

357

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1866.

No. I.

ART. I.—*Sustentation Fund.*

AT the recent meeting of the Synod of New Jersey, the Rev. Samuel J. Baird, D. D., as chairman of a committee appointed a year ago, presented an elaborate report on the subject of "unemployed ministers." One reason assigned for the fact that so many ministers, well qualified for the sacred office, were destitute of regular employment, was the insufficiency of support. Many of them had been forced to leave their fields of labour because they could not sustain themselves and families upon the salaries which they received. As the truth of this statement could not be denied, it naturally gave rise to the inquiry, What could be done to meet the difficulty, and to secure to every faithful minister devoted to his work an adequate support? The importance of this question and its bearing on the interests of individuals and of the church, secured for it the earnest consideration of every member of the Synod. In the course of the discussion which arose on this subject, reference was made to the attempt originated in 1847 to secure the adoption of the plan of a general sustentation fund analogous to that which had been so successfully carried out in the Free Church of Scotland. In that year, James Lenox, Esq., of New York, caused to be printed a pamphlet on Church Economics by the late illustrious Dr. Chalmers, a copy of which was sent to every

In England, not many years ago, the partners in a large mining company were ruined from not knowing that a certain fossil belonged to the old red sandstone, below which coal is never found. In another enterprise, £20,000 was lost in the prosecution of a scheme for collecting the alcohol that distils from bread in baking, all of which might have been saved, had the parties known that less than one hundredth part by weight of the flour is changed in fermentation.

But it is not necessary to multiply illustrations. Suffice it to say, in conclusion, we hold it to be a most manifest truth, that the general education of a community increases largely its material wealth, both by the direct effect which knowledge has upon individuals in making them individually more productive, and by the increased control which the diffusion of knowledge gives to mankind over the powers of nature. A nation or a state is wisely economical which spends largely and even lavishly upon popular education.

ART. III.—*The Patristic Doctrine on the Eucharist.*

THE theology and piety of the early fathers are the common inheritance of all Christian churches. They laboured before the separation of the East from the West, and before the rise of the Papacy proper. What they taught and believed is of equal interest, although not of equal authority, for Protestants and Greek and Roman Catholics. With the Protestant, indeed, the first and last question in all matters of Christian faith and practice is: What says the word of God? In the Greek and Roman Church, this question is coördinate in principle, and subordinate in fact to the question, What says the church, which is the only safe and legitimate interpreter of the Bible? But no sound Protestant is on that account indifferent to the testimony of the church and the teaching of the fathers, provided only it be duly subordinated to that of the Scriptures. We cannot forget that the Bible itself has come down to us

through the channel of the Catholic Church; and that the fathers shaped many of the principal institutions of Christendom, and wrought out from the Bible those fundamental articles of faith in the Holy Trinity, and the Person of Christ, which are common to the Evangelical and Catholic confessions of faith.

As regards the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the fathers have been often used and abused by different controversial writers in the interest of Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, and the Zwinglian views on the subject. We shall endeavour to divest ourselves from all denominational and sectarian bias, and to give an objective historical statement of the views of the early church on this important subject.

The Eucharist is both a sacrament, wherein God conveys to us a certain blessing, and a commemorative sacrifice which man offers to God. As a sacrament, or the communion, it stands at the head of all sacred rites; as a commemorative sacrifice, it stands alone. The celebration of it under this twofold character forms the holy of holies of the Christian cultus in the ancient church, and to this day in the greater part of Christendom.

We consider first the doctrine of the Eucharist as a *sacrament*, then the doctrine of the Eucharist as a *sacrifice*, and finally the *celebration* of the eucharistic communion and eucharistic sacrifice.

I. *The Eucharist as a Sacrament.*

The doctrine of the sacrament of the Eucharist was not a subject of theological controversy and ecclesiastical action, till the time of Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century; whereas since then this feast of the Saviour's dying love has been the innocent cause of the most bitter disputes, especially in the age of the Reformation, between Papists and Protestants, and among Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. Hence the doctrine of the ancient church on this point lacks the clearness and definiteness which the Nicene dogma of the Trinity, the Chalcedonian Christology, and the Augustinian anthropology and soteriology acquired from the controversies preceding them. In the doctrine of baptism also we have a much better

right to speak of a *consensus patrum*, than in the doctrine of the Holy Supper.

In general the fathers may be said to agree in the belief of the presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist. But the kind and mode of this presence are not yet particularly defined, and admit very different views: Christ may be conceived as really present either in and with the elements (consubstantiation, impanation), or under the illusive appearance of the changed elements (transubstantiation), or only dynamically and spiritually (the Calvinistic view).

In the ante-Nicene period we distinguish three views: the mystic view of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus; the symbolical view of Tertullian and Cyprian; and the allegorical or spiritualistic view of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. In the Nicene and post-Nicene age, the first view, which best answered the mystic and superstitious tendency of the time, preponderated, but the second also was represented by considerable authorities.*

I. The realistic and mystic view is represented by several fathers, and the early liturgies whose testimony we shall further cite below. They speak in enthusiastic and extravagant terms of the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar. They teach a real presence of the body and blood of Christ, which is included in the very idea of a real sacrifice, and they see in the mystical union of it with the sensible elements, a sort of repetition of the incarnation of the Logos. With the act of consecration a change accordingly takes place in the elements, whereby they become vehicles and organs of the life of Christ, although by no means necessarily changed into another substance. To denote this change they use very strong expressions, like *μεταβολή, μεταβάλλειν, μεταβάλλεσθαι, μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, mutatio, translatio, transfiguratio, transformatio*,†

* Rückert, in his *Geschichte der Lehre vom Abendmahl*, therefore divides the church-fathers on this point into two classes: the *Metabolical*, and the *Symbolical*. To this designation there are many objections. "Of the Synecdochian (Lutheran) interpretation of the words of institution the ancient church knew nothing." So says Kahnis, *Luth. Dogmatik*, ii. p. 221.

† But not yet the technical term *transsubstantiatio*, which was introduced by Paschasius Radbertus toward the middle of the ninth century, and the corresponding Greek term *μετωσίωσις*, which is still later.

and they appeal to the miraculous transformation of water into wine, the assimilation of food, and the pervasive power of leaven.

Cyril of Jerusalem goes further in this direction than any of the fathers. He plainly teaches some sort of supernatural connection between the body of Christ and the elements, though not necessarily a transubstantiation of the latter. Let us hear the principal passages.* “Then follows,” he says in describing the celebration of the Eucharist, “the invocation of God, for the sending of his Spirit to make the bread the body of Christ, the wine the blood of Christ. For what the Holy Ghost touches, is sanctified and transformed.” “Under the type of bread† is given to thee the body, under the type of the wine is given to thee the blood, that thou mayest be a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, and be of one body and blood with him.”‡ “After the invocation of the Holy Ghost the bread of the Eucharist is no longer bread, but the body of Christ.” “Consider therefore the bread and the wine not as empty elements, for they are, according to the declaration of the Lord, the body and blood of Christ.” In support of this change, Cyril refers at one time to the wedding-feast at Cana, which indicates the Roman theory of change of substance; but at another to the consecration of the chrism, wherein the substance is unchanged. He was not clear and consistent with himself. His opinion probably was, that the eucharistic elements lost by consecration, not so much their earthly substance as their earthly purpose.

Gregory of Nyssa, though in general a very faithful disciple of the spiritualistic Origen, is on this point entirely realistic. He calls the Eucharist a food of immortality, and speaks of a

* Comp. especially his five mystagogical discourses, addressed to the newly baptized. Cyril's doctrine is discussed at large in Rückert, *Des Abendmahl, sein Wesen u. seine Geschichte*, p. 410, sqq. Comp. also Neander, *Dogmengesch.* i. p. 426, and in part against Rückert, Kahnis, *Die Luth. Dogmatik*, ii. p. 211, sq.

† Ἐν τύπῳ ἄρτου, which may mean either under the emblem of the bread (still existing as such), or under the outward form, *sub specie panis*. More naturally the former.

‡ Σύσσωμος καὶ σύγκλιμος αὐτοῦ.

miraculous transformation of the nature of the elements into the glorified body of Christ by virtue of the priestly blessing.*

Chrysostom likewise, though only incidentally in his homilies, and not in the strain of sober logic and theology, but of glowing rhetoric, speaks several times of a union of our whole nature with the body of Christ in the Eucharist, and even of a *manducatio oralis*.† Of the Latin fathers, Hilary,‡ Ambrose,§ and Gaudentius (A. D. 410) come nearest to the later dogma of transubstantiation. The latter says: "The Creator and Lord of nature, who produces bread from the earth, prepares out of bread his own body, makes of wine his own blood."||

But closely as these and similar expressions verge upon the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, they seem to contain at most a *dynamic*, not a *substantial*, change of the elements into the body and the blood of Christ. For, in the first place, it must be remembered that there is a great difference between the half-poetic, enthusiastic, glowing language of devotion, in which the fathers, and especially the liturgies, speak of the eucharistic sacrifice, and the clear, calm, and cool language of logic and doctrinal definition. In the second place, the same fathers apply the same or quite similar terms to the baptismal water and the chrism of confirmation, without intending to teach a proper change of the substance of these material elements into the Holy Ghost. On the other hand they not rarely use concerning the bread and wine *τύπος*, *ἀντίτυπα*, *figura*, *signum*, and

* Orat. catech. magna, c. 37. Comp. Neander, l. c. i. p. 428, and Kahnis, ii. 213.

† Of an ἐμπήξαι τοὺς ἰδόντας τῆ σαρκὶ καὶ συμπλακῆναι. Comp. the passages from Chrysostom in Ebrard and Rückert, l. c., and Kahnis, ii. p. 215, sqq.

‡ De Trinit. viii. 13, sq.

§ De Mysteriis, c. 8 and 9, where a *mutatio* of the *species elementorum* by the word of Christ is spoken of, and the changing of Moses' rod into a serpent, and of the Nile into blood, is cited in illustration. The genuineness of this small work, however, is doubted by many. Rückert considers Ambrose the pillar of the mediæval doctrine of the Supper.

|| Serm. p. 42: "Ipse naturarum creator et dominus, qui producit de terra panem, de pane rursus, quia et potest et promisit, efficit proprium corpus, et qui de aqua vinum fecit, facit et de vino sanguinem." But on the other hand Gaudentius (bishop of Bripija) calls the Supper a *figure* of the passion of Christ, and the bread the *figure* (*figura*) of the body of Christ (p. 43).

like expressions, which denote rather a symbolical than a metabolical relation of them to the body and blood of the Lord. Finally, the favourite comparison of the mysterious transformation with the incarnation of the Logos, which in fact was not an annihilation of the human nature, but an assumption of it into unity with the divine, is of itself in favour of the continuance of the substance of the elements; else it would abet the Euty-chian heresy.

II. The symbolical view, though on a realistic basis, is represented first by Eusebius, who calls the Supper a commemoration of Christ by the symbols of his body and blood, and takes the flesh and blood of Christ in the sixth chapter of John to mean the words of Christ, which are spirit and life, the true food of the soul, to believers.* Here appears the influence of his venerated Origen, whose views in regard to the sacramental aspect of the Eucharist he substantially repeats.

But it is striking, that even Athanasius, "the father of orthodoxy," recognized only a *spiritual* participation, a self-communication of the nourishing divine virtue of the Logos, in the symbols of the bread and wine, and incidentally evinces a doctrine of the Eucharist wholly foreign to the Catholic, and very like the older Alexandrian, and the Calvinistic, though by no means identical with the latter.† By the flesh and blood, in the mysterious discourse of Jesus, in the sixth chapter of John, which he refers to the Lord's Supper, he understands not the earthly, human, but the heavenly, divine manifestation of Jesus, a spiritual nutriment coming down from above, which

* *Demonstr. evang.* l. c. 10; *Theol. eccl.* iii. c. 12, and the fragment of a tract *De paschate*, published by Angelo Mai in *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*. vol. i. p. 247. *Comp. Neander*, l. c. i. 430, and especially Steitz, art. on the early Greek doctrine of the Eucharist, in *Deutsche Jahrbücher* for 1865, p. 97—106.

† To this result H. Voigt comes, after the most thorough investigation, in his learned monograph on the doctrine of Athanasius, Bremen, 1861, p. 170—181, and since that time also Steitz, in his second article already quoted, l. c. p. 109 ff—127. Möhler finds in the passage *Ad Serap.* iv. 19, (the principal eucharistic declaration of Athanasius then known) the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Supper (*Athanasius der Gr.*, p. 560, sqq.), but by a manifestly strained interpretation, and in contradiction with passages in the more recently known *Festival Letters* of Athanasius, which confirm the exposition of Voigt.

the Logos through the Holy Ghost communicates to believers (but not to a Judas, nor to the unbelieving).* With this view accords his extending of the participation of the eucharistic food to believers in heaven, and even to the angels, who, on account of their incorporeal nature, are incapable of a corporeal participation of Christ.†

Gregory Nazianzen sees in the Eucharist a type of the incarnation, and calls the consecrated elements symbols and antitypes of the great mysteries, but ascribes to them a saving virtue.‡

St. Basil, likewise, in explaining the words of Christ, "I live by the Father," (John vi. 57), against the Arians, who inferred from it that Christ was a creature, incidentally gives a spiritual meaning to the fruition of the eucharistic elements. "We eat the flesh of Christ," he says, "and drink his blood, if we through his incarnation and human life become partakers of the Logos and of wisdom."§

* So in the main passage, the fourth Epistle to Serapion (Ad Serap. iv. 19), which properly treats of the sin against the Holy Ghost (c. 8—23), and has been variously interpreted in the interest of different Confessions, but now receives new light from several passages in the recently discovered Syriac Festival Letters of Athanasius, translated by Larsow, Leipzig, 1852, p. 59, 78 sqq., 153 sqq., and especially p. 101.

† In the Festival Letters in Larsow p. 101, Athanasius says: "And not only, my brethren, is this bread [of the Eucharist] a food of the righteous, and not only are the saints who dwell on earth nourished with such bread and blood, but also in heaven we eat such food; for even to the higher spirits and the angels the Lord is nutriment, and he is the delight of all the powers of heaven, to all he is all, and over every one he yearns in his love of man."

‡ Orat. xvii. 12; viii. 17; iv. 52. Comp. Ullmann's Gregor. v. Naz. p. 483—488. Neander, l. c. i. p. 431, and Steitz in Dorner's Jahrbücher for 1865, p. 133—141. Steitz makes Gregory an advocate of the symbolical theory.

§ Epist. viii. c. 4 (or Ep. 141 in the older editions): *Τρώμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνομεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα κωνωνὶ ζωίῳ διὰ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καὶ τῆς ἀίσθητις ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας. Σάρκα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐπιδημίαν [i. e., a spiritual incarnation or his internal coming to the soul, as distinct from his historical incarnation], δώμασε καὶ τὴν ἐκ πρακτικῆς καὶ φυσικῆς καὶ θεολογικῆς συνεισώσαν διδασκαλίαν, δι' ἧς τρέσεται ψυχὴ καὶ πρὸς τῶν ὄντων θεορίαν παρασκευάζεται.* This passage overlooked by Klose, Ebrard, and Kahnis, but noticed by Rückert, and more fully by Steitz (l. c. p. 127 ff.), in favour of the symbolical view, is the principal one in Basil on the Eucharist, and must regulate the interpretation of the less important allusions in his other writings.

Macarius the elder, a gifted representative of the earlier Greek mysticism (A. D. 390), belongs to the same symbolical school, he calls bread and wine the antitype of the body and blood of Christ, and seems to know only a spiritual eating of the flesh of the Lord.*

Theodoret, who was acknowledged orthodox by the council of Chalcedon, teaches indeed a transformation (*μεταβάλλειν*) of the eucharistic elements by virtue of the priestly consecration, and an adoration of them, which certainly sounds quite Romish, but in the same connection expressly rejects the idea of an absorption of the elements in the body of the Lord, as an error akin to the Monophysite. "The mystical emblems of the body and blood of Christ," says he, "continue in their original essence and form, they are visible and tangible as they were before [the consecration]; † but the contemplation of the spirit and of faith sees in them that which they have become, and they are adored also as that which they are to believers." ‡

Similar language occurs in an Epistle to the monk Cæsarius, ascribed to Chrysostom, but perhaps not genuine; § in Ephraim of Antioch, cited by Photius; and even in the Roman bishop Gelasius at the end of the fifth century (492-496).

* Hom. xxvii. 17, and other passages. Steitz (l. c. p. 142), enters more fully into the views of this monk of the Egyptian desert.

† Dial. ii., Opera. ed. Hal. tom. iv. p. 126, where the orthodox man says against the errorist: *Τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα . . . μένου ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἔσονται καὶ ἄπτα, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν.*

‡ *Προσκυνῆται ὡς ἐκείνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται.* These words certainly prove that the consecrated elements are regarded as being not only subjectively, but in some sense objectively and really what the believer takes them for, namely, the body and blood of Christ. But with this they also retained, according to Theodoret, their natural reality and their symbolical character.

§ Ep. ad Cæsarium monach. (in Chrys. Opera, tom. iii., Pars altera, p. 897 of the new Paris ed. of Montfaucon after the Benedictine): "*Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus: divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatioue panis; dignus autem habitus dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit, et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii prædicamus.*" This epistle is extant in full only in an old Latin version.

The latter says expressly in his work against Eutyches and Nestorius: "The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which we receive, is a Divine thing, because by it we are made partakers of the Divine nature. Yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine does not cease. And assuredly the image and the similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the performance of the mysteries."*

It is remarkable that Augustine, in other respects so decidedly catholic in the doctrine of the church and of baptism, and in the cardinal points of the Latin orthodoxy, follows the older African theologians, Tertullian and Cyprian, in a symbolical theory of the Supper, which however includes a real spiritual participation of the Lord by faith, and in this respect stands nearest to the Calvinistic or orthodox Reformed doctrine, while in minor points he differs from it as much as from transubstantiation and consubstantiation.† He was the first to make a clear distinction between the outward sign and the inward grace, which are equally essential to the conception of the sacrament. He maintains the figurative character of the words of institution, and of the discourse of Jesus on the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood in the sixth chapter of John; with Tertullian, he calls the bread and wine "*figuræ* or *signa* corporis et sanguinis Christi" (but certainly not *mere* figures), and insists on a distinction between "that which is visibly received in the sacrament, and that which is spiritually eaten and drunk," or between a carnal, visible manducation of

* De duabus naturis in Christo adv. Eutychen et Nestorium (in the *Bibl. Max. Patrum*, tom. viii. p. 703,) "et tamen esse non desinit *substantia* vel *natura* panis et vini. Et certe *imago* et *similitudo* corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur." Many Roman divines, through dogmatic prejudice, doubt the genuineness of this epistle. *Comp. the Bibl. Max.* tom. viii. p. 699—700.

† From his immense dogmatic authority Augustine has been an apple of contention among the different Confessions in all controversies on the doctrine of the Supper. Albertinus (*De euchar.* p. 602—742) and Rückert (*l. c.* p. 353, sqq.) have successfully proved that he is no witness for the Roman doctrine; but they go too far when they make him a mere symbolist. That he as little favours the Lutheran doctrine, Kahnis (*vom Abendmahl*, p. 221, and in the second part of his *Luth. Dogmatik*, p. 207,) frankly concedes.

the sacrament, and a spiritual eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking of his blood.* The latter he limits to the elect and the believing, though in opposition to the subjectivism of the Donatists, he asserts that the sacrament (in its *objective* import) is the body of Christ even for unworthy receivers. He says of Judas, that he only ate the bread of the Lord, while the other apostles "ate the Lord who was the bread." In another place: The *sacramentum* "is given to some unto life, to others unto destruction;" but the *res sacramenti*, *i. e.*, "the thing itself of which it is the sacramentum, is given to every one who is partaker of it, unto life." "He who does not abide in Christ, undoubtedly neither eats his flesh nor drinks his blood, though he eats and drinks the sacramentum (*i. e.*, the outward sign) of so great a thing to his condemnation." Augustine at all events lays chief stress on the spiritual participation. "Why prearest thou the teeth and the belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten!"† He claims for the sacrament religious reverence, but not a superstitious dread, as if it were a miracle with a magical effect.‡ He also expressly rejects the hypothesis of the ubiquity of Christ's body, which had already come into use in support of the materializing view, and has since been further developed by Lutheran divines in support of the theory of consubstantiation. "The body with which Christ rose," says he, "he took to heaven, which must be in a place We must guard against such a conception of his divinity as destroys the reality of his flesh. For when the flesh of the Lord was upon earth, it was certainly not in heaven; and now that it is in heaven, it is not upon earth." "I believe that the body of the Lord is in heaven, as it was upon earth when he

* In Psalm. iii. 1: "Convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui *figuram* discipulis commendavit." Contra Adamant. xii. 3 ("signum corporis sui"); Contra Advers. legis et prophet. ii. c. 9; Epist. 23; De Doctr. Christ. iii. 10, 16, 19; De Civit. Dei, xxi. c. 20, 25; De peccat. mer. ac rem. ii. 26 ("quavis non sit corpus Christi, sanctum est tamen, quoniam sacramentum est").

† Tract. in Joh. 25; "Quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede, et manducasti." Comp. Tract. 26: "Qui non manet in Christo, nec manducat carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi."

‡ De Trinit. iii. 10: "Honorem tamquam religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tamquam mira non possunt."

ascended to heaven.”* Yet this great church teacher at the same time holds fast to the real presence of Christ in the supper. He says of the martyrs: “They have drunk the blood of *Christ*, and have shed their *own* blood for Christ.” He was also inclined, with the Oriental fathers, to ascribe a saving virtue to the consecrated elements.

Augustine’s pupil, Facundus, taught that the sacramental bread “is not properly the body of Christ, but contains the mystery of the body.” Fulgentius of Ruspina held the same symbolical view, and even at a much later period we can trace it through the mighty influence of Augustine’s writings in Isidore of Sevilla, the venerable Beda, among the divines of the Carlovingian age, in Ratramnus, and Berengar of Tours, until it broke forth in a modified form with greater force than ever in the 16th century, and took permanent foothold in the Reformed churches.

Pope Leo I. is sometimes likewise numbered with the symbolists, but without good reason. He calls the communion a “spiritual food, † as Athanasius had done before, but supposes a sort of assimilation of the flesh and blood of Christ by the believing participation. “What we believe, *that* we receive with the mouth . . . The participation of the body and blood of Christ causes that we pass into that which we receive, and bear Christ in us in spirit and body.” Voluntary abstinence from the wine in the supper was as yet considered by this pope a sin. ‡

III. The old liturgies, whose testimony on this point is as

* Ep. 146: “Ego Domini corpus ita in cœlo esse credo, ut erat in terra, quando ascendit in cœlum.” Comp. similar passages in Tract. in Joh. 13; Ep. 187; Serm. 264.

† “Spiritualis alimonia.” This expression, however, as the connection of the passage in Serm. lix. 2 clearly shows, by no means excludes an operation of the sacrament on the body; for “spiritual” is often equivalent to “supernatural.” Even Ignatius called the bread of the Supper “a medicine of immortality, and an antidote of death” (φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ διὰ παντός), Ad Ephes. c. 20; though this passage is wanting in the shorter Syriac recension.

‡ Comp. the relevant passages from the writings of Leo in Perthel, Papst. Leo’s I. Leben u. Lehren, p. 216 sqq., and in Rückert, l. c. p. 479 sqq. Leo’s doctrine of the Supper is not so clearly defined as his doctrine of Baptism, and has little that is peculiar. But he certainly had a higher than a purely symbolical view of the sacrament and of the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

important as that of the church fathers, presuppose the actual presence of Christ in the Supper, but speak throughout in the stately language of sentiment, and nowhere attempt an explanation of the nature and mode of this presence, and of its relation to the still visible forms of bread and wine. They use concerning the consecrated elements such terms as: the holy body, the dear blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ, the sanctified oblation, the heavenly, spotless, glorious, awful, divine gifts, the awful, unbloody, holy sacrifice, &c. In the act of consecration the liturgies pray for the sending down of the Holy Ghost, that he may "sanctify and perfect"* the bread and wine, or that he may "sanctify and make" them the body and blood of Christ,† or "bless and make."‡

IV. As to the adoration of the consecrated elements: This follows with logical necessity from the doctrine of transubstantiation, and is the sure touchstone of it. No trace of such adoration appears, however, in the ancient liturgies, and the whole patristic literature yields only four passages from which this practice can be inferred; plainly showing that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not yet fixed in the consciousness of the church.

Chrysostom says: "The wise men adored Christ in the manger; we see him not in the manger, but on the altar, and should pay him still greater homage."§ Theodoret, in the passage already cited, likewise uses the term *προσκυνεῖν*, but at the same time expressly asserts the continuance of the substance of the elements. Ambrose speaks once of the flesh of Christ "which we to-day adore in the mysteries,"|| and Augustine,

* In the liturgy of St. Mark (in Neale's Ed.: *The Liturgies of S. Mark*, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, Lond. 1859, p. 26): "ἵνα αὐτὰ ἁγίαση καὶ τελειώσῃ . . . καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα, to which the congregation answers: Ἀμήν.

† In the liturgy of St. James (in Neale, p. 64): "ἵνα . . . ἁγίασῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τούτου σῶμα ἁγίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, κ. τ. λ.

‡ The liturgy of St. Chrysostom (Neale, p. 137) uses the terms *εὐλόγησον* and *ποιήσον*.

§ Hom. 24, in 1 Cor.

|| De Spir. S. iii. 11: "Quam [carnem Christi] hodie in mysteriis adoramus, et quam apostoli in Domino Jesu adoraverunt."

of an adoration preceding the participation of the flesh of Christ.*

In all these passages we must, no doubt, take the term *προσκυνεῖν* and *adorare* in the wider sense, and distinguish the bowing of the knee, which was so frequent, especially in the East, as a mere mark of respect, from proper adoration. The old liturgies contain no direction for any such act of adoration as became prevalent in the Latin church, with the elevation of the host, after the triumph of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the twelfth century.†

II. *The Eucharist as a Sacrifice.*

The catholic church, both Greek and Latin, sees in the Eucharist not only a *sacramentum*, in which God communicates a grace to believers, but at the same time, and in fact mainly, a *sacrificium*, in which believers really offer to God that which is represented by the sensible elements. For this view also the church fathers laid the foundation, and it must be conceded they stand in general far more on the Greek and Roman Catholic than on the Protestant side of this question. The importance of the subject demands a preliminary explanation of the idea of sacrifice, and a clear discrimination of its original Christian form from its later perversion by tradition.

The idea of sacrifice is the centre of all ancient religions, both the heathen and the Jewish. In Christianity it is fulfilled. For by his one perfect sacrifice on the cross, Christ has

* In Psalm. 98, n. 9: "Ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat nisi prius adoraverit . . . et non modo non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando."

† So says also the Roman liturgist Muratori, *De rebus liturgicis*, c. xix. p. 227: "Uti omnes inter Catholicos eruditi fatentur, post *Berengarii hæresiam* ritus in Catholica Romana ecclesia invaluit, scilicet post consecrationem elevare hostiam et calicem, ut a populo adoretur corpus et sanguis Domini." Freeman, *Principles of Div. Service*, Introduction to Part ii. p. 169, asserts: "The church throughout the world, down to the period of the unhappy change of doctrine in the Western church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, never worshipped either the consecrated elements on account of their being the body and blood of Christ, or the presence of that body and blood; nor again, either Christ himself as supernaturally present by consecration, or the presence of his divinity; neither have the churches of God to this hour, with the exception of those of the Roman obedience, any such custom."

entirely blotted out the guilt of man, and reconciled him with the righteous God. On the ground of this sacrifice of the eternal High Priest, believers have access to the throne of grace, and may expect their prayers and intercessions to be heard. With this perfect and eternally availing sacrifice the Eucharist stands in indissoluble connection. It is indeed originally a sacrament, and the main thing in it is that which we *receive* from God, not that which we *give* to God. The latter is only a consequence of the former; for we can give to God nothing which we have not first received from him. But the Eucharist is the *sacramentum* of a *sacrificium*, the thankful celebration of the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross, and the believing participation or the renewed appropriation of the fruits of this sacrifice. In other words, it is a feast on a sacrifice. "As oft as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

The Eucharist is moreover, as the name itself implies, on the part of the church a living and reasonable thank-offering, wherein she presents herself anew, in Christ, and on the ground of his sacrifice, to God, with prayers and intercessions. For only in Christ are our offerings acceptable to God, and only through the continual showing forth and presenting of his merit can we expect our prayers and intercessions to be heard.

In this view certainly, in a deep symbolical and ethical sense, Christ is offered to God the Father in every believing prayer, and above all in the holy Supper; *i. e.*, as the sole ground of our reconciliation and acceptance. This is the deep truth which lies at the bottom of the Catholic mass, and gives it still such power over the religious mind.

But this idea in process of time became adulterated with foreign elements, and transformed into the Græco-Roman doctrine of the *sacrifice of the mass*. According to this doctrine the Eucharist is an unbloody *repetition of the atoning sacrifice of Christ by the priesthood* for the salvation of the living and the dead; so that the body of Christ is truly and literally offered every day, and every hour, and upon innumerable altars at the same time. The term *mass*, which properly denoted the *dismissal* of the congregation (*missio, dismissio*) at the close of the general public worship, became, after the end

of the fourth century, the name for the worship of the faithful,* which consisted in the celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice and the communion. The corresponding terms of the Orientals are *λειτουργία, θυσία, προσφορά*.

In the sacrifice of the mass the whole mysterious fulness and glory of the Catholic worship is concentrated. Here the idea of the priesthood reaches its dizzy summit; and here the devotion and awe of the spectators rises to the highest pitch of adoration. For to the devout Catholic there can be nothing greater or more solemn than an act of worship, in which the eternal Son of God is veritably offered to God upon the altar by the visible hand of the priest for the sins of the world. But, though the Catholic worship here rises far above the vain sacrifices of heathendom and the merely typical sacrifices of Judaism, yet that old sacrificial service, which was interwoven with the whole popular life of the Jewish and Græco-Roman world, exerted a controlling influence on the Roman Catholic service of the Eucharist, especially after the nominal conversion of the whole Roman heathendom, and obscured the original simplicity and purity of that service almost beyond recognition. The *sacramentum* became entirely eclipsed by the *sacrificium*, and the *sacrificium* became grossly materialized, and was exalted at the expense of the sacrifice on the cross. The endless succession of necessary repetitions detracts from the sacrifice of Christ.

The biblical support of the sacrifice of the mass is weak, and may be reduced to an unduly literal interpretation, or a downright perversion, of some such passages as Mal. i. 10 f.; 1 Cor. x. 21; Heb. v. 6; vii. 1 ff.; xiii. 10. The Epistle to the Hebrews especially is often misapplied, though it teaches with great emphasis the very opposite, viz., the abolition of the Old Testament sacrificial system by the Christian worship, the eternal validity of the sacrifice of our only High Priest on the right hand of the Father, and the impossibility of a repetition of it (comp. x. 14; vii. 23, 24).

We pass now to the more particular history. The ante-

* The *missa fidelium*, in distinction from the *missa catechumenorum*. Comp. Schaff, vol. i. § 101, p. 383 sqq.

Nicene fathers uniformly conceived the Eucharist as a thank-offering of the church; the congregation offering the consecrated elements of bread and wine, and in them itself, to God. This view is in itself perfectly innocent, but readily leads to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, as soon as the elements become identified with the body and blood of Christ, and the presence of the body comes to be materialistically taken. The germs of the Roman doctrine appear in Cyprian about the middle of the third century, in connection with his high churchly doctrine of the clerical priesthood. *Sacerdotium* and *sacrificium* are with him correlative ideas, and a Judaizing conception of the former favoured a like Judaizing conception of the latter. The priest officiates in the Eucharist in the place of Christ,* and performs an actual sacrifice in the church.† Yet Cyprian does not distinctly say that Christ is the subject of the spiritual sacrifice; rather is the mystical body of Christ, the church, offered to God, and married with Christ.‡

The doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is much further developed in the Nicene and post-Nicene fathers, though amidst many obscurities and rhetorical extravagances, and with much wavering between symbolical and grossly realistic conceptions, until in all essential points it is brought to its settlement by Gregory the Great at the close of the sixth century. These points are the following:

1. The eucharistic sacrifice is the most solemn mystery of the church, and fills the faithful with a holy awe. Hence the predicates, *θυσία φοβερά, φρικτή, ἀναιμάκτος, sacrificium tremendum*, which are frequently applied to it, especially in the Oriental liturgies and homilies. Thus it is said in the liturgy of St. James: "We offer to Thee, O Lord, this awful and unbloody sacrifice." The more surprising is it that the people should have been indifferent to so solemn an act, and that

* "Vice Christi vere fungitur."

† "Sacrificium verum et plenum offert in ecclesia Patri."

‡ Epist. 63 ad Cæcil. c. 14. Augustine's view is similar: the church offering herself to God, in and with Christ as her head.

Chrysostom should lament: "In vain is the daily sacrifice, in vain stand we at the altar: there is no one to take part."*

2. It is not a new sacrifice added to that of the cross, but a daily, unbloody repetition, and perpetual application of that one only sacrifice. Augustine represents it, on the one hand, as a *sacramentum memorie*, a symbolical commemoration of the sacrificial death of Christ;—to which of course there is no objection.† But, on the other hand, he calls the celebration of the communion *verissimum sacrificium* of the body of Christ. The church, he says, offers (*immolat*) to God the sacrifice of thanks in the body of Christ, from the days of the apostles through the sure succession of the bishops down to our time. But the church at the same time offers, with Christ, herself, as the body of Christ, to God. As all are one body, so also all are together the same sacrifice.‡ According to Chrysostom, the same Christ, and the whole Christ, is everywhere offered. It is not a different sacrifice from that which the High Priest formerly offered, but we offer always the same sacrifice, or rather, we perform a memorial of this sacrifice.§ This last clause would decidedly favour a symbolical conception, if Chrysostom in other places had not used such strong expressions as this: "When thou seest the Lord slain, and lying there, and

* Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Ephes. (new Par. Bened. ed. tom. xi., p. 26): *Εἰκὴ θυσία καθημερινή, εἰκὴ παροιστηκασμένη τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐδεὶς ὁ μετέχων, i. e., Frustra est quotidianum sacrificium, frustra adstamus altari: nemo est qui participet.*

† Contr. Faust. Manich. l. xx. 18: "Unde jam Christiani, *peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam* celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi." Comp. l. xx. 21. This agrees with Augustine's symbolical conception of the consecrated elements as signa, imagines, similitudines corporis et sanguinis Christi. Steitz, l. c. p. 379, would make him altogether a symbolist, but does not succeed; comp. the preceding section, and Neander, Dogmengesch. i. p. 432.

‡ De civit. Dei, x. 20: "Per hoc [homo Jesus Christus] et sacerdos est ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio. Cujus rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit ecclesie sacrificium, quæ cum ipsius capitis corpus sit, se ipsam per ipsum offerre discit." And the faithful in heaven form with us one sacrifice, since they with us are one civitas Dei.

§ Hom. xvii. in Ep. ad Hebr. tom. xii, p. 241 and 242:—*Τούτο γὰρ ποιεῖτε, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Οὐκ ἄλλαν θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν εἰς ποιῶμεν* μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἔργαζ·μεθα θυσίας.*

the priest standing at the sacrifice," or: "Christ lies slain upon the altar."*

3. The sacrifice is the antitype of the Mosaic sacrifice, and is related to it as substance to typical shadows. It is also especially foreshadowed by Melchizedek's unbloody offering of bread and wine. The sacrifice of Melchizedek is therefore made of great account by Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and other church fathers, on the strength of the well-known parallel in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

4. The subject of the sacrifice is the body of Jesus Christ, which is as truly present on the altar of the church as it once was on the altar of the cross, and which now offers itself to God through his priest. Hence the frequent language of the liturgies: "Thou art he who offerest, and who art offered, O Christ, our God." Augustine, however, connects with this, as we have already said, the true and important moral idea of the self-sacrifice of the whole redeemed church to God. The prayers of the liturgies do the same.†

5. The offering of the sacrifice is the exclusive prerogative of the Christian priest. Later Roman divines take the words: "This *do* (ποιεῖτε) in remembrance of me," as equivalent to: "This *offer*," and limit this command to the apostles and their successors in office, whereas it is evidently an exhortation to all believers to the commemoration of the atoning death, the *communio sacramenti*, and not to the *immolatio sacrificii*.

6. The sacrifice is efficacious for the whole body of the

* De sacerdotibus, iii., c. 4 (tom. i., 467): "Ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸν Κύριον τεθυμένον καὶ κείμενον, καὶ τὸν ἱερεὴν ἐπιστάτην τῷ θύματι, καὶ ἐπιευχόμενον, κ. τ. λ. Homil. xv. ad Popul. Antioch. c. 5 (tom. ii. p. 187): "Ἐνθα ὁ Χριστὸς κείται τεθυμένος. Comp. Hom. in tom. ii., p. 394, where it is said of the sacrifice of the Eucharist: *Θυσία προσέφερον φρικτῆ καὶ ἀγνῆ ἰσφαγμένος πρόκειται ὁ Χριστός.*

† Freeman regards this as the main thing in the old liturgies. "In all liturgies," says he, l. c. p. 190, "the church has manifestly two distinct though closely connected objects in view. The first is, *to offer herself in Christ to God*; or rather, in strictness and as the highest conception of her aim, *to procure that she may be offered by Christ himself, and as in Christ, to the Father.* And the second object, as the crowning and completing feature of the rite, and woven up with the other in one unbroken chain of service, is *to obtain communion through Christ with God*; or more precisely again, *that Christ may himself give her, through himself, such communion.*"

church, including its departed members, in procuring the gifts which are implored in the prayers of the service. All the old liturgies proceed under a conviction of the unbroken communion of saints, and contain commemorations and intercessions for the departed fathers and brethren, who are conceived to be, not in purgatory, but in communion with God, and in a condition of progressive holiness and blessedness, looking forward in pious longing to the great day of consummation. These prayers for an increase of bliss, which appeared afterwards very inappropriate, form the transition from the original simple commemoration of the departed saints, including the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, to intercessions for the suffering souls in purgatory, as now used in the Roman church since the sixth century.*

In the Liturgy of Chrysostom, still in use in the Greek and Russian church, the commemoration of the departed reads: "And further we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of those who have departed in the faith, our ancestors, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith. . . . Especially the most holy, undefiled, excellently laudable, glorious lady, the mother of God and ever Virgin Mary. . . . The holy John the Prophet, Forerunner and Baptist, the holy, glorious, and all celebrated Apostles, and all Thy Saints, through whose prayers look upon us, O God. And remember all those that are departed in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life, and give them rest where the light of Thy countenance shines upon them."

Cyril of Jerusalem, in his fifth and last mystagogic Catechesis, which is devoted to the consideration of the eucharistic sacrifice and the liturgical service of God, gives the following description of the eucharistic intercessions for the departed:

* Neale has collected in an appendix to his English edition of the old liturgies (*The Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, etc.* Lond. 1859, p. 216 sqq.) the finest liturgical prayers of the ancient church for the departed saints, and deduces from them the positions, (1) "that prayers for the dead, and more especially the oblation of the blessed Eucharist for them, have been from the beginning the practice of the universal church. (2) And this without any idea of a purgatory of pain, or of any state from which the departed soul has to be delivered as from one of misery." The second point needs qualification.

“When the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service of God, is performed, we pray to God over this atoning sacrifice for the universal peace of the church, for the welfare of the world, for the emperor, for soldiers and prisoners, for the sick and afflicted, for all the poor and needy. Then we commemorate also those who sleep, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God through their prayers and their intercessions may receive our prayer; and in general we pray for all who have gone from us, since we believe that it is of the greatest help to those souls for whom the prayer is offered, while the holy sacrifice, exciting a holy awe, lies before us.*

This is clearly an approach to the later idea of purgatory in the Latin church. Even St. Augustine, with Tertullian, teaches plainly, as an old tradition, that the eucharistic sacrifice, the intercessions or *suffragia* and alms of the living, are of benefit to the departed believers, so that the Lord deals more mercifully with them than their sins deserve.† His noble mother, Monica, when dying, told him he might bury her body where he pleased, and should give himself no concern for it, only she begged of him that he would remember her soul at the altar of the Lord.‡

With this is connected the idea of a repentance and purification in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, which likewise Augustine derives from Matt. xii. 32, and 1 Cor. iii. 15, yet mainly as a mere opinion.§ From these and similar passages, and under the influence of previous

* Τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικτωστάτης προκειμένης Θυσίας, Catech. xxiii. 8.

† Serm. 172, 2 (Opp. tom. v. 1196): “Orationibus sanctæ ecclesiæ, et sacrificio salutari, et eleemosynis, quæ pro eorum spiritibus erogantur, non est dubitandum mortuos adjuvari, ut cum eis misericordius agatur a Domino.” He expressly limits this effect, however, to those who have departed *in the faith*.

‡ Confess. l. ix. 27: “Tantum illud vos rogo, ut ad Domini altare memoreritis mei, ubi fueritis.” Tertullian considers it the duty of a devout widow to pray for the soul of her husband, and to offer a sacrifice on the anniversary of his death; De monogam. c. 10; comp. De corona, c. 2: “Oblationes pro defunctis pro natalitiis annua die facimus.”

§ De civit. Dei, xxi. 24, and elsewhere. The passages of Augustine and the other fathers in favour of the doctrine of purgatory are collected in the much cited work of Berington and Kirk: *The Faith of Catholics*, etc., vol. iii. p. 140—207.

Jewish and heathen ideas and customs, arose, after Gregory the Great, the Roman doctrine of the purgatorial fire for imperfect believers who still need to be purified from the dross of their sins before they are fit for heaven, and the institution of special masses for the dead, in which the perversion of the thankful remembrance of the one eternally availing sacrifice of Christ reaches its height, and the idea of the communion utterly disappears. There are silent masses, *missæ solitariæ*, at which usually no one is present but the priest, with the attendant boys, who offers to God at a certain tariff the magically produced body of Christ for the deliverance of a soul from purgatory. This institution has also a heathen precedent in the old Roman custom of offering sacrifices to the Manes of beloved dead. On Gregory's doctrine of the mass, comp. the monograph of Lau, p. 484 sq. The horrible abuse of these masses for the dead, and their close connection with superstitious impostures of purgatory and of indulgence, explain the moral anger of the Reformers at the mass, and the strong declarations against it in several symbolical books, especially in the Smalcald articles of Luther and in the 80th question of the Heidelberg Catechism.

In general, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the sacrament continually retired behind the sacrifice. In the Roman churches in all countries one may see and hear splendid masses at the high altar, where the congregation of the faithful, instead of taking part in the communion, are mere spectators of the sacrificial act of the priest. The communion is frequently despatched at a side altar at an early hour in the morning.

III. *The Celebration of the Eucharist.*

The celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice and of the communion was the centre and summit of the public worship of the Lord's day, and all other parts of worship served as preparation and accompaniment. The old liturgies are essentially, and almost exclusively, eucharistic prayers and exercises; they contain nothing besides, except some baptismal formulas and prayers for the catechumens. The word liturgy (*λειτουργία*), which properly embraces all parts of the worship of God,

denotes in the narrower sense a celebration of the Eucharist or the mass.

Here lies a cardinal difference between the Catholic and Evangelical cultus: in the former the sacrifice of the mass, in the latter the sermon is the centre.

With all variations in particulars, especially in the introductory portions, the old Catholic liturgies agree in the essential points, particularly in the prayers which immediately precede and follow the consecration of the elements. They all (excepting some Syriac copies of certain Nestorian and Monophysite formularies) repeat the solemn Words of Institution from the Gospels, understanding them not merely in a declaratory, but in an operative sense; they all contain the acts of Consecration, Intercession, and Communion; all (except the Roman) invoke the Holy Ghost upon the elements to sanctify them, and make them actual vehicles of the body and blood of Christ; all conceive the Eucharist primarily as a sacrifice, and then, on the basis of the sacrifice, as a communion.

The eucharistic action in the narrower sense is called the *Anaphora*, or the *canon missæ*, and begins after the close of the service of the catechumens (which consisted principally of reading and preaching, and extended to the Offertory, *i. e.*, the preparation of the bread and wine, and the placing of it on the altar). It is introduced with the "Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας, or *Sursum corda*, of the priest: the exhortation to the faithful to lift up their hearts in devotion, and take part in the prayers; to which the congregation answers: *Habemus ad Dominum*, "We lift them up unto the Lord." Then follows the exhortation: "Let us give thanks to the Lord," with the response: "It is meet and right."*

* Or, according to the Liturgia S. Jacobi: "Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὰς καρδίας, with the response: "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον. In the Lit. S. Clem.: Priest: "Ἄνω τὸν νοῦν. All (πάντες): Ἐρχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.—Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ. Resp.: "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον. In the Lit. S. Chrys. (still in use in the orthodox Greek and Russian Church):

Ὁ ἱερεὺς: "Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας.

Ὁ χορὸς: Ἐρχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.

Ὁ ἱερεὺς: Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ.

Ὁ χορὸς: Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον ἔστι προσκυνεῖν Πατέρα, Υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Τριάδα ἁμωσύσιον καὶ ἀχώριστον.

The first principal act of the Anaphora is the great *prayer of thanksgiving*, the εὐλογία or εὐχαριστία, after the example of the Saviour in the institution of the Supper. In this prayer the priest thanks God for all the gifts of creation and of redemption, and the choir generally concludes the thanksgiving with the so-called Trisagion or Seraphic Hymn (Isa. vi. 3), and the triumphal Hosanna (Matt. xxi. 9): "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest: blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest."

Then follows the *consecration* and *oblation* of the elements, by the commemoration of the great facts in the life of Christ, by the rehearsing of the Words of Institution from the Gospels or from Paul, and by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, who brings to pass the mysterious change of the bread and wine into the sacramental body and blood of Christ.* This invocation of the Holy Ghost† appears in all the Oriental liturgies, but is wanting in the Latin church, which ascribes the consecration exclusively to the virtue of Christ's Words of Institution. The form of the Words of Institution is different in the different liturgies.‡ The elevation of the consecrated elements was introduced in the Latin church, though not till after the Berengarian controversies in the eleventh century, to give the people occasion to show, by the adoration of the host, their faith in the real presence of Christ in the sacrament.

To add an example: The prayer of consecration and oblation in one of the oldest and most important of the liturgies, that of St. James, runs thus. After the Words of Institution, the priest proceeds:

"*Priest:* We sinners, remembering his life-giving passion, his saving cross, his death and his resurrection from the dead

* Hence it is said, for example, in the Syriac version of the Liturgy of St. James: "How dreadful is this hour, in which the Holy Ghost hastens to come down from the heights of heaven, and broods over the Eucharist, and sanctifies it. In holy silence and fear stand and pray."

† Ἐπίκλησις Πνεύματος ἁγίου, invocatio Spiritus Sancti.

‡ They are collected by Neale, in his English edition of the Primitive Liturgies, p. 175—215, from 67 ancient liturgies in alphabetical order. Freeman says, rather too strongly, l. c. p. 364: "No two churches in the world have even the same words of Institution."

on the third day, his ascension to heaven, and his sitting at the right-hand of Thee his God and Father, and his glorious and terrible second appearing, when he shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works,—offer to Thee, O Lord, this awful and unbloody sacrifice;* beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst deal with us not after our sins nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to Thy goodness and unspeakable love to men wouldst blot out the handwriting which is against us Thy suppliants, and wouldst vouchsafe to us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man what Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee. And reject not Thy people, O loving Lord, for my sake and on account of my sins.

He repeats thrice: For Thy people and Thy church prayeth to Thee.

People: Have mercy upon us, O Lord God, Almighty Father!

Priest: Have mercy upon us, Almighty God!

Have mercy upon us, O God, our Redeemer!

Have mercy upon us, O God, according to Thy great mercy, and send upon us, and upon these gifts here present, Thy most holy Spirit, Lord, Giver of life, who with Thee the God and Father, and with Thine only begotten Son, sitteth and reigneth upon one throne, and is of the same essence and co-eternal,† who spoke in the law and in the prophets, and in Thy new covenant, who descended in the form of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, and rested upon him, who came down upon Thy holy apostles in the form of tongues of fire in the upper room of Thy holy and glorious Zion on the day of Pentecost: Send down, O Lord, the same Holy Ghost upon us and upon these holy gifts here present, that with his holy and good and glorious

* Προσφερόμεν σοι, Δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν. The term φοβερά denotes *holy awe*, and is previously applied also to the second coming of Christ: τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδέξου καὶ φοβερᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, κ. τ. λ., μεμνημένοι. The Liturgy of St. Chrysostom has instead: Προσφερόμεν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν (doubtless with reference to the λογικὴ λατρεία in Rom. xii. 1).

† Ἐξαπίστειλον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον, [εἶτα κλίνας τὴν ἀρχαία λέγει] τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ σύνθρονον σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ σου Υἱῷ, τὸ συμβασιλεύον, τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ τε καὶ συναΐδιον. The ὁμοουσίῳ as well as the Nicene Creed in the preceding part of the Liturgy of St. James, indicates a post-Nicene origin.

presence He may sanctify this bread and make it the holy body of Thy Christ.*

People: Amen.

Priest: And this cup the dear blood of Thy Christ.

People: Amen.

Priest: (In a low voice): That they may avail to those who receive them, for the forgiveness of sins and for eternal life, for the sanctification of soul and body, for the bringing forth of good works, for the strengthening of Thy holy Catholic Church which Thou hast built upon the rock of faith, that the gates of hell may not prevail against her; delivering her from all error, and all scandal, and from the ungodly, and preserving her unto the consummation of all things."

After the act of consecration come the *intercessions*, sometimes very long, for the church, for all classes, for the living, and for the dead from righteous Abel to Mary, the apostles, the martyrs, and the saints in Paradise; and finally the Lord's Prayer. To the several intercessions, and the Lord's Prayer, the people or the choir responds, *Amen*. With this closes the act of eucharistic sacrifice.

Now follows the *communion*, or the participation of the consecrated elements. It is introduced with the words: "Holy things for holy persons,"† and the *Kyrie eleison*, or (as in the Clementine liturgy) the *Gloria in Excelsis*: "Glory be to God on high, peace on earth, and good will to men.‡ Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: God is the Lord, and he hath appeared among us." The bishop and the clergy communicate first, and then the people. The formula of distribution in the Clementine liturgy is simply: "The body of Christ;" "The blood of Christ, the cup of life,"§ to which the receiver answers "*Amen*." In other liturgies it is longer.||

* "Ἰνα . . . ἀγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἁγίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.

† Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, Sancta Sanctis. It is a warning to the unworthy not to approach the table of the Lord.

‡ According to the usual reading ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. But the older and better attested reading is εὐδοκίας, which alters the sense and makes the angelic hymn bimembris: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of his good pleasure" (i. e., the chosen people of God).

§ Σῶμα Χριστοῦ—Αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς.

|| In the Liturgy of St. Mark: Σῶμα ἁγίου—Αἷμα τίμιον τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ

The holy act closes with prayers of thanksgiving, psalms, and the benediction.

The Eucharist was celebrated daily, or at least every Sunday. The people were exhorted to frequent communion, especially on the high festivals. In North Africa some communed every day, others every Sunday, others still less frequently.* Augustine leaves this to the needs of every believer, but says in one place: "The Eucharist is our daily bread." The daily communion was connected with the current mystical interpretation of the fourth petition in the Lord's Prayer. Basil communed four times in the week. Gennadius of Marseilles commands at least weekly communion. In the East it seems to have been the custom, after the fourth century, to commune only once a year, or on great occasions. Chrysostom often complains of the indifference of those who come to church only to hear the sermon, or who attend the eucharistic sacrifice, but do not commune. One of his allusions to this neglect we have already quoted. Some later councils threatened all laymen with excommunication, who did not commune at least on Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.

In the Oriental and North African churches prevailed the incongruous custom of *infant* communion, which seemed to follow from infant baptism, and was advocated by Augustine and Innocent I., on the authority of John vi. 53. In the Greek church this custom continues to this day, but in the Latin, after the ninth century, it was disputed or forbidden, because the apostle (1 Cor. xi. 28, 29) requires self-examination as the condition of worthy participation.†

With this custom appear the first instances, and they ex-

Σακράγιος ἡμεῶν. In the Mozarabic Liturgy the communicating priest prays: "Corpus et sanguis Domini noster Jesu Christi custodiat corpus et animam meam in vitam æternam." Resp. "Amen." So in the Roman Liturgy, from which it passed into the Anglican.

* Augustine, Epist. 118 ad Januar. c. 2: "Alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Dominico; alii certis diebus accipiunt; alibi nullus dies intermittitur quo non offeratur; alii sabbato tantum et Dominico; alibi tantum Dominico."

† Comp. P. Zorn: *Historia eucharistiæ infantium*. Berol. 1786; and the article by Kling in Herzog's *Encykl.* vii. 549 sqq.

ceptional, of a *communio sub una specie*; after a little girl in Carthage in the time of Cyprian had been made drunk by receiving the wine. But the withholding of the cup from the laity, which transgresses the express command of the Lord, "Drink ye *all* of it," and is associated with a superstitious horror of profaning the blood of the Lord by spilling, and with the development of the power of the priesthood, dates only from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and was then justified by the scholastic doctrine of concomitance.

In the Greek church it was customary to dip the bread in the wine, and deliver both elements in a spoon.

The customs of house-communion and after-communion for the sick and for prisoners, of distributing the unconsecrated remainder of the bread among the non-communicants, and of sending the consecrated elements, or their substitutes,* to distant bishops or churches at Easter as a token of fellowship, are very old.

The Greek church used leaven bread, the Latin, unleavened. This difference ultimately led to intricate controversies.

The mixing of the wine with water was considered essential, and was explained in various mystical ways; chiefly by reference to the blood and water which flowed from the side of Jesus on the cross.

* These substitutes for the consecrated elements were called *αντίδοξα* (i. e., *ἀντί τῶν δόξων εὐχαριστικῶν*), and *eulogia* (from the benediction at the close of the service).