

# *Theology* on the *Web.org.uk*

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN  
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

---

VOL. XI.

---

LONDON  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW  
1885

ing them with an essay on a subject so inevitably dry. May I be pardoned if I refer my readers to my "Hours with the Bible," in the fifth volume of which they will find not only a full picture of the man and his times, but a translation of his prophecies inserted in the narrative at the proper historical date of each.

CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE.

---

## Correspondence.

---

### THE DIVINE PRESENCE IN THE CHURCH.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

I feel obliged to Archdeacon Perowne for directing my attention to some statements in a paper of which as a whole he seems to approve, but these portions of which he thinks not worded so exactly as they might be, and needing explanation. They relate to one of the most abstruse and difficult points in theology—the Divine Presence in the Church; perhaps in itself unfathomable, but full also of exegetical difficulties. An attempt at too great brevity in the paper alluded to has probably produced some obscurity (*brevis esse laboro*, etc.); but, however full the discussion may be, it may fail of having satisfactorily solved the problem. A writer must at last fall back on Bramhall's profession, "It is not impossible that some unwilling error may have escaped me, but certainly I am most free from the wilful love of error. In questions of inferior nature, Christ regards a charitable intention more than a right opinion." As the subject is of general interest, I propose to make some observations upon it; which I hope, too, may lend greater precision to the statements in the paper. I wish it, however, to be understood, that I rather seek to elicit the opinions of others than to impose one of my own.

The first thing will be to state the bare elements of the problem as they lie on the surface of Scripture.

I. It will not, I presume, be questioned that, as the paper has it, "Christ the incarnate Son" is, in a very real sense, "no longer upon earth, but has passed into the heavens." He Himself explicitly announced His impending departure to His disciples: "I go to prepare a place for you" (John xiv. 2); "Now I go My way to Him that sent Me" (*ibid.*, xvi. 5); "I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more" (*ibid.*, 10); and, what is sometimes not sufficiently noted, this His departure was actually the condition of a greater blessing. Not the presence of the incarnate Son on earth, but His absence, insured the gift of the Holy Ghost.<sup>1</sup> "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you" (John xvi. 7). And we read in Acts i. that Christ did actually thus depart.

II. Yet the same incarnate Son promises or announces, surely in some important sense, His continual presence in and with the Church. "I

---

<sup>1</sup> Even Dean Alford on Matt. xxviii. 20 can say "The presence of the Spirit is the effect of the presence of Christ;" of the absence, Christ Himself says.

will not leave you comfortless : I will come to you " (John xiv. 18) ; can we confine this to the resurrection, or the *Parousia* ? " We," i.e., the Father and I, " will come unto him, and make our abode with him " (*ibid.*, 23). " Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you " (*ibid.*, 28). In seeming agreement with this language are the promises, " Where two or three are gathered in My name, there am I in the midst " (Matt. xviii. 20), and " Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world " (*ibid.*, xxviii. 20) ; which seem to imply not a temporary but an abiding presence of Christ Himself in the Church. Accordingly, we find later on such expressions as, " Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith " (Ephes. iii. 17) ; " Christ in us the hope of glory " (Col. i. 27) ; " Christ living in us " (Gal. ii. 21) ; " Christ formed in us " (*ibid.*, iv. 19) ; " Christ our life " (Col. iii. 4), evidently our spiritual life ; " I will come to him, and sup with him, and he with Me " (Rev. iii. 20).

III. We have yet a third element to introduce. Christ promises that though as the incarnate Son He should depart, He nevertheless would " send," or vouchsafe to His Church, not merely a Comforter, or Paraclete, but " another Comforter," a real Vicar, to take His place, and discharge offices which He Himself would have discharged had He remained on earth. This Paraclete is not the Father, for the Father is said to send Him (John xiv. 26). He is called the Holy Ghost. He accordingly came on the day of Pentecost, and thenceforward appears as the active administrator on earth of this dispensation, i.e., in the offices connected with calling, quickening, enlightening, imparting spiritual gifts, etc. He evidently acts as a Person, not a mere influence (Acts xiii., Rom. viii.) ; the Church is His temple (1 Cor. vi. 19, Ephes. ii. 22) ; and the bodies of the saints will rise again because of His indwelling in them (Rom. viii. 11).

Here then, evidently, are portions of divine truth not easy of adjustment. Christ seems absent, yet present ; present, yet absent ; present, yet represented by a divine Vicar ; and *Vicarius*, in common parlance, *est absentis*. Even the Father seems to be present in the Church as Christ is, and as the Holy Ghost is. Is there any hypothesis by which this apparent inaccuracy of language may be explained ? If the Trinitarian doctrine is true it accounts for it. For if the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are one God as regards " the substance," then where the Father is the Son must be, and where the Son is the Holy Ghost must be, and *vice versâ*. God dwells in the Church, and if He does so, each Trinitarian Person does so too. And so far, i.e., in reference to the divine indwelling, it seems that Christ may be said to be the Holy Ghost, and *vice versâ* ; and if, on the ground of the Trinitarian doctrine, there may be this interchange between them, it explains how Christ might say at one time, " I go away," and at another, " I come again." It is, in fact, an application of the old canon, *Opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt* : works such as creation, redemption, sanctification, are works of the whole Trinity as regards " the substance ;" God creates, God redeems, God sanctifies : while works *ad intra* (generation, procession) can only be predicated of the Person to whom they belong. It does not follow, then, that if a writer should say, " Christ dwelling in the Church is the Holy Ghost," he confounds the Persons, any more than St. Paul can be supposed to do when in Rom. viii. 9 he says, " If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His," and then in the very next verse, by an almost unconscious transition, says, " And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin," etc. He seems to have considered the two Persons, not in reference to works *ad intra*—in which point of view it would be improper to say, The Father is the Son, or the Son is the Holy Ghost—but in reference to works *ad extra*, of which sanctification is one ; which works, though the Church in her dogmatic statements, founded on those of Scripture,

makes them "terminate in," *i.e.*, specifically ascribes them to, one Person (as our Catechism has it, "God the Son who redeemed me," "God the Holy Ghost who sanctifieth me"), yet being performed by the Godhead, "the substance" of the Trinity, admit, as will have been seen in the Scripture-statements, of greater laxity of ascription. And it must be remembered that the Trinity of Scripture, though it implies and ultimately rests on the ontological Trinity, the Trinity *in* and *per se*, is always the œconomical Trinity, the Trinity of redemption, as befits the practical aim of revelation. Thus, if I am not mistaken, no expression is more common in good authors than "Christ dwells in the Church by His Spirit;" which involves three statements: 1. That Christ dwells in the Church; 2. That He does so by His divine Vicar the Spirit; 3. That, *in this point of view*, Christ and the Spirit may be said to be one. Yet no one supposes the writers intend to confound the Persons. To take another striking example from Scripture itself, Archdeacon Perowne asks, "Where does it ever say that Christ is the Holy Ghost?" Perhaps nowhere in express terms. But let me refer him to the remarkable passage, 2 Cor. iii. 17, "The Lord is the Spirit" (*τὸ πνεῦμα*). It seems generally agreed among commentators that by "the Lord" is meant Christ; and there is little doubt in my mind, judging from the context, that by "the Spirit" is meant the Holy Ghost. Here, then, we have St. Paul using, in slightly different terms, the very expression complained of; and he seems to have done so because he had in his mind not the ontological Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as abstract immanent relations, but the Trinity of redemption, our Saviour-God in His various redeeming acts; in short, it was "the substance" which the Apostle, in such a statement, had chiefly in view. It must always be remembered that what we mean by personality—*i.e.*, will, intelligence, etc.—belongs to "the substance," the Godhead, not to "the Persons," who are not persons in the sense which we usually attach to that word, but merely *modi subsistendi*, or relations, though immanent and eternal.

And in this sense, *i.e.*, as referring to the Trinity of redemption, the expressions in THE CHURCHMAN paper, must be taken. The question was not whether the Son and the Holy Ghost, *ad intra*, are one (which they are not), but whether as regards the *opus ad extra* of dwelling in the Church we may not say that Christ dwells in the Church by His divine Vicar, the Spirit, or even that the Holy Ghost is Christ in the Church. Nevertheless, however Scripture may seem, from time to time, to overleap these distinctions, it behoves uninspired writers to be careful what language they use. Let then the passages in the paper be thus worded: "So far forth as the Holy Ghost is Christ's divine Vicar, He is a Vicar; but as divine, He must be one with the Principal; the same Christ, therefore, as regards the Godhead, Who comforted and instructed the apostles ('He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you'), but under another form" (the expression *modus subsistendi* had better be avoided, as it is a technical expression belonging to the ontological Trinity). That is, in effect, Christ dwells in us, or in the Church, by His Spirit. This is all that I intended to convey, and all that is necessary to the argument; which was that the Redeemer Christ, or the Son incarnate, is not on earth but in heaven, and therefore cannot be said to be the active administrator in the Church, and yet is represented by a Vicar Who is virtually Himself. And it seems as if the language of Scripture were purposely constructed to lead to this solution of the problem. Nor do I see how the statements in the paper, thus explained, differ materially from those of one of our most cautious divines—Waterland. "This" (the promise of Christ, John xvi. 13), he says, "is not to be so understood as if the Holy Ghost were now our sole Conductor, exclusive of the other two divine persons;

for our blessed Lord, in the very same place where He promises to send the Comforter to 'abide with us for ever,' promises also that the Father and Himself shall make the like abode with us. Elsewhere He promises to His disciples His own spiritual presence, to continue with them as long as the Church or the world should last (Matt. xxviii. 20). From all which it is plain that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost are equally present to good men in all ages of the Church; and that when our Lord spake of His departing, and leaving the world, He meant it merely of His bodily absence; and because, from the time of the Ascension, He was to be present only in a spiritual and invisible way, as a spirit, and together with the Holy Spirit;<sup>1</sup> therefore He considered His Church from thenceforwards as being peculiarly under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, though, strictly speaking, it is under the spiritual guidance of all the three Persons. Hence it is that such spiritual guidance is sometimes ascribed to the Father, sometimes to the Son, sometimes to the Holy Ghost, as it is the common work of all; and may be indifferently and promiscuously attributed to *any of them singly*, or to all of them together.<sup>2</sup> Waterland would be the last man to "confound the Persons;" but if he can say that an effect, *i.e.*, a work *ad extra*, may be "indifferently and promiscuously attributed to any of them singly," it seems he might almost say, in a popular way, *that so far as the effect is concerned*, one Person is virtually the same as another, or occupies the place of that other.

The readers of these remarks of Waterland will perhaps perceive a point in them not sufficiently cleared up, though their general purport is plain. "His own spiritual presence;" does this mean His presence by the Holy Ghost, or a spiritual presence *besides* that of the Holy Ghost? From the expression "together with the Holy Spirit," we might infer the latter. "He was to be present only in a spiritual and invisible way, as a spirit;" as the Holy Spirit, or as another spirit? (See note 2.) These points Waterland does not define for us. Passing from personal explanations, I conclude this letter with a few remarks on them.

It will have been seen that throughout the foregoing observations I proceed upon the rubric of the Church of England in what appears to be its plain and literal sense; "The natural" (even glorified) "body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one" (Communion Service); and my attempt has been to show that we do not need any presence of Christ the Redeemer on earth to reconcile the varying statements of Scripture; they being reconcilable by the hypothesis that Christ may be said to be present, or to dwell, in the Church in and by the Holy Ghost. Yet it is well known that a large proportion of Christendom not only does teach that there is a presence of Christ besides that of the Holy Ghost upon earth, but that the Redeemer Christ thus present is the principal direct source of spiritual life. Every reader of modern Romish theology must have noted the emphasis which it lays on the Incarnation, as distinguished from other facts of redemption. The Church, says Möhler, is the continued Incarnation of Christ. The Sacraments are "an extension of the Incarnation." This language has been frequently used by certain writers of our own communion. It is to be regretted that even Hooker (always "judicious"?) gives occasional countenance to these physical theories: *e.g.*, "His Church He frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of

<sup>1</sup> How can He be present as a *divine spirit*, together with the Holy Ghost, another *divine spirit*, unless both are one?

<sup>2</sup> Sermon XXVI., on Romans viii. 14.

Man ;" "Even from the flesh of Christ our bodies do receive the life that shall make them glorious" (E. P., c. 56). St. Paul, on the contrary, says that we shall rise again because of the Holy Spirit Who dwells in us (Rom. viii. 11). In this system the *Redeemer* Christ becomes the direct source of spiritual life (He is indeed so indirectly), and the office of the Holy Ghost seems very much reduced to the bringing of Christ down again to earth, to discharge the offices of quickening, sanctifying, etc. Thus the Greek Church, and the ancient liturgies, teach that it is the Holy Ghost Who changes the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which body and blood are the true nourishment of the soul unto life eternal. May we not say that in this, and kindred theories, the office of the Holy Ghost, as set forth in Scripture, is, if not ignored, very much "lost sight of" ?

It is open, however, to question whether the words of Christ respecting Himself do not imply, as Waterland seems to suggest, a double divine presence in the Church, one of Christ Himself, the other of the Holy Ghost. The Lutherans, Protestants as they are, hold an *illocalis presentia* of Christ, a presence exempt from the laws of space, on which the doctrine of consubstantiation rests. That is, it may be a question whether the presence of Christ as God, which all acknowledge, "the essential deity" of the paper, by virtue of which He is everywhere present, exhausts and explains these promises of Christ respecting Himself, "I will come," etc. On this point I do not venture to speak with confidence. Being myself inclined, in accordance, as I believe, with the rubric quoted, to the opinion that there is no presence of the incarnate Son on earth, except through the Holy Ghost, I am compelled to understand Christ's statements respecting *Himself*, as the incarnate Son, as fulfilled in the presence of the Holy Ghost ; for which fact I can find no better expression than, "The Holy Ghost is Christ's divine Vicar." All language, indeed, must on this point be more or less inaccurate.

One thing seems plain : They who adopt the theory of a presence of Christ as well as that of the Holy Ghost, and yet are disinclined to the "physical theories" mentioned in the paper (*i.e.*, assign their full force and meaning to what Scripture states respecting the work of the Holy Ghost amongst us), must regard Christ's presence as a comparatively otiose, inoperative one, so as to avoid an appearance of the clashing of the two Presences. Under this aspect, the doctrine is hardly of much dogmatical import. We may admit it, and yet also admit that the Holy Ghost is the active administrator on earth of this dispensation. Thus, *e.g.*, if we attenuate the promises of Christ respecting Himself so as to mean, as the same Hooker, as quoted by Archdeacon Perowne, strangely enough seems to do, the image or memory of Christ in the mind produced by the teaching of the Holy Ghost—like the image of a ship in the mind, while the reality is on the waves—we certainly do obtain a sort of presence of Christ, but hardly an active operative one ; at least hardly so active a one as seems implied in the passages of Scripture above alluded to. An inmate in my house may so interest me respecting an absent friend as to raise in my mind a very vivid conception of him ; but does this amount to the friend's coming "to sup with me, and I with him" ?

Such are some of the difficulties that beset the subject. Discuss them we may and ought ; solve them we probably never shall. Meanwhile, by the statement of them, something is gained ; it may draw attention to the subject, elicit opinions, and perhaps eventually lead to some light being thrown on the mystery.

I am, yours truly,

E. A. LITTON.

NAUNTON RECTORY, Nov. 4th.

## THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW AND WICLIF.

SIR,

I should be much obliged to you to allow me to make some observations in THE CHURCHMAN on an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October, entitled "Cardinal Repyngdon and the Followers of Wiclif." The writer, after having noticed Professor Burrows' work, and my own "Life of Wiclif," which has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, writes: "There has been nothing to supersede or improve upon the well-known volumes of Lewis, Vaughan, Shirley, and Lechler." Now, I may say for myself and for Professor Burrows, that we have no wish to supersede them in so far as they are reliable authorities. But while we admit that Lewis's, and perhaps Vaughan's, works may still, on a few points, be used with advantage, we must at the same time maintain that, since they wrote in 1720 and 1853, we have obtained information about Wiclif which renders part of their works inaccurate. The works are, therefore, to some extent, superseded. We wish to do all honour to Dr. Shirley on account of his catalogue of the works of Wiclif, which he has ascertained to be genuine, with the dates of the years when they were written, as well as on account of his preface to the "Fasciculi Zizaniorum." But the latter, though valuable as far as it goes, is necessarily imperfect, as it is only a sketch of Wiclif's life. All these lives may, therefore, easily be improved upon. Dr. Lechler has indeed given a valuable life of Wiclif, partly the result of the examination of the Vienna manuscripts, but it is not adapted for popular reading. Our object was to improve upon that "life," and the other "lives," by giving, in a popular form, and in a small volume, the information drawn from them, and from all the available sources, including Wiclif's works. The Reviewer admits that I have been, to some extent, successful, when he says that the work "contains considerable information." He charges me, however (n. 1, p. 61), with inaccuracy in having described Richard the Hermit "as a chantry priest of Hampole," and with having stated (p. 72, n. 3) that Hereford, who aided Wiclif in the translation of the Bible, did *not* recant. I can only say that the learned editors of the Wiclifite versions of the Bible are my authority for the first statement, and that Dr. Vaughan has given good evidence of the truth of the latter assertion.

My book is described as "somewhat of a medley." I can only say in reply that everyone says that there is a logical coherence between the different parts, and that all the information commended by the Reviewer tends to illustrate the subject.

Again, we are told (p. 61) that Wiclif "was not the first to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular"!

Again, we are told (p. 61) that there "was nothing new or unheard-of in the utterances put forth by Wiclif." This is an incorrect statement. Bernard of Clairvaux, Arnold of Brescia, William of Ockham, Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh, and others, had indeed lifted up their voices against the Mendicant brothers, or one or more of the following abuses and corruptions: the temporal power of the Popes, the simony, the usury, the venality, the worldliness, the vices and crimes of the Church and Court of Rome. But they did not assail the doctrinal system of the Papacy. Wiclif, however, occupies a grander position than Grossteste or any of his predecessors, because he not only assailed every one of the abuses and corruptions already mentioned, but also because he was the first who, with the sacred Scriptures in his hands, pushed his inquiries into every part of her doctrinal system, and showed that she



had corrupted as well as mutilated "the faith once delivered unto the saints."

Again, we are told (p. 61) that "it is idle to hope to construct a system of doctrine from his writings, or to find there a dogmatic theology which may be trusted." We have here another erroneous statement. I have shown by quotations from his works in my "Life of Wiclif" (pp. 251-257), that Wiclif held all the truths of Holy Scripture, and opposed all the errors of the Church of Rome, brought forward in the Articles and formularies of our Church, with the single exception of purgatory, on which he speaks with a hesitating utterance; that he declares distinctly his belief in the real spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist, justification by faith, original sin, and man's moral inability to turn to God; and that he condemns the invocation of the saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary, indulgences, works of supererogation, image worship, and, in a modified sense, the sacrifice of the Mass.

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON  
(Canon of Lincoln).

UTTERBY, NEAR LOUTH, LINCOLNSHIRE,  
November 7th, 1884.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Liverpool.* Delivered in St. Peter's Cathedral on Tuesday, October 21, 1884, at his second visitation. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. London: Hunt. Liverpool: Holden, 48, Church Street.

COPIOUS extracts from this Charge have been given in the *Record* and the *Guardian*; and we may content ourselves with touching upon two or three points in its review of diocesan work and progress.

As regards the diocese, the Charge contains much valuable information, in small compass, and expressed with the Bishop's usual force and clearness. He speaks of unfavourable and unfair criticisms to which Churchmen of the new See are frequently subjected; and he shows that there is not a diocese in England or Wales in which the Established Church has to work under such disadvantages and difficulties as in the new Diocese of Liverpool. For instance, there is a lamentable lack of clergy. "The West Derby Hundred of Lancashire," says the Bishop, "which forms the new See of Liverpool, contains a population of little less than 1,200,000. For this immense mass of people we have only 187 incumbents with Parochial Districts. Let this proportion be compared with that of the six dioceses which exceed Liverpool in population. In York there are 630 incumbents for 1,300,000 people; in Manchester, 490 for 2,300,000; in Ripon, 490 for 1,600,000; in Worcester, 480 for 1,200,000; in London, 500 for 3,000,000; and in Rochester, more than 300 for 1,600,000. Of course I have used round numbers. Nor is this all. Out of the 187 consecrated churches in our new diocese, no less than 137 have been built since the year 1800, and are churches practically without endowment, and dependant upon pew rents and voluntary offerings. As to livings well endowed with rectorial tithes or lands, such as you may find by hundreds in some counties of England, I cannot find twenty in the whole West