plain that it could be made complete only by being advanced to the ground occupied by Melancthon; so in the Swiss church also a like onesided tenacity of the past discovered itself, in men like Megander, against the corresponding advance of which we now speak. This gave rise to a good deal of confusion and contradiction. Megandrian Zuinglianism and Flaccian Lutheranism are the opposite sides of the old antithesis, refusing to follow now the stream of history towards a true union of these divided interests in a higher view. That higher view, as it comes out at last in its full proportions, may be denominated Melancthonian Calvinism.

Calvin did not create this system, and then convert the Swiss church to it as a new theory. Nothing can well be more unhistorical, than to conceive of the Helvetic divines, with Bullinger at their head, as standing, down to the time of the Consensus Tigurinus for instance, in the same relation precisely to the sacramental question, in which they stood at Zuingli's death. The question in fact was no longer the same, and as a general thing they were no longer on the same ground. Zuinglian still, so far as the old issue went, they felt very widely the necessity of so extending their system as to include in it the substance also of what had been contended for by Luther. In these circumstances it was, that Calvin, admirably formed for such service by the whole constitution of his mind, became the distinguished organ in God's hands for unfolding into clear and full statement the sense which the church was struggling to reach; all with so happy a success, that Zuinglianism was brought in a very short time to surmount itself completely in the true position of the Reformed church, as we have it embodied subsequently in all the symbolical books of that age.

"This view," says Professor Ebrard, "was not brought in, as modern polemics may represent, in the way of temporary compliance towards the Lutherans, as though the Reformed church had to thank the Lutheran for such a morsel of truth as she came thus to possess; but we find it, long before Bucer's negotiations, uttered independently by Oecolampadius in the *Confessio Mylhusiana*, as Calvin brought it with him independently also from France."

*Calvinistic Theory.*

Calvin published the first edition of his *Institutes*, a. 1535, in the twenty-sixth year of his age, and before he had come into connection with either the Lutheran or Helvetic system of thinking. Here we find very distinctly stated, the sacramental doctrine which he continued to hold to the end of his life. With Zuingli, he rejects every idea of a *local* presence, and places Christ's body circumscriptively at the right hand of God; but he will not allow this to stand in the way at all of a real communication of his mediatorial life to our persons. With Luther, he asserts an actual presence of Christ's life in the sacrament; but he will not admit the thought of any corporeal ubiquity for this purpose. The mystery transcends all the conditions of common natural experience; falls not within the sphere of sense; holds out of space and above it; and is not therefore to be apprehended or explained by the natural understanding. It is effected, superlocally, by the Spirit. Christ's flesh and blood are at hand, not in the bread and wine as such, but in the transaction; not materially or by mechanical contact in space, but *dynamically*, in the way of living substance and power; not for the outward man primarily and separately, as Luther contended, but for the *soul* (by no means to be confounded here with mere understanding or mind.) as the central life of the whole person, so as to flow out from this to the *body* also as the true pabulum of immortality. The circumscription of Christ's person, says Calvin, soaring in this thought above both Luther and Zuingli, is not such as to impose any restriction on his activity; "that he should not put forth his energy wherever he may please, in heaven or on earth; or exhibit himself as present in power and virtue; or be always at hand to his people; live in them, sustain, confirm, quicken and preserve them, as fully as though he were at hand in the body."<sup>1</sup>

It is easy of course, to turn all this into the common place thought, that Christ, by his Spirit or in virtue of his divinity, sways a universal empire in the Church from which his proper human life is excluded; but no one at all familiar with Calvin, can suppose *him* to be chargeable with any such frigid sense in

<sup>1</sup> Hoc regnum nec ullis locorum spatiis limitatum, nec ullis dimensionibus circumscriptum, quin Christus virtutem suam, ubicunque placuerit, in cœlo et in terra exerat, quin se presentem potentia ac virtute exhibeat, quin suis *semper adsit*, in iis *vivat*, eos sustineat, confirmet, vegetet, conservet, non secus ac si corpore adesset. Instit. ed. prim. p. 246; as quoted by Henry.

the use of such strong language. He means to assert a real presence of Christ's full mediatorial being, only under a super-local order of existence. Those who choose to do so, may pronounce this unintelligible mysticism; our business here is not to defend it, but only to represent it as a historical fact. And yet, why should it be deemed so incredible for Him, who is raised in our nature over all material limitations, (in the *full* sense of the eighth psalm, the whole world under his feet.) to reveal the force of his entire being wherever he may please? Have we not analogies enough even in our present natural sphere, to show that separation in space is no bar whatever to the most intimate and complete *dynamic* union? Is not the root of the tree *in* its branches, and the head of the body *in* its members, far more really than they could possibly be by any mechanical juxtaposition or conjunction? See *Mystical Presence*, p. 172-173. To the profound and comprehensive mind of the great christian philosopher, Leibnitz, this idea carried no absurdity or insuperable difficulty whatever. The true reconciliation of the two confessions, Reformed and Lutheran, he finds just in this; "that the substance of the body consists in its *primitive power*, active and passive, and that the immediate application of this power forms the *presence* of such substance, *even without dimensions*." It is a most low view of the body, in any case, to make it consist of a given quantum of matter in space; its fundamental character is found only in the psychic force which comes to its revelation in this form. So Calvin saw and felt; and in such view it is, that he rejects the crass notion of Luther; not to sunder the body of Christ from the mystery of the holy eucharist, but only to make the more sure of its presence in its true vital energy and virtue.

Soon after, a. 1536, we find Calvin settled in Geneva. A very important ecclesiastical convention, the so called *September Synod*, was held the following year, a. 1537, at Bern. On this occasion, the three Genevan divines, Farel, Calvin and Viret, presented their memorable "confession of faith in regard to the eucharist." It well deserves here our special attention. "The spiritual life which Christ bestows upon us," it is here affirmed, "consists not merely in this, that he vivifies us *by his Spirit*, but that by the power of his Spirit also he makes us to partake of

<sup>1</sup> *Pensees* de Leibnitz, Paris 1803, p. 106, as quoted by Ebrard: "que la substance du corps consiste dans la *puissance primitive*, active et passive, et que c'est dans l'application immediate de cette puissance que consiste la *presence* de la substance, meme sans dimensions."

his *life-giving flesh*, (*carnis suæ vivificæ*), by which participation we are fed unto everlasting life." This is the Calvinistic *mystical union*, as it enters into the general christian life. It holds only through the soul, as the proper centre of the new man, and is wrought by the Spirit in conjunction with the activity of faith; but it is notwithstanding a real making over of Christ's human life dynamically to his people, in such a way that this is carried out into their bodies also as the principle of the resurrection and the pabulum of immortality. How far this goes beyond the notion of the mystical union as now generally held, we need not say. Calvin shows here a clear sense of the central unity of our life, as embracing corporeity and spirituality at last in the form of a single fact; and it is only the stubborn dualism which too generally characterizes our modern thinking, that makes it so hard for many to get at his sense. Our union with Christ is not outward or mechanical; it rests in no local descent or contact; but it is in the fullest sense vital, and involves an actual organic reproduction or birth in us of his very life. So the confession goes on; "When therefore we speak of the communion which believers have with Christ, we mean that they *communicate with his flesh and blood not less than with his Spirit*; so as to possess thus the *whole Christ*." This is said to be clearly the sense of the Scriptures, and it is added: "Nor is it a small or common thing the apostle teaches, when he asserts that we are *flesh of Christ's flesh and bone of his bones*, but he so designates the *admirable mystery* of our communion with his *body*, which no one may adequately describe in words." All this, it is next said, requires no *local* presence; "for the efficacy of his Spirit is not so limited by any bounds, but that he can *truly copulate and gather into one*, things that are locally disjointed. We acknowledge accordingly that his Spirit is the bond of our participation in him"—not so however, let it be well noticed, as if the Spirit simply flowed here from Christ to us in an outward way, leaving *his* proper life behind, in the way represented by Dr. Hodge—"but so, that he *feeds us truly with the substance of the Lord's flesh and blood* unto *immortality* and vivifies us by *their* participation." Then comes the relation of the general mystery to the eucharist: "This communion of his flesh and blood, Christ *offers and presents* in his holy supper, under the symbols of bread and wine, to all who rightly attend upon it in its proper character." Here is

1 Vitam spiritualem quam nobis Christus largitur, non in eo duntaxat sitam esse confitemur, quod spiritu suo nos vivificat, sed quod spiritus etiam

the objective force of the sacrament, recognized in full. It is a real *act*, on the side of Christ. Along with the outward service, proceeds an inward divine mystery, *actus in actu*, of which the outward is to be regarded as the symbol and pledge. Christ "offers and presents," in a real way, the very thing, (*viz.*, the living and vivific virtue of his flesh and blood,) which the elements of bread and wine externally represent.

This confession is exceedingly important. It was presented to a synod of the Helvetic Church, fully alive on all sides to the bearing and force of its several positions, and by no means disposed to fall blindly over into Luther's arms. A strong Megandrian interest prevailed in Bern, and just at this time no small amount of prejudice was roused by the negotiations connected with the Wittenberg Concord. Bucer and Capito found it necessary to attend the Synod, in their own defence. The subject led to large discussion and debate. Such, however, was the prevailing tendency, that in the end the scale turned, even here in Bern, in favor of Bucer's view. Megander felt himself defeated. He had formed a Catechism, in which the Lord's supper was declared to be a mere *memorial* of Christ's death; this the Synod ordered to be changed; and another section was substituted for this part of it accordingly, not long after, composed by Bucer. "The epidemic of Bucerism," it was said complain-

sui virtute carnis suæ vivificæ nos facit participes, quæ participatione in vitam æternam pascamur. Itaque cum de communione, quam cum Christo fideles habent, loquimur, non minus carni et sanguini ejus communicare ipsos intelligimus, quam spiritui, ut ita totum Christum possideant. Siquidem cum asserte testetur scriptura, carnem Christi vere nobis esse cibum, et sanguinem ejus vere potum, ipsis vero nos educari oportere constat, si vitam in Christo quærimus. Jam nec exiguum quiddam aut vulgare docet apostolus, cum nos carnem de Christi carne et ossa de ossibus ejus esse asserit, sed exitium nostræ cum ipsius corpore communionis mysterium ita designat, quod nullus verbis satis pro dignitate explicare queat. Ceterum istis nihil repugnat, quod Dominus noster in cælum sublatus, localem corporis sui præsentiam nobis abstulit, quæ hic minime exigitur. Nam utcumque nos in hac mortalitate perigrinantes in eodem loco cum ipso non includimur aut continemur, nullis tamen finibus limitata est ejus spiritus efficacia, quin vere copulare et in unum colligere possit, quæ locorum spatia sunt disjuncta. Ergo spiritum ejus vinculum esse nostræ cum ipso participationis agnoscimus, sed ita, ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vera ad immortalitatem pascat, et eorum participatione vivificet. Hanc autem carnis et sanguinis sui communionem Christus sub panis et vini symbolis in sacrosancia sua coena offert et exhibet omnibus, qui eam rite celebrant juxta legitimum ejus institutum.—Henry, *Leben Calv. I. Eilage 5*. How any scholar can pretend to question Calvin's faith in a real life communication for believers in Christ's humanity, in the face of such a passage, it is not easy to comprehend.

ingly by Megander and his friends, "spread daily more and more." The Genevan divines stood openly of course on the same ground. Bucer and Capito subscribed their eucharistic confession, and it became, in fact, an official act of union, "between the Strasburgers and the Swiss."

### *Calvin at Strasburg.*

Soon after, we find Calvin fairly in the bosom of the Lutheran church itself. His banishment from Geneva, a. 1538, led him subsequently to Strasburg, where he was settled as minister and theological teacher for a period of between two and three years. Here of course he signed the Augsburg Confession.<sup>1</sup> It is not clear, whether in its altered or unaltered form; but this is a point of no consequence whatever, as the first only expressed the sense which was attached to the last by Melancthon himself. Calvin thus had no difficulty with either. He stood on common ground with Melancthon, Bucer, and a wide section of the Lutheran church besides, and considered himself of the same confession without the least force put on his previous convictions. The case required no explanation, and cost no sort of trouble. And yet, as we have seen, the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession explicitly affirms, that the body and blood of Christ are truly presented, in the Lord's supper, along with the bread and wine. Did Calvin play the hypocrite here? Or was he the clever church politician simply, paying outward court to Lutheran prejudice and power? It needs some courage, to say or think anything so bold as that.

More than this. During his settlement at Strasburg, Calvin is found entering, without the smallest embarrassment, into ecclesiastical relations and transactions of a wholly Lutheran character, as one fully naturalized and at home in his new church sphere. In 1539, he attended the Frankfort convention; in 1540, the conferences at Hagenau and Worms; in 1541, the transactions at Ratisbon; as a delegate from the Strasburg church; and was looked upon as altogether Lutheran, no less than Bucer himself. At Frankfort, he met first with Melancthon, and had full communication with him on the subject of the Lord's supper. "He assured me," says Calvin, "that he had no other

<sup>1</sup> *Nec vero Augustanam confessionem repudio, cui pridem volens ac lubens subscripsi, sicut eam author ipse interpretatus est.—Letter to Schaling, a. 1557.*



view than the one my words expressed." The two great men entered into a bond of the most intimate friendship, which lasted through life; with the full understanding that on the mystery of the real presence they thought alike.

So little however did Calvin find it necessary to conceal or modify his sacramental doctrine in Strasburg, in favor of Luther's theory, that we find him here writing and publishing on the whole subject exactly as before. The second edition of his *Institutes* was issued from this place. Here also he published his *Catechism*, in its last complete form; also his admirable tract *de Cœna*, the great object of which was precisely to carry the whole question above the old Zuinglian and Lutheran antithesis, to the higher form in which this had come to an end in his own mind. Not the shadow of a wish do we see to *strain* the doctrine as he held it, either towards one side or the other.

The Catechism repeats in full the view presented at the September Synod in Bern. Quotations here would carry us too far. The christian life is represented as holding always in the form of a mystical union with Christ, accomplished by the Spirit through the soul or central principle of our two-fold life, but extending from this into the whole man; in the Lord's supper, this communication, always only partial in our present state, is *confirmed* and *increased*; the bread and wine are symbols, of no power aside from the action of the Spirit, but along with them is offered really and truly the life-giving virtue of Christ's flesh and blood; they are not merely *significative*, but also *exhibitive*, signs; whence the catechumen is made to say: "I do not doubt, but that as the words and signs testify, so he makes us *partakers also of his substance*, that we may coalesce with him into one life." By substance is meant of course, not matter in any sense, but the virtue and active energy in which pre-eminently, Calvin supposes Christ's glorified body to consist. All again as a mystery, transcending the categories of space and sense; "by the mirific and hidden power of his Spirit, for whom it is not difficult to bind together things which are otherwise locally far apart." We must look then not to the bread and wine as such, but to Christ in heaven; not however in the flat sense of reaching him only by our subjective thought and feeling; and still less in the dream of anything like a real local ascent of the soul to his presence, such as some have charged Calvin with teaching, to make his theory absurd; but in such a way as to expect from him superlocally, and not from the local signs in any material mode, the objective grace of the holy sacrament, a true participation namely, by the mirific power of the Holy

Ghost, in the very substance of Christ's life. Such is the clear sense of Calvin's Catechism.

The tract *On the Supper*, (de Cœna,) is only a more extended and minute exposition of the same doctrine. See *Calv. Opp. T. IX. p. 1-9*. He blames both Luther and Zuingli, for pushing their separate views to an extreme. The elements are signs; but they are sure pledges also of the accompanying presence of the things they represent. Christ hangs out here no *false colors*. "We have a very fair parallel, in an analogous case. When the Lord was pleased to manifest his Spirit at Christ's baptism, he represented it under the figure of a dove. John the Baptist, narrating the event, says that he saw the Holy Ghost descending. If we look at it closely; we will perceive that he *saw* nothing but the dove; for the essence of the Holy Spirit is invisible. As he knew however that the vision was no vain show, but the most sure sign of the presence of the Holy Spirit, he hesitates not to say that he saw it, as having been represented in such way as the case allowed. So in the communion which we have in Christ's flesh and blood, we must say, the mystery is spiritual, such as cannot be seen with the eyes nor comprehended by human understanding. It is shown to us accordingly by figures and signs that fall under the cognizance of sense, as is required by the imbecility of our nature; in such way however, that it is *not a naked and simple figure*, but joined also *with its own truth and substance*. The bread thus is of right termed Body; since it not only represents this, but actually offers it to our use." Could any statement well be more explicit and clear. Calvin employs the same striking parallel elsewhere also, to illustrate his view of the mystical or sacramental presence.

"Calvin rendered an incalculable service here to the church," says his biographer Henry, "in directing the attention of one wide section of it to the force and power of the Lord's supper, which some in Switzerland were disposed to turn into a mere commemoration. Millions of christians in the Reformed church owe it to him, that they have enjoyed the supper in its right sense, so as to partake in it of the true, spiritual, glorified Christ. His deep view moreover has almost everywhere become prevalent now in the Evangelical church." This last remark is made of Germany of course, and not of our evangelical American churches. It is somewhat queer, that the same number of the Princeton Repertory which sinks the Reformed doctrine of the

eucharist so low, in its review of the Mystical Presence, has an article highly commendatory of Calvin's Life by Henry.<sup>1</sup>

### *The Consensus Tigurinus.*

Such was Calvin in Strasburg. In 1541, he was restored again to Geneva. Switzerland, in the mean time, continued to rise more and more to the proper ground, in regard to the sacraments. Bern had come to stand in great part with Strasburg; Basel leaned strongly the same way; only the small territory centering in Zurich refused to obey the onward movement, and seemed disposed to stick in Megandrian Zuinglianism, as the absolute truth. Calvin undertook now to bring up this interest to the proper line, and to unite thus the whole Helvetic church in the same sacramental doctrine. In the face of such design indeed, an unfavorable reaction was created, towards the close of Luther's life, bearing strongly in the opposite direction. Still Calvin persevered mildly in his good endeavor. The case required, first of all, that he should come to a right understanding with Bullinger, the worthy and influential antistes or superintendent of Zurich. Bullinger held him in considerable suspicion, not knowing fully his sacramental views. This was allayed to some extent by proper correspondence. Finally, Bullinger invited him to a personal interview, on the subject, in Zurich. Calvin declared that no letter was ever more welcome to him than this; and two days after he was on his way to the place, in company with his friend Farel. The conference lasted several days, and resulted in the articles of the famous *Consensus Tigurinus*, which became now, a. 1549, the basis of agreement for the Swiss church in general.

These articles go as far as the case could possibly allow towards the Helvetic side, in the old controversy; exclude distinct-

<sup>1</sup> In this article the whole sacramental controversy of the 16th century is spoken of, as a foul excrescence simply on the Reformation; without the least sense apparently of its theological necessity in the life of the glorious movement itself; while Luther is said to have disgraced himself by his unexampled "revilings lavished on Zuingli and Calvin." Luther however never had any direct controversy with Calvin; on the contrary, he is reported to have expressed himself with regard to him, on meeting his earlier publications towards the close of his own life, in the most tolerant if not actually favorable terms. The Repertory has no right whatever to carry Zuingli's relations forward to Calvin; just as little as it has to assume either that the faith of Calvin stood in harmony here with its own; which, as we see, from Henry himself, was far enough from being the case.

ly Luther's local presence and oral communication; and lay marked stress on the sacrificial interest, as contended for by Zuingli. But it is not true that they involve, as ultra Lutherans have pretended, an abandonment of the ground previously occupied by Calvin himself in Strasburg and Geneva. On the contrary, they show the triumph of Calvinism over what was still defective in the old Swiss view. Zuinglianism here completes itself publicly, by associating with its primary position distinctly the enunciation of the sacramental *life* mystery, as the necessary basis of all interest in the *sacrifice* to which the transaction refers. It is Bullinger that rises above his old position, as Farel had done before, in free obedience to the superior mind of Calvin; not Calvin that descends, as the Princeton Review would seem to imagine, to common Megandrian ground. Every such supposition as this last is unhistorical in the extreme. It turns Calvin into either a fool or a knave. No one however can suppose him a fool; it was not possible for such a man to make so great a transition, and not be aware of the change, if it actually occurred. It comes to this then, that he played a false game either at Strasburg or Zurich. The case is of too grave a character entirely, to be resolved into holy policy and skill. But to say that Calvin played a part here, in such style, is just to pronounce him an unworthy hypocrite throughout. All can see where he stood before, and where he continued to stand afterwards. Even Dr. Hodge himself is forced to admit, that he attributed a mystical efficacy of some sort to Christ's body, which *he* cannot allow or comprehend. And yet he will have it, that this Consensus Tigurinus is down to a full level, with the sacramental faith of our modern American churches generally! If it be so, Calvin was a crafty jesuit indeed.

All that the case requires is, that the document should be interpreted according to the *usus loquendi* of the sixteenth century, and not after the sound it carries to merely modern ears.

The seventh article is quoted by Dr. Hodge in such a way as to obscure, (undesignedly of course,) its true sense. Among other ends of the sacraments, it is there said, "this one is the *principal*, that by them God may *attest, represent and seal to us* his grace. For although they signify nothing different from what is announced in the word itself, it is still a *great thing*, that they are set before our eyes as if *living images*, that may the better affect our senses by conducting as it were to the thing; while they bring to mind the death of Christ and all his benefits, that faith may be the more exercised, and *besides this confirm and ratify, as with seals*, what God had by his mouth de-

clared.”<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hodge refers the idea of *sealing*, no doubt, to the general grace of God as proclaimed in the gospel. But it lies in the whole doctrine of Calvin as elsewhere declared, and also in the phraseology of the age, that it should be taken in the sense of an authentication of what is at hand mystically in the sacramental transaction itself. The elements have not merely a doctrinal, but also a *pignoral* force, (like the dove in the Baptist's vision,) attesting the presence of Christ's life at the time, not locally but superlocally by the Spirit, for the fruition of all believing communicants. This accordingly is expressly asserted in the next article. “What the sacraments *figure* to our eyes and other senses, the Spirit truly works *within*, namely, that we first enjoy *Christ* as the fountain of all blessings, and then are reconciled to God by the benefit of his death, &c.”<sup>2</sup> All of course depends on the invisible side of the transaction; the elements are “*inanes larvæ*” separately considered, (and the Baptist's dove was no better;) but still the sacraments are *organs*, by which God works “*efficaciously*” where it seems good. Most plainly the Consensus Tigurinus understands by *signs, seals, fruition of Christ, &c.*, something far more deep and real than the simply mental process into which all is resolved apparently by Dr. Hodge.

<sup>1</sup> Art. VII.—Sunt quidem et hi Sacramentorum fines, ut notæ sint ac testerae Christianæ professionis et societatis sive fraternitatis, ut sint ad gratiarum actionem incitamenta et exercitia fidei ac piæ vitæ, denique syngraphæ ad id obligantes. Sed hic unus inter alios *praecipuus*, ut per ea nobis gratiam suam *testetur* Deus, *representet* atque *obsignet*. Nam etsi nihil aliud significat quam quod verbo ipso annunciat, hoc tamen magnum est, *subjici oculis nostris quasi vivas imagines*, quæ sensus nostros melius afficiant, quasi in rem ducendo: dum nobis Christi mortem omniaque ejus beneficia in memoriam revocant, ut fides magis exerceatur: *deinde*, quod ore *Dei renunciatum erat, quasi sigillis confirmari et sanciri*.

<sup>2</sup> Art. VIII.—Quum autem vera sint, quæ nobis Dominus dedit gratiæ suæ testimonia et sigilla, *vere proculdubio præstat ipse intus suo Spiritu*, quod oculis et aliis sensibus figurant Sacramenta: hoc est, ut potiamur Christo, tanquam omnium bonorum fonte; tum, ut beneficio mortis ejus reconciliemur Deo, Spiritu renovemur in vitæ sanctitatem, justitiam denique et salutem consequamur, simulque pro his beneficiis olim in cruce exhibitis gratias agamus.

Connect with this the immediately subsequent article, which clearly affirms an objective force in the sacrament to uphold and carry forward the life union of believers with Christ.

Art. IX.—Quare, etsi *distin uimus*, ut par est, inter signa et res signatas: tamen non *disjungimus* a signis veritatem; quin omnes, qui fide amplectantur illic oblatas promissiones, Christum spiritualiter cum spiritualibus ejus donis recipere, adeoque et qui dudum participes facti erant Christi, communionem illam *continuare et reparare* fateamur.

Dr. Ebrard goes into a particular review of the historical relations of the Consensus Tigurinus, and examines its several articles in detail, for the purpose of showing that it was in truth the triumph of Calvinism in Switzerland over all that Megandrian tendency, which in the name of Zuingli was actively at work, in certain quarters, to bring the whole idea of the mystical presence into discredit, by confounding it wrongfully with Luther's revolting dogma. The view that makes this document a sort of theological summerset in Calvin's history, (a plausible Lutheran in Strasburg just before and now in Geneva at once again a thorough Zuinglian,) betrays extreme ignorance, he thinks, of the entire course of facts belonging to the case. Calvin had distinctly in view throughout the object of winning the Swiss church, by mild negotiation, to the acknowledgment of what he conceived to be the true ultimate sense of its own doctrine, in opposition to Megandrianism; and he showed himself patient and conciliatory, for this purpose; but never in such a way as to change or conceal any essential part of the doctrine itself whose interest he was thus anxious to advance. He made open cause for instance, after his return to Geneva, (along with Farel and Viret,) with the leaders of Lutheranism in Bern *against* the Zuinglian extreme, which there threatened to carry all its own way; and this went so far, that Viret in Lausanne came near losing his credit with the Bernese magistracy just on its account. Calvin even found fault with the concessions made on the Lutheran side here, to secure toleration. "See to it," he writes to Viret, 23 Aug., 1542, "that there be no shrinking in such case from this testimony, that the communion which we have with Christ is not merely figured, but also exhibited, in the supper, and that not only *words* are there given us from the Lord, but the truth also and thing which they express; that this communion moreover is not *imaginary*, but such as involves a coalescence into one body and one substance with the head."<sup>1</sup> Again, in 1545, when the embers of the old controversy were made to glow again by Luther's rash passion, we find Calvin, always true to his own position, firmly interposing to rebuke the ultraism of both sides. Bullinger's answer is just as little pleasing to him,

<sup>1</sup> Hoc tamen velim tibi curæ esse, apud eum (the Dean of Lausanne) efficere, ut apud quoscunque loquatur, non dubitet hoc testatum relinquere, non modo figurari in Cœna communionem, quam habemus cum Christo, sed etiam exhiberi, neque verba illic nobis dari a Domino, sed veritatem ac rem constare cum verbis. Hanc porro communionem non imaginariam esse, sed qua in unum corpus unamque substantiam cum capite coalescamus.—Quoted by Ebrard, II. p. 490.

as Luther's attack. "The Zurichers may have had just cause for writing," he says in a letter to Melancthon; "but it had been better not to write at all than to write in such style. Their whole book, (by Bullinger,) is jejune and puerile; since in many things, with more pertinacity than learning, they not very modestly excuse and defend their own Zuingli, and at some points assail Luther without cause; while in the treatment of the main subject, that is in the very cause at issue, they conduct themselves in my judgment unfortunately. And yet you cannot think, what satisfaction they have with themselves, as though they had done their part excellently well." But Luther, he goes on to say, is still more in fault. "With what intemperance your Pericles is carried away in his fulminations! And this too, while *his own cause is not a whit better!* And what does he gain from raving in such style, unless to be set down by all the world as mad?" All this looks very little like truckling to either of the two extremes, between which Calvin always felt himself standing, on ground that placed him above both. He took pains to set himself in right view before the Swiss, by disowning the Lutheran consequences with which he was falsely charged; but in doing this, he showed no coquetry towards Zuinglianism. His correspondence with Bullinger is open and firm, in maintaining the proper points of his own doctrine. "When we say," he concludes in one case, "that we partake of Christ's flesh and blood as he dwells in us and we in him, and in this way enjoy all his benefits, what is there, I pray, either absurd or obscure in such language?" (Henry II. Beil. 18). A general synod was held at Bern, March 19, 1549. To this he forwarded *twenty articles* on the Lord's supper; which are found in full harmony again with what he had before published at Strasburg. His visit to Bullinger took place the same year, resulting as we have seen in the Consensus Tigurinus. Is it for a moment imaginable, that Calvin deliberately designed it to be a surrendry of his own previous doctrine in favor of Megandrian Zuinglianism? The whole character of the man forbids such a supposition. All historical documents show it to be false.

Ebrard's analysis of the Consensus brings out clearly the same result. The points of distinction in it from such Zuinglianism, are sufficiently plain. Some confusion is allowed at the same time to characterize the document at one point; which however Ebrard refers to the disturbing force of the doctrine of predestination, brought in unnecessarily to embarrass the sacramental doctrine in its proper form. "To affirm, (he says,) that Calvin accommodated himself to Zuinglianism, and relaxed

somewhat from his original view, is as we have well seen palpably untrue. As regards the point of difference with Bullinger, he did not yield an iota; that the earthly elements have no efficacy of themselves and by their own force, but are seals of a concurring operation from Christ, he had himself taught years before at Strasburg; he made not the least approach towards Zuinglianism, except in the way of *personal acknowledgment* in favor of its advocates and friends. Whilst for instance he had only two years before even heartily despised this whole way of thinking, he now saw that it had still something *true* for its object; that as the truth on Luther's side was opposition to *empty* figures, so the truth on the side of the Zuinglians was opposition to the *deification* of creaturely signs. This truth however, he had not first learned now himself from any such quarter, but had always possessed it before in his own doctrine. That he was led then to make concessions to Zuinglianism in any way, is a pure chimera!"

But we have a better witness here, than either Dr. Ebrard or any other modern critic, for the true meaning of this famous Consensus of Zurich. This is no other than Calvin himself, in his tract *Consensionis Caput Expositio*, (Opp. T. IX. pp. 653-659.) addressed to the Swiss churches four years after its appearance, for the purpose of explaining and defending it, against the assaults particularly of Westphal. "The sacraments," it is here explicitly declared, "are helps and media, by which we are either inserted into the body of Christ, or being so inserted coalesce with it more and more, till he unites us with himself in full, in the heavenly life."<sup>1</sup> We must "coalesce into Christ's body," to have part in his grace; he "diffuses his life into us, only as he is our head, from which the whole body," by joints and bands, increases and grows through all its members.<sup>2</sup> Christ truly acts what the signs show; it is no "theatrical process;" nothing is signified "which is not given."<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Adminicula et media vocantur, quibus vel inseramur in corpus Christi vel insiti magis ac magis coalescamus, donec solide nos secum uniat in cœlesti vita.

<sup>2</sup> Jam si quæritur, qualis ista sit communicatio, sic paulo ante a nobis erat descripta, ut fictitia et umbratilis dici nequeat: nempe, (quod etiam est proprium fidei munus ac perpetuum.) coalescere nos oportere in Christi corpus, ut gratiæ suæ effectus in nobis compleat: quia non aliter vitam in nos suam diffundit, nisi dum caput nostrum est, ex quo totum corpus compactum et connexum per omnem juncturam subministratiois secundum operationem in mensura cujusque membri augmentum corporis faciat.

<sup>3</sup> Primum quidem fatemur, Christum quod panis et vini symbolis figurat,



pledge is accompanied with the very thing it brings to view. It is no perception simply in the way of "thought or memory;" the "*flesh* of Christ is truly vivific;" life, from the fountain of the Godhead, is wondrously poured into it, (as a general reservoir for our fallen nature,) "from whence it flows unto us," by the superlocal or space-transcending power of the Holy Ghost, "so that we have with him one and the same life."<sup>1</sup> No crass carnal mixture is to be imagined here, of course; the mystery is allowed to be too sublime for our apprehension. He "transfunds into us the life-giving energy of his flesh;" as the vital heat of the sun enters really and truly into the vegetation that grows by its beams.<sup>2</sup>

"When they hear us confess on our side," it is said in this Defence of the Helvetic articles, "that the sacraments are neither empty figures, nor outward badges simply of piety; but *seals* of the promises of God; *attestations* of spiritual grace for cherishing and confirming faith; *organs* also by which God *efficaciously*, (efficaciter,) works in his elect; and that the signs thus, although *distinct* from the things signified, are still not *disjoined* from them and *separate*; that they are given to ratify and confirm what God has promised by his word, and especially to *seal the mysterious communication we have with Christ*: surely there is no cause left, for thrusting us into the rank of enemies. When, as I have said, their cry is on all sides that they wish only this doctrine to stand good, namely, that God employs the sacraments as helps for promoting and increasing faith, that the promises of eternal salvation are *engraven on them*, so as to be offered by them to our consciences, and that they are *not* empty signs, since God joins with them the *efficacy* of his Spirit; all these points granted, what is there to hinder now their cheerfully giving us their hand? And not to turn to secondary private authorities, *our readers will find in this Consensus all that is con-*

vere præstare, ut animas nostras carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potione alat. Facessat igitur putida illa calumnia, theatricam fore pompam, nisi re ipsa præset Dominus quod signo ostendit. Neque enim dicimus quidquam ostendi quod non vere detur.

<sup>1</sup> Carnem ergo Christi sine ullis ambagibus fatemur esse vivificam, non tantum quia semel in ea nobis salus parta est, sed quia nunc, dum sacra unitate cum Christo coalescimus, eadem illa caro vitam in nos spirat, vel, ut brevius dicam, quia arcana Spiritus virtute in Christi corpus insiti communem habemus cum ipso vitam. Nam ex abscondito Deitatis fonte in Christi carnem mirabiliter infusa est vita, ut inde ad nos fluat.

<sup>2</sup> In cælum ad se ita nos attollit, ut vivificum carnis suæ vigorem in nos transfundat, non secus ac vitali solis calore per radios vegetamur.

*tained in the so called Augsburg Confession, as published at Ratisbon, provided only it be not strained, through fear of the cross, to please the papists. The words are: In the holy supper, with the bread and wine are truly given Christ's body and blood. Far be it from us, either to rob the eucharistic symbol of its truth, or to deprive pious minds of such vast benefit. We say accordingly, lest our senses should be mocked with bread and wine, that to their outward figure is joined this true effect, that believers there receive the body and blood of Christ."*

Such is the view taken of the sacramental doctrine of the Consensus Tigurinus, by Calvin himself, the author of the instrument, and the best judge certainly of its true purport and sense. He finds it in full harmony with the Augsburg Confession.<sup>1</sup> Is it not strange now to hear Dr. Hodge say: "In these articles there is not a word, which any of the evangelical churches of the present day would desire to alter. We should like to print them all as the confession of our own faith on this subject!" Perfectly honest of course; but who can fail to see that the imagination has its birth in a theological consciousness, widely different from that which reigned in the Reformed church of the sixteenth century?

### *Calvin and Westphal.*

This brings us to what may be denominated the *Second Sacramental War* of the sixteenth century; to which the Consensus Tigurinus served in part as an outward occasion; although its true cause lay much deeper, in the bosom of the general Lutheran church itself. The issue here was widely different from the old antithesis between Luther and Zuingli. Both parties moved, to a great extent, under the common banner of the Augsburg Confession. The controversy lay between extreme Lutheranism on the one side, and the widely extended doctrine of Melancthon and Calvin on the other; forms of thinking,

<sup>1</sup>"By the terms of this agreement, it was now plain that the Swiss in the main matter were one with the Lutherans. For until this time there might be a doubt, whether they admitted in the supper a true substance of Christ's body and blood, but now doubt was no longer possible. A true presence and a real participation of Christ's body was settled. The difference regarded only the manner in which Christ is present, the Lutheran view binding the Lord's body or its substance by miracle to the sign, the Calvinistic making the believer rise to Christ to be united with him; this rising however was only metaphorical, as Christ is spiritually present."—*Das Leben Calvin's von Paul Henry, abridged edition p. 278.*

which had thus far felt themselves to have equal right in the bosom of the German church ; but whose difference came now to an open rupture, resulting finally in a formal separation under the distinctive titles of Lutheran and Reformed. We have given some account of the movement in the Mystical Presence, and also more fully in a small work on the History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism.

Westphal came out with a public assault on the Swiss churches, a. 1553. The next year a second pamphlet followed from the same violent pen. Calvin replied, with an exposition and defence of the Consensus Tigurinus. Westphal wrote again, a. 1555. Calvin's *Second Defence* appeared in 1556. The controversy thickened now on all sides. Calvin added, in 1557, his "*Last Admonition* to Joachim Westphal."

In these publications, we have in full again the very same sacramental doctrine he had taught before in Strasburg. It will be observed too, that all has regard to the Consensus Tigurinus in the way of vindication and commentary ; and the case is made still more interesting from the fact, that the very same use seems to have been made of this document by Westphal, only with a different view, that is now made of it by Dr. Hodge. Throughout indeed, there is a very remarkable correspondence between the treatment of Calvin by the ultra Lutheran school, and that to which he is now generally subjected from the opposite extreme. In both directions, it has been insisted that he played an adroit game, stretched his own convictions to please the Lutherans, paltered in double senses and ambiguous terms, involved himself in contradictions, and took refuge in unintelligible distinctions. Westphal calls him an *eel*, which no one could hold by the tail. Dr. Hodge is more respectful, but it comes much to the same thing at last. Now it so happens, that the charges of both, (for they are directly or by implication the same,) are met in the publications here before us by Calvin himself, and very summarily disposed of as false and injurious slanders. We should be glad did our limits allow, to take some notice of these in detail. One of the very best replies to Princeton, so far as Calvin is concerned, would be simply a full republication, in clear intelligible English, of his memorable *Second Defence* "*adversus Joachimi Westphali calumnias.*" As a substitute for this, we can offer here only a most cursory glance over the leading points of crimination and reply. This may be done best perhaps, in the form of a regular dialogue between the parties themselves.

*Westphal.*—Here we have it at last. An open confederation

with the Helvetians! What is this *Consensus Tigurinus* but a barefaced transition to the camp of the accursed Zuinglians, a crafty compromise with Bullinger, which goes to undermine the whole cause of Lutheran Protestantism in favor of its enemies? And yet you have professed to stand in the bosom of Lutheran Protestantism, and to be a true friend to the faith of the Augsburg Confession. Before all Germany, I proclaim you, John Calvin, a hypocrite and a traitor.

*Calvin.*—Your charge is false. I am guilty in this case of no duplicity nor change. My relation to Lutheranism remains what it was ten years ago. To one part of his sacramental theory, I never could assent; while the mystery itself which it sought to maintain, had my full faith; as for the person of the great reformer also, I have ever cherished the most profound reverence and regard. I might easily prove moreover that Luther himself looked upon my views with favor. Let Philip Melancthon however be my one voucher, in place of all others.<sup>1</sup> We have been of one mind here, and are of one mind still. I *did* subscribe the Augsburg Confession at Strasburg; taking it in its generally acknowledged sense, as settled by the authority of its illustrious framer, the excellent Melancthon himself; and to this subscription I still adhere, without any sort of mental reservation whatever.<sup>2</sup>

*Westphal.*—A fine story truly; when we see you walking arm in arm with the Zuinglians, and passing yourself off as one of their own kidney.

*Calvin.*—All turns again on your own hasty construction. I have always set my face openly against the view commonly laid to Zuingli's charge, by which the idea of an actual communication with Christ's life is excluded from the mystery of the Lord's supper. This I have not hesitated heretofore to stigmatize as absolutely profane; and I trust I shall never cease to regard it in the same light. The *Consensus Tigurinus* however proceeds on the supposition throughout, that the proper Helvetic faith involves nothing really of this sort; and it is an effort simply to carry it out, by suitable explanation and definition, to such a full statement, as might serve to relieve it from this reproach, and set it in a correct light before the christian world. The

<sup>1</sup> Quinetiam Lutherus ipse, quum scripta mea inspexisset, quale de me iudicium fecerit, mihi per testes idoneos probare non difficile erit. Sed mihi unus pro multis erit Philippus Melancthon.—*Adv. Westph. Opp. T. IX. p. 661.*

<sup>2</sup> See quotation, page 476.

statement is no act of subscription, of course, to the system of Luther strictly so called. I have always rejected that; and it is openly rejected also in this Consensus. But the instrument is not for this reason a simple falling over to the contrary extreme. It is fairly and truly a bond of union and peace, between the Helvetic churches and the faith of the Augsburg Confession.

*Westphal.*—Nonsense! You do not pretend, that this Consensus agrees with the Confession of Augsburg!

*Calvin.*—Take the tenth article of this last in the sense of its author, without any popish perversion or gloss, and I contend that the sacramental doctrine of the two instruments is in truth the same.<sup>1</sup>

*Westphal.*—You can hardly expect the world to give you credit for honesty and plain dealing, in this business. You have been playing a game. You carry two faces.

*Calvin.*—God knows, that this is not the case. I have had no worldly interest to serve; and I have used no concealment or reserve. On the contrary, I have tried always to be both candid and clear, as far as language would admit; and it will be found, I think, that few men have taken more pains to let their position be known, or have less differed from themselves with the onward progress of time. My views now are just what they were clearly stated to be twenty years ago, in the first edition of my Institutes.<sup>2</sup>

*Westphal.*—Be it so then; it only shows that you have been all along a false teacher. For only look at this Consensus Tigurinus. It evacuates the sacraments of their mystical force, and turns them thus into mere void signs.

*Calvin.*—That is a gross slander. Both the Consensus and the Exposition attached to it, most distinctly affirm the contrary.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Si nos in consensu quod continet Augustana Confessio complexos esse dixi, non est quod me astutiæ insimulet. Verbis enim subscribo, quæ illic etiam recitavi. De sensu, quia idoneus judex non est Westphalus, ad quem potius, quam ad auctorem ipsum provocabo! qui si verbulo declaret me a sua mente deflectere, protinus desistam. Lutheri alia est ratio; in cuius verbis quid ego desiderem semper ingenue professus sum: tantum abest ut me obstrinxerim.—*Ib.* p. 667.

<sup>2</sup> Hoc quidem mihi jure vindico, nunquam me ambigua loquendi forma, captiosæ aliud præ me tulisse, quam sentirem.—*Ib.* p. 661. Hoc reperient lectores, mihi nihil fuisse majori curæ, quam ut omni ambiguitate discussa, enucleate traderem quod ego quotidie in Ecclesia profiteor ac doceo, et quod Deus ipse me ex animo sentire optimus testis est ac judex.—*Ib.* p. 668.

<sup>3</sup> Testamur passim in scriptis nostris longe differre ab inanibus figuris, quæ Dominus nobis reliquit gratiæ suæ testimonia et sigilla. Diserte hoc Consensus prædicat, Dominum qui verax est intus præstare suo Spiritu quod

*Westphal.*—You make the elements mere *signs*.

*Calvin.*—Signs certainly; but by no means naked and empty signs. Christ uses here no false colors. The verities represented, by the power of God are made to go along with the signs. 'The last divinely certify the presence of the first.' The things represented are at the same time *exhibited*, or made to be actually at hand.

*Westphal.*—Exhibited, you mean, in the way of image or picture; but not as they are in their own nature; for you explicitly deny, in the case of the Lord's supper, the actual presence in any way of Christ's body and blood, materially considered, along with the bread and wine by which they are represented.

*Calvin.*—Certainly, I have always rejected, and reject still most firmly, the idea of every sort of presence here, that is to be regarded as local or material; or that may be said to fall within the experience and measure of mere nature as such. But this by no means implies, that the realities signified by the symbols are absent, or that they are at hand only in the way of picture. When I acknowledge their exhibition or presentation in the sacrament, my meaning is always that they are made to be actually present in the whole power of their own proper nature, only not in the way of sense, but in a higher way.<sup>2</sup>

*Westphal.*—All is made to depend at last, however, on the exercises of the worshipper. The verities exhibited are present only in thought and contemplation, as these enter into the action of faith.

*Calvin.*—I mean not so. The verities are at hand objectively; the inward grace in the outward transaction. Faith is only the condition, not the cause, of our mystical participation of

oculis figurant Sacramenta; nec quum distinguimus inter signa et res signatas, disjungere a signis veritatem. Hunc locum luculentius et uberius persequitur *Defensio.*—*Ib.* p. 666.

<sup>1</sup>Secundum nos, panis ita significat, ut vere efficaciter, ac re ipsa non ad Christi communicationem invitet. Dicimus enim veritatem quam continet promissio, *illic exhiberi*, et effectum externo symbolo annexum esse. Tropus ergo signum minime evacuat, sed potius ostendit quomodo non sit vacuum—*Ib.* p. 667.

<sup>2</sup>Ita panis non inanis est rei absentis pictura, &c. See quotation before note 2, p. 425.—Corpus suum se dare promittit Filius Dei: verbum ejus apud nos sine controversia plenam fidem obtinet. Ac quanquam reclamat carnis sensus, et natura tam sublime arcanum, angelis etiam admirabile, non admittit: certo tamen credimus *intus celesti virtute impleri*, quod nobis visibile signum figurat.—*Ib.* p. 672.

Christ in the holy supper. God forbid, that I should think of turning the process into a mere mental exercise of any kind.<sup>1</sup>

*Westphal.*—Still you will have it, that the process is altogether spiritual; and any objective force you may allow to the transaction, will be found to resolve itself thus into the mere agency of the Holy Ghost, exciting faith, love, and other graces.

*Calvin.*—Spiritual the process is, as distinguished from your crass conception of an oral manducation. The mystery centres in the soul, and is wrought by the vivific power of the Holy Ghost, under a mode of existence that transcends all natural experience and conception. But it is not a mere influence. The Spirit actually binds Christ and his people into one life; not as a river may join two cities which are many miles apart, by merely flowing through both; but as being the very form and medium, (“*modus habitationis Christi in nobis*,”) under and by which the life of the first is made to pass over into the last.<sup>2</sup>

*Westphal.*—The communion you think of in this way, must be regarded as holding at last only with the *divine* nature in Christ, if it be allowed to have any reality at all; for your theory completely excludes the presence of his body.

*Calvin.*—It does so only in a local or material view; but not at all, as regards living power and force. The communication which we have with Christ in the sacrament, is by no means limited to his divine nature, but extends to his humanity also, as the real seat and fountain of salvation for our dying world; in which sense it is, we are said to eat his flesh and drink his blood unto everlasting life.<sup>3</sup>

*Westphal.*—You take the word *body* in an ambiguous sense; for all that you allow in the end, is that we partake of Christ's benefits; which, as they were procured by his sufferings in the body, may be spoken of under the name of his flesh and blood. But all runs out in this way into a bold metaphor. You substitute in your mind an imagination merely, for the true and proper body of our blessed Lord.

<sup>1</sup> Ubique resonant scripta mea, *differre manducationem a fide, &c.* See quotation before, note 1, p. 425.

<sup>2</sup> Haec nostra definitio est, spiritualiter a nobis manducari Christi carnem, quia non aliter animas vivificat, quam pane vegetatur corpus; tantum a nobis excluditur substantiæ transfusio. Westphalo non aliter caro vivifica est, quam si ejus substantia *voretur*.—Neque enim simpliciter Spiritu suo Christum in nobis habitare trado, sed ita nos ad se attollere, ut vivificum carnis suæ vigorem in nos transfundat.—*Ib.* p. 669.

<sup>3</sup> Ita Christum corpore absentem doceo nihilominus non tantum divina sua virtute quæ ubique diffusa est, nobis adesse, sed etiam facere ut nobis vivifica sit sua caro.—*Ib.* p. 669.

*Calvin.*—I never confound the benefits which we have by Christ with the idea of his life. It is idle to remind us then, that his merits and benefits are not his body. 'The insinuation, that this is all I mean by the communion of his flesh and blood, is purely gratuitous and does me gross injustice.' I own no fiction or metaphor whatever, in the case. 'The body of which we partake in the blessed sacrament, is the same that once hung upon the cross, and is now glorified in heaven.'

*Westphal.*—And yet you will not hear of this being present in the sacrament, but hold it to be absent from us by an immense distance. How then can we be said to partake of it in any real way?

*Calvin.*—The whole is a mystery, as I have said before, in the sphere of the Spirit. Dynamically and organically things may be joined together in the most intimate unity, which are at the same time wide apart in space. Christ's body remains indeed always in heaven; but by the power of the Holy Ghost, as something which transcends all local and mechanical relations, not only his divine life, as this is present in all places, but the proper life of his body also, the quickening vigor of his flesh and blood, is made to pass into the souls of his people, as a true aliment of immortality.\*

*Westphal.*—You confess this, however, to be only for the soul or mind of the communicant, not for his body.

*Calvin.*—Not for the body indeed in a direct and outward way, as your theory requires; but just as little either for the mind separately considered. Soul and mind are not the same thing. I mean by the soul, the central principle of our whole life, which in the end reaches out to the body also no less than

\* *Excipit Westphalus, merita Christi vel beneficia non esse ejus corpus. Sed cur locutionem, qua splendide nostram communionem commendo, maligne extenuat? Neque enim tantum dico applicari merita, sed ex ipso Christi corpore alimentum percipere animas, non secus ac terreno pane corpus vescitur.—Ib. p. 668.*

\* *Excipit me ambigua Corporis significatione fallere. Atqui toties repetendo verum et naturale illud corpus, quod in cruce oblatum est, putabam his cavillis satis superque esse occursum.—Ib. p. 668.*

\* *Ex abscondita Deitatis fonte in Christi carnem mirabiliter infusa est vita, ut inde ad nos fluere.—Ib. p. 657. Christum corpore absentem doceo nihilominus non tantum Divina sua virtute, quæ ubique diffusa est, nobis adesse, sed etiam facere ut nobis vivifica sit sua caro. Nam quum arcana Spiritus sui gratia ad nos penetret, non necesse est, ut alibi diximus, ipsum corpore descendere.—Ib. p. 669.*



the spirit. In this way, Christ is the true food, by which our whole nature is nourished unto immortality.<sup>1</sup>

*Westphal.*—A purely spiritual transaction thus, and nothing more, is made to stand for the whole mystery. The flesh of Christ, with you is not present in the supper. You do not allow an actual giving and receiving of his body.

*Calvin.*—The presence is spiritual, allow me to repeat, only as it is not material and local; but not at all in any such sense, as may be taken to overthrow its reality. As regards this, there is no difference nor debate. I freely allow here what the sacrament requires, an actual participation in Christ's flesh and blood; and this without any sort of metaphor or rhetorical fiction. Only I cannot yield to your view of the *mode*, in which this is brought to pass; for it seems to me to be at war with the very object of the mystery itself; and I see no reason in the Bible or elsewhere, for its being made to hang exclusively on so gross a conception; but every reason rather, for insisting on a higher view. You seem to have no idea of presence in the case, save in the way of physical contact and transfusion. To my mind, I confess, it is something far more real, in the form of a *living* entrance into the inmost sanctuary of the believer's life.<sup>2</sup>

*Westphal.*—You take away the donation of the true and proper body, and give us what you are pleased to call its virtue and vigor merely in its stead.

*Calvin.*—When I say that Christ reaches us with the virtue of his life, I deny that any substitute is brought in that sets aside at all the donation of his body. I only explain the mode of the donation.<sup>3</sup>

*Westphal.*—It is a plain case, however, that what is given

<sup>1</sup> Nunc anima est quæ corpus vivificat, ne sit mortuum cadaver: ergo ab ea jure denominationem sumit. Post resurrectionem vero præstantior erit vis illa vivifica, quam a Spiritu accipiet.—*Comm. in Ep. I. ad Cor. XV. 44.*

<sup>2</sup> Respondet, fallaciter id præsentia et sumptioni veri corporis opponi. Ego autem excipio, nisi astute fucum faciat, turpiter ipsum hallucinari, quia non de sumptione, sed tantum de sumptionis modo vobis controversia est. Præsentiam corporis nullam concipit, nisi ubique diffusum sub pane delitescat: nisi idem corpus d-glutiant fideles, privari ejus manducatione putat.—*Opp. T. IX. p. 668.* Reclamat hic Westphalus, me *spiritus præsentiam* opponere *carnis præsentia*, sed quatenus id faciam ex eodem loco clare patere, malevolentia exæcatus non inspicit. Neque enim simpliciter Spiritu suo Christum in nobis habitari trado, sed ita nos ad se attollere, ut *viticum carnis suæ vigorem in nos transfundat*.—*Ib. p. 669.*

<sup>3</sup> Ego vero quum dico Christum ad nos sua virtute descendere, nego me substituere aliquid diversum, quod donationem corporis aboleat, quia modum donationis simpliciter explico.—*Ib. p. 668.*

and taken in the sacrament, as you hold it, is not the real matter of Christ's body, but something else. You will not allow that we partake of his *substance*.

*Calvin.*—Not of the outward material of his nature certainly in any way; but still of its actual substantial life; the vivific virtue of his true flesh and blood. Put away the crass thought of a manducation of the flesh, as though it were to enter the stomach by the mouth like common food, and there is no reason to deny that we are fed with Christ's flesh *substantially*. His body remains in heaven, while nevertheless life flows out from its very substance, and reaches down into the persons of his people, just as the substance of the head passes over continually to the members in the natural body.<sup>1</sup>

*Westphal.*—You are a perfect eel, sir; as all the world may see; slimy and slippery to the very tail. There is no such thing as holding you fast.<sup>2</sup> Your "*virtue*" and "*vigor*" of Christ's body resolve themselves, when all is said, into the idea of a mere influence proceeding from him through the Spirit; and mean simply the efficacy and value of his death, made available for our benefit by God, and so appropriated on our side by faith.

*Calvin.*—Miserable misrepresentation. How often must I protest against your trick of turning my words into a sense, which they openly disown? Have I not said in all possible ways, that Christ must be distinguished from the fruits he brings to pass, and that he must go before them also in the way of actual and real appropriation on the part of his people? Christ *first*; and only *then* his merits and benefits. By "*virtue*" or "*efficacy*" here, I understand always the essential living force of the Redeemer's body, once slain and now in heaven; as I use the word "*vigor*" also to express its actual power and substance, the very sap of its heavenly constitution. This in its glorified state is all "*life and spirit*;" a body of course still; but

<sup>1</sup> De voce substantiæ si quis litem moveat, Christum asserimus a carnis suæ substantia vitam in animas nostras spirare; imo propriam in nos vitam diffundere, modo nequa substantiæ transfusio fingatur.—*Ib.* p. 660.

<sup>2</sup> In hac doctrina sic persto, ut me non minus inscite quam inique Westphalus anguillæ comparet. Quid enim dubii vel perplexi in hac doctrina reperit? Corpus Christi vere spiritualement esse cibum, cujus substantia animæ nostræ pascuntur, et vivunt: idque non minus vere in sacra Cæna nobis præstari, quam externo symbolo figuratur: modo ne corpus quasi e celo detractum, in pane quispiam falsa imaginatione includat. Quia Westphalum offendit hæc exceptio, anguillam cauda non posse teneri clamat.—*Ib.* p. 667.

not such as belongs to our present mortal condition. It is capable thus of reaching over, by the Spirit, and we may say also *in* the Spirit, into the souls of his people on earth; as the head is able to live itself, in a lower sphere, into its members, or the root into its branches, independently of all local contact.<sup>1</sup>

*Westphal.*—Clouds! clouds! Spare us, if you please, these transcendental flights. We have no wings, to soar behind you into regions so high and *thin*. Seriously, we want no philosophy in this matter. Let us stick to the plain sense of the Bible. What is the voice of reason, with its carnal perplexities and plausibilities, over against the voice of Christ?<sup>2</sup>

*Calvin.*—I would a hundred times rather die, than weigh the smallest single word of Christ against the whole world of philosophy. My theology comes from another quarter. It is not philosophy which teaches, either that human flesh is endowed with life-giving virtue, or that this life breathes from heaven, or that we come into possession of it efficaciously under the outward symbol of bread; nothing of this sort falls in with common sense, or comes forth from the philosophical schools. The word of Him who founded the sacrament, is held up to us in opposition. But what is it, that he says? That he gives us his own body. This promise I reverently embrace; not stopping in what is before the eyes only, the mere bread and wine, but accepting by faith the life itself, which proceeding from Christ's flesh and blood, is secretly conveyed into our very souls. The charge of substituting philosophy for God's word, holds in truth only against the other side. It is Westphal that *theorizes* here, not Calvin.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quia dico Christum in nobis habitantem ita ad se nos attollere, ut vivificum carnis vigorem in nos transfundat, non secus ac vitali Solis calore per radios vegetamur: item, Christum in cœlo manentem ad nos sua virtute descendere, me fidem Ecclesiæ pervertere arguit, acsi negarem Christum nobis dare suum corpus. Ego vero quum dico Christum ad nos sua virtute descendere, nego me substituere aliquid diversum, quod donationem corporis aboleat.—*Ib.* p. 668.

<sup>2</sup> Quare non est quod philosophiæ et theologiæ conflictum ebuccinet Westphalus. Neque enim philosophia nobis dicitur, vel spirituali virtute præditam esse humanam carnem, ut animas vivificet, vel hanc vitam e cœlo spirare, vel efficaciter sub externo panis symbolo eadem nos vita potiri. Nihil tale vel communis sensus capiet, vel ex philosophicis scholis prohibet.—*Ib.* p. 670.

<sup>3</sup> Ego vero centies peritisse malim, quam unum Christi verbum cum tota philosophia ad trutinæ examen appendere, sicuti Westphalus postulat.—Injuste Westphalus ex philosophiæ dictatis nos magis pendere insinuat, quam ex verbo Dei. Ego autem meo jure *ipsum* admoneo, ut suæ pervicac-

*Westphal.*—It is fine for you to talk in that style! Your theory is made up of speculation; and is so full of riddles and contradictions, that a plain Bible christian, like myself, must puzzle himself in vain to say what it means. It may be questioned, whether you understand your own meaning.

*Calvin.*—God knows the simplicity and honesty of my faith; while I am not ashamed freely to acknowledge here the helplessness of my poor understanding. St. Paul himself pronounces the whole subject a “great mystery.” So I feel it to be in my inmost soul. My faith bows before it with childlike homage.<sup>1</sup>

Such we conceive to be a fair representation of Calvin’s doctrine, as it may be extracted from this controversy with Westphal, as well as from his writings in general. Even the difficulty of the Old Testament saints is urged against him by Westphal, as a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*, in the same way that Dr. Hodge now brings it forward to set his view aside. How he disposes of it, we shall see presently.

#### “Ad Discutiendas Nebulas.”

His whole sacramental doctrine is brought out, under its most round and complete form, in the *third edition* of the Institutes, a. 1559. It is strange that any one should read this, and make any question about Calvin’s faith in the mystical presence of Christ’s flesh and blood in the eucharistic transaction. By calling himself the bread of life, our Lord teaches, he says, “not only that we are saved by believing in his death and resurrection, but also that by the true communication of himself, *his life is made to pass over into us and become ours*, just as bread taken as food, conveys vigor to the body.” This life is lodged in his *flesh*, into which it wells from the divinity as a perennial fountain, for our use. All through the “*arcana Spiritus sancti operatio*,” which it is presumptuous for us to think of understanding. In the Lord’s supper, the mystery of this communication is not only represented, but sealed and certified as a present fact.

His last tract on the subject was published against Hesshuss,

*cix* valedicens, *de genuino verbi Dei sensu* doceri se sustineat. Alioqui valeat ipse cum suo phantasmate, quod in Christi verbis perperam comminiscitur.—*Ib.* p. 670. 671.

<sup>1</sup>Atqui ego mysterii altitudine in stuporem abripior: neque vero me pudet, admiratione meam ignorantiam cum Paulo fateri. Quanto enim id satius, quam extenuare carnis meæ sensu quod Paulus altum mysterium esse pronuntiat!—*Comm. in Ep. ad Eph. V. 32.*

a. 1561, near the end of his life.<sup>1</sup> It reiterates, in the most clear and full terms, the several points and positions affirmed in the controversy with Westphal, and vindicates them in the same way from slanderous misconstruction. The Princeton Review pronounces the extracts from this tract in the *Mystical Presence* "extreme passages," and says it would be easy to gather others of a different character out of Calvin's works. But why then, we may ask, has this not been done? Every such representation rests on mistake. The passages are not at all extreme. They are amply sustained by other quotations in the *Mystical Presence*; and they are in full and fair keeping only with all that Calvin has written on the sacramental question. On this, as on every question besides, he is beyond all writers of the age true to himself, without material change or contradiction, from the beginning of his theological career to its close. Nor is it at all difficult to understand what his theory was, as distinguished both from the Lutheran and Puritan extremes. It is fashionable in certain quarters, we know, to speak of it as strangely confused and hard to comprehend. But there is no room for any such charge, in the Calvinistic theory itself. All we need is to lay aside our stubborn pre-conceptions, and converse with it under its own form and on its own ground. Then all will become clear enough. It is only the medium through which it is viewed, that serves so often to wrap it in haze and mist.

There can be no escape from the true state of the case here, unless it be in the way of forcing the plain language of Calvin continually out of its proper sense, regardless of all his own limitations and definitions, so as to give it the air of springing from a wholly different system than that to which it belongs in fact. This is done perpetually by those who are bent on modernizing his doctrine, to suit the taste of the present time; and it is no wonder then, of course, that he should seem to talk strangely, and even to be out of harmony with himself. It is said, that he attributed no *special* force to the sacrament, but taught merely, that "what is elsewhere received by faith without the signs and significant actions," is here received in the same way along with their use. The "virtue of Christ's life" is taken to mean simply a quickening influence exerted by him at a distance. The idea of "substance" is made to lose its proper power, in similar style. *Soul* is held to be at once identical with mind, as

<sup>1</sup> *Dilucida Explicatio Sanæ Doctrinæ de Vera Participatione Carnis et Sanguinis Christi in Sacra Cœna. Ad discutiendas Heathurii nebulas.*—Opp. IX. pp. 723-744.

the simple opposite of the body. Stress is laid on the *spiritual* order of the process, as overthrowing the conception of its including more, or having any other form, than the converse of the pious with Christ, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, in the way of affection and thought. With such qualifications, we find the true sense of Calvin quietly obscured, on all sides, and turned into contradiction. They are however wholly without reason or ground in the system of Calvin himself; as any one may soon see, who will put himself to the trouble at all of looking into the matter with his own eyes.

True, the grace represented in the sacraments is described as being of the same general nature with what has place in the life of believers at other times. "In the supper," says the Cons. Tig., "Christ communicates himself to us, who however had imparted himself to us before, and abides in us perpetually." But does it follow from this, that the sacramental transaction carries in it no special exhibition of grace, for the confirmation and promotion of this new life under its own form? The idea of the believer's union with Christ rests on the supposition of an actual passing over of the power of his life into their persons; it needs in this view not merely a subjective but an objective basis; the pouring of a real communication progressively kept up with him, whose "flesh is meat indeed" and whose "blood is drink indeed," unto everlasting life. And why may not the holy supper be regarded then as the mystical medium, by which the union of the believer with Christ in its standing form is made to receive new support and strength, through such real communication from the Saviour's side? Or why should there be any difficulty, in that case, in acknowledging it to be of *special* significance and power, though it serve only to continue and carry forward the order of grace as it stood before; just as our common meals fall in with the general process of our natural life, and yet are special means for its preservation? Such is the view taken of the subject by Calvin. However grace may be independent of the sacraments where there is no room for their use, they are still in the church the regularly constituted media of its objective presentation; and we are bound to seek it accordingly through their proffered help. Hence they are said to be *organs* or instruments, by which God efficaciously works in the souls of his people. The right use of the eucharist serves to continue and repair (*continuare et reparare*) our communion, as already established with Christ. The full objectivity of the communication which Christ makes of himself in the mystical transaction, is asserted in the strongest and clear-

est terms. Thus in the First Defence of the Cons. Tig., we have it illustrated, by a comparison with the light and heat of the natural sun. It is not enough that the light shines; there must be on our side vision to receive it; which yet has no power to produce the light itself. "So as the heat of the sun, which quickens a living and breathing body, gives rise only to corruption in a corpse, it is certain that the sacraments, where the spirit of faith is wanting, breathe a savor of death rather than a savor of life." Life is the necessary condition of the salutary animation that comes from the sun; but it is not the cause of this, nor even its measure; for it comes in from abroad as an aliment to the life itself. And so it is also, that while the proper use of the Lord's supper depends on the condition of faith, the grace which it offers is in no sense the product of this, but must be considered rather as the real entrance of a new measure of life into the soul by its means, raising faith itself into higher exercise. In the Second Defence, this idea of the objective force of the sacrament, to the full extent of a living communion with the real human life of the Blessed Redeemer, is brought out with still greater emphasis and point; in consequence of the perverse misrepresentations of the opposite side; so that he that runs can read it, if he will, without any danger of mistake.

"We assert," it is said in the preface of this tract, "that the flesh and blood of Christ are truly offered to us in the supper, for the vivification of our souls. Nor is our definition ambiguous, that our souls are not otherwise quickened (*vegetari*) by this spiritual aliment, which is offered to us in the supper, than our bodies are nourished by earthly bread. We affirm then a true participation of Christ's flesh and blood in the supper. If any one stand on the word substance, we assert that Christ breathes *life from the substance of his flesh into our souls*; yea, that he diffuses into us his own life, if only no *transfusion* of substance be imagined."

The language seems very plain. As already intimated however, the terms here employed are often construed in a false way, that serves to bring darkness and confusion into Calvin's whole view. The misconstruction regards especially the sense of the term "*soul*," and the phraseology employed in relation to "*substance*."

"In making the *anima* the recipient of Christ," says Ebrard, "Calvin has been taken to mean by it, with strange spiritualism, not the psychic substance of man, the centre of his individuality, from which both his spiritual and corporeal functions proceed, but the soul in the sense of intellect or thought. The Reform-

er in truth, however, was far enough from all such flat psychology. One need only read what he says, Comm. I. Thess. v. 23 or Inst. I. 15, to be fully satisfied of this. The *anima*, when taken by itself in opposition to the body, is with him the immortal essence of man. This has two parts, the *intellectus* and the *voluntas*; which last again by itself is styled ὄρεξις, *appetitus*, but so far as it is in obedience to the *ratio* βούλησις. The soul, when distinguished from the body and the spirit as a third, is the 'seat of the affections, or of the will and all affections;' and the spirit then is the intelligence and reason. Spirit and soul together are not *plures animæ*, sensitive and rational, but the one soul. We see thus, that Calvin never defines *anima* as the region of thought, of the same sense with *mens* or *intellectus*; but it is always for him, in narrower sense the immortal substance of man, the natural germ of his psychic existence, the seat of his affections and impulses, the basis in short of his corporeal life on one side and of his spiritual life on the other; in wider sense however, this same substance including the development of the spirit. When he says then that the soul is fed with Christ, it means nothing other or less than this; that the *substance* of man, his proper *being*, the source of his entire individual existence, both as corporeal and spiritual, is in a real way nourished from the substance of Christ, as the only food which can truly give him life.

"With the *substance* of Christ. But this is a second point, where the doctrine is often assailed. What sort of substance does Calvin mean? The substance of Christ's body and blood? Or the substance of his person generally? Undoubtedly the last. And is the term 'substance,' it is impatiently asked, any better in such case than puppet-play, contrived to deceive the unwary? Is the substance of Christ's *person*, with which we are fed, anything more at last, in Calvin's mind, than Christ's *spiritual power*?

"Yes truly, we reply, beyond all controversy. It needs only a little reflection, to allow that the whole is not less than the part, and that the part is not excluded but included by the whole. He that believes the reception of the *whole* Christ in the sacrament—believes evidently not less, but more, than those who allow only a participation of the body and blood. That is of itself clear; but Lutheran theologians of earlier and later times have not been able to assure themselves that Calvin was fully in *earnest* in teaching our participation of the whole Christ. First it was objected, that Christ according to Calvin remains as to his human nature in heaven, so that only his divine nature



imparts itself to us in the supper. A still-born objection of a truth; since Calvin has declared over and over again, times without number, that for a real union of both the natures of Christ with us, local nearness is not needed, and local distance in view of the Spirit's omnipotence forms no bar. We have only an abortive inference thus, proceeding from the unbelieving view, falsely palmed on Calvin but altogether foreign to his mind, that a conjunction of the God-man with us holding *above* the limits of space can not be real! This objection accordingly, that only the divine nature of Christ is imparted to us, has been given up to make room for another. Calvin, it is allowed, teaches the communication of both the natures of Christ in the supper, but only as regards his *theandric spirit*, not as regards his *theandric body*. That his glorified body should be present as material substance in the bread and wine, Calvin indeed never admitted; for he was too well assured, that a glorified body is no such material substance. The glorified body of Christ is for him, in its substance, out and out, active power (*virtus*). In the glorification, the dualism between animating spirit and matter needing animation is brought to an end; the glorified body is through and through the *manifestation of spirit, life clear of space* altogether through and through *life*; it has power to *take volume* at its own pleasure, (John xx. 19, Luke xxiv. 16); but still in such way that it shall rule the matter so assumed, and not be ruled by it as an outward limitation. This at once expresses all. To many readers, no doubt, this (genuinely Calvinistic) idea will present itself as strange and out of the way; for with our philosophy of pure abstraction and reflection, we have lost the true philosophy of nature and the capacity for it; but the time will come, when men shall again learn to understand the idea of life, and the true sense of glorified corporeity. Those who think deeply must always see, that there is a discord between nature and spirit here below in the world of sin and death, but that this discord must and will come to a close. And now we ask: What other close is conceivable but this, that the human spirit shall exhibit itself not as incorporeal, but as having form, coming into view, working into nature; but so working into nature at the same time, that this shall not remain *as foreign material*, but shall appear simply as the self-projected life of the individual soul itself. If this be correct, it proves at once that the glorified body is not matter, but universal power; and as such power, it works not mechanically, moves not mechanically, communicates not itself mechanically; but all this it does dynamically. Even here below, God be praised, examples are not wanting of

such dynamic power over body. Is it a mechanical or a dynamic force, that impresses on the simple embryonic substance the lineaments of father and mother, in the womb? Is it a mechanical or a dynamic action, when in the development of the fœtus, the head gives form to the trunk and limbs? Is it a mechanical or dynamic effect, when the vine produces grapes and not apples? Is it a mechanical or dynamic operation, when the sun-beam causes the seed to sprout? Why then should that be cried down as unreal and spiritualistic, in the case of Christ's glorified body, which in common nature is acknowledged to be real? Why is it counted spiritualistic, when Calvin describes the communication of Christ as an outflow of *virtue* from him into our persons! It needs in truth to be openly and loudly proclaimed, that they are the true *spiritualists*, who are not able to rise to the Calvinistic conception of glorified corporeity, who take virtue or power for something unreal, and who remain bound thus to the dualism that hangs between a purely spiritual and a mechanically material communication of the risen Christ. It is Calvin, who has surmounted this dualistic mechanism and spiritualism."

So far on this subject Professor Ebrard; who then goes on to quote proof from Calvin himself, in confirmation of his judgment. We have already quoted enough to make the matter plain, we think, for all ingenuous readers. It is perfectly clear, that the "vivific virtue" of Christ's body signified, for Calvin, the active power of his own proper human life itself. He would hear of no transfusion of his substance, materially considered, into the persons of his people, after the manner of natural food; but take this crass notion out of the way, and he was ready to allow all besides that the idea of substance might be found to require. "Sublato hoc *transfusionis* commento, de voce *substantiæ* controversiam movere nunquam mihi venit in mentem, nec unquam dubitabo fateri, arcana Spiritus sancti virtute *vitam in nos diffundi ex ejus carnis substantiæ*, quæ non abs re cibis cœlestis vocatur." Could language well more clearly affirm, an efflux of life dynamically from the glorified *body* of the Saviour?

Those who refuse to allow this sense to Calvin, are bound at least, in all common respect to his memory, to say what *other* rational meaning his peculiar phraseology here can be supposed to bear. It is admitted that he, and others also in the Reformed church, attributed some sort of "mysterious supernatural *influence*" to Christ's body, which has been considered not to agree well with the Reformed faith at other points. What precisely was meant by this, it is not pretended to say. Enough that it be set down, as something *less* than the true and proper presence

of Christ's life; it may pass as a mere phrase otherwise, born of the Roman superstition, that never had perhaps any fixed or certain sense. But this is to do violence to the whole subject. Calvin was not a man to play all his life long with a blind theological crotchet, in such style. It is a strange compliment moreover to the age of the Reformation, to suppose that any such whim should have been passively received from him into the old symbols, as so much sound only void of all real thought. This idea of the "life-giving virtue of Christ's flesh," made over to his people "by the operation of the Holy Ghost," is altogether too prominent in the old Reformed doctrine, and too fully interwoven with its whole structure, to be set aside in any such summary way. The phraseology demands explanation. Let us be told then what it actually means. Any one who may try its solution, with an honest and candid mind, must soon find himself shut up to the one only conclusion which the case admits. By the life-giving virtue or efficacy of Christ's body, Calvin means always the very substance of Christ's life itself under its divine *human* form. What other mode of speech could he employ to express this idea, as distinguished from the crass conception of Romanists and Lutherans on one side, and the figment of mere spiritualism on the other? For him, the body of Christ, in that new order of existence to which it has been advanced by the resurrection, is no longer under law to nature as before; it has become all "spirit and life;" having its place indeed in heaven, but in such a way as to be capable of reaching forth at once, over all outward local limits, with its inmost substance and force, to the souls of his people, (and so to their bodies also,) in every part of the world. To express all this, he avoids carefully every word that might imply locality or matter, but insists, with only the more emphasis and stress on all that is included in the true conception of life in its invisible dynamic character. The human nature of Christ is made thus to be the reservoir of a life which flows into it from the divine nature, (and what else is this than his own living constitution itself,) for the use of the race; the vivific virtue which it thus comprehends, the true inward substance of his flesh and blood, is conveyed over to us by the OPERATION OF THE HOLY GHOST; and as the result of the whole process, we are so joined to him as to become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, and his life reaches into us precisely as the root lives *in* its branches and the head *in* its members, in the world of nature, only under a far more inward and vital form.

We are sometimes told, that Calvin substitutes for the local

descent of Christ's body in the sacrament, the idea of a *local ascent* on the part of the soul to heaven. It is easy to see however, that this refers merely to the order of the mystery here brought to pass, as something that transcends wholly all natural experience. He could not mean by it a simple act of thought, mounting upwards to Christ in heaven; for that would reduce all to the gross subjectivity which he continually disclaims. Could he have thought then of a literal carrying up of the soul to the place of Christ's body, by the power of the Holy Ghost, for the purpose of communion with it? This wild fancy some seem disposed to charge upon him, the more effectually to stultify his doctrine. But do they not stultify themselves rather, in falling so easily into the arms of such a childish imagination? Why should he dwell as he does on the coming down of virtue or living vigor from Christ's body, in the holy sacrament, if his theory rendered this needless at the same time by teaching also a literal translocation of the worshipper's soul into heaven? What he means in fact is sufficiently plain. The soul must be directed subjectively, in the sacrament, to heaven, or the higher sphere in which Christ dwells, and not to the sphere of matter and sense, for the accomplishment of the grace it seeks; while on the other side, the power of Christ objectively meets this upward look of faith, by actually breaking through the limitations of space, and from the bosom of his own higher order of life itself, causing the vigor of his glorified humanity to reach over into the persons of his people in an immediate and direct way. Neither ascent nor descent here are to be taken in any outward or local sense; they serve merely to express metaphorically the relation of the two orders or spheres of existence, which are brought into opposition and contrast. The whole *modus* of the sacramental mystery transcends the category of space; it belongs to heaven, as a higher order of life; but this detracts nothing from its reality or power. On the contrary, it is all the more real for this very reason.

On the force of the term *spiritual*, as applied to the transaction, it is not necessary, we presume, that anything should be added here to what has been already brought into view. It stands opposed only to the notion of material communication, and not at all to the idea of a real and true communion with Christ's human life. It regards only the mode of the mystery, not the fact of the mystery itself. "Many are averse to this word," he says in his last tract, *Opp. T. IX. p. 744*, "because they think that it implies something imaginary or empty. On the contrary however, the body of Christ is said to be given to us spiritually in the supper, because the *secret energy of the*

*Holy Spirit* causes things that are separated by local distance to be notwithstanding joined together; so that life is made to reach into us from heaven out of the flesh of Christ; which power and faculty of vivification may be said properly enough to be something derived from his substance; provided only it be taken in this sound sense, that Christ's body remains in heaven, while nevertheless life flows out from his substance, and reaches to us who sojourn upon the earth."

We are told however, that the "case of the Old Testament saints" forms a complete *estoppel* to all claim of authority here, in favor of the doctrine that our union with Christ involves any sort of participation in his human body, nature, or life. "All the Reformed taught," says the Princeton Review, "Calvin perhaps *more earnestly than most others*, that our union with Christ since the incarnation is the same in nature as that enjoyed by the saints under the old dispensation. This is perfectly intelligible, if the virtue of his flesh and blood, which we receive in the Lord's supper, is its *virtue as a sacrifice*; because he was the lamb slain from the foundation of the world.—But if the virtue in question is a mysterious power due to the hypostatical union, flowing from Christ's body in heaven, it must be a benefit peculiar to believers since the incarnation. It is impossible that those living before the advent could partake of Christ's body, in this sense, because it did not then exist; it had not as yet been assumed into union with the divine nature."

The amount of all which is, that this single difficulty as it holds in the Reviewer's mind, must be allowed to weigh down and reduce to nothing every possible amount of evidence the other way, however historically plain and sure! Admit the apparent contradiction; and yet to what can it amount, as an offset to the palpable presence of the historical *fact* which it is brought forward to overthrow? Is it not granted by the Reviewer himself, in the case of Calvin, that he did *not* limit the virtue of Christ's body and blood to their simply sacrificial efficacy separately considered? It was his idea clearly, we are told, "that besides this there was a *vivifying efficacy imparted to the body of Christ*, by its union with the divine nature, and that by the power of the Holy Ghost, the believer, in the Lord's supper and elsewhere, received into his soul and by faith *this mysterious and supernatural influence*." What then becomes of the "estoppel" just quoted; or what bearing is it expected to have on this concession? The only sufficient use of it, for the object of the Reviewer, would be to show that Calvin by the "vivifying efficacy of Christ's body" understood something dif-

ferent altogether from his proper human life; something of the same nature after all with the mere value of his sacrifice in God's mind. And this apparently is what the argument means; although we find the idea in question still noticed afterwards as an unnatural foreign non-descript in the Reformed theology, which could never be brought to coalesce truly with its other articles. But who may not see, that it comes to nothing, so far as the objection is concerned, whether Calvin understood the "efficacy of Christ's body" in the sense of his proper human life, or in some lower sense, so long as his *body* in any way is taken to be its seat and source? It must in any view be still dependent, according to the objection, on the fact of the incarnation, and so out of reach for the Old Testament saints. Does the objection come to this then, that Calvin did not know himself what he meant in talking about the efficacy of Christ's body, as he is acknowledged to have done; or that he was never honest and sincere in the strong language, he has seen fit to employ on this subject?

A monstrous supposition truly; which becomes still worse too, when we pass from the general concession of the Reviewer here to the actual strength of the case, as it lies before us in the writings of the great Reformer himself. For then we find, that it is with no incidental or simply extraneous fancy we are called to deal, in our critical examination; which we might feel ourselves at liberty to construe out of the way, as a passing slip of thought. On the contrary, we have before us a broad palpable idea, which is almost never out of sight in the discussion of the sacramental question, and which Calvin himself clearly held to be of vital consequence to his whole system. That he held and taught always a real union on the part of believers with the human nature or life of Christ, is just as plain as it is that he taught the doctrine of election. The one fact, like the other, is historically certain, whether it may be found in perfect harmony with all parts of his theological system or not. What can an indirect negative presumption be worth, in any case of the sort, when confronted with such an avalanche of direct positive historical affirmation, as we are overwhelmed with here from the opposite side!

Still more, Calvin himself had this objection of Dr. Hodge distinctly before his mind; and yet in the very face of it persisted in affirming the view which it is taken to exclude. In his Commentary, on 1 Cor. x. 1-4, he raises the question plumply. "Inasmuch as *we now* in the supper eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, how could the Jews have partaken of the same

spiritual meat and drink, when there was yet *no flesh of Christ* which they might eat?" To this he replies, that they actually partook of the vital power of the body that was to be afterwards, the Holy Ghost so working that "the flesh of Christ, *though not yet created*, became in them efficacious." At the same time he allows a material difference in their mode of participation, as compared with ours. "In our time, the manducation is *substantial*, which it *could not be then*; that is, Christ feeds us with his own flesh, slain for us and appointed unto us for meat, and we draw thence life."<sup>1</sup> This may be hard to understand; but could it well be made more apparent, that for Calvin at least the case of the O. T. saints formed *no bar* to the idea of a real communion with the proper human life of the Redeemer, in the mystery of the Lord's supper.

Westphal in fact tried to turn the difficulty to account against him, just as it is now pressed by the Princeton Review with an opposite drift. Christ had not yet put on flesh, said this Calumniator; the fathers then could partake of his body only in figure; and so by making their participation parallel to ours, you in fact sink this last to a mere figure too, notwithstanding all your fine talk. "But if he had any candor" Calvin returns, "he would notice the solution I have given of this knot in my Commentary; where I say, that the mode of eating for the fathers was different from ours, inasmuch as the manducation is now *substantial* which it could not be then; namely, as Christ feeds us with his flesh sacrificed for us, that we may draw life *from its substance*. As the lamb is said to have been slain from the foundation of the world, so it was necessary for the fathers under the law to seek spiritual nourishment from the flesh and blood, which we now enjoy more richly, not only as regards a fuller measure of revelation, but because the flesh of Christ *once offered* in sacri-

<sup>1</sup> Restat alia quæstio: Quomodo nunc in Cœna edamus corpus Christi et bibamus ejus sanguinem, quomodo ejusdem spiritualis cibi et potus fuerint participes Judæi, quando nondum erat Christi caro quam ederent? Respondeo, carnem quæ nondum extabat, fuisse nihilominus illis in cibum. Neque hæc inanis est aut sophistica argutia: salus enim eorum a beneficio mortis et resurrectionis pendebat, ideoque a carne et sanguine Christi: ergo carnem et sanguinem Christi eos percipere oportuit, ut redemptionis beneficio communicarent. Hæc perceptio opus erat arcanum Spiritus sancti, qui sic operabatur, ut caro Christi, tametsi nondum creata, in illis foret efficax. Intelligit tamen eos suo modo manducasse, qui a nostro fuit diversus: atque id est quod superius dixi, plenius nunc pro mensura revelationis exhiberi nobis Christum: Nam hodie substantialis est manducatio, quæ tunc nondum esse potuit: hoc est, carne sua pro nobis immolata, et in cibum nobis destinata, nos Christus pascit, et inde vitam haurimus.

vice is *daily* extended to us for fruition. When therefore Westphal infers, that we equal the figure to the truth, it only shows his too arrogant malice, since he knows well enough that I mention distinct grades."<sup>1</sup> I always profess, he says in another place, that the exhibition of Christ under the law was less rich and full than it is now; "and I add also, that with the flesh of Christ, which exerted its force before it was created in the fathers, we are now *substantially* fed; which is more than enough to expose the dishonesty of Westphal, who calumniates me as confounding those grades, which as is proper I am careful to distinguish."<sup>2</sup>

Altogether the sacramental doctrine of Calvin, is too plain for question or contradiction. It is no isolated or merely occasional utterance in his theological system. His writings are full of it, from the first edition of his Institutes to the last tract he ever published; and it is presented always as an article, not of secondary, but of primary and fundamental interest, which it lay near his heart to have rightly understood. No pains are spared accordingly, in the way of explanation and definition, to make it clear. He comes upon it from all sides, and considers it under all imaginable aspects; sometimes in the form of direct positive statement and discussion; at other times polemically or apologetically, over against objections and cavils urged from abroad. And still through all this multitudinous and diversified presentation, the doctrine remains from first to last one and the same, always in harmony with itself, and true to its own original type or law. It is a pure fiction too, to speak of it in this view as being either confused or obscure. It is logically more clear, than either Luther's view or that of Zuingli. His doctrine on the eucharist, we repeat, is not a whit more uncertain, as a historical fact, than his doctrine on the decrees; nor is it a whit more difficult to understand.

"Calvin has written much on the Lord's supper; and he is always clear, always consistent, always true to himself. Over and over again, in all forms of expression and explanation, he tells us, that Christ's body is indeed locally in heaven only, and in no sense included in the elements; that he can be apprehended by faith only, and not at all by the hands or lips; that nothing is to be imagined like a transfusion or intromission of the particles of his body, materially considered, into our persons. And yet that our communion with him, notwithstanding, by the

<sup>1</sup> H. Def. adv. Westph. Calumnias. Opp. T. ix. p. 671.

<sup>2</sup> Adm. Ultima. Opp. T. ix. p. 697.



power of the Holy Ghost, involves a real participation—not in his doctrine merely—not in his promises merely—not in the sensible manifestations of his love merely—not in his righteousness and merit merely—not in the gifts and endowments of his Spirit merely; but in his own true substantial life itself; and this not as comprehended in his divine nature merely, but most immediately and peculiarly as embodied in his humanity itself, for us men and our salvation. The Word became flesh, according to this view, for the purpose not simply of effecting a salvation that might become available for men in an *outward* way, but to open a fountain of life *in* our nature itself, that might thenceforward continue to flow over to other men, as a vivific stream, to the end of time. The flesh of Christ, then, or his humanity, forms the medium, and the *only* medium, by which it is possible for us to be inserted into his life. To have part in him at all, we must be joined to him in the flesh; and this not by the bond of our common relationship to Adam, but by the force of a direct implantation through the Spirit, into the person of Christ himself.”—*Myst. Pres.* p. 68.

The hypothesis by which all this is denied, for the purpose of sinking Calvin's doctrine towards the Puritan level of the present time, is violent in the extreme. It shuts its eyes against the plainest facts. Calvin signed the Augsburg Confession. He stood in open and acknowledged agreement with Melancthon. He solemnly declared, time after time, that he allowed the *fact* of the sacramental mystery as contended for by Luther, and differed from him only as to the *mode* of its accomplishment. Every contrary representation made against him by Westphal, and other such bigots, he proclaims a slander and lie. Surely it is a desperate business, in the face of all this, to think of making him after all a mere Puritan spiritualist, and the prince of theological hypocrites besides!

“I have gone over the Institutes of Calvin, as well as all his other writings in which he treats of the eucharist,” says the celebrated Leibnitz, “and have made from them such extracts as prove, that this author has seriously, constantly, strongly inculcated, the *real* and *substantial* participation of the *body* of our Lord; and when he denies the real presence, he is to be understood undoubtedly as speaking only of a *dimensional* presence.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J'ai parcouru les institutions de Calvin, ainsi que tous ses autres écrits ou il traite de l'Eucharistie, et j'en ai extrait des passages qui prouvent que cet auteur a serieusement, constamment, fortement inculqué la perception du corps de notre Seigneur réelle et substantielle; et quand il nie la

"It is perfectly plain," *Bretschneider* tells us, "that Calvin's theory includes what with Luther was the main object, namely, the true, full participation of Christ's body and blood, to the strengthening and quickening of the soul; and that the question whether this take place under the bread or along with it, by the mouth or by the soul, does not touch the substance of the case. For unless we conceive of the body of Christ as something sensible, and thus allow a Capernaitic eating, the oral participation must become at last nothing else than a participation through the soul, and it is not necessary that the Lord's spiritual body should be taken in by the mouth in order to have effect upon the soul."

According to *Schleiermacher* (*Der chr. Glaube*, § 140), the Calvinistic view of the Lord's supper connects, not indeed with the elements as such, but with the act of eating and drinking, not simply such a spiritual enjoyment of Christ as was taught by Zuingli; but the real presence of his body and blood to be had no where else (*die nirgend sonst zu habende wirkliche Gegenwart seines Leibes und Blutes*). Both views, the Lutheran and Calvinistic, he tells us, acknowledged a real presence of Christ's body and blood. It will hardly be pretended, that such a theologian as *Schleiermacher* has mistaken the sense of Calvin in this case. It deserves to be noted besides, that this great master of ratiocination himself, with all his cool and free spirit of theological inquiry, finds no absurdity or contradiction whatever in the Calvinistic theory. He prefers it on the whole to the view of Luther; although he thinks the truth may require still some higher middle theory, in which both at last shall be reconciled and made complete. The Zuinglian doctrine he says has the advantage of being very clear and easy to be understood; but it is quite too low for the subject.

Let these three witnesses stand for many. The weight of their judgment, on a question like this, will not be challenged lightly by those who have any right acquaintance with their names.

It now remains to show, that this Calvinistic doctrine, in all its essential features—not as something opposed to the primitive Helvetic faith, but as the necessary and proper completion rather of its true tendency and sense—passed over actually and in form, with the close of Calvin's life, into all the great national symbols of the Reformed church.

presence réelle, sans doute il n'a entendu parler que d'une présence dimensionnelle.—*Pensées de Leibnitz*, as quoted by *Ebrard*.

*The Reformed Confessions.*

Here we may at once see, how altogether unhistorical is the form, in which the Princeton Review has seen fit to bring forward its array of authorities, for the settlement of the general question in debate. The earlier Swiss testimonies are presented as of one and the same class precisely, with the confessional utterances that belong to the latter half of the sixteenth century ; no sort of regard is had to the broad difference there was between the *first* sacramental war and the *second* ; the Zuinglian and Calvinistic positions are taken as fixed quantities, both at hand in the same purely outward relation from the start ; no living movement is allowed in the case, but only some theological contradiction and disorder, from first to last ; Bullinger and the Helvetic divines, it is assumed, never moved an inch from the ground they stood upon at the beginning ; and so when we find them in the end on common ground with Calvin, as in the Consensus Tigurinus, we are required to look upon it at once as a formal truce and treaty, which involved in fact the full triumph of Zuinglianism over Calvinism as the permanently accredited creed of the Reformed church. So we have Zuinglian confessions, Calvinistic confessions, and Zuinglo-Calvinistic confessions, supposed to be a sort of compromise between Calvin's sound and Zuingli's sense ; all as it might seem of cotemporaneous and co-ordinate rank ; without the least care or pains taken, to show their true historical relations and connections. We protest against this whole mode of taking evidence, however, as arbitrary and unfair.

Dr. Hodge has no right to parade his first class of authorities, (purely Zuinglian as he calls them,) as a sort of parallel offset to the second. They belong wholly to a different period. As it is, they go far, in part at least, as we have already seen, to assert the very same doctrine which is more distinctly uttered at a later period. In any view, they form part of the *growing* life of the Helvetic church, and not of its mature and settled manhood. This comes into view in the period of Calvin, with the corresponding maturity of the Reformed church as a whole. Calvinism is the Zuinglian faith, carried out to its true and healthful symmetry and strength ; in opposition to Megandrianism, which sought then, and still seeks, to stunt its growth, by keeping it pedantically to the single position in which it first started. We may not make the older confessions then the measure by which to try the later, but are bound rather to look for the full sense of the first in these last ; as we find that they were

entirely superseded by them in truth, after Calvin's time. Dr. Hodge's *third* class, in which he pretends to find a sort of outward compromise between Calvinism and Zuinglianism, (this last taken in his Megandrian sense,) is very much the creature of his own imagination. The Heidelberg Catechism, as we shall see presently, is decidedly Calvinistic; the Consensus Tigurinus was considered to be so also by Calvin himself; and the Second Helvetic Confession must be interpreted in the same way. We have in fact, after the time of Calvin, but one class of authoritative symbols, and these are all Zuinglo-Calvinistic indeed; not however in the way of external amalgamation; but in such sort, that the old Zuinglian position, as asserted against Luther, is completed by development into the view of Calvin. The recognized standards of the Reformed church, in this complete stage, are the *Gallic*, *Old Scotie*, *Belgic*, and *Second Helvetic Confessions*, together with the *Heidelberg Catechism*. All older confessions, Calvin's Catechism and the Consensus Tigurinus among them, lost their force and importance with the appearance of these more perfect systems. They alone are the true ultimate rule, for determining the faith of the Reformed church in the sixteenth century.

We will direct our attention, in the first place, to the four Confessions here named, reserving the Catechism for separate consideration.

1. THE GALLIC CONFESION.—This was formed by an assembly of delegates from the Reformed churches of France, who were called together for the purpose, at Paris, in the year 1559. Its close agreement with Calvin, has led some to suppose that it proceeded from his pen. But of this there is no historical evidence; and the supposition is in no respect necessary, to account for the correspondence now mentioned. This only goes to show, that the sacramental view of Calvin was the view in truth also of the Reformed church generally, which came now to be incorporated into its symbolical books in the most direct terms. Its language on Christ's presence in the supper is as follows:

Art. XXXVI.—“ We hold that the holy supper of the Lord, the second sacrament, is a testimony to us of our union with our Lord Jesus Christ; since he has not only once died for us and risen again from the dead, *but also truly feeds and nourishes us with his flesh and blood*, that we may be one with him and that his life may become ours. For although he is now in heaven, and will remain there also till he shall come to judge the world, we believe notwithstanding, that through the *secret and incomprehensible energy of*

his Spirit, apprehended by faith, he nourishes and vivifies us with the substance of his body and blood. We say indeed that this is done *spiritually*; not however as substituting thus an imagination or thought for the power of the fact; but rather because this mystery is so high, that it transcends the measure of our sense and the whole order of nature. Belonging to heaven, in short, it can be apprehended only by faith.

Art. XXXVII.—“We believe—that in the supper, as in baptism, God in fact, that is *truly* and *efficaciously*, grants unto us what is there figured; so that we join with the signs the *true possession and fruition* of what is thus offered to us. All accordingly who bring to the sacred table of Christ a pure faith, in the way of vessel receive truly (*comme un vaisseau recoyvent vrayement*) what the signs there testify, namely, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are not less the meat and drink of the soul, than bread and wine serve as food for the body.”<sup>1</sup>

2. THE OLD SCOTCH CONFESSION.—The overthrow of Popery in Scotland took place in the year 1560; at which time also this Confession was produced, under the auspices particularly of the celebrated Reformer, *John Knox*. On the subject before us, it utters itself, (Art. XXI,) in the following style :

“And thus we utterly condemn the vanity of these that affirm sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs; no we assuredly believe, that by baptism we are ingrafted in Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of his justice, whereby our sins are covered and remitted: and also, that in the supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us, that he becometh very nourishment and food to our souls; not that we imagine any transubstantiation of bread into Christ's natural body, and of wine into his natural blood, as the papists have perniciously taught, and damnably believed; but this union and conjunction, which we have with the body and blood of Christ Jesus, in the right use of the sacraments, is wrought by *operation of the Holy Ghost*, who by true faith carrieth us above all things that are visible, carnal and earthly, and maketh us to *feed upon the body and blood* of Christ Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us, which *now is in heaven*, and appeareth in the presence of his Father for us; and yet, notwithstanding the far distance of place which is between his body now glorified in heaven, and us now mortal on this earth; yet we most assuredly believe, that the bread which we break, is the communion of Christ's body, and the cup which we bless, is the communion of his blood. So that we confess, and undoubtedly believe, that the faithful, in the

<sup>1</sup> Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, pp. 325, 338.

right use of the Lord's table, do so eat the body, and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus, that he remaineth in them, and they in him; yea, they are so made flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, that as the *eternal God-head hath given to the flesh of Christ Jesus* (which of its own nature was mortal and corruptible) life and immortality; so doth Christ Jesus *his flesh and blood*, eaten and drunken by us, give unto us the same prerogatives." <sup>1</sup>

3. THE BELGIC CONFESSION.—This dates from 1563; and is of great authority and force as a standard exhibition of the faith of the Reformed Dutch Church, both in Holland and in this country. It was solemnly approved besides by the Synod of Dort, and may be said to be clothed in this way with something of an œcumenical character. Its testimony on the mystical force of the Lord's supper, (Art. XXXV.) is particularly striking and strong:

"Christ that he might represent unto us this spiritual and heavenly bread, hath instituted an earthly and visible bread, as a sacrament of his body, and wine as a sacrament of his blood, to testify by them unto us, that as certainly as we receive and hold this sacrament in our hands, and eat and drink the same with our mouths, by which our life is afterwards nourished; that we also do *as certainly receive* by faith (which is the hand and mouth of our soul) the *true body and blood* of Christ our only Saviour in our souls, for the support of our spiritual life. Now as it is certain and beyond all doubt, that Jesus Christ hath not enjoined to us the use of his sacraments in vain, so he *works in us, all what he represents* to us by these holy signs, though the manner surpasses our understanding, and cannot be comprehended by us, as the *operations of the Holy Ghost are hidden and incomprehensible*. In the mean time we err not when we say, that that which is eat and drank by us is the *proper and natural body*, and the *proper blood* of Christ. But the manner of our partaking of the same, is not by the mouth but by the spirit through faith." <sup>2</sup>

4. THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.—The occasion which gave this a public character, was as follows. A spirit of the most violent intolerance was roused in certain parts of Germany, towards all who sided in any way with the Melancthonian or Calvinistic view of the sacraments; but in no direction

<sup>1</sup> Confession of the Faith and Doctrine believed and professed by the Protestants of Scotland.—*Duncan's Collection*, 1771.

<sup>2</sup> Conf. of the Ref. Church in the Netherlands, as used by the Dutch Church in this country.

was it more active than against the Elector of the Palatinate, Frederick the Third Fears were entertained even, that he would be excluded from the peace of the empire. In these circumstances, it became an object of great importance, to establish as far as possible a common confessional connection among the Reformed churches. Frederick especially had his heart set upon this point. Towards the close of the year 1565, he wrote to Bullinger on the subject, and begged him in particular to send him as soon as possible a confession of faith, to stop the mouths of the Lutherans, in view of the imperial diet which was then close at hand. Bullinger forwarded him at once a new confession, which he had prepared, it seems, three years before; and the elector was so well pleased with it, that he proposed immediately to have it translated and published in the German tongue. This made it desirable to clothe it with wider authority; for which purpose it was submitted to the other Helvetic churches; and in this way, being generally ratified and approved, it became known in time following as the proper Swiss Confession, having great credit also in foreign countries. On the Lord's supper, (Art. XXI,) it is particularly full.

"Under a visible form, in this sacrament," we are told, "is outwardly represented by the minister, and as it were set before the eyes, what is inwardly and invisibly wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit himself. Outwardly bread is presented by the minister, and the words of the Lord are heard: *Take, eat; this is my body: Take and divide it among you; drink ye all of it; this is my blood.* Believers accordingly receive what is given by the minister of the Lord, and eat the Lord's bread and drink the Lord's cup. Inwardly however, *in the mean time*, by the operation of Christ through the Holy Spirit, they partake also of the *Lord's flesh and blood*, and are nourished by them unto eternal life. For the flesh and blood of Christ are true meat and drink unto eternal life; and Christ himself, as delivered up for us and our salvation, is that which mainly makes the supper, nor do we suffer any thing else to be put in his room."

The article then goes on, in explanation of this statement, to describe different sorts of manducation. There is first a *corporal* manducation, such as the Capernaïtes had in their mind, when they strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then there is a *spiritual* manducation, by which Christ is so appropriated in the way of ordinary faith, that he lives in us and we in him. Still different from this, finally, is the *sacramental* manducation.

“ Besides the foregoing spiritual manducation, there is also a sacramental manducation of the Lord’s body ; by which the believer not only partakes of the true body and blood of the Lord spiritually and inwardly, but outwardly also by coming to the Lord’s table receives the visible sacrament of the Lord’s body and blood. Before indeed the believer received, in believing, life-giving nourishment, which he enjoys still ; but he receiveth *something more now*, in receiving also the sacrament. For he *makes farther progress* in the communion of the Lord’s body and blood, so that faith is kindled more and more, and groweth and gaineth strength by spiritual nourishment. For while we live, faith hath continual accessions. And whoso with true faith receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth *not the sign only*, but as already said enjoyeth also *the thing itself* (re ipsa fruitur).”<sup>1</sup>

The Gallic, Scotch, Belgic, and Second Helvetic Confessions all made their appearance, it will be observed, between the years 1559 and 1563. And now we say, no one at all familiar with the distinctive points of Calvin’s sacramental theory, and the phraseology employed to represent them in his writings, can fail at once to recognize it in each of these publications. The same stress is not laid in each case indeed on the same points ; one aspect is made more prominent here, and another there ; but in all of them the doctrine is so fully characterized as to preclude every construction, by which it might be sought to explain it away. The language is rational with a Calvinistic interpretation, but becomes extravagant and absurd, the moment we try to take it in any less sublime and mysterious sense.

In every case, of course, the Reformed positions are firmly taken against the Roman and high Lutheran theories. No local presence, no oral manducation, no inclusion of Christ in the elements, no participation for unbelievers ; all by the *Holy Ghost* and through the organ of *faith*, and for the *soul* primarily of the pious communicant. The elements, aside from the attendant grace of God, are powerless and vain. Christ’s body remains locally in heaven. We feed upon it, not in any natural or outward way, but sacramentally and mystically only. As to all these points, there is no room for question or doubt. The Reformed Confessions, as with one voice, make common cause here throughout with Zuingli.

So also undoubtedly they assert, with unequivocal emphasis, the Zuinglian idea of the *sacrificial* interest exhibited in the ordinance, as a “ commemoration ” of the atoning virtue of

<sup>1</sup> Niemeyer’s Coll. Conf. pp. 519–521.



Christ's broken body and shed blood. It is emphatically the *death* of Christ, as a past fact, which is here shown forth, by lively signs, to the faith of his people, to be appropriated by them in its efficacy and value to take away sin.

But do these determinations exhaust and conclude the sense of the doctrine, as here taught, in such a way as to shut out the mystical view, that meets us so familiarly in all the writings of Calvin? By no means.

To deny a local presence, is not to make the presence itself a mere figment. The alternative to sense and flesh, is not necessarily naked thought and contemplation. To lay stress on the covenant in Christ's blood, is not to exclude the idea of a true fellowship with his life as its necessary basis. The *mystery* of the Lord's supper is not overthrown, by being simply lifted from the sphere of nature into the sphere of the Spirit.

If we feed not on Christ with the mouth, just as little can we be said to do so with the understanding or mind. Neither *dente* nor *mente*, not "in *ventrem*," and yet just as little "in *mentem*," was the current Reformed distinction in regard to the subject, in the period of which we now speak. The reigning Puritan view of the present time resolves all into a mental process, upsetting thus in full the old mystery of a real communication with Christ's true divine-human life. The process is made to be purely subjective, involving at most certain gracious influences of God's Spirit, and corresponding moral exercises in the worshipper's soul, parallel precisely with the use that may be made of any other means of spiritual edification. But this is *not* the doctrine of the old Reformed symbols. They hold fast to the "mystery," and make high account of it as lying at the bottom of the whole sacramental transaction.

Thus, while faith is required as the necessary condition of our union with Christ, it is not allowed to be its cause. The main force of the sacrament, is found in the objective action of the Holy Ghost.

This again is no general influence merely, but a real making good of what the signs represent. The elements are only bread and wine, visible symbols of Christ's flesh and blood; but they are not void signs; the verities they signify go with them, in another sphere, by the Spirit.

True, Christ's body is in heaven, and not in the bread, but still its vivific power, that in which its true substance consists, is by the mysterious action of the Holy Ghost actually joined to our souls in the sacramental transaction; so that we are fed by

it dynamically, though not of course in any outward or fleshly way.

This participation is accordingly through the soul, as a spiritual process, and not in any sense by the mouth; but the soul, in this case, is not the mind, as one side simply of our general life; it is the centre of our being as a whole, (which is not dualistic but monadic or single,) and determines in the end both form and contents for the entire man. Thus centrally to feed upon Christ's substantial life, is to be nourished in truth by his flesh and blood, in our whole persons, unto everlasting life.

The question is not, what sense these Confessions can be made to bear when sundered from their own age; but what sense they *must* bear, as part and parcel of the theological history of the sixteenth century, starting into life from the very heart of the *second sacramental war*, in full view of all the Calvinistic issues and determinations, and surrounded on all sides with the din of controversy, ringing changes perpetually on the technical terms and phrases they are found to employ. Interpreted in this way, their actual meaning is sufficiently clear. The Gallic Confession insists on our real union with Christ, in his human nature; sets aside the difficulty of local distance, by resolving all into the mysterious power of the Holy Ghost; makes faith the vessel merely, through which the objective grace in such form is received; places this emphatically in the life-giving substance of the Redeemer's flesh and blood; and explicitly defines the word *spiritual* in the case, as not used synonymously with intellectual, but only to set the whole process above the sphere of nature and sense. The Old Scotie Confession is less logically compact and clear; but its general drift and force are the same. It will hear of no nude or void signs; faith is the organ, but Christ's body and blood now in heaven are the object, and the power of the Holy Ghost is the medium, of the sacramental manducation; no bar in such circumstances is created by local distance; the flesh of Christ is filled with life from the Godhead, for the use of his people; and they have part in it by eating his flesh and drinking his blood, that is, by partaking mystically of the substance of his human life as it is now gloriously exalted in heaven. According to the Belgic Confession, the outward part of the sacrament is not only the sign, but the testification also, of the grace it represents, namely the donation of the true body and blood of Christ for the nutriment of our spiritual life, as a mystery actually at hand at the time; faith is not the cause of this grace, but only the mouth that makes room for its reception; Christ objectively works in us what the signs rep-

resent; the mode is indeed transcendent, lying in an occult and incomprehensible operation of the Holy Spirit; but still the result is sure, and involves nothing less at last than an actual participation of the very flesh and blood of the glorified Saviour.<sup>1</sup> The Second Helvetic Confession most carefully excludes the Roman and Lutheran conceptions, but only so as to assert again at the same time the sacramental mystery as taught by Calvin. Along with the outward *representation* goes an actual *presentation*, inwardly and by the power of the Holy Ghost, Christ's objective act over against the mere receptivity of faith, causing his people to partake of his body and blood unto life eternal. These not only strengthen the soul, but "uphold it also in life" (*sed etiam in vita conservant*); they are no *cibus imaginarius* merely, but a real substantial aliment, lying at the root of all interest besides in Christ's merits and benefits; and the sacramental manducation, as distinguished from the continuous habit of the christian life, brings with it a new real fruition of this divine aliment, objectively at hand by the mystical action of the Spirit, to repair and advance the being of the new man in its own sphere.

### *The German Reformed Church.*

The Reformed church, as distinguished from the Lutheran, falls naturally, when we look back to its origin, into three sections or divisions; which need to be kept in sight always, in order to understand properly its general constitution and history.

<sup>1</sup> The language of this venerable symbol is of a truth admirably strong and distinct. For the "soul" as the seat of the christian life, so liable to be confounded with the notion of mere *mind*, we have here the idea of the "new man," (embracing our total nature, soul and body,) the product of our second nativity "in the union of Christ's body." Christ is the pabulum of this new man; faith is "the hand or mouth" for its reception; the eucharistic symbols are divine certifications of its being actually at hand; what is represented, is made good by Christ himself, in the mysterious transaction; the mode of the mystery is such as transcends all understanding; it falls within the invisible abyss of God's power; "what is eaten, however, is the very natural body of Christ, (*ipsissimum Christi corpus naturale*), and what is drunk his true blood." Alas, that it should be so hard for us, at the present time, to climb even in thought to the plain literal sense of so sublime and magnificent a creed! The *Reformed Dutch Church* of this country, whose boast it is to hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints as it was afterwards held by the Protestant fathers, may well be congratulated in the possession of this true and noble monument to the sacramental orthodoxy of the 16th century,

These have been styled the Zuinglian, the Calvinistic, and the Melancthonian branches of the communion.

The first comprehends the original Helvetic or German Swiss Protestantism, which formed in the beginning an entirely independent interest over against the Protestantism of Germany proper, under the auspices primarily of Ulrick Zuingli. The second embraces the several church organizations, in French Switzerland, France, the Netherlands and Scotland, which took character and form at a later period directly from the influence of Calvin. The third, of later rise still, is made up of that part of the Protestantism of Germany proper, which under the influence particularly of Melancthon and his school, refused to fall in with the confessional movement of the Lutheran church, that gave birth finally to the Form of Concord, and in this way found itself compelled to raise the banner of a different confession. This German movement, in the nature of the case, involved an active correspondence with the life of the Reformed church in Switzerland, and elsewhere; the weight too of Calvin's name especially could not fail to be felt; for he was universally known to stand, with regard to the sacramental question, on common ground with Melancthon. But still it cannot be said with any truth at all, that the Reformed church of Germany sprang in any sense from the Reformed church of Switzerland, or from the same church anywhere else. It grew neither from Zuingli's reformatory mission, nor from that of Calvin; but can be understood properly, only as an outbirth of German Protestantism itself, under the working of the deep and genial spirit of Philip Melancthon, the illustrious author of the Augsburg Confession.

It took its rise first, as is well known, in the Palatinate. Our limits will not permit us here to enter far into its history.\* We have already seen, in the case of Calvin's controversy with Westphal, the general nature of the question which lay at the foundation of the second sacramental war, and which caused Germany by means of it to rock for so many years with universal theological commotion. The question lay in truth in the bosom of the Lutheran church itself. Calvin, it was well understood all round, represented a broad and powerful interest, which considered itself perfectly at home in the church of the Empire, as it was called, and underneath the shadow of the Augsburg Confession. This it was especially, that inflamed the

\* We have given some account of it, in our small work entitled, *The History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism.*

zealotism of the other side to the highest pitch. In due time, it came to a general war. This broke out first in the city of Bremen; where a truly inquisitorial crusade was carried on for a number of years by the notorious Timann, against the amiable and excellent Albert Hardenberg, an intimate friend of Melancthon and the main ornament of the place. In close connection with this soon after, but of much more serious and far reaching consequence, stands the religious revolution of the Palatinate. The general superintendent Hesshuss, a man of unbounded ambition and intolerance, undertook to carry all before him, with a high hand, in favor of extreme Lutheranism. This excited opposition. The reigning religious life of the Palatinate looked another way; being in active sympathy all along with the spirit of Melancthon; who was a native of the country, and always retained towards it a sense of special patriotic interest and affection. The Reformation had gone forward there from the beginning, in close connection with his counsels. He of all other men deserves to be considered the soul of it throughout; and it soon appeared now, accordingly, that though absent in the body he was in truth mightily present in the spirit, to counteract and defeat the views of Hesshuss. Heidelberg became the theatre of violent controversy. The whole province was thrown into commotion. In the midst of it, the elector, Frederick the Third, wrote to Melancthon for his advice. He had already concluded in his own mind, no doubt, what was best to be done; and probably this was itself the result of an understanding previously had with the Reformer; but he wished now to sustain himself openly and in form with his high authority. This drew forth the celebrated *Response* of Melancthon, as it is called; one of his last theological acts; which came out soon after over his fresh grave, and involved his memory in no small reproach with the stiff party in the Lutheran church, to whose views it was found to be opposed. It was in full conformity with its views, that the elector silenced the sacramental controversy in his dominions, and took measures to settle the faith of the Palatinate permanently on the Melancthonian or Calvinistic basis, as distinguished from that of Westphal, Hesshuss, and other men of the same intolerant stamp. The object with Melancthon was not, of course, anything like a secession from the Lutheran church; but neither was this in the mind of Frederick. Both of them, to the last, adhered to the Augsburg Confession. Out of the movement, however, sprang in truth the confessional rupture of Protestant Germany. Melancthon became here, in a certain sense, the author of the *German Reformed church*.

The new communion, in time, was brought to include other portions of the German field ; but always with the same reigning spirit, and under the same general relation to the Augsburg Confession.

“ In Germany, the Reformed Confession gained ground gradually, far beyond the bounds of the Palatinate. This was owing partly to the influence exerted by neighboring countries, particularly Switzerland and Holland ; but still more, no doubt, to the process, by which Lutheranism itself became complete, in being carried forward to its last consequence, the *Form of Concord*. A large amount of Calvinistic (or more strictly Melancthonian) feeling, which had prevailed in the church as moderate Lutheranism, was forced by this onward movement to seek a different position. In all directions accordingly we discover, with the advance of time, the presence of Reformed views and principles, in conflict with the rigid orthodoxy of the other confession, and a more or less full and open profession of the Reformed faith.— All along the Rhine, in different cities and provinces, *Juliers*, *Cleves*, *Berg*, &c., the principles of the Reformed church unfolded themselves more or less successfully, in conflict with the high toned Lutheranism of the day. The *Form of Concord*, a. 1576, as just intimated, served greatly to strengthen the tendency in this direction. Thus in the close of the century, the churches of *Nassau*, *Hanau*, *Isenburg*, and others of smaller note seceded formally from the Lutheran ranks, and became Calvinistic. *Anhalt*, in the year 1597, made a similar transition. Still more important was the change which took place, in the beginning of the next century, when Maurice, landgrave of *Hesse*, and John Sigismund, elector of *Brandenburg*, embraced the Reformed communion. In this last case indeed the resolution was not at once so entire as in the other ; since the prince was disposed to allow the free profession of Lutheranism, as before, in his dominions. The bigotry of the party however soon made it necessary for him to suppress the *Form of Concord*, by public authority. In other respects, the liberal and tolerant policy of Sigismund continued the permanent order of the State.”—*Hist. and Genius of the Heid. Cat.* pp. 89–90.

With such historical distinction from the other divisions of the same general communion, the German Reformed church has exhibited from the beginning also its own distinct constitutional character and spirit, answerable in general to the relations out of which it first sprang, and in the bosom of which it has all along since stood. Its type in this view may be denominated *Melancthonian* ; not simply as the spirit of this great man was directly

active in its original organization, but still more as it may be said to represent that side particularly of the *German* religious life, of which Melancthon appears the leading organ, over against Luther, in the age of the Reformation. It is not necessary to enter minutely here into the points of difference and contrast, between this German type of the Reformed faith and that which takes its name directly from Calvin. One material variation is found, in the view taken of the doctrine of election. With Calvin, God's absolute decree is made to be the *principle* of the christian salvation; out of which the entire process grows, in a direct and immediate way, in the case of every individual believer. This involves, by strict and necessary consequence, the whole supralapsarian theory, a limited atonement, made *only* for the elect, and predestination to perdition in the case of all besides. Altogether a truly terrific view, which is in plain contradiction to the entire idea of Christianity, and which no logical force has been able accordingly to save from various qualifications in the history of the Calvinistic creed itself. The German mind always recoiled from it, with a sort of instinctive dread. Melancthon, it is well known, (and Luther also,) renounced it as a metaphysical abstraction, at war with the historical realness of the new life revealed in Christ. In this feeling, the whole German church participated. Both confessions here were substantially of the same mind. The erection of the *Reformed* standard, in no case implied an agreement with Calvin's theory of the decrees. The only *Calvinism* involved in it, was that which stood in the doctrine of the sacraments.

This doctrine, it is easy to see, derived no benefit from the connection in which it stood with the idea of predestination, as held by Calvin. It must be allowed rather, that the sacramental interest and that of the decrees, in his system, are not free from some inward conflict, and that the one has a tendency continually to overthrow the other. Hence it is no doubt, that in those sections of the Reformed church where the doctrine of the decrees has been regarded as the main interest in theology, the original Calvinistic view of the sacraments has fallen more and more into the shade, so as to be frequently of no authority whatever. And yet the doctrine of the decrees, as held by Calvin never belonged at all to the constitution of the Reformed church as such; whereas the sacramental doctrine entered in truth into its distinctive character as a confession. The German Reformed church then, by its relation to the doctrine of the decrees, was in some respects better situated theologically than the same communion elsewhere, for the right apprehension and utterance of

the true Reformed doctrine of the holy sacraments. We need not be surprised accordingly to find it brought out here in a symbolical form, which in precision and force even surpasses at some points what we have had thus far under consideration.

*The Heidelberg Catechism.*

The true life and spirit of the German Reformed church are found embalmed in the simple and beautiful formulary, with which it first proclaimed its presence in the Palatinate, and which was afterwards accepted as its fundamental symbol also in Germany at large. It deserves to be considered, in some respects, the crown and glory of all the symbolical books of the Reformed church; as from the beginning indeed it has found almost universal favor throughout its communion, and has carried with it accordingly a sort of œcumenical authority in all lands, as being at once the last and best fruit of the general confessional movement to which it belongs. For with it properly the Reformed confessions come to an end; what follows in this character afterwards, as in Hesse-Cassel, Brandenburg, &c., being for the purpose of explanation only rather than of any new production.

The Heidelberg Catechism was the product directly of the religious revolution, by which the moderate or Melancthonian tendency was triumphantly established in the Palatinate, as the true form of its faith, over against the intolerance of the contrary interest in the Lutheran church. It was prepared by the will and order of the elector, Frederick the Third, under the general sanction of Melancthon's counsel. The authorship of it belongs to Caspar Olevianus and Zacharias Ursinus; particularly to this last, who was for seven years a student under Melancthon, and afterwards one of his most intimate and honored friends.<sup>1</sup> The parties concerned in its production had no thought of disowning the faith of the Augsburg Confession. Discussion and disputation, under the most public form, attended the movement; but it went on the assumption throughout, that the controversy regarded not at all the fact of the mystical presence in

<sup>1</sup> His first settlement was in Breslau, a. 1558, his native city; where however he soon fell into bad credit with some for his Melancthonianism. This led to his first appearance as a writer, in a short work on the sacraments; of which Melancthon is said to have expressed his approbation in the most favorable and flattering terms.—*Seisen, Gesch. d. Reformation zu Heidelberg*: p. 159.



the sacrament, but only its mode or manner. The mystery itself was allowed on all hands. At the imperial diet at Naumburg, a. 1561, the elector Frederick III., renewed his signature, with the other German princes, to the Augsburg Confession; the Catechism was published under his auspices in 1563; and yet three years after, a. 1566, we hear him again, at another diet, appealing to this very subscription in proof of his orthodoxy, and publicly ratifying it as still valid for his hand and heart. So little sense had either he or his theologians of any essential variation in the new symbol, from what they conceived to be the true meaning of the Augsburg creed. The whole was felt to be a necessary protest simply against the tyranny of the party, which was trying to fix on the Confession a sense disclaimed by its author, and to make this the only rule and measure of Lutheran orthodoxy. From this quarter accordingly rose also the opposition, with which the Catechism was met on its first appearance. The offence found with it was not, that it openly rejected the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession; but that while it pretended to allow this in form, it brought in the Calvinistic distinction with regard to mode, which was held to subvert in reality the whole mystery that the article affirms.

To have any clear sense of these historical relations, is at once to see clearly at the same time the vanity of the imagination, that the Heidelberg Catechism is as much Zuinglian as Calvinistic in its sacramental doctrine, and, in this respect lower toned here than some of the Confessions we have just had under consideration. The Princeton Review speaks of it in this way as a sort of irenical compromise "between the Zuinglians and Calvinists," and thinks there is nothing in its sacramental doctrine "to which exception would even now be taken," from the common stand-point of the American churches. But this only shows how easy it is to miss the true meaning of confessional terms and phrases, when we allow ourselves to overlook altogether the living associations in the midst of which they had their birth. That the formulary of the Palatinate should have been designed to fall *below* Calvinism in its doctrine of the sacraments, or to give up in any way the substance of the mystery affirmed in the tenth article of the Confession of Augsburg, is such a supposition as in view of all the circumstances of the case must be counted purely impossible and absurd. The controversy which gave rise to it, was not the old question at all that lay between Zuingli and Luther; but the new issue created, in the bosom of the Lutheran church, between the doctrine of the mystical presence in the Spirit, as held by Melancthon and

his school, and the crass conception of a corporeal presence in the bread, as contended for by the party which finally produced the Form of Concord. The first view was the same that Calvin held in the Reformed church, the Zuinglo-Calvinistic as it might be termed, matured from the old Zuinglian stock into becoming consistency and perfection. As for Megandrian Zuinglianism, we hear not a word of its influence in the Palatinate. The truth is, the Reformed church here springs properly from the spirit of Melancthon; as it is his spirit also which, through his favorite disciple Ursinus, more than that of any other of the older reformers, pervades every page, we may say, of the Heidelberg Catechism.

When we look into the Catechism itself, we find its sacramental doctrine to be in fact just what might be expected in this view. It is Melancthonian throughout; the terminology of Calvin filled with Melancthon's spirit. Throughout, we have the two great aspects of the ordinance carefully distinguished, and yet just as carefully held together. All looks to the sacrifice once offered on Calvary, the covenant of pardon and peace established in Christ's bloody *death*; but all is made immediately to turn again on the power of a real union with his present *life*, now glorified in heaven, as the only stream by which it is possible for such vast grace to be conveyed into our souls. Five times over, to say the very least, in the 75th, 76th, 77th, 79th, and 80th Questions, we have the idea of a life communion with Christ, in the holy supper, solemnly proclaimed as lying at the ground of our communion with his death. If it had been designed to anticipate and confound the imagination, that these two conceptions are of heterogeneous nature, and so not capable of being inwardly joined together in the same doctrine, it could hardly have been done to more purpose than we find it to be as the Catechism now stands. The whole runs as follows:

“Q. 75. How art thou admonished and assured in the Lord's supper, that thou art a partaker of that one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross, and of all his benefits?”

“A. Thus, that Christ has commanded me, and all believers, to eat of this broken bread, and to drink of this cup, in remembrance of him; adding these promises, first, that his body was offered and broken on the cross for me, and his blood shed for me, as certainly as I see with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken for me, and the cup communicated to me; *and further, that he feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life, with his crucified body and shed blood, as assuredly, as I receive from the hands of the minister and taste with my mouth the bread and cup of the Lord, as certain signs of the body and blood of Christ.*

“ Q. 76. What is it then to eat the crucified body, and drink the shed blood of Christ ?

“ A. It is *not only* to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the pardon of sin and life eternal ; *but also, besides that*, to become more and more united to his sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us ; so that we, though Christ is in heaven, and we on earth, are, notwithstanding, ‘ flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone ;’ and that we live and are governed for ever by one spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul.

“ Q. 77. Where has Christ promised, that he will as certainly feed and nourish believers with his body and blood, as they eat of this broken bread, and drink of this cup ?

“ A. In the institution of the supper, which is thus expressed : ‘ The Lord Jesus, in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, take, eat ; this is my body which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of me : After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood ; this do ye as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death until he come.’

This promise is repeated by the holy Apostle Paul, where he says, ‘ the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body ; because we are all partakers of that one bread.’

“ Q. 78. Do then the bread and wine become the very body and blood of Christ ?

“ A. Not at all ; but as the water in baptism is not changed into the blood of Christ, neither is the washing away of sin itself, being only the sign and confirmation thereof appointed of God ; so the bread of the Lord's supper, is not changed into the very body of Christ, though, *agreeably to the nature and properties of sacraments*, it is called the body of Christ Jesus.

“ Q. 79. Why then doth Christ call the bread his body, and the cup his blood, or the new covenant in his blood ; and Paul the communion of the body and blood of Christ ?

“ A. Christ speaks thus not without great reason, namely, *not only* thereby to *teach us*, that as bread and wine support this temporal life, so his crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink whereby our souls are fed to eternal life ; *but more especially* by these visible signs and pledges to *assure us*, that we are *as really partakers of his true body and blood* (by the operation of the Holy Ghost) as we receive by the mouths of our bodies these holy signs in remembrance of him ; and that all his sufferings and

obedience are as certainly ours, as if we had in our own persons suffered and made satisfaction for our sins to God.

“ Q. 80. What difference is there between the Lord's supper and the Popish mass ?

“ A. The Lord's supper testifies to us, that we have a full pardon of all sin by the only sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that we *by the Holy Ghost are ingrafted into Christ*, who, according to his human nature, is now not on earth, but in heaven, at the right hand of God his father, and will there be worshipped by us :—but the mass teacheth, that the living and the dead have not the pardon of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is also daily offered for them by the priests; and further, that Christ is *bodily under the form of bread and wine*, and therefore is to be worshipped in them; so that the mass at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry.”

Observe how carefully and constantly here the benefits of Christ are made to depend on connection with his life; and how clearly the *pignoral* force of the sacrament, as the mystical pledge and seal of such connection, is distinguished from its force as a mere sign for the understanding. *First*, the fact of the atonement as already made is set forth in the way of divine picture; *secondly*, the outward transaction certifies or makes sure divinely the inward result, by the Spirit, of a real present communication with the life, in which only the atonement has its perennial seat, as the aliment of immortality, for our souls. The first object may never be forgotten; but the case involves always the other also, (“ further”—“ besides that”—“ more especially,”) as the necessary completion of the sacrament, and that without which in fact the first aspect itself could not stand. *As certainly* as the outward part of the solemnity goes forward in the sphere of sense, this mystery of a real participation of the true body and blood of Christ, uniting us more and more to his sacred life, goes forward at the same time in the sphere of the Spirit. Take particularly the 76th and 79th Questions. Here are all the Calvinistic or Melanthonian points, in clear and precise enunciation; the memorial of the atonement; our present fruition of Christ's life, as the ground of all interest in his death; the local barrier surmounted by the Holy Ghost; and so a real participation, in the very substance or vivific vigor of his glorified person.

Altogether, could it well be more strongly asserted than it is here said in fact, that in the holy eucharist by the act of Christ objectively through his wonder-working Spirit, and not simply

by our act, we are made to participate, not orally and outwardly, but mystically, dynamically and substantially, through the inmost soul-centre of our being, in the divine life that springs up perpetually through the fountain of his humanity, as Calvin has it, for the use of our dreary and dying nature.

*Frederick the Third and Ursinus.*

If however there might be any doubt with regard to the true sense of the Heidelberg Catechism, in itself considered, it ought to vanish certainly from the most incredulous mind, before the direct testimony of the man who wrote it, and the prince by whose authority it first became a public rule of faith. This happily we have within reach, under the most clear and explicit form.

The Catechism, we have already said, took its rise in the midst of much public debate. Strenuous efforts were made from abroad, to turn the course of things in the Palatinate another way. In June, 1560, a disputation was held, which lasted five days, on the sacramental question alone; the point being simply, *how* the mystery of the real presence was to be regarded as having place; while the fact of the mystery itself was allowed fully on both sides. The Reformed thesis was, "that the true substance of the true body of Christ" is received in the sacrament, but only through faith, by the power of the Holy Ghost, and not in an oral way. The appearance of the new formulary, a. 1563, was the signal for a general burst of opposition on the side of the extreme Lutherans. The theologians of the neighboring province of Wurtemberg especially led the way, in this controversy. It became necessary for Ursinus and his colleagues to stand forward in their own defence. The elector too was solemnly taken to task by his brother princes. In this way the sacramental doctrine of the Catechism especially was brought under full discussion; so that we are not left in any uncertainty whatever, with regard to what were its actual relations to the theology of that time. The case is historically clear as the light of day.

The elector *Frederick*, as we have before seen, professed to remain true to the Augsburg Confession, as long as he lived; and he was not a man, to make such a profession either blindly or falsely. Few princes have been equal to him in piety and wisdom. On the 14th of Sept. 1563, he published a Declaration, in reply to a Remonstrance on the part of some of his fel-

low princes, in which he disclaims all thought of falling away from his former faith, and on the subject of the Lord's supper, in the name of his preachers and for himself, bears this truly striking and memorable testimony :

“ They believe and teach, that not alone bread and wine are there given us, as holy divine signs and seals, (according to the language of the inspired Scriptures, and also of the Augsburg Confession and Apology,) and not only the merit of Jesus Christ, nor his divinity alone ; but that the Lord Christ himself wholly, (*ganz und gar,*) true God and man, his essential body and essential blood, (*sein wesentliches Leib und wesentliches Blut,*) as given and shed for us on the cross, likewise all his merits, benefits, heavenly treasures and goods, and life everlasting, truly, without any deceit, and not in mere fancy, but really, *re ipsa*, by the power and operation of the Holy Ghost at hand to faith as the food and drink of our souls, are by the Lord himself offered and handed over to us ; so that we, by such communion with Christ, become true members of his blessed body, to remain and live he in us and we in him.”<sup>1</sup>

The view of *Ursinus* is clearly declared in his Commentary on the Catechism, as published by David Pareus after his death. Several extracts from this are given in the Mystical Presence. They are particularly distinct and emphatic, on the relation which the two sides of the sacrament hold to each other, in the Reformed doctrine, as *joint factors* in the constitution of its peculiar mystery. The outward sign and the inward grace *both* enter into the idea of the ordinance, with equal authority and right ; and they are tied together by direct present *bond*, as truly as the union of form and substance in any other case, though in a wholly special and extraordinary way. “ The sign and the thing signified are united in this sacrament,” we are told, “ not by any natural copulation, or corporal and local existence one in the other ; much less by transubstantiation, or changing one into the other ; but by signifying, sealing, and exhibiting the one by the other ; that is, *by a sacramental union*, whose bond is the promise added to the bread, requiring the faith of the receivers.” Passing by all this however at present, we beg leave to fix attention on the following plain and full testimony from a tract drawn up by *Ursinus*, and published in the name of the whole Heidelberg Faculty, soon after the Catechism appeared, for the very purpose of explaining and vindicating its doctrine in

<sup>1</sup> Article on the German Reformed church by *Dr. H. Hepp*, in *Ullmann's "Studien u. Kritiken"* for July, 1850.

regard to the holy sacraments. Who will pretend to say, that *such* an interpretation is not *authentic*, and entitled to credit from the whole world.'

In the second part of this publication, which treats of the supper, it is said :

"That we might live eternally by Christ, it was not enough for him to become a sacrifice for us, but he must also *incorporate us with himself*, that we may become by him again a habitation of God, John 15. Hence he makes us partakers *not only of his merit*, but also *of himself*, that is, of his *person, substance, and essence*, and *thus* also of his power and operation, or of his condition, property and glory. Himself he gives over to us, by *dwelling in us truly with his Spirit*, and by so joining and uniting us, through this Spirit which dwells both in him and us, *with his true essential body*, that we hang to him as limbs to the head or branches to the vine, and *have life out of him*. For Christ is our head and vine, according to his divinity *and humanity*. According to his divinity, he abides in us essentially along with the eternal Father and the Holy Ghost, John 14 : 23 ; but according to his humanity, he is not *within* our body. For as the head in the natural body is not in the arm or foot, nor the arm in the head, and as the stock of the vine is not within the branches nor the branches within the stock, but all members so hang and grow to the head, and all branches to the vine, by their veins, hands and joints, that they draw thence their life, whether far off or near as regards *place* ; so also the body of Christ is not in ours, as our body also is not in his, but the Holy Ghost, which dwells in him and in us, is the living eternal, *incomprehensible bond* between him and us, by which **OUR MORTAL FLESH IS INCORPORATED AND KNIT TO THE LIVING FLESH OF CHRIST A THOUSAND TIMES MORE CLOSELY, FIRMLY AND STRONGLY, than all the members of our body are joined by their veins and fleshly bands to our head**, and we are made members of Christ, *of his flesh and of his bone*, it matters not whether the body of Christ be *as to situation and place* near at hand or far off."

"Gründlicher Bericht vom h. Abendmal unsers HERRN Jesu Christi, aus einhelliger Lehre, der h. Schrift, der alten rechtgläubigen Christlichen Kirchen, und auch der *Augsburgischen Confession*. Gestellt durch der Universität Heidelberg Theologen. Auch Herrn Philippi Melanthonis Bedencken über der Spaltung vom Abendmal." Quoted at large by Ebrard, II. pp. 618-634. The original Latin form of the tract is referred to by Seisen, (Gesh. d. Ref. zu Heidelberg,) when he says, p. 162 : "Against the charge that the Palatinate had admitted a *new doctrine* of the Lord's supper *different from the Augsburg Confession*, Frederick III. caused an *Exegesis veras doctrinae de Sacramentis et Eucharistia* to be composed by Ursinus, which was issued, with the approbation and authority of the consistory, as a public confession."

What could be more fully in point, for the whole question with which we are here concerned? Who will dare turn the bold phraseology of the 76th and 79th Questions of the Catechism into a mere flourish of speech, in view of so clear a statement under the hand of Ursinus himself? The clear sighted man, no less than Calvin himself, knew full well what he meant to assert, by resolving the sacramental mystery into the POWER OF THE HOLY GHOST, as transcending all local limitations. What at last is any merely mechanical union, as compared with the organic, plastic force that binds together dynamically here the subjects of a common life?

"It is a great misunderstanding or perversion," we are told again, "that some so take and give the word *spiritual*, as though it did not signify what actually occurs, but were only a thought or imagination. For as *corporeal*, in this question, expresses what is perceived and done with the senses and members of the body, so also that is *spiritual* which takes place by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Hence the body of Christ also, although it is no spirit, but true human, natural, visible and palpable flesh and blood, is notwithstanding a *spiritual* gift and bestowment, since the participation of it is spiritual, that is, comes to us by the Holy Ghost."

A truly weighty interpretation, we may say with Professor Ebrard, of a most weighty idea!

The ninth and last part of this memorable "*Gründlicher Bericht*," is devoted to the object of showing that the sacramental doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism, is in full harmony with the true and proper sense of the Augsburg Confession.

### *Secondary German Reformed Symbols.*

These grew out of the religious changes, by which the Reformed church, as already mentioned, gained new ground in different parts of Germany, after the introduction of the Form of Concord. They are not so much regular confessions, as declarations rather publicly describing and explaining what they take to be the true sense of the Reformed Protestant faith. Under such view, however, they are specially important, in the case before us, as they serve to show clearly the light in which the eucharistic mystery was regarded by the German Reformed church, as a whole, in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The *Repetitio Anhaltina*, as it is called, (a. 1579,) proclaims its full assent to the Augsburg Confession; and on the subject of the Lord's supper uses the following language:



“Resting in the words of institution as a sure foundation, we shrink with our whole heart from every profanation of this tremendous mystery; and neither by defect nor excess fall in with those who go aside from the king's high way. We retain this most simple and clear sense of the words, that in the Lord's supper, along with the bread and wine, is truly distributed and received, *that very body which was offered for us on the altar of the cross, and the self-same precious blood that flowed from the sacred wounds of Christ, freely shed for us for the remission of sins.* —He causes us to partake, not only of his merit and efficacy, but also of *the substance of his body and blood*, that we may be certain, that our sins are truly remitted on account of his passion and death, and that he himself is willing to dwell in us, and to bear us as branches inserted into his person, and to sustain us to eternal life.”<sup>1</sup>

The following extracts are from a Catechism and Confession, which were adopted by a General Synod of *Hesse-Cassel* in the year 1607.<sup>2</sup>

“The Lord's supper is a sacrament or divine transaction, where the Lord Christ himself present, with visible signs of bread and wine, images, seals and *makes over* to us the gifts and heavenly goods promised, namely, his *true body* broken for us and his *true blood* shed for us for the remission of our sins.”—*Catechism.*

“Since the Lord says of the bread, *This is my body* which is broken for you; and again, *This do in remembrance of me*; with which words he requires us to believe and wills, that we not only eat the earthly bread with the mouth of the body, but that with the mouth of the heart we eat and drink the heavenly food, that is, his true body given for us, and his true blood shed for us on the cross from his side and wounds for the remission of our sins; so we believe that in the holy supper, *along with* the oral fruition of the sacrament of Christ's body, we *partake likewise* of the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, not *imaginarie* or in mere thought, but truly, and that by such participation Christ dwells in our hearts. Thus then the Lord Jesus Christ, *not absent but present*, in his holy supper truly *feeds us with his flesh* and makes us to *drink of his blood*, and this participation of Christ's body and blood brings and gives powerful comfort, life and eternal salvation, to all timid, troubled and believing hearts.”—*Confession.*

Specially worthy of notice is the spirit of the German Reformed church of Prussia, as exhibited to our view originally

<sup>1</sup> Niemeyer: Coll. Conf. p. 623.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by *Heppé*: Article on Ger. Ref. Church, in *Stud. u. Krit.* July, 1850.

in the electorate of Brandenburg. This we find in the celebrated Confession of Sigismund, (das märkische Glaubensbekenntniss,) bearing date May, 1614; in the Articles of the Leipsic Conference, held in the year 1631; and in the Declaration of Thorn, a. 1645; which are sometimes styled the Three Brandenburg Confessions. The last two grew out of efforts which were made under the auspices particularly of prince Sigismund, in favor of religious union; and they are of particular interest in this view, as showing how far the Reformed theologians were willing to go towards the settlement of a common rule of faith. The design in both cases failed; but the spirit of the Reformed church was exemplified at least, with good advantage, in its publicly adhering, as it subsequently did, to the irenic platform here proposed.

The *Confession of Sigismund* broadly declares its adhesion to the Augsburg Confession, as presented to Charles V. in the year 1530; asserts the sacramental presence of Christ's true body and true blood, in the Lord's supper, though only in the Calvinistic or Melancthonian sense; and distinctly rejects at the same time the idea of all unconditional election and reprobation.<sup>1</sup>

The *Leipzig Conference* proceeded throughout on the same basis. The articles of the Augsburg Confession were taken up separately, for the purpose of determining clearly the sense in which they were understood. On the tenth article, the report gives us the following transaction:

“The theologians of Brandenburg and Hessia (Reformed) accepted the article on the Lord's supper in full, word for word, as it stands in the Confession presented a. 1530. Along with the Saxon divines, (Lutheran,) they rejected the popish transubstantiation, likewise the *concomitance*, the abiding sacramental presence of the body and blood beyond the solemnity, the *συνουσία*, the co-existence, inexistence, every sort of local and bodily presence of the body, and the worship whether of the bread or its form.

<sup>1</sup> Im heiligen Abendmal—gläuben und bekennen S. Churfl. Gn. weil zweyerley Ding daselbst zu befinden, die eusserliche Zeichen Brodt und Wein, und der wahre Leib Christi, so für uns in den Tod gegeben, und sein heiliges Blut, so am Stamm des heiligen Kreuzes vergossen, dass auch auf zweyerley Weise dieselben genossen werden. Das Brodt und Wein mit dem Munde, der wahre Leib und das wahre Blut Christi eigentlich mit dem Glauben, und dass demnach wegen der Sacramentlichen Vereinigung in dieser heiligen Action beide zusammen seyn, und zugleich ausgespendet und genommen werden. —Also—dass d. h. Abendmal auch eine geistliche Speise der Seelen sey, dadurch dieselbe erruicket, getröstet, gestärcket, und mit dem vereinigten Leibe der Unsterblichkeit gespeiset und egehalten wird. —*Niemeyer: Coll. Conf. p. 647.*

They acknowledged further, that in the Lord's supper not only are the outward elements of bread and wine present; and not only the power and effect, or the mere signs of the body and blood; but that the true essential body which was broken for us, and the true essential blood of Jesus Christ himself, which was shed for us, by means of the consecrated bread and wine are truly and in a present way distributed and received, *in virtue of the sacramental union*, which consists not in the character of a mere sign, nor yet in the force of a seal only, but also in the *joint undivided presentation of the earthly elements and of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ*; only this sacramental union has no place beyond the sacred transaction itself, but alone in the same.

This moreover was agreed, that in the spiritual side of the transaction not only the power, benefit, and effect, but the essence and *substance* of the body and blood of Jesus Christ himself, in the use of the holy supper, here on earth, are enjoyed, that is, are in a spiritual way by true faith eaten and drunk, and that this spiritual participation is of necessary account for the right use of the ordinance."

The report then goes on to say, that the Reformed theologians could not allow this spiritual participation to be by the organ of the mouth, but only through the action of faith, as the medium of a process above sense; while the Saxons insisted on the idea of an *oral* communication, holding in the case of unbelievers as well as believers. Here accordingly the agreement failed; but not till it came to this. The Reformed had no quarrel with the matter of what the Lutherans were concerned to uphold in the sacrament, the fact of a real mystical communication with the living substance of Christ, but only with their crass view of the way in which the mystery was supposed to come to pass.

The *Declaration of Thorn* completes this class of expository symbols. It was presented by the Reformed theologians to the General Synod held at Thorn in the year 1645, as a solemn statement of what they judged to be the true sense of the Reformed creed, as exhibited in previous confessions; in which character, it passed into symbolical credit afterwards in Poland, as well as in Brandenburg and Prussia. For the *German* Reformed church thus especially, it must be regarded as of absolutely conclusive force, on the whole subject now under consideration; since it certifies to us, in the most direct and authentic form, the precise import of its sacramental faith, as it stood in the beginning. The chapter on the "Lord's supper" consists of *fourteen* articles. The first three run as follows:

"1. As Baptism is the sacrament of our spiritual *regeneration* in Christ, so the holy supper is the sacrament of our spiritual *nutrition*

in the same; wherein Christ himself, by the outward symbols of bread and wine, sanctified by his word, which we are commanded to eat and drink corporally and visibly in memory of his sacrifice, attests that he exhibits and communicates to us his body given for us and the blood of the N. Testament shed for us, as spiritual food and drink unto eternal life.

"2. This sacrament then consists of *terrene things*, bread and wine, and *celestial things*, the body and blood of the Lord; both of which, though it be in a different mode, are still exhibited to us in the most true, real and present way. Namely, the terrene things in a natural, bodily and terrene mode; but the celestial things in a spiritual, mystical and celestial mode, such as *inscrutable to reason and sense* we hold by faith only; by which we grasp the words of promise and the thing itself promised, to wit, Christ crucified with all his benefits.

"3. Hence even the terrene things, bread and wine, are styled the body and blood of Christ, as being so in truth, not indeed substantially or corporeally, but *sacramentally and mystically*, or through and on account of the *sacramental union*; which does not consist in naked signification, nor yet in *obsignation only*, but also in this *joint and simultaneous exhibition and communication* of the terrene and celestial things, under their different modes."

The two next articles explain, in what sense the early fathers speak of the elements as changed into Christ's body and blood, and of the whole ordinance as a sacrifice; after which follows, in articles 6-9, a rejection in full of transubstantiation, every sort of local inclusion or co-existence, and the idea of a corporal or oral communication in any way whatever, together with the mass and the worship of the host. Passing over this, we resume our quotation with the tenth article.

"10. Still the signs are by no means nude, void and vain, but *simultaneously exhibit* what they signify and seal, as most certain media and *efficacious instruments*, by which the body and blood of Christ, and so Christ himself with all his benefits, are *exhibited and offered* to all communicants, while to *believers* they are actually *donated and delivered*, so as to be *received* by them as saving and life-giving food to the soul.

"11. Nor do we by any means deny the *true presence* of Christ's body and blood in the supper, but only the local and corporal mode of presence, and a substantial union with the *elements*; the presence itself as *with us*, we sacredly believe and this *not* as imaginary, but as *most true*, *most real*, and *most efficacious*, namely, that very *mystical union* of Christ with us, which *he himself*, as he promises by word and by symbol offers, by his Spirit also *effects*, and which we *through faith accept*, and by love feel, agreeably to that ancient

saying: The motion is felt, the mode unknown, the presence believed (Motum sentimus, modum nescimus, presentiam credimus).

"12. Whence it is clear, that not merely the *virtue, efficacy, operation* or *benefits* of Christ, are presented and communicated to us, but especially the *substance itself of Christ's body and blood*, that self-same victim which was given for the life of the world and slain upon the cross, that by believing communion with the victim and union with Christ himself, we might in *consequence* partake also of the merits and benefits procured by his sacrifice, and abide in him even as he does in us.

"13. And this, *not only as to the soul*, but also *as to our body*. For although, as by the bodily mouth we receive the terrene part, so it is by the faith of the heart as the proper organ that we receive the celestial part; according to that old line, 'ventrem, quod terimus, mentem, quod credimus, intrat;' still by the mediation of this faith, *not merely our souls*, but also our *bodies themselves*, are inserted and united into Christ's *body* BY HIS SPIRIT, unto the hope of the *resurrection* and everlasting life, that we may be flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, and so one mystical body with himself, which the apostle with good reason has styled a great mystery."

The last article insists on the use of the cup for the laity, as well as the bread.'

Altogether what a luminous commentary we have here on the sacramental phraseology of the Reformed symbols, as it was understood by the German church in the beginning of the seventeenth century. And who will pretend to say, that such a commentary is not of more weight at least than any amount of merely modern Puritan authority, arbitrarily wresting the same phraseology into another sense altogether, to please its own anti-mystical humor? The relation between sign and thing signified, is not general only but special; both enter into the constitution of the sacrament; the "exhibition" of the invisible grace is its actual *presentation* at the time, under an objective form; this is too, not the benefits of Christ merely, but the quickening substance of his life itself; and that again his proper *man's life*, in which he died on the cross and with which he now reigns in heaven; the soul or heart, acted upon by the Holy Ghost in the *great mystery* of its participation is not the understanding simply as a separate existence, but the inmost ground and centre of our whole living nature, out from which in a real way the organic force of Christ's life is reproductively carried into both mind and body, transmuting them, as Hooker has it, from sin

' Niemeyer: Coll. Conf. pp. 681-683.

to righteousness, from death and corruption to glory and immortality. All in full harmony with the beautiful representation of Calvin : " *Christi caro instar fontis est divitis et inexhausti, quæ vitam a divinitate in seipsam scaturientem ad nos transfundit.*"

—  
IV.

CONCLUSION.

We have now carried our historical trial as far, as the proper wants of the subject would seem to require ; and we may safely leave it with all candid readers, we think, to decide for themselves what force the whole should have, as regards the general question in debate. If we are not entirely mistaken, the evidence we have brought forward is sufficient to show conclusively, that the original and proper sacramental doctrine of the Reformed church was of a truth in all material points, what we have described it to be in the Mystical Presence ; and that the counter statement of Princeton, accordingly, falls altogether short of the full and entire truth. To see at a glance the difference between the two representations, as well as to estimate their comparative claims to regard, in the light of the examination through which we have now gone, we have only to repeat the recapitulatory paragraph of the Princeton article, which we have before quoted, adding to its several clauses at the same time what is needed in the way of supplement to complete their sense. To make the contrast between the two forms of statement more immediately plain, the supplementary parts are presented in a different type, and of course without quotation marks.

" Christ is really present to his people, in this ordinance, not bodily, but by his Spirit," *as the medium of a higher mode of existence ; " not in the sense of local nearness, but of efficacious operation," nullifying miraculously the bar of distance and bringing the very substance of his body into union with their life.* " They receive him, not with the mouth, but by faith," *as the organ by which only the soul is qualified to admit the divine action now noticed ; " they receive his flesh, not as flesh, not as material particles," but dynamically in the inward power of its life, (so that the clause " nor its human life," is not correct ; ) " his body as broken and his blood as shed," the value of that sacrifice carried in the vivific virtue of the same body now gloriously exalted in heaven.* " The union thus signified and effected between him and them, is not a corporeal union, nor a mix-

ture of substances," *in the Roman or Lutheran sense*, "but spiritual and mystical;" *not merely mental, but including the real presence of Christ's whole life under an objective character, and reaching on our side also through the soul into the body*; "arising from the indwelling of the Spirit," *not as the proxy only of an absent Christ, but as the supernatural bond of a true life connection, by which his very flesh is joined to ours, more intimately far than the trunk to its branches, or the head to its members, in the natural world.* "The efficacy of this sacrament, as a means of grace, is not in the signs," *separately taken*, "nor in the service," *outwardly considered*, "nor in the minister, nor in the word, but solely in the attending influence of the Holy Ghost," *as the necessary complement or inward side of the divine mystery itself of whose presence the outward signs are the sure guaranty and pledge, and whose mirific action can never fail to take effect objectively where the subject is in a state to admit it by faith.* "This we believe," *so filled out with positive contents*, "to be a fair statement of the doctrine of the Reformed church."

The fact then of a broad and serious variation from the old Reformed doctrine of the Lord's supper, in the reigning Puritan view of the present time, ought not to be disputed nor disguised. Some pains are taken, in the *Mystical Presence*, to illustrate and define this modern view, by suitable extracts from popular authors; as also to place it in direct contrast at several points with the older doctrine, for the purpose of bringing the fact now mentioned into clear light. Let the two following quotations, the first from Professor Stuart of Andover, the other from that well known work, *Dick's Theology*, suffice at present, in place of all other authorities, for specimen and exemplification. Both of these distinguished divines sink the Lord's supper into a simply commemorative ordinance throughout.

"Here we find," says Prof. Stuart, "the great object of the symbols at the table of the Lord. They are to *show forth his death until he come.*' They are designed in a peculiar manner to recall to the mind of the communicant, the sufferings and death of him who instituted these memorials. Other views of him must accompany such recollections. His love, his pity, his constancy, his inextinguishable compassion for perishing men, his hatred of sin, his earnest desire for the purification and holiness of all his followers—all these, and more of the like things, stand inseparably connected with the remembrance of his death on the cross. And it is by a lively remembrance of these things, and a lively and active faith in them, that the believer must be profited, if profited at all, at the

table of the Lord." — "Just so far as the symbols in question recall and impress divine truth, so far they may have a sanctifying influence. To look for such influence beyond this, is not rational expectation, founded on the Scriptures and on the nature of the Christian religion, but superstition and groundless mystical conjecture."<sup>1</sup>

"Why should any man talk as Calvin does," exclaims Dr. Dick, "of some inexplicable communion in this ordinance with the human nature of Christ; and tell us that, although it seems impossible, on account of the distance to which he is removed from us, we are not to measure the power of the Divine Spirit by our standard? I am sure that the person who speaks so, conveys no idea into the minds of those whom he addresses; and I am equally certain, that he does not understand himself." — "The ordinance is misunderstood, when it gives rise to carnal meditations; and is then only observed aright, when our minds are employed in the spiritual contemplation of his atonement, and its effects. When our church, therefore, says 'that the body and blood are as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses,' (Westm. Conf. ch. xxix. §. 7); and that they 'feed upon his body and blood, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace,' (Larger Cat. Q. 168); it can mean only, that our incarnate suffering Saviour is apprehended by their minds, through the instituted signs, and that by faith they enjoy peace and hope: or it means something unintelligible and unscriptural. Plain, literal language is best, especially on spiritual subjects, and should have been employed by Protestant churches with the utmost care, as the figurative terms of Scripture have been so grossly mistaken." — "The doctrine of his presence I would not found, as others do, upon the words of institution, which, when justly interpreted, merely import that the elements are signs of his body and blood. Now, a sign is very far from implying that the thing signified is present. It is rather understood to represent an absent object, and is put in its place to remind us of it because it is removed to a distance from us. Instead of being a fair conclusion from the words of institution, that there is a peculiar, mysterious presence of our Saviour, which can be accounted for only by the miraculous power of the Spirit, it might rather be inferred that he is not present at all, and that the design of the symbols is to call him to remembrance in his absence. The doctrine of his presence in the sacred supper, is legitimately deduced from his general promise, which relates to all his ordinances without any special respect to the supper: 'Where two or three,

<sup>1</sup> Article on the Lord's supper by Moses Stuart, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 1. p. 274, 276.



&c.' Matth. xviii. 20. It is this promise which gives us ground to consider him as present in the eucharist, in baptism, in prayer, in the preaching of the gospel. In all these ordinances he is present; and he is present in the same manner in them all, namely, by his Spirit, who renders them effectual means of salvation."<sup>1</sup>

These quotations will be acknowledged generally, no doubt, to be a fair representation of the Puritan doctrine of the Lord's supper, in its present reigning form. And can there be any question, we ask, whether it varies materially or not from the original doctrine of the Reformed church? Does it not flatly deny what that doctrine always took pains to affirm; the mystical force of the sacrament; its objective efficacy; the union of sign and thing signified in its constitution; its relation to the life of Christ as the basis of his atonement; the presence in it especially of the life-giving virtue of his flesh and blood, or true human nature, by the power of the Holy Ghost, as the proper food of the soul? The difference between the two forms of belief is palpable and wide. No honest interpretation can pretend to explain it away. It is just as palpably too of the most serious significance and account.

Here is a *fact* then, which all should be willing openly to see and allow. Be its claims what they may to consideration and regard, on *other* grounds, this Puritan doctrine is a departure from the sacramental faith of the Reformed church as it stood in the beginning. This should be acknowledged, without reserve or qualification, on all sides.

Dr. Hodge himself owns as much, in the case at least of Calvin and a part of the church besides; and lays his finger very fairly, at the same time, on the point where the two systems first fall asunder. Two views of the Lord's supper, he tells us, for a time struggled together in the bosom of the old doctrine; one referring the sense of the institution wholly to Christ's *death*, as something past; the other referring it to his *life* also, as something present. The latter however he represents to have been from the first a foreign element, in conflict with the true genius of Protestantism, and especially with the article of justification by faith, which in due time, accordingly, fell out of the system altogether. As we have now seen however, it was not only one phase of the Reformed doctrine in the beginning that bore this peculiar aspect, but the doctrine in its general character. Participation in the life of Christ was insisted upon by the Reform-

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Theology. by the late Rev. John Dick, D. D., Lect. XCII.

ed confession, no less than by the Lutheran, as an essential constituent of the sacramental mystery. Not of course to the exclusion of the other interest; but in reality for its preservation. For the two ideas are by no means of heterogeneous nature. On the contrary they mutually support and require one another. The sacrifice of Christ is of perennial force, only through the undying presence of his life; and how should there be a real, and not simply imaginary, fruition of the first, then, without a real communication at the same time with the last? Such was the sense undoubtedly of the old sacramental doctrine. It sought to hold together here the objective and subjective sides of the christian salvation. No mere exercises of man were felt to be enough, in the case; the living power of the new creation, as a higher order of existence in Christ, must come in perpetually to uphold the process. In the holy supper especially, as the central solemnity of the christian worship, this side of our salvation could not be allowed to fail; for must it not in that view be skorn of its mystical character altogether, and so cease to be a *sacrament* at all in any special sense? Hence it was held, that the power of Christ's life, the virtue and vigor in particular of his flesh and blood, that is, of his true human nature, are objectively at hand in the transaction, by the agency of the Holy Ghost, for our spiritual nourishment and *growth* in grace. From all this, the modern Puritan doctrine has fallen away. The entire interest of communion with Christ's human *life*, it deliberately rejects as an antiquated superstition. It will hear only of communion with his *death*; by which it means, not the abiding force of this as a real quality or property of the still living Saviour, but the thought or memory of it only as something past and gone. The bond thus between sign and thing signified is completely severed. The "invisible grace" evaporates into thin air. The objective power of the institution is overthrown. Its mystical character fails entirely. Here, of a truth, is a most material change. Dr. Hodge considers it an improvement, and styles it a "process of growth." To our mind, we confess, it carries a very different aspect. The *fact* however, in any view, is not to be called in question. The modern doctrine and the old doctrine are not the same; and the difference between them is by no means either casual or small. It reaches to the very constitution of the sacrament itself.

We enter into no discussion here of the *merits* of this change, in a theological view. Our object has been simply, to exhibit its true character as a fact of history. It may be proper however, in bringing the subject to a close to submit the following

general reflections for the serious consideration of the thoughtful.

In the first place, the Puritan theory now before us turns *Lutheranism* into a theological nullity. The side of the original Reformed doctrine which it rejects as a foreign element, incongruous with the true genius of Protestantism, and at war with the article of justification by faith, lies towards the Lutheran confession, and forms the bond of common interest and common life with it, in the great movement of the Reformation. To give it up then is not merely to fall away from the primitive constitution of the Reformed doctrine, but also at the same time to break in full with the inward life of the other communion.<sup>1</sup> To charge it with folly, is to bring an *a fortiori* charge of the same sort against Luther himself, and the whole church of the Augsburg Confession. For it will not be denied surely, that for this section of Protestantism at least, the idea of communion with Christ's *human life* was of primary and necessary significance. And yet it is here precisely, that we find all stress also laid on the article of justification by faith, as the very pillar of all true christianity! How is this? Must it be set to the account of Luther's headstrong humor merely, that he could never be brought to feel the innate contradiction of the two ideas thus forced together in his system; or that he would never allow himself to see in the old catholic notion of sacramental grace, an element foreign to the whole sense of Protestantism, the very worm that must in the end eat out the core of his great article of justification itself, if not ejected by a "process of growth" clear off to the other side? And was it only blind reverence for his authority, that bound the giant theology of the Lutheran

<sup>1</sup> It is greatly to be regretted, that the distinctive life of the Lutheran confession has been so extensively lost in this country on the part of the Lutheran church itself. Old Lutheranism, as it is called, is indeed behind the age, and can never meet its wants. Its stiff pedantry serves only to make it ridiculous. But this by no means implies, that the general substance of Lutheranism itself, as it stood in the beginning, should be set aside. This, as we take it, has a right to make itself permanently felt in the history of Protestantism; and where that ceases to be the case, the whole interest of Protestantism must suffer. It is a calamity then that Lutheranism in America, has in its most active character thus far appeared quite out of rank and place; falling short even of the true line of the Reformed confession, on the opposite side; having only a nominal distinction, without any separate character really answerable to its own name. Of all monstrosities in theology, it would be hard to name one more absurd than the figment of a purely "American Lutheranism," under no bond to the past historical identity of this confession, and free to be anything and everything at its own good pleasure.

communion to the same grand solecism, after his death? So Puritanism would seem in its heart to believe; for it makes no account whatever of the original confessional position of Lutheranism over against the Reformed tendency; but makes this, under a view that sunders it out and out from the opposite interest, to be at once the whole and only proper meaning of Protestantism. Now where all sense for history is gone, and the merest subjectivity is taken for the last measure of truth, this style of theological thinking may pass as quite satisfactory; but surely not a particle farther. To nullify the entire question on which the two confessions originally split; to set the actual and whole truth of Protestantism clear off from it, on the side of the Reformed tendency, and in no contact with it whatever; is of course to nullify Lutheranism at the same time, to turn its *distinctive* constitution into absurdity, to make its theology worthless, and in this way to stultify along with it a vast part of the universal movement of the Reformation, to which it belonged and in which it may be said in some sense to have led the way. Is a theology to be trusted, we ask, which has lost the power even of taking any interest in the first deepest confessional issue of Protestantism, and whose fancied superiority to this issue stands not in any scientific mastery of it whatever, but in the cool and quiet affectation merely of having thrust the whole question aside at last as an exploded superstition? For our part, we think not. We are not Lutheran; but truly we see not, how the life of the Reformation can be honestly respected, where all sympathy with Lutheranism is wanting, and its vast creations in theology regarded with indifference or contempt. We feel morally sure on the contrary, that if the Reformation came from God, no such absolute and total rupture between the two original confessions embraced in its constitution can ever be rational or safe. The perfection of the Reformed tendency lies not in its full divorce from the contrary interest; but in the constant recognition rather of its rightful claims, and in such a triumph finally as may be at the same time the triumph also of this interest itself, by the fair and true mastery of the grand theological problem, whose settlement they are bound to seek from opposite sides. It is no healthy symptom then, where the Reformed principle is found to have broken away completely from the authority of the Lutheran, and affects to be separately, with the full exclusion and negation of this last, the whole truth of Protestant Christianity. So in the case immediately before us, a theory of the sacraments which refuses every sort of correspondence with the Lutheran doctrine, making its whole substance a

“foreign element” in Protestantism, which it has been a clear gain to lose altogether, deserves for this very reason, we think, to be regarded with jealous and mighty distrust.

In the second place, however, the theory here in consideration falls away palpably also from the sacramental faith of the whole ancient church. The idea which it pretends to set aside as a “foreign element,” beyond all controversy, entered into the old catholic doctrine of the sacraments, not only as we find this caricatured in the later Roman creed, but as it meets us also in the earliest times, and long before Romanism appeared. No one at all familiar with church history, will think of calling this in question. Indeed the Roman corruptions are themselves fair evidence of the fact; for they could never have sprung certainly from any such view of the sacraments as we find now opposed to them, on the part of Puritanism. The first faith of the christian world *must* have been far different, to make the gradual rise of transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, at all practicable or possible. We have evidence enough however, apart from this, that it was thus far different in fact. The mystical force of both sacraments was acknowledged from the beginning; and in the Lord's supper especially, along with the value of Christ's death as a sacrifice for sins, there was felt to go always also the presence of his veritable human life, as the necessary basis of the other grace, and the true pabulum of immortality for the souls of his people. With this old catholic faith, original Protestantism, Reformed as well as Lutheran, professed and endeavored earnestly to abide in communion. Now however it is made to be the test of sound and *mature* Protestantism, to have no sense for it nor sympathy with it whatever. The Puritan theory before us discards all mystery from the eucharist, empties it of all inward or objective force, turns it into a mere memorial of the Saviour's sacrifice, and treats the imagination of any real communion in it with his human life as an obsolete superstition. But can it serve to recommend this modern view, we seriously ask, that it thus falls away from the ancient doctrine, as well as from the original Protestant doctrine, and makes a mere part in each case nakedly taken of more account and worth than the whole? It has been a “process of growth,” we are told; in other words, a theological *development*. But what sort of growth is that, which leaves behind it the very substance and type of the original life itself, which it pretends in such style to carry forward and complete? We too allow the idea of development or progress; but not in any such way as this. All true development is the unfolding of the same substance into

higher form; not the casting away of it altogether, to make room for what is wholly of another nature. To develop the old catholic idea of the sacraments into the shape here noticed, is clearly to kill it, to force the life out of it completely, and to fetch in for it a new thing altogether, that can hardly be said to be the phantom even, much less the concrete perfection, of the glorious mystery as it once was.

It deserves consideration again, that in thus falling away from the old church faith, this modern improvement falls in strikingly with the genius of Rationalism, which seeks in various forms to set aside the idea of the church altogether. It is not easy to see any clear difference between it and the view which was formerly taken of the sacraments, not merely by the Arminians, but also by the Socinians; the same substantially, we may add, that comes before us in the writings of the later open Rationalists. It agrees remarkably well also with the false spiritualism of the Quakers and Baptists, and with the reigning sect spirit indeed generally, which so sunders form and substance in the life of the church as to make the first a mere outward accident to the second, if not an actual incumbrance; and so runs legitimately at last into the denial of infant baptism at least, if not the renunciation in full of both the sacraments. The doctrine before us looks and leans this way; and having parted with the mystical interest of the sacraments, it offers no counterpoise against the rationalistic tendency which it thus favors. It is comparatively powerless against the doctrine of the Baptists; being in truth at bottom the very view out of which that doctrine springs. Even against Quakerism it has but small strength. For what does the question of the sacraments amount to, in either direction, if the *being* of the sacraments, as it was once held by the universal church, their distinctive nature and constitution, be given up as false? In that case, it is of small account whether we have two sacraments, or fifty, or none; for all turns on the *name* merely; the thing itself, the true and proper reality, resolves itself into a mere outward commandment at best, an empty shell or letter, and nothing more.

Look finally at the theological relations of the subject, and the general doctrine of the Bible. Against all history and past authority, it is the humor of Puritanism here, as in every case besides, to parade its own sense of the Scriptures simply as the rightful end of controversy. But the early church had the Bible too; and so had the Protestant world of the sixteenth century, with such men as Luther, Calvin and Melancthon, to assist in its interpretation. What rational reason can be assigned then,

for ruling the older use of it out of the way at once, in favor of the modern ; as though this last were accredited from heaven itself, as the infallible mind of the Spirit! The true doctrine of justification, we are told, requires it in the present case. To make this fully objective, something from abroad and not the product of the sinner's own life, it would seem to be thought necessary to make it at the same time an abstraction, a simple thought in the Divine Mind, setting the man free from guilt in a purely outward way. But is not this in truth to fall into the very vortex of Pelagianism, which it is pretended thus to avoid? It brings the subject to no real union with the grace of redemption. Justification, to be real, must be also concrete, the force and value of Christ's merit brought nigh to the sinner as a living fact. Strange, that there should seem to be any contradiction here, between the grace which we have by Christ's death, and the grace that comes to us through his life. Could the sacrifice of Calvary be of any avail to take away sins, if the victim there slain had not been raised again for our justification, and were not *now* seated at the right hand of God as our advocate and intercessor? Would the atonement of a *dead* Christ be of more worth than the blood of bulls and goats, to purge the conscience from dead works and give it free access to God? Surely it is the perennial, indissoluble *life* of the once crucified Redeemer, which imparts to his broken body and shed blood all their power to abolish guilt. This, if we read it rightly, is the very thought that rules in particular the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the sublime contrast it draws between the New Testament substance here and the Old Testament types. The sacrifices of the Law were many, and its priests many, because they were only of transient force ; but the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ are *one*, as always remaining. His works are not events simply, that once were and now are not, save as they live in the world's memory. They carry with them a perpetual, undying force. His one offering needs no repetition ; but just for the reason, that it never comes to an end and passes away. It is " *once* for all," because the *once* reaches through all time. This it can do however, only as the life in which it has been rendered continues to live and make itself felt. Abstract it from this, and it becomes in truth a mere legal fiction. The atonement, in this view, is a quality or property of the glorified life of the Son of Man. So the church felt from the beginning ; and this right feeling it was, that led her to see in the central mysteries of her faith the presence of the living Christ always, as the necessary guaranty and medium of all true communion with the benefits

procured by his death. In the Lord's supper especially, the idea of the living Saviour, the true fountain of life for the world, perpetually surrounded and enshrined the idea of the Saviour who once hung upon the cross. The sacrifice in this way came to have a present reality; it lived in the presence of the glorious life, which had been perfected by its means; and it is not difficult to understand, how it might even come to seem then like a new and fresh transaction in the solemnity of the eucharist. So in the age of the Reformation, it was felt on all sides unsafe to sunder the benefits and merits of Christ from his living person. How earnestly Calvin insisted on their connection, we have had ample opportunity to see. What Christ does or has done, must ever be conditioned certainly by what he is; and it is hard to see, how the force of his righteousness forensically taken can ever be impaired, by its being allowed to be in truth a part of himself and in union always with his own life.

J. W. N.

---

**CORRECTION.**—After the word “proper,” in the 3rd line from the beginning of this article, insert the word “sacramental,” so as to read “proper sacramental faith of the Reformed, &c.”