

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 HISTORY
OF THE
DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

WORKS BY THE
REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.

HOLY BAPTISM. (Oxford Library.) Crown 8vo, 5s.

THE HOLY COMMUNION. (Oxford Library.)
Crown 8vo, 5s.

OUTLINES OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. Crown 8vo,
7s. 6d.

CHRIST AND HUMAN LIFE. Crown 8vo, *2s. 6d. net.*

OUTLINES OF MEDITATIONS FOR USE IN
RETREAT. Crown 8vo, *2s. 6d. net.*

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS. Cheap Re-
issue, with a New Preface. 8vo, *1s. net.*

THE LAW OF CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE,
ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO THE
DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER'S MARRIAGE
ACT. (Pusey House Papers.) Crown 8vo,
sewed, *3d.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Crown 8vo, *7s. 6d. net.*

THE CHURCH: ITS MINISTRY AND
AUTHORITY. Small Fcap. 8vo, *1s. net.*

LONDON: RIVINGTONS.

A HISTORY
OF
THE DOCTRINE OF
THE HOLY EUCHARIST

BY
DARWELL STONE, M.A.
PUSEY LIBRARIAN
FORMERLY PRINCIPAL OF DORCHESTER MISSIONARY COLLEGE

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1909

PREFACE.

SOME explanation may be needed of the history of this book, and of its relation to other writings of mine. For many years it was my duty constantly to lecture on Christian doctrine. In connection with my lectures, it was my custom to read as fully as circumstances permitted what has been written in different periods on the subjects which I had to treat, so that I might be able in lecturing to state briefly the salient points of the teaching of representative men and important times. In some cases this led to my forming lists of passages which seemed to be of special importance. One such list was in regard to the Eucharist. Parts of the materials thus collected on this subject were utilised in a series of articles, entitled *The Holy Eucharist: An Historical Inquiry*, which I was allowed to contribute to the *Church Quarterly Review* in the years 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904; and these articles in turn lay behind the much briefer treatment of the history of the doctrine in the volume, *The Holy Communion*, in the *Oxford Library of Practical Theology*. Since the publication of that volume in 1904, I have spent much time on the verification and revision and supplementing and arrangement of the materials to which I have referred; and the result of the work is published in this book. It will be seen that a plan of quoting at considerable length has been adopted. In so acting,

it has been my aim to show as well as is possible what the meaning of the writers quoted is ; and I hope that my own personal dislike of scanty quotations and unexplained allusions and generalisations which leave readers at the mercy of authors may not have caused me to make the passages unnecessarily long. In the part of the book which deals with the period beginning in the sixteenth century, the work of selection has not been easy, in consequence of the vastness of the literature : I have tried to choose writers and works which are really representative, and to cite fully and frankly opinions which I do not share : if I have failed in this, the failure has been due not to lack of will, but to human infirmity.

My thanks are due to the Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* for allowing me to use the substance and very occasionally the language of the series of articles already mentioned, and also of an article contributed to the *Review* in October, 1908, entitled *Eucharistic Doctrine and the Canon of the Roman Mass*. My indebtedness to others is shown in some footnotes ; and my special gratitude is due to my friend, the Rev. C. O. Becker, Vicar of St. Botolph's, Aldersgate Street, who most generously read this book before it was in print, and gave me the help of much valuable advice and many useful suggestions.

The book is, as it is called, a history : the foundation of it was formed, as has been stated, in study undertaken for purposes of my own : if it should help any to a better understanding of the great doctrine of which it treats, or if it should do anything to promote the cause of peace, such a practical result will be in accordance with my best hopes.

D. S.

January 25, 1909.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

CHAPTER I.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Introduction—	PAGE
1. Object—An historical statement - - - - -	1
2. Importance of this - - - - -	1
3. Need of systematic grouping and scientific estimate of evidence - - - - -	2
I. Preliminary considerations—	
1. The Person of Christ - - - - -	2
2. Familiarity of idea of Communion with God by means of a sacred meal to—	
(a) Pagans - - - - -	2
(b) Jews - - - - -	3
(c) The Disciples of Christ - - - - -	3
3. Place of rite in New Testament - - - - -	3
II. The Institution—	
1. New Testament Accounts - - - - -	4
2. Parallels in St. Justin Martyr and St. Irenæus - - - - -	6
3. Doctrinal inferences - - - - -	7
III. Teaching of St. Paul - - - - -	12
IV. Epistle to the Hebrews - - - - -	15
V. Epistles of St. Peter - - - - -	16
VI. The Revelation and the First Epistle of St. John - - - - -	17
VII. The discourse at Capernaum - - - - -	17
VIII. Interpretation of passages - - - - -	19
IX. Summary as to New Testament - - - - -	20

CHAPTER II.

THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

Introduction—	
1. Interest and importance of this period - - - - -	22
2. Basis of teaching - - - - -	22
3. Grouping of writers - - - - -	22

	PAGE
I. Teaching as to presence and gift—	
1. An undefined spiritual gift - - - - -	23
2. The “symbols” or “figures” of the body and blood of Christ - - - - -	29
3. The body and blood of Christ - - - - -	33
II. Teaching as to sacrifice—	
1. Repudiation of carnal sacrifices - - - - -	42
2. Sacrificial character of Christian belief and life and worship - - - - -	44
3. The Eucharist called a sacrifice - - - - -	46
4. Use of Malachi i. 11 - - - - -	49
5. Association with the sacrifice of the cross and with our Lord’s risen and heavenly life - - - - -	49
6. Priestly character of Christian community - - - - -	52
III. Summary - - - - -	54

CHAPTER III.

THE PERIOD OF THE GREAT COUNCILS.

Introduction—

1. Characteristics of period - - - - -	55
2. Writers and documents - - - - -	55
I. Ideas as to presence and gift—	
1. General references to the body and blood of Christ -	58
2. “Symbols” or “figures” - - - - -	61
3. Heightened efficacy of elements - - - - -	67
4. The body and blood of Christ - - - - -	70
5. Method of consecration - - - - -	84
6. Spiritual character of presence - - - - -	88
7. The body of Christ in the Eucharist and the mystical body the Church - - - - -	94
8. The heavenly body of Christ - - - - -	96
9. Attempts at Explanation—	
(a) Emphasis on continued existence of bread and wine - - - - -	98
(b) Emphasis on change of bread and wine - - - - -	102
10. Adoration - - - - -	106
II. Ideas as to sacrifice—	
1. General sacrificial phraseology - - - - -	109
2. Association with passion and death of Christ - - - - -	114
3. Association with risen and ascended life of Christ - - - - -	116
4. Culmination in Communion - - - - -	121
5. The sacrifice of the Church - - - - -	123

	PAGE
III. Evidence taken separately—	
1. Aphraates and St. Ephraim the Syrian - - - -	124
2. Correspondence between Peter Mongus and Acacius - -	128
3. Homily ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa - - - -	129
IV. Summary - - - - -	131

CHAPTER IV.

EASTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME.

Introduction—

General Characteristics of East - - - - -	133
---	-----

I. Centuries VI., VII.—

<i>Canons of Athanasius, Leontius of Byzantium, Ephraim of Antioch, Eusebius of Alexandria, St. Anastasius of Sinai, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Eutychius of Constantinople, Maximus the Confessor, Sayings of the Fathers</i> - - - - -	134
--	-----

II. Iconoclastic Controversy—

St. John of Damascus, Council of Constantinople of 754, Second Council of Nicæa of 787, <i>Liturgy of St. Basil, Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, On the Stainless Body</i> -	143
---	-----

III. Sacrifice in centuries VI.-X.—

Eutychius of Constantinople, St. John of Damascus, Second Council of Nicæa, Nicephorus of Constantinople, <i>Liturgy of St. Basil, Liturgy of St. Chrysostom</i>	152
--	-----

IV. Œcumenius, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Soterichus Panteugenus, Council of Constantinople of 1156, Nicolas of Methone, Germanus II., Cabasilas, Symeon of Thessalonica, Council of Florence, Gennadius - - - - -	156
---	-----

V. Gabriel of Philadelphia - - - - -	173
--------------------------------------	-----

VI. Cyril Lucar, <i>Orthodox Confession</i> , Council of Constantinople of 1642, Council of Jerusalem of 1672, Correspondence of Eastern Bishops with Nonjurors, Council of Constantinople of 1727, Russian Holy Synod in 1838, <i>Longer Catechism, Greek Catechisms</i> (of Bernadakis, Moschakis, Kyriakos, Nektarios), Bishop Makarios, Khomiakoff - - - - -	175
--	-----

VII. Summary - - - - -	192
------------------------	-----

CHAPTER V.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY :
PART I.

Introduction—

Differences of West from East	193
I. Centuries VI.-VIII.—	
St. Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, St. Germain of Paris, Venerable Bede, Alcuin, Theodulf of Orleans	193
II. Western Liturgies, centuries VI.-VIII.	203
III. Amalarius of Metz, Florus of Lyons	210
IV. Paschasius Radbert, Walafrid Strabo, Rabanus Maurus, Ratramn	216
V. Hinemar of Rheims, Haymo of Halberstadt, Remi of Auxerre, Gerbert	233
VI. Aelfric	236
VII. Pope Nicolas I., Ratherius of Verona	238

CHAPTER VI.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY :
PART II.

Introduction—

Prevalent doctrine early in Century XI.	242
I. Fulbert of Chartres	242
II. The Berengarian Controversy—	
Berengar, Lanfranc, Durand of Troarn, Witmund of Aversa, Eusebius Bruno, Councils at Rome, Brionne, Vercelli, Paris, Tours, Rouen, Poitiers, Saint Maixent, Bordeaux	244
III. St. Peter Damien (?)	259
IV. St. Anselm	261
V. Odo of Cambrai, Ivo of Chartres, William of Champeaux, Alger of Liège, Gregory of Bergamo	263
VI. Hildebert of Tours, Honorius of Autun, Stephen of Autun, Otto of Bamberg (?)	276
VII. Hugh of St. Victor, <i>The Mirror of the Mysteries of the Church</i> , Robert Paululus, <i>On the Canon of the Mystic Libation</i>	283

CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
VIII. Rupert of Deutz - - - - -	291
IX. Abelard, Abbaud, William of St. Thierry - - - - -	295
X. St. Bernard, Robert Pulleyn, Peter the Venerable - - - - -	301
XI. Peter Lombard - - - - -	303
XII. Peter of Poitiers, Pope Innocent III. - - - - -	307
XIII. Fourth Lateran Council - - - - -	313

CHAPTER VII.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY : PART III.

Introduction—

Features of Century XIII. - - - - -	314
I. Alexander of Hales, William of Auvergne - - - - -	314
II. Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas - - - - -	319
III. St. Bonaventura, Duns Scotus - - - - -	334
IV. Illustrations of doctrine from—	
1. Bull of Pope Urban IV. on the Feast of Corpus Christi	344
2. Hymns of St. Thomas Aquinas - - - - -	346
3. Acts of reverence and adoration - - - - -	352
4. <i>The Lay Folks Mass Book, the Ancrens Riwele</i> - - - - -	356
5. Belief in physical support from reception of Sacrament	359
6. Durand of Mende - - - - -	359

CHAPTER VIII.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY : PART IV.

Introduction—

New views in Centuries XIV.-XV. - - - - -	361
I. John of Paris, Durand of St. Pourçain, William of Ockham, John Wyclif, Lollards, Sir John Oldcastle, John Hus, Jerome of Prague, Peter d'Ailly, John Wessel - - - - -	361
II. University of Oxford in 1381, Council of London of 1382, Condemnation of Sawtry and Wyche, University of Oxford in 1412, Archbishop Arundel, Council of Constance, Thomas Netter, Council of Florence, Pope Eugenius IV. - - - - -	373

	PAGE
III. Illustrations of doctrine from—	
1. Mother Juliana of Norwich - - - - -	380
2. John Myrc - - - - -	381
3. Thomas a Kempis - - - - -	382
4. Langforde's <i>Meditations</i> - - - - -	384
IV. Further illustrations from—	
1. Hereford Missal - - - - -	385
2. Customary of St. Augustine's, Canterbury - - - - -	385
3. Sarum Missal and Processional - - - - -	385
4. York Processional - - - - -	388
5. Sarum Cautels - - - - -	388
V. Gabriel Biel - - - - -	388
VI. York Guild of Corpus Christi - - - - -	391
VII. Summary of the period from the Sixth to the Fifteenth Century - - - - -	392
Index of Subjects - - - - -	399
Index of Passages in Holy Scripture referred to - - - - -	401
Index of Authors, Councils, and Books referred to - - - - -	404

CHAPTER I.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE object of the present book is to set out in as simple and clear a form as may be possible the doctrines about the Holy Eucharist which have been current among Christians. It is not the aim of the author to enter into controversial arguments or theological reasonings to any extent beyond that which the intelligible treatment of facts necessarily involves. The world and the Church being as they are, such arguments and reasonings have their use and their proper place and even their necessity. But the purpose of the following pages is to provide an historical account of the actual forms in which Christian belief has been held. In attempting to carry out this purpose the author cannot disguise from himself that he will be compelled to call attention to much which very many might wish to be forgotten. The surprises of history, and perhaps especially of Church history, are often unwelcome. The complexities which historical treatment reveals are sometimes provoking or painful or perplexing to those who have found in simple beliefs a stay for life or a power in teaching. Nor may the student and the scholar ever rightly forget that a sign of the kingdom of Him who is the Light and the Hope of the world is that "the poor have the Gospel preached to them". Yet to close the eyes to facts is to invite an awful Nemesis. History has its own ways of avenging itself on those who ignore its lessons. Candid investigation is not always the enemy of faith. And, if there is to be a way out of current controversies, and a lessening of discord, and a step towards that outward unity of Christendom for which true Christians long, it will be as facts are realised and the history of doctrine is grasped and understood. Those who live in the present and work for the future will build on but insecure foundations if they suffer themselves to be unmindful of the past.

The needs thus contemplated will not be met simply by collections of facts and *catenæ* of quotations. The facts and the quotations cannot be properly understood apart from their setting. If the right value is to be assigned to evidence of this kind, the evidence must be systematically grouped and scientifically treated.

I.

The starting point for such an historical inquiry into the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as is here contemplated must necessarily be found in the institution of the Sacrament by our Lord Himself. In approaching the starting point there are three preliminary considerations to be borne in mind, the Person of Him who instituted the Sacrament, the preparation for the institution which God had mercifully vouchsafed, and the place which the administration filled in the earliest Christian life as shown in the New Testament records.

1. No inquiry into Christian doctrine may forget Him who is the centre of distinctively Christian thought and the way by which Christian faith has its access to the Father. When the Lord Jesus instituted the Eucharist He was really and perfectly Man. All that makes up a human body and all that comprises a human soul were His both in outward appearance and in inward reality. He was also truly and eternally God. There was no loss or diminution to His Godhead and no maiming of His Manhood when in the mystery of the Incarnation the one eternal divine Person of the Son of God made human nature His own. In Him there is, not only to a pre-eminent degree but also after a unique method, the union of God and man. The words which He speaks, besides being human, are the words of God. The actions which He performs, besides being human, are the actions of God. It is the central motive of His life that in it God and man are to be made at one and to hold communion. Here is the verity apart from which the Christian religion does not exist. Only by remembering it can there be hope of understanding the meaning of what He does at the institution of the Eucharist, as at other times.

2. When the Eucharist was instituted, the idea of communion with God by means of a sacred meal had long been familiar. Among the Greeks this idea underlay the mystic food

and drink in the mysteries of Eleusis. All over the world it has furnished the highest point of savage rites. God, who "left not Himself without witness" in the Gentile world, and did not destroy that image of God in man which human sin had marred, enabled the dim yearnings of heathen thought to find, amid whatever distortions, the vestiges of a great truth.¹ For the Jew the central place of worship was the place of meeting between God and man, where God would dwell; the sacrifice which men offered was the bread of God; sacrifices in some instances led up to the meal of the worshippers; the altar of propitiation was the table of communion; Melchizedek, the "priest of God Most High," "brought forth bread and wine"; the personified Wisdom of the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus invited to a mystic meal described in one passage as of bread and wine.² In the case of the Apostles this idea had been further emphasised by our Lord Himself before the Eucharist was instituted. It permeated the miracles of the feeding of the five thousand³ and of the four thousand.⁴ It was drawn out at length by our Lord in the discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. "I am the bread of life." "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven." "The bread which I will give is My flesh." "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life." "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him." "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever."⁵

3. The references in the New Testament to the administration of the rite of the Eucharist are of that incidental and passing character which implies an ordinary and recognised part

¹ See Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures on The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, pp. 287-90; Jevons, *An Introduction to the History of Religion*, pp. 152, 154, 285, 414, 415; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, ii. 337-66 (second edition); Illingworth, *Christian Character*, pp. 145, 146. See also the present writer's *The Holy Communion*, pp. 1-9.

² Exod. xxix. 43-46; Lev. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22, xxii. 25; Num. xxviii. 2; Lev. iii. 11, 16; Exod. xii. ; Lev. vii. 15-21; Ezek. xli. 22, xliv. 16; Mal. i. 7, 12; Gen. xiv. 18; Prov. ix. 1-5; Eccus. xxiv. 19-21.

³ St. Matt. xiv. 19, 20; St. Mark vi. 41, 42; St. Luke ix. 16, 17; St. John vi. 11, 12.

⁴ St. Matt. xv. 36, 37; St. Mark viii. 6-8.

⁵ St. John vi. 48-58.

of Christian life. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul speaks of it as an ordinance of Christ and an habitual element in the worship of the Corinthians.¹ In the Acts of the Apostles "the breaking of bread" is so connected with "the prayers," and "breaking bread at home" is so associated with "continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple," as to indicate that the Eucharist was observed in the Apostolic Church;² and a like conclusion can be inferred from the breaking of bread by St. Paul at Troas on the first day of the week.³ Thus, without including the meal at Emmaus⁴ and the meal on the ship after the shipwreck of St. Paul⁵ among celebrations of the Eucharist, there is sufficient indication of its place in the habitual round of Christian life.

II.

The New Testament contains four accounts of the institution of the Eucharist. Mentioned in chronological order, these are given by St. Paul, and in the Second, First, and Third Gospels. For the purposes of comparison, it may be convenient to quote them in a tabular form.

1 Cor. xi. 23-25.	St. Mark xiv. 22-25.	St. Matt. xxvi. 26-29.	St. Luke xxiii. 14-20.
The Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed	As they were eating,	As they were eating,	And when the hour was come, He sat down, and the Apostles with Him, and He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And He received

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16-21, xi. 23-29. ² Acts ii. 42, 46. ³ Acts xx. 7, 11.

⁴ St. Luke xxiv. 30-35. On the improbability that this meal was the Eucharist, see the author's *The Holy Communion*, pp. 15, 16.

⁵ Acts xxvii. 35.

1 Cor. xi. 23-25.

St. Mark xiv. 22-25.

St. Matt. xxvi. 26-29.

St. Luke xxii. 14-20.

took
bread; and when He
had given thanks,
He brake it, and

said,

This is My body
which is¹ for you :
this do for My
memorial.

In like manner
also the cup
after supper,

saying,

This cup is the
new covenant in
My blood :

He took
bread, and when He
had blessed,
He brake it, and
gave to them, and

said,
Take ye :
this is My body.

And He took a
cup,

and when He had
given thanks,
He gave to them :
and they all
drank of it.

And He said unto
them,

This is My blood
of the² covenant,

which is poured
out for many.

Jesus took
bread, and
blessed, and
brake it; and
He gave to the
disciples, and
said,
Take, eat ;
this is My body.

And He took a
cup,

and
gave thanks, and
gave to them,

saying,

Drink ye all of
it : for
this is My blood
of the² covenant,

which is poured
out for many
unto remission

a cup, and when
He had given thanks,
He said, Take this,
and divide it among
yourselves : for I
say unto you, I will
not drink from
henceforth of the
fruit of the vine,
until the kingdom
of God shall come.

And He took
bread, and when He
had given thanks,
He brake it, and
gave to them,

saying,

This is My body,
[which is given for you :
this do for My
memorial.

And the cup in like
manner
after supper,

saying,

This cup is the
new covenant in
My blood,
even that which is
poured out for you].³

¹ The word "broken" is probably a very early addition, but not part of the original text.

² Some MSS. insert "new".

³ It is doubtful whether the words in square brackets are part of the original text. See Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, pp. 157-60; Frankland, *The Early Eucharist*, pp. 114-19.

6 THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST

1 Cor. xi. 23-25. St. Mark xiv. 22-25. St. Matt. xxvi. 26-29. St. Luke xxii. 14-20.
of sins.

this do, as oft
as ye drink it,
for My memorial.

Verily I say
unto you, I will
no more drink of
the fruit of the
vine, until that
day when I drink
it new

in the king-
dom of God.

But I say
unto you, I will
not drink henceforth
of this fruit of the
vine, until that
day when I drink
it new
with you
in My
Father's kingdom.

¹ For as often as
ye eat this bread,
and drink the
cup, ye proclaim
the Lord's death
till He come.

Before proceeding to discuss the doctrinal teaching which is implied in the New Testament accounts of the institution of the Sacrament, it may be convenient to quote statements in regard to it which are found in the *First Apology* of St. Justin Martyr, written about 145 A.D., and in St. Irenæus, writing about 190 A.D. St. Justin Martyr writes: "The Apostles in their memoirs, which are called Gospels, have handed down the command which Jesus gave, that He took bread and gave thanks and said, Do this for My memorial, this is My body; and that in like manner He took the cup and gave thanks and said, This is My blood; and that He gave it to them alone".² St. Irenæus writes: "He took that which in its created nature is bread and gave thanks and said, This is My body; and in like manner the cup, which is of that created nature which is used by us, He acknowledged as His blood, and taught to be the new oblation of the New Testament".³

What inferences as to doctrine, then, may rightly be drawn from the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist?

¹ It appears most likely, but not certain, that these words are St. Paul's comment, not quoted by him from our Lord's words at the institution.

² St. Justin Martyr, *Ap.* i. 66.

³ St. Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.* IV. xvii. 5.

1. All the accounts contained in the New Testament, as also those which were known to St. Justin Martyr and St. Irenæus, concur in representing our Lord as having used the words "This is My body". It is probable that He spoke in Aramaic; but, unless we are to ignore every principle of sound criticism, it must be supposed that the Greek words which all our authorities give accurately represent what He said. In Aramaic the word "is" would not be verbally expressed; the same meaning as that conveyed by it would be involved in the juxtaposition of the subject "this" and the predicate "My body". The phrase then shows that our Lord used language by which in some real though unexplained sense He identified the bread which He held in His hand and gave to the Apostles with His body. It would be unnatural to suppose that the word "this" denoted anything different from the bread so held and given, or that the word "body" was used in any unreal sense.

2. The accounts of our Lord's words used at the delivery of the cup differ slightly. According to St. Paul and St. Luke He said, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood"; as reported in the First and Second Gospels the words were, "This is My blood of the covenant". Leaving aside for the moment any consideration of what is involved in the use of the word "covenant," it must be noticed that the phrase "This is My blood" asserts, and the phrase "This cup is the new covenant in My blood" implies, a similar identification of the wine with our Lord's blood to the identification of the bread with His body involved in His words at the delivery of the bread. The word "this," or the phrase "this cup," obviously denotes the contents of the cup; the phrase "new covenant in My blood" implies that what was given by our Lord and received by the Apostles as marking and making the covenant was His blood.

3. To the words "This is My body," at the delivery of the bread, St. Paul adds, "which is for you: this do for My memorial," and the longer text of St. Luke adds, "which is given for you: this do for My memorial". To the words at the delivery of the cup already quoted, additions are made of "which is poured out for many" in the Second Gospel, of "which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" in the First Gospel, of "even that which is poured out for you" in the longer text of

the Third Gospel, and of "this do, as oft as ye drink it, for My memorial" by St. Paul. The words "covenant," "do," "memorial," and "poured out" need to be considered in connection with one another.

(a) Covenant (*διαθήκη*). When our Lord said, "This is My blood of the covenant," or "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," His words were of such a kind as to suggest a connection between the rite which He was instituting and the sacrificial feasts in which the worshippers partook of the sacrifice and thereby received the blessing associated with it. They would recall also the covenants recorded in the Old Testament and the promise of a "new covenant" in the prophecies of Jeremiah.¹ In particular a reference is naturally understood to the covenant between the Lord and Israel related in the Book of Exodus,² which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews describes as the "first" "covenant" as compared with the "new covenant" of which our Lord is the "mediator".³ In the making of the covenant with Israel the law of God was declared to the people by Moses, and the people answered in acceptance of the law, "All the words which the Lord hath spoken will we do". After this declaration and acceptance of the law there were sacrifices of burnt offerings and peace offerings. As a further stage in the sacrifice "Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar". Then, after again declaring the law which he had written in the "book of the covenant" and after the people had again accepted it, "Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words". These acts were followed by the vision of God and the completion of the sacrificial meal. "Then went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel." "And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand: and they beheld God, and did eat and drink." It is unnecessary here to enter into the many questions connected with the historical setting of this account, or with the vision of God which is described in it. It is sufficient to point out that to the mind of a Jew the phrase

¹ Jer. xxxi. 31-34.

² Ex. xxiv. 1-11.

³ Heb. ix. 15-20.

“My blood of the covenant,” or “new covenant in My blood,” would suggest a close association with a sacrificial rite in which man approached God; that the words were spoken at a meal which was either the Passover itself or an anticipation or representation of it;¹ and that in its origin the Passover was a sacrifice in which deliverance was accomplished by means of blood, the symbol of life.²

(b) Do (*ποιεῖτε*). The first and obvious meaning of the words “This do” is that they denote “Perform this action”; and it is clear that they were usually so understood by the writers of the early Church and the compilers of the Liturgies. But it has often been observed, and with justice, that in Holy Scripture both the Hebrew word *יָשַׁע* and the Greek word *ποιεῖν* have the sense of “offer” where the context contains sufficient indication of a sacrificial meaning, in something the same way that the English word “do” is used in the sense of “offer” in the well-known sentence in which Shakespeare wrote, “Go bid the priests do present sacrifice,”³ that is, as rightly explained by Mr. Michael Macmillan,⁴ “offer sacrifice immediately”. Thus, for instance, the translation adopted in the Authorised Version and the Revised Version of a verse in Exodus, “The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even,” is a perfectly correct rendering, although the word translated “offer” is literally “do” both in the Hebrew (*יָשַׁע*) and in the Greek (*ποιεῖν*).⁵ Supposing then that the setting in which our Lord’s words were spoken is thought to be sufficiently suggestive of sacrificial ideas, “This do” may well be regarded as indicating, in addition to its primary meaning of “Perform this action,” a sacrificial element in the rite instituted.

(c) Memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*). This word occurs five times in

¹ It is not likely that the suggestion of Mr. Box (*Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1902) that the association is with the “Kiddush” not the Passover is correct. On this and on the connection of the Last Supper with the Passover see a note in the present writer’s *The Holy Communion*, pp. 289-91.

² See Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, pp. 34-37; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 293-95.

³ *Julius Cæsar*, II. ii. 5.

⁴ Note *in loco* in *The Arden Shakespeare*.

⁵ Exod. xxix. 39; cf. e.g., Lev. ix. 7; Ps. lxxvi. 15; see also St. Luke ii. 27.

the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament. As translated from the Hebrew in the Revised Version, the first four of these passages are as follows: "Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be to the bread for a memorial (Hebrew לְזִכְרוֹן; Septuagint *eis anámnēsin*), even an offering made by fire unto the Lord".¹ "In the day of your gladness, and in your set feasts, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; and they shall be to you for a memorial (Hebrew לְזִכְרוֹן; Septuagint *ánámneis*) before your God."² "A Psalm of David, to bring to remembrance" (margin of Revised Version, "to make memorial": Hebrew לְהִזְכִּיר; Septuagint *eis anámnēsin*).³ "For the chief musician. A Psalm of David; to bring to remembrance" (margin of Revised Version, "to make memorial": Hebrew לְהִזְכִּיר; Septuagint *eis anámnēsin*).⁴ The fifth passage, as translated in the Revised Version from the Septuagint, is as follows: "For admonition were they troubled for a short space, having a token of salvation, to put them in remembrance (*eis anámnēsin*) of the commandment of Thy law".⁵ In the first two of these five passages it is clear that the word denotes a sacrificial memorial before God. In the fifth of them it is equally clear that the context requires the meaning of a memento to man. The third and fourth passages are not without share in the obscurity which surrounds the titles of the Psalms; but the probability is very strong that a memorial before God is denoted. The best commentators explain the title of these two Psalms as a liturgical note signifying that the Psalms were to be used in connection with the offering of incense, or, as appears to be more probable, the offering of the *Azkara*, as the portion of the meal offering mixed with oil and burnt with incense on the altar (Lev. ii. 2) and the incense placed on the shewbread and afterwards burnt (Lev. xxiv. 7) were technically called in the Levitical ritual;⁶ and these are among the many passages in which the marginal renderings of the Revised Version preserve translations more acceptable to the best Hebrew scholars than those printed in

¹ Lev. xxiv. 7. ² Num. x. 10. ³ Ps. xxxviii. (Sept. xxxvii.) 1.

⁴ Ps. lxx. (Sept. lxx.) 1.

⁵ Wisd. xvi. 6.

⁶ See, e.g., Delitzsch *in loco* and Kirkpatrick *in loco*.

the text of that version.¹ Moreover, on the less likely hypothesis that the titles of these Psalms refer to their contents, not to their liturgical use, the sacrificial meaning of a memorial before God would not be absent. "His broken-hearted faith," wrote Dr. Kay, explaining the title in reference to the contents of the Psalm, "is presented to the Lord like the *azkarah*-frankincense of the meat-offering, burnt with fire."² As regards the use of the word memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*) in the Septuagint, then, it is used twice clearly in the sense of a sacrificial memorial before God, twice probably in that sense, and once to denote a memento to men. The only place in the New Testament, in addition to the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist, in which the word is used is Hebrews x. 3. "In those (that is the Jewish) sacrifices there is a remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) made of sins year by year," where the memento to the worshippers in connection with the Levitical sacrifices is denoted. On the whole it may be said that the word memorial naturally suggests, without actually necessitating, the sense of a sacrificial memorial before God; and that in the case of the institution of the Eucharist the probability of a sacrificial meaning is greatly strengthened by the use of the word covenant just before and by the sacrificial surroundings when our Lord spoke.

(d) Poured out (*ἐκχυνόμενον*). This word occurs in the accounts of the Institution given in the First, Second, and Third (longer text) Gospels. It is grammatically connected with the word "blood" in the First and Second Gospels, and with the word "cup" in the Third Gospel. In each place it was translated "shed" in the Authorised Version. The Revised Version has "poured out" in St. Luke, but "shed" is retained in St. Matthew and St. Mark. Consistency seems to require "poured out" as the right translation in each place;³ and the word suggests the pouring out of the blood of the slain victim at the base of the altar in the Jewish sacrifices, rather than the shed-

¹ See a valuable statement on the margins of the Revised Version in Driver, *The Book of Job*, pp. xxiv.-xxxiii.

² Kay *in loco*; cf. Wordsworth *in loco* and Cook *in loco*.

³ See Westcott, *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament*, p. 90, note.

ding of the blood in death.¹ The emphasis on this action in the Jewish law, the analogy of the pouring out of drink offerings before the Lord, and the generally sacrificial character of the whole rite, as well as the inferences which may be drawn from the history of sacrifice in other nations, concur to make it highly probable that in these Jewish sacrifices the blood was poured out as an offering to God, and that the pouring out was not merely a utilitarian method of disposing of the blood.

4. The sentence added in 1 Corinthians xi. 26, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come," will be more appropriately considered in connection with the teaching of St. Paul than as part of the account of the institution of the Sacrament, since it is more probable that they are a comment of St. Paul than that they were spoken by our Lord.

5. The elements used by our Lord were at that time associated with sacrificial rites. Bread and wine were largely employed both in Jewish and in heathen sacrifices. Among the Jews the meal offerings consisted of fine flour, the drink offerings consisted of wine. It is not unworthy of notice that in Latin one of the most distinctively sacrificial terms, *immolatio*, the source of the English word immolation, was derived from *mola*, the salted meal with which the victims in sacrifices were sprinkled. In the first century of the Christian era bread and wine would naturally suggest the idea of sacrifice.

6. The doctrinal inferences then which may rightly be drawn from the accounts of the institution of the Sacrament are that our Lord in some sense identified the bread and wine which He gave to the Apostles with His body and blood; and that the Eucharist, while not explicitly described as a sacrifice, was associated with terms and a method of administration which are indicative of sacrifice rather than opposed to it.

III.

After the words of institution, it is necessary to consider the teaching of St. Paul.

¹ Cf. the use of *ἐκχέω* in the Septuagint in Exod. xxix. 12; Lev. iv. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34, viii. 15, ix. 9; 1 Ki. (= 1 Sam.) vii. 6; Isa. lvii. 6; Eccus. i. 15. A different word (*πάίρω*) is used for the sprinkling of the blood on the Day of Atonement in Lev. xvi. 14, 15, 19; cf. Exod. xxix. 21; Lev. iv. 17, v. 9, viii. 11, xix. 16, 27; Num. xix. 4.

1. Two passages in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians treat directly of the Eucharist.

(a) In the first of these passages St. Paul is dealing with the question of the duty of Christians in regard to the eating of food sacrificed to idols. This leads him on to write on the possibility of those who possess spiritual privileges failing to be benefited by them, and to illustrate this truth from the history of Israel. Returning to his subject of the relation of Christians to idols, he writes, "Flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not fellowship in the blood of Christ (*κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ*)? The bread which we break, is it not fellowship in the body of Christ (*κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ*)? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of (*μετέχομεν*) the one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices fellowship in the altar (*κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*)? What say I then? that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with the demons (*κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων*). Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot partake of (*μετέχειν*) the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons."¹ In this passage it is to be observed that St. Paul (i.) treats the Eucharist as having in the Christian religion a position in some respects parallel to the sacrifices to demons in the heathen rites; (ii.) regards the Eucharist as a means of fellowship (*κοινωνία*) in the body and the blood of Christ; (iii.) describes the partaking of it as a ground of the unity in which Christians are one body; (iv.) refers to two crucial moments in the rite, namely, the breaking of the bread and blessing of the cup, and the reception of these by the communicants.

(b) The second passage is that already referred to in connection with the institution of the Sacrament. As in the first passage, the reference to the Eucharist is incidentally introduced in relation to a practical question. The existence of factions at Corinth leads St. Paul to the subject of disorders in connection with the Agape and the Eucharist. In the course of his rebuke

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16-21.

of these disorders he refers to his own reception from the Lord of the description of the institution of the Sacrament which he had delivered to the Corinthians. After recounting the institution, he goes on, in words which are more likely to be his own comment than part of what our Lord had said, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim (*καταγγέλλετε*) the Lord's death till He come"; and adds further, "Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep."¹ Here, as in the tenth chapter, the idea of the Eucharist as a means of fellowship in the body of Christ is found. It is this idea which gives force to the warning that whosoever eats or drinks unworthily is guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord, and that one who receives the Eucharist without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment to himself. St. Paul speaks also of the reception of the Eucharist as a proclamation of the death of the Lord. The primary meaning appears to be that the memorial instituted in the Eucharist is a memento set up in the Church as a reminder to Christians. But in view of what has been said already about the words covenant, do, memorial, poured out, and the general sacrificial setting of the institution and the parallel to heathen sacrifices,² it is difficult to exclude the further idea of a proclamation before God in the sense of a sacrificial memorial and presentation. It is to be noticed that St. Paul does not say that the proclamation is simply of the Lord, but that it is of His death; that is, of the many aspects of our Lord's life which must be remembered and presented in any memorial of Him, that which is selected for special mention is the point of His death.

2. St. Paul's representation of the Eucharist as a means of fellowship in the body of Christ must be considered in relation to his teaching that Christians are, by virtue of their baptism, members of Christ and His body. At no great distance from the explicit references to the Eucharist in the First Epistle to the

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 26-30.

² See pp. 3, 8-12, *supra*.

Corinthians, he writes, "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptised into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. . . . Ye are the body of Christ, and members each in his part."¹ His teaching about the Eucharist is not isolated. It has place in a whole aspect of Christian life and the supernatural and sacramental relation of the Christian to Christ.

3. With any indications in St. Paul's writings of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist must be connected his view of the whole of Christian life and worship as having a sacrificial aspect. He besought Christians "to present" (*παραστήσαι*) their "bodies"—the bodies of those who, being "many, are one body in Christ," and the members of the body of Christ—"a living sacrifice, holy, well-pleasing to God" as their "spiritual (*λογικήν*) service."² He described the alms collected by the Philippians and brought to him by Epaphroditus as "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."³ In reference to his own work he wrote, "The grace that was given me of God, that I should be the priest (*λειτουργόν*) of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, doing the work of a priest (*ιερουργούντα*) in respect of the Gospel of God, that the oblation (*προσφορά*) of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."⁴ Because of this aspect of what Christians are and do, the Eucharist is not regarded as anything isolated, but in harmony with, and taking its place in, Christian life as a whole.

IV.

One of the main ideas of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the abiding character of the priesthood of Christ. He is a High Priest for ever. This carries with it the idea also of the abiding character of His sacrifice. It is one sacrifice for ever. In union with Christ and His heavenly sacrifice Christian worship and

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27. ² Rom. xii. 1, 4, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12-14.

³ Phil. iv. 18.

⁴ Rom. xv. 16. On this verse see Sanday and Headlam, *in loco*; and Sanday, *The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England*, pp. 89, 90.

life are spoken of in the Epistle as possessing a sacrificial element. "Through Him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."¹ So also, Christian life and worship as a whole are regarded as affording a parallel to the Jewish sacrifices;² and in a contrast between Christians and Jews it is said, "We," that is, Christians, "have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle".³ It is quite possible that in the word "altar" there is a reference to the cross of Christ, or to Christ Himself; but the word "eat" distinctly suggests a connection with the Eucharist, and implies that in this rite, forming as it does the centre of the earthly worship and life of Christians, there is access to the abiding sacrifice of Christ in heaven and to the heavenly High Priest Himself, as the earthly sanctuary affords the means of approach to the heavenly worship in which Christians "come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel".⁴

V.

The idea of the Christian body as priestly, and of the life and worship of Christians as sacrificial is found also in the First Epistle of St. Peter. "Ye also," St. Peter writes, "as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. . . . Ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession."⁵

In the Second Epistle of St. Peter there is a strong expression of the union with God which is allowed to Christians. "That through these" (the promises of God), it is said, "ye may become partakers of the divine nature."⁶

¹ Heb. xiii. 15, 16.

² *Ibid.* 9, 11, 12.

³ *Ibid.* 10.

⁴ Heb. xii. 22-24.

⁵ 1 St. Peter ii. 5, 9.

⁶ 2 St. Peter i. 4.

VI.

The Revelation of St. John implies the priestly and sacrificial character of Christian life and worship, and that the central point of these is to be found in the sacrifice of the heavenly sanctuary. In the vision of the worship of heaven, the imagery of which appears to have been taken from the worship of the Church on earth, the living creatures and the elders are depicted as worshipping the "Lamb standing, as though it had been slain," that is, our Lord living and active after passing through death present in His slain but victorious Manhood, and praising Him because He has made men to be "a kingdom and priests".¹

This same idea of the central action of our Lord in heaven is found in the First Epistle of St. John. "If any man sin," it is there said, "we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."² This advocacy of our Lord is here referred to as a present work carried on by Him in His heavenly life and making His propitiation effective for Christians. As Bishop Westcott wrote:—

"Nothing is said of the manner of Christ's pleading: that is a subject wholly beyond our present powers. It is enough that St. John represents it as the act of a Saviour still living and in a living relation with His people. His work for them continues as real as during His earthly life, though the conditions of it are changed. He is still acting personally in their behalf, and not only by the unexhausted and prevailing power of what He has once done. He Himself uses for His people the virtue of the work which He accomplished on earth. . . . The 'propitiation' itself is spoken of as something eternally valid and not as past."³

VII.

In the discourse at Capernaum, after the feeding of the five thousand recorded in the Fourth Gospel, in close connection with the miraculous meal previously described, instruction on "the meat which abideth unto eternal life" is summed up. Our Lord identifies Himself with "the bread of life," of which the manna in the wilderness was only a sign. In Him is to be found the gift of eternal life. "This is the bread which cometh down

¹ Rev. v. 6, 8-10.² 1 St. John ii. 1, 2.³ Westcott, *in loco*.

out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea, and the bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world." To the puzzled question of the Jews, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" the reply is given, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him. As the living Father sent Me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth Me, he also shall live because of Me. This is the bread which came down out of heaven: not as the fathers did eat, and died: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." Knowing of the perplexity and murmuring of many of His disciples, our Lord went on to say, "Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where He was before? The Spirit is the life-giver; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life."¹ Three comments may be made here on the teaching contained in this discourse. (1) A possible means of communion with Christ, and a necessary means of possessing Christian life, is described as eating the flesh of Christ and drinking His blood; and it is hinted that this is made possible by the operation of the Holy Ghost.² (2) It is unnatural to separate the language of the discourse from the only other occasion on which our Lord used similar language, namely, the institution of the Eucharist. (3) The gift of our Lord's flesh and blood is viewed in relation to His death in the words "the bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world,"³ and in relation to His resurrection when He spoke of Himself as "the bread of life" and "the living bread".⁴

¹ St. John vi. 26-63.

² An interpretation of "the Spirit" in the phrase "the Spirit is the life-giver" to denote our Lord in His divine nature might be supported by references to Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 18; but the usage in St. John's Gospel is in favour of interpreting it of the Holy Ghost; see St. John i. 32, 33, iii. 5, 6, 8, 34, vii. 39, xiv. 17, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13.

³ St. John vi. 51.

⁴ *Ibid.* 35, 48, 51.

VIII.

The positive and cumulative reasons which the New Testament affords for interpreting our Lord's words at the institution of the Eucharist as identifying that which He gave to His disciples with His body and His blood cannot rightly be set aside because of other expressions in the Gospels on which great stress has been laid by some writers; and the light shed on His words by the spiritual character of His risen body is not to be ignored because they were spoken before His death.

1. It has often been alleged that phrases by which our Lord on other occasions described Himself are parallel to the words used at the institution of the Eucharist and are merely metaphorical. An inference has been drawn that a metaphorical interpretation is to be placed on the words of institution, and that they are to be understood to mean either that the bread and the wine represent the body and blood of Christ without being His body and blood or that they are means by which, though themselves only bread and wine, those who receive in faith may partake inwardly and spiritually of Christ. Such phrases are "I am the bread of life," "I am the living bread," "I am the light of the world," "I am the door of the sheep," "I am the good shepherd," "I am the way," "I am the true vine."¹ In considering the argument based on these expressions it is important to notice three facts. First, as a matter of interpretation, the explanation that the bread and wine are means, and only means, by which the faithful communicants may spiritually receive Christ is not satisfactory. The alternatives are really two,— "This is in fact My body," or "This represents My body,"— not three,— "This is in fact My body," "This represents My body," "This is a means by the reception of which My body may be spiritually received". Secondly, neither the phrases which are used to support a metaphorical interpretation nor the circumstances in which these phrases were spoken were parallel to the words and circumstances at the institution of the Eucharist. Thirdly, a view by which the phrases are regarded as simply metaphorical attaches to them an altogether inadequate meaning. Each phrase denotes an actual fact about our Lord. It is not by way of metaphor but in spiritual reality that He feeds Christians, and gives them

¹ St. John vi. 35, 41, 48, 51, viii. 12, ix. 5, x. 7, 8, 11, 14, xiv. 6, xv. 1, 5.

light, and admits them into the Church, and tends them, and affords them access to the Father, and unites them to Himself. In like manner, it is not by way of metaphor but in spiritual reality that the bread and the wine of the Eucharist are His body and His blood.

2. To avoid the difficulty of the gift at the institution of the Eucharist being of the spiritual body and blood of the risen life of Christ, it has been supposed by some who interpret our Lord's words in their obvious sense that they were anticipatory only and denote not what the Apostles received at the institution but what they and other Christians were to receive after His ascension.¹ It is more reasonable to suppose that the anticipation was in actual fact of the spiritual powers of our Lord's risen life, and that, as in the days of His humiliation in the course of His ministry He possessed by anticipation in His human nature the glory of His ascended life for the purposes of the Transfiguration, so at the close of His ministry before that humiliation was ended He similarly possessed by anticipation the powers of His risen life for the purposes of the institution of the Sacrament and the gift to the Apostles.²

IX.

The doctrinal teaching of the New Testament on the subject of the Holy Eucharist may then be summarised as follows.

1. An essential element in Christian life is such communion with our Lord as is described as eating His flesh and drinking His blood.

2. At any rate a pre-eminent way of eating His flesh and drinking His blood is the reception of the Holy Communion.

3. In view of our Lord's words, "This is My body," "This is My blood," and St. Paul's words, "The cup of blessing which we bless" and "The bread which we break," the gift of our Lord's flesh and blood is to be connected with the acts of the minister, and not only with the reception by the communicant.

4. The Christian Church is in a supernatural and sacra-

¹ See, e.g., Goudge, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 105, 106.

² On the condition of our Lord's body during His mortal life see Oxenham, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, Excursus iv. (pp. 358-62, fourth edition).

mental relation to Christ ; Christians are a priestly body ; and Christian life and worship have a sacrificial element.

5. The spiritual sacrifices in Christian life and worship must be in union with the one, abiding, heavenly sacrifice of Christ.

6. The language used about the Eucharist and the position assigned to it suggest that, as communion with Christ is pre-eminently granted by means of it, so the sacrificial aspect of Christian life and worship have their centre in it, and are thereby brought into relation with the heavenly offering of Christ. As a memorial of Him, it is a memorial in some special sense of His death, which formed an essential element in that dedication of His life which led on to the presentation of His risen and ascended manhood in heaven.

CHAPTER II.

THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

THE allusions to the Holy Eucharist in the Christian writings between the close of the canon of the New Testament and the Council of Nicæa in 325 are less numerous and less lengthy than might perhaps be anticipated by those familiar with modern controversies. For the purpose of an historical inquiry into the doctrine held in the Church they have the advantage that they are found in writers representing different lines of thought, who lived in different localities and were of different types of character. They thus possess far more value as testimony than would be in much more voluminous evidence from one writer or place only. Moreover, the period itself is of special interest and importance because of its proximity to the time of the Apostles and its priority to the friendship between the Church and the State in the reign of Constantine. The basis of the thought which the writers express was in the administration of the Sacrament which they possessed in the Church, the words of the New Testament, the tradition which they inherited as to details in the administration and as to explanations of doctrine, and in some cases the mystical interpretation of parts of Holy Scripture not explicitly referring to the Eucharist. On this basis they taught that the Christian in Communion partakes of Christ's life, that the consecrated elements are in some sense the body and blood of Christ, and that the Eucharist is in some sense a sacrifice. If they are grouped geographically, Asia Minor is represented by St. Justin Martyr and Abercius; Syria by St. Ignatius; Alexandria by the *Epistle of Barnabas*, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Dionysius of Alexandria; Athens by the *Epistle to Diognetus* and Athenagoras; Rome by St. Clement of Rome, St. Justin Martyr, and Hippolytus; Gaul by St. Irenæus and an inscription at Autun; Carthage by Tertullian and St. Cyprian; while the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*

may be either Syrian or Alexandrian, and the *Canons of Hippolytus* either Alexandrian or Roman. If a grouping on the principle of theological affinities is attempted, the Alexandrian writers may be placed together as representing with greater or less completeness the obscurity, the mysticism, the intense spirituality usually associated with Alexandria; the love of system, the love of order, the power of rule which mark the Church of Rome through the long course of history are already manifest in St. Clement of Rome; St. Ignatius is in much the precursor of the most orthodox type of Eastern teaching; Tertullian and St. Cyprian have the legal turn of mind which strongly marked African Christianity; St. Justin Martyr and Athenagoras and the writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* and St. Irenæus have points of contact with both East and West. As to dates, the *Epistle of Barnabas* may have been written between 70 and 79; St. Clement of Rome wrote about 95; St. Ignatius was a martyr about 117; St. Justin Martyr wrote about 150; the *Epistle to Diognetus* may be of the same date or a little later; Athenagoras flourished in the latter half of the second century; Abercius was Bishop of Hierapolis in the third quarter of the second century; St. Irenæus wrote about 180; the Autun inscription is probably of the end of the second century; Clement of Alexandria died early in the third century, Hippolytus about 238, Origen in 253, Dionysius of Alexandria in 265, Tertullian died in the first half of the third century, St. Cyprian in 258; the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* may have been written either in the first or in the second century, the *Canons of Hippolytus* either late in the second or in the third.

I.

In regard to the presence and gift in the Eucharist, the writers who have been mentioned afford instances of three different kinds of phraseology.

1. That which is bestowed in the Eucharist is described in terms which denote a spiritual gift without defining its specific nature. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* the words of prayer quoted as used in connection with the administration of the Eucharist include references to "the holy vine of David" made known through Jesus, "the life and knowledge" made known through Jesus, "the knowledge and faith and immor-

tality" made known through Jesus, and the "spiritual food and drink and eternal life" bestowed through Him; and that which is received is described as "the holy thing".

"Concerning the Eucharist (τῆς εὐχαριστίας) thus give thanks (εὐχαριστήσατε). First, as to the cup: we give thanks (εὐχαριστοῦμεν) to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever. Then, as to the broken bread (τοῦ κλάσματος): we give thanks (εὐχαριστοῦμεν) to Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever. As this broken bread (κλάσμα) was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom: for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. But let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist (εὐχαριστίας) but they who have been baptised in the name of the Lord (εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου);¹ for concerning this also the Lord hath said, 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs'.² And after ye have received (τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι) thus give thanks (εὐχαριστήσατε): we give thanks (εὐχαριστοῦμεν) to Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy name, which Thou didst make to tabernacle in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality, which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever. Thou, Almighty Master, didst create all things for Thy name's sake, and didst give food and drink to men for their enjoyment that they might give thanks (εὐχαριστήσωσιν) to Thee, but didst bestow on us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy servant."³

Somewhat similar language to these expressions in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* is found in the Epistles of St. Ignatius in addition to much more explicit phraseology which

¹ As *Κυρίου* is without the article, it probably means the Holy Trinity, not our Lord specifically. The actual form of Baptism is given in chapter vii. as "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost".

² St. Matt. vii. 6.

³ *Didache*, 9, 10. Compare the praise and thanksgiving addressed to our Lord, which do not include any description of that which is given and received in the Sacrament, in the *Acts of John*, 106-10, which probably preserve language of the latter part of the second century: see Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, II. i. 203-9.

must be noticed later. St. Ignatius refers to the Eucharist as "the bread of God," and as "one bread," "which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ".¹ With these definite references to the Eucharist may be compared the passages in which, with the Eucharist probably in his mind, St. Ignatius speaks of "faith, which is the flesh of the Lord," and "love, which is the blood of Jesus Christ"; "the bread of God, which is the flesh of Christ," and "His blood, which is love uncorrupted"; and "taking refuge in the Gospel as the flesh of Jesus".²

In discussing our Lord's teaching at Capernaum about the spirit and the flesh in connection with the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, Tertullian writes:—

"Making His spoken word life-giving, because that word is spirit and life, He also described His flesh in the same way, because the Word became flesh; therefore, to obtain life, we ought to long for Him, and to devour Him with our hearing, and to ruminate on Him with our understanding, and to digest Him by our faith."³

This kind of expression is more fully developed in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Clement writes:—

"The Lord expressed this by means of symbols in the Gospel according to John when He said, 'Eat My flesh and drink My blood,' depicting (ἀλληγορῶν) plainly the drinkable character of faith and the promise by means of which the Church, as a human being consisting of many members, is refreshed and grows and is welded together and compacted of both, of faith as the body and of hope as the soul, as also the Lord of flesh and blood."⁴

[After a more explicit passage quoted on pp. 37, 38, *infra*.] "But you are unwilling to understand it thus, but perhaps more generally (κοινότερον). Hear it also as follows: The Holy Ghost uses flesh as a picture (ἀλληγορεῖ) for us, for by Him was the flesh created. Blood signifies (ἀντίκειται) for us the Word, for as rich blood the Word has been poured into our life."⁵

"The blood of the Lord is twofold. In one sense it is fleshly, that by which we have been redeemed from corruption; in another sense it is spiritual, that by which we have been anointed. To

¹ *Eph.* 5, 20. In the phrase "bread of God," "of God" occurs in all the authorities except the Armenian Version, which omits.

² *Tral.* 8, *Rom.* 7, *Philad.* 5.

³ *De carn. res.* 37.

⁴ *Paed.* I. vi. 38.

⁵ *Ibid.* 43.

drink the blood of Jesus is to partake of the Lord's immortality ; and the Spirit is the strength of the Word, as blood of flesh. As then wine is mixed with water, so is the Spirit with man. And the one, the mixture, nourishes to faith ; and the other, the Spirit, guides to immortality. And the mingling of both—of the drink and the Word—is called Eucharist, renowned and beautiful grace ; and those who partake of it in faith are sanctified in both body and soul, since the will of the Father has mystically united the divine mixture, man, by the Spirit and the Word. For in truth the Spirit is joined to the soul that is moved by it, and the flesh, for the sake of which the Word became flesh, to the Word.”¹

“The food is the mystic contemplation ; for the flesh and blood of the Word are the comprehension of the divine power and essence. ‘Taste and see that the Lord is Christ,’² it is said ; for so He imparts of Himself to those who partake of such food in a more spiritual manner, when now the soul nourishes itself, as says the truth-loving Plato. For the eating and drinking of the divine Word is the knowledge of the divine essence.”³

Thus, of one aspect of Clement's teaching it is true to say :—

“The flesh and blood of the Logos are the apprehension of the divine power and essence ; the eating and drinking of the Logos is knowledge of the divine essence ; the flesh is the Spirit, the blood is the Logos, the union of the two is the Lord who is the food of His people.”⁴

The mode of speech thus found in Clement of Alexandria is carried on in the writings of Origen ; and the latter lays some stress on the more perfect understanding of the phraseology about the Eucharistic elements which is possessed by those who have deeper knowledge of the Christian religion. Thus he writes :—

“Our Lord and Saviour says, Unless ye eat My flesh and drink My blood, ye will not have life in yourselves ; My flesh is truly food, and My blood is truly drink. Because therefore Jesus is wholly clean, His whole flesh is food, and His whole blood is drink, because every work of His is holy and every word of His is true. Therefore

¹ *Paed.* II. ii. 19, 20.

² *Ps.* xxxiv. (Sept. xxxiii.) 8, reading *χριστός* for *χρηστος*.

³ *Strom.* V. x. 67.

⁴ J. B. Mayor in Hort and Mayor, *Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies, Book vii.*, p. 383.

also His flesh is true food and His blood is true drink. For by the flesh and blood of His word as clean food and drink He gives drink and refreshment to the whole race of men. In the second place after His flesh Peter and Paul and all the Apostles are clean food. In the third place are their disciples. And so each one, in proportion to the extent of his merits and the purity of his senses, is made clean food for his neighbour." ¹

"Those of the Jews who followed the Lord were offended and said, Who can eat flesh and drink blood? But the Christian people, the faithful people, hear the saying, and embrace it, and follow Him who says, 'Except ye eat My flesh and drink My blood, ye will not have life in yourselves; for My flesh is truly food, and My blood is truly drink'. And moreover He who thus spoke was wounded on behalf of men, for He Himself 'was wounded for our sins,' as Isaiah says. Now we are said to drink the blood of Christ not only in the way of Sacraments, but also when we receive His words, in which life consists, as also He Himself said, 'The words which I have spoken unto you are spirit and life'. Therefore He Himself was wounded, whose blood we drink, that is, receive the words of His teaching." ²

"That bread which God the Word confesses to be His own body is the word that nourishes souls, the word proceeding from God the Word, and is bread from the heavenly Bread, which is placed upon the table of which it is written, 'Thou hast prepared before me a table against those that trouble me'. And that drink which God the Word confesses to be His blood is the word that gives drink and excellent gladness to the hearts of those who drink, which is in the cup of which it was written, 'And Thy gladdening cup, how excellent it is'. And that drink is the fruit of the True Vine, which says, 'I am the True Vine'. And it is the blood of that grape which, cast into the wine-press of the passion, brought forth this drink. So also the bread is the word of Christ, made of that corn of wheat which falling into the ground yields much fruit. For not that visible bread which He held in His hands did God the Word call His body, but the word in the mystery of which that bread was to be broken. Nor did He call that visible drink His blood, but the word in the mystery of which that drink was to be poured out. For what else can the body of God the Word, or His blood, be but the word which nourishes and the word which gladdens the heart? Why then did He not say, This is the bread of the new covenant, as He said, 'This is the blood of the new covenant'? Because the

¹ *In Lev. Hom.* vii. 5; *cf.* xiii. 6.

² *In Num. Hom.* xvi. 9.

bread is the word of righteousness, by eating which souls are nourished, while the drink is the word of the knowledge of Christ according to the mystery of His birth and passion. Since therefore the covenant of God is set for us in the blood of the passion of Christ, so that believing the Son of God to have been born and to have suffered according to the flesh we may be saved not in righteousness, in which alone without faith in the passion of Christ there could not be salvation, for this reason it was said of the cup only, 'This the cup of the new covenant'.¹

"Let the bread and the cup be understood by the more simple according to the more common acceptance of the Eucharist, but by those who have learnt to hear more deeply according to the more divine promise, even that of the nourishing word of the truth."²

Other instances of this kind of phraseology may be seen in the Ethiopic document sometimes described as the *Statutes of the Apostles*, which probably represents a third century form of the "Lost Church Order," in the Syriac *Didascalia of the Apostles*, also probably of the third century, and in the Verona Latin fragments of the *Canons of the Apostles*, which probably represent an ante-Nicene text. In the *Statutes of the Apostles*, besides many more explicit statements, the value of the consecration of the elements is in one place described as being that the gift may be to the communicants "for holiness, and for filling them with the Holy Spirit, and for strengthening of faith in truth, that Thee they may glorify and praise".³ In the Syriac *Didascalia* the Eucharist is called "the divine food which endureth for ever".⁴ In the Verona Latin fragments the words of administration are, "the bread of heaven in Christ Jesus".⁵

In any attempt to place the phraseology of which instances have here been given in its right position in the history of Christian thought, it must be remembered that the less definite descriptions of the Sacrament in the Letters of St. Ignatius and in the *Statutes of the Apostles* occur side by side with the more explicit terminology in the same writings which will be quoted later,⁶ that the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen contain many instances of "the more common acceptance of the Eucharist" which in the last quotation Origen described as suit-

¹ *In Mat. Comm. Ser.* 85.

² Horner's edition, p. 141.

³ Hauler's edition, p. 112.

⁴ *In Joann.* xxxii. 24 (16).

⁵ Gibson's edition, p. 68.

⁶ See pp. 33, 39, *infra*.

able only for "the more simple," and that a marked characteristic of the Alexandrian theology was the excessive extent to which it carried allegorical and mystical interpretation.

2. Another kind of phraseology is found most markedly in Tertullian, though it occurs also in Clement of Alexandria and in the *Statutes of the Apostles* and in the *Canons of the Apostles*. Clement incidentally says that "the Scripture named wine as the mystic symbol (*σύμβολον*) of holy blood".¹ In one place the Saidic text of the *Statutes of the Apostles* refers to the Eucharistic bread as "the form of the flesh of the Christ".² The Verona Latin fragments of the *Canons of the Apostles* speak of the bread and wine as the "copy" (*exemplum*) or "antitype" (*antitypum*) of the body and blood of Christ.³ Tertullian more than once uses like language with explicit reference to the Eucharist. He asserts our Lord's intention to have been to show that bread was "the figure (*figura*) of His body": he explains the words "This is My body" as meaning "This is the figure (*figura*) of My body"; he interprets the words of institution as placing our Lord's body under the head of, or in the category of, bread (*corpus eius in pane censetur*).⁴ He says also that our Lord by the use of bread "makes present (*repraesentat*) His very body".⁵ The consideration of this type of phraseology must include some discussion of (a) the meaning of the words "symbol" (*σύμβολον*) and "figure" (*figura*); (b) the meaning of the word translated "makes present" (*repraesentat*); (c) the relation of the passages here quoted to other statements of the same writers.

(a) Students of the history of language and thought will be quick to recognise the difficulty involved in such words as "symbol" and "figure". Even at the present time most minds marked by the characteristics of the thought of the West of Northern Europe would approach the whole question of what is meant and conveyed in a symbol quite differently from those which have been mainly influenced by the traditions and associations and tendencies of the South. The tendencies of the East, again, are different from those of either North or South in the West. In the past very different ideas have been connected

¹ *Paed.* II. ii. 29.

² Horner's edition, p. 319.

³ Hauler's edition, pp. 112, 117.

⁴ *Adv. Marc.* iii. 19, iv. 40; *De Orat.* 6.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 14.

with symbolism at different epochs and in different countries. As regards the early Church it may be confidently stated that the notions suggested by words meaning "symbol" would differ in important respects from those which like words would suggest to an ordinary Englishman or German of to-day. Dr. Harnack has stated a crucial difference with great clearness. "What we nowadays," he writes, "understand by 'symbol' is a thing which is not that which it represents; at that time 'symbol' denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies"; "What we now call 'symbol' is something wholly different from what was so called by the ancient Church".¹ That these general statements would hold good in the case of Clement of Alexandria is rendered likely by the characteristics of Alexandrian thought. "Symbol" is one of the words which the Alexandrian theologians obviously borrowed from the terminology of the Greek mysteries. Clement of Alexandria uses it for the various acts and objects which in these mystic rites were regarded as at once the signs and the vehicles of divine gifts,—the eating out of the drum, the drinking from the cymbal, the carrying the vessel, the entrance into the bridal chamber, the reception of the touch of the serpent gliding over the breast, the dice, the ball, the lamp, the sword, and other material things.² With like thoughts evidently in mind Origen refers incidentally to Baptism as "the symbol of purification".³ An essential element in the understanding of the word in Greek theology is the recollection of this connection with the pagan mysteries. Still more explicit indications of the meaning of such terms in the phraseology of Tertullian may be shown by an examination of his language elsewhere and by a comparison of other known uses of the word "figura". In describing the Incarnation Tertullian uses the phrase "caro figuratus" to denote that our Lord received in the womb of His Virgin Mother not only the appearance but also the reality of flesh.⁴ He says that our Lord made known

¹ *History of Dogma*, ii. 144, iv. 289; cf. Hagenbach, *History of Christian Doctrines*, § 73; Strauss, *The Life of Jesus*, § 124.

² *Protrep.* ii. 15, 16, 18, 22. Compare Wobbermin, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Urchristentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 177; Hort and Mayor, *Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies, Book vii.*, p. lv.

³ *C. Cels.* iii. 51.

⁴ *Apol.* 21; cf. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 21.

to the Apostles "the form (*figura*) of His voice".¹ He uses the word "*figura*" in the sense of a main point in, or head of, a discussion.² Elsewhere he denotes by it the prophetic anticipation of an event afterwards to be fulfilled.³ Such a method of using the word follows the lines of what is found in other writings. In one of Seneca's letters it is the equivalent of the Greek word *ιδέα* as used in the Platonic philosophy.⁴ The translation of "being in the form of God" (*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*) in Phil. ii. 6 by "in *figura Dei constitutus*" in the old Latin version⁵ ought not to be left out of account in considering Tertullian's use of the word "*figura*"; and it is worth notice that after his time a Roman Council spoke of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost as being "of one Godhead, one power, one *figura*, one essence,"⁶ and a Gallican version of the Nicene Creed translated "was made flesh and became man" (*σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*) by "*corpus atque figuram hominis susceperat*".⁷ A scholar of great authority as to the meaning of early Latin documents has inferred from these facts that in the Tertullian "*figura*" is equivalent not to *σχήμα* but to *χαρακτήρ*,⁸ that is, it would approach more nearly to "actual and distinctive nature" than to "symbol" or "figure" in the modern sense of those terms. The question of the meaning of such words in connection with the Eucharist will recur again in a later period. It may be sufficient here to express the warning that to suppose that "symbol" in Clement of Alexandria or "figure" in Tertullian must mean the same as in modern speech would be to assent to a line of thought which is gravely misleading.

(b) The phrase "by which He makes present (*repræsentat*) His very body" occurs in a passage in which Tertullian is de-

¹ *Scorp.* 12.

² *Adv. Marc.* ii. 21.

³ *De Monog.* 6, "Aliud sunt figuræ, aliud formæ; aliud imagines, aliud definitiones; imagines transeunt adimpletæ, definitiones permanent adimplendæ; imagines prophetant, definitiones gubernant". Cf. *Adv. Iud.* 10.

⁴ Seneca, *Ep.* lxxv. 7, "Deus . . . plenus hic figuris est quas Plato *ιδέας* appellat, immortales, immutabiles, infatigabiles".

⁵ See St. Cyprian, *Test.* ii. 13; iii. 39.

⁶ Council of 370 A.D., Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 773.

⁷ See Turner, *Eccl. Occid. Mon. Iuris Antiqua*, i. 174.

⁸ Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vii. 596.

scribing the use of material things in the ministries of grace as an argument against the view of Marcion that matter is essentially evil. The Lord whom Marcion acknowledges, he says :—

“ Even up to the present time has not disdained the water which is the Creator’s work, by which He washes His own people, or the oil whereby He anoints them, or the mixture of milk and honey with which He feeds them as infants, or the bread by which He makes present (*repraesentat*) His very body, requiring even in His own Sacraments the ‘ beggarly elements ’ (*mendicitatibus*) of the Creator.”¹

The meaning of the Latin verb *repraesentare* is to make present that which has been unseen or has passed out of sight. According to the context in which it is used it may denote that the presence is actual or that it is only to the mind. It and the connected noun are favourites with Tertullian and he uses them in both senses. In considerably more than half the instances in his writings they denote actual presence, while in the other instances an anticipatory or a mental or a stage representation is meant. Thus the noun *repraesentatio* is used for the actual manifestation of the kingdom of God in the future,² for the actual infliction of punishment in this life,³ for the second coming of Christ at the end of the world,⁴ for the manifestations of God by means of material elements in the Old Testament,⁵ for the revelation of the name of Christ in the prophets,⁶ for the actual infliction of the retaliation allowed by the Jewish law,⁷ for the manifestation to the disciples of the Christ whom prophets and kings had desired to see,⁸ for the presence of the bodies of men at the judgment-seat,⁹ for that future realisation of God which is contrasted with the present apprehension by means of faith,¹⁰ and for the revelation of God in Christ through the Incarnation.¹¹ Similarly the verb *repraesentare* is used for the actual descent of fire from heaven which took place at the word of Elijah and for which the disciples wished,¹² for the accomplishing of the promises

¹ *Adv. Marc.* i. 14.

² *De Pudic.* 14.

³ *Ibid.* 10.

⁴ *Ibid.* 16.

⁵ *Ibid.* v. 12; *De carn. res.* 14, 17.

⁶ *Adv. Prax.* 24; cf. the use of *repraesentator* in the same chapter.

⁷ *De Patient.* 3; *Adv. Marc.* iv. 23.

⁸ *De Cor.* 15; *De Orat.* 5.

⁹ *Adv. Marc.* iii. 7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* iv. 13.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 25.

¹² *De carn. res.* 23.

of God,¹ for the effecting of healing in the miracles of Christ,² for the work of the Father in manifesting His Son at the Transfiguration,³ and for the presence of the body at the Day of Judgment.⁴ On the other hand, in a smaller number of instances the noun is used for the mental anticipation of future punishment,⁵ and the representation of the Christian Church in a council;⁶ and the verb denotes the representation of a character by an actor on the stage,⁷ the representation of a deity in an image,⁸ the imaginations of the mind,⁹ and the depicting of Christ in the Psalms.¹⁰ Consequently an examination of the usage of Tertullian in other places does not decisively determine whether the phrase "the bread by which He makes present His very body" means that the "very body" is actually present in the element of bread or that by means of the bread it is depicted or represented to the mind and soul.

(c) It is therefore important to inquire what is the teaching of Tertullian about the Sacraments, and about the Eucharist in particular, in other passages than those in which he uses the words "figura" and "repraesentat" which have so far been examined. This other phraseology of his falls under the head of, and must be taken with, the third of the three groups into which the Eucharistic language of the writers of the first three centuries has been divided.

3. According to a third kind of phraseology the bread and wine of the Eucharist are described as the body and blood of Christ. Besides the less definite language of St. Ignatius which has already been quoted, it is one of his charges against the Docetics that "they abstain from Eucharist and prayer," that is, the public prayer of the Church, "because they do not acknowledge that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered on behalf of our sins, which the Father in His goodness raised"; and it is part of his exhortation to the faithful, "Be zealous to use one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for union with His blood".¹¹

¹ *Adv. Marc.* iv. 6.

² *Ibid.* 22.

³ *Apol.* 23.

⁴ *Apol.* 15; *De spectac.* 17.

⁵ *De monog.* 10; *De poen.* 3.

⁶ *Smyrn.* 6; *Philad.* 4.

⁷ *Ibid.* 9.

⁸ *De carn. res.* 17, 63.

⁹ *De icium.* 13.

¹⁰ *Apol.* 16.

¹¹ *Adv. Prax.* 11.

In a different context St. Justin Martyr says much the same as St. Ignatius. In the course of his defence of Christian belief and worship and life against heathen attacks he refers at some length to the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. Of the latter he says :—

“This food is called among us the Eucharist, of which no one is allowed to partake unless he believes that our teaching is true and has been washed in the laver for the remission of sins and for regeneration and is living as Christ commanded. For we do not receive it as common bread or common drink ; but just as Jesus Christ our Saviour, made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word that is from Him—that food from which our blood and flesh are by assimilation nourished—is both the flesh and the blood of the Jesus who was made flesh.”¹

The circumstances in which St. Irenæus referred to the Eucharist resembled those which led to the teaching of St. Ignatius. He had to deal with that fundamental Gnostic error which interposed an insuperable barrier between spiritual beings and material things, between the true God and the universe of matter. In the mind of St. Irenæus the Eucharistic doctrine and practice of the Church afforded the standing refutation of any such mistake. And, as it showed the falsity of the central delusion of the Gnostic thinkers, so also it supplied an answer to their denials of the reality of Christ’s flesh and of the resurrection of the body.

“How can they allow,” he says, “that the bread over which the thanksgiving has been said is the body of their Lord and that the cup is of His blood if they say that He is not the Son of the Creator of the world, that is His Word, through whom the wood is fruitful and the springs flow and the earth yields first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear ? How, again, do they say that the flesh which is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord descends to corruption and does not attain unto life ? Either then let them change their mind or let them cease to offer that which has been mentioned. For our belief is in harmony with the Eucharist ; and the Eucharist, again, establishes our belief. For we offer unto Him the things that are His own, proclaiming harmoni-

¹ *Ap.* i. 66.

ously the communion and unity of flesh and spirit. For as the bread of the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but Eucharist, made up of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity."¹

"How could the Lord, if He was the Son of another Father, have rightly taken the bread which is of the same creation as ourselves and acknowledged it to be His body, and affirmed the mixed wine in the cup to be His blood?"²

"If" "the flesh" "is not the object of salvation, then neither did the Lord redeem us by His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communication of His blood, nor is the bread which we break the communication of His body. . . . The cup of created wine, from which He bedews our blood, He acknowledged as His own blood; and the created bread, from which He increases our bodies, He affirmed to be His own body. When therefore the cup of mingled wine and the made bread receive the word of God, and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ,³ and the substance of our flesh is increased and sustained by these, how do they say that the flesh cannot receive the gift of God, which is life eternal, since the flesh is nourished from the body and blood of the Lord and is a member of Him? . . . As a cutting of the vine planted in the ground bears fruit in its season, and as a grain of wheat falling into the ground and being decomposed rises manifold by the operation of the Spirit of God, who contains all things, and then through the wisdom of God comes to the use of men and receiving the word of God becomes Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ; so also our bodies being nourished by it and laid in the earth and decomposed there shall rise at the due season, the Word of God granting them resurrection to the glory of our God and Father."⁴

The words of the first part of an inscription found at Autun probably belong to the end of the second century or the quite early years of the third. They speak of our Lord, described under the well-known symbol of a fish from the initial letters

¹ *Adv. Haer.* IV. xviii. 5.

² *Ibid.* xxxiii. 2.

³ So the Greek, *καὶ γίνεσθαι ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ*: the Latin version has "and the Eucharist of the blood and body of Christ is made".

⁴ *Adv. Haer.* V. ii. 2, 3.

of the Greek words for "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour," as being in the hands of the communicant:—

"Divine race of the heavenly Fish,¹ a holy heart
Put forth, receiving among mortals the immortal fount
Of sacred waters; nourish, beloved, thy soul
With the ever-flowing waters of enriching wisdom.
Receive the honey-sweet food of the Saviour of the holy;²
Eat, drink, having the Fish in thy hands."³

A very imperfect idea of the Eucharistic doctrine of Tertullian would be given if attention were confined to those passages in his writings in which he describes the Eucharist as the "figura" of the body of Christ and the means by which our Lord "makes His body present". To understand it rightly, it must be viewed in the general setting of sacramental principle which Tertullian emphasises. In his eyes the Incarnation has introduced new aspects of the relation of man to God. The human flesh which the Lord then took is an abiding reality. "That same Person who suffered," he declares, "will come from heaven; that same Person who was raised from the dead will appear to all. And they who pierced Him will see and recognise the very flesh against which they raged."⁴ With this Christ, thus retaining His human body and blood, Christians are closely united. The baptised are clothed with Christ; in them Christ lives.⁵ By the daily reception of the bread of life there is continuance in Christ and abiding union in His body.⁶ Before the Incarnation the flesh was far off from God, "not yet worthy of the gift of salvation, not yet fitted for the duty of holiness"; but Christ's work, accomplished in the flesh, has changed all that.⁷ Since the Incarnation Sacraments have become necessary and effectual;⁸ and that which in the ordinances of the Church touches the flesh benefits the soul.⁹ It is

¹ Ἰχθύς, from the initial letters of Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ. For the fish as an early symbol of our Lord, see Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 673, 674. Cf. p. 38, *infra*.

² Or "of the holy things of the Saviour" (Σωτήρος ἁγίων).

³ See Leclercq in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, i. 3195-3198.

⁴ *De carn. Christi*, 24.

⁵ *De fug.* 10; *De poen.* 10.

⁶ *De orat.* 6.

⁷ *De pud.* 6.

⁸ *De Bapt.* 11, 13.

⁹ *De carn. res.* 8.

in harmony with these general sacramental principles that Tertullian not only calls the Eucharist "the holy thing,"¹ but also often and naturally refers to it as the body of Christ. It is a matter for anxious care that no drop of the wine or fragment of the bread should fall to the ground.² It was the Lord's body which the disciples received at the Last Supper.³ It is the Lord's body which the communicant receives in the Church or reserves for his Communion at home.⁴ It is the Lord's body with the richness of which the Christian is fed in the Eucharist.⁵ It is Christ's body and blood with which "the flesh is clothed, so that the soul also may be made fat by God".⁶ Even in unworthy Communion it is the body of the Lord which wicked hands approach, the body of the Lord which wicked men outrage and offend.⁷ And yet side by side with all this must be set that interpretation of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel already mentioned, which seems to regard the flesh and blood of Christ there spoken of as His life-giving words received in faith.⁸ The writings of Tertullian certainly bear witness to his belief that the Eucharistic food is a special means of union with the Manhood of Christ, and that in some sense it is His body and His blood. When we view the complexity and varying elements of his language, perhaps we are wise if we are not too positive as to what further definitions he might have made if he had explained more precisely what his exact meaning was.⁹

As in Tertullian, so also in Clement of Alexandria and Origen there are other elements than those to which reference has already been made. Clement explains that the Lord feeds Christians with His own flesh and blood even as a mother feeds her infant child from her own body.

"The young brood which the Lord Himself brought forth with throes of the flesh, which the Lord Himself swaddled with precious

¹ *De spectac.* 25, "the mouth with which thou hast uttered Amen to the holy thing (*in sanctum*)".

² *De cor.* 3.

³ *Adv. Marc.* iv. 40.

⁴ *De orat.* 19.

⁵ *De pud.* 9.

⁶ *De carn. res.* 8.

⁷ *De idol.* 7.

⁸ *De res. carn.* 37. Cf. *De orat.* 6. See p. 25, *supra*.

⁹ Cf. Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation*, pp. 308-12.

blood. O holy birth, O holy swaddling clothes, the Word is all to the babe, father and mother and tutor and nurse. 'Eat ye My flesh,' He says, 'and drink ye My blood.' This suitable food the Lord supplies to us, and offers flesh and pours out blood; and the little children lack nothing that their growth needs."¹

Origen speaks of Christ giving to Christians "His own body and His own blood";² and of Christians receiving "the bread which becomes a kind of holy body because of the prayer".³ If in some places he seems to identify the flesh and blood of Christ with His words, in one remarkable passage he reminds his hearers of the reverent care which they know is taken to prevent any part of the body of the Lord which is received in the mysteries from falling to the ground or being lost, and exhorts them to be no less careful to receive the words of Christ than to protect His body which Origen thus distinguishes from them:—

"If for the protection of His body ye take so great care, and are right to take it, can ye suppose that to be careless of the word of God is a less offence than to be careless of His body?"⁴

This identification of the Eucharistic food with the body and blood of Christ is found also in the epitaph of Abercius, in Hippolytus, in the document known as the *Canons of Hippolytus*, in the *Statutes of the Apostles*, in the *Canons of the Apostles*, and in *Dionysius of Alexandria*. The epitaph which Abercius, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, wrote for his own tomb describes how in his journeys in West and East, to Rome and Nisibis,

"Everywhere faith led the way, and set before me for food the fish from the fountain,⁵ mighty and stainless (whom a pure virgin grasped), and gave this to friends to eat always, having good wine and giving the mixed cup with bread."⁶

In a fragment of uncertain origin and history ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome the "house" which the Wisdom of the

¹ *Paed. I. vi. 42, 43.*

² *In Jer. Hom. xviii. (al. xix.) 13; cf. In Matt. Comm. Ser. 86*, where Origen speaks of the gift as Christ's "own body," though he says also that Christ "gives according as each one is able to receive".

³ *C. Cels. viii. 33.*

⁴ *In Ex. Hom. xiii. 3.*

⁵ For the fish as an early symbol of our Lord, see pp. 35, 36, *supra*.

⁶ In Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II. i. 480-81; Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. 722-23.

Book of Proverbs built¹ is interpreted of the flesh which the Lord took of the Virgin in the Incarnation; and the "table" which Wisdom "furnished"² is explained to denote "the promised knowledge of the Holy Trinity, and the Saviour's precious and stainless body and blood, which are daily consecrated on the mystic and sacred table". "He hath given us," it is added, "His sacred flesh and His precious blood, to eat and drink for remission of sins."³ In another fragment ascribed to Hippolytus is the sentence:—

"We receive His body and His blood, for He is the pledge of eternal life for each one who draws near to Him in humility."⁴

In the Roman or Alexandrian document known as the *Canons of Hippolytus* is the provision:—

"The bishop is to give to them the body of Christ, saying, This is the body of Christ, and they are to say, Amen. And, when he gives them the cup, saying, This is the blood of Christ, they are to say, Amen."⁵

In the *Statutes of the Apostles* the effect of consecration is said to be that the elements become the body and blood of Christ, the bread and the wine are described as the body and blood of Christ at the moment of Communion, any profanation of the Sacrament is said to be a profaning of the body and blood of Christ.⁶ In the Verona Latin fragments of the *Canons of the Apostles* it is said that "the body of Christ is to be eaten by believers and not to be despised," and that one who exposes the contents of the cup to profanation is "guilty of the blood" of Christ.⁷ In a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Xystus,

¹ Prov. ix. 1.

² *Ibid.* 2.

³ On Prov. ix. 1, in *Hippolyti Opera*, ed. Fabricius, i. 282; P.G. x. 625, 628. See also Salmon in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iii. 103. Dr. Salmon says, "It appears" from the "shorter version of the same fragment" published by Tischendorf (*Anecdota Sacra*, p. 227) that "all the Eucharistic language which we have a right to ascribe to Hippolytus is" the sentence translated above, "He hath given us His sacred flesh and His precious blood, to eat and drink for remission of sins".

⁴ On Gen. xxxviii. 19, in *Hippolytus Werke*, ed. Bonwetsch and Achelis, i. (2) 96.

⁵ §§ 146, 147.

⁶ Horner's edition, pp. 137, 140, 141, 156, 157, 178, 180, 181, 206, 201, 243, 255, 256, 257, 261, 276, 277, 319, 320, 326, 344, 345.

⁷ Hauler's edition, pp. 117, 118.

Bishop of Rome, there is a description of one who in this respect had lived a normal faithful Christian life as having

“heard the thanksgiving (or the Eucharist) and joined in repeating the Amen and stood by the table and stretched out his hands for the reception of the holy food and received it and partaken for a long time of the body and blood of our Lord.”¹

In another letter Dionysius speaks of the act of Communion as touching the body and the blood of Christ.²

The writings of St. Cyprian contain very many incidental references to the Eucharist. It is always mentioned with profound reverence. The Eucharistic food is described as “sanctified”³—a phrase applied also, it must be noticed, to a person who has been made holy by being baptised,⁴ and to the water and the oil made holy for use in the administration of Baptism.⁵ With obvious or expressed reference to our Lord’s words, “Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine,”⁶ it is spoken of as “the holy thing,”⁷ or “the holy thing of the Lord,”⁸ or “the pearls of the Lord.”⁹ “The blood of Christ” is said to be “shown” or “set forth” by the wine in the cup; the bread and wine which the Lord offered to the Father are called “His body and blood”; the “wine of the cup of the Lord” is spoken of as “blood.”¹⁰ Communicants are

¹ In Eusebius, *H.E.* vii. 9; cf. Feltoe, *Dionysius of Alexandria*, p. 58.

² In Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iii. 230, 231; cf. Feltoe, *op. cit.* p. 103; see also Eusebius, *H.E.* vii. 26.

³ *De laps.* 25. ⁴ *E.g.*, *Ep.* lxix. 2, 8, 10, 11, 15, lxx. 2, lxxiii. 18.

⁵ *Ep.* lxx. 1, 2. ⁶ *St. Matt.* vii. 6.

⁷ *De laps.* 26; cf. Pseudo-Cyprian, *De spectac.* 5. In *Ad Demet.* 1, however, “sanctum” is used in a quite general sense. In Pseudo-Cyprian, *De aleat.* 11, Christ and the angels and the martyrs are referred to as present at the Eucharist in general.

⁸ *De unit.* 8; *De laps.* 15, 26; *Ep.* xxxi. 6. ⁹ *Ep.* xxxi. 6.

¹⁰ *Ep.* lxiii. 2, “nor can His blood, by which we have been redeemed and quickened, be seen to be in the cup, when wine, which is shown (*ostenditur*) to be the blood of Christ, is absent from the cup”; 4, “our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same thing as Melchizedek, that is bread and wine, namely His body and blood”; 6, “when the blood of the grape is spoken of, what else is shown than the wine of the cup of the Lord which is blood?” 7, “mention is made of wine that by wine may be understood the blood of the Lord, and that what was afterwards manifested in the Lord’s cup might be foretold in the predictions of the prophets”.

said to receive and to be sustained and protected by the body and blood of Christ.¹ When any communicate unworthily the body and blood of the Lord are taken and drunk with defiled hands and polluted mouth, and are outraged and profaned.² To complete what may be gathered as to St. Cyprian's thought of the Eucharistic presence, there are two passages which need to be correlated to those already in view. In the first of these passages St. Cyprian says of one who took part in the Eucharistic rite after an act of apostasy:—

“He could not eat and handle the holy thing of the Lord, but found that he was carrying a cinder in his open hands. By this single instance it was shown that the Lord departs when He is denied, and that what is received does not benefit unto salvation one who is unworthy, since the saving grace is changed into a cinder on the departure of the holy thing.”³

In the other passage St. Cyprian is speaking of an opposite instance, where the faith of Christ is victoriously maintained in time of persecution:—

“Let us arm,” he says, “the right hand also with the sword of the Spirit, so that it may bravely reject the deadly sacrifices of the heathen, and that the hand which mindful of the Eucharist receives the body of the Lord may embrace the Lord Himself, hereafter to obtain the reward of the heavenly crowns of the Lord.”⁴

In the first of these passages, in distinction from those in which the body and blood of the Lord is said to be taken and drunk and outraged and profaned in unworthy Communion, the possibility is contemplated of a withdrawal of the sacred presence in such cases; in the second of them the embrace of the Lord Himself seems to be regarded as a special gift over and above what is in every good Communion.

The question of the crucial moment in the consecration of the Eucharist belongs rather to later controversies than to the ante-Nicene period of Church history; but it may here be briefly noticed that Tertullian⁵ appears to connect the presence with the use of the words of Institution, that St. Justin Martyr⁶ and

¹ *De laps.* 2; *De dom. orat.* 18; *Ep.* xi. 5, lvii. 2, lviii. 1, 9, lxiii. 7.

² *De laps.* 16, 22, 25; *Ep.* xv. 1, lxxv. 21. ³ *De laps.* 26.

⁴ *Ep.* lviii. 9. ⁵ *Adv. Marc.* iv. 40. ⁶ *Ap.* i. 66.

Origen¹ ascribe it to the prayer offered in the Church, and that St. Irenæus speaks of it as effected by this prayer described as "the invocation of God,"² or "the Word of God".³ If the *Statutes of the Apostles*⁴ and the Verona Latin fragments of the *Canons of the Apostles*⁵ accurately represent ante-Nicene texts, there already existed at this time a rite in which the words of Institution were recited, and after them a prayer for the sending of the Holy Ghost upon the offering of the Church was used.

II.

It is necessary next to consider the teaching of the writers of the anti-Nicene Church which bears on the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

1. Throughout this period the repudiation of carnal sacrifices is constant and is found in different quarters. As is natural, the emphasis on it is very strong in documents so hostile to Judaism as are the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Epistle to Diognetus*. "The Lord," says the writer of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, probably not the companion of St. Paul but some later namesake,—

"hath made manifest to us by all the prophets that He wanteth neither sacrifices nor whole burnt-offerings nor oblations, saying at one time, 'What to Me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith the Lord. I am full of whole burnt-offerings, and the fat of lambs and the blood of bulls and of goats I desire not, not though ye should come to be seen of Me. For who required these things at your hands? Ye shall continue no more to tread My court. If ye bring fine flour, it is vain; incense is an abomination to Me; your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot away with.'⁶ These things therefore He annulled, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, being free from the yoke of restraint, might have its oblation not made with human hands. And He saith again unto them, 'Did I command your fathers when they went forth from the land of Egypt to bring Me whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices?⁷ Nay, this was My command unto them, Let not any one of you bear a grudge of evil against his neighbour in his heart, nor love ye a false oath.'⁸ So we

¹ *C. Cels.* viii. 33.

² *Adv. Haer.* IV. xviii. 5.

³ *Ibid.* V. ii. 3.

⁴ Horner's edition, pp. 140, 141, 255, 343, 344.

⁵ Hauler's edition, p. 107.

⁶ *Isa.* i. 11-13.

⁷ *Jer.* vii. 22, 23.

⁸ *Zech.* viii. 17.

ought to perceive, unless we are without understanding, the mind of the goodness of our Father; for He speaketh to us, desiring us not to go astray like them, but to seek how we may approach Him. Thus then He speaketh to us, 'The sacrifice to God is a broken heart,¹ the smell of a sweet savour to the Lord is a heart that glorifies its Maker.'²

In like manner the writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* says:—

"He that made the heaven and the earth and all things that are therein, and furnisheth us all with what we need, cannot Himself need any of these things which He Himself supplieth to them that imagine they are giving them to Him. But those who think to perform sacrifices to Him by means of blood and fat and whole burnt-offerings, and to honour Him with these honours, seem to me in no way different from those who show the same respect towards deaf images; for the one class think fit to make offerings to things unable to participate in the honour, the other class to One who is in need of nothing."³

And in the *Apology* of Aristides it is said that "God asks no sacrifice and no libation, nor any of the things that are visible".⁴

This repudiation of carnal sacrifices does not depend on the particular point of view of the writers of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Epistle to Diognetus* and possibly of Aristides, that in the establishment of such sacrifices even the Jews had misunderstood the commands and wishes of God. It is found also in the idea of St. Justin Martyr⁵ and Tertullian⁶ that the institution of the sacrifices of the Jewish law was a concession to the hardness of heart of the Jews and belonged to a past dispensation; in the assertions of St. Justin Martyr,⁷ St. Irenæus⁸ and Tertullian⁹ that God needeth not such sacrifices; and in the way in which Athenagoras and Clement of Alexandria express their scorn of the sacrifices of the heathen. Athenagoras writes:—

¹ Ps. li. 19.

² An unidentified quotation. The passage from the *Epistle of Barnabas* is ii. 4-10.

³ iii. 4, 5.

⁴ Syriac text, 1; cf. 13; cf. also Armenian and Greek texts; see Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, I. i. 28, 31, 36, 47, 100.

⁵ *Dial.* 22.

⁶ *Adv. Marc.* ii. 18, 22.

⁷ *Ap.* i. 10, 13.

⁸ *Adv. Haer.* IV. xvii.

⁹ *Ad. Scap.* 2.

"Look ye, I pray, at each charge that is made against us, and first that we do not offer sacrifice. He who is Maker and Father of this universe needs not blood nor fat nor the sweet smell of flowers and incense, since He Himself is the perfect odour who needs nothing from within or from without. . . . What further need of a hecatomb is there? . . . What are whole burnt-offerings to me, since God needs them not?"¹

Clement of Alexandria picks out from the comic poets derisive descriptions of heathen sacrifices; and expresses his view on the subject in these terms:—

"As then God is not circumscribed in place nor made like to the form of any creature, so neither is He of like nature, nor lacks He anything after the manner of created things, so as because of hunger to desire sacrifices for the sake of food. Things to which suffering pertains are all mortal, and it is vain to offer meat to Him who is not nurtured."²

2. In this repudiation of carnal sacrifices it is recognised that the place of them is taken by Christian belief and life and worship. The writer of the *Epistle of Barnabas* speaks of "the oblation not made by human hands" which pertains to "the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ".³ St. Justin Martyr associates with his assertion that "the Creator needs not blood and libations and incense" a statement that Christians offer to Him prayer and praise and thanksgiving.⁴ Athenagoras links with his rejection of carnal sacrifices a description of "the greatest sacrifice of all" as recognition of the true God; and adds to his expression of contempt for whole burnt-offerings the words, "Yet it is right to offer a bloodless sacrifice and to present our reasonable service".⁵ So also Clement of Alexandria defines "the sacrifice which is acceptable to God" as "unswerving separation from the body and its passions";⁶ and after pouring ridicule on animal sacrifice, he proceeds to say:—

"If the Deity, being by nature exempt from all need, rejoices to be honoured, we have good reason for honouring God by prayer, and for sending up to the most righteous Word this sacrifice, the best and holiest of sacrifices when joined with righteousness, venerating Him through whom we receive our knowledge, through Him

¹ *Supp.* 13.

² *Strom.* VII. vi. 30.

³ ii. 6.

⁴ *Ap.* i. 13.

⁵ *Supp.* 13.

⁶ *Strom.* V. xi. 67.

glorifying Him whom we have learnt to know. At any rate our altar here on earth is the congregation of those who are devoted to the prayers, having, as it were, one common voice and one mind. . . . The Church's sacrifice is speech rising like incense from holy souls, while every thought of the heart is laid open to God along with the sacrifice. . . . The truly hallowed altar is the righteous soul, and the incense from it is the prayer of holiness." ¹

Elsewhere Clement, after describing a virtuous life of communion with God, says :—

“These virtues I affirm to be an acceptable sacrifice with God, as the Scripture declares that the unboastful heart joined with a right understanding is a whole burnt-offering to God.” ²

Elsewhere, again, he writes :—

“It is not then expensive sacrifices that we should offer to God but such as are dear to Him, namely, that composite incense of which the Law speaks,³ an incense compounded of many tongues and voices in the way of prayer, or rather which is being wrought into the unity of the faith out of divers nations and dispositions by the divine bounty shown in the covenants, and is brought together in our songs of praise by purity of heart and righteous and upright living grounded in holy actions and righteous prayer.” ⁴

Again, in his description of the most perfect Christian, Clement writes :—

“All his life is a holy festival. His sacrifices consist of prayers and praises and the reading of the Scriptures before dining, and psalms and hymns during dinner and before going to bed, and also of prayers again during the night. By these things he unites himself with the heavenly choir, being enlisted in it for ever-mindful contemplation in consequence of his uninterrupted remembrance of it. Moreover, is he not acquainted with that other sacrifice which consists in the free gift both of instruction and of money among those who are in need?” ⁵

In the *Canons of Hippolytus* the prayer at the consecration of a bishop and the ordination of a presbyter includes the supplication that “his prayers and oblations, which he offers day and night” may be accepted by God.⁶ So too Origen describes

¹ *Strom.* VII. vi. 31, 32.

² *Ex.* xxx. 25.

³ *Ibid.* vii. 49.

⁴ *Ibid.* iii. 14.

⁵ *Strom.* VII. vi. 34.

⁶ § 16.

those whom the truth has set free from distraction as "offering to the God of the universe a reasonable and smokeless sacrifice," and the true worshipper as "continually offering the bloodless sacrifices in his prayers to the deity".¹ In the Syriac *Didascalia of the Apostles* is an exhortation:—

"Hear therefore these things, ye also, ye laymen, the Church chosen of God. . . . Ye then, holy and perfect Catholic Church, royal priesthood, holy assembly, people of inheritance, great Church, Bride adorned for the Lord God. As therefore was said before, hear also now, Bring heave offerings and tithes and first fruits to the Christ, the true High Priest. . . . Instead of the sacrifices of that time, offer now prayers and supplications and thanksgivings; then were first fruits and tithes and oblations and gifts, to-day are offerings that are presented by means of the bishops to the Lord God, for those are your high priests. Priests and Levites, now presbyters and deacons, and orphans and widows. For the Levite and the high priest is the bishop."²

3. Christian belief and life and worship then are regarded as spiritual sacrifices by the very writers who are explicit in rejecting sacrifice that is carnal. It should not therefore excite surprise that in the ante-Nicene Church the Eucharist is constantly referred to as a sacrifice. To denote it and in connection with it, sacrificial phraseology is habitually employed. In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* it is twice called without explanation "the sacrifice" of Christians.³ In the Epistles of St. Ignatius the word "altar" (*θυσιαστήριον*) is used five times in relation to Christian worship;⁴ and in two of the passages the connection with the Eucharistic food, with the celebration of the Eucharist, and with the liturgical prayer of the Church is too close to allow of the Eucharist being altogether out of sight in the use of the word. For St. Ignatius writes:—

"If any one be not within the precinct of the altar, he lacketh the bread of God. For, if the prayer of one and another hath so great force, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole Church."⁵

"Be ye careful to observe one Eucharist; for there is one flesh

¹ *C. Cels.* vii. 1, viii. 21.

² Gibson's edition, pp. 47, 48.

³ xiv. 1, 2, ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν (or possibly in the former passage ἡμῶν, which is there the reading of the MS.).

⁴ *Eph.* 5; *Magn.* 7; *Trall.* 7; *Philad.* 4.

⁵ *Eph.* 5.

of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union with His blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons.”¹

St. Justin Martyr says that the Jewish oblation of fine flour was a type of the Eucharist; and repeatedly calls the Eucharist a sacrifice (*θυσία*).² St. Irenæus describes the Eucharist as “the new oblation of the new covenant,” “the oblation of the Church,” “the pure sacrifice.”³

“Giving to His disciples counsel to offer to God first fruits from His creatures, not as to one who stands in need, but so that they themselves may be neither unfruitful nor thankless, He took that bread which is of created nature, and gave thanks, saying, ‘This is My body’. And the cup likewise which is of the same created nature as ourselves He declared to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant; which the Church receiving from the Apostles offers throughout the whole world to God, to Him who affords us food, as first fruits of His gifts in the new covenant.”⁴

“The oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught to be offered throughout the whole world, has been reckoned a pure sacrifice with God, and is acceptable to Him. . . . We ought to offer to God first fruits of His creation. . . . Oblation as such (*genus oblationum*) is not condemned, for there are oblations among us as well as among the Jews, sacrifices in the Church as well as among the ancient people of God; but it is the way of sacrifice (*species*) only that is changed, since the offering is now made not by slaves but by freemen.”⁵

“We ought to make oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God the Creator . . . offering first fruits of those things which are His creatures. And this oblation the Church alone offers pure to the Creator, offering to Him of His creation with thanksgiving.”⁶

Sacrificial phraseology then occurs throughout the second century in different parts of the Church. The sacrificial idea receives somewhat more definite expression in the third century from the Carthaginian writers, Tertullian and St. Cyprian. In a description of Christian life and worship Tertullian says, “We annually offer oblations (*oblationes fucimus*) on behalf of the

¹ *Philad.* 4.

³ *IV.* xvii. 5, xviii. 1.

⁵ *IV.* xviii. 1.

² *Dial.* 29, 41, 116, 117; *cf.* 70.

⁴ *IV.* xvii. 5.

⁶ *IV.* xviii. 4.

departed on the anniversaries of their deaths".¹ Elsewhere he mentions among the duties of a Christian husband that he "offers sacrifice" on behalf of his wife,² and of a Christian widow that she "annually offers sacrifice on behalf of the soul" of her husband "on the anniversary of his decease".³ The words "sacrifice," "priest," and "altar" are all used by him in a Christian sense;⁴ and in a case which he contemplates of a communicant on a fast day receiving the Sacrament in his hands but not consuming it till later in the day at home, he speaks of the communicant having taken part in the sacrifice.⁵ The writings of St. Cyprian are full of allusions to the Eucharist as a sacrifice. The priestly terms for the ministry, *sacerdos* for the bishop, *sacerdotium* for his office, are found. To celebrate the Eucharist is to "offer" and to "sacrifice". The Eucharist itself is the "sacrifice," or the "oblation," or "the sacrifice of the Lord," or "the victim of the Lord". The place where it is offered is the "altar".⁶ In a remarkable sentence, occurring when he is dealing with the point of practice that both wine and water are to be placed in the Eucharistic cup, St. Cyprian writes:—

"If our Lord and God Christ Jesus is Himself the High Priest of God the Father and offered Himself as a sacrifice to the Father and commanded this to be done for a memorial of Himself, certainly that priest truly performs his office in the place of Christ who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the Church to God the Father a real and complete sacrifice when he begins to offer as he sees Christ Himself offered."⁷

In the *Statutes of the Apostles* the Apostles are represented as saying of our Lord, "As He is the Chief Priest for us, so He offered spiritual sacrifice to God the Father before He was crucified, and He commanded us to do likewise. . . . After His

¹ *De cor.* 3.

² *De exhort. cast.* 11.

³ *De monog.* 10.

⁴ E.g., *sacrificium* in *De orat.* 18, 19; *sacrificare* in *Ad Scap.* 2; *sacerdos* in *De bapt.* 17; *ara* in *De orat.* 19.

⁵ *De orat.* 19.

⁶ E.g., *sacerdos* in *De unit.* 17; *Ep.* i. 2; *sacerdotium* in *Ep.* xvii. 2; *offerre* in *Ep.* xvi. 2; *sacrificare* in *De laps.* 25; *sacrificium* and *oblatio* in *Ep.* i. 2; *sacrificium dominicum* in *Ep.* lxiii. 9; *dominica hostia* in *De unit.* 17; *altare* in *De unit.* 17.

⁷ *Ep.* lxiii. 14.

ascension we offered according to the ordinance of the holy bloodless oblation.”¹

4. This use of sacrificial language in connection with the Eucharist must be viewed in the light of the interpretation frequently found of a passage in the book of the prophet Malachi. Malachi proclaimed in the name of the Lord of Hosts, “From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto My name, and a pure offering: for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.”² Whatever the exact meaning of this declaration for Malachi’s own generation,³ a prophetic anticipation of the extension of the kingdom of God to include the Gentiles appears to have been involved in it. Early Christian writers give it a more specific interpretation. They regard it as a prophecy of Christian worship, and in particular of the Eucharist. In *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, after referring to the Eucharist, and calling it a “sacrifice,” the writer goes on, “For this is the sacrifice which was spoken of by the Lord, ‘In every place and at every time offer to Me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great king, saith the Lord, and My name is wonderful among the Gentiles’.”⁴ A like foreshadowing of the Eucharist in the prophecy is observed by St. Justin Martyr⁵ and St. Irenæus.⁶ It is interpreted of the spiritual sacrifices of the prayer and praise and thanksgiving of Christians by Tertullian,⁷ and of the new sacrifice of the Christian Church by St. Cyprian.⁸ The mark made on early Christian thought by these prophetic words ought not to be left out of account in any consideration of the Christian use of sacrificial phraseology.

5. In this early period no explanation is found of the sense in which the word sacrifice is applied to the Eucharist. Yet both the general setting of the references and the repudiations of carnal sacrifices imply that some deeper thought is involved than the simple notion of the oblation of the elements, the offering of the first fruits of created things, as an act of thanksgiving

¹ Horner’s edition, pp. 221, 292.

² Mal. i. 11.

³ See Driver *in loco* in *The Century Bible*.

⁴ xiv. 3.

⁵ *Dial.* 28, 41, 116, 117.

⁶ *Adv. Haer.* IV. xvii. 5, 6.

⁷ *Adv. Marc.* iii. 22; *Adv. Jud.* 5, 6.

⁸ *Test.* i. 16.

for the material blessings of life ;¹ and there are hints of two lines of thought, different but not inconsistent, which at later times are more fully developed.

The first of these hints suggests an association of the Eucharist with the sacrifice of the cross. When St. Ignatius says that the Eucharist is "the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ," he adds, "which suffered for our sins".² St. Justin Martyr speaks of "the bread of the Eucharist, which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to offer (*ποιεῖν*) for a memorial (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*) of the passion, which He suffered for those who cleanse their souls from all wickedness";³ and in another place, after mentioning the Eucharistic sacrifice as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi and the prayers and thanksgivings which are the only sacrifices of Christians, he says, "In the memorial (*ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει*) made by their food, both dry and liquid, in which there is remembrance also of the passion, which the Son of God suffered for their sakes".⁴ When Tertullian describes our Lord as consecrating the wine "as a memorial of His blood,"⁵ the reference may be to the blood of the Lord as shed on the cross. In an obscure passage in which Origen describes the Eucharist as "the only memorial which makes God propitious to men," his description of our Lord as "that shewbread which God set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood"⁶ may allude to the passion. St. Cyprian quite definitely connects the Eucharist with the commemoration of the passion, and says that "the passion is the sacrifice of the Lord which we offer".⁷

The second hint afforded in this early period is that of the association of the Eucharist with our Lord's risen and heavenly life. St. Ignatius, St. Justin Martyr, and Tertullian all suggest that the memorial in the Eucharist is not restricted to the passion. St. Ignatius adds to his statement that the Eucharist is "the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins" the further comment, "which the Father of His goodness raised".⁸ St. Justin Martyr, in addition to the descriptions already quoted of the Eucharistic sacrifice as "a memorial of the

¹ See the passages quoted from St. Irenæus on p. 47, *supra*.

² *Smyrn.* 6.

³ *Dial.* 41.

⁴ *Ibid.* 117.

⁵ *De anim.* 17.

⁶ *In Lev. Hom.* xiii. 3.

⁷ *Ep.* lxiii. 5, 9, 17.

⁸ *Smyrn.* 6.

passion," shows that he regards the "memorial" as of wider significance by saying also that Christ commanded Christians "to offer (*ποιεῖν*) it as a memorial (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*) of His Incarnation for the sake of those who believe in Him, for whose sake also He became capable of suffering".¹ Tertullian, in describing the Priesthood of our Lord, says that He "after His resurrection was clad with a garment down to the feet and named a Priest for ever of God the Father".² In the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome the life and worship of Christians are regarded as spiritual sacrifices; our Lord is called "the High Priest of our offerings," and viewed as abiding in "the heights of the heavens"; all Christians are said to have their own place and part in the giving of thanks; the offering of the gifts is mentioned as a distinctive work of the ministry; and these offerings of the Christian ministry are compared with the ministrations commanded in the Jewish law.³ If these passages are combined with one another, the most reasonable explanation of them is seen to be that St. Clement of Rome regarded the whole of Christian worship as sacrificial, as having its centre in the offering of the Eucharist on earth and the presentation by Christ the High Priest of His offering in heaven. The heavenly centre of Christian worship is more explicitly asserted by St. Irenæus. In close connection with his assertion of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist he explains that there is "an altar in the heavens," to which "our prayers and oblations are directed," and "a temple," and "a tabernacle".⁴ The same idea is found in characteristically mystical interpretations of Holy Scripture in the Homilies of Origen. Students who have made a serious attempt to master the theology of Origen will hardly be confident that they have fully understood the intricacies and versatility of his thought or exhausted the meaning of a thinker so enterprising and eccentric, so subtle and profound. But amid all that is doubtful this much seems clear. To Origen the centre of Christian life and worship was in the perpetual pleading of the ascended Lord at the Father's throne. In the heavens are an altar and a sacrifice, not an altar of wood or stone or a sacrifice of carnal things, but the abiding offering of that sacred Manhood which the Son of God took for

¹ *Dial.* 70.

² *Adv. Jud.* 14.

³ *Cf.* 18, 35, 38, 40, 41, 44, 52, with 36.

⁴ *Adv. Haer.* IV. xviii. 6.

the salvation of the creatures in the Incarnation, the blood of which He shed in His death. In that offering the holy dead and the priestly society of the Church on earth have their place and share. Into it are gathered all the elements of the sacrificial life which Christians live, the sacrifices of praise and prayers, of pity and chastity, of righteousness and holiness. To it there is access in Communion, and he who keeps the feast with Jesus is raised to be with Him in His heavenly work. So Origen says, with the emphasis of constant repetition, that our Lord in His heavenly life "is the advocate for our sins with the Father," "approaches the altar to make propitiation for sinners," presents in the inner sanctuary, the true Holy of Holies, the heaven itself, all those sacrificial offerings which Christians in the outer sanctuary on earth bring to God's altar, so that they "come to Christ, the true High Priest, who by His blood made God propitious to" man "and reconciled" man "to the Father," and "hear Him saying, 'This is My blood'"; and that "the souls of the martyrs" and "those who follow Christ" "stand at the divine sacrifices" and "reach to the very altar of God, where is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the High Priest of good things to come".¹ Moreover,—

"He who keeps the feast with Jesus is above in the great upper room, the upper room swept clean, the upper room garnished and made ready. If you go up with Him that you may keep the feast of the passover, He gives to you the cup of the new covenant, He gives to you also the bread of blessing, He bestows His own body and His own blood."²

6. An important part of the teaching of Origen is that in which he dwells on the priestly character of the whole Christian body.

"In accordance with the promises of God, ye are the priests of God, for ye are a holy nation, a holy priesthood."³

"He has given command that we may know how we ought to approach the altar of God. For that is an altar on which we offer our prayers to God, that we may know how we ought to offer, that is, that we may lay aside filthy garments, which are the foulness of

¹ *In Lev. Hom.* vi. 2, vii. 2, ix. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10; *In Jud. Hom.* vii. 2; *Mart.* 30, 39.

² *In Jer. Hom.* xviii. 13 (al. xix.).

³ *In Lev. Hom.* vi. 2.

the flesh, the vices of character, the defilements of lust. Or, are you ignorant that to you also, that is to the whole Church of God and a nation of believers, the priesthood has been given? . . . You have then a priesthood, because you are a priestly nation, and therefore you ought to offer to God the sacrifice of praise, the sacrifice of prayers, the sacrifice of pity, the sacrifice of chastity, the sacrifice of righteousness, the sacrifice of holiness. But that you may offer these worthily, you have need of clean garments, . . . and you require divine fire, not any fire alien from God, but that which is given by God to men, of which the Son of God says, 'I came to send fire on earth, and how I wish that it were kindled' (St. Luke xii. 49).¹

The same thought, based of course on the First Epistle of St. Peter,² is found in Clement of Alexandria when he says that the true Christian is a "royal man, the holy priest of God";³ that "the true presbyter and real deacon of the will of God" are those who "do and teach the things of the Lord";⁴ and that "the only true priests of God are those who live a holy life".⁵ Tertullian exaggerated it in his Montanistic days when he, contrary to the tradition of the Church and his own earlier mind,⁶ allowed to the Christian layman the right to celebrate the Eucharist in some circumstances.⁷ Before all these St. Justin Martyr had expressed it in a fashion not unlike that in which it is found in the writings of Origen.

"We, who through the name of Jesus believe as one man on God the Creator of the universe, have put off our filthy garments, that is, our sins, through the name of His first-begotten Son, and are set on fire by the word of His calling, and are the true high-priestly race of God, as God Himself testifies, saying that in every place among the Gentiles they offer unto Him acceptable and pure sacrifices. But God receives not sacrifices from any except through His priests. God therefore testifies beforehand that all who through this name offer the sacrifices which Jesus the Christ commanded, that is, at the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, which are offered in every part of the world by Christians, are acceptable to Him."⁸

¹ *In Lev. Hom.* ix. 1.

² *Strom.* VII. vii. 36.

³ *Ibid.* IV. xxv. 157, 158.

⁴ *De exh. cast.* 7.

⁵ ii. 5, 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, VI. xiii. 106.

⁷ *De praes. haer.* 41.

⁸ *Dial.* 116, 117.

III.

It may be convenient to end this chapter with a brief summary of the doctrinal teaching about the Eucharist found in the writers of the ante-Nicene Church.

1. On the subject of the presence and gift contained in and conveyed by the Eucharist three kinds of language were used as the writers of the Church tried to present to their own minds and in their teaching the ideas conveyed by the doctrine which they had received. In these different groups the phraseology is vague and indefinite about the nature of the spiritual gift which is received, or describes the elements as the figure or symbol of the body and blood of Christ, or identifies them with His body and blood. In some cases instances of more than one of these methods of phraseology, or of all of them, are found in the same writer. In these instances it is most natural and reasonable to understand the less definite language in the light of the more definite; and throughout the writers of the period the identification of the elements with the body and blood of Christ appears to be the ruling idea. Yet it must also be observed that parts of the teaching of Clement of Alexandria and Origen have great affinities with the later opinions of some mystics and even of the Quakers in characteristics which may have been due in some measure to ideas derived from the Greek mysteries.

2. The belief that the Eucharist is a sacrifice is found everywhere. This belief is coupled with strong repudiations of carnal sacrifices; and is saved from being Judaic by the recognition of the elements as Christ's body and blood, of the union of the action of the Church on earth with that of Christ in heaven, and of the spiritual character of that whole priestly life and service and action of the community as the body of Christ which is a distinguishing mark of the Christian system.

CHAPTER III.

THE PERIOD OF THE GREAT COUNCILS.

THE period of Church History which begins with the Council of Nicæa in the year 325 and ends with the close of the fifth century has many important characteristics of its own. For the greater part of the time the friendship of the State has taken the place of hostility or indifference. The dangers to the Church from the world are now those rather of allurements than of persecution. The proximity to the apostolic age is gone. The heresies which arise are for the most part of a different type from those of earlier times. With the new attitude of the State and of the world have come more opportunity for thought and more possibility of systematic action. Councils on a large scale have become an ordinary feature in the Church's life. There is a tendency for doctrine to be more carefully expressed and more accurately formulated. The meaning and bearing of the Incarnation in particular are considered and discussed and explained with the most elaborate pains. In the four great councils held at Nicæa in 325, at Constantinople in 381, at Ephesus in 431, and at Chalcedon in 451, the four truths of the Godhead, the Manhood, the one Person, the two natures of the incarnate Son of God, which combine to make up the central features of the doctrine of the Incarnation, receive explicit expression and affirmation. At such a time of consideration and definition it is of some special interest to observe what was said and done in regard to the Eucharist.

The writers and documents belonging to this time which contain references to the Eucharist are from very different quarters and extend from the beginning to the end of the period.

The evidence from the East is of great amount. The Council of Nicæa in 325 included representatives, says Dr. Bright, "from Syria, Cilicia, Phœnicia, Arabia, Palestine, Egypt, Pontus, Gala-

tia, Cappadocia, Pamphylia, Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, Western Europe, and countries lying outside the limits of the empire".¹ The *Dialogue* of the otherwise unknown Adamantius was probably written soon after 330. Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, the great Church historian, the friend of the Emperor Constantine, the most learned man of his time, who probably really believed the full truth of our Lord's deity but hesitated to throw in his lot unreservedly with its orthodox defenders because of the intensity of his caution and the excess of conservatism which made him reluctant to use a new term to describe an old truth, died in 339 or 340. St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, whose long life extended from about 296 to 373, was the foremost defender of the vital truth that our Lord is God in no less sense than that in which the Father is God, the man who beyond all others, even in an age of great men, possessed the keen vision and the clear insight of the highest type of theological mind. His friend, Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis in the Delta, probably the writer of the Liturgical Prayers which go by his name, died about 370. The *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, whose friendship with semi-Arians does not appear to have impaired his own orthodoxy, were delivered in 347 before his consecration as bishop. The Cappadocian doctors, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Bishop of Sasima in 372 and of Constantinople in 381, but spending his life mostly in retirement, who died in 392, and St. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, who died about 395, though they, and the latter in particular, were not unaffected by the influence of Origen, were great champions of orthodoxy in the struggle with Arianism and had much to do with the victory of the Catholic faith over that heresy. St. Chrysostom, the great preacher of Antioch, who became Bishop of Constantinople in 398, died in 407 after three years of an exile brought about by the machinations of a hostile faction and the enmity of the court. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, though incorporating much older material, appear to have been compiled in the neighbourhood of Antioch in the latter half of the fourth century. Macarius Magnes probably lived at the end of that century. St. Macarius of Egypt died in 389. St. Cyril, who became Bishop of Alexandria in 412 and died in 444, was the great champion of the Church against the Nestorian heresy. Theodoret, who was consecrated Bishop of

¹ *The Age of the Fathers*, i. 78.

Cyrrhus about 423 and died about 457, defended Nestorius and attacked St. Cyril, probably through misunderstandings of the position of both, though it is not impossible that in his zeal to maintain the truth of the two natures of Christ he was led to some want of balance of thought as well as of language. Isidore of Pelusium, famous as an ascetic and spiritual guide, was a contemporary of St. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret, and died not later than 450.

In the West, though the evidence is less in amount than in the East, there are writers of great authority. At the Council of Arles in 314 representatives of a great part of Western Christendom were present; and it may be regarded as a general council of the West. St. Hilary of Poitiers, who was consecrated Bishop of Poitiers in 353 and died in 368, in spite of a tendency to minimise the reality of the human feelings of our Lord, was a teacher of great orthodoxy and power, to whom the Catholic faith in Gaul owed much, and a man who in the midst of controversy shared to some extent in the great gift of St. Athanasius, the capacity to understand when apparent denials of the truth were verbal only and when they were the outcome of real unbelief. St. Optatus was Bishop of Milevis in Numidia in the latter half of the fourth century. St. Ambrose, who was born in Gaul, where at the time of his birth his father was prefect, became Bishop of Milan in 374 and died in 397. The treatise *De Sacramentis*, which has sometimes been ascribed to St. Ambrose, is probably not his work, but is likely to have been written in North Italy not much if at all later than 400. St. Jerome, who was born in Pannonia about 346, was baptised at Rome before 366, and between that time and his death in 420 lived in Gaul, Italy, Syria, and Constantinople. St. Augustine, the most eminent of the Latin fathers, was baptised in 387 at the age of thirty-three, was consecrated Bishop in 395 as assistant to the Bishop of Hippo on the coast of Numidia, and succeeded to that see a year later. He died in 430. His writings comprise expositions of Holy Scripture, Sermons, Letters, controversial treatises against the Arians, the Manichæans, the Donatists, and the Pelagians in great abundance. St. Leo was Bishop of Rome from 440 to 461, and Gelasius from 492 to 496.

The types of mind, the lines of argument, the methods of thought, are almost as different as the places are various. In

estimating the testimony in regard to any doctrine, agreement and difference are alike significant.

I.

In the period of the great councils, the fourth and fifth centuries, as in the period which precedes the Council of Nicæa, it will be convenient to consider separately the evidences of belief found in regard to the presence and gift in the Eucharist and those relating to the Eucharistic sacrifice. Taking the ideas as to the presence and the gift first, it will add to clearness to classify them in distinct groups.

1. Representative writers both of the East and of the West supply sentences in abundance in which there are references of a general character to the Eucharist as the means whereby Christians receive the body and blood of Christ. Of this general way of speech it may be sufficient to quote instances from the canons of the Council of Nicæa, from St. Athanasius, from St. Macarius of Egypt, from a Roman writer of the latter part of the fourth century, and from St. Leo the Great.

The eighteenth canon of the Council of Nicæa deals with a practice which had arisen in some places by which in the administration of the Sacrament presbyters received it from the hands of deacons. It appears to have been usual in the middle of the second century for the deacons to administer to the congregation in both kinds, though later the administration of the species of bread was confined to the bishop or celebrating presbyter, so that the deacons administered from the chalice only.¹ At the time of the Council of Nicæa it is evident that the deacons in some places were in the habit of administering not only to the congregation but also to those presbyters who were present. In view of this practice and of another abuse

¹ St. Justin Martyr, *Ap.* i. 65, 67 (administration of both kinds by deacon both to congregation in church and to absent at home); *Canons of Hippolytus*, 146, 147, 214 (administration in both kinds by bishop), 215 (administration by deacon to sick presbyter, absent from church, probably in both kinds), 216 (administration by deacon with leave of bishop or presbyter, apparently in both kinds); St. Cyprian, *De laps.* 25 (administration of chalice by deacon); St. Athanasius on St. Matt. vii. 6, quoted on p. 60, *infra* (administration of species of bread by deacon); *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 13 (administration of species of bread by bishop, of chalice by deacon).

by which deacons had received before bishops other than the celebrant, the Council laid down regulations as to the order of reception and the method of administration, incidentally describing the consecrated elements as the body of Christ in the sentence, "It is contrary to the canons and to custom for those who have not authority to offer to give the body of Christ to those who offer".

St. Athanasius frequently alludes incidentally to the Eucharist as the body and blood of Christ. The *Encyclical Letter* of the Council of Alexandria of 339, quoted by him in his *Defence against the Arians*, contains the words:—

"Our sanctuaries, as always, so also now are clean, adorned only with the blood of Christ and the worship of Him."

"It is only to you who preside over the Catholic Church that it pertains to administer the blood of Christ, and to no other. But as he who breaks the cup belonging to the mysteries is impious, much more impious is he who treats with insult the blood of Christ; and he so treats it with insult who 'does this'¹ contrary to the rule of the Church."²

A letter of Julius, Bishop of Rome, quoted by St. Athanasius in the same treatise, lays stress on the wrong done by a trial in a civil court of a matter involving questions of fact as to the administration of the Eucharist.

"The presbyters who asked to attend the inquiry were not allowed to do so; and the inquiry concerning the cup and the Table took place before the prefect and his band in the presence of heathen and Jews. . . . Presbyters, who are the ministers of the mysteries, are not allowed to attend; but an inquiry concerning the blood of Christ and the body of Christ takes place before an external judge, in the presence of catechumens, and worse still of heathen and Jews who are of ill report in regard to Christianity."³

In his *Letter to Maximus* St. Athanasius, in maintaining the deity of Christ, speaks incidentally of Christians as "not partaking of the body of some man or other but receiving the body of the Word Himself."⁴ In the *Festal Letters* there are similar phrases.

¹ Evidently referring to our Lord's words at the institution of the Eucharist.

² St. Athanasius, *Ap. c. Ar.* 5, 11.

³ *Ibid.* 31.

⁴ § 2.

"We do not approach a temporal feast, my beloved, but an eternal and heavenly. Not in shadows do we show it forth but we come to it in truth. For they (the Jews) being filled with the flesh of a dumb lamb, accomplished the feast, and having anointed their door-posts with the blood, implored aid against the destroyer. But now we, eating of the Word of the Father, and having the lintels of our hearts sealed with the blood of the new covenant, acknowledge the grace given us from the Saviour."¹

"We eat, as it were, the food of life, and constantly thirsting we delight our souls at all times, as from a fountain, in His precious blood."²

"Let us be prepared to draw near to the divine Lamb, and to touch heavenly food."³

Commenting on our Lord's words, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs," he says, "Do thou then also, deacon, take heed that thou do not give to the unworthy the purple of the sinless body."⁴

In the *Homilies* ascribed to St. Macarius of Egypt it is said:—

"Those who partake of the visible bread spiritually eat the flesh of the Lord."⁵

The author of the *Questions on the Old and New Testaments*, apparently a Roman writer contemporary with Pope Damasus, who died in 384, refers to the Eucharist as the "reality" of which there had been types in the manna and in the bread and wine brought forth by Melchizedek, and speaks of that which is given as the body of Christ.

"The manna is a type of the spiritual food which by the resurrection of the Lord became a reality in the mystery of the Eucharist."⁶

"Neither did the Lord deny to him (Judas) . . . His body."⁷

"Melchizedek showed the future mystery of the Incarnation and passion of the Lord when to Abraham first as the father of the faithful he gave the Eucharist of the body and blood of the Lord that there might be beforehand in the case of the father a type of that which was to be a reality in the case of the sons."⁸

¹ iv. 3.

² v. 1.

³ v. 5.

⁴ Fragment on St. Matt. vii. 6 (*P.G.* xxvii. 1380).

⁵ xxvii. 17 (*P.G.* xxxiv. 705). For a valuable statement of the internal evidence of these *Homilies* as supporting the ascription of them in the MSS. to St. Macarius, see the Bishop (Gore) of Birmingham's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1906, pp. 85-90.

⁶ xcvi. 3.

⁷ cii. 25.

⁸ cix. 18.

Similar allusions to the Eucharist occur in the writings of St. Leo the Great. Denouncing the Manichæans at Rome, he said :—

“Since to conceal their unbelief they dare to be present at our meetings, they behave at the communion of the mysteries in such a way that sometimes, lest they should fail to be concealed, they receive with unworthy mouth the body of Christ, though they altogether refuse to drink the blood of our redemption.”¹

In one of his passiontide sermons he taught :—

“Nothing else is brought about by the participation of the body and blood of Christ than that we pass into that which we receive, and bear throughout both in spirit and in flesh Him in whom we died and were buried and were raised together with Him.”²

In another sermon, while maintaining the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation against the heresy of Eutyches, he said :—

“Ye ought so to partake at the Holy Table as to have no doubt at all concerning the reality of the body and blood of Christ. For that is taken in the mouth which is believed by faith ; and it is vain for them to respond Amen who dispute against that which is taken.”³

In a letter addressed to the clergy and people of the city of Constantinople against Manichæan and other heresies, he wrote :—

“In what darkness of ignorance and what depth of sloth have they hitherto lain that they have neither learnt from hearing nor understood from reading the truth which in the Church of God so resounds in the mouths of all that at the rite of the Communion not even the tongues of infants are silent as to the reality of the body and blood of Christ ? For in that distribution of spiritual nourishment such a gift is bestowed, such a gift is taken, that receiving the virtue of the heavenly food we pass into the flesh of Him who became our flesh.”⁴

2. A second group of passages is formed by those in which the elements are spoken of as “figures” or “symbols” or the “image” or “likeness” of the body and blood of Christ. This phraseology recalls a like manner of speech found in the second and third centuries ;⁵ and in the later writers as in the earlier

¹ *Serm.* xlii. 5.

² *Ibid.* lxiii. 7.

³ *Ibid.* xci. 3.

⁴ *Ep.* lix. 2.

⁵ See pp. 29-33, *supra*.

it needs careful attention and consideration. In the period with which the present chapter is concerned it is found in Adamantius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Serapion of Thmuis, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, St. Macarius of Egypt, Theodoret, the author of the book *On the Sacraments*, and St. Augustine.

In his *Dialogue* directed against the Manichæans Adamantius as a part of his argument in defence of the reality of our Lord's body says:—

“If, as these say, He was fleshless and bloodless, of what flesh or of what blood was it that He gave the images (εἰκόνας) in the bread and the cup, when He commanded the disciples to make the memorial of Him by means of these?”¹

In the course of his treatment of the Incarnation and life of our Lord as a fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Eusebius of Cæsarea refers to the words in the dying prophecy of Jacob:

“Binding his foal unto the vine,
And his ass's colt unto the choice vine;
He hath washed his garments in wine,
And his vesture in the blood of grapes:
His eyes shall be red with wine,
And his teeth white with milk;”²

and, after mentioning our Lord's words, “I am the true vine,”³ and His triumphant entry into Jerusalem, and the prophetic saying of Zechariah,⁴ proceeds:—

“As to the passage, ‘He shall wash His garments in wine, and His vesture in the blood of the grape,’ does He not as in mysteries signify His mystic passion, in which He washed His garments and His raiment in the laver by means of which it is made clear that He washes away the ancient filth of those who believe in Him? For by means of the wine, which was the symbol (σύμβολον) of His blood, He cleanses from their former sins those who are baptised into His death and have believed on His blood, washing and wiping away their ancient garments and raiment, so that they, having been redeemed by the precious blood of the divine and spiritual grape and the wine of the aforesaid vine, put off the old man together

¹ v. 6.

² St. John xv. 1.

³ Gen. xlix. 11, 12.

⁴ Zech. ix. 9.

with his deeds and put on the new man that is renewed unto knowledge according to the image of the Creator. And I think that the passages, 'His eyes gladdening from wine,' and 'His teeth whiter than milk,' again mystically refer to the mysteries of the new covenant of our Saviour. For it is my opinion that the words 'His eyes gladdening from wine' signify the gladness from the mystic wine which He gave to His own disciples saying, 'Take, drink, this is My blood which is poured out for you for the remission of sins; do this for My memorial'; and that the words 'His teeth whiter than milk' signify the brightness and purity of the mystic food. For again He gave to His disciples the symbols (τὰ σύμβολα) of the divine dispensation, bidding them make the image (τὴν εἰκόνα) of His own body. For since He no longer allowed the sacrifices offered with blood, nor those appointed by Moses in the slaughter of divers animals, but ordained the use of bread as the symbol (συμβόλιον) of His own body, He fittingly signified the brightness and purity of the food by saying, 'His teeth whiter than milk'." ¹

Similarly, Eusebius speaks elsewhere of the Eucharistic food as "the symbols (συμβόλων) of His body and His saving blood," ² and as "the mystic symbols (ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα) of the saving passion" ³.

The Eucharistic Anaphora in the *Prayers* of Serapion of Thmuis contains expressions which may be compared with those quoted from Eusebius.

"To Thee we have offered this bread, the likeness (τὸ ὁμοίωμα) of the body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of the holy body, because the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread and brake and gave to His disciples saying, 'Take and eat, this is My body which is being broken for you for the remission of sins'. Wherefore we also making the likeness (τὸ ὁμοίωμα) of the death have offered the bread. . . . We have offered also the cup, the likeness (τὸ ὁμοίωμα) of the blood, because the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to His own disciples, 'Take, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My blood which is being poured out for you for the remission of trespasses'. Wherefore we also have offered the cup, presenting a likeness (ὁμοίωμα) of the blood." ⁴

¹ VIII. i. 76-80.

² *Op. cit.* I. x. 28.

³ *H.E.* x. 3.

⁴ § 1.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* uses the sentences, "According to the Gospel His body bore the figure (τύπον ἔφεραν) of bread";¹ "In the figure (τύπων) of bread is given to thee the body, and in the figure (τύπων) of wine is given to thee the blood";² "the antitype (ἀντιτύπου) of the body and blood of Christ".³

St. Gregory of Nazianzus incidentally speaks of the reserved Sacrament as "the antitypes (τῶν ἀντιτύπων) of the precious body or blood," and of the elements received by the communicant as "the figures (τοὺς τύπους) of my salvation".⁴

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* it is said that our Lord committed to the Apostles "the mysteries that are antitypes of His precious body and blood";⁵ the Eucharist is described as "the antitype of the royal body of Christ";⁶ and the elements are called the "antitypes" of "the precious blood" and "the precious body" "of Jesus Christ".⁷

The Homily ascribed to St. Macarius of Egypt, from which a quotation has already been made,⁸ contains the sentence:—

"In the Church bread and wine are offered, the antitype of His flesh and blood."⁹

Theodoret repeatedly speaks of the elements as the "symbols" of Christ's body and blood.¹⁰

In describing the words used by the priest at the consecration of the Eucharist the author of the book *On the Sacraments*, which has sometimes been ascribed to St. Ambrose, writes:—

"You have taken the likeness of the death. . . . You drink also the likeness of the precious blood. . . . The priest says, 'Make this oblation to us approved, ratified, reasonable, acceptable, because it is the figure (*figura*) of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'" ¹¹

St. Augustine uses phraseology resembling that of Tertullian ¹² when he says:—

¹ xiii. 19.

² xxii. 3.

³ xxiii. 20.

⁴ *Orat.* viii. 18, xvii. 12.

⁵ v. 14.

⁶ vi. 30.

⁷ vii. 25.

⁸ See p. 60, *supra*.

⁹ xxvii. 17 (*P.G.* xxxiv. 705).

¹⁰ *Dial.* i. ii. (t. iv. pp. 25, 26, 125, 126, Schulze; *P.G.* lxxxiii. 56, 165-68).

¹¹ iv. 20, 21.

¹² See pp. 29-33, *supra*.

“The Lord did not hesitate to say, ‘This is My body,’ when He gave the sign (*signum*) of His body.”¹

“The supper, in which He committed and gave to His disciples the figure (*figuram*) of His body and blood.”²

With these brief sentences of St. Augustine may be compared statements in his treatise *Concerning Christian Doctrine* and his anti-Manichæan book, *Against an Opponent of the Law and the Prophets*. In the treatise *Concerning Christian Doctrine*, he says:—

“If a command either forbids what is disgraceful or wrong or orders what is useful or kindly, it is not figurative. But, if it seems to order what is disgraceful or wrong, or to forbid what is useful or kindly, it is figurative. It is said, ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye will not have life in yourselves.’³ This seems to order what is wrong or disgraceful: therefore it is a figure, ordering that there is to be communion in the passion of the Saviour, and that there is to be sweet and useful remembrance that for us His flesh was crucified and wounded.”⁴

In the book *Against an Opponent of the Law and the Prophets*, after referring to the typical significance of the marriage relation of Abraham with Sarah and Hagar and of the births of Isaac and Ishmael and of marriage as a figure of the union between Christ and the Church, he writes:—

“With faithful heart and mouth we admit that the Man Christ Jesus, the Mediator between God and men, gives us His flesh to eat and His blood to drink, although it seems more horrible to eat human flesh than to kill it, and to drink human blood than to shed it; and in all Holy Scripture, whenever anything is figuratively said or done, in any matters contained in the sacred pages, it is to be explained in accordance with the rule of sound faith, and we are to listen not with scorn but with wisdom.”⁵

Macarius Magnes mentions those who spoke of the Eucharist in a way which he himself repudiated.

“It is not a figure (*τύπος*) of the body and a figure of the blood, as some whose minds are blinded have foolishly said (*ἔρραψωψόδησαν*), but really the body and blood of Christ.”⁶

¹ *C. Adim. Man.* xii. 3.

² *In Ps. iii. Enar.* 1.

³ *St. John* vi. 53.

⁴ *iii.* 24.

⁵ *ii.* 35. Cf. *Ep.* xcvi. 9, quoted on p. 84, *infra*.

⁶ *iii.* 23.

In considering what inferences may rightly be drawn from the phraseology of which instances have been given it is necessary to remember the elements of the problem pointed out in the last chapter,¹ namely the marked difference between the use of such words as "figure" and "symbol" in the early Church and their present usual meaning, the sense evidently attached to the word "figure" in some passages in Tertullian and other Latin writers, the influence of the language of the Greek mysteries on the use of the word "symbol" by the Alexandrian theologians; and further to observe instances of a different type of phraseology in the same writers to be given later.² In addition to these general considerations there are four special points which require notice here. (a) In the Eucharistic Anaphora of Serapion of Thmuis and in the treatise *On the Sacraments*—apart from one passage in the latter, where the reference is shown by the context to be to the outward sign³—the instances of the phrases "likeness of the body" and "likeness of the blood" and "likeness of the death" and "figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" occur before the sentences which are evidently regarded as the crucial moment of the consecration.⁴ (b) A comparison of other passages in St. Cyril of Jerusalem in which he uses the words "figure" (τύπος) and "antitype" (ἀντίτυπος) shows meanings which he elsewhere attaches to them. Joshua is said to have borne the figure (τύπον ἔφερον) of Christ;⁵ the barren fig-tree is said to have been cursed for the sake of the figure (διὰ τὸν τύπον)⁶; incidents of the fall are regarded as figures of incidents of the redemption accomplished by Christ;⁷ the brasen serpent is called the figure of the crucifixion;⁸ Jonah is spoken of as a figure of Christ;⁹ the sprinkling of the blood on the door posts and the crossing of the Red Sea are described as figures of the blood of Christ and of Holy Baptism.¹⁰ Baptism is called an antitype (ἀντίτυπον) of the sufferings of Christ;¹¹ and anointing is said to be an antitype (ἀντίτυπον) of the Holy

¹ See pp. 29-33, *supra*.

² See pp. 67-84, *infra*.

³ *De Sacr.* iv. 20. See p. 64, *supra*, and especially pp. 81, 82, *infra*, where the context is quoted.

⁴ See pp. 84-87, *infra*.

⁵ x. 11.

⁶ xiii. 18.

⁷ xiii. 19.

⁸ xiii. 20.

⁹ xiv. 20.

¹⁰ xix. 2, 3.

¹¹ xx. 6.

Ghost.¹ Yet, though these illustrations of St. Cyril's use of the words taken by themselves might seem to point towards the sentences formerly cited having the meaning that the Eucharistic food merely represents the body and blood of Christ, his language elsewhere will be found to be incompatible with such a view.² (c) Theodoret, in addition to speaking of the elements as "symbols," is explicit that after consecration they are what they are called, the body and blood of Christ;³ and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, while calling the elements "antitypes," very definitely describes them after consecration as our Lord's body and blood.⁴ (d) On the other hand, the denial by Macarius Magnes of the opinion of those who declared that the Eucharist is a figure of the body and blood appears to imply that he understood at any rate some who used this phraseology to denote by it a belief contrary to his own identification of the elements with the body and blood.⁵

3. One part of the teaching of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Cyril of Alexandria suggests the idea of the heightened efficacy of the elements. This thought is prominent in St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Gregory of Nyssa, and appears to be implied by St. Cyril of Alexandria.

In the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem the effect of the Eucharistic consecration is definitely compared with the effect of the heathen invocation on heathen offerings and the effect of the Christian invocation on the chrism in Confirmation, and by implication it is regarded as parallel to the effect of the Christian invocation on the water in Baptism.

"The things which are hung up at the idol festivals, whether flesh or bread or other such things, having been defiled by the invocation of the foul demons, are reckoned in the pomp of the devil. For as the bread and the wine of the Eucharist before the invocation of the holy and adorable Trinity were simple (λιτός) bread and wine, but when the invocation has taken place the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ, so in like manner such food of the pomp of Satan, though in its own nature simple (λίτά), becomes profane (βίβηλα) by the invocation of the demons."⁶

¹ xxi. 1.

² See p. 71, *infra*.

³ See pp. 99-101, *infra*.

⁴ See p. 75, *infra*.

⁵ See pp. 73, 74, *infra*.

⁶ xix. 7.

“Beware of supposing this chrisem (μύρον) to be bare (ψίλον). For as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is no longer simple (λιτός) bread but the body of Christ, so also after invocation this holy chrisem is no longer bare (ψίλον) nor, so to say, common but becomes Christ’s gift of grace (χάρισμα) and by the coming of the Holy Ghost fit to impart His Godhead.”¹

“Do not pay heed to the laver as simple (λιτῶ) water but to the spiritual grace that is given with the water. For as the things that are brought to the heathen altars, though simple (λιτά) in their nature, become defiled by the invocation of the idols, so contrariwise the simple (λιτόν) water on receiving the invocation of the Holy Ghost and of Christ and of the Father acquires the power of holiness.”²

A similar conception of the heightened efficacy of material things and a similar parallel between the different rites of the Church are expressed at some length by St. Gregory of Nyssa in his sermon *On the Baptism of Christ*. In describing the effects of Christian Baptism he says :—

“The Spirit” “blesses the body which is baptised and the water which baptises. Wherefore despise not the sacred laver, nor count it cheap as a common thing, because of the use of the water. For that which operates is great, and the effects which it accomplishes are wonderful. Since also this holy altar at which we stand is in its nature common stone, nothing differing from the other blocks with which our walls are built and our floors adorned. But through being hallowed for the worship of God and receiving consecration it is a holy Table, a stainless altar, no longer to be touched by all but only by the priests, and that with reverence. The bread again is up to a certain point common bread; but when the mystery has consecrated it, it both is called and becomes the body of Christ. In like manner the mystic oil, in like manner the wine, being things of little worth before they are hallowed, after the consecration effected by the Spirit have each their distinctive operation. The same power of the word makes the priest also reverend and honourable, separated by his new consecration from the ordinary multitude. For, while yesterday and the day before he was one of the multitude and of the people, he is all at once rendered a guide, a ruler, a teacher of orthodoxy, a leader in hidden mysteries; and he does these things without any change in body or in form; but being in appearance what he was, by a certain invisible power and grace he

¹ xxi. 3² iii. 3.

is in his invisible soul transformed (*μεταμορφωθείς*) to what is better."¹

A like comparison between the effects of the blessing of the water in Baptism and the result of the Eucharistic consecration appears to be implied in language about Baptism used by St. Cyril of Alexandria, if compared with statements about the Eucharist in the same father.² Commenting on our Lord's words to Nicodemus, "Except any one be begotten of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,"³ St. Cyril says:—

"The spirit of man is sanctified by the Spirit, the body by the water which in its turn has already been sanctified. For as the water that is poured out in cauldrons receives the power that is derived from the fire, so the perceptible water through the activity of the Spirit is re-elemented (*ἀναστοιχειούται*)⁴ to a certain divine and mystic power, and hereafter sanctifies those to whom it comes."⁵

It is obvious that in themselves the parallel between the different rites and the whole conception of the heightened efficacy of the Eucharistic elements are capable of two interpretations. In themselves they might mean that in all cases alike the outward part is merely the instrument employed to effect a particular purpose, or that, while in all cases the outward part is the instrumental means whereby a spiritual purpose is effected, in the case of the Eucharist it is more than an instrument and itself contains or is identified with that which it is the means of bestowing. Though in the abstract either of these interpretations might be a tenable explanation of the conception, there are not wanting indications in the passages of St. Cyril of Jerusalem which have been quoted already that the latter is intended by this father, and it will be found in the subsequent course of this investigation that all the three writers from whom quotations have here been made use language elsewhere which shows that the parallel with the other rites was not meant by them to exhaust the truth about the Eucharist, but that they

¹ T. iii. pp. 369, 370, ed. Paris, 1638; P.G. xlvi. 581-84.

² See pp. 76, 105, *infra*. ³ St. John iii. 5.

⁴ Another reading is "transelemented" (*μεταστοιχειούται*).

⁵ In *Joan. Ev.* on iii. 5 (t. iv. p. 147, ed. Aubert; P.G. lxxiii. 244, 245).

believed the elements not only to receive such a heightened efficacy as enables them to effect the reception of the spiritual food but also themselves to become the body and blood of Christ.

4. The passages which must be considered next are those in which the consecrated elements are identified with the body and blood of Christ. Such passages are found in writers of different types in both the East and the West. In some instances they are the work of those who use also phraseology which has already been referred to as of a more general character, or as describing the elements as "figures" or "symbols," or as denoting the heightened efficacy of the elements. The following quotations supply the illustrations of the identification of the consecrated elements with the body and blood of Christ which appear to be more distinct and most characteristic.

Two fragments of a *Sermon to the Baptized* ascribed to St. Athanasius, quoted by Eutychius, who was Patriarch of Constantinople in the sixth century, in his *Sermon on the Pasch and on the Most Holy Eucharist*,¹ are as follows:—

"You will see the Levites (that is, the deacons) bringing the bread and the cup of wine, and placing them on the Table. And so long as the supplications and prayers are not yet made, the bread and the cup are bare elements (*ψιλός*). But when the great and marvellous prayers are completed, then the bread becomes the body, and the cup the blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ."²

"Let us come to the consecration of the mysteries. This bread and this cup, so long as the prayers and supplications are not yet made, are bare elements (*ψιλά*). But when the great prayers and the holy supplications are sent up to God, the Word descends upon the bread and the cup, and they become His body."³

Very similar is the language used in the Prayers of Serapion of Thmuis, St. Athanasius's contemporary and friend. In the Eucharistic Anaphora which these Prayers contain, after the allusions to the bread and the cup as the "likeness" of the body and blood of Christ,⁴ the following passage occurs:—

"O God of truth, let Thy Holy Word come upon this bread that the bread may become the body of the Word, and upon this cup that the cup may become the blood of the Truth."⁵

¹ § 8. P.G. lxxxvi. 2401.

² P.G. xxvi. 1325.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See p. 63, *supra*.

⁵ § 1.

The following are among the explicit statements made by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* that the consecrated bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ.

“The bread and the wine of the Eucharist were simple (λιτός) bread and wine before the invocation of the holy and adorable Trinity; but when the invocation has taken place the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ.”¹

“The bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is no longer simple (λιτός) bread but the body of Christ.”²

“Since then He declared and spake of the bread, ‘This is My body,’ who will dare to doubt any longer? And since He affirmed and said, ‘This is My blood,’ who will ever hesitate so as to say it is not His blood?”³

“Regard the bread and the wine then not as bare elements (ψιλοῖς); for they are (πυγγάνει) the body and blood of Christ according to the declaration of the Lord.”⁴

“We beseech the merciful God to send the Holy Ghost upon the oblations that He may make the bread the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ; for whatever the Holy Ghost has touched is surely consecrated and changed (ἡγίασται καὶ μεταβέβληται).”⁵

In a letter to Amphilochius, the Bishop of Iconium, St. Gregory of Nazianzus uses the very remarkable expressions contained in the following sentence:—

“Be not negligent both to pray and to intercede for us, when by word you draw down the Word, when with bloodless cutting you sever the Lord’s body and blood, using your voice as your sword”.⁶

St. Gregory of Nyssa deals with the Eucharist at some length in his *Catechetical Oration*. The possibility of Sacraments, he teaches, is shown by the truth of the Immanence of God. They carry on the principle of the Incarnation, and have their validity because of the guarantee afforded by the promise of God. Through Baptism and the Eucharist Christians possess union with God through Christ. In Sacraments that is accomplished

¹ xix. 7. ² xxi. 3. ³ xxii. 1. ⁴ xxii. 6. ⁵ xxiii. 7.

⁶ *Ep.* clxxi. Like phraseology about the severing of the body and blood is found in the West in the thirteenth century and later: see, e.g., pp. 66, 67, 315, 325, 361, 363, 372, 373, *infra*, and vol. ii.

continuously and for individuals which was accomplished once for mankind in general by the Incarnation. Man is compounded of body and soul. It is therefore necessary that those who are to be in the way of salvation should lay hold of Christ by both body and soul. Hence arises the need of both faith and Sacraments. Human nature has been poisoned through the body; and therefore the antidote to the poison must be received through the body. This antidote can be nothing else than that body which has conquered death and is the first fruits of our life. The necessary entrance of the body of Christ into human bodies can only be by means of eating and drinking. This fact suggests the problem how it is

“possible for that one body, being continually (εἰς ἀεί) portioned to so many myriads of the faithful throughout the whole world, to become in its entirety the possession of each recipient¹ through the portion received, and yet to remain whole in itself.”²

In attempting to solve this problem St. Gregory of Nyssa, after showing that the life of the human body is preserved by means of the food and drink which are consumed and digested and assimilated and thereby become the body and blood of the persons who eat and drink them, points out that this process of nourishment took place in our Lord's earthly life, and that the change which is effected in the Eucharist is parallel to that in the preservation of His manhood by means of food.

“The body which was the body of God by receiving the nourishment of bread was in a certain manner (λόγῳ τινι) the same as it, the nourishment, as has been said, being changed into the nature of the body. For that which is characteristic of all was acknowledged also in the case of that flesh, namely, that that body too was maintained by bread. Moreover, that body by the indwelling of God the Word was transmaded (μετεποιήθη) to the dignity of Godhead. Rightly, then, do we believe that now also the bread which is consecrated by the word of God is transmaded (μεταποιεῖσθαι) into the body of God the Word. . . . In this case the bread, as says the Apostle,³ is consecrated by means of the word of God and prayer; not that it advances by the process of eating into becoming the body of the

¹ Reading ὅλον ἐκάστου γένησθαι. With the reading ἐν ἐκάστῳ the meaning is not substantially different.

² Ch. 37.

³ 1 St. Tim. iv. 5.

Word, but it is at once transmuted (*μεταποιούμενος*) into the body by means of the word, as the Word said, 'This is My body'. . . . In the dispensation of grace He plants Himself in all the faithful by means of that flesh composed of wine and bread, blending Himself with the bodies of the faithful, so that man also may become partaker of incorruption by the union with the immortal. He bestows these gifts as He transelements (*μεταστοιχειώσας*) the nature of the visible things to that immortal thing by virtue of the consecration."¹

It will be necessary to recur to this passage later on;² it is quoted now as showing St. Gregory of Nyssa's belief that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, and his defence of his belief on the grounds of analogy with natural processes and harmony with the principle of the Incarnation.

Teaching greatly resembling the characteristic thought of St. Gregory of Nyssa occurs in Macarius Magnes. In the *Dialogue*, which represents a discussion between a heathen opponent and a Christian, the heathen is depicted as taking exception to the Eucharist. The command to eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood as a condition of life³ is said to be unreasonable and savage; and it is maintained that even if the words have some allegorical and mystic meaning the impression created by them is still injurious to the soul.⁴ To this objection a lengthy reply is given. A new-born babe, it is said, must die unless he eats the flesh and drinks the blood of his mother, since his food is the mother's blood which a physical process has converted into milk. If, then, the infant thus eats the flesh and drinks the blood of his mother, it is not unreasonable that Christ should command those to whom He gave authority to become the children of God to eat His flesh and drink His blood, to eat the mystic flesh and drink the mystic blood of her who bare them. For the Wisdom of God brought forth children and fed them from the two breasts of the two covenants and gave them her own flesh and blood and bestowed on them immortality; and this Wisdom of God is Christ. Men are made from the earth, and in corn and wine and other food they after a fashion eat the flesh and drink the blood of the earth. From the earth they are nourished, and the earth does not sustain loss or injury

¹ Ch. 37.

² See pp. 103, 104, *infra*.

³ St. John vi. 53.

⁴ iii. 15.

through giving them nourishment. The only begotten Son created the earth in the beginning, and in the Incarnation He took from the earth His body. The bread and the wine are not figures of Christ's body and blood but really His body and blood, since the source of His body and the source of bread and wine is the earth. The words of Christ would have been untrue if they had been spoken by Abraham or any other than Christ Himself.

"Common bread that is grown in the earth, even though it is the flesh of the earth, is not declared to have eternal life, but it bestows on those who eat it only a short-lived benefit, since without the divine Spirit its force is quickly quenched. But the bread that is grown in the blessed earth of Christ, being united to the power of the Holy Ghost, by the mere taste gives immortality to man. For the mystic bread, having received the inseparable invocation of the Saviour—the invocation that is on His body and blood—unites him who eats to the body of Christ and makes him the limbs of the Saviour. For as the writing-tablet receives power through the letters which the teacher writes on it and gives this power to the scholar, and by means of it uplifts and unites him to the teacher, so the body, which is the bread, and the blood, which is the wine, receiving the immortality of the unstained deity, give it from themselves to him who receives them, and by means of it restores him to the uncorruptible abiding of the Creator. Therefore the flesh of the Saviour when it is eaten is not destroyed, and this blood when it is drunk is not consumed, but he who eateth attains to an increase of divine powers, and that which is eaten remains unspent, since it is kindred to and inseparable from the inexhaustible nature."¹

In the writings of St. Chrysostom, besides abundant allusions to the participation in Christ which is gained by Communion, there are more explicit statements. He speaks with sympathy and belief of the vision of which he had heard of angels "surrounding the altar and bowing down, as one might see soldiers standing in the presence of a king."² The body and blood of Christ are, he says, received in the hands, and in the mouth;³

¹ iii. 23. In iv. 25, Macarius makes a similar comparison between the power of letters written by a king, as contrasted with the worthlessness of the same letters written by a private individual, and the efficacy of the water that is marked by the name of Christ in Baptism.

² *De Sac.* vi. 4.

³ *Ad illum. cat.* ii. 2; *In 2 Cor. Hom.* xxx. 2.

the tongue is touched by the flesh of Christ;¹ the elements become the body and blood of Christ;² the Lamb is on the Table;³ "that which is in the chalice is that which flowed from the side" of our Lord on the cross;⁴ and the identification of the bread and wine with the body and blood is implied in the passionate declaration:—

"I will surrender my own life rather than grant unworthily the reception of the blood of the Lord; I will shed my own blood rather than grant wrongly the reception of blood so awful."⁵

In the second book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* communicants are not only said to partake of "the body of the Lord and His precious blood," but are also ordered to come up to the place of Communion "with reverence and devotion as approaching the body of a King"; in the eighth book the words of administration are given as "the body of Christ," "the blood of Christ, the cup of life," and communicants are said to partake of "the precious body and the precious blood of Christ."⁶

The teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria about the Eucharist is closely connected with the truth of the one Person of the incarnate Son of God, with the defence of which his life is pre-eminently associated. In numberless passages he lays stress on the fact that the value of the Eucharist is derived from, and dependent on, the personal union between the divine and human natures of our Lord. The flesh that was taken by our Lord in the Incarnation and is received by communicants in the Eucharist has its life-giving properties because it is the flesh, not of some man however holy or in however close communion with God, but of the Person of God the Word.⁷ An instance of teaching of this kind which occurs in the third letter to Nestorius is of some special interest, since the letter which contains it received a general assent from the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus in 431.⁸ The passage is as follows:—

"Proclaiming the death according to the flesh of the only begotten Son of God, that is, Jesus Christ, and confessing His resurrec-

¹ *In 1 Cor. Hom.* xxvii. 5.

² *De prod. Jud.* i. 6.

³ *De coem. et cruc.* 3.

⁴ *In 1 Cor. Hom.* xxiv. 1.

⁵ *In Mat. Hom.* lxxxii. 6.

⁶ ii. 57, viii. 13, 14.

⁷ See, e.g., *Ep.* xvii. 7; *Adv. Nest.* iv. 4-6; *Comm. in Joan. Ev.* on vi. 64; *Explan. duodecim cap.* xi.

⁸ Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 1441.

tion from the dead and ascent into heaven, we celebrate the bloodless sacrifice¹ in our churches; and thus we approach the mystic blessings, and are sanctified by partaking of the holy flesh and the precious blood of Christ the Saviour of us all. And we receive it, not as common flesh (God forbid), nor as the flesh of a man sanctified and associated with the Word according to the unity of merit, or as having a divine indwelling, but as really the life-giving and very flesh of the Word Himself.”²

Besides reiterated statements to this effect there are passages in which St. Cyril identifies the consecrated elements with the body and blood of Christ.

“It was needful for Him, then, to be in us through the Holy Ghost after a divine fashion; and to be as it were mingled with our bodies through His holy flesh and His precious blood, which verily we also had for a life-giving blessing, as in bread and wine. For in order that we should not be paralysed with horror, by seeing flesh and blood set out on the holy Tables of the churches, God condescends to our infirmities and sends the power of life into the elements and transfers (*μεθίστησιν*) them into the efficacy (*ἐνεργεία*) of His own flesh, that we may have them for life-giving reception, and that the body of life may be found in us a life-giving seed. And doubt not that this is true, since He says clearly, ‘This is My body,’ and ‘This is My blood’; but rather receive in faith the word of the Saviour; for He is the Truth and does not lie.”³

“If then it is the body of God which is given, here is true God, Christ the Lord, and not bare (*ψιλός*) man, or an angel, as they say, ministering, or one of the created spirits. And if the drink is the blood of God, then it is not simply God, one of the adorable Trinity, the Son of God, but God the Word incarnate. But if the food were the body of Christ, and the drink the blood of Christ, and according to their view bare (*ψιλός*) man, how is it proclaimed as a means of eternal life to those who approach the holy Table? How, if they were right, could it dwell⁴ here and everywhere and not be diminished? For bare (*ψιλόν*) body is never a fount of life to those who receive it.”⁵

¹ *θυσίαν*: al. service (*λατρείαν*).

² Aubert, v. (2, 2) 72; P.G. lxxvii. 113.

³ *Comm. in Luc.* on xxii. 19 (P.G. lxxii. 912).

⁴ Reading *ἐνανθίζεται*. Another reading is *αὐτὸ μερίζεται* (“how could it be divided?”).

⁵ *Hom. in myst. cen.* (Aubert, v. (2, 1) 378; P.G. lxxvii. 1028, 1029).

Each of these passages appears to connect the presence and gift of the flesh and blood of the one Person of God the Son with the consecrated elements. That this was St. Cyril's belief is confirmed by the terms in which he alludes to the reserved Sacrament in his letter to Calosyrius, the Bishop of Arsinoe.

"I hear they say that the sacramental consecration does not avail for hallowing if a portion of it be kept to another day. In saying so they are mad. For Christ is not altered, nor will His holy body be changed ; but the power of the consecration and the life-giving grace still remain in it."¹

The *Letters* of Isidore of Pelusium contain references to the effect of Communion as the incorporation of the communicant with Christ,² and to the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ.³

As illustrations of the identification of the elements with the body and blood of Christ in the West during this period it may be sufficient to quote from the writings of St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Optatus, St. Ambrose, the author of the book *On the Sacraments* which has sometimes been ascribed to St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine.

The works of St. Hilary of Poitiers contain incidental references which imply that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ. In his description of the outrages at Toulouse during the Arian persecution in 356, after mentioning the ill-treatment of the presbyters and deacons, he says:—

"And on Himself, as holy persons understand with me, on Christ Himself hands were laid,"⁴

apparently alluding to the insults offered to the holy Sacrament as an Arian means of denying the validity of Catholic ministrations.⁵ In the version of the letter of the Eusebian bishops at Philippopolis in 343 which St. Hilary preserves a like outrage alleged to have been perpetrated on Arians by Marcellus of Ancyra is described.

"As must be told with tears and mourning, he openly and publicly profaned the consecrated body of the Lord hung on the necks of the priests."⁶

¹ Aubert, vi. (2) 365 ; *P.G.* lxxvi. 1073-76.

² i. 228, iii. 195. ³ i. 109, 123, iv. 166.

⁴ *C. Constant. Imp.* 11.

⁵ See Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, i. 239.

⁶ *Fragm.* iii. 9.

In one passage in his treatise *On the Trinity* St. Hilary deals with the subject of the Eucharist at some length. He there defends the doctrine that the union of Christians with God and the unity of Christians with one another is accomplished and maintained in nature not in will. As an illustration of this doctrine he refers to Baptism, observing that St. Paul¹ shows that "the unity of the faithful" is derived from "the nature of the Sacraments," so that the unity of Christians "in Christ Jesus" arises from "the unity of the Sacrament" not from "an agreement of will".² He gives a further illustration of the same doctrine from the Eucharist.

"If in truth the Word has been made flesh, and if we in truth receive the Word made flesh in the food of the Lord, must we not believe that He abides in us naturally? For He, born as Man, has assumed the nature of our flesh now inseparable from Himself, and has joined the nature of the flesh that is thus His own to the nature of the eternal Godhead (*æternitatis*) in order that in the Sacrament (*sub sacramento*) that flesh may be communicated to us. For so are we all one, because the Father is in Christ, and Christ is in us. . . . If in truth then Christ has taken the flesh of our body, and if in truth that Man who was born of Mary is Christ, and if in truth we receive in the mystery (*sub mysterio*) the flesh of His body—and in this way we shall be one, because the Father is in Him, and He is in us—how is it possible to assert that this is a unity of will, seeing that the special property of nature received through the Sacrament is the Sacrament of a complete unity? . . . Concerning the verity of the flesh and blood there is no room left for doubt. For now it is shown both by the declaration of the Lord Himself and by our faith that in truth it is flesh and in truth it is blood. And these when eaten and drunk bring it to pass that both we are in Christ and Christ is in us. . . . Therefore He Himself is in us by means of His flesh, and we are in Him, while our own nature (*hoc quod nos sumus*) is with Him in God. . . . We have Christ dwelling in our fleshly nature (*in nobis carnalibus*) by means of His flesh, and we shall live through Him in the same manner as He lives through the Father. . . . We live through Him according to the flesh, that is, having partaken of the nature of His flesh. . . . The mystery of the real and natural unity is to be preached in the light of the glory of the Son bestowed on us, and of the Son dwelling in us by His flesh

¹ Gal. iii. 27, 28.

² viii. 8.

(*carnaliter*), while we are united in Him bodily (*corporaliter*) and inseparably."¹

St. Optatus of Milevis, in describing the outrages of the Donatists against the Catholics, speaks of those who "commanded the Eucharist to be thrown to dogs" as "guilty of the holy body"; compares the perpetrators of these outrages with the Jews at the crucifixion of our Lord, since "the Jews laid hands on Christ on the cross, by you He was smitten on the altar"; and calls the altar "the abode of the body and blood of Christ," and the place "where the body of Christ dwelt".²

The treatise of St. Ambrose *On the Mysteries* contains a careful statement and defence of the doctrine that the Eucharistic bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ. After an explanation of Baptism and Confirmation he describes how "the cleansed people, rich with these adornments, hastens to the altar of Christ," and so goes on to speak of the Eucharist. The Sacraments of the Church, he says, are more ancient than those of the synagogue and more excellent than the manna with which the Jews were fed in the wilderness. They are more ancient than those of the synagogue because they were foreshadowed by the sacrifice of Melchizedek, who was a type of Christ. They are more excellent than the manna because those who ate of the manna died in the wilderness, while "whosoever shall eat of this bread," "the bread that came down from heaven," "shall never die," "and it is the body of Christ". Moreover this food is "in reality" (*in veritate*), while the manna and the water from the rock were "in a shadow" (*in umbra*); and "light is better than the shadow, the reality than the figure, the body of its Giver (*auctoris*) than the manna from heaven". At this point St. Ambrose supposes that an inquiry is made how the Sacrament can be the body of Christ; and he proceeds to explain how the Sacrament "is not what nature made but what the blessing consecrated," and that "the nature itself is changed by the blessing," by several illustrations. The rod of Moses became a serpent. The streams of Egypt were made blood. The Red Sea was divided, and the Jordan was turned back, so that "the nature of the waves of the sea and of the river stream was changed".

¹ viii. 13-17.

² ii. 19 (*cf.* ii. 21), vi. 1.

Water flowed from the rock. The bitter water was made sweet. The axe-head floated.

“ We observe then that grace has more power than nature ; and yet so far it has been the grace of the blessing of a prophet only of which we have made mention. If the blessing of a man had so great power that he could change nature, what are we to say of that consecration of God wherein the very words of our Lord and Saviour are instrumental ? For that Sacrament which you receive is made by the word of Christ. If the word of Elijah had so great power that it brought down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ have power to change the nature (*species*) of the elements ? You have read concerning the making of the whole world, ‘ He spake, and they were made ; He commanded, and they were created ’.¹ Shall not the word of Christ, which was able to make out of nothing that which was not, be able to change things which are into that which they were not ? For it is not less to give new natures to things than to change their natures. . . . Was the ordinary course of nature preserved when the Lord Jesus was born of Mary ? If we look for what usually happens, it is the wont of a woman to conceive when she has had intercourse with a man. Certainly then for a virgin to conceive was outside the ordinary way of nature. And this body which we make is that which was born of a virgin. Why do you look for the usual course of nature in the body of Christ, when the Lord Jesus Himself was born of a virgin and not according to nature ? In very deed it is the true flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried. In truth then the Sacrament is of His flesh. The Lord Jesus Himself proclaims, ‘ This is My body ’. Before the blessing of the heavenly words another nature (*species*) is named ; after the consecration the body is denoted (*significatur*). He Himself speaks of His blood. Before the consecration it is called by another name ; after the consecration it is named blood. And you say, Amen, that is, It is true.”²

While there is much in the arguments of St. Ambrose which is in harmony with those used by St. Gregory of Nyssa,³ St. Gregory of Nyssa lays great stress on the analogy with the processes of nature, while with St. Ambrose the chief emphasis is on the Eucharistic consecration as a supernatural reality which transcends nature.

The belief shown by the treatise *On the Sacraments* differs

¹ Ps. cxlviii. 5.

² §§ 43-54.

³ See pp. 71-73, *supra*.

little, if at all, from that of St. Ambrose himself. There is a like assertion of the greater antiquity and excellence of the Christian Sacraments as compared with the rites of the Jews and the gifts to the Jewish people, a like comparison with the miracles of the Old Testament, a like emphasis on our Lord's birth from a virgin, and a like distinction between the nature of the elements before consecration and after it. On this last point the writer says:—

“This bread is bread before the sacramental words; when the consecration has taken place, from being bread it becomes the flesh of Christ. Let us then declare this. How can that which is bread be the body of Christ? By consecration. But by what words is the consecration effected, and who is He that spoke them? For everything else which is said before is spoken by the priest, prayer is offered to God, prayer is made for the people, for kings, for all others; but when the time comes for the making of the venerable Sacrament, the priest no longer uses his own words, but he uses the words of Christ. Therefore the word of Christ makes this Sacrament. What is the word of Christ? Assuredly that by which all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the heaven was made; the Lord commanded, and the earth was made; the Lord commanded, and the seas were made. The Lord commanded, and every creature was created. You see how powerful the word of Christ is. If then there is so great force in the word of the Lord Jesus that those things which were not should begin to be, how much more does it bring to pass that those things which were shall be and shall also be changed into something else. The heaven was not, the sea was not, the earth was not; but hear the words of David, ‘He spake and they were made; He commanded, and they were created’. Therefore that I may give you an answer, before consecration it was not the body of Christ; but after consecration I tell you that it is now the body of Christ. He spake and it was made; He commanded and it was created. You were yourself, but you were an old creature; after you were consecrated, you began to be a new creature. Do you wish to know how a new creature? ‘Every one,’ says Scripture, ‘in Christ is a new creature.’¹ . . . You have learnt that from bread the body of Christ comes to be, and that wine and water are placed in the cup but become blood by the consecration of the heavenly Word. But perhaps you say, I do not

¹ 2 Cor. v. 17.

see the nature¹ of blood. Yet it has likeness; for as you have received the likeness of the death, so also you drink the likeness of the precious blood, so that there may be no horror at gore, and that none the less the price of redemption may accomplish its work. You have learnt then that what you receive is the body of Christ.”²

As in other matters which the profound and versatile mind of St. Augustine considered, so in regard to the Eucharist different lines of thought are found in his writings. Among them is the identification of the elements with the body and blood of Christ. In this connection notice must be taken of the passages in which he maintains that at the institution of the Sacrament our Lord held Himself in His own hands; that the bread becomes the body of Christ by receiving the blessing of Christ; that the instruction and experience of children in regard to the Eucharist, apart from other knowledge, would naturally lead to their supposing that Christ manifested Himself in His incarnate life as bread and wine; and that the gift received by worthy and unworthy communicants is the same, though with different effects.

In his *Enarrations on the Thirty-third Psalm* the mystical exposition of the words, “He changed his behaviour³ before Abimelech, who drove him away, and he departed,”⁴ leads St. Augustine to say of our Lord:—

“Christ was carried in His hands, when in giving His own body He said, ‘This is My body’. For He carried that body in His hands.”⁵

“When He gave His own body and His own blood, He took in His hands what the faithful know; and in a certain manner (*quodam modo*) He carried Himself, when He said, ‘This is My body’.”⁶

Elsewhere he says:—

¹ *Speciem*. Possibly the meaning here is “appearance”; but the use of the word to denote “nature” in St. Ambrose, *De Myst.* 51, 52, 54, is in favour of a similar meaning in this writer.

² iv. 14-20.

³ In St. Augustine’s Latin version *vultum suum*; cf. Septuagint, τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.

⁴ Ps. xxxiv. (Hebrew, =xxxiii. in Septuagint, etc.), title.

⁵ i. 10.

⁶ ii. 2.

“Not all bread, but that bread which receives the blessing of Christ, becomes the body of Christ.”¹

In a remarkable passage in the treatise *On the Trinity* he writes as follows in reference to the theophanies and types of the Old Testament :—

“What man knows how angels made or assumed those clouds and fires to signify what they announced, even if the Lord or the Holy Ghost was manifested in those bodily forms? As in the case of that which is placed on the altar and consumed at the end of the rite of Christian worship little children do not know whence or how it is made and whence it is taken for the use of religion. And if they never learnt by experience of their own or of others and never saw that outward sign (*illam speciem rerum*) except when it is offered and administered at the celebration of the Sacrament, and if they were taught on the weightiest authority whose body and blood it is, they would be sure to believe that the Lord appeared to the eyes of men in that form (*specie*) and that it was that liquid which flowed from such a smitten side.”²

In one part of his teaching St. Augustine is emphatic that the identification of the elements with the body and blood of Christ is so complete that even the wicked recipients of the Sacrament receive Christ’s body and blood as really, though with different effects, as those who partake of the Sacrament worthily. Thus in his book *On Baptism against the Donatists* he says :—

“For as Judas, to whom the Lord gave the sop, allowed place in himself to the devil not by receiving what was evil but by receiving in an evil way, so one who receives the Sacrament of the Lord unworthily does not bring about that it is evil because he is evil or that he has received nothing because he has not received to salvation. For it is the body and blood of the Lord no less in the case of those of whom the Apostle said, ‘Who eats unworthily eats and drinks judgment to himself.’”³

Similarly in one of his *Sermons* he insists that it is possible to “eat the very flesh” and “drink the very blood” of Christ in such a way as to “eat and drink judgment,” and that there are two ways of “eating that flesh and drinking that blood,” one of which leads to the recipient abiding in Christ and Christ in him, the other of which leads to judgment.⁴

¹ *Serm.* ccxxxiv. 2.

² iii. 21.

³ v. 9.

⁴ lxxi. 17.

It will be convenient to associate with this teaching two statements, one of which appears to add some qualification and the other of which closely resembles passages already quoted from St. Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius Magnes.¹ With the words already quoted on the action of our Lord at the institution of the Sacrament in carrying Himself in His own hands "in a certain manner"² may be compared a phrase in one of St. Augustine's *Epistles*, where he says:—

"If the Sacraments had not any likeness to those things of which they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. And from this likeness for the most part also they receive the names of the things themselves. As then after a certain fashion (*secundum quemdam modum*) the Sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the Sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the Sacrament of faith is faith."³

In an earlier passage than those already quoted from the *Enarrations on the Thirty-third Psalm*, St. Augustine uses the comparison between a mother feeding her child with her own body and the feeding of the children of God with the body and blood of Christ. He there says that our Lord has willed our salvation to be in His body and blood, and that His humility has made it possible for us to eat and drink these. The food which the mother eats becomes fit food for her infant child by means of the process of passing through her flesh. In like manner the Wisdom of God feeds Christians; and the Incarnation and the Passion have made possible the gift to them of the flesh and blood of the Lord.⁴

5. The next step in the consideration of the Eucharistic theology of the fourth and fifth centuries is to observe instances of the connection of a particular moment in the rite with the consecration of the elements.

In the *Liturgical Prayers* of Serapion of Thmuis the recital of our Lord's words at the institution of the Sacrament appears as an historical narrative, and is followed by the prayer for the descent of the Word on the elements, so that they may become "the body of the Word" and "the blood of the Truth".⁵ Here then the invocation of the Word is regarded as the crucial

¹ See pp. 72-74, *supra*.

⁴ i. 6.

² See p. 82, *supra*.

³ xcvi. 9.

⁵ Quoted on pp. 63, 70, *supra*.

moment in the consecration. The connection between the descent of the Word and the elements becoming His body in a sermon by St. Athanasius,¹ coupled with this prayer of Serapion, makes it likely that this was an Egyptian characteristic of the middle of the fourth century.

In two passages² in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem the consecration is connected with the invocation of the Holy Ghost. A like connection is found in the writings of St. Chrysostom and of Theophilus of Alexandria. In his *Homily on the Burial-ground and the Cross*, preached at Antioch about 392, when exhorting to reverence, St. Chrysostom says:—

“When the priest stands before the Table, holding up his hands to heaven, and calling on the Holy Ghost to come and touch the elements, there is great quiet, great silence. When the Spirit gives His grace, when He descends, when He touches the elements, when you see the Sheep sacrificed and consummated, do you then cause tumult or turmoil or strife or abuse?”³

In St. Jerome's Latin version of the *Second Paschal Letter* of Theophilus of Alexandria the work of the Holy Ghost is thus referred to:—

“He says that the Holy Ghost does not operate in those things which are lifeless, and does not come to what is without reason. In so contending he does not recognise that in Baptism the mystic waters are hallowed by the coming of the Holy Ghost; and that the bread of the Lord, by which the body of the Saviour is shown and which we break for our sanctification, and the sacred cup, which are placed on the Table of the Church and are lifeless, are sanctified by the invocation and coming of the Holy Ghost.”⁴

In one passage in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem⁵ the consecration is connected with the invocation of the Holy Trinity.

In the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* the consecrating prayer is given as follows:—

“In the night that He was betrayed He took bread in His holy and blameless hands, and, looking up to Thee, His God and Father,

¹ Quoted on p. 70, *supra*.

² Quoted on p. 71, *supra*.

³ § 3. But see p. 87, *infra*, for what appears to be a different view.

⁴ Among St. Jerome's *Epistles*, xcvi. 13.

⁵ Quoted on p. 71, *supra*.

He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, This is the mystery of the new covenant, take of it, eat, this is My body which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise also, having mixed the cup with wine and water, and having consecrated it, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, this is My blood which is poured out for many for the remission of sins; do this for My memorial; for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim My death until I come. Mindful therefore of His passion and death and resurrection from the dead and ascent into heaven and His future second coming, in which He is to come with glory and power to judge the living and the dead and to render to each one according to His works, we offer to Thee, our King and God, according to His ordinance this bread and this cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him in that Thou hast counted us worthy to stand before Thee and to do priestly service to Thee; and we beseech Thee propitiously to look on these gifts which are set before Thee, O God who needest nothing, and to be well pleased with them for the honour of Thy Christ, and to send down on this sacrifice Thy Holy Ghost, the Witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He may make (*ἀποφήνη*) this bread the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of Thy Christ, that those who partake thereof may be strengthened in piety, may obtain remission of sins, may be delivered from the devil and his craft, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain eternal life through Thy reconciliation to them, O Lord Almighty.”¹

A different way of regarding the consecration is found in St. Ambrose and in the writer of the treatise *On the Sacraments*. The crucial moment is here represented as being in the recitation of our Lord's words at the institution of the Sacrament. In St. Ambrose's work *On the Mysteries* the consecration is more than once referred to as being effected by these words;² and elsewhere he says that the word of Christ consecrates the Eucharist.³ In the treatise *On the Sacraments* the writer refers several times in general terms to the consecration being the work of the word of Christ;⁴ and afterwards writes as follows on this subject:—

“Do you wish to know that the Sacrament is consecrated by the heavenly words? Receive what the words are. The priest says,

¹ viii. 12.

³ In *Ps. xxxviii. Enar.* 25; see p. 119, *infra*.

² See p. 80, *supra*.

⁴ See p. 81, *supra*.

Make this oblation to us approved, ratified, reasonable, acceptable, because it is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who on the day before He suffered took bread in His holy hands, and looked up to heaven to Thee, holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave that which was broken to His Apostles and His disciples, saying, 'Take and eat ye all of this; for this is My body, which will be broken for many'. In like manner also after supper on the day before He suffered He took the cup, and looked up to heaven to Thee, holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, and gave thanks, and blessed, and gave to His Apostles and His disciples, saying, 'Take and drink ye all of this; for this is My blood'. Behold all this. The words of the Evangelist go as far as 'Take' both in the case of the body and in the case of the blood. Thus the words of Christ are, 'Take and drink ye all of this; for this is My blood'. And mark the separate words. 'Who on the day before He suffered took bread in His holy hands.' Before it is consecrated it is bread; but when the words of Christ have been added it is the body of Christ. Again, hear Him saying, 'Take and eat ye all of it; for this is My body'. Before the words of Christ the cup is full of wine and water; when the words of Christ have operated there is made (*efficitur*) the blood of Christ, which redeemed the people."¹

And in a *Homily* preached at Antioch about 395, St. Chrysostom, who elsewhere refers to the consecration as effected by the descent of the Holy Ghost,² speaks of Christ as the consecrator and of the words of institution as the means of consecration.³

Thus, there is evidence of different customs from different quarters. In Italy in the fourth century the consecration was associated with the recitation of our Lord's words at the institution of the Sacrament. In Egypt the invocation of the Word, and later the invocation of the Holy Ghost, was regarded as the distinctive act of consecration. In Syria, most of the evidence connects the consecration with the invocation of the Holy Ghost, but one passage in St. Cyril of Jerusalem refers it to the invocation of the Holy Trinity, and one passage in St. Chrysostom to the words of institution.

The prayer of consecration in the Syrian or Cilician document

¹ iv. 21-23.

² See p. 85, *supra*.

³ *De prod. Jud.* i. 6, quoted on p. 104, *infra*; cf. ii. 6.

The Testament of our Lord has important characteristics ; and part of it may for that reason be cited here. It is to be noticed that what corresponds to the invocation is addressed to the Holy Trinity, and expresses the prayer that the elements may be beneficial to the communicants without any explicit request for their transformation into the body and blood of Christ. After the recital of the words of institution and the commemoration of our Lord's death and resurrection, the bishop is directed to say:—

“We offer to Thee this thanksgiving, Eternal Trinity, O Lord Jesus Christ, O Lord the Father before whom all creation and every nature trembleth fleeing into itself, O Lord the Holy Ghost ; we have brought this drink and this food of Thy Holiness ; cause that it be to us not for condemnation, not for reproach, not for destruction, but for the medicine and support of our spirit. Yea, O God, grant us that by Thy name every thought of things displeasing to Thee may flee away. . . . Feed the people in uprightness ; sanctify us all, O God ; but grant that all who partake and receive of Thy holy things may be made one with Thee, so that they may be filled with the Holy Ghost, for the confirmation of the faith in truth.”¹

6. There are many examples of teaching that the presence and gift are of a spiritual character. Instances may be given from the writings of Eusebius of Cæsarea, St. Athanasius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine.

In his book *On the Theology of the Church*, Eusebius quotes from Marcellus of Ancyra an argument based on our Lord's words, “The flesh profiteth nothing,”² to the effect that since the flesh is profitless it is unreasonable to suppose that the Word permanently preserves His union with it. In refutation of this argument Eusebius writes:—

“But do you, receiving the Scriptures of the Gospels, perceive the whole teaching of our Saviour, that He did not speak concerning the flesh which He had taken but concerning His mystic body and blood. For when He had sustained the multitudes with the five loaves, and in this had shown a great wonder to those who beheld it, very many of the Jews despised what was done and said to Him, ‘What then doest thou for a sign, that we may see, and believe?’

¹ i. 23.

² St. John vi. 63.

and then mentioned the manna which was in the wilderness, saying, 'Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, as it is written, He gave them bread out of heaven to eat'. To this the Saviour answered, 'It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven; but My Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven'. Then He adds, 'I am the bread of life,' and again, 'I am the bread which came down out of heaven,' and again, 'The bread which I will give is My body (σῶμα),'¹ and He adds again, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is true food, and My blood is true drink. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him.' When He had discussed these and such things more mystically, some of His disciples said, 'The saying is hard; who can hear it?' The Saviour answered them, saying, 'Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where He was before? The Spirit is the life-giver; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.' In this way He instructed them to understand spiritually (πνευματικῶς) the words which He had spoken concerning His flesh and His blood; for, He says, you must not consider Me to speak of the flesh with which I am clothed (ἦν περικεμαι), as if you were to eat that, nor suppose that I command you to drink perceptible and corporal (σωματικόν) blood; but know well that 'the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life,' so that the words themselves and the discourses themselves are the flesh and the blood, of which he who always partakes, as one fed on heavenly bread, will be a partaker of heavenly life. Therefore, He says, let not this cause you to stumble which I have spoken concerning the eating of My flesh and concerning the drinking of My blood; nor let the offhand (πρόχειρος) hearing of what I have said about flesh and blood disturb you; for these things 'profit nothing' if they are understood according to sense (αἰσθητῶς); but the Spirit is the life-giver to those who are able to understand spiritually (πνευματικῶς)."²

In one of the *Epistles to Serapion* by St. Athanasius there is an important passage on the spiritual meaning of our Lord's words. St. Athanasius is discussing "the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,"³ and in commenting on the distinction between

¹ In St. John vi. 51 the word is "flesh" (σάρξ).

² iii. 11, 12.

³ St. Matt. xii. 32; St. Mark iii. 29, 30; St. Luke xii. 10.

speaking against the Son of man and speaking against the Holy Ghost explains that "the Son of man" denotes our Lord's human nature, and that "the Holy Spirit" denotes His divine Person. To illustrate this interpretation he refers to the words, "What then if ye should see the Son of man ascending where He was before? The Spirit is the life-giver";¹ and proceeds to explain the meaning of our Lord's discourse at Capernaum as being that the flesh manifested in His earthly life is to be given as food to each Christian, that the gift of it is to be in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the purpose of the gift is to preserve unto eternal life.

"Here also He has used both terms about Himself, namely flesh and spirit; and He distinguished the spirit from what relates to the flesh in order that they might believe not only in what was visible in Him but also in what was invisible, and might thereby learn that what He says is not fleshly but spiritual. For how many would the body suffice for eating, that it should become the food of the whole world? But for this reason He made mention of the ascension of the Son of man into heaven, in order that He might draw them away from the bodily notion, and that from henceforth they might learn that the aforesaid flesh was heavenly eating from above and spiritual food given by Him. For, He says, what I have spoken unto you is spirit and life, as much as to say, That which is manifested, and is given for the salvation of the world, is the flesh which I wear. But this and its blood shall be given to you by Me spiritually as food, so that this may be imparted (*ἀναδιδοσθαί*) spiritually to each one, and may become to all a preservative for resurrection to eternal life."²

So also in one of his *Festal Epistles* St. Athanasius emphasises the need of faith, saying:—

"Let us mortify our members which are on the earth, and be nourished with living bread—by faith and love to God—knowing that without faith it is impossible to be partakers of such bread as this."³

With this teaching of St. Athanasius it is well to compare some sentences in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem which indicate that the gift is of a spiritual kind affecting the whole nature of the recipients.

¹ St. John vi. 62, 63.

² iv. 19.

³ vii. 7.

“Christ in discussion with the Jews said, ‘Except ye eat My flesh and drink My blood, ye have not life in yourselves’. They not having understood His words spiritually were offended and went back, supposing that He was urging them to eat flesh. In the old covenant also there was the shew-bread; but this as belonging to the old covenant has come to an end. But in the new covenant there is heavenly bread and a cup of salvation, sanctifying soul and body. For as the bread corresponds to the body, so also the Word is appropriate to the soul.”¹

“‘Give us this day our substantial (ἐπιούσιον) bread.’ This common bread is not substantial (ἐπιούσιος), but this holy bread is substantial (ἐπιούσιος), that is, appointed for the substance (οὐσία) of the soul. For this bread does not go into the belly, and is not cast out into the draught; but it is imparted (ἀναδίδοται) to your whole system (σύστασις) for the benefit of body and soul.”²

A like thought as to the spiritual character of the presence and gift occurs in a passage of St. Chrysostom where he is emphasising to the full the wonder and sanctity of the Sacrament. In one of the *Homilies on St. Matthew* he says:—

“How much purer than the rays of the sun ought to be the hand which divides this flesh, the mouth that is filled with spiritual fire, the tongue that is reddened with most awful blood.”³

St. Ambrose also joins to the strong assertions in his book *On the Mysteries* that the bread and wine become at the consecration the body and blood of Christ a reference to the spiritual character of the Eucharistic food.

“In that Sacrament is Christ, because it is the body of Christ. Therefore it is not bodily food, but spiritual. Whence also the Apostle says of the type of it, ‘Our fathers ate spiritual food and drank spiritual drink’.⁴ For the body of God is a spiritual body; the body of Christ is the body of the divine Spirit, because the Spirit is Christ.”⁵

There are elements in the teaching of St. Augustine which need notice in the same connection. In one of his *Sermons*, while commenting on the discourse at Capernaum, he mentions the difficulty felt by some of the disciples, and says:—

“What then does He answer? ‘Does this make you stumble? What then if ye shall see the Son of man ascending where He was

¹ xxii. 4, 5. ² xxiii. 15. ³ lxxxii. 5. ⁴ 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. ⁵ § 58.

before?’ What does He mean by ‘Does this make you stumble?’ Do you think that of this body of Mine which ye see I shall make pieces, and cut up My limbs, and give them to you? What does He mean by ‘If then ye shall see the Son of man ascending where He was before?’ Certainly He who could ascend whole could not be consumed. Therefore He both gave to us healthful nourishment from His body and blood and in a few words solved so great a question about His wholeness. Therefore let those eat who eat, and let those drink who drink; let them be hungry and thirsty; let them eat life, let them drink life. To eat this is to be nourished; but so are you nourished that the source of your nourishment does not fail. To drink this, what is it but to live? Eat life, drink life; you will have life, and yet the life is whole. Then this will happen, that is, the body and blood of Christ will be life to each one, if what is visibly received in the Sacrament is spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk in very truth.”¹

There is a longer exposition of the same discourse in St. Augustine’s *Treatise on the Gospel of St. John*, where the ideas of feeding on Christ by faith and the need of spiritual union with Christ if sacramental communion is to be profitable cross and recross the conception of the Eucharist as the body and blood of Christ.

“‘Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent.’ This then is to eat the food which does not perish but ‘abideth unto eternal life’. Why do you prepare teeth and stomach? Believe and you have eaten.”²

“The Lord said that He is the bread which cometh down from heaven, exhorting us to believe in Him. For to believe in Him is to eat the living bread. He who believes eats; he is invisibly fed because he is invisibly reborn.”³

“We to-day receive visible food; but the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament is another. How many there are who receive from the altar and die, who die through receiving. Whence the Apostle says, ‘He eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself’.⁴ For the sop of the Lord was not poison when given to Judas. And yet he received it, and when he received it the enemy entered into him; not because he received what was evil but because being evil he received in an evil way that which was good.

¹ cxxxi. 1.² xxv. 12.³ xxvi. 1.⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

Take heed then brethren, eat the heavenly bread spiritually, bring innocence to the altar." ¹

"'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die.' Yes, but he who eats that which pertains to the virtue of the Sacrament, not that which pertains to the visible Sacrament; who eats within, not without; who eats in the heart, not he who presses with the teeth." ²

"'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life.' He then has it not who does not eat that bread or drink that blood; for men can have the life of time without this, but eternal life they certainly cannot have. He then who does not eat His flesh and drink His blood has not life in Himself; and he who eats His flesh and drinks His blood has life. And in each case the word which He used 'eternal' applies. It is not so with this food which we receive for the purpose of sustaining this life of ours in time. For he who shall not have received it will not live; but it does not follow that he who shall have received it will live. For it can come to pass that very many who have received it die from old age or disease or some accident. But in the case of this food and drink, that is, the body and blood of the Lord, it is not so. For both he who receives it not has not life, and he who receives it has life, and that too eternal. And so He wishes this food and drink to be understood to mean the participation (*societatem*) of His body and His members, because the Holy Church is in His saints and faithful ones who are predestined and called and justified and glorified. Of which the first has already taken place, that is, the predestination; the second and third have taken place and are doing so and will do so, that is, the calling and justifying; the fourth now exists in hope but has yet to be in fact, that is, the glorifying. The Sacrament of this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, in some places daily, in other places on certain selected days, is made ready on the Table of the Lord, and is received from the Table of the Lord, by some to life, by others to destruction; but the thing itself, of which this is the Sacrament, is to every man to life, to none to destruction, whoever shall have been partaker of it." ³

"He explains how it is that what He speaks of happens, and the meaning of eating His body and drinking His blood. 'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me, and I in Him.' This then is to eat that food and to drink that drink, to abide in Christ, and to have Him abiding in oneself. And in this way he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not

¹ xxvi. 11.

² xxvi. 12.

³ xxvi. 15.

abide, without doubt neither eats His flesh nor drinks His blood, but rather to His own judgment eats and drinks the Sacrament of so great a thing."¹

"What is the meaning of 'The flesh profiteth nothing'? It is true that the flesh profiteth nothing, but only when the flesh is understood as they understood it; for they regarded the flesh as it is cut up in a corpse or sold in the market, not as it is given life by the Spirit. . . . 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' but that is the flesh alone; let the Spirit be added to the flesh, . . . and it profiteth much. . . . As they understood the flesh, not so do I give My flesh to be eaten."²

"All this which the Lord spake about His body and His blood, and His promise of eternal life to us in the grace of the administration of it; and that He willed the eaters and drinkers of His flesh and blood to be understood in this way, that they should abide in Him and He in them; and that those who did not believe did not understand; and that they were caused to stumble through interpreting spiritual things in a carnal sense; and that when they were caused to stumble and were perishing the Lord allowed consolation to the disciples who had remained, whom He asked for the purpose of proving them, 'Would ye also go away?' so that the answer that they would remain might be known to us; for He knew that they would remain;—all this should have the effect on us, dearly beloved, that we should not eat the flesh of Christ and the blood of Christ only in the Sacrament, which many also who are evil do; but we should eat and drink with spiritual participation (*usque ad spiritus participationem*), so that we may abide as limbs in the body of the Lord, so that we may be given life by His Spirit, and may not be caused to stumble, even if many now eat and drink with us the Sacraments in time, who at the last will enter eternal torments. For now the body of Christ is mixed as in the threshing floor; but the Lord knoweth who are His."³

7. The quotations which have been made from the writings of St. Augustine, notably the last, serve to illustrate the close connection which existed in his thought between the Eucharist as the body of Christ and the Church as His mystical body. Further illustrations of this particular point may be seen in the three following passages from his *Sermons*.

¹ xxvi. 18. This is the passage from which, in the form in which it was interpolated by some writers in the Middle Ages, a quotation is made in the Twenty-ninth Article of the Church of England. See p. 200, and vol. ii. p. 209, *infra*.

² xxvii. 5.

³ xxvii. 11.

“That virtue which is there (in the Eucharist) understood is unity, that being joined to His body and made His limbs we may be that which we receive.”¹

“I promised you, who have been baptised, a sermon in which I would explain the Sacrament of the Lord’s Table, the Sacrament which now also you see, of which last night you became partakers. You ought to know what you have received, what you are about to receive, what you ought to receive daily. That bread which you see on the altar, having been consecrated by means of the word of God, is the body of Christ. That cup, or rather what the cup contains, having been consecrated by means of the word of God, is the blood of Christ. In this way the Lord willed to impart His body and His blood, which He shed for us for the remission of sins. If you have received well, you are that which you have received.”²

“That which you see is bread and the cup, which even your eyes declare to you ; but as to that in which your faith demands instruction, the bread is the body of Christ, the cup is the blood of Christ, . . . Such a thought as this may occur in some one’s mind. Our Lord Jesus Christ—we know whence He received flesh, of the Virgin Mary. As a babe He was suckled, was nourished, grew, . . . He was slain, . . . He rose again, . . . He ascended into heaven, . . . there He is now sitting at the right hand of the Father: how is the bread His body? How is the cup, or that which the cup contains, His blood? Brethren, these things are called Sacraments for this reason, that in them one thing is seen, another thing is understood. That which is seen has bodily appearance; that which is understood has spiritual fruit. If you wish to understand the body of Christ hear the Apostle speaking to the faithful, ‘Now ye are the body and members of Christ’.³ If you then are the body and members of Christ, your mystery is laid on the Table of the Lord, your mystery you receive. To that which you are you answer Amen, and in answering you assent. For you hear the words, The body of Christ; and you answer Amen. Be a member of the body of Christ, that the Amen may be true. Wherefore then in the bread? Let us assert nothing of our own here; let us listen to the reiterated teaching of the Apostle, who when he spoke of this Sacrament said, ‘We who are many are one bread, one body’;⁴ understand and rejoice; unity, truth, goodness, love. ‘One bread.’ What is that one bread? ‘Many are one body.’ Remember that the bread is not made from one grain but

¹lvii. 7.²ccxxvii.³1 Cor. xii. 27.⁴1 Cor. x. 17.

from many. When ye were exorcised, ye were so to speak ground. When ye were baptised, ye were so to speak sprinkled. When ye received the fire of the Holy Ghost, ye were so to speak cooked. Be what you see, and receive what you are. This the Apostle spake of the bread. What we are now to understand about the cup, though it is not spoken, he shows with sufficient clearness. . . . Brethren, recall whence the wine is made. Many grapes hang on the cluster, but the juice of the grapes is gathered together in unity. So also the Lord Christ signified us, wished us to belong to Him, consecrated on His Table the mystery of our peace and unity." ¹

Thus in the teaching of St. Augustine there are three very closely connected but not identical ideas as to the reception of the body of Christ. The consecrated elements are Christ's body and blood. Those who receive the elements have already been made the members of Christ by means of Baptism. In the reception they are His body.

An illustration of a similar line of thought may be taken from St. Chrysostom. In his exposition of the teaching of St. Paul that the Eucharistic bread is "a communion of the body of Christ," St. Chrysostom writes:—

"What is the meaning of 'a communion'? We are that body itself. For what is the bread? The body of Christ. And what do they who partake become? The body of Christ, not many bodies but one body." ²

So also Theodoret, commenting on the same passage in St. Paul's Epistle, says:—

"Do not we who receive the holy mysteries communicate of the Lord Himself, whose body and blood we say we are, since we all partake of the one bread?" ³

8. Illustrations have been given of teaching as to the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence and the relation of the body of Christ in the Eucharist to the Church as the mystical body of Christ. With this teaching it is well to link a distinction found in the writings of St. Jerome between different senses of the phrase, the body of Christ. As a prelude to the consideration of a remarkable passage in which this distinction is clearly stated, other passages referring to the Eu-

¹ cclxxii.

² In 1 Cor. Hom. xxiv. 2.

³ On 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

charist in the writings of St. Jerome may be mentioned. St. Jerome incidentally describes the reserved Sacrament, when being carried to the sick, as "the body of the Lord" and His "blood".¹ He affirms that all communicants "equally" receive "the body of Christ," although "that which is one becomes different in proportion to the merits of the recipients".² He draws a contrast between the typical presentation of Melchizedek and the presentation of Christ "in the reality of His body and blood,"³ and maintains that "there is as much difference between the shew-bread and the body of Christ as there is between a shadow and bodies, between an image and the reality, between the patterns of future things and those very things which were prefigured by the patterns".⁴ These statements must be viewed in the light of the passage previously mentioned, where St. Jerome explains that there is the same kind of difference between the body of Christ in the days of His earthly life and the spiritual body which is received in the Eucharist as there is between the flesh of the saints while on earth and that flesh wherewith they will behold God in heaven. His words are :—

"Who is He, they say, who is so great and of such a nature as to be able to redeem the whole world by the ransom which He pays? Jesus Christ the Son of God gave His own blood, and delivered us from slavery, and bestowed freedom on us. And in truth, if we believe the histories of the heathen, that Codrus and Curtius and the Decii Mures put an end to pestilences in cities and famines and wars by their deaths, how much more must it be held possible in the case of the Son of God that by His blood He cleansed not one city only but the whole world? But the blood of Christ and the flesh of Christ are to be understood in two ways. There is that spiritual and divine flesh and blood of which He said, 'My flesh is truly food, and My blood is truly drink,' and 'Except ye shall have eaten My flesh and drunk My blood, ye shall not have eternal life'. There is also the flesh which was crucified and the blood which flowed forth from the wound made by the soldier's lance. According to this distinction a difference of blood and flesh is understood also in the case of His saints, so that there is one flesh which will

¹ *Ep.* cxxv. 20.

² *Adv. Jovin.* ii. 25.

³ *Comm. in Mat.* on xxvi. 26, "Ut . . . ipse quoque in veritate sui corporis et sanguinis representaret". On *represso* see pp. 32, 33, *supra*.

⁴ *Comm. in Tit.* on i. 8, 9.

see the salvation of God, and there is another flesh and blood which cannot possess the kingdom of God." ¹

This passage is of great significance as emphasising that the body and blood of the Eucharist are those of the risen and ascended Christ, and bringing in all the distinctions between the nature and possibilities of flesh and blood in the earthly state of humiliation and those in the heavenly state of glory on which St. Paul lays stress in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.²

9. In the period now under review there is but little attempt to explain the method of the relation of the presence of the body and blood of Christ to the elements of bread and wine. The writers who say anything bearing on this subject may be divided into two groups,—those who push the connection between the Incarnation and the Eucharist in the direction of emphasising the abiding reality of the elements of bread and wine, and those who tend towards affirming a change in the elements themselves.

(a) Before the end of the fifth century four writers lay stress on the continued existence of the bread and wine in the Eucharist as parallel to the abiding reality of the manhood of Christ in His incarnate life.

Nestorius was a native of Germanicia, who became Patriarch of Constantinople in 428, was deposed in 431 as a consequence of his failure to clear himself from the heretical denial of the one Person of our Lord, and died about the middle of the fifth century. In a recently discovered Syriac version of a work by him, known as the *Bazaar of Heraclides*, he maintains that the bread in the Eucharist remains bread after consecration, as the body of our Lord remains body in His incarnate life. He suggests the answer No to the inquiry:—

“Is the bread the body of Christ by a change of *ousia*, or are we His body by a change, or is the body of the Son of God one in nature with God the Word?”

and says:—

¹ *Comm. in Eph.* on i. 7. On the effect of the Resurrection, and consequently eventually of the Incarnation, on the body of Christ, compare, e.g., St. Athanasius, *Ep. ad Epictetum*, 9; St. Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, xiii. 23 (2).

² 1 Cor. xv. 35-54.

“How is it that, when He said over the bread ‘This is My body,’ He did not say that the bread was not bread and His body not body? But He said ‘bread’ and ‘body’ as showing what it is in *ousia*. But we are aware that the bread is bread in nature and in *ousia*. Yet Cyril¹ wishes to persuade us to believe that the bread is His body by faith and not by nature: that what it is not as to *ousia*, this it becomes by faith.”²

Theodoret was born at Antioch near the end of the fourth century, became Bishop of Cyrrhus in the north of Syria about 342, and died about 457. One of his works consists of three dialogues between a Eutychian heretic and an orthodox divine. In the course of the second of these dialogues the orthodox divine maintains against the Eutychian that the body of the Lord continues really to exist after the resurrection and ascension, although it has become incorruptible, impassible, and glorious. As part of his contention he introduces the subject of the Eucharist, and the following discussion is represented as taking place:—

“*Orth.*—Tell me now; the mystic symbols which are offered to God by those who perform priestly rites, of what are they symbols?

“*Eran.*—Of the body and blood of the Lord.

“*Orth.*—Is it really the body, or is it not really so?

“*Eran.*—It is really the body.

“*Orth.*—Good. For the image must have its archetype. For painters also imitate nature, and depict the images of the things that are seen.

“*Eran.*—True.

“*Orth.*—If then the divine mysteries are antitypes of that which is really the body, therefore even now the body of the Lord is a body, not changed into the nature of Godhead but filled with divine glory.

¹That is, St. Cyril of Alexandria; see p. 105, *infra*.

²The above quotations are made from the English translation of a part of the *Bazaar of Heraclides* in Bethune Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, pp. 145, 146. It is hoped that an edition of the Syriac text may be published by Father Ermoni of Paris. Nestorius elsewhere laid stress on our Lord having referred to that which is eaten by Christians as His flesh, not His Godhead: see Loofs, *Nestoriana*, pp. 227-30, and the quotation in St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Adv. Nest.* iv. 5 (Aubert, t. vi. p. 114). Mr. Bethune Baker in the above work gives his reasons for his opinion that Nestorius was not a “Nestorian”.

"*Eran.*—Opportunely have you introduced the subject of the divine mysteries. For from this I will show you the change of the Lord's body into another nature. Answer then my questions.

"*Orth.*—I will answer.

"*Eran.*—Before the priestly invocation what do you call the gift that is offered?

"*Orth.*—It is not right to say clearly; for perhaps some who are uninitiated are present.

"*Eran.*—Let your answer be phrased enigmatically.

"*Orth.*—Food of such and such grain.

"*Eran.*—And by what name do we call the other symbol?

"*Orth.*—This name too is common, signifying a kind of drink.

"*Eran.*—But after the consecration what do you call these?

"*Orth.*—The body of Christ and the blood of Christ.

"*Eran.*—And do you believe that you partake of the body of Christ and of His blood?

"*Orth.*—I do so believe.

"*Eran.*—As then the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are one thing before the priestly invocation, and after the invocation are changed and become different, so the body of the Lord after the ascension was changed into the divine substance.

"*Orth.*—You are caught in the net of your own weaving. For even after the consecration the mystic symbols do not depart from their own nature. For they remain in their previous substance and figure and form; and they are visible and tangible as they were before. But they are regarded as being what they have become, and they are believed so to be, and they are worshipped as being those things which they are believed to be."¹

In this discussion it is important to observe the points in which the disputants agree, and those in which they differ. Both the Eutychian heretic and the Catholic theologian agree that after the consecration by the priestly invocation the Eucharistic elements are the body and blood of Christ; and that this presence of the body and blood is effected by means of the consecration. They differ in this respect. The Eutychian maintains that after the ascension the body of Christ is changed into the divine nature so as to be no longer a human body, and after the consecration the elements are changed into the body and blood of Christ so as to be no longer bread and wine. The Catholic maintains that after the ascension the body of Christ still

¹ *Dial.* ii. (t. iv. pp. 125, 126, Schulze; *P.G.* t. lxxxiii. col. 165-68).

remains a human body, although it is now incorruptible and glorious, and after the consecration the elements still continue to be bread and wine in substance and figure and form, although they are also the body and blood of Christ.

Similarly, in the first *Dialogue* the Catholic theologian says that

“Our Saviour changed the names, and placed upon the body the name of the symbol and upon the symbol the name of the body. Thus He called Himself a vine and spoke of the symbol as blood. . . . He wished those who partake of the divine mysteries not to give heed to the nature of the visible objects, but by means of the interchange of the names to believe the change that is wrought by His grace. For He who spoke of his natural body as corn and bread, and again named Himself a vine, dignified the visible symbols by the name of the body and the blood, not changing their nature but adding the grace to the nature.”¹

In a letter against the Monophysite heresy, which has been ascribed to St. Chrysostom, but is probably of the latter half of the fifth century, an argument in regard to the Incarnation is derived from the continued existence of the bread in the Eucharist after consecration:—

“As before the bread is consecrated we call it bread, but after the grace of God has consecrated it through the agency of the priest it is no longer called bread but counted worthy of the name of the body of the Lord, although the nature of bread remains in it, and we speak not of two bodies but of one body of the Son, so in this case when the divine nature was united to the body the two natures made one Son, one Person.”²

The same line of thought is found also in Gelasius, who was Pope of Rome from 492 to 496. In his treatise *On the Two Natures in Christ* a comparison is made between the Incarnation and the Eucharist. Pope Gelasius is there defending against the Eutychians the doctrine of the abiding reality of the human nature of Christ affirmed by the Council of Chalcedon; and he introduces an argument from the Eucharist in much the same way as the Catholic theologian in the *Dialogue* of Theodoret and the writer of the letter ascribed to St. Chrysostom. The

¹ *Dial.* i. (t. iv. p. 26, Schulze; *P.G.* t. lxxxiii. col. 56).

² *Inter Opp. S. Chrys.*, Benedictine edition, iii. 744; *P.G.* lii. 758.

one Person of Christ, he maintains, is abidingly in the two unimpaired natures of manhood and Godhead. In like manner there are in the Eucharist both the body and blood of Christ and the substance and nature of bread and wine.

“The Sacrament which we receive of the body and blood of Christ is a divine thing. Wherefore also by means of it we are made partakers of the divine nature. Yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine does not cease to be. And certainly the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ is set out in the celebration of the mysteries. Therefore it is plainly enough shown to us that we must think this in the case of the Lord Christ Himself which we confess, celebrate, and receive in the case of the image of Him. Thus, as the elements pass into this, that is the divine, substance by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and none the less remain in their own proper nature, so they show that the principal mystery itself, the efficacy and virtue of which they truly make present (*repræsentant*) to us, consists in this, that the two natures remain each in its own proper being so that there is one Christ because He is whole and real.”¹

(b) On the other hand there are writers whose tendency is to minimise any continuance of the elements of bread and wine after the consecration, and to approximate towards some form of the doctrine known in later times as the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

There are sentences in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem which, if taken by themselves, might be held to imply such a physical change in the elements as requires the cessation of the existence of the bread and wine after consecration. When they are viewed in relation to the statements which St. Cyril elsewhere makes that the consecrated elements are not “simple” or “bare” bread and wine,² such an explanation of them may be thought to be precluded; but it may still

¹ See Thiel, *Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum Genuinæ*, i. 541, 542. The passage is also in *Bibl. Patrum*, v. 475 (1575 A.D.), iv. 565 (1589 A.D.), viii. 703 (1677 A.D.); Routh, *Script. Eccl. Opusc.* ii. 493. That Pope Gelasius is the author has been disputed: see Bellarmine, *De Sac. Euch.* ii. 27; Migne, *P.L.* lix. 11, 12 (b). But there appear to be good grounds for ascribing it to him: see Thiel, *op. cit.* pp. 73-77; Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*, deuxième série, pp. 327-29.

² See p. 71, *supra*.

fairly be said that their tendency is to make the continued existence of the elements of but little importance. They therefore to some extent supply a contrast to the line of thought which underlies the arguments used in the treatises of Theodoret and Gelasius.

“He once at Cana in Galilee changed the water into wine, akin to blood (*οικείον αἵματι*: another reading is *οικείω νεύματι*, by His own will); and is it incredible that He should change (*μεταβαλὼν*) wine into blood? When He was called to a bodily marriage, He wrought this wonderful miracle; and shall it not much rather be acknowledged that He bestowed on the sons of the bridechamber the fruition of His body and blood? Wherefore with full assurance let us partake as of the body and blood of Christ; for in the figure (*τύπη*) of bread is given to thee the body, and in the figure (*τύπη*) of wine is given to thee the blood, in order that by partaking of the body and blood of Christ thou mayest become of one body and of one blood with Him (*σύνσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ*). For so also do we become Christbearers (*χριστοφόροι*), since His body and blood are distributed throughout our members. Thus according to the saying of the blessed Peter,¹ we become partakers of the divine nature.”²

“The seeming (*φαινόμενος*) bread is not bread, even though it is sensible to the taste, but the body of Christ, and the seeming (*φαινόμενος*) wine is not wine, even though the taste will have it so, but the blood of Christ.”³

“Trust not the judgment to thy bodily palate; no, but to unflinching faith; for they who taste are bidden to taste not bread and wine but the antitype (*ἀντιτύπου*)⁴ of the body and blood of Christ.”⁵

St. Gregory of Nyssa teaches with great definiteness that by the consecration the elements are transmuted (*μεταποιεῖσθαι*) and transelemented (*μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι*) into the body and blood of Christ as in the ordinary processes of life bread and wine are transmuted into body and blood by consumption, digestion, and assimilation, and as in our Lord's incarnate life the bread which He ate was transmuted into His body.⁶ In his use of the words “transmuted” and “transelemented” and in his whole argument he appears to contemplate such a physical change in the ele-

¹ 2 St. Pet. i. 4.

² xxii. 2, 3.

³ xxii. 9.

⁴ See pp. 64, 66, 67, *supra*.

⁵ xxiii. 20.

⁶ See pp. 72, 73, *supra*.

ments as takes place "when the constituent elements (*στοιχία*) of bread and wine are, in the process of digestion, rearranged under a new form (*εἶδος*), so that they acquire the properties of 'body'".¹ Thus, the "form," as distinct from the "substance," of the bread and wine is changed, so as to be that of the body and blood of Christ. The idea is parallel to, but different from, the later Western doctrine of Transubstantiation, according to which the change is in the "substance" of the elements. The differences between St. Gregory's view and this later doctrine, real as they are, pertain rather to different methods of philosophical thought than to essential theological principle.

The nature of the effect of consecration on the elements is treated with less detail by St. Chrysostom and St. Cyril of Alexandria than by St. Gregory of Nyssa, and it is not probable that they had bestowed much thought on the connected philosophical subjects; but some such general notion as that maintained by St. Gregory of a new "form" given by consecration to the bread and wine may underlie words which they use. Thus St. Chrysostom applies to the body of Christ what properly refers to the outward element when he says that Christ's "flesh" is "divided" in Communion;² and that Christ, "enduring to be broken that He may fill all," "suffers" in the Eucharist "that which He did not suffer on the cross"³ and writes of the elements being "re-ordered" and "transformed" by the act of consecration.

"Christ now also is present. He who adorned that table is He who now also adorns this. For it is not man who makes the gifts that are set forth to become the body and blood of Christ; but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling a figure, speaking those words, but the power and grace are of God. This is My body, he says. This word re-orders (*μεταρρυθμίζει*) the gifts that are set forth."⁴

"He who then did those things at that Supper is He who now also accomplishes them. We hold the rank of ministers. But it is He who consecrates and transforms (*μετασκευάζων*) them."⁵

¹ Srawley, *The Catechetical Oration of St. Gregory of Nyssa*, p. xxxix. See also Harnack, *History of Dogma* (English translation), iv. 296.

² *In Mat. Hom.* lxxxii. 5.

³ *In 1 Cor. Hom.* xxiv. 2.

⁴ *De prod. Jud.* i. 6; *cf.* ii. 6.

⁵ *In Mat. Hom.* lxxxii. 5.

St. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of the elements being "transferred".

"That we may not be stupefied by seeing flesh and blood lying on the holy Tables of the churches, God, condescending to our infirmities, sends the power of life into the gifts that are set forth and transfers (*μεθίστησιν*) them into the efficacy (*ἐνεργείαν*) of His own flesh, that we may have them for lifegiving participation, and that the body of the Life may be found in us as a lifegiving seed." ¹

If a fragment ascribed to Isidore of Pelusium is really his, he wrote, in language going somewhat beyond that of St. Chrysostom, of the body of the Lord being subjected to the teeth and dissolved in the mouth.²

Some such general idea again of a change of "form" rather than a change of "substance" may underlie the assertions of St. Ambrose that the effect of consecration is to "transform," and of the writer of the book *On the Sacraments* that the elements continue to exist and yet are changed. St. Ambrose writes:—

"The Sacraments" "by means of the mystery of the holy prayer are transformed (*transfigurantur*) into flesh and blood."³

The writer of *On the Sacraments* says:—

"If then there is such power in the word of the Lord Jesus that those things which were not should begin to be, how much more is it operative that the things which were should still be and should be changed into something else. The heaven was not; the sea was not; the earth was not; but hear David saying, 'He spake and they were made; He commanded and they were created'. Therefore, that I may answer thee, it was not the body of Christ before the consecration; but after the consecration I say to thee that it is now the body of Christ."⁴

It is not to be supposed that all the writers in either group viewed the effect of consecration on the elements in exactly the same light, or that this question had received any very careful consideration; but there is little room for doubt that there were tendencies at work in two different directions among those who

¹ *In Luc.* on xxii. 19, 20.

² See *Ep.* xxxiv. ascribed to Michael Glycas; *cf.* *P.G.* xciv. 399.

³ *De fide*, iv. 124.

⁴ iv. 15, 16.

agreed that the consecrated elements were the body and blood of Christ,—the tendency to lay great stress on the continued existence of the bread and wine with all their natural properties wholly unaltered, and the tendency to minimise the importance of any such continuance or to affirm an actual change in them.

10. The attitude of reverence towards the Holy Eucharist and the practice of adoration of our Lord in it are occasionally referred to in this period.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* instructs the newly baptised to receive the Holy Communion with great care and reverence.

“Make thy left hand a throne for thy right, as for that which is to receive a king. And hollowing thy palm receive the body of Christ, saying over it the Amen. Hallow then with care thine eyes by the touch of the holy body, and partake of it, giving heed lest thou lose any part of it; for whatever thou shouldst lose would be evidently a loss to thee as from one of thine own members. For tell me, if any one gave thee grains of gold, wouldest thou not hold them with all care, taking heed lest thou shouldst lose any of them and suffer loss? Wilt thou not much more carefully be on thy guard lest a crumb fall from thee of what is more precious than gold and precious stones? Then, after thou hast made thy communion of the body of Christ, draw near also to the cup of His blood, not stretching out thy hands, but bending and in an attitude of reverence and worship saying the Amen, hallow thyself by partaking also of the blood of Christ.”¹

St. Gregory of Nazianzus, writing with apparent reference to the Sacrament reserved in church, speaks of “Him who is honoured” upon the altar. His sister Gorgonia, he says, in a time of great illness—

“Despairing of any other help, betook herself to the Physician of all, and waiting for the dead of night, at a slight intermission of the disease fell before the altar with faith, and, calling on Him who is honoured thereon with a great cry and with every kind of entreaty, and pleading with Him by all His mighty acts accomplished at any time, for she knew both those of ancient and those of later times, at last ventured on an act of pious and splendid boldness; she imitated the woman the fountain of whose blood was dried up by the

¹ xxiii. 21, 22.

hem of Christ's garment.¹ What did she do? Placing her head on the altar with another great cry and with a wealth of tears, like one who of old bedewed the feet of Christ,² and declaring that she would not let go until she was made well, she then applied to her whole body this medicine which she had, even such a portion of the antitypes³ of the honourable body and blood as she treasured in her hand, and mingled with this act her tears. O the wonder of it! She went away at once perceiving that she was healed, with the lightness of health in body and soul and mind, having received that which she hoped for as the reward of hope, and having gained strength of body through her strength of soul. These things indeed are great, but they are true."⁴

Passages in the *Homilies* of St. Chrysostom imply that his hearers were familiar with the practice of adoring the sacramental presence of our Lord.

"This body even when lying in the manger the Magi revered. Heathen and foreign men left their country and their home, and went a long journey, and came and worshipped Him with fear and much trembling. Let us then, the citizens of heaven, imitate these foreigners. For they approached with great awe when they saw Him in the manger and in the cell, and saw Him in no way such as thou dost see Him now. For thou dost see Him not in a manger but on an altar, not with a woman holding Him but with a priest standing before Him, and the Spirit descending upon the offerings with great bounty. . . . For as in the palaces of kings what is most splendid of all is not the walls, or the golden roof, but the body of the king sitting on the throne, so also in heaven there is the body of the King; but this thou mayest now behold on earth. For I show to thee not angels, nor archangels, nor the heaven, nor the heaven of heavens, but Him who is the Lord of these Himself."⁵

"Not in vain do we at the holy mysteries make mention of the departed, and draw near on their behalf, beseeching the Lamb who is lying on the altar, who took away the sin of the world."⁶

Theodoret in a passage which has already been quoted represents the Catholic theologian in his discussion with the Eutychian heretic as appealing to what is evidently common

¹ St. Matt. ix. 20-22; St. Mark v. 25-34; St. Luke viii. 43-48.

² St. Luke vii. 38. ³ See p. 64, *supra*. ⁴ *Orat.* viii. 18.

⁵ *In 1 Cor. Hom.* xxiv. 5.

⁶ *Ibid.* xli. 4.

ground when he says that the consecrated Sacrament is "worshipped" as being the body and blood of Christ.¹

The speech addressed by St. Ambrose to the Emperor Theodosius, recorded by Theodoret, when he forbade him to receive the Holy Communion or enter the Church at Milan after the massacre at Thessalonica, expresses a similar sense of the reverence due to the consecrated Sacrament as that in the *Catechetical Lectures* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

"With what eyes will you look on the temple of our common Lord? With what feet will you tread that holy threshold? How will you stretch out the hands that are still dripping with the blood of your unjust slaughter? How will you receive with such hands the all-holy body of the Lord? How will you raise to your mouth the precious blood when in your rage you have transgressed by shedding so much blood?"²

In his treatise *Of the Holy Ghost* St. Ambrose refers more definitely to the adoration of our Lord in the Eucharist. Quoting a verse of the ninety-ninth Psalm as it is in the Septuagint and the Latin versions, "Worship His footstool, for it is holy,"³ he explains the "footstool" to mean the incarnate Lord and the worship to be such as the Apostles gave to Him "when He rose again in the glory of the flesh". This worship of Christ is right and due because of His Godhead. Earth in general may not be worshipped, because it is a creature of God. But, he continues:—

"Let us see whether the prophet does not say that that earth is to be adored which the Lord Jesus took when He put on flesh. And so by 'footstool' is understood earth, but by earth the flesh of Christ, which to this day we adore in the mysteries, which the Apostles, as we have said above, adored in the Lord Jesus. For Christ is not divided but is one; and when He is adored as the Son of God it is not denied that He was born of the Virgin."⁴

In commenting on the same Psalm St. Augustine, like St. Ambrose, quotes the verse as "Worship His footstool, for it is holy". The "footstool," he says, means earth. There is then the difficulty how the earth may be worshipped, since God is the right Object of worship. This difficulty is solved by the Incar-

¹ See p. 100, *supra*.

³ Ps. xcix. 5.

² Theodoret, *H.E.* v. 18.

⁴ *De Spir. Sanc.* iii. 76-80.

nation, through which it becomes possible for earth to be worshipped without impiety. For our Lord, St. Augustine goes on to say :—

“took earth from earth, because flesh is of earth, and from the flesh of Mary He received flesh. And because He lived here in the flesh itself, and gave the flesh itself for us to eat for our salvation, and because no one eats that flesh without first adoring, a way has been found in which such a footstool of the Lord may be adored and in which we not only do not sin if we adore but should sin if we did not adore.”¹

II.

To the doctrine in regard to the presence and gift in the Holy Eucharist found during the period of the great Councils must be added the teaching of the same period about the Eucharistic sacrifice.

1. The general sacrificial phraseology, often incidentally introduced, which has already been noticed in the period preceding the Council of Nicæa, is continued during this later period, and illustrations of it may be given from writers of both East and West.

In the eighteenth canon of the Council of Nicæa deacons are described as “those who have not authority to offer” in distinction from presbyters, who are referred to as “those who offer”.

Eusebius of Cæsarea repeatedly alludes to the Eucharist as a “sacrifice” or the “memory” or “memorial” of a “sacrifice”. Jews and Gentiles, he says, who have alike received the benefits of Christ’s atonement—

“are right in celebrating daily the memory of Him and the memorial of His body and blood; and, being admitted to the sacrifice and priestly ministration which are better than those of ancient times, we deem it no longer holy to fall back to the first and weak elements, which were symbols and images but did not embrace the truth itself.”²

He describes how our Lord—

“offered to the Father on behalf of the salvation of us all a wonderful sacrifice and unique victim, and delivered to us a memory to offer continually to God in the place of a sacrifice.”³

¹ *In Ps. xcvi. Enar.* 9. ² *Dem. Evang.* I. x. 18. ³ *Ibid.* 25.

After referring to the work of Christ as the accomplishment of that which was foreshadowed in the sacrifices of the Old Testament, he says :—

“ Having then received the memory of this sacrifice to celebrate upon the Table by means of the symbols of His body and His saving blood, according to the laws of the new covenant, we are again taught by the prophet David to say :—

“ Thou hast prepared a table before me in the sight of mine adversaries :

“ Thou hast anointed my head with oil ; and Thy cup cheering me, how good it is.’¹

“ Plainly then are here signified the mystic chrism and the solemn sacrifices of the Table of Christ, through which in our happy sacrificial rites (*καλλιερούντες*) we have been taught to offer all life long bloodless and reasonable and acceptable sacrifices to the supreme God through His High Priest, who is over all. . . . These spiritual sacrifices (*ἀσωματόντων καὶ νοεράς θυσίας*) again the words of the prophet proclaim, saying in a certain place :—

“ Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise ;
And pay thy vows to the Most High ;
And call upon Me in the day of trouble ;
And I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me.’²

“ And again,

“ The lifting up of my hands the evening sacrifice.’³

“ And again,

“ A sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit.’⁴

“ All these things then, which were divinely foretold of old, are being celebrated among all the nations at the present time through the teaching of our Saviour in the Gospels, the truth bearing witness to the prophetic voice by which God rejecting the sacrifices of the law of Moses proclaims that which is to be among ourselves, saying, ‘ From the rising of the sun even unto its setting My name has been glorified among the nations ; and in every place incense is offered unto My name, and a pure sacrifice ’.⁵ We sacrifice then to the supreme God a sacrifice of praise ; we sacrifice the divine and solemn and most holy sacrifice ; we sacrifice in a new way according to the new covenant the pure sacrifice. ‘ A contrite heart ’ has been called ‘ a sacrifice to God ’. ‘ A contrite and humbled heart God will not despise.’⁶ And moreover we burn the incense

¹ Ps. xxiii. 5.

² Ps. l. 14, 15.

³ Ps. cxli. 2.

⁴ Ps. li. 17.

⁵ Mal. i. 11.

⁶ Ps. li. 17.

spoken of by the prophet, in every place bringing to Him the sweet smelling fruit of the excellent theology, offering it by means of our prayers to Him. This also another prophet teaches in saying,

“Let my prayer be as incense before Thee.”¹

“We then both sacrifice and burn incense, celebrating the memory of the great sacrifice in the mysteries which He has delivered to us and bringing to God our thanksgiving for our salvation (τὴν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν) by means of pious hymns and prayers, and also wholly dedicating ourselves to Him and to His High Priest, the Word Himself, making our offering (ἀνακέμενοι) in body and soul.”²

“Our Saviour Jesus, the Christ of God, after the manner of Melchizedek still even now accomplishes by means of His ministers the rites of His priestly work among men. For as that priest of the Gentiles never seems to have used bodily sacrifices, but only wine and bread when He blessed Abraham, so our Saviour and Lord Himself first, and then all the priests who in succession from Him are throughout all the nations, celebrating the spiritual priestly work in accordance with the laws of the Church, represent (αἰνίττονται) with wine and bread the mysteries of His body and saving blood.”³

In one of his *Festal Epistles* St. Athanasius uses phraseology of this same general character.

“For no longer were these things done at Jerusalem which is beneath; neither was it considered that the feast should be celebrated there alone; but wherever God willed it to be. Now He willed it to be in every place, so that in every place incense and a sacrifice might be offered to Him.”⁴

And in a fragment ascribed to St. Athanasius in a sermon by St. John of Damascus⁵ it is said that “the divine and bloodless sacrifice is a propitiation.”⁶

The *Liturgical Prayers* of Serapion contain before the recital of the institution of the Eucharist the words:—

“O Lord of Hosts, fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation; for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering”;

and between the recital of the institution and the invocation of the Word,

¹ Ps. cxli. 2.

² *Dem. Evang.* I. x. 28-38.

³ *Ibid.* V. iii. 18, 19.

⁴ *iv.* 4.

⁵ *De his qui in fide dormierunt*, 19.

⁶ *P.G.* xxvi. 1249, xc. 265.

"we have offered the bread, and beseech Thee through this sacrifice. . . . We have offered also the cup." ¹

St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* speaks of the Eucharist as "the spiritual sacrifice, the bloodless service," "that sacrifice of propitiation," "this sacrifice," "the holy and most awful sacrifice" ²

St. Gregory of Nazianzus in defending his flight to avoid exercising the office of the priesthood writes :—

"I then knowing these things, and that no one is worthy of the great God and the sacrifice and the High Priest who has not first offered Himself to God a living sacrifice and holy, and set forth the reasonable and acceptable service, and sacrificed to God the sacrifice of praise and a contrite spirit, which is the only sacrifice which He who giveth all demands from us, how was I to take courage to offer to Him the external sacrifice (τὴν ἑξωθεν, sc. θυσίαν), the antitype of the great mysteries, or how was I to put on the fashion and name of a priest before I had consecrated my hands by holy works?" ³

The writings of St. Chrysostom abound in references to the "sacrifice," the "memorial of the sacrifice," the "victim," and to the action of "offering" in the Holy Eucharist. ⁴

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* the Eucharist is incidentally referred to as a sacrifice, and is said to be offered; ⁵ and the following passage on the sacrificial character of Christian worship occurs in the second book :—

"You therefore to-day, O bishops, are to your people priests and Levites, who minister to the holy tabernacle, the Holy Catholic Church, and stand at the altar of the Lord our God, and offer to Him the reasonable and bloodless sacrifices through Jesus the great High Priest. . . . Hear this, you of the laity also, the elect Church of God. For the people were formerly called the people of God and a holy nation. You, therefore, are the holy and sacred Church of God, 'enrolled in heaven,' 'a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession,' ⁶ 'a bride adorned' ⁷ for the Lord God, a great Church, a faithful Church. Harken now to what was said

¹ § 1.

² xxiii. 8, 9.

³ *Orat.* ii. 95.

⁴ See, e.g., *De Sac.* iii. 4; *In Ps.* cxl. 4; *In Act. Hom.* xxi. 4; *In Heb. Hom.* xvii. 3.

⁵ ii. 57, 58; viii. 12, 13.

⁶ Heb. xii. 23; 1 St. Peter ii. 9.

⁷ νύμφη κεκαλλωπισμένη; cf. ἡτοιμασμένην ὡς νύμφην κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς in Rev. xxi. 2.

formerly. Offerings and tithes belong to Christ the High Priest and to His ministers. . . . Those which then were sacrifices are now prayers and supplications and thanksgivings; those which then were first fruits and tithes and offerings and gifts are now oblations, which are offered by the ministry of the holy bishops to the Lord God through Jesus Christ, who died for them. For these are your high priests, and the presbyters are your priests, and your Levites are the present deacons and your readers and the singers and the doorkeepers and your deaconesses and the widows and the virgins and your orphans. But the high priest, who is above all these, is the bishop.”¹

St. Cyril of Alexandria in his *Homily on the Mystic Supper* describes the Eucharist as “the priestly work of the awful sacrifice,” and refers to our Lord in connection with it as “the priest and the sacrifice” “who offers and is offered”.²

There is like terminology in the West. A canon of the Council of Arles, held in 314 A.D., like the Council of Nicæa eleven years later in the East,³ incidentally contains the word “offer” to describe the work of the presbyters which the deacons might not perform.⁴ St. Optatus of Milevis uses the words “sacrifice” and “offer” in regard to the Eucharist.⁵ St. Ambrose says that it is part of the work of the Christian ministry to “offer sacrifice for the people”; that Christ “is Himself offered on earth when the body of Christ is offered”; and that the word of Christ “consecrates the sacrifice which is offered”.⁶ St. Augustine refers to the Eucharist as “the sacrifice of our redemption,” “the sacrifice of the Mediator,” “the sacrifice of peace,” “the sacrifice of love,” “the sacrifice of the body and blood of the Lord,” “the sacrifice of the Church”.⁷ St. Leo speaks of “the offering of the sacrifice” as an act of Christian worship.⁸

As in the earlier period, this constant use of sacrificial language in reference to the Eucharist is unaccompanied by any explicit and detailed explanation of the way in which the Eucharist

¹ ii. 25.

² T. v. (2), pp. 377, 378, Aubert; P.G. t. lxxvii. col. 1028, 1029.

³ See p. 109, *supra*.

⁴ Canon 15.

⁵ ii. 12.

⁶ In Ps. xxxviii. Enar. 25.

⁷ Conf. ix. 32; Enchir. 110; In Ps. xxi. Enar. ii. 28; In Ps. xxxiii. Enar. i. 5; De civ. Dei, x. 20.

⁸ Serm. xxvi. 1, xci. 3.

is a sacrifice. Yet there are not wanting lines of thought which tend towards suggesting some explanation; and these are harmonious with what has already been noticed in the earlier period.

2. The memorial in the Eucharist is sometimes connected with the passion and death of Christ.

St. Athanasius in one of his *Festal Letters*, while drawing a contrast between Jewish and Christian rites, says of Christians, with apparent reference to the Eucharist, that they are—

“no longer slaying a material lamb, but that true Lamb which was slain, even our Lord Jesus Christ, who was led as a sheep to the slaughter and was dumb before her shearers; being purified by His precious blood.”¹

In the *Liturgical Prayers* of Serapion “the likeness of the death” is said to be made when the sacrifice is offered.²

St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his last *Catechetical Lecture*, after referring several times to the Eucharist as a sacrifice, and after speaking of the benefit which accrues through it to the faithful departed, imagines an objector asking what good commemoration in the prayer of the Church can do to a soul which has departed from this world, and proceeds to reply to this possible objection:—

“If a king were to banish men who had given him offence, and then their relatives were to weave a crown and offer it to him on behalf of those under punishment, would he not grant to them a remission of the penalties? In the same way we also, when we offer our supplications to Him on behalf of those who have fallen asleep, even though they be sinners, weave no crown, but offer Christ sacrificed on behalf of our sins, propitiating the merciful God for them as well as for ourselves.”³

St. Gregory of Nazianzus, with apparent reference to a sacrificial commemoration of the death of Christ, writes of the “bloodless cutting” with which “the Lord’s body and blood” are “severed” by the “sword” of the priest’s voice in the consecration of the Eucharist.⁴

St. Chrysostom very closely connects the Eucharistic sacrifice with the passion and death of our Lord.

¹ i. 9. ² § 1. ³ xxiii. 10. ⁴ *Ep.* clxxi. quoted on p. 71, *supra*.

“Him who was nailed to the Cross we are to see as a Lamb slaughtered and sacrificed. . . . When thou seest the Sheep sacrificed and completely offered. . . . He was slain for thee, and thou neglectest to see Him sacrificed. . . . Think what that is which has been shed. It is blood, blood, which blotted out the hand-writing of our sins, blood, which cleansed thy soul, which washed away the stain, which triumphed over the principalities and the powers. . . . He made a show openly, triumphing on the Cross.”¹

“Reverence then, reverence this Table, of which we all have communion, Christ slain on our behalf, the sacrifice that is laid upon it.”²

“We offer, making a memorial of His death. . . . Our High Priest is He who offered the sacrifice which cleanses us. We offer also now that which was then offered, which cannot be exhausted.”³

In a sermon which has been ascribed to St. Chrysostom, but which Dr. Loofs and Mr. Bethune Baker concur in regarding as by Nestorius, there is a reference, similar to that by St. Gregory of Nazianzus, to the prayer at the consecration as a sword. “Christ,” it is said, “is crucified in symbol (*κατὰ τὸν τύπον*), being slain by the sword of the prayer of the priest.”⁴

The *Apostolic Constitutions* represent the Eucharist as a commemoration of our Lord’s passion and death.⁵

In the West this connection of the Eucharistic sacrifice with the passion and death of Christ is found in St. Ambrose and St. Augustine. The saying of St. Ambrose that “Christ” “is offered as Man, as taking on Himself suffering (*recipiens passionem*),”⁶ probably refers rather to the taking of a nature capable of suffering in the Incarnation than to the passion and death in particular; but the same writer elsewhere explicitly states that in the Eucharist “we proclaim the death of the Lord.”⁷ St. Augustine, after referring to Communion, says that our Lord—

“made Himself low that man might eat the bread of angels, and ‘taking the form of a slave, being made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, being

¹ *De coem. et cruc.* 3. ² *In Rom. Hom.* viii. 8. ³ *In Heb. Hom.* xvii. 3.

⁴ *Inter opera S. Chrys.*, P.G. lxiv. 489; cf. Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 241; Bethune Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, p. 112.

⁵ viii. 12, quoted on p. 86, *supra*.

⁶ *De off.* i. 248.

⁷ *De fide*, iv. 124.

made obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross,'¹ that now from the cross the flesh and blood of the Lord might be commended to us as a new sacrifice."²

3. The Eucharist is regarded as a presentation, not only of our Lord's death, but also of His resurrection and ascension and heavenly life.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus lays strong stress on the heavenly realities of which earthly rites are the figure, to share in which the earthly rites are designed to lead; and on the Eucharistic memorial of the whole life of the Lord.

"Will they keep us from the altars? But I know of another altar, of which those things which now are seen are the types, to which no axe or hand went up, on which no iron was heard, nor any work of the craftsmen or men of skill, but all is accomplished by the mind, and the ascent is by means of contemplation. At this will I stand, at this will I offer acceptable gifts, sacrifice, and offering, and burnt offerings, better than those which now are offered, as the reality is better than the shadow."³

"We will partake of the passover, still now after the fashion of a type, yet more plainly than under the ancient law. . . . Let us make the head, not the earthly Jerusalem but the heavenly City, not that which is trodden under foot by armies but that which is glorified by angels. Let us sacrifice not young calves or lambs with horns and hoofs, of which much is without life and feeling; but let us sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise upon the heavenly altar with the heavenly dances; let us hold aside the first veil, let us approach the second and look into the holy of holies. To speak of what is greater, let us sacrifice ourselves to God, or rather let us continue sacrificing throughout every day and at every movement. Let us accept all things for the sake of the Word. By sufferings let us imitate His suffering. By blood let us honour His blood. With ready mind let us ascend His cross. . . . Keep the feast of the resurrection. . . . If He descend into Hades, go down with Him. Learn there also the mysteries of Christ. . . . And if He ascend into heaven, go up with Him."⁴

The teaching of St. Gregory of Nazianzus thus carries on the ante-Nicene idea of the one sacrifice of Christ which, abidingly presented in heaven, gathers into itself earthly worship

¹ Phil. ii. 7, 8.

² *In Ps. xxxiii. Enar.* i. 6.

³ *Orat.* xxvi. 16.

⁴ *Ibid.* xlv. 23-25.

and life, and pre-eminently the Eucharistic oblation in which the Church offers to God the whole life of Christ as well as His death. The same idea is found in St. Chrysostom. After referring to the emphasis laid by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the truth of the one sacrifice of Christ, he proceeds:—

“What then? Do we not offer every day? Certainly we so offer, making a memorial of His death. And this is one, and not many. How is it one, and not many? Inasmuch as it was once offered, as that which was carried into the holy of holies. This [the Jewish sacrifice] is a type of that [the sacrifice of Christ], and this [the sacrifice in the Church] of that [the sacrifice of Christ]. For we ever offer the same Person, not to-day one sheep and to-morrow another, but ever the same offering. Therefore the sacrifice is one. By this reasoning then, since the offering is made in many places, does it follow that there are many Christs? By no means. For Christ is everywhere one, complete here and complete there, one body. As then when offered in many places He is one body and not many bodies, so also there is one sacrifice. Our High Priest is He who offered the sacrifice which cleanses us. We offer also now that which was then offered, which cannot be exhausted. This is done for a memorial of that which was then done. For ‘do this,’ He said, ‘for My memorial’. We do not offer another sacrifice, as the high priest of old, but we ever offer the same; or rather we make the memorial of the sacrifice.”¹

With this strong emphasis on the unity of the sacrifice must be compared passages in which St. Chrysostom is no less emphatic that the centre of the sacrificial worship of Christians is in heaven, and that all true Christian life is a sacrificial offering.

“Our High Priest is in heaven, and far better than those among the Jews, not only in the kind of priesthood but also in the place and the tabernacle and the covenant and the Person. . . . We have our victim in heaven, our Priest in heaven, our sacrifice in heaven. Let us then present such sacrifices as can be offered on that altar, no longer sheep and oxen, no longer blood and steaming fat. All these things have been done away, and in their place the reasonable service has been brought in. What is the reasonable service? The offerings made through the soul, through the spirit. ‘God,’ it is said, ‘is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and

¹ *In Heb. Hom. xvii. 3.*

truth,'¹ things which need no body or instruments or places, such as gentleness, restraint, mercy, endurance of evil, long-suffering, lowliness of mind."²

"Do not thou, because thou hearest that He sitteth, suppose that His being called High Priest is idle talk. For the former, His sitting, pertains to the dignity which He has as God, and the latter [His being called High Priest] pertains to His love for man and His care for us. For this reason he elaborates this point, and dwells upon it; for he was afraid lest the other truth [that of the Godhead of Christ as shown in His sitting] should overthrow this [the fact of His being a High Priest]. Therefore he again brings the discourse to this subject, since some were inquiring for what reason He died being a Priest. Now there is no priest without a sacrifice. Therefore He also must have a sacrifice. And in another way: having said that He is in heaven, he says and shows that He is a Priest from every consideration, from Melchizedek, from the oath, from offering sacrifice. . . . What are the heavenly things which he here speaks of? The spiritual things. For though they are celebrated on earth, yet they are worthy of heaven. For when our Lord Jesus lies as a slain victim, when the Spirit is present, when He who sits on the right hand of the Father is here, when sons are made by the Washing, when they are fellow-citizens of those in heaven, when we have a country in heaven and a city and a citizenship, when we are strangers as to things on earth, how can all this fail to be heavenly? What? Are not our hymns heavenly? Is it not true that those very songs which the divine choirs of the angel hosts sing in heaven are the songs which we who are on earth utter in harmony with them? Is not the altar also of heaven? How? It has nothing carnal. All the oblations become spiritual. The sacrifice does not disperse into ashes or smoke or steaming fat; but it makes the oblations bright and splendid. But how can the rites be other than of heaven, when those who minister in them still hear who it was that said, 'Whose ye retain, they are retained; and whose ye remit, they are remitted'.³ When these possess even the keys of heaven, how can all things fail to be of heaven?"⁴

"When thou seest the Lord sacrificed and lying as an oblation, and the priest standing by the sacrifice and praying, and all things reddened with that precious blood, dost thou think that thou art still among men and standing on earth? Nay, art thou not straightway translated to heaven, so as to cast every carnal thought

¹ St. John iv. 24.

² In *Heb. Hom.* xi. 2, 3.

³ St. John xx. 23.

⁴ In *Heb. Hom.* xiv. 1, 2.

out of thy soul, and with unimpeded soul and clean mind to behold the things that are in heaven?"¹

The *Apostolic Constitutions* add to the mention of our Lord's passion and death the commemoration of His "resurrection from the dead and ascent into heaven, and His future second coming".²

Like the connection of the Eucharistic sacrifice with the passion and death of Christ, this association with our Lord's risen and ascended life finds expression in the West in the writings of St. Ambrose, in the treatise *On the Sacraments*, and in the works of St. Augustine. St. Ambrose is fond of contrasting the "shadow" (*umbra*) in the Jewish law, the "image" or "symbol" (*imago*) in Christian worship, and the "reality" (*veritas*) which is in heaven. With this contrast in mind, he writes:—

"Now has the shadow of night and of Jewish darkness passed by, the day of the Church has come. Now we see what is good by means of symbol, and we hold fast the good which is in the symbol. We have seen the High Priest coming to us; we have seen and heard Him offering His own blood for us: we priests, as we are able, follow, that we may offer sacrifice for the people, though weak in our deserts yet honourable in our sacrifice, because, although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet He Himself is offered on earth when the body of Christ is offered; nay, He Himself is shown to offer among us, since His word consecrates the sacrifice which is offered. And He Himself indeed stands as an Advocate for us with the Father; but now we see Him not; then shall we see, when the symbol has passed away and the reality has come. Then at length, not by a mirror but face to face, will those things which are perfect be seen."³

"Here the shadow, here the symbol, there the reality. The shadow in the law, the symbol in the Gospel, the reality in heaven. Formerly a lamb was offered and a calf was offered; now Christ is offered. But He is offered as Man, as one taking on Himself suffering (*recipiens passionem*); and He offers Himself as High Priest, that He may forgive our sins, here in symbol, in reality there where He pleads with the Father for us as Advocate."⁴

In another passage St. Ambrose closely connects the passion and the offering in heaven:—

¹ *De Sac.* iii. 4.

² viii. 12, quoted on p. 86, *supra*.

³ *In Ps. xxxviii. Enar.* 25.

⁴ *De off.* i. 248.

“A priest must offer something, and in accordance with the Law enter into the holy places by means of blood. Therefore, since God had rejected the blood of bulls and goats, it was needful for this Priest also, as you have read, to make entrance into the supreme holy of holies in heaven by means of His own blood, that the offering for our sins might be for ever. Therefore the Priest and the Victim are one and the same; and yet the sacrifice is performed in the state of manhood, for He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and He is a Priest after the order of Melchizedek.”¹

This association with the resurrection and ascension and heavenly life of our Lord, as well as with His passion, is very clearly shown in the portion of the canon of the Mass quoted in the treatise *On the Sacraments*, which probably represents the Liturgy used in North Italy about 400. Here there is first the specific commemoration of the passion and resurrection and ascension; this is followed by the prayer for the reception of the sacrifice on the heavenly altar; and there is afterwards the allusion to the gifts of Abel typifying the ungrudging dedication of what costs most, the sacrifice of Abraham prefiguring the death on the cross, and the offering of Melchizedek representing the pleading of Christ as the High Priest in heaven.

“Therefore mindful of His most glorious passion and His resurrection from the dead and His ascension into heaven, we offer unto Thee this spotless offering, a reasonable offering, a bloodless offering, this holy bread and the cup of eternal life; and we pray and implore that Thou mayest receive this offering on Thy altar on high by the hands of Thy angels, as Thou didst deign to receive the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham and the offering which the high priest Melchizedek offered to Thee.”²

St. Augustine closely connects the Eucharistic altar on earth with the altar of our Lord's offering in heaven; regards our Lord's heavenly work as the fulfilment of the type in the sacrifice which the Jewish high priest offered in the holy of holies; and speaks of the approach to the earthly altar as symbolic both of the present access of Christians to our Lord in heaven and of their future entrance therein.

“There is also an altar before the eyes of God, whither the Priest has entered who first offered Himself for us. There is an

¹ *De fide*, iii. 87.

² *De Sacr.* iv. 27.

altar in heaven ; and no one touches that altar who does not wash his hands in innocency. For many who are unworthy touch this altar on earth ; and God endures that His Sacraments suffer outrage for a time.”¹

“That the forgiveness of God may be obtained, propitiation is made by a sacrifice. Therefore there is One who is our Priest, who was sent by the Lord God, who took from us what He should offer to the Lord, that is the holy firstfruits of flesh from the virgin’s womb. This burnt-offering He offered to God ; He stretched out His hands on the cross. . . . He hung on the cross, and propitiation was made for our wickedness. . . . Thou art the Priest, Thou art the Victim ; Thou art the Offerer, Thou art That which is offered. He is Himself the Priest who has now entered into the parts within the veil, and alone there of those who have worn flesh makes intercession for us. In the type of which thing in that first people and in that first temple, one priest entered into the holy of holies, all the people stood without, and he who alone entered into the parts within the veil offered sacrifice for the people standing without. . . . Propitiation having been made for our sins and iniquities by that evening sacrifice [that is, the sacrifice on the cross], we go unto the Lord, and the veil is taken away. On this account also, when the Lord was crucified, the veil of the temple was rent.”²

“This altar, which is now set in the Church on earth for celebrating the symbols of the divine mysteries, exposed to earthly eyes, many even of the wicked can approach. . . . But that altar whither the forerunner Jesus has entered on our behalf, whither the Head of the Church has gone before, while the rest of the members are to follow, none of those can approach of whom, as I have already related, the Apostle said, ‘those who do such things shall not possess the kingdom of God’.³ For the Priest alone, yet clearly there the whole Priest, will stand, that is with the body added of which He is the Head, which has already ascended into heaven.”⁴

4. The Christian’s act in offering the sacrifice is represented as culminating in his Communion as uniting him to our once slain but now living Lord.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus describes the Eucharist as—

“The bloodless sacrifice, by which we partake of Christ both as to His sufferings and as to His Godhead.”⁵

¹ *In Ps. xxv. Enar.* ii. 10.

² *In Ps. lxiv. Enar.* 6.

³ *Gal.* v. 21.

⁴ *Serm. cccli.* 7.

⁵ *Orat.* iv. 52.

St. Chrysostom uses to "touch" or "partake of" or "receive" the "sacrifice" as phrases denoting the reception of Communion.

"Be mindful, O man, what sacrifice thou art about to touch, what Table thou art about to approach; bethink thee that thou, who art earth and ashes, dost receive the blood and body of Christ. . . . When we receive the spotless and holy sacrifice, let us kiss it tenderly, let us embrace it with our eyes, let us kindle our minds."¹

"It is needful to cleanse the conscience and then to touch the holy sacrifice. For he who is polluted and unclean ought not even on a festival to partake of that holy and awful flesh, while he who is clean and has washed off his transgressions by careful penitence both on a festival and always may rightly partake of the divine mysteries and is worthy to enjoy the gifts of God."²

"This [that is, the tongue] is the member by which we receive the awful sacrifice."³

"Many partake of this sacrifice once in the whole year, others twice, others often."⁴

St. Ambrose associates the proclamation of the death of the Lord in the Eucharist with the act of Communion.

"As often as we receive the Sacrament which by means of the mystery of the holy prayer is transfigured into flesh and blood, we proclaim the death of the Lord."⁵

St. Augustine connects communion with God with his definition of sacrifice, and makes the reception of Communion part of the Christian sacrificial action.

"The fact that by the ancient fathers such sacrifices were offered in the victims of beasts, which the people of God now reads of but does not offer, is to be understood in no other way than that by those things are signified these which are celebrated among us with this intent that we may be united (*inhæreamus*) to God, and that we may promote for our neighbour a like union. A sacrifice therefore is a visible sacrament, that is a sacred sign, of an invisible sacrifice. Whence that penitent in the prophet or the prophet himself seeking to have God propitious to his sins says, 'If Thou hadst willed sacrifice, I would indeed have given it, Thou wilt not de-

¹ *In diem nat. D.N.J.C.* 7.

² *De bapt. Chr.* 4.

³ *In Ps. cxl.* 4.

⁴ *In Heb. Hom.* xvii. 4.

⁵ *De fid.* iv. 124.

light in burnt offerings. A sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit ; a contrite and humbled heart God will not despise.¹ Let us observe how, where he said that God wills not sacrifice, there he shows that God wills sacrifice. He then does not will the sacrifice of a slain beast, but He wills the sacrifice of a contrite heart. . . . That which is called by all men a sacrifice is a sign of a real sacrifice. Now mercy is a real sacrifice ; whence is that said which I quoted just now, 'For with such sacrifices God is well pleased'.² Whatever things then in the service of the tabernacle or of the temple in many ways concerning sacrifices are said to have been commanded by God are understood to signify love to God and one's neighbour. For 'In these two commandments,' as has been written, 'hangeeth the whole Law and the prophets'.³ Therefore every work which is done in order that we may be united (*in hæreamus*) in holy fellowship to God, that is in regard to that end of good whereby we may be truly happy, is a real sacrifice."⁴

Elsewhere St. Augustine, after explaining that the one true sacrifice which Christ offered was foreshadowed in different ways among heathen and Jews, adds :—

"Wherefore now Christians celebrate the memorial of the same accomplished sacrifice by the most holy offering and reception of the body and blood of Christ."⁵

5. The last quotation but one from St. Augustine is pervaded by a favourite thought of this Father, that the true sacrifice is the dedication of self to God. This idea runs through Christian theology as a whole. Instances of it in an earlier period have already been referred to.⁶ It is emphasised in close connection with the Eucharist in this period in passages which have been quoted from the Eastern Fathers St. Gregory of Nazianzus⁷ and St. Chrysostom.⁸ But it finds its most characteristic expression in the repeated teaching of St. Augustine that in the Eucharist is the sacrifice of the Church and of Christians.

"The whole redeemed City itself, that is the congregation and society of the saints, is offered as a universal sacrifice to God by the High Priest, who offered even Himself in suffering for us in the form of a servant, that we might be the body of so great a Head. For this form of a servant did He offer, in this was He offered ; for

¹ Ps. li. 16, 17.

² Heb. xiii. 16.

³ St. Matt. xxii. 40.

⁴ *De civ. Dei*, x. 5, 6.

⁵ *C. Faust.* xx. 18.

⁶ See p. 45, *supra*.

⁷ See pp. 112, 116, *supra*.

⁸ See pp. 122, 123, *supra*.

in this is He mediator and priest and sacrifice. And so when the Apostle exhorted us that we should present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God, our reasonable service, and that we be not conformed to this world but reformed in the newness of our mind, to prove what is the will of God, that which is good and well-pleasing and complete, which whole sacrifice we ourselves are. . . . This is the sacrifice of Christians: 'the many one body in Christ'. Which also the Church celebrates in the Sacrament of the altar, familiar to the faithful, where it is shown to her that in this thing which she offers she herself is offered." ¹

After making the distinction that our Lord receives sacrifice in His Godhead and in His Manhood is Himself the sacrifice, he says:—

"Thus is He priest, Himself offering, Himself also that which is offered. Of this thing He willed the sacrifice of the Church to be the daily Sacrament; and the Church, since she is the body of the Head Himself, learns to offer herself through Him." ²

Later in the same treatise is the sentence—

"We ourselves, that is His City, and His most splendid and best sacrifice, of which we celebrate the mystery in our oblations which are known to the faithful." ³

In the course of his explanation that the sacrifice is offered only to God, and not to the martyrs who are commemorated in the offering of it, he writes:—

"The sacrifice itself is the body of Christ, which is not offered to them, because they themselves are it." ⁴

III.

It is convenient to take separately from the evidence hitherto under review the writings of Aphraates and St. Ephraim the Syrian, a correspondence between Peter Mongus and Acacius of Constantinople, and a Latin *Homily* of uncertain date and authorship.

1. The two Syrian writers, Aphraates and St. Ephraim the Syrian, are naturally considered in close connection with one another. Aphraates was a monk and bishop in East Syria in the first half of the fourth century. St. Ephraim the Syrian was

¹ *De civ. Dei*, x. 6.

³ *Ibid.* xix. 23 (5).

² *Op. cit.* x. 20.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxii. 10.

born later than 306 and died about 373. The greater part of his life was spent at Nisibis and Edessa.

Aphraates says that the body and blood of Christ are received in the Eucharist, that Christ at the institution gave His body for food and His blood for drink, and gave His body with His hands, that He now gives the bread of life, and gives us His body, and that there is sacrifice in the Church.¹ The passages which most distinctly connect the presence of the body and blood of Christ with the elements are the following:—

“There is one door to your house, the house that is the temple of God; and it is not seemly for thee, O man, that filth and mire should come out from the door by which the King enters. For when a man abstains from all evil deeds and receives the body and blood of Christ, he ought to guard his mouth, by which the Son of the King enters.”²

“Our Lord arose from the place where He had kept the pass-over and had given His body to be eaten and His blood to be drunk, and went with His disciples to the place where He was taken. Now one who has eaten his own body and drunk his own blood is accounted among the dead. And our Lord with His own hands gave His body to be eaten, and before He was crucified gave His blood to be drunk.”³

St. Ephraim the Syrian refers to the body of Christ as the means of nourishing and perfecting Christians. He regarded the consecrated elements as the means of receiving the body of Christ and as made to be His body and blood. He believed that the presence of Christ's body was withdrawn from the elements in the event of an unworthy Communion.

“He spat on His fingers and placed them in the ears of the deaf man; and He made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man. So He taught us that there was defect in the ears of the deaf man, as there was fault in the eyeballs of the man who was born blind. Therefore by leaven from the body of Him who completes was that which was lacking in our frame supplied. For it was not fitting that our Lord should cut off anything from His body to supply that which was lacking in other bodies; but with what could be taken away from His body He supplied the

¹ *Demonstr.* iii. 2, iv. 19, vii. 21, xii. 6, 8, 9, xxi. 9, 10 (*Graffin's Patrologia Syriaca*, i. 101, 181, 349, 517, 524, 525, 528, 957, 960).

² *Demonstr.* iii. 2 (*Patr. Syr.* i. 101). ³ *Ibid.* xii. 6 (*Patr. Syr.* i. 517).

deficiency of those who lacked, as mortals eat Him in that which can be eaten." ¹

"He dipped the bread and gave it to the thief. . . . He dipped the bread and gave it to him who was secretly dead; the bread was that from which the medicine of life had been washed away." ²

"He washed away the medicine of life from the unleavened bread; He gave it to Judas as a medicine of death." ³

The foregoing quotations are from works which in the judgment of Dr. Burkitt, ⁴ a very severe critic, may be cited with security as by St. Ephraim; with them may be compared three other passages, containing like doctrine and referring also to the reception of the Holy Ghost in the Eucharist, the first from a work found in several MSS. the oldest of which is of the ninth century, the second and third from a work found in a MS. of the fourteenth century. ⁵

"When the leper was purified, the priest sealed him with oil, and brought him to the spring. The figure has passed; the reality has come. Behold, ye are sealed with oil; in Baptism ye are completed; ye are joined to the flock; with the body are ye nourished." ⁶

"Jesus took in His hands mere bread at first, and blessed it, and signed it, and consecrated it in the name of the Father and in the name of the Spirit, and brake it, and distributed it severally to His disciples in His compassion. He called the bread His living body, and He filled it with Himself and the Spirit; and stretching out His hand gave to them the bread which His right hand had consecrated, saying, Take, eat ye all of this which My word has consecrated. This which I have now given to you, regard not as bread; ⁷ eat this bread, and waste not the crumbs of it; that which I have called My body is really so. For the least crumb of it sanctifies many thousands, and is sufficient to give life to all who eat it. Take, eat in faith, nothing doubting that this is My body, and that he who eats it in faith eats it in fire and the Spirit. If any one eats

¹ *Serm. de Dom. nostro*, 11 (Lamy's edition, i. 171).

² *Hymni Azymorum*, xiv. 13, 15 (Lamy, i. 603).

³ *Ibid.* xviii. 16 (Lamy, i. 623).

⁴ *Cambridge, Texts and Studies*, vii. 2, pp. 24, 25.

⁵ See Lamy, i. 1, 2, 339, 340.

⁶ *Hymni in fest. Epiph.* iii. 17 (Lamy, i. 37).

⁷ Compare some of the phraseology of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, quoted on pp. 102, 103, *supra*.

it doubting, to him it is mere bread ; but he who eats in faith the bread which has been consecrated in My name, if he is holy, his holiness is preserved, if he is a sinner, he is pardoned. But he who despises it, or slights it, or treats it with contempt, let him know that he treats the Son with contempt, who called the bread His body and actually made it so to be. Take of it, eat ye all of it, and in it eat the Holy Ghost ; for it is really My body.”¹

“After the disciples had eaten the new and holy bread, and perceived and believed by it that they had eaten the body of Christ, Christ went on to unfold and deliver the whole Sacrament. He took and mingled the cup of wine ; then He blessed it, and signed it, and consecrated it, acknowledging it as His blood which was to be poured out. Then, extending His right hand towards Simon, He gave to him first the cup, that from it he might partake of that which had been blessed ; then He gave it to him who was next to Him. Then they all came near and drank from the cup, that is, eleven of them. For when Jesus had distributed the bread to the eleven without any distinction, Judas came near that he might receive as the rest of the company who had drawn near and had received, but Jesus dipped the bread in water, and washed away the blessing from it, and in this way marked out the bread for Judas. Hence it was known to the Apostles that it was Judas who was about to betray Him. Jesus dipped the bread, that the blessing might be annulled from it, and He gave it to Judas. The bread which Judas ate was not still blessed, and he did not drink from the cup of life. He was angry because the bread had been dipped, for he knew that he was not worthy of life, and wrath prevented him from drinking of the cup of the blood of Jesus ; he went forth to the crucifiers, and so did not see the consecrated cup. Satan hastened to separate Iscariot from his companions so that he might not become a participant with them in the living and life-giving Sacrament. . . . Jesus made them drink, and explained to them that the cup which they had drunk was His blood, This is My real blood, which is poured out for you all ; take, drink ye all of it, because it is the new covenant in My blood ; as ye have seen Me, so shall ye do for My memorial. And behold, when ye are gathered together in My name in the Church in all quarters of the world, do ye for My memorial this which I have done, and eat ye My body, and drink ye My blood, the new and the old covenant. . . . I am the Son of the living Father ; in this sixth period of a thousand years I came down from heaven to give

¹ *Serm. in Hebd. Sanc.* iv. 4 (Lamy, i. 415, 417).

the new covenant to My Church and through the memorial of My body and blood to abolish the destruction which I am bringing on the wicked who sin against Me as the men of old. Other teaching of life did our Lord deliver to His disciples in the evening when He distributed His body and made His blood to be their drink.”¹

2. A correspondence between Peter Mongus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria from 477 to 490, and Acacius, the Monophysite Patriarch of Constantinople from 471 to 489, exists in an Armenian MS. in the library of the Armenian Fathers of St. Anthony now at Stamboul, which was at Rome until 1871. In this correspondence the Eucharist is repeatedly called a sacrifice and is said to be offered; a vision is described of “our Lord Jesus Christ in the form of a youth,” “clad in a white tunic of linen,” having “the sign of the nails,” “upon the disk and paten which were laid upon the holy altar”; and the consecration is spoken of in the following terms:—

“The Holy Spirit shall hear you and shall come down upon your sacrifice, and with His own divine power shall sanctify you who are priests, as well as the heavenly hosts that stand around you, and who aforesaid stood around you, as well as all the priests and all the congregations who live in consequence of your prayers. For the Holy Spirit, that is equal in power and authority with the Father and the Son, rests upon them. The same Holy Spirit by the might of God shall come down and fill the entire sanctuary; I mean the holy altar upon which Christ is being sacrificed by you, the priest, and is dispensed to them that are called and chosen. The Holy Spirit Himself will then descend along with you, the chief priest, and will overshadow and cover the entire sanctuary with His great power and might, and change and convert the bread into the body of the Son of God, Jesus Christ. As also the cup in which the wine is poured out shall be changed and converted by His divine authority into the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, the blood, I mean, which was poured forth from the divine side for the forgiveness and remission of sins. For in this divine blood we have been washed and hallowed and saved, and His Catholic Apostolic Holy Church He rules even to the ends of the earth. In this wise shall we who are priests of the Lord

¹ *Serm. in Hebd. Sanc.* iv. 6 (Lamy, i. 421-25). The author is indebted to the Rev. D. C. Simpson, of Wadham College, Tutor of St. Edmund Hall, for help in connection with Syriac writings.

Almighty receive with true faith and orthodoxy the spotless and pure body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.”¹

3. A remarkable *Homily* of uncertain date and authorship, which probably belongs to some part of the period under consideration in this chapter, is best placed by itself. It is the *Homily on the body and blood of Christ* which was traditionally ascribed to Eusebius, who was Bishop of Emesa in Syria from about 340 to about 360, which has of late been thought more probably to be the work of Faustus, the Bishop of Riez in Provence, who died about 492. Some special interest beyond that which it has in itself attaches to it because of the frequency with which parts of it are quoted by the writers of the mediæval Church and by some of the reformers. In it the Eucharist is described as an abiding offering of the sacrifice of Christ; the elements are said to be converted and changed at the consecration into the substance of the body and blood of Christ; this conversion is said to be parallel to the work of God in creation and at Baptism; the reception of the body of Christ is spoken of as a spiritual act in the power of grace; and Christ is said to be wholly present in that which each communicant receives. The whole *Homily* is of great interest; the parts of chief doctrinal importance are the following:—

“Because He was about to remove from our sight the body which He had taken, and to raise it to heaven, it was needful that He should consecrate for us on this day the Sacrament of His body and blood, so that what was once offered for a ransom might in the mystery (*per mysterium*) lawfully be worshipped continually, and so that, because the redemption for the salvation of men was of daily and unwearied power (*quotidiana et indefessa currebat*), there might be also an abiding offering of the redemption, and that eternal (*perennis*) Victim might live in memory and be ever present in grace. . . . The visible priest by the word of Christ with unseen power converts the visible creatures into the substance of Christ’s body and blood, saying, ‘Take and eat, this is My body,’ and

¹ The above quotations are made from the translation of the Armenian document which Mr. F. C. Conybeare published in the *American Journal of Theology* for October, 1905, pp. 719-40. The long passage quoted is on p. 731; the other passages referred to are on pp. 728-33, 736, 738, 739. The date of the MS. is 1298; Mr. Conybeare gives his reasons for thinking that the translation of the correspondence into Armenian was made in 595.

with repeated consecration, 'Take and drink, this is My blood'. Therefore, as at the nod of the Lord's command the heights of heaven and the depths of the sea and the expanses of earth suddenly existed out of nothing, so His might gives equal power to words in the spiritual Sacraments and accomplishes its effect. How great and how wonderful are the results of the power of the blessing of God, and how it ought not to seem new and impossible to you that earthly and mortal things are changed into the substance of Christ, ask yourself, who have already been regenerated in Christ. . . . As, therefore, without any bodily perception your former vileness was laid aside, and you were suddenly clad with new dignity, and, as it was not shown to eye or sense that God healed in you what was wounded and removed what was diseased and cleansed what was stained, so, when you approach the sacred altar to be fed with heavenly food, behold the holy body and blood of your God, honour it, wonder at it, grasp it with your mind, receive it with the hand of your heart, and most of all inwardly drink it. . . . For recognising and perceiving the sacrifice of the real body of the Lord, let the power itself of the Consecrator strengthen you; and let Him who of old lay hid prefigured in the manna now be manifested to you in grace. . . . When this bread is taken, each individual has no less than all together; one receives the whole, two receive the whole, a greater number receive the whole without any diminution; because the blessing of this Sacrament knows how to be distributed, but knows not how to be destroyed in the distribution. . . . As the grains that are united in the making of the bread cannot be separated, and as the waters which are mixed with the wine cannot again return to their own substance, so also the faithful and wise who know that they have been redeemed by the blood and passion of Christ ought in such a way to be joined to their Head as inseparable members by keeping of the faith and most earnest religious life that they cannot be separated from Him, by will or by any necessity, or by any ambition of earthly hope, or even be divided from Him by death itself. Nor should any one doubt that the excellent creatures at the nod of the power of God by the presence of the supreme majesty can pass into the nature of the body of the Lord, when he sees that man himself is made the body of Christ by the operation of the heavenly mercy of Christ. And, as whoever comes to the faith of Christ is still in the chain of his old sin before the words of Baptism, but when these have been said is freed from all the filth of sin, so when the creatures that are to be blessed by the heavenly words are placed on the holy altar,

before they are consecrated by the invocation of His name, the substance which is there is bread and wine, but after the words it is the body and blood of Christ.”¹

IV.

The detailed statement and the classification of the evidence make it possible to summarise the teaching of the period of the great councils in regard both to the presence and gift and to the sacrifice in the Eucharist.

1. The thought which runs through all the phraseology of the period is that the Sacrament is the body and blood of Christ. Careful attention to the use of the words “figure” and “symbol” in the early Church and to the general teaching of writers who employ these terms in regard to the Eucharist elicits that such a description of the Eucharistic elements does not indicate that they are regarded as, in the modern sense, simply figurative or symbolical of the body and blood. Consideration of the idea of their heightened efficacy shows that it does not imply that a change in use and power and effect is alone indicated. Those writers who speak of the elements as “symbols,” or as having heightened power, are seen also to believe that they are that which they symbolise and convey. This view of the elements as the body and blood of Christ is connected in different parts of the Church with the act of consecration, whether the crucial moment of this be represented as the recitation of the words of Christ, the invocation of God the Word, the invocation of God the Holy Ghost, or the invocation of the Holy Trinity. Attempts are made to explain the mystery of the presence of Christ’s body and blood. Emphasis is laid in some quarters on the spiritual character of the presence. The parallel to known physical processes is elsewhere insisted on. The bearing of the fact that Christians are the body of Christ by Baptism is pointed out. The difference between the state of the body in this life and its condition after the resurrection is suggested as affording an explanation. On one side the parallel of our Lord’s incarnate life is held to support a belief that the presence of His body and blood in the consecrated Sacrament does not lessen the reality of the bread and the wine; on another side the

¹ §§ 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12. This *Homily* is printed among the works of St. Jerome in *P.L.* xxx. 280-84.

parallel of the conversion in physical processes tends towards a view which attaches less importance to or ignores the continued existence of the elements. The adoration of our Lord in the Sacrament is referred to by some writers in terms which imply that it was familiar and habitual in the Church.

2. The dedication of life to God is regarded as the true sacrifice of Christians. This sacrificial offering of life has one of its features in sacrificial worship. Thus, in the language specially characteristic of St. Augustine, in the Eucharist the Church offers itself, and Christians offer themselves. But this is only one part of the Eucharistic sacrifice. It is the memory of Christ, the act in which the Church remembers Christ, and in remembering Him presents the memorial of Him to the Father. As the memorial of Him, it is the memorial of every aspect of His human life. Consequently at one moment the stress is laid on the association with His passion and death, at another moment on that with His risen and ascended life. Of the Victim who is offered in His body and blood, that is His manhood, it is equally true to say that He has died and that He is now alive, risen, ascended, a High Priest in heaven. And as to the fathers the idea of sacrifice naturally included communion with God at least as much as propitiation of God, the culmination of the act of sacrifice is spoken of as being in the reception of Communion. These ideas are not found in any systematised or elaborated form. They occur separately rather than correlated. For the most part the Eucharist is simply referred to as a sacrifice as if that way of describing it were a matter of course which needed no explanation. By combining different statements this consistent representation of the Eucharistic sacrifice can be discerned.

CHAPTER IV.

EASTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME.

IN the time which follows the period of the great councils it will be convenient to consider the East separately from the West. Such a division is not a matter simply of order and system. For the characteristics of Eastern minds and of Eastern theology differ widely from those of the West. In the East till the ninth century there is more tendency to speculation, more power of theological instinct, more capacity for realising abstract truth. In the West there is a love of the concrete and the practically useful and efficient, a desire to make sharp distinctions and press alternatives, a fuller regard for considerations of common sense. And the controlling powers are different in these different parts of the Church. In the East the authority of the Church as a whole, expressing its voice by means of conciliar decisions which the Christian community accepts and ratifies, continues to be a dominant force. In the West the government of the Church passes more and more into the hands of the Popes, though councils and the collective acceptance of doctrine continue to exist. In the East the power of the State over the Church reaches a degree which the position of the Papacy prevents in the West. In the East from the ninth century conservatism is stronger; and enterprise is greater in the West. Marked differences of character and general history, of which these are representative, necessarily affect the maintenance and development of particular doctrines, and among them of the Eucharist. And from at any rate the eighth century onwards the special form taken by the veneration of images in the East has had an important bearing on some matters connected with Eucharistic doctrine.

I.

The Eastern writers of the sixth and seventh centuries yield but little on the doctrine of the Eucharist. In what may be found there are the same general ideas as in the earlier periods, those of the communication of Christ's body and blood and of the Eucharist as a sacrifice.

The document entitled *The Canons of Athanasius Patriarch of Alexandria* has been preserved in a Coptic translation of the Greek original and in an Arabic version of the Coptic translation. The Arabic version appears to have been made in the eleventh century; and the MS. containing the Coptic translation is assigned to the sixth or seventh century. The Greek original was compiled probably not later than the sixth century. In this document the Eucharist is described as an offering, and as the sacrifice of "the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ";¹ the expression "the body is divided" is used of the dividing of the Sacrament;² and it is said of the Eucharistic elements:—

"Because the Lord standeth upon the altar, so are the altar vessels spiritual and neither silver nor gold nor stone nor wood; even as the bread and wine, before they are raised upon the altar, are bread and wine, yet, after that they are raised upon the altar, are no more bread and wine but the life-giving body of God and blood, so that they that communicate therein die not but live eternally."³

Some special interest attaches to two passages in the writings directed against the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies by Leontius of Byzantium, a monk whose literary activity may be placed in the first half of the sixth century, whom in recent times a writer of insight has styled "the best theologian of the sixth century".⁴ Writing in strong condemnation of the view which he ascribed to Theodore of Mopsuestia that "there was one person of God the Word and another of Jesus the Christ," Leontius uses as an argument the inferences which may be deduced from the Eucharist, and says:—

¹ Arabic canons 32, 34, 39, 107; Coptic canon 40 (Riedel and Crum's edition, pp. 32, 33, 69, 117; cf. pp. 73, 74).

² Arabic canon 39 (Riedel and Crum, p. 33).

³ Arabic canon 7 (Riedel and Crum, pp. 14, 15; cf. p. 75). Cf. the fragments of St. Athanasius quoted on p. 70, *supra*.

⁴ Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation*, p. 276.

"Whose body and blood then do those who are of such a mind think that they receive? Is it of Him who gave the benefit, or of Him who received it? If it is of God the Word, who gave the benefit, how can they say this, when they do not acknowledge that He was made flesh and became man? If it is of Him who received the benefit, their hope is vain, since they bring in the worship of a man."¹

Here then Leontius carries on the teaching in which St. Cyril of Alexandria connects the value of the gift in the Eucharist with the doctrine of the one Person of our Lord, since it is as Christians receive the body and blood of Him who is personally God that the Eucharist is the means of communion with Him and reception of His power.² Elsewhere Leontius, without explicitly referring to the Eucharist, emphasises strongly the fact that in God's use of natural means for supernatural purposes that which is natural is not destroyed but empowered.

"The supernatural leads up and elevates the natural, and empowers it for more perfect actions, such as it could not accomplish if it remained within the limits of the natural. The supernatural therefore does not destroy the natural but educes and stimulates it both in its capacity for actions of its own and in its receiving power for those things which are beyond this capacity."³

Leontius gives instances of the operation of this principle in the elevation of natural material by art; and applies it to the truth of the abiding reality of the human nature of our Lord when used by Him in the Incarnation. Though not explicitly referring to the Eucharist, this passage may be mentioned here as a notable instance of the principle which, at an earlier time, led Theodoret and Gelasius to insist on the continued existence of the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist.⁴

A definite assertion of the application of this principle to the Eucharist is found in a fragment from the treatise against Nestorius and Eutyches written by Ephraim the Bishop of Antioch in the middle of the sixth century, which has been preserved, like much else in the works of Ephraim, through being quoted by Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, in the ninth

¹ *Adv. Incurrup. et Nestor.* (P.G. lxxxvi. 1385).

² See pp. 75, 76, *supra*.

³ *C. Nestor. et Eutych.* ii. (P.G. lxxxvi. 1333). ⁴ See pp. 99-102, *supra*.

century. After speaking of the union of the two unimpaired natures of Godhead and manhood in the one Person of Christ, Ephraim continues:—

“So the body of Christ which is received by the faithful does not depart from its perceptible (*αἰσθητῆς*) substance (*οὐσίας*) and remains indivisible from the spiritual (*νοητῆς*) grace.”¹

Here Ephraim so fully identifies the Sacrament with the presence of Christ that he calls the outward element “the body of Christ,” and at the same time maintains that it preserves its natural existence in the way in which the manhood of Christ remains unimpaired in the union of the Incarnation.

On the other hand, the line of thought which tends to make little of, or lose sight of, the continued existence of the elements of bread and wine is also found in confusions between the inward and the outward parts.

The *Homilies* ascribed to Eusebius Bishop of Alexandria were probably delivered in the sixth century, though they may be somewhat earlier. In the sixteenth of these the writer gives instructions as to the keeping of Sunday. These instructions include directions about attendance at the Liturgy. They are noteworthy as containing a reference to the practice, alluded to by Clement of Alexandria in the third century,² of Christians remaining in the Church throughout the whole celebration of the mysteries but abstaining from Communion if their conscience tells them that there is a hindrance to their communicating worthily. In the course of the exhortation to be present at the Liturgy it is said, “Behold thy Lord divided in pieces and distributed and not spent,”³ where the phrase that in the Eucharist Christ is “divided” applies to the inward reality that which is true of the outward part.

A more extreme instance of confusion between the inward and the outward parts, involving also the opinion that the body of Christ present in the Eucharist is in the condition of the pre-resurrection not the risen body, occurs in a treatise of St. Anastasius of Sinai, probably written late in the sixth century. St.

¹ Quoted in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 229 (P.G. ciii. 980).

² *Strom.* I. i. 5.

³ *Serm.* xvi. 2 (P.G. lxxxvi. 416). See p. 104, *supra*, for a similar expression in St. Chrysostom.

Anastasius is there combating the error of the Gaianites, an offshoot of the Monophysites, who maintained that the body of Christ was incorruptible from the beginning of its union with His divine nature in the Incarnation. To refute this error he introduces in his work a discussion between an orthodox theologian and an advocate of the position of the Gaianites. In this discussion reference is made to the Eucharist, and both disputants agree that the Sacrament is not mere bread or a figure of the body of Christ but is His real body and blood. The orthodox divine then proposes an extraordinary test. He suggests that the consecrated Sacrament from a church of the Gaianites should be reserved for some days. If at the end of the time it remains uncorrupted, this will show, he says, that the Gaianites are right in maintaining the incorruptibility of the body of Christ from the beginning of His incarnate life. If, on the other hand, it becomes corrupted, then, unless it be the case that it is not the real body of Christ or that because of the perverse belief of the Gaianites the Holy Ghost has not descended on it in the consecration, positions which the Gaianites would themselves repudiate, the corruption shows that the Gaianite contention is wrong, and that the body of Christ was subject to corruption before His resurrection.

“The Orthodox.—Is the Communion of the all holy body and blood of Christ, which you offer and receive, the real body and blood of Christ, the Son of God, or is it mere bread, such as is sold at home, and a figure of the body of Christ? . . .

“The Gaianite.—God forbid that we should say that the holy Communion is a figure of the body of Christ or mere bread, but we truly receive the actual body and blood of Christ the Son of God. . . .

“The Orthodox.—So we believe and so we confess according to the word of Christ Himself. . . . Since then Christ Himself bears witness that what we Christians offer and receive is truly His body and blood, bring to us from the Communion of your Church, which you say is more orthodox than any other Church, and we will place this holy body and blood of Christ with all honour splendidly in a vessel; and, in a few days, if it be not corrupted or altered or changed, it will be plain that you rightly preach Christ as having been in every way incorruptible from the very beginning of the Incarnation. But, if it be corrupted or changed, we must maintain one of the following alternatives. Either

that which you receive is not the real body of Christ but a figure and mere bread, or because of your misbelief the Holy Ghost did not descend upon it, or the body of Christ is corruptible before the resurrection as being slain and put to death and wounded and divided and eaten. For an incorruptible nature is not cut or wounded in the side and hands or divided or put to death or eaten or at all held or handled; but is of such a kind as the incorruptible nature of angels and souls.”¹

The argument here used by St. Anastasius shows, first, an agreement between Catholics and Gaianites that the consecrated elements are the real body and blood of Christ; secondly, a confusion between the inward and outward parts which could spring more readily out of an opinion that the elements themselves are changed into the body and blood of Christ than from a belief that they are His body and blood without departing in any way from their natural substances; and, thirdly, a view of the body and blood of Christ present in the Sacrament which is at the opposite pole of thought from the aspect of the presence as that of the spiritual risen body, a notable instance of which in an earlier period has been seen in the writings of St. Jerome.² Incidentally the passage also shows the belief of St. Anastasius that the consecration was effected at the invocation of the Holy Ghost.

A different way of regarding the Eucharist than that found in Leontius of Byzantium and Ephraim of Antioch or in Eusebius of Alexandria and Anastasius of Sinai may be seen in the intense mysticism of the writer known as Dionysius the Areopagite. The date of this writer is involved in much uncertainty. His writings are certainly not earlier than the fifth century, and are possibly considerably later. It is not unlikely that Bishop Westcott was right in his suggestion that Dionysius wrote between 480 and 520 either at Edessa or under the influence of the Edessene school.³ The central thought of the theology of Dionysius is the conformity of man to God by means of participation in the divine life. This is the object, he says, of all the

¹ *Hodegos*, 23 (*P.G.* lxxxix. 297). Note also that in *Question* 113 (*P.G.* lxxxix. 765) St. Anastasius speaks of the reserved Sacrament as “the all holy body of Christ”.

² See pp. 97, 98, *supra*.

³ *Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West*, p. 153.

ordinances of religion and of all the ministrations of the Church.¹ In the accomplishment of this object the Eucharist is a means of the assimilation of the lives of those who partake of it to the life of God. Through it they are mystically united to the human nature which the eternal Word took in the Incarnation, and thereby to the divine being.

“Let us with holiness observe for what reason the title which is common to the other hierarchic rites is applied to this in a special sense beyond the rest, so that it is uniquely styled Communion and Assembly, since each mystic action gathers together our divided lives into one uniform assimilation to God and by the divine union of those that are separated bestows communion and unity with the One. But we say that from the thearchic and completing gifts of this is accomplished the completion of the reception of the other hierarchic symbols.”²

“The hierarch . . . after he has received and given the thearchic Communion ends with holy thanksgiving, the multitude having beheld only the divine symbols but he himself being ever hierarchically uplifted by the thearchic Spirit in the purity of his godlike state in blessed and spiritual perceptions to the holy archetypes of the earthly rites.”³

“The most divine common and peaceful participation in one and the same bread and cup enjoins on them [that is, the partakers], as on those brought up in the same family, a godly harmony of character, and brings them to the holy remembrance of the most divine Supper, which is the primal type of the rites.”⁴

“O most divine and holy Sacrament, revealing the garments of riddles with which thou art in symbolic fashion clothed, show us plainly, and fill our spiritual vision with single and unclouded light.”⁵

“There seems to me to have taken place among us the accomplishment of all the divine works the praise of which is sung, nobly sustaining our substance and life, and forming with archetypal beauty that which is godlike in us, and placing us in possession of a more divine state and uplifting, taking care to recall to our ancient condition by good things supplied to us the lack of the divine gifts which we incurred through sloth, and by the complete reception of what is ours to grant the most complete partaking of His own, and thus to bestow on us communion with God and the things that are divine.”⁶

¹ *De eccl. hier.* I. iii.

² *Ibid.* III. i.

³ *Ibid.* III. ii.

⁴ *Ibid.* iii. 1.

⁵ *Ibid.* 2.

⁶ *Ibid.* III. iii. 7.

“When the venerable symbols, by means of which Christ is signified and is received, have been placed upon the divine altar, at once the description of the holy things is here, which manifests inseparably the bond of their supernatural and holy union with Him.”¹

“That which is one and simple and hidden in Jesus, the the-archic Word, by His Incarnation among us came in His goodness and kindness without any change to that which is composite and visible, and nobly wrought out unifying communion between us and Himself, supremely uniting our lowliness with His divinity in the identity of His spotless and divine life, if indeed we also are joined to Him as limbs to a body, and if we do not become unfitted for those divine and most healthy limbs and separate from them and without share in their life through being slain by destructive passions. For we must, if we desire communion with Him, look up to His most divine life in the flesh, and by assimilation to it run up to the godlike and spotless state of holy sinlessness. For so will He harmoniously bestow on us communion that leads to likeness. This is what the hierarch shows by the acts which he sacredly performs, uncovering the hidden gifts and dividing their unity into many parts, and by the supreme union of the elements distributed with those who receive them making the partakers to have communion in them. For in these he depicts perceptibly our spiritual life as in images, bringing Jesus Christ under our sight, from that which is hidden in His divine being kindly taking our form by His complete and unconfused Incarnation among us, and without any change proceeding from His natural unity to our divided nature, and through this noble kindness calling the race of man to participation in Himself and His own good things, if so be we are united to His most divine life, by assimilation to it according to our power; and thus shall we truly be made in communion with God and the things that are divine.”²

The sermon *On Easter and the Holy Eucharist* by Eutychius the Patriarch of Constantinople, who died in 582, is of importance because in it Eutychius, besides referring to communicants “receiving the holy body and blood,”³ calls the elements the “antitypes,” maintains that the whole body of Christ is received in each fragment of the Sacrament, and condemns those who adopted a practice of honouring the Sacrament before consecration in ways which would be appropriate only after the elements had been consecrated.

¹ *De eccl. hier.* III. iii. 9.

² *Ibid.* III. iii. 12, 13.

³ § 3 (*P.G.* lxxxvi. 2396).

“The Lord . . . after He had supped took the bread and gave thanks and showed and brake it uniting Himself to the antitype. In like manner also He mixed the cup of the fruit of the vine and gave thanks and showed it to God the Father and said, ‘Take, eat,’ and ‘Take, drink’; ‘This is My body,’ and ‘This is My blood’. Therefore every one receives the whole holy body and precious blood of the Lord, if he receive any part of these elements; for He is divided among all without any division because of the union.¹ As also one seal imparts its impressions and forms to those things which receive it, and remains one, and is not lessened after being imparted, and is not changed towards those things which receive it, even if they be very many in number. Or as again one voice which is uttered by any one and poured out into the air also remains whole in him who uttered it, and being in the air comes whole to the ears of all, no one of those who hear it receiving more or less than another, but is wholly undivided and complete to all, even though they be ten thousand or more, although it is a body, for a voice is nothing else than air which has been struck. Let no one then suspect that after the mystic rite and the holy resurrection the incorruptible and immortal and holy and life-giving body of the Lord, placed in the antitypes by means of the priestly rites, puts out its own powers less than the aforesaid examples, but let all be sure that it is wholly found in every part. For all the fulness of the Godhead of God the Word dwells bodily, that is essentially, in the body of the Lord itself.”²

“They act with folly who, when the bread of the oblation and the freshly mixed cup are about to be borne to the holy altar in the liturgic rite, deliver to the people a hymn to be sung, suited as they think to what is being done, saying that they are offering the King of glory or even so calling the gifts which are being brought in and have not yet been consecrated by the high-priestly invocation and their splendid hallowing.”³

There is an interesting passage in a treatise by Maximus the Confessor, who was appointed Abbot of the monastery of Chrysopolis in the year 639, who was a leading champion of Catholic truth against the Monothelite heresy. Maximus following, as he says, Dionysius the Areopagite, explains the

¹ *I.e.*, the uniting of our Lord to the elements previously mentioned.

² §§ 2, 3 (*P.G.* lxxxvi. 2393, 2396).

³ § 8 (*P.G.* lxxxvi. 2400, 2401). To support this condemnation Euty-chius quotes two passages ascribed to St. Athanasius, for which see p. 70, *supra*.

meaning of Communion to be the incorporation of the Christian with Christ, and a foretaste of the future perfect union with Him.

“By means of the holy reception of the stainless and life-giving mysteries is denoted the communion and identity with Him that is allowed in participation through likeness (κατὰ μέθεξιν ἐνδεχομένην δι’ ὁμοιότητος), by means of which man is privileged to become God from being man. For those gifts of the Holy Ghost of which we believe that we partake here in the present life through the grace that is in faith, of these we believe that we shall partake in the future world truly, really, in very deed, . . . passing from the grace that is in faith to the grace that is of sight (κατ’ εἶδος), our God and Saviour Jesus Christ transmaking us into Himself by the destruction of the marks of the corruption that is in us, and granting to us the archetypal mysteries which are indicated by the present perceptible symbols.”¹

In estimating the importance of the teaching thus implied by Maximus notice must be taken of the mystical character of his theology in general and of that of his master Dionysius; and the affinities with much in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen² in an earlier period need close attention.

Considerable interest attaches to a passage in the *Sayings of the Fathers* ascribed to Palladius, who was Bishop of Helenopolis early in the fifth century, by Ânân-Îshô a monk of Northern Mesopotamia in the latter half of the sixth and the first half of the seventh century as given in a Syriac MS. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century now at Mōsul. In this passage mention is made of an individual instance of the opinion that the consecrated elements are no more than the symbols of the body and blood of Christ; the ordinary repudiation of such a view is recorded; and an account is given of a vision of the presence of the body and blood of Christ.

“Abbâ Daniel Parnâyâ, the disciple of Abbâ Arsenius, used to tell about a man of Scete, and say that he was a man of great labours but simple in the faith, and in his ignorance he considered and declared that the bread which we receive is not in very truth the body of Christ, but a similitude of His body. And two of the fathers heard this word which he spake, and because they knew of his sublime works and labours, they imagined that he had spoken

¹ *Mystagogia*, 24 (P.G. xci. 704, 705).

² See pp. 25-28, 37, 38, 54, *supra*.

it in his innocence and simple-mindedness; and they came to him and said unto him, 'Father, we have heard a thing from a man which we do not believe, for he saith that this bread which we receive is not in very truth the body of Christ, but a mere similitude'. And he said unto them, 'It is I who have said this thing,' and they entreated him, saying, 'Thou must not say thus, father, but according to what the Holy Catholic Church hath handed down to us, even so do we believe, that is to say, this bread is the body of Christ in very truth, and is not a mere similitude'. . . . And the old man said, 'Unless I be convinced by the thing itself, I will not hearken to this'; then the fathers said unto him, 'Let us pray to God for the whole week on this mystery, and we believe that He will reveal it unto us,' and the old man agreed to this with great joy, and each man went to his cell. . . . And God heard the entreaties of the two fathers, and when the week was ended they came to the church, and the three of them sat down by themselves on one seat, and the old man was between the other two; and the eyes of their understandings were opened, and when the time of the mysteries had arrived, and the bread was laid upon the Holy Table, there appeared to the three of them as it were a child on the Table. And when the priest stretched out his hand to break the bread, behold the angel of the Lord came down from heaven with a knife in his hand, and he slew the child and pressed out his blood into the cup; and, when the priest broke off from the bread small members, the old man drew near that he might partake of the holy offering, and a piece of living flesh smeared and dripping with blood was given to him. Now when he saw this he was afraid, and he cried out with a loud voice, saying, 'I believe, O Lord, that the bread is Thy body, and that the cup is Thy blood'; and straightway the flesh which was in his hand became bread like unto that of the mystery, and he took it and gave thanks unto God. And the old men said unto him, 'God knoweth the nature of men, and that it is unable to eat living flesh, and for this reason He turneth His body into bread, and His blood into wine, for those who receive Him in faith.'"¹

II.

In the eighth century the iconoclastic controversy supplied the absorbing subject of theological thought among Eastern Christians. The beginning of the controversy itself may be

¹*The Paradise or Garden of the Holy Fathers* (edited by Dr. Wallis Budge), ii. 159, 160.

reckoned from the edict of the Emperor Leo III., known as "the Isaurian," which was issued in the year 726. Before the reign of this Emperor the reverence given to the images of the saints by means of outward acts of veneration had reached a high pitch. The edict of 726, the tenth year of his reign, was directed against any such veneration; and a further edict, issued in 730, prohibited the use of images for purposes of religion altogether.¹ These edicts led to a prolonged struggle. Leo III. continued to use the power of the State against the veneration of images until his death in 741. His successor, Constantine Copronymus, carried on the same policy; and under his auspices a Council was held at Constantinople in 754, which decreed that all images should be banished from the churches, and forbade the making or veneration or possession of any image. In spite of the resistance of most of the bishops, of the monks as a body, and of the people in general, Constantine Copronymus endeavoured until his death in 775 to put down the use of images, and met with much apparent success. The policy of the State remained unaltered during the reign of Leo IV., which lasted from 775 to 780. After his death the Empress Irene assumed the government during the minority of her son Constantine VI. She was a zealous advocate of the veneration of images; and her rule made possible the meeting of the Second Council of Nicæa in 787, which decreed that honour was to be paid to images, and was eventually recognised as the Seventh Ecumenical Council.² The chief theologian of the East in the eighth century, St. John of Damascus, took a prominent part in the iconoclastic controversy, and was one of the most notable defenders of the rightfulness of the cause which was victorious at the Second Council of Nicæa. He was born before the end of the seventh century, and died probably sometime between the Council of 754 and that of 787.

In the first of his *Discourses on the Holy Images* St. John of Damascus ascribes to the opponents of the veneration of images a line of thought which is Jewish and even Manichæan. This line of thought, he maintains, is grounded on notions of antagonism between what is divine and what is human which are unten-

¹ For the view that the first edict ordered the destruction of images, see Hefele, *History of the Councils of the Church*, v. 272-301.

² See the present writer's *The Christian Church*, pp. 356-62.

able since the redemption of man, and requires a degree of contempt for material things which is inconsistent with the way in which they have been used in the works of salvation and grace. The wood of the cross, the tomb whence our Lord rose, the book of the Gospels, are all material things; and each one of them has had its spiritual office to perform. In the celebration of the Eucharist the same principle holds good.

“Is not the life-bringing Table, which ministers to us the bread of life, material? Are not the gold and the silver, from which crosses and patens and chalices are made, material? Above all these, are not the body and blood of our Lord material?”¹

The same argument, in almost identical language, is repeated in the second of the *Discourses on the Holy Images*.² By using it St. John of Damascus appears to take for granted that the food which is given and received in the Holy Eucharist is the actual human body and blood which our Lord took in the Incarnation. In his comments on the First Epistle to the Corinthians he reproduces the teaching of St. Chrysostom that “that which is in the chalice is what flowed from the side” of Christ on the cross, and that communicants are the body of Christ, but does not reproduce St. Chrysostom’s phrase that being “broken” in the Eucharist Christ “suffers what He did not suffer on the cross”.³

In his great doctrinal treatise *On the Orthodox Faith* St. John of Damascus treats the subject of the Eucharist at greater length. After recounting the facts of the institution he proceeds:—

“If then the word of God is living and active, and the Lord hath done all things whatsoever He hath willed; . . . if the heaven and the earth, fire and water and air, and all that pertains to them, were made complete by the word of the Lord, and moreover man, the most famous of living creatures; if God the Word Himself by the exercise of His will became man, and the pure and spotless blood of the holy ever-virgin supplied to Him flesh without generation by man—cannot He make bread His own body and the wine and the water blood? . . . God said ‘This is My body,’ and ‘This is My blood,’ and ‘Do this for a memorial of Me’; and by His

¹ i. 16.

² ii. 14.

³ On 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. For the passages in St. Chrysostom, see pp. 75, 104, *supra*.

almighty command it comes to be until He come. . . . For, as all things which God did He did by the operation of the Holy Ghost, so also now the operation of the Holy Ghost performs the things which are beyond nature, which faith alone can grasp. 'How shall this be to me,' says the holy Virgin, 'seeing I know not a man?' The Archangel Gabriel answers, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee'. And now thou askest, How does the bread become the body of Christ, and the wine and the water the blood of Christ? I also say to thee, The Holy Ghost comes on them and makes them those things which are beyond reason and thought. Bread and wine are taken; for God knows the weakness of man. . . . As in the case of Baptism, since it is customary for men to wash with water and anoint themselves with oil, He has linked with the oil and the water the grace of the Spirit, and has made it to be the laver of regeneration, so, since it is customary for men to eat bread and to drink water and wine, He has linked with them His Godhead, and has made them His body and blood, in order that by means of wonted and natural things we may reach those which are supernatural. The body, that is the body which was derived from the holy Virgin, is truly united to Godhead, not that the body which ascended comes down from heaven, but that the bread and wine itself is transmaded (*μεταποιεῖται*) into the body and blood of God. But if you inquire as to the method, how this comes to be, it is enough for you to hear that it is by means of the Holy Ghost, as also from the holy Mother of God by means of the Holy Ghost the Lord took to Himself flesh to be His own. And we know no more than that the word of God is true and active and almighty, while the method is inscrutable. But there is no harm in saying this, that, as in the processes of nature bread through being eaten and wine and water through being drunk are changed (*μεταβάλλονται*) into the body and blood of him who eats and drinks them, and do not become a different body from his former body, so the bread that is offered and the wine and water are by means of the invocation and descent of the Holy Ghost supernaturally transmaded (*μεταποιούνται*) into the body and the blood of Christ, and are not two things but one and the same thing. . . . The bread and the wine are not a figure of the body and blood of Christ (God forbid) but the body of the Lord itself that is filled with Godhead, since the Lord Himself said, 'This is My'—not figure of the body but—'body,' and not figure of the blood but 'blood'. . . . The bread of the Communion is not mere bread but united to Godhead; and the body united to Godhead is not one nature only, but

one nature of the body and another of the Godhead that is united to it, so that both together are not one nature but two. . . . The flesh of the Lord is life-giving Spirit, because it was conceived of the life-giving Spirit; for that which is born (τὸ γεγεννημένον) of the Spirit is spirit. Now this I say, not removing the nature of the body but wishing to make clear its life-giving and divine character. If some have called the bread and the wine the antitypes of the body and the blood of the Lord, as holy Basil said, they in using this word spoke of the offering not after the consecration but before the consecration. It is called participation, for by means of it we partake of the Godhead of Jesus. It is called and really is Communion, because through it we have communion with Christ and receive His flesh and Godhead, and also through it have communion with and are united with one another; for since we partake of one bread, we all become one body of Christ and one blood and members one of another; being called sharers in the body of Christ. . . . And they are called antitypes of the things to come, not as not being really the body and blood of Christ, but because now by means of them we partake of the Godhead of Christ, while hereafter we shall partake of it spiritually (νοητῶς) by means of the vision only.”¹

This explicit teaching of St. John of Damascus has points of contact with that found in an earlier period in writers so different from one another as St. Ambrose, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and Macarius Magnes. Like St. Ambrose St. John of Damascus lays stress on the parallels of the exertion of the almighty power of God in the work of creation and in the birth of our Lord from a virgin.² Like St. Gregory of Nyssa he uses the phrase “transmade” of the effect of consecration on the elements and compares the ordinary physical process by which bread and wine which are eaten are changed into the flesh and blood of him who eats them.³ Like Macarius Magnes, who uses parallels in the same order of thought from the production of bread and wine from the earth and the change of the blood of a mother into milk so as to be her infant child’s food, he repudiates the phraseology which describes the elements after consecration as the figures of the body and blood of Christ.⁴ This denial that the consecrated elements are figures was probably due partly to an instinctive dislike of language which might be interpreted

¹ *De fid. orth.* iv. 13.

² See pp. 72, 73, *supra*.

³ See pp. 79, 80, *supra*.

⁴ See pp. 73, 74, *supra*.

so as to be inconsistent with the doctrine that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, and partly to the stress of the iconoclastic controversy and the fear that if the consecrated elements were described as figures this might lead to a view that they were no more the body and blood of Christ than the image of a saint is that saint. In this latter connection there are important allusions to the phraseology in the Acts of the councils already mentioned as held at Constantinople in 754 and at Nicæa in 787.

The Acts of the iconoclastic council held at Constantinople in 754 contain the following statement:—

“Let them be glad and rejoice and be full of boldness who with most sincere soul make and desire and reverence the true image of Christ, and offer it for salvation of soul and body, which the High Priest and God, having wholly taken from us the mass of our nature, at the time of His voluntary passion delivered to His faithful ones as a figure and most clear memorial. For when He was about voluntarily to give Himself up to His glorious and life-giving death He took the bread and blessed it, and gave thanks and brake it, and gave it to them and said, ‘Take, eat, for the remission of sins; this is My body’. In like manner also He gave them the cup and said, ‘This is My blood, do this for My memorial’. Thus no other form under heaven was chosen by Him, and no other figure can be an image of His Incarnation. See then the image of His life-giving body made honourably and worthily. For what did the all-wise God intend by this? Nothing else than plainly to show and make clear to us men the mystery which was accomplished in His dispensation. For, as that which He took from us is only the material of human substance perfect in all respects but not formed in the likeness of any individual person lest an addition of person be made to the Godhead, so also He commanded selected material, that is the substance of bread, to be offered as His image, not wrought into the form of man lest idolatry should be introduced. As therefore the natural body of Christ is holy since it is united to Godhead, so also it is plain that that body which is His by adoption, that is His image, is holy since it is united to Godhead by grace through some consecration. For this also, as we have said, our Master Christ brought about, that, as He united to Godhead the flesh which He took with its own natural sanctification from the union itself, so also He was pleased that the bread of the Eucharist as a true image of His natural flesh being consecrated

by means of the descent of the Holy Ghost should become a divine body, the priest mediating by making the offering in the transference of that which is common so as to be holy. Further the natural flesh of the Lord which was possessed of soul and mind was anointed with the Holy Ghost so as to be of the Godhead. In like manner also the God-given image of His flesh, the divine bread, together with the cup of the life-giving blood from His side, was filled with the Holy Ghost. This then has been shown to be the true image of the fleshly dispensation of Christ our God, as was said before, which He Himself, the true Creator of our nature, has with His own mouth delivered to us." ¹

This statement of the iconoclastic Council of Constantinople of 754 was read at the Second Council of Nicæa in 787; and a document subsequently read by Epiphanius the deacon, though without the authority of the formal decree, evidently expressed the mind of the latter council upon it. It is there said:—

“None of the trumpets of the Spirit, the holy Apostles, none of our glorious fathers, ever called our bloodless sacrifice, which is for a memorial of the passion of our God and of His whole dispensation, the image of His body. For they did not thus receive from the Lord to speak or acknowledge. . . . Never did the Lord or the Apostles or the fathers call the bloodless sacrifice which is offered by the priest an image but the body itself and the blood itself. It has indeed seemed good to some of the holy fathers that they should be called antitypes before the completion of the consecration. . . . Before the consecration they were called antitypes but after the consecration they are called, and are, and are believed to be properly the body and blood of Christ. But these fine fellows in their desire to do away with regard for the venerable images have brought in another image, which is not an image but body and blood. . . . They have explained that this divine oblation is made by adoption. As to say this is sheer madness, so also to call the body and blood of the Lord an image is equally insane and is as impious as it is ignorant. Then leaving their falsehood they lay hold of a little bit of the truth, saying that it becomes a divine body. Yet if it is an image of the body it is not possible for it to be the divine body itself. . . . They are like madmen who imagine things to be different from what they really are, saying at one time that our hallowed sacrifice is an image of the holy body of Christ, at another time that it is His body by adoption.” ²

¹ Hardouin, *Concilia*, iv. 368, 369.

² *Ibid.* 369-72.

It is instructive to compare the statements of these two councils. The aim of the iconoclastic council of 754 was to exclude the veneration and even the use of images by saying that the Eucharist is the image and the only image of Christ, though at the same time allowing that the elements become the body and blood of Christ by consecration through the descent of the Holy Ghost. The aim of the Seventh Œcumenical Council was to protect and secure the use and veneration of images by saying that the consecrated elements are not an image but the actual body and blood of Christ, and that such a term as antitype can be applied to them rightly only before consecration. The decision embodied in the formal decree on the subject of images was eventually received in the whole Church. The statement about the Eucharist, which, as has been pointed out, does not possess the authority of the formal decree, is apparently historically in error in saying that the fathers had used the word antitype only of the unconsecrated elements. The truth rather is that by a different terminology some fathers had called the Eucharist the image or symbol or figure of the body and blood of Christ, while at the same time regarding it as actually His body and blood.¹ The distinction made by St. John of Damascus and the bishops of the Seventh Œcumenical Council that the elements are the image of Christ's body and blood before consecration and His actual body and blood after consecration had an important effect on the religious practice of the Eastern Churches in promoting the prevalence of the veneration of the Sacrament as an image of Christ before consecration.

Like doctrine to that in the proceedings of the Seventh Œcumenical Council is contained in the writings of Nicephorus, who became Patriarch of Constantinople in 806, was deposed in 815 through the dominance of the iconoclasts which followed the accession of the Emperor Leo V., known as "the Armenian," in 813, and died in exile in 825. His body was translated to Constantinople as the relics of one who had suffered for the truth on the accession in 842 of the youthful Emperor Michael III., known as "the Drunkard," whose mother Theodora favoured the veneration of images. According to the teaching of Nicephorus "by means of the ministry of the priest" the Eucharist "becomes properly and really the body of Christ," "that body which He

¹ See pp. 29-31, 36, 37, 61-67, 71-73, *supra*.

took from the holy Virgin"; it is "neither image nor figure of that body, but the actual body of Christ"; as God the Word was conceived by the Virgin, and as bread and wine and water which are eaten and drunk are naturally changed into the body and blood of him who eats and drinks them, so the Eucharistic elements "at the invocation by the priest and the descent of the Holy Ghost are supernaturally changed into the body and blood of Christ"; and they are "called antitypes not after the consecration but only before it".¹

The Byzantine rite current in the eighth and ninth and tenth centuries, as shown in the texts of the *Liturgies of St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom* given in the manuscripts of that date, denotes the belief that in answer to the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost the elements are made by God to be the body and blood of Christ.

In the *Liturgy of St. Basil* are the words:—

"We draw nigh to Thy holy altar and offering the antitypes of the holy body and blood of Thy Christ we pray and entreat Thee, Most Holy One, that by the pleasure of Thy goodness Thy all-holy Spirit may come on us and on these gifts which are presented to Thee and bless and sanctify them and manifest this bread as the precious body itself of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen. And this cup as the precious blood itself of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen. Which was poured out for the life of the world. Amen." ²

The corresponding passage in the *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom* is as follows:—

"We offer to Thee this reasonable and bloodless service and entreat and pray and supplicate, Send down Thy Holy Spirit on us and on these gifts which are presented to Thee and make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ changing it by Thy Holy Spirit. Amen. And that which is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ changing it by Thy Holy Spirit. Amen." ³

¹ *Antirr.* ii. 2, 3 (P.G. c. 333, 336). Cf. *Apol. pro sacr. imag.* 27, 69 (P.G. c. 605, 768).

² Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 329, 330. From the MS. Grottaferrata 173 vii. ascribed by Mr. Brightman (*op. cit.* i. lxxxix.) to the ninth or tenth century.

³ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 329, 330. From the Barberina MS. ascribed by Mr. Brightman (*op. cit.* i. lxxxix.) to the years between 788 and 797.

In the Liturgy of the presanctified as used since at any rate the latter part of the eighth century, at the Great Entrance, when the elements consecrated at a previous celebration are brought in from the sacristy to the altar, these words are said:—

“Now the powers of heaven with us invisibly do service; for, behold, the King of glory enters; behold, the mystic accomplished sacrifice is escorted; let us draw near with faith and fear, that we may become partakers of life eternal.”¹

A short treatise entitled *On the Stainless Body of which We are Partakers*, which has found a place among the works of St. John of Damascus but is probably of later date than his time, may be noticed here. Most of the teaching contained in it is of the same character as that of St. John of Damascus and lays stress, as he does, on the parallel between the Holy Ghost descending on the holy Mother of our Lord and causing her, though a virgin, to conceive her divine Son and the descent of the Holy Ghost in the Eucharist whereby the bread and wine are supernaturally made to be the body and blood of Christ. But there is one remarkable passage in which the contrast between the pre-resurrection and the risen body of Christ is pushed to the extent of saying that the risen body had no blood, and it appears to be implied that the body of Christ which is given and received in the Eucharist is in the condition of the preresurrection not the risen body. After speaking of the institution of the Sacrament, the writer goes on:—

“For what reason did He so act not after the resurrection but before the resurrection? Because the body that is incorruptible by means of the resurrection is not broken nor eaten nor drunk; neither does the incorruptible body possess blood, as also it would not in the proper sense be called flesh. . . . This body and blood of our God of which we partake is corruptible, being broken and poured out, eaten and drunk.”²

III.

The references to the Eucharist as a sacrifice continue to be of much the same character during the period from the sixth to

¹ Brightman, *op. cit.* i. 348. The same words are still used, except that “longing” (πρόσφ) has been substituted for “fear” (φόβος).

² § 2; cf. § 5. On the authorship of this treatise see Le Quien’s Introduction reprinted in *P.G.* xcvi. 397-402; and cf. Smith and Wace’s *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iii. 417.

the tenth century as at an earlier time. It is unquestioned that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. There is little explanation of the way in which it is so. Occasionally the sacrifice is connected with the passion of our Lord or with His whole incarnate life or with His work in heaven. Its earthly culmination is in Communion.

Eutychius the Patriarch of Constantinople in his *Sermon on Easter and the Holy Eucharist* says that our Lord "mystically sacrificed Himself" in the Upper Room at the Institution of the Sacrament,¹ and that on "rising from the dead, He offered Himself to God the Father for the salvation of the whole human race".²

In his *Answers* to questions submitted to him St. Anastasius of Sinai states that it is right for the Eucharistic offering to be made on behalf of the departed, though he limits the sins for which forgiveness may thus be obtained for the dead to lesser offences.³ In his discourse *On the Holy Communion* he refers to the Eucharist as "the bloodless sacrifice,"⁴ and in one place speaks at some length of its connection with our Lord's heavenly life.

"Since the priest is the mediator between God and men and makes propitiation to God for the remission of the sins of the people, observe how he warns and exhorts all, saying to the congregation in some such words as these, Since ye have set me as a mediator with God on your behalf at this mystic Table, I beseech you, be ye also zealous together with me: depart from all worldly thoughts; leave every bodily care; for it is the time for earnest prayer and not for vain idleness. Hearken how the deacon addresses you, 'Let us stand rightly,' 'let us stand with fear'. Let us draw near to the holy oblation, let us bow our necks, let us bind our thought, let us bind our tongue, let us fill our mind, let us go up to heaven. Let us lift up our mind and our hearts, let us raise the eye of our soul up to God, let us pass through the heaven, let us pass through the angels, let us pass through the cherubim, let us run even to the very throne of the Lord, let us lay hold of the undefiled feet of Christ themselves, let us implore, let us put constraint on the tenderness of His mercy, let us make confession at the holy and super-

¹ §§ 2, 5 (P.G. lxxxvi. 2393, 2397). ² § 4 (P.G. lxxxvi. 2396).

³ *Quæst.* xxii. (P.G. lxxxix. 536), *extra ord.* (P.G. lxxxix. 753), cx. (P.G. lxxxix. 764).

⁴ *De sac. syn.* (P.G. lxxxix. 837, 841).

celestial and spiritual altar. Thus the priest exhorts us saying, 'Let us lift up our hearts'. And what is our answer? It is, 'We lift them up unto the Lord'. . . . Take heed, I beseech you, lest you lift not up your heart to the Lord but drag it down to the devil. What are you doing, O man? The priest offers the bloodless sacrifice on your behalf to the Lord, and are you despising it? The priest is in conflict on your behalf. Standing at the altar as at a dread tribunal he beseeches and earnestly strives that the grace of the Holy Ghost may descend from heaven upon you, and are you careless about your own salvation?"¹

The treatment of the Eucharistic sacrifice by St. John of Damascus is much briefer than his statement about the effects of consecration. It is worth notice that in his account of the institution he quotes our Lord's words in the form in which they are given in the *Liturgy of St. James*² containing a reference to the resurrection of our Lord as proclaimed in the Eucharist, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the death of the Son of Man and confess His resurrection until He come". In distinct allusion to the sacrifice he only says:—

"With bread and wine did Melchizedek, the priest of God Most High, receive Abraham as he was returning from the rout of the aliens. That table prefigured this mystic Table, as that priest was the figure and image of Christ the real High Priest. For, says Scripture, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek'. Of this bread the shewbread was an image. This is the pure even the bloodless sacrifice which the Lord said through the prophet should be offered to Him from the rising to the setting of the sun."³

At the Second Council of Nicæa Epiphanius the deacon spoke of the Eucharist as "the bloodless sacrifice that is offered by means of the priest" and "our bloodless sacrifice, the memorial of the passion of our God and of His whole dispensation".⁴

Nicephorus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, refers to the Eucharist as a sacrifice of the body of Christ, in which Christ "our great High Priest is in His manhood victim and lamb and sacrifice"; and says that in it Christians "proclaim the death of the Lord, and confess His resurrection".⁵

¹ *De sac. syn.* (P.G. lxxxix. 836, 837).

² See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 52.

³ *De fid. orth.* iv. 13.

⁴ Hardouin, *Concilia*, iv. 369.

⁵ *Antirrh.* ii. 3, 19 (P.G. c. 336, 372, 373). Cf. *Apol. pro sacr. imag.* 27 (P.G. c. 605).

In the Byzantine rite of the eighth and ninth and tenth centuries, as shown in the texts previously referred to, mention is made of the reception of the earthly sacrifice at the heavenly altar; our Lord's passion and resurrection and presence in heaven are spoken of in close connection with the oblation; and the commemoration of His death and resurrection is associated with Communion.

The Prayer of the Prothesis in the *Liturgy of St. Basil* contains the words:—

“O God, our God, who didst send forth the heavenly Bread, the nourishment of the whole world, our Lord and God Jesus Christ, as Saviour and Redeemer and Benefactor, blessing and sanctifying us, do Thou Thyself bless this oblation, and receive it at Thy heavenly altar.”¹

Between the recital of the words of institution and the invocation of the Holy Ghost the *Liturgy of St. Basil* has the following:—

“We also mindful of His saving sufferings, His life-giving cross, the burial for three days, the resurrection from the dead, the ascension into heaven, the sitting on the right hand of Thee our God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second coming.”²

In the same place the *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom* has much the same words:—

“Mindful of this saving command and of all the things which have been done on our behalf, the cross, the tomb, the resurrection on the third day, the ascent into heaven, the sitting on the right hand, the second and glorious coming again.”³

At the end of the celebration the *Liturgy of St. Basil* has the following prayer:—

“Accomplished and completed, so far as is in our power, are all things which Thou hast appointed unto us as the mysteries of

¹ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 309. From the Barberina MS. ascribed by Mr. Brightman (*op. cit.* i. lxxxix.) to the years between 788 and 797. Cf. the present form of the *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom* in Brightman, *op. cit.* i. 360.

² Brightman, *op. cit.* i. 328, 329. From the MS. Grottaferrata Γβ vii. ascribed by Mr. Brightman (*op. cit.* i. lxxxix.) to the ninth or tenth century.

³ *Ibid.* From the Barberina MS. (see above).

immortality: we have found the memorial of Thy death, we have seen the figure of Thy resurrection, we have been filled with Thy inexhaustible dainties, we have tasted of Thy endless life, which mayest Thou count us all worthy to attain in the world to come, O Christ our God." ¹

IV.

As in other matters, so in regard to the Eucharist the main lines of Eastern theology in later times follow the doctrine taught by St. John of Damascus and that implied in the Liturgies of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries. But from time to time there are instances of teaching which it is well to notice either because of the witness they afford to the continuance of a tradition or because of some special feature.

The commentaries on the Acts and the Epistles by Œcumenius, who was Bishop of Tricca in Thessaly in the latter half of the tenth century, are to a large extent based on the *Homilies* of St. Chrysostom and often reproduce his language. In regard to the Eucharist he uses the phrase that in it our Lord "for our sakes endures that which He did not suffer on the cross (for it is said, a bone of Him shall not be broken) in being broken that He may unite us to Himself," and lays stress on Christians being that which they receive.² He follows St. Chrysostom also in his references to the different aspects of the one sacrifice of Christ, offered on the cross, in heaven, and on the altar of the Church.

"It is the property of a ministering priest to stand and minister, while to sit is the mark of God, to whom the priestly service is offered. But, as has been said, He mingles things lowly with things lofty, that He may show His Godhead by means of sitting and His care for us and His manhood by means of ministering as priest. And this work of priestly ministration and of offering sacrifice is to cleanse men from their sins and make them holy. . . . He died that He might offer the sacrifice, and He rose from the dead and ascended into heaven that He might have heaven as His dwelling-place, where He must offer sacrifice. And by offering sacrifice understand His intercession on our behalf." ³

"As in the sacrifices which were offered for sin the blood was

¹ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 344. From the Barberina MS. (A.D. 788-797).

² On 1 Cor. x. 14-18. See pp. 96, 104, *supra*, p. 158, *infra*.

³ On Heb. viii. 1-6.

carried into the sanctuary by the high priest, and the body was burned outside the camp, so also the blood of Christ which was shed for the sins of the world cleansed all the world, and His body was hung on the cross outside the city of Jerusalem. . . . This blood then is brought in to our altar by our high priest.”¹

Theophylact was Archbishop of Bulgaria in the latter part of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. He died in A.D. 1107. His chief writings consist of commentaries on the books of the New Testament and on some of the Minor Prophets. His indebtedness to St. Chrysostom is very great. His comments on the passages which refer to the Holy Eucharist supply clear indications of his belief about it. His teaching on the transformation of the communicant into Christ resembles that which Maximus the Confessor derived from the writer known as Dionysius the Areopagite.² Like St. John of Damascus he repudiates the phraseology which by describing the consecrated elements as figures seemed to endanger the truth of the actual presence of Christ, and regards the elements as changed by means of the descent of the Holy Ghost at the consecration into the body and blood of Christ. Thus he describes Communion as “the mystic reception of the body” and “the flesh” “of the Lord,”³ says that “he who eats” Christ is “transformed” (*μεταστοιχειούμενος*) into Him,⁴ denies that the bread and the wine are an “antitype” of the body and blood of Christ, and asserts that they are “transmade” (*μεταποιέται*) and “changed” (*μεταβάλλεται*) “by means of the mystic blessing and the descent of the Holy Ghost” into that body and blood.⁵ Like St. Cyril of Alexandria⁶ he emphasises the life-giving character of the flesh which is received in the Eucharist because it is the flesh of Him who is God.⁷ In one passage, most of which is an expression of the ordinary teaching about the Sacrament, there are traces of a tendency to confuse the outward part and the unseen reality since Theophylact, following St. Chrysostom, there speaks of Christ Himself being broken in the Eucharist.

“Holding the cup of the Eucharist in our hands we bless and give thanks to Him who shed His blood on our behalf and bestowed on us ineffable good things. St. Paul said not participation but

¹ On Heb. xiii. 9-11.

² See pp. 138-42, *supra*.

³ On St. John vi. 27, 48-51.

⁴ On St. John vi. 56-58.

⁵ On St. Matt. xxvi. 26-28; St. Mark xiv. 22-25; St. John vi. 48-51.

⁶ See pp. 75, 76, *supra*.

⁷ On St. John vi. 56-58.

communion, that he might show something greater, that is most complete union. What he says is this, that what is in the chalice is what flowed from the side; and in partaking of this we hold communion with, that is we are united to, Christ. . . . That which the Lord suffered not on the cross (for not a bone of Him was broken) now He endures, being broken for our sake;¹ for it is said 'which we break'. And he said 'is the communion of the body of Christ' in the sense that, as that body is united to Christ, so we also are united to Him by means of this bread. . . . We are that body itself. For what is the bread? The body of Christ. And what do they who partake of it become? The body of Christ, not many bodies but one body."²

The teaching of Theophylact which bears on the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is of very considerable interest. He evidently regarded the sacrifice of our Lord as one abiding action associated with His death on the cross, with His priestly work in heaven, and with the Eucharist on earth. He speaks repeatedly of the death on the cross as a sacrifice for sin. "Christ," he says, "was offered," that is in His death on the cross, "by Himself"; "besides being High Priest, He is also sacrifice and victim"; "His death was the equivalent for the destruction of all, and, so far as His act was concerned, He died on behalf of all"; "He died, bearing our offences, and offering sacrifice to the Father, that He might blot out the sins which caused His death".³ "Christ Himself offered one sacrifice, that is His own body, for our sins"; "completely did He free from sins those who are sanctified and anointed with His blood by being baptised into His death"; "through the offering of the body of Christ which took place once for all we were sanctified".⁴ Christ "offered," that is on the cross, "a sacrifice of such a kind and of so great power that by means of it He once for all cleansed the world".⁵ But the priestly action of Christ is not regarded by Theophylact as ending with His death. "For our sake He entered in within the heaven that He might open for us the way"; He entered in "on our behalf, that is that He might intercede with the Father on our behalf, as also the high priest entered into the sanctuary once in the year, making propitiation on behalf of the people".⁶ "He entered in with a sacrifice that is able to appease the Father";

¹ See pp. 104, 156, *supra*. ² On 1 Cor. x. 16. ³ On Heb. ix. 28.

⁴ On Heb. x. 10, 12, 14. ⁵ On Heb. vii. 27. ⁶ On Heb. vi. 20.

“He appears on our behalf because He entered in as High Priest, for His entrance took place because of our reconciliation”.¹ “While it is true that He sits, yet He has not on this account ceased to be High Priest”; being a priest, “He is not a priest without a sacrifice”; “this was nothing else than His own body”.² “Because of His manhood it is said that He intercedes”; “He lives and is ever able to perform His high-priestly work on our behalf”; “that the Son bearing flesh should sit with the Father is intercession on our behalf, since the flesh makes supplication on our behalf to the Father”.³ His high-priestly work is associated with the Eucharist on earth as well as with His intercession in heaven. In the Eucharist “He offers Himself by means of His ministers,” “with priestly action He will perform (*ἱερουργήσει*) for us the more perfect and mystic rites, giving Himself to us for food and drink in a new fashion which surpasses all thought”.⁴ Carrying on the same conception Theophylact speaks of the Christian “altar” and “the bloodless sacrifice of the life-giving body,” and says that “our high priests, accomplishing the memorial of that sacrifice,” that is the sacrifice on the cross, “bring the blood of the Lord to our sanctuary and to the altar, as to heaven”.⁵ “To-day at the mystic Table it is He Himself who gives the mysteries”; while the “memorial” is in one of its aspects a reminder to Christians, it is also a “sacrifice” which they “received from Christ Himself”.⁶

The writings of Euthymius Zigabenus, also called Zigadenus, are of slightly later date than those of Theophylact. He was a monk of Constantinople and flourished in the reign of the Emperor Alexius Comnenus. He died about A.D. 1118. His most important works are his commentaries on Holy Scripture and his *Dogmatic Panoply of the Orthodox Faith*.

In regard to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist the teaching of Euthymius is much the same as that of St. John of Damascus and Theophylact. He lays stress on the effect of the descent of the Holy Ghost as making the elements the body and blood of Christ, denies that they are symbols, and compares the consecration with the conception of our Lord by His virgin Mother. In the *Dogmatic Panoply of the Orthodox Faith* he quotes at length without comments of his own passages from the

¹ On Heb. ix. 24.² On Heb. viii. 3.³ On Heb. vii. 25.⁴ On Heb. vii. 3.⁵ On Heb. xiii. 10-12.⁶ On 1 Cor. xi. 23-26.

writings of St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. John of Damascus.¹ In his comment on the record of the institution of the Sacrament he says:—

“He did not say, These are symbols of My body and of My blood, but, These are My body itself and My blood itself. It follows therefore that we must not look at the nature of the elements but at their efficacy. For, as He supernaturally added deity to the flesh which He took, so He ineffably transmakes (*μεταποιᾷ*) these also into His life-giving body itself and His precious blood itself, and into the grace of them. Yet the bread bears a certain resemblance to the body, and the wine to the blood. For the bread and the body are of the earth; and the wine and the blood are full of warmth. And as the bread gives strength, so also does the body of Christ, and moreover it sanctifies both body and soul. And as the wine gladdens, so also does the blood of Christ, and moreover it becomes a preservative.”²

There is a very close resemblance between the teaching of Euthymius on the Eucharistic sacrifice and that of Theophylact. There is the same central idea of the one sacrifice of Christ, offered by Him in His death and in heaven, and offered by Christians on earth. In the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane Christ was fulfilling the type of the Jewish high priest and was performing His office as “High Priest after the order of Melchizedek,” and “offered in His manhood prayers and supplications”.³ “Christ, who is king as God, became also priest as Man when He sacrificed Himself for the remission of our sins.”⁴ “He offered Himself as a sacrifice on our behalf when He delivered Himself up to death. The one same sacrifice then because of its supreme value availed for the remission of all the defilements of sin committed before the reception of Baptism.”⁵ “Once was He sacrificed, this one sacrifice availing and having power surpassing every other.”⁶ Consequently He does not leave heaven after His entrance at the ascension and return again and again; but it is sufficient that He has entered once with His

¹ *Pan. Dogm.* xxv., quoting St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat. Cat.* xxxvii. (see pp. 71-73, *supra*), and St. John of Damascus, *De fid. Orth.* iv. 13 (see pp. 145-47, *supra*).

² On St. Matt. xxvi. 28.

³ On Heb. v. 7, 10. The commentaries of Euthymius on the Epistles were not printed till 1887. An edition of them was published at Athens in that year, edited by Archbishop Kalogeras.

⁴ On Heb. vii. 14.

⁵ On Heb. vii. 27.

⁶ On Heb. ix. 26.

“sacrifice” of “His sacrificed flesh”.¹ “When He had made His offering once for all, He sat down as Lord.”² None the less He continues to exercise His priestly office in heaven on our behalf. “Since He is an eternal priest He ever saves and He completely saves”; “even now also He is the representative, as Man, on behalf of our salvation”; “His manhood itself beseeches the Father on our behalf”.³ “In heaven He performs the priestly work of representation on our behalf”; “since He rose and ascended and lives, again He performs as priest a better and heavenly priestly office”; “being in heaven He has obtained a more lofty priestly work, accomplishing as priest His mediation with the Father on our behalf”.⁴ It is His present office “to make propitiation to the Father on our behalf as our High Priest”; “now in heaven He appears with His sacrificed flesh”.⁵ This one sacrifice of Christ is also offered in the Eucharist. The Eucharistic “memorial” is a reminder to Christians that our Lord “delivered up His body to death and shed His blood on our behalf” and also a “sacrifice,”⁶ even “the mystic sacrifice of the body of the Lord”.⁷

“We ever offer the same sacrifice, even that which was then offered by Christ; for it is for a memorial of that; for He said, ‘Do this for My memorial’. As then it does not follow that there are many Christs because Christ in many places offers the bloodless sacrifice, but there is the same Christ everywhere; so also here it does not follow because we offer often that there are many offerings, but there is one and the same offering.”⁸

In the middle of the twelfth century there was a controversy on the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Byzantine Rite of that date contained the words addressed to God the Son, “Thou art He who dost offer and art offered and dost receive the sacrifice”.⁹ It was contended by Soterichus Panteugenus

¹ On Heb. ix. 25.

² On Heb. x. 11, 12.

³ On Heb. vii. 25.

⁴ On Heb. viii. 2, 4, 6.

⁵ On Heb. ix. 24.

⁶ On St. Matt. xxvi. 28 and 1 Cor. xi. 25.

⁷ On Heb. xiii. 9.

⁸ On Heb. x. 3.

⁹ See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 378. For the earlier form as used in the eighth century, “Thou art He who dost offer and art offered, who dost sanctify and art sanctified,” see Brightman, *op. cit.* i. 318. The phrase “He who offers and is offered, and receives and is distributed” is used by St. Cyril of Alexandria in his *Homily on the Mystic Supper*, t. v. (2), p. 378, Aubert; *P. G. lxxvii. 1029: cf. p. 113, supra.*

the Patriarch-elect of Antioch and others that the sacrifice of the cross was offered only to the Father and the Holy Ghost, not to the Godhead of the Son who Himself offered it; and that to assert the contrary would inevitably imply the Nestorian heresy. Against this view it was maintained that, since the Son is a Person in the Holy Trinity, the sacrifice must necessarily have been offered to Him as well as to the Father and the Holy Ghost; and it was urged that this theological argument was supported by the assertion in the Liturgy that the Eucharistic sacrifice, which must correspond to the sacrifice of the cross, is offered to the Son. In these circumstances the controversy about the sacrifice inevitably involved discussions in regard to the Eucharist. A dialogue ascribed to Soterichus has been preserved by Nicetas of Chonae, a thirteenth century writer. This dialogue contains the following statement placed in the mouth of Soterichus:—

“If you say that the Saviour offers to the Father those who are saved by Him, and that He Himself is offered by means of the bloodless sacrifice which is for His memorial, and that He as God receives what we offer, we are in assent and concord with your argument. But, if you predicate these statements of the natures, and ignore the Person, and say that the nature which was taken offers what belongs to the flesh, and that the sacrifice of the flesh is offered, and that the Godhead receives the sacrifice, without knowing it you are weaving a rope out of the sand. . . . Further, who that is orthodox would wish to refer the reception of the offering to the sacrifice which took place at the passion? For the Apostle Paul cries out, ‘Christ died on our behalf once for all’; and again, ‘This He did once for all when He offered up Himself,’ and elsewhere, ‘For by one offering He hath perfected for ever those that contend’.¹ When the Apostle says that His offering is offered once for all and is one, do you say that He offers Himself daily?”

To this contention of Soterichus the other interlocutor in the dialogue replies:—

“Yes, He offered Himself once for all; but He also now offers those who are saved by Him, as we said. Moreover, He is offered by means of the sacrifice that is supernaturally changed into His life-giving and saving body and blood. Do you not hear the priestly

¹ Rom. v. 8; Heb. vii. 27, x. 10, 14.

ministrants saying whenever the rite is offered, 'The Lamb is sacrificed'."

The answer represented as that of Soterichus is as follows:—

"This indeed is rightly said by them, since they celebrate the saving passion which was of yore as if it were present. For the memorial which the Saviour commanded us to make renews by way of representation, or rather by way of image, the things which happened long ago as if they were present, as the custom in the festival orations is to speak of things which are past as though they were present on whatever day the celebration takes place. Wherefore also we say after the manner of a festival oration, Christ is born, and He is baptised. It is our custom also to celebrate the saving passion in this way."¹

In connection with this teaching of Soterichus a council was held at Constantinople under the Emperor Manuel Comnenus in January, 1156. At this council it was unanimously agreed that—

"The precious blood of the Only Begotten was offered not only to the Father but also to the Son and the Holy Ghost, the one Godhead";

a representative statement of those made at the discussions was to the effect that—

"The life-giving sacrifice, neither at the first when it was offered by the Saviour Christ nor at any time since to the present day, has been offered and is offered only to the Father of the Only Begotten, the Source of all things, but also to the Word who became incarnate, and the Holy Ghost is not left out in so divine an honour; and the oblation of the mysteries, which is consecrated on each occasion by the power of the Trinity, has been made and is made in general to the Godhead in the Trinity of Persons, which is known to us as united and one, sharing in the same nature and co-eternal";

and condemnations were passed on the statements that the sacrifice of the cross was not received by God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, that the sacrifice in the mysteries was not offered to the Holy Trinity, and that the memorial in the mysteries is by way of representation or by way of image. At a later

¹This dialogue is in Nicetas of Chonae, *Thesaurus Orth. Fid.* xxiv. (P.G. cxl. 140-48).

session of the council in May, 1156, it was affirmed that on the cross our Lord "offered Himself in His manhood, while as God He together with the Father and the Spirit received the sacrifice," and that "the bloodless sacrifices" are offered to and received by the Trinity. Soterichus was with difficulty induced to make a statement that he assented to the teaching of the council that the sacrifice offered on the cross and that now offered in the Church are one and the same. In spite of this statement he was declared to be unfit to be consecrated Patriarch of Antioch.¹

The works of Nicolas, Bishop of Methone in the Peloponnesus, about the Eucharist have the interest that they were written to defend the current doctrine against attacks. They include two short treatises written in 1157 in connection with the controversy raised by Soterichus Panteugenus. In these treatises the opinion of Soterichus is very strongly condemned, and is represented as necessarily involving heresy, since the tendency of it is to divide the one Person of Christ, to make a division in the Holy Trinity, and to deny to the Son equal glory with the Father. The positive teaching of Nicolas in regard to the sacrifice in the Eucharist does not differ from that found in Theophylact and other Greek writers. The death of our Lord on the Cross was the sacrifice in which "once for all" Christ offered Himself a "living sacrifice". There is an "abiding presentation" of "the blood of salvation" on "the heavenly altar". Herein is exercised our Lord's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. This "abiding presentation" in heaven is closely connected with the sacrificial action of the Church on earth, whereby in the Eucharist our Lord "as Man offers and is offered," and "as God, together with the Father and the Spirit, receives His own sacrifice". There is one sacrifice, which was offered "once for all" on the cross, is offered on earth in the Eucharist "in relations of time," and is offered "abidingly" in heaven.²

¹The proceedings of the council are in Nicetas of Chonae, *Thesaurus Orth. Fid.* xxiv. For the passages quoted see P.G. cxi. 148, 149, 152, 176, 177, 185, 189.

²The treatises were printed for the first time in an edition published at Leipsic in 1865 by Andronikos Demetrakopoulos. The passages referred to above are on pp. 18, 19, 37, 38, 48-53, 67.

The same treatises contain incidental allusions to the presence of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament, and to the gift bestowed and received in Communion. The bread and wine are said to be "transelemented (*μεταστοιχειουμένων*) by the operation of the Holy Ghost" into the body and blood of Christ; and the Holy Ghost makes "those who receive these in faith to be of one body with Christ and partakers of Him".¹

The subject of the presence of Christ is treated more fully by the same writer in his book *Against those who doubt, and say that the consecrated bread and wine are not the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ*. He describes the Eucharist as "the mystic and bloodless priestly rite in which we believe that the bread and the cup on being consecrated are transmuted (*μεταποιεῖσθαι*) into the body and blood of the Lord". The "object" and "end" wherewith it was instituted are "participation of Christ and the eternal life of those who have share in Christ," who are granted "reception of the divine nature" (*ἐκθέωσις*) in becoming "the body of Christ" through receiving it. The supernatural "change" (*μεταβολή*) of the elements into the body of Christ is analogous to the facts "transcending nature and reason and mind and thought" in the birth of our Lord from a virgin, His resurrection, His ascension, and the other wonders of His life. Nicolas ends his treatise with the prayer:—

"Deliver, Lord, by Thy mercy from such deceit and madness all those who do not rightly acknowledge that the bread and wine which are consecrated by us are the perfect body and precious blood of Thy Christ."²

The *Mystic Contemplation* of Germanus II, who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 1221 to 1239, explains in elaborate detail the mystical meaning of the various parts of the Eucharistic rite, and incidentally alludes to doctrine which does not differ from that already noticed in many writers. Germanus refers, for instance, to—

"the holy Table" "on which is set forth the true and heavenly bread, the mystic and bloodless sacrifice, who being sacrificed has

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 51, 56, 61.

² This treatise is in *P.G.* cxxxv. 509-18.

given to the faithful His flesh and blood for food and drink of eternal life";¹

and writes:—

"The altar is the mercy seat on which offering was made for sin according to the holy memorial of Christ, on which altar also Christ offered Himself a sacrifice to God the Father, through the offering of His body, as a Lamb slain, and as High Priest and Son of Man, offering and being offered, sacrificed for a mystic and bloodless sacrifice and reasonable service for the faithful, by which we have been made partakers of eternal and immortal life."²

Of the consecration he says:—

"The divine gifts are signed that by the descent and glorious presence of the Holy Ghost He may change and make them, the bread the precious body itself of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that which is in the cup the precious blood itself of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, which was poured out for the life and salvation of the world; and that to those who partake of it, it may be for remission of sins and eternal life."³

Of the presence of the whole body of Christ in each fragment of the consecrated bread he writes:—

"After the elevation the division of the divine body is made. Yet, though it is divided, it remains undivided and unsevered, being known and found to be whole in each part of the separated pieces."⁴

The doctrine of the Eucharist is treated with great fulness by Nicolas Cabasilas, who was Metropolitan of Thessalonica in the middle of the fourteenth century. A large part of his lengthy treatise *On Life in Christ* is taken up with an exposition of the benefits of Communion and the completeness of the union with Christ which results from the reception of it. In another treatise, the *Explanation of the Holy Liturgy*, he deals more fully and systematically than any earlier writer with the sacrificial aspects of the Eucharist. This latter book also contains incidental allusions to the doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Thus, the effect of consecration is said to be "the

¹ P.G. xcvi. 387. The treatise is here printed among the works of Germanus I. who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 715 to 730; but there is much probability that it is not by him but by Germanus II. as stated above.

² *Ibid.* 389.

³ *Ibid.* 440.

⁴ *Ibid.* 449.

change (*μεταβολή*) of the gifts into the divine body and blood";¹ Christ is described as "sanctifying the gifts, changing (*μεταβάλλων*) them into His body and blood";² it is affirmed that "God takes these gifts to be His own in such a way that He makes them the body and blood of the Only Begotten," and "receives our bread and wine and gives back to us the Son Himself".³ Cabasilas writes in strong reprobation of the Western view that the consecration is effected by the recital of the words of institution,⁴ and in the following passage connects the consecration with the invocation of the Holy Ghost and describes its results:—

"When" the priest "has made mention of that awful supper, and how" the Lord "delivered it to His holy disciples before His passion, and that He received the cup and took bread and hallowed the Eucharist, and that He spoke the words by which He manifested the mystery, and when he in turn has uttered the same words, he bows down and prays and implores God, applying those divine words of His only begotten Son, our Saviour, to the gifts offered on the altar, that they receiving His all-holy and almighty Spirit may be changed, the bread into His precious and holy body itself, and the wine into His stainless and holy blood itself. And, when this has been said, the whole of the priestly rite has been accomplished and completed, and the gifts have been consecrated, and the sacrifice has been perfected, and the great sacrifice and victim, which was slain for the sake of the world, is seen to lie on the holy Table; for the bread is no longer a figure of the Lord's body, nor a gift which bears an image of the real gift or which brings in itself some representation of the saving sufferings as in a picture, but the real gift itself, the body itself of the all-holy Lord, which really received all the shame, the insults, the scourging, which was crucified, which was slain, which witnessed before Pontius Pilate the good confession, which was beaten, which was reviled, which endured the spitting, which tasted the gall. In like manner also the wine is the blood itself which leapt out from the slain body, this body, this blood, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, which was born of the holy Virgin, which was buried, which rose on the third day, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of the Father."⁵

In explanation of the attitudes of worship adopted at the time of the Great Entrance, when the as yet unconsecrated

¹ C. 1.² C. 49.³ C. 47.⁴ Cc. 29, 30.⁵ C. 27.

gifts are carried with much pomp to the altar, Cabasilas writes :—

“The people sing and fall down before the priest with all reverence and devotion, begging that he will remember them in the offering of the gifts. He goes on accompanied by lights and incense, and so approaches the altar. . . . It is right that the gifts with which the sacrifice is to be offered should be brought in and placed on the altar ; and that this should be done with all possible dignity and solemnity. . . . This rite can also be regarded as signifying the last manifestation of Christ, in which He greatly kindled the envy of the Jews, when He took His journey from His own country to Jerusalem, where He was to be sacrificed, when He entered the city riding, accompanied by many and greeted with singing. Also it is right that we should fall down before the priest and beg him to remember us in those prayers. . . . If some of those who fall down before the priest when he comes in with the gifts worship and speak of the gifts which are brought in as the body and blood of Christ, they are misled by the entrance of the pre-sanctified gifts,¹ being ignorant of the difference between this rite and that. For in this entrance the gifts are still unsanctified and have not yet been consecrated ; but in that case they are complete and have been consecrated and are the body and blood of Christ.”²

On the subject of the sacrifice this treatise of Cabasilas follows much the same lines as those in the *Mystic Contemplation* of Germanus II. He expounds in detail the mystical meaning of the various ceremonies in the Liturgy. The idea already familiar in Greek theology, that before consecration the elements are an image of the body and blood of Christ although they cease to be such an image on actually becoming the body and blood at the consecration is worked out so as to depict the ceremonies as a representation in mystery of the successive moments of the human life of Christ and to show the rite itself as setting forth the whole Incarnation. Thus—

“In the sacred rite of the Eucharist the whole Incarnation of Christ is written in the bread as on a writing tablet ; for as in a figure we behold Him as a babe, and led to death, and crucified, and pierced in His side ; then also the bread itself changed (*μεταβαλλόμενον*) into that all-holy body which really endured this,

¹ *I.e.*, in the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified.

² C. 24.

and rose from the dead, and was taken into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father."¹

"The consecration of the gifts, the sacrifice itself, proclaims His death and His resurrection and His ascension, because God changes (*μεταβάλλει*) these precious gifts into the body of the Lord itself, which received all these, since it was crucified and rose and ascended into heaven. But the parts of the rite which precede the sacrifice are those before the death, namely the coming, the showing forth, the perfect manifestation. And the parts of the rite after the sacrifice are the promise of the Father, as He said, the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, the conversion and union of the Gentiles to God through them."²

"He commanded us to make the memorial of Him in the things which seem to signify weakness, the cross, the passion, the death. . . . This the Lord Himself showed when He delivered the mystery. For when He said, 'This is My body,' 'This is My blood,' He did not add miracles to these by saying, 'I raised the dead,' 'I cleansed lepers'. What did He add? Only His passion and His death, 'That which is broken on your behalf,' 'That which is poured out on your behalf'."³

"Let us observe how often and where this memory of the priestly rite takes place. For it takes place twice, first at the beginning, when the oblation of the gifts is made, secondly when the sacrifice of them is offered. . . . What in the second place is indicated by the memory of the cross and of the things which followed the cross, this in the first place is the memorial of the Lord."⁴

This memorial of Christ, thus mystically set forth in the stages of the Eucharistic rite, is regarded by Cabasilas as the act in which the Church keeps alive among Christians the memory of Christ,⁵ and presents before God the commemoration of His human life. Through the whole exposition runs the thought of the oneness of Christ's sacrifice.

"This sacrifice is not an image and figure of a sacrifice but a real sacrifice, and that which is sacrificed is not bread but the body of Christ itself, and moreover the sacrifice of the Lamb of God is one and took place once for all."⁶

That the sacrifice of Christ was offered once for all does not impair the reality of His abiding sacrificial action.

¹ C. 37 ; *cf.* 6, 8.

² C. 1 ; *cf.* c. 16.

³ C. 7.

⁴ C. 50.

⁵ C. 9.

⁶ C. 32.

“In offering and sacrificing Himself once for all He did not cease from His priesthood, but He exercises this perpetual ministry for us, in which He is our advocate with God for ever, for which reason it was said of Him, ‘Thou art a priest for ever’.”¹

“He is the mediator through whom all the good things given to us by God have come, or rather they are ever being given. For He did not once for all mediate and deliver to us all for which He mediated and then depart but He is ever a mediator, not by words and supplications, as are ambassadors, but by act. And what is the act? It is His uniting us to Himself and His bestowing on us through Himself His own gifts according to each one’s desert and the measure of his cleansing. . . . He it is who alone reconciles to God, who makes this peace, apart from whom there is no hope for those who are at enmity with God to receive any of His good things. . . . What is it which reconciles God to the nature of men? Assuredly that He sees His beloved Son as Man. So also He is reconciled to each individual man, if one wears the form of the Only Begotten, and bears His body, and is seen to be one spirit with Him. . . . If then we must believe that some refreshment is granted to the souls from the prayer of the priests and the offering of the holy gifts, we must first believe that this also happens in this way in which alone it is possible for man to obtain refreshment. In what way has been said, namely by being reconciled to God and not being at enmity with Him. And how is this? By being united to God and becoming one spirit with the Beloved, in whom alone the Father is well pleased. But this is the work of the holy Table, which is common, as has been shown by what has been said, to both living and dead alike.”²

Elsewhere Cabasilas explains that the sacrifice of the Eucharist, which is thus one with the sacrifice offered on the cross and the high priestly work of Christ in heaven, is presented in prayer for the living and the departed, and in thanksgiving for the saints, especially the blessed Mother of God;³ and that it sanctifies by way of intercession both the dead and the living, by way of Communion the living only.⁴ Following the doctrine affirmed in the condemnation of Soterichus Panteugenus, Cabasilas teaches that the sacrifice is offered to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost; and that in it our Lord offers the sacrifice of Himself, and is offered as a sacrifice, and receives the sacrifice, “offering and receiving as God, being offered as Man”.⁵

¹ C. 28; *cf.* cc. 2, 8. ² C. 44. ³ C. 33. ⁴ C. 42. ⁵ C. 49.

An instance of like treatment of the Eucharist to that of Cabasilas may be given from the early part of the fifteenth century in the writings of Symeon, who was Metropolitan of Thessalonica from 1410 to 1429. Symeon's *Dialogue against all heresies and on the Faith of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ and on the sacred rites and all the mysteries of the Church* contains sections which deal at length with the rites and the liturgy. Doctrinal teaching occurs only incidentally. Of Communion Symeon says that it "unites to the Lord Himself, and we really partake of His flesh and blood".¹ Of the consecrated Sacrament he says that it—

"is Christ, really His body and blood itself, which He consecrated for the sake of us His peculiar people, and allows and desires us to taste and see and touch."²

The detailed ceremonies of the liturgy are regarded as a mystical representation of the events in the passion of Christ,³ and the whole rite is viewed as the Church's presentation of Christ's sacrifice in mystery before God.⁴ In his *Exposition of the Holy Sanctuary* Symeon says that at the consecration "the bread and the cup become the body and blood of Christ"; that the consecration is effected by the invocation of the Holy Ghost; and that—

"it is Christ Himself who acts through the priest together with the Father and the Spirit, and it is He who offers and is offered, who consecrates and is consecrated, who receives the sacrifice and is distributed."⁵

Explaining the attitudes of worship at the Great Entrance, he writes:—

"All the faithful fall down before the priests, and rightly, partly asking for their prayers and begging for their remembrance in the rite, partly honouring the holy gifts. For, although they are still unconsecrated, yet they have been dedicated to God in the prothesis,⁶ and the priest there offered them to God and prayed

¹ C. 36; cf. 99.

² C. 99.

³ See especially cc. 84, 85, 92; cf. Symeon's *Expos. de div. templo*, 92-96. Part of the latter treatise is translated in the Introduction to Neale and Littledale, *Translations of the Primitive Liturgies*, pp. xxi.-xl.

⁴ Cc. 79-99.

⁵ C. 88.

⁶ *I.e.*, the preliminary part of the Liturgy, corresponding to the Western Offertory, performed in the chapel on the left of the altar.

that they might be received on the heavenly altar. Therefore, although they are still unconsecrated, yet they have been prepared for consecration, and are an offering to God and antitypes of the Lord's body and blood. . . . The holy images are worthy of veneration as representations of the realities; so also are the gifts that are dedicated to God and offered that they may become the body and blood of Christ. If then we ought to assign honour and veneration to the holy images, much more ought we to do so to the gifts themselves, which are antitypes, as great Basil says, and are offered that they may become the body and blood of Christ."¹

The *Definition* of the Council of Florence, which was accepted by the representatives of the Eastern Church in 1439, contained incidental statements that "the body of Christ is really consecrated," and that "the holy sacrifices" benefit the departed.²

At the time of the Council of Florence George Scholarius, then a layman, who was afterwards known as Gennadius, was eager for union between the East and the West, and inclined to go a long way to meet Western ideas in order to promote that union. Later in his life he became much more hostile to the West, and in the period immediately preceding the fall of Constantinople in 1453 he displayed great enmity against the Westerns. In 1453 he was appointed Patriarch of Constantinople. His *Homily on the Sacramental Body of our Lord Jesus Christ* is of interest because in it Gennadius, while maintaining the positive teaching of the traditional Eastern theology, introduces phraseology and lines of thought which by this time had become current in the West. This may have been due partly to Western influence at one time in his life, and partly to his study of and affection for the Aristotelian philosophy. He uses the word Transubstantiation (*μετουσίωσις*). He speaks of the change (*μεταβολή*) of the substance (*οὐσία*) of the elements into the substance (*οὐσία*) of the body and blood of Christ; of the accidents (*συμβεβηκότα*) of the bread and wine remaining unchanged; of the body of Christ being without its appropriate accidents (*χωρὶς τῶν αὐτῷ προπόντων συμβεβηκότων*), while the bread retains its accidents (*συμβεβηκότα*) without its own substance (*οὐσία*); and of the outward state (*τῆς ἔξωθεν διαθέσεως*) of the elements being preserved in view of the repugnance which communicants might otherwise feel. He maintains

¹ C. 78.² Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix. 421.

that the body of Christ is not in the Sacrament naturally (*φυσικῶς*) but after the manner of a Sacrament (*μυστηριωδῶς*), and therefore is not in it as in a place (*καθάπερ ἐσκηνωμένον ἐν τινι τόπῳ*), and is not under the dimensions of the real body (*ὑπὸ ταῖς ἰδίαις ταῖς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ σώματος διαστάσεσιν*) but under the dimensions of the bread only (*ὑπὸ ταῖς τοῦ ἄρτου διαστάσεσιν μόναις*). He says that each fragment is the whole body of Christ, and that the body of Christ in heaven and on every altar on earth is one and the same, being that body which was born of the Virgin, was once on the cross, and is now in heaven.¹

V.

Gabriel Severus was born at Napoli di Malvasia or Monemvasia in Epidaurus in the Morea. In 1577 he was appointed Bishop of Ala Sher (Allah-shehr) in Asia Minor, the ancient Philadelphia, but, finding little to do in that diocese, he went to Venice, where he acted as Bishop of the Eastern Christians in the Venetian States. He became known as a theologian and published several theological treatises. Among them is a work on the Eastern acts of reverence at the Great Entrance entitled *Against those who say that the Orthodox Children of the Eastern Church do wrongly and unlawfully in honouring and venerating the Holy Gifts when the Cherubic Hymn is sung and the Priest carrying them enters the Holy Sanctuary*, which was published in 1604² in reply to the attacks of Latin Christians on the practice. In this treatise Gabriel defends the reverence at the Great Entrance by the argument that the elements even before consecration are worthy of veneration as being not only good creatures of God but also set apart and sanctified to become by the subsequent consecration the body and blood of Christ, though they do not receive before they are transubstantiated at the consecration that adoration which is given to them when consecrated as being then the body and blood.

¹ This *Homily* is printed in P.G. clx. 351-74.

² This treatise, together with three other of Gabriel's works (*Περὶ τῶν μεριδῶν, Περὶ τῶν κολύβων, Περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς θείας λειτουργίας*), were printed with a Latin translation and notes by the Oratorian Richard Simon in a volume entitled *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis seu Gabrielis Metropolitae Philadelphiensis Opuscula*, published at Paris in 1671 (re-issued with a new title-page in 1686). The references here given are to this edition.

“This bread and wine receives and possesses three degrees of honour. The first it has by nature (*φυσικῶς*), the second it receives by participation (*μετοχικῶς*), it enters on (*εἰσδύεται*) the third through the Holy Ghost by Transubstantiation (*μετουσιαστικῶς*). The natural honour it has in that it is a creature and work of God. . . . Wherefore, it is not for this venerated, or worshipped, or carried in procession, but is commended as the fair creation of God. The second degree of honour and regard it receives by participation (*μετοχικῶς*) when it is brought to the holy table, and blessed by the priest, and dedicated.¹ Then it is no longer bread and wine as before, but is holy and an honourable gift and divine, and matter fit and set apart and assigned to become properly the body and blood of Christ, the substance of it, and the accidents of the substance, still remaining. For this reason it is reasonably venerated, and rightly honoured, and is revered, and is carried in procession² with hymns and lights and sweet odours without any wrong. But the third degree of regard and unspeakable honour it receives by Transubstantiation (*κατὰ μετουσίωσιν*) when it puts off the whole of its own substance of the nature of bread, and is transubstantiated into the flesh and blood of Christ. Wherefore it is not only venerated (*προσκυνεῖται*) but is also adored (*λατρεύεται*), and is believed by all the orthodox Christians to be properly the flesh and blood of Christ our God, although its accidents are preserved, the Lord granting this as a concession to human weakness.”³

“If we kneel to a material image which cannot become the flesh of Christ, why should you forbid us to offer honour and the bowing of head and knees to the matter that is dedicated to God, and inseparably appointed to become the body and blood of Christ, since even before the Transubstantiation which results from the blessing and prayer of the priest it has an ineffaceable hallowing? . . . Therefore, brethren, it is right and pious and holy and fitting for orthodox Christians to honour (*τιμᾶν*) and venerate (*προσκυνεῖν*) the holy image of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, as the Holy Church of Christ commands; but it is still more right for the holy gifts to be honoured (*τιμᾶσθαι*) and revered (*γεραίρεσθαι*) in that they are holy gifts and matter dedicated to God appointed and suitable to become the flesh and blood of Christ by means of the blessing and the power of the prayers. . . . The Eastern

¹ *I.e.*, at the Prothesis; see p. 171, note 6, *supra*.

² *I.e.*, at the Great Entrance.

³ Pp. 3, 4. The substance of the above passage occurs also several times elsewhere in this treatise.

Catholic Holy Church of Christ, which keeps the faith unburied, teaches her true children to venerate (*προσκυνεῖν*) and reverence (*γεραίρειν*) the holy gifts when they are brought in, and to say, 'Lord, remember me in Thy kingdom,' as holy gifts and honourable and matter definitely appointed to be changed (*μεταβληθῆναι*) into the flesh and blood of Christ, but not as the completed (*τέλειον*) body of the Lord; for this she orders them to adore (*λατρεύειν*) when the priest standing at the doors of the sanctuary says, 'Draw near with the fear of God and faith and love'. And then each one says, not, 'Lord, remember me in Thy kingdom,' but, 'I believe, Lord, and confess that Thou art Jesus Christ the Son of the living God, who came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am first'." ¹

VI.

In the first half of the seventeenth century the Eastern Church was brought into contact with some of the results of the Western Reformation. Cyril Lucar, Patriarch first of Alexandria and then of Constantinople, had resided in Germany and Switzerland, and had there studied Western theology. He had been attracted by some elements in the teaching of the Reformers, was a correspondent of Archbishop Laud, and showed his interest in and appreciation of England by his gift of the Alexandrian MS. of the Old and New Testaments, which is now in the British Museum, to King Charles I. and by sending Metrophanes Kritopulos, afterwards Patriarch of Alexandria, to England, where he studied at Balliol College. He formed the project of a theological system which might preserve what he deemed to be the best features of the traditional theology of the East in combination with those parts of the teaching of the Western Reformers which appealed to him. In pursuance of this object he drew up a document entitled *The Eastern Confession of the Orthodox Faith*. This *Confession* was published in Latin in 1629; and a translation into Greek, dated 1631, was published in 1633. On the Sacraments in general the fifteenth chapter of the *Confession* stated:—

"We believe that there are in the Church mysteries of the Gospel which the Lord delivered in the Gospel; and that these are two. For so many were delivered unto us; and He who instituted them delivered no more. And we firmly maintain that these con-

¹ Pp. 15, 16.

sist of a word and an element ; and that they are seals of the promises of God, and procure grace. But for the mystery to be perfect and entire, it is necessary that the earthly matter and the outward act concur with the use of that earthly thing which was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, united with sincere faith ; for when faith is wanting in the receivers the entirety of the mystery is not preserved.”¹

So far as the Eucharist is concerned, this statement appears to mean that for a valid Sacrament there are needed, besides the consecration of bread and wine, the use in Communion and the faith of the communicants.

The sixteenth chapter of the *Confession* was on Baptism. In the seventeenth chapter Cyril Lucar wrote :—

“We believe the other mystery instituted by our Lord to be what we call the Eucharist. For in the night in which the Lord gave Himself up, He took bread and blessed and said to His Apostles, ‘Take, eat ; this is My body’. And He took the cup of the Eucharist and said,² ‘Drink ye all of it ; this is My blood which is poured out for you ; do this for My memorial’.³ And Paul adds ‘For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord’s death’.⁴ This is the simple, true, and genuine tradition of this wonderful mystery, in the performance and administration of which we acknowledge and believe is the true and real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ ; nevertheless, such as our faith presents and offers to us, not such as Transubstantiation (*μετουσίωσις*) vainly invented teaches. For we believe that the faithful who partake of the Supper eat the body of our Lord Jesus Christ not by perceptibly pressing and dissolving the Communion with the teeth, but by the soul realising Communion. For the body of the Lord is not what is seen in the mystery with the eyes and received, but what faith spiritually apprehends and presents and bestows upon us. Wherefore it is true that we eat and partake and have Communion, if we believe. If we believe not, we are deprived of all benefit of the mystery. Consequently to drink the cup in the mystery is

¹ Kimmel, *Mon. Fid. Eccl. Orient.* i. 34.

² This is the translation of the Greek text λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστίας ἔλεγε. In his *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, p. 203, Mr. J. N. W. B. Robertson suggests that εὐχαριστίας is “a mistake for εὐχαριστήσας, analogously to what is said of the bread; and agreeably to the Latin, which has ‘Et accepto calice gratias agens, dicebat’”.

³ St. Luke xxii. 20.

⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 26.

really to drink the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the same manner as is said of the body. For as He who instituted gave commandment concerning His own body, so also He did concerning His own blood, which commandment ought not to be mutilated according to the fancy of every one, but rather the tradition of the institution should be preserved entire. When, therefore, we worthily partake and entirely communicate in the mystery of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, we are already, we confess, reconciled to our Head, and united to Him, and made one body with Him, having also the certain hope of being co-heirs with Him in the kingdom."¹

Here also the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is said to depend on the Sacrament being received in Communion, and on the faith of the communicants. Consequently, in denying "Transubstantiation," Cyril appears to have intended to reject not only any Western technicalities of which he may have known but also the traditional Eastern doctrine that by means of the act of consecration the elements become the body and blood of Christ.

Cyril Lucar was strangled in 1638 by the order of the Sultan Murad IV. in consequence of accusations of treason brought against him. It is probable that these accusations were simply a device of theological opponents who resented Cyril's acceptance of some of the opinions which had arisen among the Reformers in the West and his opposition to plans then being formed for the union of the East with Rome.

One result of the work of Cyril Lucar was the compilation of *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church* in 1640. The object of this *Confession* was to re-assert the traditional doctrine of the East in those matters in which Cyril Lucar had denied or modified it. It was drawn up in Russian by Peter Mogila, the Metropolitan of Kieff, and other theologians. It was translated into Greek. It was approved by the Council of Jassy in 1642; by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem in 1643; and by the Council of Jerusalem in 1672. On the subject of the Eucharist the teaching of the *Confession* was as follows:—

"Christ is now in heaven only and not on earth after that manner of the flesh wherein He bore it and lived in it when He

¹ Kimmel, *Mon. Fid. Eccl. Orient.* i. 35-37.

was on earth; but after the sacramental manner, whereby He is present in the holy Eucharist, the same Son of God, God and Man, is also on earth by way of Transubstantiation (κατὰ μετουσίωσιν). For the substance (οὐσία) of the bread is changed (μεταβάλλεται) into the substance (οὐσίαν) of His holy body, and the substance (οὐσία) of the wine into the substance (οὐσίαν) of His precious blood. Wherefore it is fitting to worship and adore the holy Eucharist even as our Saviour Jesus Himself." ¹

"The priest must know that at the moment when he consecrates the gifts the substance (οὐσία) itself of the bread and the substance (οὐσία) of the wine are changed (μεταβάλλεται) into the substance (οὐσίαν) of the real body and blood of Christ through the operation of the Holy Ghost, whom the priest invokes at that time, consecrating this mystery by praying and saying, 'Send down Thy Holy Ghost on us and on these gifts set before Thee, and make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ and that which is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing (μεταβαλόν) them by Thy Holy Ghost'. For immediately after these words the Transubstantiation (μετουσίωσις) takes place, and the bread is changed (ἀλλάσσει) into the real body of Christ, and the wine into His real blood. Only the species (εἶδη) which are seen remain, and this by the ordinance of God, first, that we may not see the body of Christ, but may believe that it is there; . . . secondly, because human nature shrinks from the eating of raw flesh. . . . The honour which it is fitting to give to these awful mysteries is of such a kind as that which is given to Christ Himself. . . . This mystery is also offered as a sacrifice on behalf of all orthodox Christians, both the living and those who sleep in hope of a resurrection to eternal life; and this sacrifice shall never fail until the last Judgment. The fruits of this mystery are these: first, the commemoration of the sinless passion and death of Christ . . . ; secondly, . . . this mystery is a propitiation and atonement with God for our sins both of the living and of the dead . . . ; thirdly, . . . that each Christian who shall frequent this sacrifice and partake of this mystery may be delivered by means of it from the temptation and danger of the devil." ²

This *Confession* thus followed the ordinary teaching of the East that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ through the operation of the Holy Ghost, invoked in the Liturgy; that the presence is such as to call for adoration; and

¹ I. 56. See Kimmel, *Mon. Fid. Eccl. Orient.* i. 125, 126.

² I. 107. See Kimmel, *Mon. Fid. Eccl. Orient.* i. 180-84.

that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Further, it asserted that the substance of the bread and the wine is changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, and accepted the word "Transubstantiation" which Cyril Lucar had repudiated, probably using it, as he had used it, simply to denote the change of the elements by consecration into Christ's body and blood. As to the nature of the presence of the body and blood different statements in the *Confession* suggest different ideas. The reference to the natural shrinking from "the eating of raw flesh" as one of the reasons why the outward species remain looks as if the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence of Christ's risen and ascended body and blood had been forgotten. On the other hand, the distinction between the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist and that of His visible presence on earth and His presence in heaven is perhaps a stronger indication of belief in the spiritual character of His presence in the Eucharist.

In 1642, two years after the first drawing up of *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, a council was held at Constantinople to condemn the opinions of Cyril Lucar. The decrees of the council contain the following statement concerning his teaching about the Eucharist:—

"He so destroys the Holy Eucharist as to leave to it nothing but an empty figure, as if our worship were still in the shadow of the ancient law. For he says that not the bread which is seen and eaten is, after it has been consecrated, the real body of Christ, but that which is spiritually perceived, or rather represented. Which opinion is full of all impiety. For Jesus did not say, 'This is the figure of My body,' but 'This is My body,' and 'This is My blood'—this, that is, which is seen and taken and eaten and broken, when it has been consecrated and blessed."¹

Thirty years later, in 1672, under Dositheus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, a council, known as the Council or Synod of Jerusalem or of Bethlehem, was held at Bethlehem at which the *Confession* of Cyril Lucar was again considered. The holding of the council was partly due to the controversy in the West between Claude and Arnauld in which Claude had claimed the authority of the Eastern Church for his contention that Transubstantiation

¹C. 17. See Hardouin, *Concilia*, xi. 173-76.

was a modern invention.¹ At the council doubt was expressed whether the *Confession* ascribed to Cyril Lucar was really by him. Many passages from his *Homilies* were cited containing different teaching from that in the *Confession*. In those relating to the Eucharist were the expressions, "When you communicate, what do you see? Is it bread and wine? Do you not discern? If this is all you behold, you see an appearance; but, if you open the eyes of the soul, and see the Lord, you would recognise there the flesh of the Lord"; and "the infinite power of the Deity in the Transubstantiation of the bread".² It was further asserted at the council, that, if the *Confession* was the work of Cyril Lucar, it must have been simply an expression of his own opinions, and not an utterance of the Easterns in general or of the Church, so that, even on the supposition that he wrote it, it could not be taken as in any way committing the Eastern Church. As a positive statement of Eastern theology the council affirmed the *Confession* of Dositheus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The parts of this *Confession* which relate to the Eucharist are as follows:—

"We reject as alien to Christian doctrine the opinion that the integrity of the mysteries requires the use of the earthly thing. For this is contrary to the mystery of the offering, which, being instituted by the heavenly Word, and consecrated by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is perfected by the presence of that which is signified, namely, the body and blood of Christ. And the perfecting of this necessarily goes before its use. For, if it were not perfect before its use, then he who uses it badly would not eat and drink judgment to himself, since he would partake of bare bread and wine. But, as it is, he who partakes unworthily eats and drinks judgment to himself. Therefore the mystery of the Eucharist has its perfection not in the use but even before the use. Moreover, we reject as destructive and abominable the opinion that the integrity of the mystery is impaired by weakness of faith."³

"In the celebration of this we believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is present, not figuratively, or in an image, or by superabundant grace, as in the other mysteries, nor by a simple presence, as some of the Fathers have said concerning Baptism, nor by conjunction, as that the Deity of the Word is personally united to the bread of the

¹ See the statements by the Council in Hardouin, *Concilia*, xi. 181, 265.

² Hardouin, *Concilia*, xi. 208.

³ C. 15. See Hardouin, *Concilia*, xi. 249.

Eucharist which is set forth, as the Lutherans most ignorantly and miserably think ; but really and actually, so that after the consecration of the bread and the wine the bread is changed (*μεταβάλλεσθαι*), transubstantiated (*μετουσιούσθαι*), transmaded (*μεταποιείσθαι*), and reordered (*μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι*), into the real body of the Lord itself, which was born in Bethlehem of the Ever-Virgin, was baptised in Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose, ascended, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, and will come on the clouds of heaven ; and the wine is transmaded (*μεταποιείσθαι*) and transubstantiated (*μετουσιούσθαι*) into the real blood of the Lord itself, which was poured forth for the life of the world when He hung on the cross. Further, we believe that after the consecration of the bread and the wine the substance (*οὐσία*) of the bread and the wine no longer remains, but there is the body itself and the blood of the Lord in the species (*εἶδει*) and form (*τύπῳ*) of the bread and the wine, that is to say, under the accidents (*συμβεβηκόσιν*) of the bread. Further, that the all-pure body itself and blood of the Lord are distributed and enter the mouth and stomach of the communicants, both pious and impious ; only they convey to the pious and worthy remission of sins and eternal life, but they involve to the impious and unworthy condemnation and eternal punishment. Further, that the body and the blood of the Lord are severed and divided by the hands and teeth by way of accident (*κατὰ συμβεβηκός*), that is, in the accidents (*συμβεβηκότα*) of the bread and the wine, in which they are acknowledged to be visible and tangible, while in themselves they remain altogether unsevered and undivided. Wherefore also the Catholic Church says, ‘ He is separated and distributed who being separated is not divided, who is ever eaten and never consumed, but sanctifies those who partake,’¹ that is, worthily. Further, that in every part and the smallest fragment of the changed (*μεταβληθέντος*) bread and wine there is not a part of the body and blood of the Lord, for that would be blasphemous and wicked, but the whole Lord Christ wholly in substance (*κατ’ οὐσίαν*), that is, with His soul and Godhead, perfect God and perfect Man. Wherefore, though there may be many celebrations in the world at one and the same hour, there are not many Christs or many bodies of Christ, but one and the same Christ is present really and actually, and His body and His blood are one in all the several churches of the faithful ; and this not because the body of the Lord which is in heaven descends on the altars but because the bread which is offered and

¹ Quoted from the *Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil*. See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 393.

set forth in all the several churches, being transmade (*μεταποιούμενος*) and transubstantiated (*μετουσιούμενος*), becomes and is after the consecration one and the same as that which is in heaven. For the body of the Lord is one in many places, and not many bodies. . . . Further, that the body itself and the blood of the Lord which are in the mystery of the Eucharist ought to be honoured in the highest way, and worshipped with divine adoration. For the worship of the Holy Trinity and of the body and blood of the Lord is one. Further, that it is a real and propitiatory sacrifice offered for all the orthodox, living and dead, and for the benefit of all. . . . Further, that before the use immediately after the consecration and after the use that which is kept in the holy pyxes for the reception of those who are about to depart is the real body of the Lord, and not in any respect different from it; so that before the use after the consecration, in the use, and after the use, it is altogether the real body of the Lord. Further, that by the word Transubstantiation (*μετουσίωσις*) the manner in which the bread and the wine are transmade (*μεταποιούνται*) into the body and blood of the Lord is not explained; for this is altogether incomprehensible and is impossible except for God Himself; and attempts at explanation bring Christians to folly and error. But the word denotes that the bread and the wine after the consecration are changed (*μεταβάλλεται*) into the body and blood of the Lord not figuratively or by way of image or by superabundant grace or by the communication or presence of the Deity alone of the Only Begotten. Neither is any accident (*συμβεβηκός τι*) of the bread and of the wine transmade (*μεταποιείται*) in any way or by any change into any accident (*συμβεβηκός τι*) of the body and blood of Christ; but really and actually and substantially (*οὐσιωδῶς*) the bread becomes the real body of the Lord itself, and the wine the blood of the Lord itself, as has been said above."¹

There is an incidental statement on the reality of the presence in, and the honour due to, the reserved Sacrament.

"It is a ridiculous charge that, because some Eastern priests keep the holy bread in wooden vessels within the Church but outside the sanctuary hanging on one of the pillars, they do not acknowledge the actual and real change (*μεταβολήν*) of the bread into the body of the Lord. For that certain poor priests keep the Lord's body in wooden vessels we do not deny; for Christ is not honoured by stones and marbles, but He asks from us a sound purpose and a pure heart. And this is as it is put by Paul.

¹C. 17. See Hardouin, *Concilia*, xi. 252-56.

For he says, 'We have the treasure in earthen vessels'.¹ But where particular Churches are able, as with us in Jerusalem, within the sanctuary of each Church the Lord's body is honoured and has a lamp with seven lights always burning before it.'²

These declarations of the Council of Jerusalem of 1672 re-assert the main lines of the traditional Eastern doctrine. It is of interest to observe the marks made by Western controversies in the repudiation of any theory of "conjunction" such as that ascribed to Luther,³ and of any view that the presence of Christ is vouchsafed only during the use of the Sacrament in Communion such as that held by the later Lutherans,⁴ and in the assertions about the "accidents".⁵

During the years from 1716 to 1725 a lengthy correspondence took place between the English and Scottish Nonjurors and the Bishops of the Greek Church in hope that some plan for re-union might be agreed upon. The Eucharist was one of the subjects discussed. Throughout, the Easterns adopted the theological position and terminology of the Council of Jerusalem of 1672, and affirmed that the elements are consecrated by the operation of the Holy Ghost; that by consecration they are changed and transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; that the accidents remain; that the whole Christ, perfect God and perfect Man, is substantially in every part of the consecrated bread and wine; and that the body of Christ, present in the consecrated elements, is to be adored.⁶ They were careful to quote a synodical declaration of the year 1691 in which it was explained that in using the word Transubstantiation (*μετουσίωσις*) the Easterns had not borrowed from the West but had followed their own tradition, and that by it they intended no further definition than that in the Sacrament there

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 7.

² Q. 4. See Hardouin, *Concilia*, xi. 265.

³ See vol. ii. p. 88, *infra*.

⁴ See vol. ii. pp. 23, 24, 32, *infra*.

⁵ See, e.g., pp. 306, 321, 329, 362, 365, and vol. ii. pp. 10, 11, *infra*.

⁶ See Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, pp. 56-59, 69, 70, 76-82. For a description of the original documents, now in the Theological College at Edinburgh, see Bishop Dowden in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. 562-68; and for the documents printed from the copies at Constantinople and a collation of the originals at Edinburgh with these, see Martin and Petit, *Collectio Conciliorum Recentiorum Eccl. Univ. i.* 369-624.

is a change (*μεταβολή*) of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.¹

The decrees of the Council of Jerusalem of 1672 have remained ever since that time the authorised statements of the doctrine of the Greek Church. As a short summary made in the eighteenth century of the teaching contained in them it may be convenient to quote the article concerning the Eucharist in an exposition of the faith put out by a council held at Constantinople in 1727.

“It is right to believe and confess that the most mystic and all-holy rite and Eucharist of the holy liturgy and bloodless sacrifice, which is for a memorial of Christ our God voluntarily sacrificed on our behalf, is celebrated in the following way. Leavened bread is offered and wine together with warm water is placed in the holy cup, and they are supernaturally changed (*μεταβάλλεσθαι*), the bread into that life-giving body of the Lord and the wine into His precious blood, by the all-holy Spirit by means of the prayer and invocation of the priest which depends on the power of the words of the Lord. Not that the consecration is effected by the words ‘Take, eat,’ etc., or by the words ‘Drink ye all of it,’ etc., as the Latins think; for we have been taught that the consecration takes place at the prayer of the priest and at the words which he utters, namely, ‘Make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing (*μεταβαλόν*) them by Thy Holy Ghost,’ as the glorious Apostles and fathers filled with the Spirit who compiled the holy liturgies explained and handed down, and as this tradition of their divine teaching has come to us and to the Holy Church of Christ, and as also is clearly shown by the example of the Lord Himself, who first prayed and then commanded His Apostles, ‘Do this for My memorial’. Therefore we acknowledge that at the invocation of the priest that ineffable mystery is consecrated, and the living and with-God-united body itself of our Saviour and His blood itself are really and substantially (*οὐσιωδῶς*) present, and that the whole without being in any way impaired is eaten by those who partake and is bloodlessly sacrificed. And we believe without any doubt that in the reception and communion of this, even though it be in one kind only, the whole and complete Christ is present; nevertheless according to the ancient tradition which has prevailed in the

¹ See Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, p. 78; cf. Martin and Petit, *Coll. Conc. Recent. Eccl. Univ.* i. 465.

Catholic Church we have received that Communion is made by all the faithful, both clergy and laity, individually in both kinds, and not the laity in one kind and the priests in both, as is done in the innovation which the Latins have wrongly made. As an explanatory and most accurately significant declaration of this change (*μεταβολῆς*) of the bread and the wine into the body of the Lord itself and His blood the faithful ought to acknowledge and receive the word Transubstantiation (*μετουσιώσεως*), which the Catholic Church as a whole has used and receives as the most fitting statement of this mystery. Moreover they ought to reject the use of unleavened bread as an innovation of late date, and to receive the holy rite in leavened bread, as has been the custom from the first in the Catholic Church of Christ." ¹

In 1838 the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem, which had now been for over 150 years the authorised formularies of the Greek Church, were accepted by the Holy Synod of the Russian Church with certain modifications. In the decree relating to the Eucharist the phrase "the substance of the bread and wine no longer remain," was altered to "the very bread and wine no longer remain" and the words "under the accidents of the bread" were omitted.² The reason for these alterations appears to have been a desire on the part of the Russian divines to avoid some of the technicalities which had become current in the West.

The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East, based on earlier catechisms, was drawn up in its present form by Philaret, the Metropolitan of Moscow, and was adopted after revision by the Russian Holy Synod in 1839. It was subsequently translated into Greek and received the approval of all the Eastern Patriarchs. It contains the following questions and answers on the subject of the Eucharist:—

"Q.—What is the Communion?"

"A.—The Communion is a Sacrament in which the believer,

¹ C. 6. See Martin and Petit, *Coll. Conc. Recent. Eccl. Univ.* i. 897-99.

² See Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, ii. 1174; Palmer (of Magdalen College), *Dissertations on Subjects Relating to the "Orthodox" or "Eastern-Catholic" Communion*, pp. 207, 208; Palmer (of Worcester College), *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, i. 172, 173; W. J. B. on *The Russian Church and the Council of Trent* in the *Guardian* of March 31, 1897.

under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very body and blood of Christ, to everlasting life. . . .

"Q.—What is the most essential act in this part of the Liturgy?

"A.—The utterance of the words which Jesus Christ spake in instituting the Sacrament, 'Take, eat, this is My body; drink ye all of it, for this is My blood of the New Testament'; Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28; and after this the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing the gifts, that is, the bread and wine which have been offered.

"Q.—Why is this so essential?

"A.—Because at the moment of this act the bread and wine are changed or transubstantiated into the very body of Christ, and into the very blood of Christ.

"Q.—How are we to understand the word Transubstantiation?¹

"A.—In the exposition of the faith by the Eastern Patriarchs it is said that the word Transubstantiation is not to be taken to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of the Lord; for this none can understand but God; but only this much is signified, that the bread truly, really, and substantially becomes the very true body of the Lord, and the wine the very blood of the Lord. . . .

"Q.—What benefit does he receive who communicates in the body and blood of Christ?

"A.—He is in the closest manner united to Jesus Christ Himself, and in Him is made partaker of everlasting life. . . .

"Q.—What part can they have in the Divine Liturgy who only hear it without approaching the Holy Communion?

"A.—They may and should take part in the Liturgy by prayer and faith and especially by a continual remembrance of our Lord Jesus Christ, who expressly has commanded us to 'do this in remembrance of Him' (Luke xxii. 19).

"Q.—What should we remember at that time in the Liturgy when they make the procession with the Gospel?

"A.—Jesus Christ appearing to preach the Gospel. So also when the Gospel is reading we should have the same attention and reverence as if we saw and heard Jesus Christ Himself.

¹ It seems best to follow Blackmore in translating *presushchestvlenie* Transubstantiation, as the Greek equivalent *μετουσίωσις* has been translated. It has however been stated that Philaret, who wrote this *Catechism*, did not approve of this translation, probably on the ground that the connotation of *οὐσία* differs from that of *substantia*. See an article in the *Tserkovny Věstnik*, translated in the *Guardian* of May 12, 1897.

“Q.—What should we remember at that time in the Liturgy when they make the procession with the gifts from the table of preparation to the altar?

“A.—Jesus Christ going to suffer voluntarily as a victim to the slaughter, while more than twelve legions of angels were ready around to guard Him as their King. . . .

“Q.—What should we remember at the moment of the consecration of the Sacrament, and while the clergy are communicating within the altar?

“A.—The mystical supper of Jesus Christ Himself with His Apostles, His suffering, death, and burial.

“Q.—What is set forth after this by the drawing back of the veil, the opening of the royal doors, and the appearance of the holy gifts?

“A.—The appearance of Jesus Christ Himself after His resurrection.

“Q.—What is figured by the last showing of the holy gifts to the people, after which they are hid from view?

“A.—The ascension of Jesus Christ into heaven.”¹

In the office for the consecration of a bishop in the Russian Church, which has been in use since 1725, the bishop-elect makes a profession which includes the following statement:—

“I do believe and understand that the Transubstantiation of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper is made, as the Eastern and ancient Russian doctors teach, by the influence and operation of the Holy Ghost at the invocation, when the bishop or priest prays to God the Father in these words, ‘Make therefore this bread the most honourable body of Thy Christ.’”²

Four of the best known of the Greek Catechisms in ordinary use at the present time are the *Holy Catechism* of M. Bernadakis, the *Orthodox Christian Catechism* of M. Moschakis, the *Christian Catechism* of M. Kyriakos, and the *Orthodox Holy Catechism* of

¹ From the English translation of the *Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East*, given in Blackmore, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, pp. 89-94.

² Printed by King, *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, p. 296, from a form issued at St. Petersburg in 1725. The references to Peter the Great, the Holy Synod, and the reigning Empress show that the parts of the office surrounding the profession are later than the formation of the Holy Synod in 1721 and the death of Peter the Great in January, 1725.

Bishop Nektarios. Of these that by M. Bernadakis is the shortest and simplest, that by Bishop Nektarios is the longest and most complete, the other two are intermediate. Each of the four contains teaching about the Eucharist. That in the *Holy Catechism* of M. Bernadakis is as follows:—

“The third mystery is the Eucharist, which is also called Reception and Communion. . . . The priest takes bread and wine with water, which with the prayers of the priest and the prayers and supplications of the Church are changed (*μεταβάλλονται*) by the Holy Ghost; and the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine His blood. In this way the Christian partakes of the actual (*ἰδιον*) body and blood of Christ, although the Holy Communion has the taste not of flesh and blood but of bread and wine. The Christian by partaking of the holy body and blood of the Saviour Christ becomes one with Him, and thus gains possession of the strongest weapon against the devil and sin, and is sanctified and strengthened for works that are good and well-pleasing to God.”¹

In the *Orthodox Christian Catechism* of M. Moschakis it is said:—

“The Eucharist is a mystery in which by partaking of the bread and the wine we believe that we have communion in the body and blood of Christ. . . . Great is the mystery of the Eucharist because it represents (*ἀναπαριστᾷ*) the death of Jesus and His sacrifice on the cross on our behalf, and because by it we are made one with Jesus. . . . Baptism is our spiritual regeneration, and the Eucharist is our spiritual food and sustenance.”²

The following is the explanation given in the *Christian Catechism* of M. Kyriakos:—

“The Eucharist is that holy rite in which we believe that by partaking of the bread and the wine we have communion in the body itself and the blood of the Lord, and are united with Him, and also make remembrance of His death on our behalf. . . . The Eucharist . . . represents to us (*ἀναπαρίστησιν ἡμῖν*) actually and really the death itself and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross. Therefore the Protestants err when they deny the notion of sacrifice in the Eucharist, and that it stands in the closest possible relation to the death of the Lord on the cross.”³

¹ Pp. 26, 27 (seventh edition, 1882).

² P. 59 (fifth edition, 1897).

³ Pp. 91, 92 (fourth edition, 1897).

In the explanation of the High Priesthood of Christ given in the *Orthodox Holy Catechism* of Bishop Nektarios the following passage occurs :—

“ For ever does He offer Himself a sacrifice on behalf of the life and salvation of the world through His holy mysteries, which He has appointed in His Church, because in the rite of the mystic sacrifice it is He who offers and is offered, who receives the sacrifice and is distributed.”¹

Farther on in the same *Catechism*, in the explanation of the Eucharist Bishop Nektarios writes :—

“ The Eucharist is the spiritual food of the Christian, which gives life to the soul and leads man to immediate communion with the Saviour Christ, because he who communicates, receives under the species (εἶδος) of the bread and the wine the precious body itself and the precious blood itself of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is united mystically with Him. The Eucharist is for the healthful joy of soul and body, for remission of sins, and for eternal life. . . . In this mystery the priest gives and the faithful partake of and communicate in the body and blood of our Saviour Christ. . . . The Christian . . . under the species (εἶδη) of the bread and the wine receives the body itself and the blood of the Lord. . . . The words ‘ Do this for My memorial ’ signify the continual memory of the Incarnation of the Son of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, and His saving sufferings, the great benefit which we received through the redemption, and the eternal good things of which we have been counted worthy in the kingdom of God. . . . Those who receive worthily become partakers of the body and blood of the Lord . . . and receiving the remission of their sins are declared to be heirs of the heavenly kingdom, and receive eternal life.”²

These *Catechisms* represent in simple ways the theology about the Eucharist which has been seen to be traditional in the East. Naturally they express it in a less technical manner than the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem. Like the *Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East* they do not refer to the “accidents”; unlike it they make no mention of “Transubstantiation”. But it is evident that the doctrine which they are intended to convey is the same as that taught by the Council of Jerusalem and in the *Longer Catechism*.

¹ P. 72 (edition 1889).

² Pp. 172, 173.

The treatise on Dogmatic Theology by Dr. Makarios, who was Bishop of Vinnitza and Rector of the Seminary in St. Petersburg in the middle of the nineteenth century, is of high repute as representing the doctrine ordinarily held and taught in the Russian Church. In this treatise the doctrine of the Eucharist is explained and defended at length. The general lines adopted are identical with those which have already been observed in many quarters; and a few short extracts may sufficiently show the teaching contained in the book.

“At the moment when the minister who celebrates the Sacrament of the Eucharist, following the commandment of the Saviour, invokes the Holy Ghost on the oblations and blesses and consecrates them . . . the bread and the wine are really changed by the descent of the Holy Ghost to the real body and real blood of Jesus Christ.”¹

“The bread and the wine cannot become the real body and the real blood of Jesus Christ except by the translation or change of the substance itself of the bread and the wine into the substance of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ, that is, by Transubstantiation.”²

“Under the species of the bread and wine . . . the body and the blood of Jesus Christ . . . are complete and inseparable; for Jesus Christ is always one and inseparable; . . . His body and His blood remain inseparable and always complete, inasmuch as His body is a living body which ‘being raised from the dead dieth no more’ (Rom. vi. 9), a glorified body, a spiritual body (1 Cor. xv. 43, 44), and immortal.”³

“In the Eucharist the body and the blood of the Saviour, which are offered to us as food, are offered also as a sacrifice to God for men.”⁴

“The sacrifice offered to God in the Eucharist is in its nature exactly the same as that of the cross; for to-day we still offer on the altars of the Church the same Lamb of God who offered Himself of old on the cross for the sins of the world, the same flesh infinitely pure which suffered then, the same blood infinitely precious which was then poured out. To-day also this mysterious oblation is invisibly accomplished by the same eternal High Priest who offered Himself on the cross.”⁵

¹ ii. 456. All the passages from Makarios are quoted from, and the references are given to, the French translation of his book published at Paris in 1860 under the title *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe par Macaire*.

² ii. 471.

³ ii. 475, 476.

⁴ ii. 492.

⁵ ii. 498.

“ In the method and circumstances of the oblation the Eucharistic sacrifice differs from the sacrifice of the cross. On the cross the Lord Jesus offered visibly in sacrifice to God His body infinitely pure and His blood of infinite value ; in the Eucharist He offers them under the species of the bread and the wine. There He Himself, immediately, as High Priest celebrated the sacrifice of expiation ; here, though He also Himself celebrates it, He does so invisibly through the agency of the pastors of the Church. There the sacrifice was offered by the actual immolation of the Lamb, it was a bloody sacrifice, for the Lord Jesus really suffered, poured out His blood, tasted death in His flesh ; to-day, in that ‘ being raised from the dead He dieth no more, ’ and that ‘ death hath no more dominion over Him ’ (Rom. vi. 9), the sacrifice is offered in the Eucharist by means of mysterious transformation by the Holy Spirit or Transubstantiation of the bread and the wine into the body and the blood of Jesus Christ without sufferings, without shedding of blood, without death. . . . The two sacrifices are inseparably united, properly speaking forming only one sacrifice, and yet at the same time different the one from the other.”¹

This treatment of the doctrine of the Eucharist by Bishop Makarios follows so closely the ordinary Eastern teaching since the Council of Jerusalem that one point only in it calls for comment. The entire absence of any allusion to the work of our Lord in heaven in connection with the Eucharistic sacrifice is in marked contrast to the way in which Eastern theologians in patristic and later times lay stress on the unity of the one sacrifice offered on the cross, in heaven, and in the Eucharist.²

In further illustration of the teaching of the Russian Church the following passage from M. Khomiakoff's *Essay on the Unity of the Church* is of great interest :—

“ Concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist the holy Church teaches that in it the change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is verily accomplished. She does not reject the word Transubstantiation ; but she does not assign to it that material meaning which is assigned to it by the teachers of the churches which have fallen away. The change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is accomplished in the Church and for the Church. If a man receive the consecrated gifts, or worship them, or think on them with faith, he verily receives, adores, and thinks

¹ ii. 499, 500.

² See, e.g., pp. 117, 118, 158-61, *supra*.

on, the body and blood of Christ. If he receive unworthily, he verily rejects the body and blood of Christ; in any case, in faith or in unbelief he is sanctified or condemned by the body and blood of Christ. . . . Not in spirit alone was Christ pleased to unite Himself with the faithful, but also in body and in blood; in order that the union might be complete, and not only spiritual but also corporal. . . . We shall not rise again without the body, and no spirit except the Spirit of God can be said to be entirely incorporeal. He that despises the body sins through pride of spirit.”¹

VII.

The main fact to be noticed in the history of Eucharistic doctrine in the East from the sixth century to the present time is the continuance and unanimity of the teaching that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, that the consecration is effected by the work of the Holy Ghost elicited by the invocation of Him in the Liturgy, and that the Eucharist is a sacrificial presentation of Christ to God. In the earliest part of the period and often afterwards there is a tendency to confuse the outward and the inward parts of the Sacraments; from the eighth century onwards a distinction is clearly made that before consecration the elements are the image of the body of Christ, and that, on becoming His actual body at the consecration, they cease to be the image; in the fifteenth and later centuries elaborate distinctions are found between the substance and the accidents and between the natural and the sacramental presence of Christ, and the word Transubstantiation is used. The idea of the sacrifice during the greater part of the period is that of one sacrifice pleaded on the cross, in heaven, and on the altar, though in the latter part of it the connection between our Lord's heavenly offering and the offering of the Eucharist is but seldom expressed. The description of the elements before consecration as the image of Christ's body, taken with the way of regarding images customary in the East, is associated with the setting forth of the stages of Christ's earthly life, passion, resurrection, and ascension in the Liturgy as a sacrificial presentation.

¹ Pp. 207, 208 of the translation in Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*.

CHAPTER V.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

SOME of the more characteristic differences between Eastern and Western theology have been noticed in the introduction to the last chapter. It is unnecessary to repeat here what was there said. But there are specific points of difference of historical fact to which it may be well to refer. In the East the history of Eucharistic doctrine is for the most part untouched by controversy. Such controversies as arose concerning the application of the word *image* to the elements and the direction of the offering of the sacrifice leave unbroken the main stream of belief in the principal aspects of the doctrine. The discussions in the sixteenth century about the teaching of Cyril Lucar were rather the repelling of alien ideas coming in from outside than real difference among theologians properly Eastern. In the West the history from the ninth century to the fifteenth is continually broken by controversy; and from the sixteenth century onwards the literature of the subject is almost wholly controversial. Without going beyond the fifteenth century, there are at best marked differences of view and at worst bitter controversy in the disputes resulting from the teaching of Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century, the conflicts concerning Berengar in the eleventh, the varying types of scholastic thought in the thirteenth, and the questionings and denials and re-assertions of mediæval doctrine in the fourteenth and fifteenth.

I.

In the writers of the period from the sixth century to the eighth there are but scanty references to Eucharistic doctrine, and few of them are of any special importance. It may be suffi-

cient to mention some passages in the writings of St. Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, St. Germain of Paris, the Venerable Bede, Alcuin, and Theodulf of Orleans.

St. Gregory the Great was born at Rome about 540 ; he became Pope in 590 ; he died in 604. His life and writings are entitled to special interest on the part of Englishmen who remember him with gratitude as “ ‘Gregory our father,’ who ‘sent us Baptism’ ”.¹ His allusions to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist make no attempt at definition, but they imply a belief that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ. Of the gift bestowed and received in Communion he says :—

“The good Shepherd laid down His life for His sheep, that in our Sacrament He might give (*verteret*) His body and blood, and might satisfy the sheep whom He had redeemed with the nourishment of His flesh.”²

“His body is taken, His flesh is distributed for the salvation of the people, His blood is poured not now into the hands of unbelievers but into the mouths of the faithful.”³

He incidentally refers to the reserved Sacrament as “the body of the Lord” in the account of a monk who had died without the blessing of St. Benedict, whose body could not be kept under the earth until the Sacrament had been placed on his breast.

“The man of God at once gave with his hand the Communion of the body of the Lord, saying, ‘Go and place this body of the Lord on his breast with great reverence, and thus lay him in the grave’. And when this was done the earth received and kept his body and no longer cast it out.”⁴

St. Gregory, without exactly defining wherein the sacrifice of the Eucharist consists, asserts that it is a sacrifice, ascribes specific effects to the offering of the sacrifice, connects it with both the passion and the heavenly offering of our Lord, and sees in it some kind of renewal of the passion. After mentioning instances of deliverance from captivity, impending death, and purgatory

¹ Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*, p. 40, quoting from the Council of Clovesho of 747 and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *sub ann.* 565. The author cannot deny himself the pleasure of referring to the learned and admirable book by Dr. F. Homes Dudden, entitled *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought*.

² *In Ev. Hom.* xiv. 1.

³ *Dial.* iv. 58.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. 24.

through particular offerings of the sacrifice with specific aims, he declares the duty of

“offering to God daily oblations of tears, the daily sacrifices of His flesh and blood. For this victim in a unique way saves the soul from eternal destruction, which in mystery renews (*reparat*) for us the death of the only-begotten Son, who, though He rising from the dead dieth no more and death shall not again have dominion over Him, yet living in Himself immortally and incorruptibly is again sacrificed on our behalf in this mystery of the sacred oblation. . . . Let us think of what kind this sacrifice on our behalf is, which to set us free ever represents the passion of the only-begotten Son. For who of the faithful can hold it doubtful that in the very hour of the sacrifice at the voice of the priest the heavens are opened, in that mystery of Jesus Christ the bands of the angels are present, things lowest are brought into communion with the highest, things earthly are united with the heavenly, and the things that are seen and those which are unseen become one?”¹

Elsewhere he speaks similarly of the renewal of the passion and of the association with the heavenly offering.

“He who in Himself rising from the dead dieth no more still by means of this sacrifice suffers again in His own mystery on our behalf. For as often as we offer unto Him the sacrifice of His passion, so often we renew His passion to ourselves to set us free.”²

“Without intermission the Redeemer offers a burnt-offering on our behalf, who without ceasing presents to the Father His Incarnation for us. For His Incarnation is itself the offering of our cleansing, and, when He shows Himself as Man, He washes away by His intervention the sins of man. And by the mystery of His humanity He offers a perpetual sacrifice because these things also which He cleanses are eternal.”³

In this teaching two things are alike clear. St. Gregory does not mean that the Eucharist involves any physical renewal of our Lord’s sufferings or any repetition of His death; he does assert that it is a mysterious presentation to the Father of the passion and death and risen and ascended life of the incarnate Son.

With the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist as the offering of Christ St. Gregory links the oblation which Christians make of themselves. In like manner he connects the need of good con-

¹ *Dial.* iv. 58.

² *In Ev. Hom.* xxxvii. 7.

³ *Mor.* i. 32.

duct on the part of communicants with the necessity of receiving Communion. As in much else of his theology, he thereby follows teaching emphasised by St. Augustine.¹ On these subjects he writes:—

“The mere reception of the Sacraments of our Redeemer is not enough really to consecrate the mind unless good works also be added. For what does it profit to receive with the mouth His body and blood and to be His enemy by evil conduct?”²

“We must offer ourselves to God with a penitent heart, because we who celebrate the mysteries of the passion of the Lord are bound to imitate the rite which we perform. Then will it be really a sacrifice to God on our behalf, when we have made ourselves a sacrifice. . . . After death we shall not need the healthful sacrifice, if before death we ourselves have been a sacrifice to God.”³

Incidentally St. Gregory refers to the worship of our Lord in the Sacrament when, in a passage already quoted, he speaks of the Lord’s body being carried “with great reverence,”⁴ and when he elsewhere says:—

“That the Sacrament of the Lord’s passion may not be ineffectual in us, we are bound to imitate what we receive, and to proclaim what we revere (*veneramur*).”⁵

Isidore of Seville was born at Seville or at Cartagena about 560; he became Archbishop of Seville about 600; he died in 636. He was thus a younger contemporary of Pope Gregory the Great; and they may be taken as representative, St. Gregory of the Italian, Isidore of the Spanish, theology of their time.

Isidore teaches that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and that the elements are made by consecration to be the body and blood of Christ.

“A type of this sacrifice was shown before in the priesthood of Melchizedek. . . . ‘Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,’⁶ that is, according to the rite of this sacrifice which Christ completely offered in His passion, and which He commanded that His Apostles also should have as His memorial. . . . Christ, the Wisdom of God, has made for Himself a house, that is, the holy

¹ See pp. 94, 123, 124, *supra*.

² *Dial.* iv. 59, 60.

³ *Mor.* xiii. 26.

⁴ *In Ev. Hom.* xxii. 8.

⁵ See p. 194, *supra*.

⁶ *Ps.* cx. 4; *Heb.* v. 6, vii. 17.

Church, in which He has offered the sacrifices of His body, in which He has mingled the wine of His blood in the cup of the divine Sacrament, and has made ready a Table, that is, the altar of the Lord, sending His servants, the apostles and teachers, to the foolish, that is, to all nations ignorant of the true God, saying to them, 'Come, eat My bread, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you,'¹ that is, Receive the food of the holy body, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you, that is, Take the cup of the sacred blood."²

"The transformation (*conformatio*) of the Sacrament, that the oblation which is offered to God, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, may be transformed (*conformetur*) to the body and blood of Christ. . . . The sacrifice which is offered by Christians to God, Christ our Lord first instituted as Master, when He gave to the Apostles His own body and blood. . . . The bread which we break is the body of Christ. . . . The wine is His blood. . . . The bread, because it strengthens the body, is called the body of Christ; the wine, because it produces blood in the flesh, is referred to the blood of Christ. Though these things are visible, yet being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, they are changed (*transeunt*) into the Sacrament of the divine body. . . . To offer the sacrifice for the repose of the faithful departed, and to pray for them, because this custom is preserved throughout the whole world, we believe has been handed down from the Apostles themselves."³

Like St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great, Isidore clearly teaches that Communion does not benefit those who receive unworthily.

"They who live wickedly in the Church and do not cease to communicate, imagining that they are cleansed by such Communion, are to learn that it is of no avail for cleansing them."⁴

In two sentences already quoted, the phrase "sanctified by the Holy Ghost" ascribes to the Holy Ghost the work of the consecration of the elements. In his letter to Redemptus Isidore quotes the words of institution in a manner which implies that he regarded them as the formula of consecration.

"The essentials of the Sacrament are the words of God used by the priest in the sacred rite, that is, 'This is My body,' and wheaten

¹ Prov. ix. 5.

² *De fid. cath.* II. xxvii. 1, 3.

³ *De eccl. off.* I. xv. 3, xviii. 1, 3, 4, 11.

⁴ *Sent.* I. xxii. 7.

bread and wine, with which it is customary to mix water because both, that is, blood and water, flowed from the side of Christ.”¹

In the same letter Isidore mentions that the presence is of the glorified body of Christ and that the whole Christ is present in both species.

“When the consecration has taken place, it is not the case, as some ignorant people think, that the flesh of Christ alone is under the species of bread, and that in the cup only the blood is taken; but in each kind is God and Man, whole and perfect Christ in His glorified body, whole Christ in the cup, living Bread who came down from heaven, whole in each kind.”²

St. Germain of Paris was an older contemporary of the two writers last mentioned. He was born at Autun about 496, became Archbishop of Paris in 555, and died at Paris about 576. He is thus a representative of Gallican theology. He says that “the bread is transformed (*transformatur*) into the body, and the wine into the blood,” and that “the mystery of the Eucharist is offered in commemoration of the passion of the Lord.”³ Unless the reference is to a portion of the consecrated Sacrament reserved from a preceding celebration, he speaks of the still unconsecrated elements, when solemnly carried to the altar at the offertory, as “the body of Christ.”⁴

The Venerable Bede was born in 673 at Jarrow or Wearmouth. From the age of seven until his death in 735 he lived under monastic rule. Ordained deacon in 691 and priest in 702, he devoted his life to the work of a Christian student. An interesting figure to all who care for erudition or industry or devotion, he is an object of very special interest to English people, being, as Dr. Bright well said, “our first truly national scholar and author, the father of our history,” “the man of patriotic feeling, who loves old English songs, and hates whatever en-

¹ *Ep.* vii. 2.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Expos. brev. antiq. lit. Gall.* i. (*P.L.* lxxii. 93).

⁴ *Op. cit.* (*P.L.* lxxii. 92, 93). An instance of similar Eastern phraseology is in the words used at the offertory in the Nestorian Liturgy, “The body of Christ and His precious blood are upon the holy altar”: see Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 267. With the use of this anticipatory language may be compared the veneration at the Great Entrance in the East, though probably to be ascribed to a different cause: see pp. 171-75, *supra*.

feebles his country or degrades the national life," "a man 'venerable' and dear to all generations of English Christianity, a 'candle,' in the words of the great St. Boniface,¹ 'which the Lord lighted up' in Northumbria".² Voluminous and various as are Bede's writings, they do not contain any systematic teaching about the Eucharist. Incidental allusions, however, show that the doctrine held by this Northumbrian scholar was not different from that professed by St. Gregory the Great in Italy and Isidore of Seville in Spain and St. Germain of Paris in Gaul. Thus, he describes Communion as "the reception of the body and blood of the Lord";³ he refers to the Eucharist as a "sacrifice," "the most holy offering," "the heavenly sacrifice," "the sacrifice of the saving Victim," which is offered to God on behalf of the living and the dead;⁴ and in one of his *Homilies* for Easter Even he says of the worship of Christians:—

"We celebrate the rite of the Mass, we offer anew to God for the advance of our salvation the most holy body and precious blood of our Lamb, by which we have been redeemed from sin."⁵

Alcuin was born of a noble Northumbrian family about 735. In his youth he was a pupil of Egbert the Archbishop of York, who had been the disciple and friend of the Venerable Bede, and of Ethelbert, who succeeded Egbert in his archbishopric. He was ordained deacon by Ethelbert soon after 767. Much of his life was spent at the court of the Emperor Charles the Great. Bishop Stubbs has told us that "the schools of Northumbria had gathered in the harvest of Irish learning, of the Franco-Gallican schools," "and of Rome"; that in the school of York "was centred nearly all the wisdom of the West"; that "its greatest pupil was Alcuin"; and that "he carried the learning which would have perished in England, into France and Germany, where it was maintained whilst England relapsed into the state of ignorance from which it was delivered by Alfred".⁶ He died at Tours about 804. His unquestioned writings show that in regard to the Eucharist he did not differ from St. Gregory the Great

¹ *Ep.* xxxviii.

² Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 368-71.

³ *Ep. ad Egbertum*, 9 (*P.L.* xciv. 665).

⁴ *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 5, iii. 2, iv. 14, 22, 28, v. 10.

⁵ *Hom.* II. i. (*P.L.* xciv. 139).

⁶ In Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. 74.

and Isidore of Seville and St. Germain of Paris and Bede. His commentary on St. John's Gospel reproduces the teaching of St. Augustine as to the need of abiding in Christ and of spiritual union with Him,¹ with the additions made by him or by some other writer of his time for the purpose of preventing readers from supposing the passage to be a denial that the unworthy communicant receives the body of Christ, and so as to run:—

“This then is to eat that food and to drink that drink, to abide in Christ, and to have Him abiding in oneself. And in this way he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, without doubt does not spiritually eat His flesh, though carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, but rather to his own judgment eats and drinks the Sacrament of so great a thing.”²

In his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews³ he reproduces the teaching of St. Chrysostom on the one sacrifice offered by our Lord on the cross, in heaven, and on the altar of the Church on earth.⁴ In his letters the following passages occur:—

“We have heard that some maintained that salt is to be placed on the sacrifice of the body of Christ. . . . From water and flour is made the bread which is consecrated to be the body (*in corpus*) of Christ; water and wine will be consecrated to be the blood (*in sanguinem*) of Christ. . . . Did the flesh of Christ rot in the tomb, so that His body should now need salt in the sacrifice? . . . Of this most sacred oblation a type went before in Melchizedek, who was wont to offer wine and bread to the most high God. Moreover the consecration of this mystery shows the effect of our salvation. In the water is understood the people of the believers. In the grains of wheat whence the flour is made that it may become bread, the union of the whole Church is indicated, which by the fire of the Holy Ghost is baked into one body, so that the members may be united to their Head. Also, in the waters which are mixed with the wine there is a figure, as we said, of the nations. But in the wine the blood of the Lord's passion is shown.”⁵

“Forget not, I beg, the name of your friend Alcuin, but store it

¹ See pp. 93, 94, *supra*.

² On St. John vi. 57. The additions are “spiritually” and “though carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ”. See pp. 93, 94, *supra*, and vol. ii. p. 209, *infra*.

³ On x. 1-4. ⁴ See pp. 117, 118, *supra*. ⁵ *Ep.* xc. (*P.L.* c. 289).

up in some casquet of your memory, and bring it out at that fitting time when you have consecrated the bread and wine to be the substance (*in substantiam*) of the body and blood of Christ." ¹

Questions have been raised whether the treatise entitled *Confession of the Faith*, ascribed to Alcuin, is his work; but, since, whoever the author, it is a good representative of Western thought and belief of the eighth and ninth centuries, parts of it may be quoted here. The fourth book of the treatise is called *Of the Body and Blood of the Lord*. After an expression of personal unworthiness and of a deep sense of the mystery of the Sacrament, the writer proceeds:—

“ Though it is offered by man, yet this Sacrament is a divine thing. And if it is a divine thing, or rather because it is such, God forbid that anything should be understood about it in other than a divine and spiritual sense. Therefore, although with bodily eyes I see the priest offering bread and wine at the altar of the Lord, yet by the gaze of faith and by the pure sight of the heart I behold the supreme officiant and true High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ, offering Himself, of whose flesh and blood we eat and drink, and are thereby washed and satisfied and sanctified, and are made partakers of the one and supreme Godhead. Verily He Himself is the priest, He Himself is the sacrifice; and therefore this saving victim is not ever or anywhere diminished or increased, changed or altered, whether it is a righteous or a guilty priest who approaches the altar, but this Sacrament abides always and everywhere the very same. For by the power and words of Christ that bread and cup have been consecrated from the first. By the power and words of Christ it is always consecrated, and will be consecrated. Christ Himself speaks daily in His priests. His is the word which sanctifies the heavenly Sacraments. Priests perform their office, but Christ by the majesty of divine power does the work. . . . He Himself by the power of the Spirit the Paraclete and by the heavenly blessing consecrates His holy body and blood. Therefore in this most holy offering of the Lord's body and blood common worship is presented to God both by the priests and by the whole family of the house of God. . . . I do not doubt that the citizens of heaven are present at this mystery, so that by means of the ministrations and prayers of the angels, as at the altar on high, it is offered in the sight of the divine majesty. For, if in that home there is a sacrifice of perpetual praise and a perpetual priest, there is a perpetual priest and a perpetual altar in

¹ *Ep.* xli. (*P.L.* c. 203).

heaven, not material but reasonable and spiritual, to which the offering is borne. . . . This is the true offering, in which the Son is offered and the Father is reconciled. This is the true and eternal victim, because His is the true and eternal power, and through Him is accomplished the true and eternal salvation. . . . He is offered while He is not being slain, He is eaten without being diminished, He restores others but fails not in Himself, being eaten He is alive because He rose from the dead. . . . All eat of Him, yet each one eats Him whole. He is divided into parts, and yet He is whole in every part. . . . Cleanse first your conscience. You can be injured not aided, if you approach unclean. So great is the virtue of this sacrifice that the body and blood of Christ is for righteous only, not for sinners. It cleanses those sins without which this life cannot be. . . . Because Christ foresaw that we should sin after that salvation wherewith He redeemed us, He instituted this ineffable Sacrament in order that by its sanctification we might be pardoned without intermission. Therefore to some He comes for remission of sins and increase of virtue, to others for weight of judgment and greatest loss. . . . To each one will the body and blood of Christ be life, if that which is visibly taken in the Sacrament is spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk in very truth. . . . Where is His body, there truly is Christ Himself."¹

Theodulf of Orleans may have been a native either of Spain or of Italy. He was brought to Gaul by the Emperor Charles the Great, and became Bishop of Orleans and Abbot of Fleury about 788. The probable date of his death is 821. Incidental references to the Eucharist in his writings afford an additional instance to those already given of the ordinary settled belief of the Western theologians at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century before the controversies of the ninth century arose. Theodulf speaks of the Eucharist as a sacrifice; he says that the Jewish priests had not a sacrifice so holy as that of Christians, and that Christian priests "handle not beasts as victims but the stainless body and blood of the Lord itself," and that "by the visible offering of the priests and the invisible consecration of the Holy Ghost the bread and wine are changed (*transeunt*) into the dignity of the body and blood of the Lord."²

¹ *Conf. fid.* iv. 1, 2, 3, 7. See pp. 213, 214, *infra*.

² *Cap.* i. 5; *Cap.* ii.; *De ord. bapt.* 18 (*P.L.* cv. 193, 216, 240).

II.

Reference has been made in an earlier chapter to the liturgical prayers in use in North Italy at the close of the fourth century.¹ It may be convenient to quote here some parts of the Western rites used in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries.

Taking first the fixed element known as the canon of the Mass,² this may be quoted as given in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, a Roman document of the seventh or eighth century:—

“Thee therefore, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord we humbly pray and beseech that Thou wouldest accept and bless these offerings, these gifts, these holy spotless sacrifices, which we offer to Thee, in the first place, for Thy Holy Catholic Church, that Thou wouldest deign to keep in peace, to guard, to unite, and to govern it throughout the whole world, together with Thy servant our Pope and our ruler the bishop. Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaidens, and all here present, whose faith is known to Thee, and their devotion plain, who offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and for all their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety, who pay their vows to Thee, the eternal and true and living God. Joining in communion with and venerating the memory in the first place of the glorious and ever virgin Mary, the mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ, and also of Thy blessed Apostles and martyrs Peter and Paul . . . and all Thy saints, to whose merits

¹ See pp. 87, 120, *supra*.

² It is probable that the canon was compiled out of Latin prayers of a variable order in the time of Pope Damasus, who died in 384. See E. Burbidge in the *Guardian*, 24th March, 1897. See Pseudo-Augustine, *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* (contemporary with Damasus), cix. 21, for a reference to the words “the high priest Melchizedek”; *Liber Pontificalis* (early in the sixth century), xlvi., Leo I., for a statement that St. Leo the Great added the words “a holy sacrifice, a stainless offering”; St. Gregory the Great, *Ep.* ix. 12, for a statement that the canon was composed by some “learned man” (*scholasticus*). The canon is usually regarded as beginning with “Thee therefore” and ending before the Lord’s Prayer: see Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, p. 138; Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* II. xi. 1, xiv. 5; Lambertini (Pope Benedict XIV.), *De sacros. sacrif. Missae*, II. xii. 2; and the present Roman Missal, *Rubr. gen. Miss.* xii. xiii., *Ritus serv. in cel. Missae*, vii. viii. ix. In the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, however, it is said to begin with the *Sursum corda*; and early in the ninth century Amalarius of Metz speaks of the “Thee therefore” as being “in the midst of the canon”; see *De eccl. off.* iv. 27 (*P.L.* cv. 1146).

and prayers grant that in all things we may be defended by the help of Thy protection. Through Christ our Lord. This oblation therefore of our service, and also of that of Thy whole family, we beseech, O Lord, that Thou wouldest be pleased to accept, and to order our days in Thy peace, and to command us to be delivered from eternal condemnation and numbered in the flock of Thy elect. Through Christ our Lord. Which offering do Thou, O God, we beseech, vouchsafe to make in all things blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may become to us the body and blood of Thy dearly beloved Son our Lord God Jesus Christ. Who on the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with His eyes lifted up to heaven to Thee, the God, His almighty Father, gave thanks to Thee, and blessed, brake, gave to His disciples, saying, Take and eat ye all of this. For this is My body. In like manner after supper, taking also this excellent cup into His holy and venerable hands, and also giving thanks to Thee, He blessed, gave to His disciples, saying, Take and drink ye all of this: for this is the cup of My blood of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of faith, which will be poured out for you and for many for the remission of sins. As often as ye shall do this, ye shall do it for a memorial of Me. Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and also Thy holy people, are mindful of the so blessed passion of Christ Thy Son our Lord God, and also of His resurrection from the dead, and also of His glorious ascension into heaven; we offer to Thy excellent majesty of Thy gifts and bounties a pure offering, a holy offering, a stainless offering, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation. Upon which mayest Thou deign to look with favourable and gracious countenance, and to accept, as Thou didst deign to accept the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchizedek offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice, a stainless offering. Humbly we beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these to be borne by the hands of Thy Angel to Thy altar on high in the presence of Thy divine majesty, that all we who shall receive from this participation of the altar the most holy body and blood of Thy Son may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.¹ To us sinners also, Thy

¹ Here the Rheinau MS. inserts, "Remember also, O Lord, the names of those who have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep in the sleep of peace. To them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ we beseech Thee to grant a place of refreshment, light, and peace. Through Christ our Lord."

servants, trusting in the multitude of Thy mercies, mayest Thou deign to grant some part with Thy holy Apostles and martyrs, with John . . . and with all Thy saints, into whose company we beseech Thee to admit us, not weighing our merit but allowing us indulgence. Through Christ our Lord. Through whom all these good things, O Lord, Thou dost ever create, sanctify, quicken, bless, and bestow on us. Through Him and with Him and in Him is to Thee God the Father almighty in the unity of the Holy Ghost all honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen." ¹

The text of the *Leonine Sacramentary* is probably of the latter part of the sixth century, though it is assigned by some scholars to the seventh. It represents the use of the Roman Church of that time. Among the prayers contained in it which bear on the doctrine of the Eucharist are the following:—

"Humbly we beseech Thee, O Lord our God, that we who have received the substance of the heavenly table may attain to eternal life."

"Look, O Lord, with propitiation on the sacrifice that is to be celebrated, that it may cleanse us from the faults of our state and make us acceptable to Thy name."

"We humbly implore Thy majesty, that, as Thou dost feed us with the food of the most holy body and blood, so Thou wilt make us partakers of the divine nature."

"We give Thee thanks and praise, O Lord, who hast fed us with the communion of the body and blood of Thy dearly beloved Son our Lord, humbly imploring Thy mercy that this Sacrament of Thine, O Lord, may not be to us guilt for punishment but may be made a healthful intercession for pardon."

"We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the gifts which Thou hast bestowed, that in regard to our mortal life they may testify the aid of Thy creation, and may accomplish for us the remedy of immortality." ²

A series of eleven Gallican Masses in a MS. of the end of the seventh century which was found at Reichenau contains the following passages:—

¹ The above is quoted as printed from the MS. in the Vatican Library in Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 234-36. Other readings are given by Mr. Wilson in his notes on pp. 237-40. For a critical comparison of the early texts of the Roman canon see E. Bishop in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, iv. 555-77.

² *Sacr. Leon.* (P.L. lv. 69, 74, 76, 77; Feltoe's edition, pp. 61, 67, 71, 72).

"We pray that Thou wilt bless this sacrifice with Thy blessing, and pour upon it the dew of Thy Holy Spirit, that it may be a valid (*legitima*) Eucharist to all who receive it."

"May this oblation being converted (*conversa*) into the body and blood of Christ prevail; may it be for rest to the departed; may it abide for reward to those who offer it, for salvation to those who receive it."

"We implore Thee, Almighty Father, to pour the Spirit of sanctification upon these creatures laid on Thine altar, that by the transformation (*transfusione*) of the heavenly and invisible Sacrament this bread may be changed (*mutatur*) into the flesh, and the cup transformed (*translatus*) into the blood."

"May there descend, O Lord, the fulness of Thy power, Godhead, goodness, might, blessing, and glory upon this bread and upon this cup, that there may be to us a valid (*legitima*) Eucharist in the transformation (*transformatione*) of the body and blood of the Lord."

"We consecrate (*sacramus*) the body and blood of Thy dearly beloved Son."

"He commanded also that, as often as His body and blood should be taken, there should be a commemoration of the passion of the Lord. . . . We pray that Thou wilt bless this sacrifice with Thy blessing, and pour upon it the dew of the Holy Spirit, that it may be a pure and real and valid (*legitima*) Eucharist to all who receive it."¹

The *Gothic Missal* is probably of the end of the seventh century or of the eighth. It is largely Gallican, though it contains some Roman elements. The following passages may be quoted from it:—

"Fed with heavenly food, and remade by the drinking of the eternal cup, let us unceasingly give thanks and praise to our Lord God, seeking that we who have spiritually received the most holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ, being freed from carnal vices, may be counted worthy to be made spiritual."

"We humbly pray that Thou wilt deign to receive and bless and sanctify this sacrifice, that it may be made to us a valid (*legitima*) Eucharist in Thy name and the name of Thy Son and the name of the Holy Ghost, for the transformation of the body and blood of our Lord God Thy only begotten Son Jesus Christ."

"Let us venerate the day of the Epiphany, asking with pious

¹ Mone, *Lateinische und Griechische Messen*, pp. 18, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27; reprinted in *P.L.* cxxxviii. 866, 867, 869, 871, 873.

prayer that He who then changed water into wine may now convert the wine of our offerings into His blood."

"Let there descend, O Lord, on these sacrifices of Thy blessing the co-eternal and co-working Spirit the Paraclete, that the offering which we have made to Thee from Thy fruitful earth we may so receive, through the heavenly gift and Thy sanctification, that, the fruits of the earth being transformed (*translata*) into the body and the cup into the blood, what we have offered for our faults may avail to our merits."

"May Thy body, O Lord, which we have received and Thy cup which we have drunk remain within us; grant, Almighty God, that no stain may abide where pure and holy Sacraments have entered."

"Mindful of the most glorious passion of the Lord, and of His resurrection from the dead, we offer to Thee, O Lord, this stainless offering, a reasonable offering, a bloodless offering, this holy bread and the cup of salvation, beseeching Thee to pour upon us Thy Holy Ghost, that we who eat and drink may thereby attain to eternal life and the everlasting kingdom."¹

The *Gelasian Sacramentary* represents, as has been said above, the use of the Roman Church in the seventh or eighth century. The following are among the passages in it which concern the doctrine of the Eucharist:—

"Do Thou, O Lord, pour upon these Thy servants whom we dedicate with the honour of the presbyterate the hand of Thy blessing, that . . . in the service of Thy people they may transform with stainless blessing the body and blood of Thy Son."

"We humbly beseech Thee, O Lord our God, that, as Thou dost feed us with the food of the most holy body and blood of Thy Son, so Thou wilt make us to be partakers also of His divine nature."

"O Lord God Almighty, deign to sanctify and bless and consecrate these linen cloths for the use of Thy altar for covering and enfolding the body and blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ."

"We consecrate and sanctify this paten that on it may be made the body of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"May the mystic offering, O Lord, avail for us, and may it free us from our guilt and strengthen us with everlasting salvation."²

¹ *Miss. Goth.* (P.L. lxxii. 229, 237, 242, 246, 315, 316).

² *Sacr. Gelas.* (ed. Wilson, pp. 24, 44, 134, 242).

Some remarkable expressions in the *Mozarabic Liturgy* of Spain may possibly be as old as the period here dealt with.

“Here no bleating of sheep, no lowing of oxen, no cry of birds under the stroke of death brings grief. There is no horror of blood, no disgust at raw flesh; but the offering is so wonderful and marvellous that it is bloodless, since it is received alive. For, though real body is eaten, and most plain blood is drunk, yet no horror is caused, since the salvation of souls is ministered in spiritual food and drink. . . . We pray that Thou wouldest sanctify this offering by uniting to it Thy Spirit, and ratify it by the complete transformation of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.”¹

The *Antiphony of Bangor* is an Irish book from the Monastery of Bangor in County Down, Ireland. It is of the closing years of the seventh century. It contains a hymn appointed to be sung at the time of the Communion. Literally translated, it is as follows:—

“Come ye who are holy, take the body of Christ,
And drink the holy blood by which ye were redeemed.

Saved by the body and blood of Christ,
And by it refreshed, let us give thanks to God.

By this Sacrament of the body and blood
Are all delivered from the jaws of hell.

The Giver of salvation, Christ, the Son of God,
Saved the world by His cross and blood.

For all was the Lord sacrificed:
He Himself is Priest and Victim.

The Law ordered victims to be offered;
By it are shadowed the mysteries of God.

The Giver of light and Saviour of all
Has bestowed wonderful grace on the holy.

Let all draw near believing with a pure mind;
Let them take the eternal guard of salvation.

The Keeper of the holy, their Ruler and Lord,
Is the Giver of everlasting life to believers.

¹ *Miss. Mixtum* (P.L. lxxxv. 249, 250).

He gives the bread of heaven to the hungry ;
From the living stream He supplies the thirsty.

Alpha and Omega, Christ the Lord Himself,
Is here, who is to come to judge mankind."¹

The *Stowe Missal* is another Irish book, though it is marked by Roman and Gallican influences. It dates from the eighth century. A chant sung after the consecration at the fraction of the consecrated bread contains the words, "The bread which we break is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, Alleluia; the cup which we bless, Alleluia, is the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, Alleluia, for the remission of our sins, Alleluia."²

These liturgical books supply abundant illustrations that the Eucharist was regarded as a sacrifice, and of the two parallel ideas that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, and that in Communion there is a spiritual gift to the souls of the recipients of the Sacrament.³

Together with these doctrines there were ways of treating the consecrated Sacrament which would seem strange to those who in later times held the same beliefs. In the order of the Roman Mass which appears to have been drawn up about the year 770 by Pope Stephen III. on the basis of an earlier order, though the Pope "with bowed head salutes the Holy," that is, the consecrated Sacrament reserved from the previous Eucharist, the placing of the consecrated bread in linen bags and the pouring of the consecrated wine from the chalice into other vessels involved risks of irreverence which at a later date Christians would have wished to avoid.⁴ The probable explanation is to be found in the different feelings and habits of life of different times.

¹ *The Antiphonary of Bangor* (Henry Bradshaw Society), i. 10, v, 11, r, ii. 10, 11. There is a metrical translation of this hymn in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (No. 269, new edition, "Draw nigh and take the body of the Lord"); *The English Hymnal* (No. 307, "Draw nigh, and take the body of the Lord"), and other hymn-books.

² *The Stowe Missal* (Henry Bradshaw Society), i. 45, 46.

³ See Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*, deuxième série, pp. 349-54.

⁴ §§ 8, 19, 20 (*P.L.* lxxviii. 941, 946, 947; Atchley's edition in vol. vi. of the "Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology," pp. 128, 140, 142).

III.

Amalarius of Metz was a pupil of Alcuin at Aix-la-Chapelle not earlier than 782. He became Bishop of Treves in 811. He died about 850. In his treatises *On the Offices of the Church* and *Selections on the Office of the Mass* he expounded an elaborate system of interpreting the prayers and ceremonies of the Eucharist as a symbolical presentation of the life and death and resurrection and ascension of our Lord, in such a way that one element of the Eucharistic sacrifice was the series of acts in which the Church made its own recollection and its commemoration before God of the whole incarnate life of Christ. The line of thought thus adopted has much in common with the idea of the elements before consecration as the image of the body of Christ current in the East in the eighth century and with the Eastern liturgical treatises of the thirteenth and fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹ It does not seem impossible that Amalarius may have been to some extent indebted to Eastern theologians. From 813 to 814 he was on an embassy at Constantinople; in 825 there was a project of his being sent thither again; some interest taken by him in the East may have led to his selection for such work; and, since the earlier of the two treatises was not completed till 827, he may easily have been influenced in the writing of it by ideas learnt during his sojourn at Constantinople in 813 and 814. On the other hand there is nothing improbable in this way of regarding the successive stages of the Liturgy having been worked out as a natural result of beliefs common to the East and the West independently of any direct influence of Eastern methods or thought.

One of the letters of Amalarius seems to show that he did not regard the eating of the flesh of the Son of Man spoken of by our Lord in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel as equivalent to the reception of the Eucharist; for he explains the words "Except ye shall have eaten the flesh of the Son of Man and shall have drunk His blood, ye shall not have life in yourselves"² as meaning "Unless ye shall have been partakers of My passion and shall have believed that I died for your salvation, ye shall not have life in you".³

These two lines of thought did not hinder Amalarius from

¹ See pp. 148-50, 165-72, *supra*.

² St. John vi. 53.

³ *Ep.* iv. (*P.L.* cv. 1334).

believing that at consecration the elements are made to be the body and blood of Christ, and that these consecrated gifts are a sacrifice which is accepted by God in heaven. Speaking of the Consecration and the prayers which follow it, he says:—

“Here we believe that the simple nature of the bread and of the mingled wine is turned (*verti*) into a spiritual (*rationabilem*) nature, namely of the body and blood of Christ. . . . In the Sacrament of the bread and the wine, as well as in my memory, the passion of Christ is present. . . . The priest adds in his own name and in that of the people, ‘Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants and also Thy people, mindful of the so blessed passion of the same Thy Son Christ our Lord, and also of His resurrection from the dead, and also of His glorious ascension into heaven, do offer unto Thy excellent majesty, of Thine own gifts and bounties, a pure offering, a holy offering, a stainless offering’. . . . ‘The holy bread of eternal life, the cup of everlasting salvation.’ The bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation is Christ, or, as I said before, the bread is the pure offering, the holy offering, the cup is the stainless offering, and the bread and the wine are both because they make one body. . . . Then the prayer goes on, ‘Upon which vouchsafe to look with a favourable and gracious countenance, and to accept, as Thou wast pleased to accept the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchizedek offered unto Thee, a holy sacrifice and a stainless offering’. The priest prays God the Father that, as in past time He deigned to look on the gifts of Abel and the sacrifice of the patriarch and also that of Melchizedek, so he will have regard to the present supplication, which had its beginning from the sacrifice of Christ. Then he prays that they may be received by saying, ‘We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these to be borne by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thy altar on high to the presence of Thy divine majesty, that all we who from this participation of the altar shall receive the most holy body and blood of Thy Son may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace: through Christ our Lord’. The priest prays that the offering on earth may be accepted in the presence of the divine majesty, so that they who are to receive it may at the same time be made heavenly and filled with the grace of God. Wonderful and great is the faith of the holy Church, which . . . believes that the sacrifice on earth is carried by the hands of the angels into the presence of the Lord, and perceives that it may be eaten by a human mouth. For it believes that this is the body and blood

of the Lord, and that the souls of those who partake are filled with heavenly blessing by eating it.”¹

In spite of the deep sense of the spiritual realities which transcend material things shown by Amalarius in these and other passages in his writings, he evidently felt much difficulty in reconciling his belief in the Eucharistic presence with the material surroundings of consecration and Communion. A habit of his, which perhaps may have seemed less strange to him and his contemporaries than it would to an Englishman of the twentieth century, of spitting after he had received the Sacrament gave scandal to some who thought that this practice involved irreverence; and, when he knew this, his defence of himself included the following statement:—

“When the body of the Lord has been received with good intention, I must not discuss whether it is invisibly taken up into heaven, or is kept in our bodies till the day of burial, or is breathed out into the air, or passes out from the body with the blood, or goes out though the passages, as the Lord says, ‘Everything which goeth into the mouth passeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught.’² This alone must be my care that I take it not with the heart of Judas, and that it is not despised but most healthfully discerned from common food.”³

And in the work *On the Offices of the Church* it is difficult to be sure whether his meaning is that there is an actual division in our Lord’s body in the Eucharist and that He has three distinct bodies, or whether the allusion is simply to a mystical division and to three different aspects of His body. Thus, he writes:—

“Threefold is the body of Christ, that is, of those who have tasted death and are about to die. The first is that holy and stainless body which was taken from the Virgin Mary; the second is that which walks on the earth [*i.e.*, the Church militant]; the third is that which lies in the tomb [*i.e.*, departed Christians]. By the particle of the offering which is placed in the cup the body of Christ which has now risen from the dead is signified; by that which is eaten by the priest or the people that which still walks on the earth; by that which is left on the altar that which lies in the tomb.”⁴

¹ *De eccl. off.* iii. 24, 25 (P.L. cv. 1141-42).

² St. Matt. xv. 17; St. Mark vii. 18, 19.

³ *Ep.* vi. (P.L. cv. 1338).

⁴ *De eccl. off.* iii. 35 (P.L. cv. 1154-55).

In his later work, *Selections on the Office of the Mass*, which may have been written after the controversy shortly to be mentioned, though he speaks of the unity of Christ's body, he still seems unable to shake off the idea of some kind of division in it.

"As there are many churches throughout the world because of the differences of place, and nevertheless there is One Holy Catholic Church because of the unity of faith, so also the many offerings which are made because of the supplications of those who offer are one bread because of the unity of the body of Christ. For, if you ask why the whole of the oblation is not placed in the cup since it is clear that the Lord's whole body rose, the answer is that in part it is about to rise, in part it now lives, so that it dieth no more, in part it is mortal and yet is in heaven."¹

On the assumption that his statements were intended to assert an actual division in the body of Christ, and that some of his mystical interpretations of the ceremonial of the Mass involved a return to Jewish ideas, Amalarius was bitterly attacked by Florus, a deacon of Lyons and Master of the Cathedral School there; his teaching was brought before the Council of Thionville in 835 and the Council of Qiercy-sur-Oise in 838; and at the latter council some kind of condemnation was passed upon it.² An unfavourable view involving strong disapproval has been taken of his opinions by a theologian of so great insight as Dr. Vacant;³ but when his teaching is considered as a whole it is perhaps more likely that assertions, which, if literally and materially meant could not be defended, were intended to be of a mystical nature, and that Dom Morin is right in saying, "The heresy of which Florus accused him on the subject of the three-fold body of Christ cannot be taken seriously."⁴

Florus the Deacon, who died about 860, was himself the author of a treatise entitled *On the Explanation of the Mass*, which was probably written at an earlier date than his attacks on Amalarius. Many sentences in this work are identical with sentences in the fourth book of the *Confession of the Faith* ascribed to Alcuin, from which quotations have already been

¹ *Ecc. de off. miss.* (P.L. cv. 1328).

² Florus, *Opuscula adv. Amal.* (P.L. cxix. 71-96).

³ *Hist. de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Église Latine*, p. 31.

⁴ In the *Dict. de Théologie Catholique*, i. 934.

made,¹ This may be due to the *Confession of the Faith* being not by Alcuin but later than the book by Florus, or to both writers having incorporated phraseology ordinarily current in the eighth and ninth centuries. In this treatise and in the writings against Amalarius the belief of Florus as to the means and effect of consecration is made very clear. The consecration is accomplished by the operation of the Holy Ghost at the recitation of the words of institution ; by virtue of consecration the elements are made to be the body and blood of Christ ; this work is effected not in any material fashion but in ways wholly spiritual.

“By the action of the power of the Holy Ghost the oblation, . . . although it is taken from mere fruits of the earth, is made the body and blood of the only begotten Son of God by the ineffable power of the divine blessing.”²

“In these words [*i.e.*, the recital of the institution] without which no language, no place, no city, that is, no part of the Catholic Church can make, that is, consecrate the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, the Lord Himself gave to the Apostles, whence the universal Church might continually celebrate the memory of its Redeemer ; and the Apostles gave them generally to the whole Church. By the power and words of Christ, then, the consecration is always made, and will be made. It is His word which hallows the heavenly Sacraments. He speaks daily in His priests. They perform the office ; He works by the majesty of divine might. . . . He Himself by the power of the Spirit the Paraclete and the heavenly blessing makes” “these holy sacrifices” “to be His holy body and blood.”³

“The bread of the most holy oblation is the body of Christ, not by way of matter or in visible appearance, but by spiritual power and might. For the body of Christ is not produced for us in the field, nor does His blood grow on the vine, nor is it pressed out in the threshing-floor. Mere bread is made from the fruits of the earth, mere wine is distilled from grapes ; to these comes the faith of the Church which offers them, there is added the consecration of the mystic prayer, there is added the outpouring of divine power ; and so, wonderfully and in ineffable manner, that which is naturally bread and wine of earthly growth is spiritually made the body of Christ, that is, the mystery of our life and salvation, in which we behold one thing with the eyes of the body and another thing with the gaze of faith, and partake of not only what we receive with the

¹ See pp. 201, 202, *supra*.

² *De expos. miss.* 59.

³ *Ibid.* 60 ; *cf.* p. 201, *supra*.

mouth but also what we believe with the mind. . . . The body of Christ, as has been said before, is not in visible appearance but in spiritual power."¹

The work of Florus, *On the Explanation of the Mass*, contains many allusions to sacrifice. The true sacrifice was foreshadowed among the Jews, was offered on the cross, is pleaded in heaven, and is commemorated in the Eucharist, wherein the Church makes its memorial of the passion and enters into the heavenly worship.

"Between Godhead alone and manhood alone there mediates the human divinity and divine humanity of Christ,² who even offered Himself for us in the passion."³

"By that unique sacrifice, in which the Mediator was slain, are heavenly things made one with earthly, and earthly with heavenly."⁴

"He performed for us the office of priest when on the altar of the cross He offered to God the Father the stainless offering of His flesh."⁵

"The Mediator of God and men, God above us, Man for our sakes, by means of His manhood pleads for us to the Father, by means of His Godhead hears and accepts us with the Father."⁶

"Our holy fathers in the Old Testament offered to the one God and Creator of all things victims which He Himself willed should be offered to Him, promising through the likeness in these the real Victim, through whom He reconciled us to Himself by the remission of sins in Christ Jesus our Lord, so that a likeness foreshadowing the reality of the sacrifice was offered to Him, to whom was to be offered the reality itself set forth in the passion of the body and blood of Christ. Before the coming of Christ the flesh and blood of this sacrifice were foreshadowed in likeness by means of victims, in the passion of Christ they were set forth in the reality itself, after the ascension of Christ the memory thereof is celebrated in the Sacrament."⁷

"The Church offers this sacrifice wherein Christ is shown forth as having already suffered, who is the real Priest because He offered Himself as a real sacrifice on our behalf."⁸

"This sacrifice of praise, that is, the offering of the Lord's passion, . . . the devotion of the faithful offers for themselves and for all their own . . . both for the living and for the dead."⁹

¹ *Opusc. adv. Amal.* i. 9.

² Obviously, a loose way of describing the one Person of Christ, who is God and Man.

³ C. 22.

⁴ C. 25.

⁵ C. 33.

⁶ C. 22.

⁷ C. 4.

⁸ C. 4.

⁹ C. 53.

"This is the real offering, in which the Son is offered, in which the Father is reconciled,¹ and well pleased with the living offering appoints our days in His peace."²

"He takes away the sins of the world and washes us from our daily sins in His blood, when at the altar the memory of His blessed passion is renewed."³

"That the hearts of the faithful may become heavenly, and, as they have borne the image of the earthly, may bear also the image of Him who is of heaven, . . . they ought to be cleansed not with the gore of brute beasts but with the spiritual gore of the blood of Christ, who . . . offered Himself through the Holy Ghost without spot to God. For this is daily renewed for us in the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Son of God."⁴

"The priest begins to utter the prayer by which the very mystery of the Lord's body and blood is consecrated. For so is it right that in that hour of so holy and divine action the whole mind should be withdrawn by the grace of God from earthly thoughts, and that the Church with the priest and the priest with the Church should in spiritual desire enter into the heavenly and eternal sanctuary."⁵

"No one with carnal thought is to suppose that there is in heaven a material altar, made from a heavenly or super-heavenly body, but rather . . . we are to understand that the heavenly altar of God is reasonable and spiritual in the chosen and reasonable creature, that is, angelic and human, which in the holy angels, from the time that it was made, upraised in the contemplation of their Creator and wholly united in the spirit of peace, is a real and heavenly altar of God, from which God receives the perpetual sacrifice of praise and offering of joy, to the unity of which altar the whole multitude of chosen men are joined now by faith, and hereafter by the sight of the vision of God."⁶

In the course of his treatise Florus takes some pains to explain that the Eucharistic sacrifice is offered to the Son and the Holy Ghost as well as to the Father by virtue of their co-equal Godhead.⁷

IV.

A controversy of a different kind from that originated by the writings of Amalarius arose in consequence of a treatise by Pas-

¹ In c. 4 the phraseology is different: "He reconciled us," "we are reconciled".

² C. 58.

³ C. 90.

⁴ C. 59.

⁵ C. 42.

⁶ C. 66.

⁷ Cc. 32-35.

chasius Radbert. Paschasius was a monk of the Abbey of Corbey, who, after being master of the monastic school, was elected abbot in 844. He resigned that office in 851, and died in 865. About 831 Paschasius composed a treatise on the Eucharist for the instruction of some of the younger monks in one of the daughter houses of the Abbey of Corbey; and in 844 he presented a revised edition of this treatise under the title *On the Lord's Body and Blood* to the King, afterwards the Emperor, Charles the Bald. In this treatise and also in a letter written at a later time Paschasius, like Florus, is careful to emphasise the spiritual character of the presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, thus still preserving the mark made on Western theology by this element in the teaching of St. Augustine.

"These mysteries are not carnal, though they are flesh and blood, but are rightly understood as spiritual. . . . It is foolish . . . to speculate about . . . the mixture of this food with other food in the process of digestion. When spiritual food and drink are taken, and through them the Holy Ghost works in man, so that anything still carnal in us is made spiritual and man becomes spiritual, where can such mixture come in at all? As far as the life of eternity is from this present mortal life, so far does this food surpass that common food which we share with the beasts."¹

"Wrong is the thought of those who have carnal ideas about this mystery."²

While thus maintaining the spiritual character of the presence of our Lord, Paschasius follows the general tradition of the Church in regarding the consecrated elements as Christ's body and blood, and deduces from the idea that the elements are changed at the consecration—which, though found at various times in the West,³ is most characteristic of the East⁴—the notion that they are wholly and substantially converted into the body and blood of Christ, so that after consecration they do not truly and properly continue to exist as bread and wine. Further, the consecration is effected at the recital of the words of institution by the power of Christ and the operation of the Holy Ghost; and the body thus present is that very body which was born of

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* xx. 2, 3.

² *Ep. ad Frudegardum* (*P.L.* cxx. 1356).

³ See, e.g., pp. 105, 197, 198, *supra*.

⁴ See, e.g., pp. 102-4, 146, *supra*.

the Virgin, which suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb. That so marvellous a work is accomplished is due, like creation itself, to the exercise of the almighty power of God.

“Since nothing is beyond the power of God, therefore He can do all things. For God, the Maker of the universe, did not create the natures of things in such a way as to remove from them His own will, because the existence of all created things depends on the same will and power of God in which it had its origin, not only that it should be whatever it is but also that it be in such a way as the will of God itself decreed, which is the cause of all created things. . . . As often as the nature of a created thing is changed or increased or lessened, it is not diverted from Him in whom it is, because it so is and so becomes as He in whom it is decrees. It is plain therefore that nothing is beyond or contrary to the will of God, but all things are altogether subject to Him. Let not any one then be disturbed concerning this body and blood of Christ, that in the mystery there is real flesh and real blood, so long as He who created has so willed ; . . . and, because He has willed, though the figure of bread and wine remain, yet these are altogether a figure, and after consecration we must believe that there is nothing else than the flesh and blood of Christ. . . . And that I may speak more wonderfully, this certainly is no other flesh than that which was born of Mary and suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb. . . . God is truth ; and, if God is truth, whatever Christ promised in this mystery, that certainly is true ; and therefore it is the real flesh and blood of Christ, which He who eats and drinks worthily has eternal life abiding in him ; but to bodily sight and taste they are not changed for this reason that faith may be exercised to righteousness, and that because of the merit of faith the reward of righteousness may ensue.”¹

“Because it is not right that Christ should be torn by the teeth, He has willed that in the mystery this bread and wine be potentially created by the consecration of the Holy Ghost really His flesh and blood, and in being so created be daily mystically sacrificed for the life of the world, that, as real flesh was created from the Virgin without paternal generation by the operation of the Spirit, so by the operation of the same Spirit the same body and blood of Christ be mystically consecrated from the substance of the bread and wine. . . . He speaks of no other than real flesh and real blood, though mystically ; whence, because the Sacrament is mystic, we cannot

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom. i. 1, 2, 5.*

deny that it is a figure. But, if it is a figure, we must ask how it can be a reality. . . . It is reality then in that the body and blood of Christ are made by the power of the Spirit at His word from the substance of bread and wine; it is a figure in that the priest as it were performs some outward action for the memorial at the altar of the sacred passion so that, while this was once for all accomplished, there is the daily offering of the Lamb."¹

"What is that which men eat? Behold, all without distinction often receive the Sacraments of the altar. Clearly they so receive; but one spiritually eats the flesh of Christ, and drinks His blood, while another does not, although he is seen to receive a morsel from the hand of the priest. And what does he receive, since there is one consecration, if he does not receive the body and blood of Christ? Truly, because being guilty he receives unworthily, as Paul the Apostle says, 'He eats and drinks judgment to himself, not first examining himself, and not discerning the Lord's body'.² Behold, what does the sinner eat, and what does he drink? In truth, he does not eat and drink the flesh and blood usefully to himself, but judgment, though he is seen to receive with the rest the Sacrament of the altar. . . . He does not believe or understand of what kind or how great judgment he takes, because he sees all alike visibly eating of one food and does not sufficiently know by reason of faith whether there is any further virtue in it. Wherefore the virtue of the Sacrament is withdrawn from him, and moreover the judgment on his guilt is doubled on account of his presumption."³

"Up to this point are the words of the evangelists; then follow the words of God, full of power and all effectiveness, 'Take and eat ye all of this, for this is My body'. . . . Believe, my son, that this is so, since He has said, and you cannot doubt that it is done; He has commanded, and it has been created. . . . 'This is the cup of My blood, of the new and eternal covenant.' By this word that which before was wine and water is made blood. . . . As often as you drink this cup or eat this bread, think not that you drink any other blood than that which was poured out for you and for all for the remission of sins, or that you eat any other flesh than that which for you and for all was betrayed and hung on the cross. . . . That this mystery, although it is real flesh, can be called bread the Apostle proves, when he says, 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the cup';⁴ for it is the flesh of Christ and real flesh, and yet is rightly called the living Bread which

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* iv. 1.

² 1 Cor. xi. 29.

³ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* vi. 2.

⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 28.

came down from heaven, flesh indeed by grace but bread by effect, because, as this earthly bread supplies temporal life, so that heavenly Bread affords eternal and heavenly life, because it is life eternal." ¹

"When He brake and gave to them the bread, He did not say, This is, or there is in this mystery, a kind of virtue or figure of My body, but He said plainly, 'This is My body'. And therefore it is what He said, and not what any one pretends. . . . Wherefore I marvel that there are some now who want to say that in the Sacrament there is not in fact the reality of the flesh and blood of Christ, but a kind of virtue of the flesh and not the flesh itself, a virtue of the blood and not the blood itself, a figure not a reality, a shadow not a body." ²

The teaching of Paschasius in regard to the Eucharistic sacrifice is of great interest. He regards the Eucharist as unquestionably a sacrifice. In it the Church on earth offers gifts and prayer through the instrumentality of the ministering priest. When at the consecration the bread and wine are made to be the body and blood of Christ by the power of the Lord and of the Holy Ghost, they are uplifted into the heavenly sphere, presented on the heavenly altar of the body of Christ, offered by Christ as His own sacrifice, and given back by Him to the communicants on earth as supernatural food.

"When the priest begins to offer this sacrifice, he adds to the other prayers, 'Command these to be borne by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thy altar on high, in the presence of Thy divine majesty'. And do you think, O man, to receive the gift from any other place than from that altar, to which on high it has been translated, and where it is consecrated? But perhaps blind reasoning may object, How is it so suddenly offered in heaven in the presence of the divine majesty, while here, though it is called either bread or flesh, it is always visibly held in the hand of the priest. . . . Learn, O man, that you taste something else than that which is perceived by the fleshly mouth, that you behold something else than that which is shown to the eyes of the flesh. Learn that God is spirit and is everywhere without the limitations of restrictions of space (*illoca-liter ubique est*). Understand that these things are spiritual, and as no question of space enters in (*sicut nec localiter*) so neither are they borne on high in carnal fashion into the presence of the divine majesty. Think then if anything corporeal can be on high, when the

¹ *Op. cit.* xv. xvi.

² *Ep. ad Frudegardum* (P.L. cxx. 1357).

substance of the bread and wine is effectually made by an inner change (*efficaciter interior commutatur*) into the flesh and blood of Christ, so that after the consecration it is now believed actually to be the real flesh and blood of Christ, and is regarded by believers as nothing else than Christ the Bread from heaven. Do you think there is any other altar where Christ the High Priest stands than His own body, by means of which and on which He offers to God the Father the offerings of the faithful and the faith of believers? And, if that heavenly altar is believed to be actually the body of Christ, you will no longer think that you receive His flesh and blood from any other source than from Christ's body itself." ¹

"This offering is daily repeated—though Christ suffered once for all in the flesh, and by one and the same passion of His death once for all saved the world, and death shall no more have dominion over Him in His rising to life from this death—because in truth the wisdom of God the Father foresaw this as necessary for many reasons, chiefly because we daily sin, at least with those sins without which mortal weakness cannot live, because, though all sins were forgiven in Baptism, yet the weakness of sin still remains in the flesh. . . . And therefore, because we daily fall, daily is Christ mystically offered on our behalf, and the passion of Christ is daily presented (*traditur*) in the mystery, so that He who by once dying conquered death may daily forgive the sins of repeated offences by means of these Sacraments of His body and blood. . . . Not only did He wash us from our sins in His blood when He gave His blood for us on the cross, or when any one of us was washed in the mystery of His most holy passion and in the Baptism of water; but also He daily takes away the sins of the world, and daily washes us from our sins in His blood, when the commemoration of His blessed passion is reproduced on the altar, when the creature of bread and wine is translated into the Sacrament of His flesh and blood by the ineffable sanctification of the Spirit. . . . That our Redeemer still to this day celebrates by the daily memorial of His blessed passion all which He did once for all at the time of His passion is, I think, the chief reason why we continually reproduce the memory of His most holy death by daily offering the sacrifice of His most sacred body and blood on the altar." ²

"If you give heed to the priest, give heed to Christ the Word of the Father, who is flesh, and doubt not that what was once for all done is daily performed in the mystery, when by means of it flesh and

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* viii. 1, 2.

² *Ibid.* ix. 1, 2.

blood are made our eternal food, for this purpose indeed that we also may be His body. Wherefore the priest does not say of himself that he himself can be the creator of body and blood, because if this could be, which is absurd, he would be the creator of the Creator; but he beseeches the Father through the Son, through whom we have access to Him. . . . Before the body of Christ comes to be by consecration there is the offering of the priest, as he himself confesses, or the joint offering of the family of those who offer it, but by the word and power of the Holy Ghost there is a new creation in the body of the Creator for our restoration and salvation. Wherefore it is proved, as Scripture shows, that He ever stands at the altar on high, so that from His offering of His sacrifice we may receive the body and blood." ¹

In view of the teaching of Paschasius some incidental expressions in a liturgical work by his contemporary Walafrid Strabo, who was born in 806, became a monk at Reichenau in 821 and abbot there in 842, and died in 849, are of interest. The sentences are:—

"In the Last Supper, which He held with His disciples before His betrayal, after the rites of the ancient Passover, Christ gave to the same disciples the Sacraments of His body and blood in the substance of bread and wine, and taught them to celebrate these for the commemoration of His most sacred passion." ²

"We must so understand that the same mysteries of our redemption are really the body and blood of the Lord that we ought to believe them to be pledges of that complete unity which we now have with our Head by hope and shall have hereafter in fact. . . . He who eats and drinks the body and blood of the Lord worthily shows that he is in God and that God is in him." ³

Rabanus Maurus was a monk of Fulda, who became abbot of that monastery in 825 and Archbishop of Mentz in 847. He died in 856. A noticeable feature in his Eucharistic teaching was his explicit rejection of the contention of Paschasius Radbert that the body present in the Eucharist is the same body as that which was born of the Virgin and suffered and rose. Yet it may be doubted whether the difference on this point was really deep. Paschasius was at pains, as has been seen, to em-

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* xii. 2, 3.

² *De ecclesiasticarum rerum exordiis et incrementis*, 16 (P.L. cxiv. 936).

³ *Op. cit.* 17 (P.L. cxiv. 937).

pharise the spiritual character of the presence. Rabanus Maurus taught clearly that the presence is that of the real flesh and blood of the Lord. If it was the belief of Paschasius that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ which He took and used in the Incarnation, being so made in spiritual fashion by the power of the Holy Ghost, and if it was the belief of Rabanus that the elements are really changed at consecration into Christ's flesh and blood by an actual spiritual transformation, only in some different state and mode of presence from His state in His life on earth and His mode of presence in the glory of His heavenly life, the difference of their points of view does not appear to have been greater than might have been removed by a more accurate understanding of the real meaning in the mind of each.

The rejection by Rabanus Maurus of the assertion of Paschasius Radbert is contained in the following passages:—

“The Sacrament of the body and blood is made from visible and bodily things; but it effects the invisible sanctification and salvation both of body and of soul. . . . Certain people lately, having wrong ideas about the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, have said that this is the body itself and blood of the Lord which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which the Lord Himself suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb, in reply to which error, writing as fully as we could to Egilus the abbot, we have explained what is rightly to be believed about the body itself.”¹

“How is it right for this flesh of Christ to be eaten, if it was born of Mary and suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb, especially since that flesh of Christ rising from the tomb was so glorified that it could no longer in any way be eaten?”²

The assertions that the consecrated elements are really the body and blood of Christ are as follows:—

“Who would ever have believed that bread could be converted into flesh, or wine into blood, unless the Saviour Himself had said

¹ *Pœnitentiale*, 33 (*P.L.* cx. 492, 493).

² *Ep.* iii. 2 (*P.L.* cxii. 1513). There is some doubt as to the authorship of this letter; but it is probably by Rabanus, and that referred to in the previous quotation. On the distinction between the body of Christ in the Eucharist and that in His life on earth, *cf.* the passages from Clement of Alexandria and St. Jerome, quoted on pp. 25, 26, 97, 98, *supra*.

so, who created bread and wine and made all things out of nothing? It is easier to make something out of something than to create all things out of nothing. The Saviour Himself willed to take a human body and to unite man to God so that there should be one Mediator of God and men, the Man Christ Jesus. And He Himself willed that by us bread and wine should be offered to Him and should be divinely consecrated by Him, and that the faithful people should believe that the mystery which He delivered to His disciples is real."¹

"That the body and blood of the Lord are real flesh and real blood, each Christian ought to believe, to know, to hold, and also to acknowledge and unhesitatingly assert."²

On the different effects of the reception of the Sacrament in different cases Rabanus Maurus writes:—

"Our Lord gave His body and blood in those things which are gathered together into some one thing, as from many grains or unleavened cakes, in order that He might show the unity of the love of the saints and might allow the unity of His body and His members to be understood, that is, the holy Church in those who are predestined and called and justified and glorified, His saints and faithful ones. Of these things the first has already happened, that is, in predestination; the second and third have happened and are happening and will happen, that is, the calling and justifying; the fourth is in fact yet to come, that is, the glorifying. Of this thing the Sacrament, that is, the unity of the body and blood of Christ, is taken from the Table of the Lord, by some to life, by others to destruction, but the thing itself is to every man for life, to no one for destruction, whoever shall have been partaker of it, that is, shall have been made a member of Christ the Head in the heavenly kingdom, because the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament is another, for the Sacrament is received by the mouth, by the virtue of the Sacrament the inner man is fed. For the Sacrament goes to the nourishment of the body, but by the virtue of the Sacrament the honour of eternal life is obtained. In the Sacrament all the faithful who communicate enter the bond of unity and peace. For in the virtue of the Sacrament all the members joined to their Head and united together will rejoice in eternal glory. As then this [*i.e.* the Sacrament, in the sense of the

¹ *De sac. ord.* 19 (*P.L.* cxii. 1185).

² *Ep.* iii. 1 (*P.L.* cxii. 1510, 1511). On this letter, see p. 224, note 2, *supra*.

outward part] is converted into us when we eat and drink it, so also we are converted into the body of Christ when we live obediently and devoutly. But yet, as we have said above, so great is the dignity and the power of the Sacrament itself that whoever shall have received it unworthily brings on himself condemnation rather than salvation. . . . Then do we really and healthfully receive the body and blood of Christ, if we not only wish that we may eat the flesh and blood of Christ in the Sacrament but also that we may eat and drink even for the participation of the Spirit, so that we may abide as members in the body of the Lord and may be quickened by His Spirit.”¹

The teaching of Rabanus Maurus on the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice is less vividly expressed than that of Paschasius Radbert, but does not substantially differ from it. The following passages show that he regarded the Eucharist as a sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ offered by priest and people and presented in the worship of the heavenly sanctuary.

“They are offerings which are voluntarily given; they are gifts which are offered for the sake of some kindness or reward, as we offer to God in order that our sins may be forgiven; they are sacrifices which are consecrated together with prayers. . . . This offering must be made to God alone. . . . It ought to be offered on behalf of the Holy Catholic Church. . . . The priest has prayed for all those who have come to hear Mass. Then he prays for those who bring their offerings, ‘Who offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise’. He calls it a sacrifice of praise because they offer it in the first place for the praise of God. Afterwards he adds, ‘For themselves and for all their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety, they pay their vows to Thee, the eternal, living, and true God’. . . . The priests themselves . . . ought to be mindful that they celebrate the Mass and offer the sacrifice instructed by the example of Christ; and they ought to know what they celebrate, because a request is foolish if a man does not know what he asks. The holy people ought also to remember that Christ suffered not only for the priests but also for the people. . . . ‘We offer to Thy excellent majesty of Thy gifts and bounties a pure offering, a holy offering, a stainless offering, the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation.’ O Lord, mindful of all Thy good gifts which we have mentioned, we offer to Thy majesty ‘a pure offering,’ that is, with a pure heart,

¹ *De cler. inst.* i. 31 (*P.L.* cvii. 317, 318).

because Thy body is pure, which we believe is made to be from this bread. We offer 'a holy offering,' because Thou didst sanctify Thy body when Thou didst unite man to God; and now sanctify this bread that it may become Thy body. We offer 'a stainless offering,' because Thou without stain of sin didst suffer for us. We offer 'the holy bread of eternal life,' because Thou art the living Bread which came down from heaven, and Thou hast willed us to receive Thy body in this bread which has been consecrated by Thee, and Thou hast willed us to take Thy blood through the cup of Thy passion. Do Thou sanctify this offering, that it may become to us Thy body and Thy blood. . . . As Melchizedek offered bread and wine, so Christ in His passion offered His body and blood to God the Father on our behalf. And in bread and wine He willed us to imitate the mystery of His passion. . . . Humbly we pray that our gifts, offered upon this altar which can be seen, the heavenly Father will command to be borne by the hands of His holy Angel to that altar on high which is before His divine majesty, which we cannot see with our eyes because it is not bodily but spiritual."¹

The treatise of Ratramn entitled *On the body and blood of the Lord* is of great importance in connection with the controversy which surrounded the teaching of Paschasius Radbert. Ratramn was born early in the ninth century, was a monk and priest at Corbey, the monastery of Paschasius himself, and afterwards became Abbot of Orbais. He is known to have been alive in 870. As has been mentioned, about 844 Paschasius presented his treatise *On the body and blood of the Lord* to Charles the Bald. It was possibly in consequence that Charles addressed two questions in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist to Ratramn. These two questions are thus described by Ratramn:—

"Your excellent majesty inquires whether the body and blood of Christ, which in the Church is taken by the mouth of the faithful, is made such in mystery or in external reality (*in veritate*), that is, whether it contains anything hidden, which is open only to the eyes of faith, or whether without the veil of any mystery the sight of the body outwardly sees that which the vision of the mind inwardly beholds, so that all that is done is clearly manifested and seen; and whether it is that body itself which was born of Mary

¹ *De sac. ord.* 19 (*P.L.* cxii. 1183-87).

and suffered and died and was buried, which rose again and ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of the Father.”¹

In thus stating the questions, it will be seen that Ratramn explains the phrase “in mystery” to mean that the body and blood of Christ are really present but cannot be discerned by the senses and are cognizable only by faith, and the phrase “in external reality (*in veritate*)” to mean that they are not only really present but also to be discerned by the outward faculties. So explained, it is obvious that there could only be one answer to the first question. After defining “figure” as “a certain outshadowing which exhibits its meaning by certain veils,” such as the word “bread” or “vine” to denote our Lord; and “external reality (*veritas*)” as “a plain setting forth of a matter which is veiled by no shadowy images but conveyed by clear and open and natural significations,” “an uncovered and open signification,” such as the statement that Christ was born of the Virgin, suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried,²—Ratramn proceeds:—

“Now let us return to that subject for the sake of which this has been said, namely the body and blood of Christ. For, if that mystery be celebrated under no figure, then it is not rightly called a mystery, since that cannot be called a mystery in which there is nothing hidden, nothing removed from the bodily senses, nothing concealed under any veil. But that bread which by the ministry of the priest is made the body of Christ, shows one thing outwardly to the human senses, and proclaims another thing inwardly to the minds of the faithful. Outwardly indeed the form of bread, which it was before, is presented, the colour is exhibited, the taste is perceived; but inwardly a far different and much more precious and much more excellent thing is signified, because what is heavenly and divine, that is, the body of Christ, is shown forth, which is perceived and taken and eaten; not by the fleshly senses but by the gaze of the faithful soul. Likewise the wine, which by the consecration of the priest is made the Sacrament of the blood of Christ, shows one thing on the surface and contains another thing within. For what else is seen on the surface but the substance of wine? Taste it, there is the savour of wine; smell it, there is the scent of wine; look at it, there you see the colour of wine. But, if you consider it within, no longer the liquid of wine but the liquid of the blood of Christ is the savour when it is tasted, and is recognised when it is beheld, and is acknowledged when it is

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 5 (*P.L.* cxxi. 129, 130). ² *Ibid.* 7, 8.

smelt, to the minds of believers. Since no one can deny that this is so, it is plain that the bread and wine are by way of figure the body and blood of Christ. For according to sight, neither is the nature (*species*) of flesh recognised in that bread nor is the fluid of blood manifested in that wine; yet after the mystic consecration they are no longer called bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ.”¹

So far it does not appear that there is any difference between the teaching of Ratramn and that of Paschasius. To both alike the inner unseen spiritual reality is the body and blood of Christ; to both alike that which is apparent to the bodily senses is bread and wine. According to Ratramn’s own definition of his terms, that the body and blood of Christ are present by way of figure does not in his terminology mean that they are not present as a matter of fact but they are present in such a way that they cannot be discerned by the bodily senses; and a denial of “external reality (*veritas*)” does not imply that they are not spiritually real. But, as Ratramn goes on to develop his own way of regarding the mystery, a difference between him and Paschasius appears to emerge. Ratramn is further than Paschasius from any idea of actual change in the elements themselves, and he makes a clear distinction between that body of Christ which is in the Sacrament and the flesh which was born, crucified, and buried.

“How is that called the body of Christ, in which no change is perceived to have been made? For every change is either from not being to being, or from being to not being, or from being one thing to being another thing. But in this Sacrament, if it is considered simply as a matter of external reality (*in veritatis simplicitate*), and if nothing else is believed than that which is seen, no change is perceived to have been made. For it has not passed from not being to being, as is the change in things that are born, since before they were not, and in order to be they have passed from not being to being. But in this case the bread and the wine existed before they passed into the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Nor again is there the change from being to not being, as is the change in the case of things which suffer failure or annihilation; for whatever perishes first existed, and that which has never been cannot be destroyed; and in this case this change is perceived not to have been made, since according to external reality (*secundum veritatem*) the

¹ *De corp. et sang.* 9, 10.

nature (*species*) of the creature is perceived to have remained what it was before. Further, neither is there here perceived to have been made that change which is from being one thing to being another, which is seen in things which undergo change of quality, as for instance when what before was black is changed so as to be white; for in this case no change is detected in taste or colour or smell. If then no change has taken place, it is not different from what it was before. Yet it is something different, since the bread has been made the body, and the wine the blood, of Christ. . . . Since they confess that they are the body and blood of God, and that this could not be except by a change being made for the better, and since this change is made not corporally but spiritually, it must be said that it has been made by way of figure, since under the veil of bodily bread and bodily wine the spiritual body and spiritual blood exist. Not that two things different from one another exist, namely body and spirit, but that one and the same thing is in one respect the nature (*species*) of bread and wine, and in another respect the body and blood of Christ. So far as they are corporally handled, their nature (*species*) is that of corporal creatures; but according to their power, and as they have been spiritually made, they are the mysteries of the body and blood of Christ.”¹

“Let us consider the font of Holy Baptism. . . . In that font, if one considers only what the bodily senses see, there is seen the element of water, which is subject to corruption and is not capable of washing anything but the body; but through the consecration of the priest the power of the Holy Ghost is added, and it is made able to wash not only bodies but also souls, and by spiritual efficacy to remove spiritual stains.”²

“The sea and the cloud [*i.e.*, those referred to in 1 Cor. x. 1-4] conveyed the cleansing of sanctification not in respect of their outward bodily nature but in respect of that sanctification of the Holy Ghost which they invisibly contained. For there was in them a visible form, apparent to the bodily senses not in image but in external reality (*in veritate*); and there was also a spiritual power which was shining within, which was discernible not to the sight of the flesh but to the eyes of the mind. . . . In those bodily substances [*i.e.*, the manna and the water from the rock] the spiritual power of the Word was present, which gave food and drink to the minds rather than the bodies of believers. . . . One and the same Christ at that time gave to the people in the desert, who were baptised in the cloud and in the sea, His flesh for food and His blood for drink,

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 12, 13, 16.

² *Ibid.* 17.

and now in the Church gives to the people of believers as food the bread of His body and as drink the stream of His blood. . . . He who now in the Church by almighty power spiritually converts bread and wine into the flesh of His body and the stream of His own blood at that time also wrought invisibly in making the manna which was given from heaven His body, and the water which flowed from the rock His own blood. . . . As a little before He suffered He was able to convert the substance of bread and the creature of wine into His own body which was about to suffer and into His blood which was afterwards to be poured out, so even in the desert He was able to convert the manna and the water from the rock into His flesh and blood, although long time was to elapse before His flesh was to hang for us on the cross, and before His blood was to be poured out to cleanse us.”¹

“Christ said to His disciples, who received His words not with unbelief but in faith, though they did not grasp how to understand them, ‘Does this make you stumble? What then if ye should see the Son of Man ascending where He was before,’² as though to say, Think not that My flesh or My blood is to be corporally eaten or drunk by you, or that it has been divided or is to be divided into pieces, for after My resurrection ye shall see Me ascend into heaven with the completeness of My whole body and blood. Then shall ye understand that My flesh is not to be eaten by believers as faithless people think, but that bread and wine really converted in mystery into the substance of My body and blood are to be taken by believers.”³

“From all which has so far been said it has been shown that the body and blood of Christ, which are received by the mouth of the faithful in the Church, are figures in respect of visible nature (*speciem*); but in respect of invisible substance, that is, the power of the divine Word, they are really the body and blood of Christ.”⁴

“Now we must examine the second question propounded, and see whether that body itself which was born of Mary and suffered and died and was buried, which sits at the right hand of the Father, is that which is daily taken by the mouth of the faithful in the Church in the mystery of the Sacraments. . . . St. Ambrose says that in that mystery of the blood and body of Christ a change is made, and that it is made wonderfully because it is divine, and ineffably because it is incomprehensible. Let those who wish to

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 21, 22, 23, 25, 28.

² St. John vi. 61, 62.

³ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 30.

⁴ *Ibid.* 49.

take nothing here according to power hidden within but to weigh everything according to what visibly appears say in what respect the change is here made. For as regards the substance of the creatures, they are after consecration what they were before. Bread and wine they were before, and after they have been consecrated, they are seen to remain in the same nature (*specie*). There has been then an inner change by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost; and it is this which faith beholds, which feeds the soul, which supplies the substance of eternal life. . . . Those things which are seen are not in nature (*specie*) but in power the body and blood of Christ. . . . St. Ambrose . . . distinguishes between the Sacrament of the flesh and the external reality (*veritate*) of the flesh, inasmuch as he says that He was crucified and buried in the external reality (*veritate*) of the flesh which He took of the Virgin, but that the mystery which is now celebrated in the Church is the Sacrament of that real flesh in which He was crucified; he openly teaches the faithful that that flesh in respect of which Christ was crucified and buried is not a mystery but an external reality of nature (*veritas naturæ*), but that this flesh which now contains the likeness of that flesh in mystery is not flesh by nature (*specie*) but sacramentally (*sacramento*), since indeed as to nature (*in specie*) it is bread but by way of Sacrament (*in sacramento*) it is the real body of Christ. . . . The difference is great which distinguishes the body in which Christ suffered and the blood which He shed from His side when hanging on the cross from this body which is daily celebrated by the faithful in the mystery of the passion of Christ and the blood which is taken by the mouth of the faithful, so that it may be a mystery of that blood by which the world was redeemed.”¹

“It is further to be considered that in the bread there is a figure not only of the body of Christ but also of the body of the people believing in Him. . . . As that bread is taken to be the body of Christ in mystery, so also in mystery the members of the people believing in Christ are signified. And as that bread is called the body of believers not corporally but spiritually, so also it must be understood to be the body of Christ not corporally but spiritually. So also water is ordered to be mixed with the wine which is called the blood of Christ, and one is not allowed to be offered without the other. . . . The water in the Sacrament bears the image of the people. If then the wine when consecrated by the office of the ministers is corporally converted into the blood of

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 50, 54, 56, 57, 69.

Christ, the water also which is mixed with it must be corporally converted into the blood of the believing people. . . . Whatever signification there is of the body of the people in the water is taken spiritually ; whatever therefore is indicated of the blood of Christ in the wine must be taken spiritually.”¹

“This body and blood are the pledge and image of a future thing, so that what is now shown by way of likeness shall in the future be revealed by way of manifestation. Since they will hereafter manifest that which they now signify, that which is now celebrated is one thing, that which will be hereafter manifested is another. Wherefore that which the Church celebrates is both the body and the blood of Christ, but as a pledge, as an image. But the manifested reality (*veritas*) will be when there is no longer pledge or image but when the reality of the thing itself will be outwardly shown (*ipsius rei veritas apparebit*).”²

“Let it not be thought that in the mystery of the Sacrament the body and blood of the Lord Himself are not taken by the faithful, for faith receives what it believes, not what the eye sees. It is spiritual food and spiritual drink, spiritually feeding the soul and bestowing the life of eternal satisfaction.”³

The allusions to the Eucharistic sacrifice in the treatise of Ratramn are incidental only. In the course of his argument he contrasts it with the sacrifices of the Jews by saying that “they had a figure of things to come,” while “this sacrifice is a figure of things past”; he says that the Eucharistic body of Christ is “for the commemoration of His passion and death,” and that “the bread and wine, which are called and are the body and blood of Christ, represent the memory of the Lord’s passion and death”; and he adds that “they are placed on the altar for a figure or memorial of the Lord’s death, that they may recall to our present recollection that which was done in time past”.⁴

This book of Ratramn on the Eucharist is of great importance not only in its bearing on the beliefs and controversies of the ninth century, but also because of the influence exercised by it in later times. The use of it in England in the tenth century may be seen from the reproduction of much of the teaching contained in it by Aelfric.⁵ It is probably the book which, in the belief that it was the work of John the Scot,

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 73, 74, 75.

² *Ibid.* 86, 87.

³ *Ibid.* 101.

⁴ *Ibid.* 91, 92, 99, 100.

⁵ See pp. 236-38, *infra*.

otherwise known as Scotus Erigena, played a part in the Berengarian controversy in the eleventh century.¹ The estimation in which it was held by Ridley in the sixteenth century was a fact of most momentous consequence to the Church in England.² It is tantalising to be baffled by the problem of Ratramn's meaning. The present writer has read the book many times in the hope of being able to form some clear idea on this subject, and can only confess his failure to reach a conclusion which seems to him to satisfy all the elements in Ratramn's teaching, and to solve the problem whether he regarded the inner spiritual gift which the elements are made to be and convey as simply a mysterious power of effecting a spiritual union with Christ or as Christ Himself present in those elements and to the communicant in spiritual fashion.

V.

Hincmar of Rheims was one of the most prominent of the figures in the ecclesiastical world of the ninth century. He was born about 806, was made Archbishop of Rheims in 845, and died in 882. Among his writings is a treatise *On Avoiding Vices and Acquiring Virtues*, which was addressed to Charles the Bald, three chapters of which relate to the Eucharist. Most of what he thus wrote is little more than a reproduction of statements of earlier writers, as, for instance, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great and Paschasius Radbert and Florus of Lyons, on the perpetual offering of His manhood by Christ in heaven, on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, on the commemoration there made of Christ's death, on the effect of consecration in making the elements the body and blood of Christ by virtue of the creative power of God there exercised as in the conception by the Virgin and the miracles of the Old Testament, on the spiritual character of the presence and gift so that the whole Christ is entirely present in each fragment of the Sacrament, on the reception of the body of Christ by those who already are His mystical body, and on the different consequences of reception in those who communicate worthily or unworthily.³ Hincmar's agreement with Paschasius as to the identity of the Eucharistic body with the body which our Lord

¹ See p. 245, *infra*.

² See vol. ii. p. 184, *infra*.

³ *De cav. vit. et virt. exerc.* 8, 9, 10 (*P.L.* cxxv. 912-28).

took of His virgin mother appears to be shown by a passage where he says:—

“In the holy Church, which is the body of Christ, neither are the priestly acts efficacious nor are the sacrifices real unless the actual High Priest reconcile us in the characteristic life and reality of our nature (*in nostrae proprietate ac veritate naturae*) and the actual blood of the stainless Lamb cleanse us, who, though He be set on the right hand of the Father, yet in the same flesh which He took from the Virgin accomplishes the Sacrament of propitiation.”¹

Another instance of the acceptance of the teaching of Paschasius Radbert may be given from a letter of Haymo. Haymo was born about 778; he was a friend of Rabanus Maurus at Fulda and at Tours; he became Abbot of Hersfeld in 839 and Bishop of Halberstadt in 840 or 841; he died in 853. His fame as an expositor of Holy Scripture was very great. In his letter about the Eucharist he says:—

“We believe and faithfully confess and hold that by the operation of the power of God, as has been said above, this substance, that is, the substance of bread and wine, that is, the nature of bread and wine, is substantially converted into another substance, that is, into flesh and blood. . . . The invisible Priest changes His visible creatures into the substance of His flesh and blood by His unseen power. In which body and blood of Christ the savour and appearance of bread and wine remain to prevent disgust on the part of those who receive them, the nature of the substances being wholly converted into the body and blood of Christ. . . . It must be observed that this consecrated bread and cup are called signs. But this is not to be understood in relation to the flesh and blood of Christ; . . . for in that case they would not be the body and blood of Christ. No sign is that of which it is the sign; and no thing is called the sign of itself but of something else. And every sign, insofar as it is understood to be a sign, is different from that which it signifies. The body and blood of Christ then are called a Sacrament, that is, a sacred sign, not of themselves, . . . but they are rightly called signs in regard to the likeness of those who receive them. For, as bread, which is consecrated to be the body of Christ, is made one bread out of many grains, and as the liquid, which becomes by consecration the blood of Christ, is made one liquid out of many grapes, so all those who receive this Sacrament worthily are made

¹ *De cav. vit. et virt. exerc.* 10 (P.L. cxxv. 928).

one body in Christ out of many people. The body and blood of Christ can also be called signs, in another way, inasmuch as that which we eat and transfer into our body of Christ seems to be incorporated and united in some kind of way with us. Therefore this bodily and temporal eating and incorporation of the flesh and blood of Christ signifies that spiritual and perpetual vision of eternal society and refreshment, whereby we shall be with Him incorporated and united in the future, so to remain with Him for ever. . . . This also the faith of those who receive this Sacrament ought firmly to hold, that, whatever fragment they may seem to receive of this Sacrament, they receive the body of Christ not divided and separated into parts but wholly complete. . . . He is no different from an unbeliever who irreverently, when he is defiled by all the offences of sin, presumes to approach the Table of the Lord; or rather he is worse than an unbeliever and deserves more severe punishment. . . . 'That ye come not into judgment,'¹ that is, that ye do not receive the body of Christ blameably to your condemnation."²

A short treatise *On the Celebration and Meaning of the Mass*, which forms the fortieth chapter of a treatise *On the Divine Offices* wrongly ascribed to Alcuin, may have been written by Remi of Auxerre about 908. In it the Eucharist is regarded as a commemoration of the passion,³ and a means of union with the worship and the priestly work of Christ in heaven.⁴ The earthly offering is the act of the whole Church, though needing the specific ministry of the priest.⁵ The consecration is effected by the blessing of God and the power of the Holy Ghost and the power and words of Christ; and at all the altars where it takes place there is the one body of Christ which He took from the Virgin and gave to the Apostles.⁶ He is thus daily eaten and drunk, yet He abides living and unhurt.⁷ He who gave His blood for us on the cross, and who washes the baptised by the mystery of His passion, "also daily takes away the sins of the world, and washes us from our daily sins in His blood, when the memorial of His same blessed passion is made at the altar".⁸

The famous French scholar Gerbert, who as Sylvester II. was Pope from 999 to 1003, wrote a short book *On the body and blood of the Lord*, partly to defend the main thesis of Paschasius

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 34.

³ *P.L.* ci. 1246.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1260.

² *De corp. et sang. Dom.* (*P.L.* cxviii. 815-18).

⁴ *Ibid.* 1262, 1263.

⁷ *Ibid.* 1261.

⁵ *Ibid.* 1258.

⁸ *Ibid.* 1270, 1271.

and partly to deprecate some of the coarser current speculations as to the natural processes to which the body of Christ might be supposed to be subjected after the reception of it by communicants. His own beliefs may be shown by the following quotations:—

“Let us, ‘not minding high things but condescending to things that are lowly,’¹ simply acknowledge that there is a figure, since the bread and the wine are outwardly seen; but also a reality, since the body and blood of Christ are believed in reality to be within.”

“That which we receive from the altar is by nature (*naturaliter*) the body of the Lord, since it is so in reality, not as represented.”

“As a certain wise man says, . . . how plain it is that the body of Christ is one with that which He took from the Virgin’s womb. For it must actually and unhesitatingly be believed that at the very time of the sacrifice the heavens are opened at the prayer of the priest, and it is borne by the ministry of angels to the altar on high, which is Christ Himself, who is both Priest and Victim, and by His touch becomes one.”

“There is the outer man, who is subject to corruption, and there is the inner man, who is renewed. Now the body of Christ is spiritual food which pertains rather to the inner man, with whom the process of digestion has nothing to do. Yet if it should pertain at all to the outward man, it would be pious and healthful to believe that it is diffused throughout the members so as to benefit those who are to be raised in the general resurrection. It is clear that it does not share the lot of natural food.”²

VI.

On the other hand, towards the end of the tenth century there is an instance in England of the influence exercised by the treatise of Ratramn *On the body and blood of the Lord*. Aelfric was Abbot of Cerne in Dorset before 1000 and became Abbot of Eynsham in 1005. He is to be distinguished from three other Churchmen of the same name with whom he has sometimes been confused, namely, Aelfric, Archbishop of Canterbury; Aelfric, Archbishop of York; and Aelfric, Abbot of Malmesbury.³ Between the years 985 and 990 he wrote two books of homilies,

¹ Rom. xii. 16.

² *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 4, 7, 8, 10 (*P.L.* cxxxix. 182, 185, 187, 188).

³ See Hunt in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, i. 164-66, and *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 374.

each containing forty homilies, five being subsequently added to the second book, the number forty being reckoned by him as sufficient for the preaching for one year. One of his homilies, appointed for use on Easter Day, is on the Eucharist. The following quotations show how closely Aelfric adopted the teaching and phraseology of Ratramn:—

“Certain men have often asked, and do yet ask, how the bread which is prepared from corn and baked by fire’s heat can be turned into Christ’s body, or how wine that is pressed from many grapes can be turned into the Lord’s blood by blessing. Now we say to such that some things are said of Christ through a figure and others literally. It is a true and certain thing that Christ was born of a maiden, and of His own will suffered death, and was buried, and on this day rose from death. He is called bread through a figure, and a lamb, and a lion, and what else. . . . But yet according to true nature Christ is neither bread nor a lamb nor a lion. Why then is the holy housel called Christ’s body or His blood, if it be not truly what it is called? The bread and the wine which are hallowed through the priest’s Mass appear one thing without to men’s understanding, and another thing inwardly to believing minds. Without they seem to be bread and wine both in aspect and in taste; and after their hallowing they be truly Christ’s body and His blood through spiritual mystery. . . . Great is the difference between the invisible might of the holy housel and the visible appearance of its own nature. By nature it is corruptible bread and corruptible wine; and by the power of the divine word it is truly Christ’s body and His blood; not however bodily but spiritually. Great is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered and the body which is hallowed for housel. The body truly in which Christ suffered was born of Mary’s flesh, with blood and with bones, with skin and with sinews, in human limbs, with a reasonable soul living; and His spiritual body, which we call housel, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bones, without limb, without soul, and therefore nothing therein is to be understood bodily but all is to be understood spiritually. . . . This housel is temporal not eternal, corruptible and divided into sundry parts, chewed by the teeth and sent into the belly; nevertheless in spiritual power it is all in every part. Many receive this holy body, and yet it is all in every part after the spiritual mystery. . . . This mystery is a pledge and symbol; Christ’s body is truth. This pledge we hold mystically until we come to the truth, and then will this pledge be ended. Truly it is, as we said before, Christ’s body and His blood, not bodily

but spiritually. Ye are not to search how it is done, but to hold to your belief that it is done.”¹

Like the teaching of Ratramn, on which it is based, this homily of Aelfric is open to two interpretations, either merely that through reception of the Sacrament there is a gift of spiritual union with Christ, or that by consecration the elements are made to be spiritually the body and blood of Christ. On either interpretation, what has so far been quoted is very different from the doctrine taught by Paschasius Radbert. It must be added that Aelfric goes on to recount two legends of the sight of human flesh and blood being vouchsafed to some who were present at the celebration of the Eucharist, which are more congruous to a belief that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ than to any other view and recall passages in the work of Paschasius.²

In an exhortation at the end of the canons of Aelfric, after directions as to the Mass of the Presanctified and the reserved Sacrament, it is said:—

“The housel is Christ’s body, not bodily but spiritually, not the body in which He suffered but that body of which He spake when He blessed bread and wine for housel one night before His passion. . . . Know now that the Lord, who was able to change the bread into His body before His passion, and the wine into His blood, in a spiritual manner, Himself daily blesses bread and wine by the hand of His priests into His spiritual body and blood.”³

VII.

Before the period of the ninth and tenth centuries is left, two quotations from other writers may be made, in each case for a special reason.

Nicolas I. was Pope from 858 to 867. In one of his letters to the Eastern Emperor Michael III. written in 860 during the

¹This homily is in Anglo-Saxon and English in Thorpe’s edition of Aelfric’s *Homilies*, published by the Aelfric Society, ii. 268-73, and in Thomson, *Select Monuments of the Doctrine and Worship of the Catholic Church before the Norman Conquest*. There is an English translation also as an appendix to *The Book of Bertram* published at Oxford in 1838.

²See Thorpe’s edition, ii. 272, 273; Thomson, *op. cit.* pp. 26-29; and cf. Paschasius, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* xiv.

³Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, ii. 360, 361; Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 405.

controversy which arose about the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Nicolas refers incidentally to the Eucharist as affording an illustration of the rightfulness of the practice of venerating the images of Christ and His Mother and the saints. His language resembles that of St. Gregory of Nyssa in the fourth century;¹ and, like St. Gregory of Nyssa, he combines the two ideas, different but not inconsistent, of the heightened efficacy of the elements and of their being made the body and blood of Christ by consecration. After speaking of images in general and of the figure of Christ above the altar, he proceeds:—

“The holy altar, on which we pay to almighty God the vows of our sacrifices, is by nature common stone, differing not at all from other blocks, which adorn our walls and floors. But because it has been consecrated by the help of God and has received a blessing, it is made to be a holy Table. Again, the bread, which is offered upon the altar, is by nature common bread; but, when it has been consecrated as a Sacrament, it becomes in reality the body of Christ, and it is so called. So also the wine, which before it has been blessed is of some moderate worth (*vinum modicum aliquid digna existentia ante benedictionem*), after the consecration by the Spirit is made the blood of Christ. For the image of the cross itself, before it receives the figure of its form, is common wood like any other wood; but, on receiving the all venerable likeness, it is holy, and terrible to demons, because the form of Christ has been made on it.”²

As was pointed out before, the idea of the heightened efficacy of the elements is in itself consistent either with a view that they are merely instruments or with a conception that they are through consecration the body and blood of Christ.³ In the case of Pope Nicolas I. it is obvious from his phrases “it becomes in reality the body of Christ” and “it is made the blood of Christ” that he held it concurrently with the belief that the elements are the body and blood of Christ through consecration.

The other passage is from Ratherius, who became Bishop of Verona in 931, and, after many vicissitudes due in part to his earnest struggles to promote Christian morality and in part to the violence of his temperament, died at Namur in 974. Ratherius joins to an explicit assertion that the consecrated

¹ See pp. 68, 69, *supra*.

² *Ep.* iv. (*P.L.* cxix. 778).

³ See pp. 69, 70, *supra*.

elements are really the flesh and blood of Christ a protest against too closely searching into the method by which this presence is effected.

“As at Cana of Galilee the water was made real and not figurative wine by the command of God, so this wine by the blessing of God is made real and not figurative blood, and the bread is made flesh. If it seems an argument against this that the taste and the colour remain, I put something else before you. Do you believe the authority of Scripture, which says that man was formed from the mud of the earth? I have no doubt that you will answer that you do believe it. Well, you remember the words, ‘Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return’.¹ I imagine that you reply that you remember the passage and believe it. Then the man whom you see in front of you is dust and ashes. That is so, you say, because he was made from the mud. What appearance then of mud is here? There is none: I should rather call it earth. Is there any appearance of earth? No. Is man none the less earth? He is. What of the appearance of mud? It has been transformed by the wisdom of the Creator. Does the substance yet remain? It does. So also here, though the colour remains, and the taste, yet believe that what you receive is by the operation of the same wisdom real flesh and blood, as you do not doubt that, when the appearance of mud is changed by creation into the appearance of man, nevertheless the substance of the mud remains. But you ask, perhaps unseasonably, that the vanity of human curiosity may have place, whence and by what agency it has come, and if it is brought down from above, and if the bread is invisibly taken up, or if the bread itself is changed into flesh. These are, I think, the stones with which a beast, that is, a carnal heart and a natural (*animalis*) man, who perceiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God,² is stoned, if it have presumed to touch the mount of the mysteries of God.³ Therefore let us inquire of the Gospel: ‘Jesus,’ it says, ‘taking bread gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Take and eat, this is My body. In like manner also the cup after He had supped, saying, This is the cup of My blood of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of faith, which will be poured out for you and for many for the remission of sins.’⁴ You have of what body

¹ Gen. iii. 19. ² 1 Cor. ii. 14. ³ Heb. xii. 20; cf. Exod. xix. 13.

⁴ St. Matt. xxvi. 26-28; St. Mark xiv. 22-24; St. Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. RATHERIUS quotes “and eternal,” “the mystery of faith,” as in the canon of the Mass.

this is the flesh and blood by so much the more certainly as you are instructed by the voice of the same Truth, who speaks. For the rest, I beg, be not anxious, since you hear that it is a mystery, and that of faith; for, if it is a mystery, it cannot be grasped; if it is of faith, it ought to be believed, but not to be investigated.”¹

¹*Ep.* i. 3, 4 (*P.L.* cxxxvi. 646-48).

CHAPTER VI.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PART II.

THERE can be but little doubt that in the early years of the eleventh century the doctrine taught by Paschasius Radbert that the elements are wholly converted by consecration into that body and blood of Christ which He took from the Virgin, in which He was born and suffered and died, which was buried in the tomb and rose and ascended into heaven, was usually held in the West; and it is probable that in many cases it was held without the emphasis on the spiritual character of the conversion at the consecration and of the presence after consecration which had marked the teaching of Paschasius himself.

I.

An instance of teaching in which stress is laid both on the reality of the presence and on the spiritual character of the gift, both on the substantial identity and on the mystical distinctness of the body born of the Virgin and the body present in the Eucharist, may be seen in two letters of Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, who died in 1029. In one of these letters Fulbert says:—

“Let us now go on to the venerable Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, which is so terrible to speak of as the mystery is not of earth but of heaven, not to be weighed by human understanding but to be wondered at, not to be discussed but to be revered. . . . Pitying the failure of our weakness, He provided for us against the daily offences of our frailty the remedy of the appeasing sacrifice, so that, because a little later he was going to take away from our sight into heaven His body which He once for all offered for us for our ransom, lest we should be deprived of the present help of His ascended body, He left to us the healthful pledge of His body and

blood, no sign of an empty mystery but the real body of Christ, which in daily worship through the uniting force of the Holy Ghost the unseen power invisibly brings to be under the visible form of the creature in the holy rites. . . . When we receive the Communion of His body and blood, we boldly say that we are united to His body and that He abides in us. I say He abides in us, not only through unity of will but also through the reality of united nature. For, if the Word was made flesh, and we really receive the Word made flesh in the food of the Lord, how can we fail to think that Christ abides in us in His nature (*naturaliter*)? . . . Though the elements a little before bear the likeness of a simple nature, yet later they have a heavenly nature, when through the gift of consecration the true majesty is poured out, and that which appeared outwardly as the substance of bread and wine now becomes within the body and blood of Christ. . . . From the faith of the inner man comes the power of tasting the divine sweetness, when of a surety through the reception of the healthful Eucharist the soul of the communicant within is entered by Christ, whom the heavenly mind in its chaste sanctuary receives in that form whereby in the memorial of the mystery by the revelation of the Spirit it beholds Him present as an infant or sacrificed on the altar of the cross or resting in the tomb or rising from conquered death or raised on high above the heavens in the glory of the Father. . . . It were impious to doubt that, by the equal power of Him at whose command all things suddenly out of nothing came to be, the earthly matter in the spiritual Sacraments, transcending the merit of its nature and being, is changed into the substance of Christ.”¹

In the other letter Fulbert quotes, and makes his own, an answer once received by him from a bishop in reply to an inquiry which had brought up the question of the possibility of any difference between the reserved Sacrament given to priests at their ordination for their Communion on forty subsequent days and the Sacrament consecrated in an ordinary Mass. In this answer of the bishop it is said:—

“The bread consecrated by a bishop and the bread hallowed by a priest are transformed into one and the same body of Christ by virtue of the unseen power of the one operative force. But in a certain kind of way there is said to be one thing which, after the flesh had been taken in the Virgin’s womb, bore the injury of the cross,

¹ *Ep. v. (P.L. cxli. 201-3).*

and rising from the tomb appeared to the disciples, the memorial of which the bishop is seen to celebrate in the bread given to the priests; another thing is celebrated in mystery, when the bishops and all the priests on the Table of the altar in the Sacrament of the communicated flesh are seen to consecrate the holy bread daily by the secret prayer, which pertains to that which the newly ordained priests consecrate and receive with the pontifical offering. For that body of the Lord, raised from the dead and placed in heaven, dieth no more, while this of the Sacraments to us dies daily, to us rises daily, appears and is consumed. But neither in regard to this ought the mind of the faithful to incur the scandal of doubt on hearing that Christ, after once for all tasting death, will die no more, and also that the flesh of the taken manhood is seated in the glory of the Father, and also that the bread consecrated on earth is called the real body of Christ, since both that which was taken from the Virgin and that which is consecrated from the material and virginal creature is transformed into the substance of real flesh by the unseen action of one and the same Spirit in His working; that is, not the flesh of any one but really that flesh of Christ of which He said, 'Except ye shall have eaten My flesh, ye will not have life in you.'¹

II.

Berengar of Tours was a pupil of Fulbert, and it is possible that he, though probably affected more by the treatise of Ratramn *On the body and blood of the Lord* than by any other influence, may have derived from Fulbert ideas which he developed in some parts of his future teaching. Born at Tours about 1000 and educated at Chartres, he became Director of the Cathedral School at Tours in 1031, and was appointed Archdeacon of Angers, though without ceasing to reside at Tours, about 1040. He was a diligent student of Holy Scripture, of the tradition of the Church, and of philosophy; and appears to have been known for independence of judgment, and for originality of thought. During the ten years which followed his appointment as Archdeacon of Angers about 1040 he developed views in regard to the Eucharist which led to a controversy far more acute than those

¹ *Ep.* iii. (*P.L.* cxli. 194, 195). It may be worth while to notice the phrase "the sacrifices of bread and wine are transfigured into the life-giving mysteries of the body and the blood of the Lord" in Othlon, a monk of St. Emmeran at Ratisbon, who died in 1072 or 1073 at Fulda; see his *De tribus questionibus*, 48 (*P.L.* cxlvi. 128).

of the ninth century. About 1048 Adelman of Liège, afterwards Bishop of Brixen, who had been a fellow-pupil of Fulbert with Berengar at Chartres, wrote to Berengar telling him of, and asking him to deny, a widespread report that he held opinions other than those of the Catholic faith "about the body and blood of the Lord, which is daily offered in every land on the holy altar," and regarded it "not as the real body and real blood of Christ but a kind of figure and likeness". In this letter Adelman complains that he has received no reply to a similar inquiry addressed to Berengar two years before; and gives some of his reasons for his belief that He who made the light out of nothing and turned water into wine can make bread His body and wine His blood.¹ Not later than the summer of 1049 Hugh, Bishop of Langres, who also had been a fellow-pupil with Berengar, wrote to him on the same subject, remonstrating with him for his contention that that body of Christ is in the Sacrament "in such a way that the nature and essence of the bread and wine are not changed," and maintaining that, if the body present in the Eucharist is only a creation of the mind and the actual body of Christ is in the Sacrament merely in power and effect, this Sacrament would lose its distinctness from other Sacraments and particularly from Baptism. The same letter contained a statement that the altar is "both priest and sacrifice," since Christ is Himself "the altar on high of the Father".² In 1050 Berengar himself addressed a short letter to Lanfranc, then Prior of Bec, who afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he declared his acceptance of "the opinions of John the Scot about the Sacrament of the altar," and his rejection of those of Paschasius; and added that, if Lanfranc regarded John the Scot as a heretic, he must similarly condemn, among others, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine.³ By "the opinions of John the Scot" Berengar probably meant the views expressed either in the treatise of Ratramn *On the body and blood of the Lord*, which may by this time have come to be ascribed to Scotus Erigena, or in a work maintaining a similar position actually written by Scotus and now lost.⁴ This letter

¹ *Ad Bereng. Ep.* (P.L. cxliii. 1239-92).

² *De corp. et sang. Christi* (P.L. cxlii. 1325-34).

³ Hardouin, *Concilia*, vi. (1) 1015, 1016.

⁴ See Floss in P.L. cxxii. pp. xx-xxii; Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation*, pp. 240, 247; Miss Alice Gardner, *Studies in John the Scot*, pp. 91-93.

was read at a council held at Rome under Pope Leo IX. in 1050; and a sentence of excommunication was passed on Berengar in his absence. Lanfranc states that there was a report that he, like Berengar, held opinions regarded as unorthodox: and at the command of the Pope he explained his belief before the council with the result that what he said was approved.¹ Probably in the same year, 1050, a council was held at Brionne near Bec, convoked by William of Normandy, afterwards William I. of England, at which Berengar is said to have been reduced to silence by argument and to have assented to declarations of the doctrine ordinarily believed.² In September, 1050, a council was held at Vercelli, to which Berengar was summoned; but he was prevented from attending by the action of King Henry I. of France, who imprisoned him for a short time. At this council a condemnation was passed on "the book of John the Scot on the Eucharist" and on the opinions of Berengar.³ In October, 1050, King Henry I. summoned a council, which met at Paris, to consider the same matter; and at this council the opinions of Berengar were again condemned.⁴ Four years later, in 1054, a council was held at Tours under the presidency of Hildebrand, afterwards Pope Gregory VII., as papal legate. Berengar was present, and denied the charge brought against him of having said that "the holy bread of the altar is only bread and does not differ from unconsecrated bread," and asserted that "the bread and wine of the altar after the consecration are really the body and blood of Christ".⁵ In 1059, during the Papacy of Nicolas II., a council was held at Rome. Berengar was present, and, apparently after considerable pressure, burnt his own writings and assented to the following document, which was drawn up by Cardinal Humbert:—

¹ Lanfranc, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 4 (P.L. cl. 413); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1015, 1016.

² Durand of Troarn, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 33 (P.L. cxlix. 1422); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1017, 1018. For the date see Vernet in Vacant and Mangenot's *Dict. de Théol. Cath.* ii. 724.

³ Lanfranc, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 4 (P.L. cl. 413); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1017, 1018.

⁴ Durand of Troarn, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 33 (P.L. cxlix. 1422, 1423); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1021, 1022.

⁵ Lanfranc, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 4 (P.L. cl. 413); Witmund of Aversa, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* iii. (P.L. cxlix. 1487); Berengar, *De sac. cen.* p. 51 (ed. Vischer); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1041, 1042.

"I, Berengar, an unworthy deacon of the Church of St. Maurice of Angers, acknowledging the true Catholic and Apostolic faith, anathematise every heresy, especially that concerning which I have hitherto been in ill repute, which attempts to affirm that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are after consecration only a Sacrament and not the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that these cannot be held or broken by the hands of the priests or crushed by the teeth of the faithful with the senses but only by way of Sacrament (*sensualiter nisi in solo sacramento*). And I assent to the Holy Roman and Apostolic See, and with mouth and heart I profess that concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Table I hold the faith which the Lord and venerable Pope Nicolas and this holy synod have by evangelical and apostolical authority delivered to be held and have confirmed to me, namely that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are after consecration not only a Sacrament but also the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that with the senses (*sensualiter*) not only by way of Sacrament but in reality (*non solum sacramento sed in veritate*) these are held and broken by the hands of the priests and are crushed by the teeth of the faithful."¹

At a council held at Rouen in 1063 a formula, which had been drawn up on some previous occasion, was recited as an act of repudiation of opinions ascribed to Berengar:—

"We believe with the heart and profess with the mouth that the bread placed on the Lord's Table is only bread before consecration, but at the consecration itself is converted by the ineffable power of God into the nature and substance of flesh, and not of any other flesh but of that flesh which was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, which also for us and for our salvation was scourged, hung on the cross, lay in the tomb, on the third day rose from the dead, and sits on the right hand of God the Father. In like manner the wine which mixed with water is placed in the cup to be sanctified is really and essentially converted into that blood which from the wound pierced in the Lord's side by the soldier's spear happily flowed for the redemption of the world."²

¹ Lanfranc, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 1, 2 (*P.L.* cl. 409-11); Berengar, *De sac. cena*, pp. 25, 26, 74 (ed. Vischer); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1064. Lanfranc says that Berengar actually subscribed this statement; Berengar himself says that he only accepted it in silence.

² Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1141, 1142.

Some time after the council held at Rouen in 1063 Lanfranc published his book *On the body and blood of the Lord*.¹ In it he defended at length the doctrine expressed in the declaration drawn up by Cardinal Humbert and accepted by Berengar at the Council of Rome of 1059, and charged Berengar with the continued teaching of false doctrine, which he had then promised to avoid. According to the representations here made by Lanfranc, the teaching of Berengar contained denials of any conversion at the consecration and that the consecrated elements were in any but a wholly symbolical and figurative sense the body and blood of Christ. Against these views of Berengar, Lanfranc develops the expression of his own belief. The bread and the wine, he maintains, are converted at consecration into the real body and blood of Christ. Though they may still be called bread and wine, as being the Bread from heaven and the Wine which maketh glad the hearts of the servants of God, they are incomprehensibly and ineffably converted into the substance of Christ's flesh and blood; and that which is converted must in that part cease to be what it was before. The flesh and blood are invisible and spiritual; but they are the flesh and blood of that body which was visibly manifested. The rite is full of mystery; and in it the nature of the elements is essentially changed. The miracles by which the flesh of Christ has actually been seen in the Sacrament show the reality of His presence in it. As material bread nourishes the flesh of those who eat it rightly, so the spiritual and invisible body of Christ nourishes the soul of those who receive it worthily. Though Christ is really eaten by communicants on earth, yet in heaven He is whole and unbroken. On the cross Christ offered Himself as a sacrifice for the redemption of men; in the Sacrament there is the memorial of the daily offering of the same flesh as that offered on the cross. To quote two passages in which Lanfranc sums up the doctrine which pervades the whole treatise:—

“We believe then that the earthly substances, which are on the Lord's Table, are divinely consecrated in the priestly mystery, and are ineffably, incomprehensibly, wonderfully converted by the operation of heavenly power into the essence of the Lord's body, the

¹ Apparently, the passage in chapter ii. (*P.L.* cl. 411), which refers to the council held at Rome in 1079, is a later addition.

species of the things themselves being preserved, and certain other qualities, so that men may not shrink through perceiving what is raw and bloody and that through belief they may receive the fuller rewards of faith, the Lord's body itself none the less existing in heaven at the right hand of the Father, immortal, unviolated, whole, unbroken, unhurt, so that it can be truly said that we receive that very body which was taken from the Virgin, and yet that it is not the same:—the same indeed so far as concerns the essence and peculiarity and power of the real nature, but not the same as regards the species of bread and the species of wine and the other things mentioned above."

"The real flesh of Christ and His real blood are offered on the Lord's Table, are eaten and drunk, bodily, spiritually, incomprehensibly."¹

With the doctrine thus expressed by Lanfranc may be compared the provision made in his statutes for Canterbury Cathedral, which may previously have been in use at Bec, for the carrying of the Sacrament in procession on Palm Sunday, and for acts of adoration in connection with the procession.

"When the cantor begins the antiphon 'The multitudes meet,' two priests vested in albs are to come forward, who are to carry the shrine, which a little before daybreak ought to have been placed there by the same priests, in which the body of Christ ought to have been laid. Those who carry the banners and the crosses and the other things which have been mentioned above are to move forward at once to the shrine; and, while those who carry the shrine stand still, they are to stand on the right and on the left of the shrine in the order in which they have come. . . . At the end of the antiphon 'The multitudes meet' the boys and those who are with them are to begin the antiphon 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' genuflecting both at the beginning and at the end of the antiphon, because 'Hosanna' is said in both places. The choir is to repeat this antiphon, and in like manner to genuflect. Then the boys are to sing the antiphon 'With the angels,' genuflecting only at the end of the antiphon. This antiphon is to be repeated by the monks, and in like manner a prostration is to be made. When this has been done, the abbot or the cantor is to begin the antiphon 'Hail our King,' and the bearers of the shrine are to pass through the midst of the station, while those who carry the banners and the

¹ *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 18, 19 (*P.L.* cl. 430, 435).

other things mentioned before go in front, all keeping in returning the order which they had in coming. As the bearers of the shrine pass by, all are to genuflect, not all at once but one by one on this side and on that as the shrine passes before them. . . . Before the entering of the gates the shrine is to be placed on a table covered with a pall in such a way that the aforesaid bearers, standing on each side, may have their faces turned towards the shrine in their midst."¹

Like veneration on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday is mentioned in these statutes. The priest was ordered after Mass on Maundy Thursday to place "the body of the Lord" in an "appointed place most beautifully adorned," "censed before and after," before which a light was to be continually burning. It was directed that after the adoration of the cross on Good Friday the priest and the deacon, preceded by lights and incense, should go to the place where the Sacrament was, that it should be censed and brought to the high altar, and that, on the approach to the altar, "all the brethren should genuflect and adore the body of the Lord".²

The same statutes of Lanfranc contain careful provisions for dealing with any accident which may have befallen the Sacrament.³

Another treatise of importance against Berengar is that of Durand, the Abbot of Troarn, *On the body and blood of the Lord*. Durand died an old man in 1089; his book was probably written nearly twenty years earlier, about the same

¹ *Decreta pro Ord. S. Benedicti*, i. 4 (P.L. cl. 456). Cf. the *Ordinarium Canonicorum Regularium S. Laudi Rotomagensis* ascribed to John, Archbishop of Rouen, who died in 1079, in P.L. cxlvii. 167, 168. See also Martene, *De ant. monach. rit.* III. xii. 13-15. For other instances of this procession, see pp. 352, 353, 385-88, *infra*.

² *Op. cit.* i. 4 (P.L. cl. 460, 465). Cf. John of Rouen, *op. cit.* (P.L. cxlvii. 171, 175); *De off. eccl.* (P.L. cxlvii. 50, 52). See also Martene, *op. cit.* III. xiii. 46, xiv. 39. For the Salisbury custom of burying the Sacrament in the Sepulchre from Good Friday to Easter Day in the thirteenth century or earlier, see Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, i. 153. For an earlier practice of apparently placing the Sacrament in the altar at the consecration of a church, see the *Pontifical of Egbert*, a tenth-century copy of an eighth-century Office Book, in Surtees Society publications, xxvii. 46, and the Council of Chelsea (816), can. 2, in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, iii. 580. See also pp. 387, 388, *infra*.

³ *Op. cit.* x. (P.L. cl. 492, 493).

time as that of Lanfranc. Durand, like Lanfranc, represents Berengar and his adherents as holding that the consecrated elements are only figuratively the body and blood of Christ. His own belief also appears to have been much the same as that of Lanfranc in his assertions of the reality of the presence of the body and blood and of the spiritual character of the change effected at the consecration. The visible elements, he maintains, are invisibly and substantially made the real body and blood of Christ by the incomprehensible working of God the Holy Ghost when the words of institution are recited by the priest. The flesh thus present is the same as that which was taken of the Virgin and is now in heaven; and the elements are changed into it by the operation of the same power as accomplished the Incarnation. Being the flesh of Christ, it is the object of the adoration of Christians. It is spiritually received by communicants; and by receiving it they are united to Christ, so that He is in them, and they are in Him, and they are transformed from what is human to what is divine and from what is carnal to what is spiritual. Being so spiritual and divine a thing, it is not subject to the ordinary processes of digestion but fits the souls of those who receive it for dwelling with God. It is offered as a sacrifice appointed by God, whereby He is propitiated and men are reconciled for their sins of daily infirmity. To quote two passages, which include in a short space some of the main features of the teaching contained in this book:—

“The Sacrament of the Lord is really the body and blood of Christ, not only in the effective and spiritual force of power but also in the most complete peculiarity of natural reality; nor is it any other than that same flesh which the Virgin conceived of the Holy Ghost, and brought forth with the integrity of her spotless virginity unbroken, contrary indeed to the ordinary course of human nature but not contrary to the reality of the human body; which was condemned to the cross, and sentenced to death, but afterwards glorified in the triumph of the blessed resurrection, and ascended above the heights of heaven, and now sits on the eternal right hand of the Father, where for us, according to the true words of the Apostle Paul, He has been made a High Priest for ever, and in His human flesh continually intercedes, while in the reality of His divine nature He receives the prayers of His faithful

people, and in His divine power and majesty grants their prayers." ¹

"It is a grave offence to suppose this, namely, that the flesh of the Lord should be thought to be received as common flesh or as that of some animal, since rather it must be believed to be spiritually received by a Sacrament, and yet to be none other than that which bore the passion, though the species of the bread that is offered be seen; and it ought to be faithfully believed that this is accomplished by the appointment of God, so that human weakness, which is not wont to feed on its own flesh, may find nothing in the appearance to shrink from, and for the rest may realise the truth that the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ is in the Sacrament, of which the Apostle says, 'Though we have known Jesus Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more'.² Here the Apostle does not deny the reality of the nature taken from us, but he shows the incorruptibility of our glorified substance as it is in God through the resurrection, which, as it is incorruptible in God, so we receive incorruptible in the Sacrament under the visible and accustomed species. But the minds of those who receive it are to be conformed and fitted to this so great Sacrament, so that what is received in the mystery may be of profit to them by inward result to the end that whoever partakes of so great holiness may be dead to the world and to sin, and may strive henceforth to live in newness of life."³

A third treatise of importance by an opponent of Berengar, published, like the two which have been hitherto mentioned, during the period between the earlier condemnations of his teaching already recorded and the Roman Councils of 1078 and 1079 yet to be described, is that entitled *On the Reality of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist*, by Witmund of Aversa. Witmund was a Norman, a pupil of Lanfranc, and regarded as one of the most eminent theologians of his day. He was offered an English bishopric by William the Conqueror but refused to accept it because of his conviction that William's policy of filling English sees with Norman bishops was destructive of the best interests of the English Church and nation. He was afterwards nominated Archbishop of Rouen by William, but declined to continue to seek that office in consequence of opposition to his appointment. Later he went to Italy. Pope

¹ *De corp. et sang. Christi*, 9 (P.L. cxlix. 1387).

² 2 Cor. v. 16.

³ *De corp. et sang. Christi*, 23 (P.L. cxlix. 1411).

Gregory VII. made him a cardinal, and Pope Urban II. appointed him Archbishop of Aversa. His book on the Eucharist is longer and more systematic than either of those by Lanfranc and Durand of Troarn; and it shows traces of a more careful study both of the opinions of Berengar and of other current views. Yet, in spite of his great reputation, he appears to have possessed much less insight than either Lanfranc or Durand; and his theological statements differ in important respects from both earlier and later Western theology. He mentions four different opinions about the Eucharist which he aims at refuting. He ascribes two of these four opinions to two different schools of Berengarians, the first being that the Sacrament is only a figure of the body and blood of Christ, the second, which he describes as said to be that of Berengar himself, being that in the Sacrament "the body and blood of the Lord are really but secretly contained, so that in some kind of way they can be received, and are, so to speak, impanated," the holders of these two opinions agreeing that "the bread and the wine are not essentially changed". The third opinion is that part of the elements is changed into the body and blood of Christ, while part of them remains unchanged. The fourth opinion is that the bread and the wine are wholly changed into the body and blood of Christ; but that, if they are received unworthily, they are changed back again into bread and wine. The common reason for these third and fourth opinions is the desire to avoid admitting that those who communicate unworthily receive the body and blood of Christ. In contravening these opinions Witmund shows his own belief. According to it the elements are essentially changed in a way to which the change of ordinary food into the substance of the body of those who eat it may be regarded as parallel. The body of Christ is pressed by the teeth of communicants, as it was touched by St. Thomas and the holy women after the resurrection. Christ is able in the Sacrament to divide His body. On the other hand, no death or injury results; each fragment of the Sacrament is the whole body of Christ; He does not divide Himself but bestows Himself on each individual to whom He comes; His body does not suffer corruption, or reception by irrational creatures,¹ or the

¹ But he also says in ii. 8 (*P.L.* cxlix. 1449; Hurter, *Opusc. Selecta*, xxxviii. 62) that, "even if by some judgment of God any irrational crea-

ordinary processes of digestion. Witmund carries his doctrine of a substantial change so far that he ascribes incorruptibility to the sacramental species, and appears to regard this as a consequence of his belief that the presence of Christ is not by way of impanation or invination or after the manner of a figure but substantially. On the subject of the reception by the wicked, he says one who communicates unworthily "eats and does not eat: he eats bodily but he does not eat spiritually".¹ At the end of his book Witmund sums up his position by saying:—

"Our sacrifice is not a shadow only or a figure of the flesh and blood of Christ, nor can it cover Christ impanated in it as Berengar thinks, nor can reality allow that the substance of the bread and wine is in part changed but in part abides unchanged, nor may one think that after being changed it returns to what it was before or is changed again into something else. It remains that by the help of God this is the unimpaired and firm faith, that the whole of the bread and the whole of the wine of the altar of the Lord are so substantially changed by the consecration of God into the flesh and blood of Christ that afterwards henceforth for ever they are nothing else at all than the flesh and blood of our Saviour and Lord God Jesus Christ."²

In reply to Lanfranc and probably with other attacks on his teaching in view, Berengar wrote his treatise *On the Holy Supper*. In this book Berengar complains of the unfair and violent treatment of himself by the rulers of the Church; affirms his right to appeal to argument and logic, since reason is the gift of God and a characteristic of the image of God; depreciates the importance of the opinions of majorities; and appeals to the accredited authorities of Scripture and tradition. The book is extremely controversial and is occupied almost entirely with attacks on, and arguments against, his opponents; though it represents his mature view, which he says he has gradually attained, there are great difficulties in ascertaining from it what he really held as positive opinion. It is clear that he denied any destruction of the elements or material change in them. "After consecration,"

tures should not only touch but also be able to devour the most holy mysteries," this is not a reason for denying "the reality of the Lord's flesh and blood".

¹ iii. 51 (*P.L.* cxlix. 1492; Hurter, *Opusc. Selecta*, xxxviii. 179).

² iii. 57 (*P.L.* cxlix. 1494; Hurter, *Opusc. Selecta*, xxxviii. 185).

he says, "there is on the altar the material bread"; "the bread and wine cannot materially lose their own nature"; the bread and the wine are not so called after consecration in any "figurative sense but literally"; they "are not destroyed but abide".¹ It is clear also that he denied any carnal presence of Christ. He explicitly rejects the idea that "the body of Christ is brought down from heaven and carnally present on the altar".² It is doubtful whether by his assertions that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ he means that they are so in actual fact and spiritual reality, or whether he means only that they are so figuratively or virtually. On the one hand, there are passages which most easily lend themselves to the latter interpretation, as when he says:—

"The blood of Christ the Lord is set before you, but not carnally, that you may be washed in it; it is set before you, but not carnally, that you may also drink it. If the Lord God had instituted that you must do these things carnally according to the outer man, in the first place and principally you would rightly have shrunk back in the worth of the mind; but nothing has been set before you which can rightly be horrible to you. Christ the Lord requires from you that you believe that His mercy towards the human race led Him to shed His blood and that so believing you may be washed by His blood from all sin; He requires that you, having that same blood of Christ always in remembrance, may in it, as in food for making the journey of this life, base your inner life, as you base your outward life in outward food and drink. . . . He requires that, believing inwardly that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son as a propitiation for sins, you may be outwardly plunged in this element of water and thus by means of the element of water represent to yourself the death of Christ; . . . He requires that by means of bodily eating and drinking, which takes place through outward things, through bread and wine, you may remind yourself of the spiritual eating and drinking which are in the mind concerning the flesh and blood of Christ, while you refresh yourself inwardly with the Incarnation and passion of the Word, so that in humility, by which the Word became flesh, and in patience, through which He shed His blood, you may establish your inner life, as you ought, in humility, and, as you ought, excel in patience, so that in these you may rest and delight yourself, as in your outer life you rest in food and drink."³

¹ Pp. 31, 122, 209, 248 (ed. Vischer).

² P. 199.

³ Pp. 222, 223.

On the other hand he says that the Eucharistic bread is "the body of Christ"; that "after consecration the bread and wine are really the body and blood of Christ"; that "the bread and wine are converted by means of the consecration into the real body and blood of Christ on the altar"; that they are "the Sacrament of the Lord's passion, of the mercy of God, of peace and unity, lastly of the flesh and blood taken from the Virgin, each in their proper and distinct ways"; and writes as follows of the change at the consecration:—

"The word converted has more senses than one. For some things are converted by the destruction of the subject into something which they were not before; but it is quite a different thing for something to be converted by the consecration of its subject than for it to be converted by the destruction of its subject. Now the bread and the wine by the attestation of all Scripture are converted into the flesh and blood of Christ by consecration; and it is clear that everything which is consecrated, and everything which is blessed by God, is not removed or taken away or destroyed but abides and is necessarily advanced to something better than it was before."¹

In regard to the sacrifice Berengar quotes with approval from the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews which he thought to be the work of St. Ambrose:—

"Christ was once offered, but the sacrifice of the Church is the representation (*exemplum*) of the sacrifice of Christ. . . . As that which is everywhere offered is one body and not many bodies, so also there is one sacrifice, and the High Priest is He who made the offering which cleanses us. We offer that even now. We ever offer, not a different sacrifice, but the same, or rather we make the remembrance of the sacrifice."²

The obscurity in Berengar's own statement of what he describes as his developed and mature opinion, the real changes in his thought which appear to be indicated by this description, and his vacillations under persecution combine to explain the fact that Lanfranc and Durand of Troarn represent him as holding that the consecrated elements are only figures of the body and blood of Christ, while Witmund distinguishes him from those Berengarians who so held and says that he himself

¹ Pp. 31, 34, 51, 52, 57, 64, 161, 162, 248.

² P. 131; cf. p. 191.

was said to adopt such a view of the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements as Witmund describes as "impanation" or "invination".

After councils condemnatory of his opinions at Poitiers in 1075 and at Saint Maixent in 1076,¹ Berengar was summoned to Rome by Pope Gregory VII. for a council which took place in 1078. At this council he accepted the following statement:—

"I profess that the bread of the altar is after consecration the real body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, which suffered on the cross, which sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and that the wine of the altar, after it has been consecrated, is the real blood which flowed from the side of Christ."²

At a later council held at Rome in 1079 Berengar subscribed, after some resistance and attempted evasions, a fuller and more explicit statement:—

"I, Berengar, believe with my heart and confess with my mouth that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are by the mystery of the holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer substantially converted into the real and true and life-giving flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are after the consecration the real body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin and which was offered and hung on the cross for the salvation of the world and which sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and the real blood of Christ, which was shed from His side, not only by way of sign and sacramental power but in peculiarity of nature and reality of substance."³

A year later, in 1080, Berengar gave an account of his belief at a council held at Bordeaux, which was apparently allowed by the council.⁴ He died in 1088 on St. Cosme, an island in the Loire near Tours.

It is probable that Berengar in the earlier stages of his teaching was desirous of emphasising the spiritual character of the consecration of the elements and the presence of Christ. From this he himself at times may have gone on to deny the traditional

¹ Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1551-54. ² Mansi, *Suppl.* ii. 27-30.

³ Lanfranc, *De corp. et sang. Dom.* 2 (*P.L.* cl. 411); Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1583-85.

⁴ Hardouin, *Conc.* vi. (1) 1587, 1588.

doctrine that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ. Such a denial formed part of the belief of some of his adherents. As there were two schools among his followers, some regarding the consecrated elements as merely figures and others asserting the presence of Christ in them in some form other than their change into His body and blood, so differences existed to a certain extent among their opponents. There was a marked tendency not only to affirm the traditional doctrine that the consecrated elements are Christ's body and blood but also to use language of a carnal character in regard to this presence. Instances of this tendency may be seen in the statement imposed on Berengar at the Council of Rome in 1059, and in the writings of Lanfranc and Witmund. But in other parts of Lanfranc's work and in the treatise of Durand of Troarn an opposite tendency, namely to protect the spiritual character of the consecration and presence, may be discerned. And it is noteworthy that the most carnal phraseology of the statement made at the Council of Rome of 1059 is absent not only in the shorter definitions of the Councils of Rouen of 1063 and Rome of 1078 but also in the longer statement of the Council of Rome of 1079. Moreover, while there is no doubt that carnal tendencies existed both in language and in thought, the probability must not be forgotten that such phrases as "the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are held and broken by the hands of the priests and are crushed by the teeth of the faithful" were used by many as clumsy ways of expressing the conviction that the Sacrament which is so held and broken and crushed is the body and blood of Christ.

A letter which was addressed to Berengar by Eusebius Bruno, who became Bishop of Angers in 1047 and died in 1081, is of considerable interest. Berengar had expressed his wish to hold a discussion on the Eucharist with Gottfrid, a priest of Tours, who had defended the doctrine taught by Lanfranc, in the presence of Eusebius to act as judge. Eusebius wrote to refuse the request, to express his sense of the danger in which the whole controversy was involved, and, while not deprecating study and the consideration of the writings of the fathers on the part of those who were fitted for such tasks, to emphasise his wish that men would "live in the quiet of Christian peace, content with the simple teaching and sufficient support of the holy faith found

in the most holy words of Christ" at the institution of the Sacrament. After quoting the account of the institution, he said :—

"We believe and confess that by the power and act of this Word, by whom all things were made, after the consecration by the priest consecrating by these words the bread is the real body of Christ, and in the same way the wine is His real blood. If any one should ask how this can be, we answer him not according to the order of nature but according to the almighty power of God. Both this and all things whatsoever He has willed God has done in heaven and on earth, in the sea and in all deeps. For no eloquence of language could explain according to the order of nature how God the Word, who was in the beginning with God, was conceived of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin, and how after the resurrection the real body of the Lord Jesus could find admission to the disciples when the doors were shut, and could be touched by them; and yet it must be believed most firmly and most faithfully that these things were done in reality according to the almighty power of God."¹

III.

The treatise entitled *An Exposition of the Canon of the Mass*, which has been ascribed to St. Peter Damien, the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, the friend of Pope Gregory VII., who died in 1071, if not by St. Peter Damien himself, may have been written at no long interval after his death with the intention of setting out his beliefs. The facts that throughout the Berengarian controversy to the time of his death St. Peter Damien was the trusted friend of the authorities of the Church and that at the Roman Council of 1078 Berengar appealed to words of his as a justification of his own opinions² may supply an indication that he had expressed what the Church authorities were really desirous to maintain and had said something to protect the spiritual aspects of the mystery of the Eucharist. With such an indication the teaching contained in the *Exposition of the Canon of the Mass* would fall in well. The writer goes through the canon of the Mass from the recital of the institution to the *Agnus Dei*³ with brief comments

¹ *Ep. ad Beren. de sacram. Euchar.* (P.L. cxlvii. 1201-4).

² Mansi, *Suppl.* ii. 29, 30.

³ The canon of the Mass is usually regarded as ending before the Lord's Prayer: see p. 203, note 2, *supra*. For the use of the term as here to describe the office to the end of the Mass, see, e.g., Odo of Cambrai, *Expos. in can. Missae*, referred to on pp. 263-66, *infra*. Cf. Gühr, *Das heilige Messopfer*, p. 553.

and explanations. He describes the Eucharist as the "sacrifice of the body and blood" of Christ and the "sacrifice of praise"; as the commemoration of three events, the passion, the resurrection, and the ascension; and, in the words of St. Gregory the Great, the means of the union of earthly and heavenly worship when borne to the altar on high by the ministry of angels.¹ At the recital of the words of institution by the priest the bread and wine are changed into the flesh of Christ which was taken from the Virgin and the blood which He shed on the cross by the power of the Word which was exercised in the creation and the Incarnation, in the miracles of the Old Testament, and when the water was made wine.² This change is called Transubstantiation; and the bread and the wine are said to be transubstantiated into the flesh and blood of Christ.³ On questions which, as has been seen, were keenly discussed in the Berengarian controversy it is here said:—

"The whole Church daily partakes of, yet never consumes, the flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. But whether parts are made into parts or the whole into the whole He knows who accomplishes it; what is left I burn with fire, for we are commanded to believe, we are forbidden to distinguish. But because an importunate questioner demands an answer, we grant that, the faith being preserved, such bread is changed into such body, and not a part into a part. Nevertheless, the majesty of the faith being preserved, I confess that, when the bread has been consecrated, the whole Christ is in the whole species of bread, whole under every separate part, whole in what is great and what is small, whole in what is unbroken and what is broken. . . . It is inquired whether the body of the Lord is local, whether it makes local distance, whether it ought to be said that He lies or sits or stands; but many other inquiries could be made on the present subject, which I wish rather to leave untouched than to define rashly; for 'the beast which shall have touched the mountain shall be stoned'.⁴

¹ Cc. 2, 8, 12 (*P.L.* cxlv. 881, 884, 886). In c. 12 the passage of St. Gregory the Great cited on p. 195, *supra*, is quoted.

² Cc. 3, 4 (*P.L.* cxlv. 881, 882).

³ Cc. 7, 14, 16 (*P.L.* cxlv. 883, 888, 889). These are probably the earliest instances of the words "transubstantiatio" and "transubstantiare". "Transubstantiatio" occurs next in Hildebert of Tours and "transubstantiare" in Stephen of Autun; see pp. 275, 280, *infra*.

⁴ Heb. xii. 20; *cf.* Ex. xix. 13.

It is safer in such matters to remain within the limits of reason than to go beyond them. . . . Many often ask and but few understand what is here broken, what is devoured by a beast, what is consumed when the Sacrament is burnt. The answer is that as the substance is miraculously converted into the Lord's body and the body begins to be in the Sacrament, so after a kind of way there is a miraculous return, when that ceases to be there. . . . The species of bread is broken and crushed, but the body of Christ is taken and eaten; the references to corruption concern the species of bread, those to reception concern the body of Christ. . . . Christ passes from the mouth to the heart; it is better that He go to the mind than that He descend to the stomach. This food is not of the flesh but of the soul. . . . The species suffers corruption and defilement, but the reality is never corrupted or polluted.¹ . . . For three reasons He instituted the Sacrament of His body and blood to be received under a different species, to increase merit, to help feeling, to avoid ridicule; to increase merit, because in this one thing is seen and another thing is believed; to help feeling, lest the mind should be repelled by what the eye would see; to avoid ridicule, lest the heathen should mock at anything done by a Christian".²

The treatise contains comments on some of the ceremonial used in connection with the prayers of the canon of the Mass, particularly on the signing of the Sacrament with the cross as significant of the stages in the mystical commemoration of the passion and on the commixture as signifying "the union of the flesh and the soul in the resurrection of Christ".³

IV.

The writings of St. Anslem supply an instance of the teaching ordinarily current at the end of the eleventh century and the opening years of the twelfth. Anslem was born at or near Aosta about 1033, was a pupil of Lanfranc at Bec, and succeeded him

¹ Cf. the letter addressed to Meginhard by Wolphem, who became Abbot of Branwiller near Cologne about 1091, quoted in the *Life* of Wolphem by his pupil Conrad, "This visible sun, created and not almighty, sends its beams into the sewers and other filth of the world, and draws them back again to itself without any defilement; and this body, after Communion has been completed in the Catholic way, draws itself back to the Father safe and sound, living and complete": see *P.L.* cliv. 414.

² *Cc.* 4, 5, 6, 7 (*P.L.* cxlv. 882-84). ³ *Cc.* 16, 18 (*P.L.* cxlv. 889-91).

as Prior of Bec in 1063. From 1078 to 1093 he was Abbot of Bec, from 1093 to 1109 Archbishop of Canterbury. He often refers to the consecrated bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ and to the Eucharist as a sacrifice or the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ.¹ His *Prayers* describe the consecration as being effected by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the offerings; contain words of loving address and devout adoration to "that most sweet body of the most sweet Lord which" the priest holds "in the hands," "which is really that body which was born of the Virgin and crucified and laid in the tomb, which on the third day rose from the dead, which ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of the Father"; and refer to the angels as present at "the hour of sacrifice" and worshipping the flesh and blood of Him who created them.² In one of his letters he touches briefly on some matters which had been the subject of much discussion and controversy:—

"It must not be supposed that in taking the blood we receive the soul of Christ without His body, or that in taking the body we receive His body without His soul, but when we take the blood we receive the whole Christ God and Man, and when we take the body we receive Him whole in like manner. And although we take first the body and then the blood, yet we do not receive Christ twice but we receive Him once being immortal and impassible. . . . It must be understood that the bread placed on the altar is changed by means of the words of the rite into the body of Christ, and that the substance of bread and wine does not remain. Yet the species does remain, that is, the form and colour and taste; and according to the species which remains certain things happen which cannot possibly happen according to that which they are, namely to be broken and to be shut in one place. . . . According to the species, again, the Sacrament can be received by faithful and unfaithful alike. Yet the faithful receive in a different and unique way, namely, that, since they are conformed to Christ by innocence, by the reception of His body and blood they are conformed to God, in the present their virtues are increased and their free will is strengthened, and in the future they are fully endowed with immortality and impassibility, as also is He. . . . Which method of receiving all the unfaithful altogether lack. Nevertheless it is not to be denied that the

¹ See, e.g., *De azym. et ferment.* 1, *De sacram. divers.* 4, *Ad Waleranni quer. resp.* 2 (*P.L.* clviii. 541, 542, 550, 553).

² See, e.g., *Orat.* 27, 28, 29, 35 (*P.L.* clviii. 918, 919, 924, 927).

wicked themselves receive the real substance of the body of Christ. . . . Within the Catholic Church in the mystery of the body of Christ nothing less is received from an evil priest, and nothing more is received from a good priest, because the consecration takes place not by the merit of the consecrator but by the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Ghost; for if it were by the merit of the priest not at all would it pertain to Christ. But now as it is He who baptises, so it is He who by the Holy Ghost makes this bread and wine to be transformed into His flesh and blood.”¹

V.

Odo of Cambrai was born at Orleans in 1050; he became Master of the Cathedral School at Tournai in 1087, abbot of the monastery of St. Martin at Tournai at some later date, and Bishop of Cambrai in 1105; he was exiled in 1110, and died at Anchin in 1113. In his treatise *An Exposition on the Canon of the Mass* he goes through the canon of the Mass sentence by sentence with explanatory comments. It is of much interest in regard both to the Eucharistic presence and to the Eucharistic sacrifice. On the presence the teaching of Odo is very clear that at the moment of consecration the elements become the body and blood of Christ. More than once he speaks as if the bread and the wine cease to exist when consecrated, and he refers to the deception of the senses in a way which seems to imply not only the presence of the body and blood of Christ but also the absence of the bread and wine. With these statements he links strong assertions of the spiritual character of the flesh and blood of Christ as present and received and a reference to the spiritual condition of His body after the resurrection, though there are fewer traces in this book of serious effort to co-relate the reality and the spirituality of the presence of Christ than are found in the treatise on the same subject ascribed to St. Peter Damien and in the letter already quoted from St. Anselm. Of the bread immediately before consecration he says, “It is still bread, not yet flesh”; of it immediately after consecration he writes, “Now it is flesh, it is no longer bread”.² Of the act of consecration he says, “By the word of Christ” “the creature” “becomes the body and blood of Christ”.³ On the deception of the senses he

¹ *Ep.* cvii. (*P.L.* clix. 255-58).

² *P.L.* elx. 1061; *cf.* 1065.

³ *Ibid.* 1063.

writes, "It is perceived by the senses to be wine; and it is not. It does not appear to be blood; and it is."¹ As to the spiritual character of the flesh and blood, his words are:—

"This offering is pure because, although it is real flesh and blood, yet it is spiritual and incorruptible. It is divided, and it cannot be consumed. It is eaten, and it remains uncorrupted. It is crushed, and it is unimpaired. It is broken, and it is whole. This offering is flesh, but it is not carnal. Rather it is unstained light, and therefore pure. It is body, but not corporal. Rather it is spiritual light, and therefore pure. It is pure and cleansing, pure and purifying, pure because divine, purer than material light."²

With this should be compared an earlier passage in the treatise in which Odo exhibits less carefulness to avoid confusion of expression than the book ascribed to St. Peter Damien and the letter of St. Anselm. He there writes:—

"We daily consume Christ on the altar, and yet He abides; we eat Him, and yet He lives; we crush Him with the teeth, and yet He is unbroken. Now we consume and eat and crush not only in the species but also in fact, not only in the form but also in the substance. And in a marvellous way He who abides is consumed, He who is unmarred is crushed, He who is undivided is distributed, as after the resurrection He gave a spiritual body to be handled. With like contrariety that which is spiritual cannot be touched, and that which can be touched is not spiritual. For in the species and taste of bread and wine we eat and drink the very substance of the body and blood, the substance under the same qualities being changed, so that under the figure and taste of the former substance the real substance of the body and blood of Christ is made to be."³

On the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice there are passages of great interest in connection with the prayers in the canon of the Mass in which supplication is made that the offering may be accepted as the offerings of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek were accepted, and that it may be borne to the altar on high.

"Why do we pray the Father to be favourable and gracious towards the offering, and to accept it, when there is nothing which He holds more acceptable and when He always regards it favourably and graciously? For it is written, 'This is My beloved Son, in

¹ *P. L.* clx. 1063.

² *Ibid.* 1064.

³ *Ibid.* 1062.

whom I am well pleased'.¹ But the reference is to those who offer, that they who are afraid because of their sins and have no trust in themselves, may stretch out on their behalf an acceptable offering, so that, protecting themselves under its shield, they may implore the Father to be favourable and gracious to them, and may desire that they be accepted because of that the acceptableness of which they never question, so that they who dare not offer in themselves, lest they should provoke by evil, set forth the beloved Son, that they may come in, and under His protection enter the presence of the Father. . . . There is a difficulty how we pray that the body and blood of the Lord may be borne in the presence of God, since it is written that Christ ever stands before the face of the Father, making intercession for us, and we read that Christ, ascending to heaven, was exalted above all things, sitting on the right hand of the Father. How then do we pray that Christ may be borne where He ever is? . . . We pray that, as Christ was borne away from the earth into heaven in the presence of His disciples, and vanished out of their sight, being about to send the gift of the Holy Ghost afterwards, so this offering may be borne from the earthly altar, on which it is offered, to the altar on high in the presence of God, so that thence we may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace, so that what is visibly done on earth may be invisibly accomplished in heaven. It is offered here, it is accepted there, not by change of place or by succession of time, as if a movement of translation were begun in this place and completed in another. But in the same place that which was bread becomes the flesh of the Word. There is no transference of place that bread may become flesh; yet there is transference from the altar to heaven, because from being bread it is made God. But, since God is everywhere, it is not by change of place that the flesh which is made from bread is joined to God. . . . In mentioning Christ we pray that our prayers may be borne by the hands of the angel, that the good angels may present good prayers under the plea of so great a sacrifice. . . . What is it for the offering to be borne to the altar on high except for the sheep to be placed on the shoulders of the Shepherd? And what is it for the sheep to be placed on the shoulders except for man to be taken by the Word? And what is higher than the Word of God? Daily the Word of God takes to Himself the faithful by their participation in this sacrifice. The Word of God then is the altar on high, to which we pray that the offering may be borne in the presence of God and that we through it

¹St. Matt. iii. 17.

may be brought in. The presence of God is the Word of the Father in whom He sees all things which He has done. . . . What then is the meaning of the offering being borne to the altar on high in the presence of God except that our offering be joined to the Word, be united to the Word, become God, and that through it we may be taken to God and that our prayers may be accepted. . . . The Church has a visible altar on earth, and there is an invisible altar in heaven with God. The offering which we offer to God on this altar is joined to God and becomes God. In this sacrifice earthly things are joined to heavenly, the creature to God. When from this altar we take His creature, we receive God from the altar on high. When here we take the body and blood of Christ, we receive God from heaven, in whom we are filled with all heavenly blessing and grace."¹

Here, as in his teaching about the presence, Odo is hampered by his lack of clear thought or expression; but there can be little doubt that he is struggling to convey and explain the idea strongly emphasised by Paschasius Radbert, that at consecration the elements which have thereby become the body and blood of Christ are spiritually borne to the altar on high in the heavenly sphere and there presented in the presence of God and then given back to the people on earth as the body and blood of the Lord.²

Ivo of Chartres was born at Beauvais about 1040. After being abbot of the monastery of St. Quentin at Beauvais he became Bishop of Chartres in 1091. He died in 1116. His collection of enactments of Church law known as *Panormia* contains forty sections relating to the Eucharist. They are collected from very various sources of very different dates and concern many matters of doctrine and practice. It is assumed in them that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ at consecration, and that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. They include the declaration to which Berengar assented at the Council of Rome of 1059.³ One of the *Sermons* of Ivo is a lengthy comparison between the rites of the Old Testament and those of the Christian religion. The earlier part of it is occupied with an enumeration and explanation of Old Testament

¹ *P.L.* clx. 1066-68.

² See pp. 220-22, *supra*.

³ *Panormia*, i. 123-62 (*P.L.* clxi. 1071-84). The declaration made by Berengar is in section 126 (*P.L.* clxi. 1072). For it see p. 247, *supra*.

prophecies and types of Christ, especially of His priesthood and sacrifice. After these Ivo goes on to explain the mystical significance of the stages of the offering of the Eucharist. He regards the details of the rite from the Introit to the Offertory as the mystical representation of the Old Testament foreshadowings of Christ. From the secret prayers which follow the Offertory to the end there is the presentation in mystery of our Lord's earthly passion and of His intercession in heaven, both being represented as prefigured by the ceremonies of the Jewish Day of Atonement. On the Jewish Day of Atonement there were the death of the victim and the sprinkling of the blood in the Holy of Holies; in the sacrifice offered by Christ there are His death, His presentation of His blood in heaven, and His abiding pleading; in the Eucharist there are the commemoration of His death and the union of the earthly offering with His acts in heaven. The quotation of one passage of some length may be sufficient to show his line of interpretation:—

“The priest [that is, in the Eucharist] spiritually expresses what he asks for, namely, that these bodily elements may become to us the body and blood of Christ. This prayer as with smoke of most subtle perfumes shrouds the mercy-seat, and asks that the earthly and corruptible element may be united to the heavenly and incorruptible body. But faith alone must be used for this height of divine counsel, and it goes forth even to the parts within the veil, into which it could not enter if it strove to prove by the persuasive words of human wisdom the mysteries therein contained. The priest who serves the shadow [that is, of the Jewish law] turns to the East and sprinkles the mercy-seat and the sanctuary and the tabernacle with the blood of the bullock, and in the same rite with that of the goat which was offered; for the same Christ of whom the bullock was a type and who was signified by the goat which was offered for sin,—even Christ ascending to the East, that is, to the Father, from whom He came forth,—sprinkles Him, that is, the Father, whom He made propitious to us by the sprinkling of His blood. He sprinkles also the sanctuary and the tabernacle, because, entering into the holy places by His own blood, He made at peace things divine and human, for, as the Apostle says, ‘It pleased the Father in Him to restore all things which are in heaven and which are on earth,’¹ that is, the Church, which on earth was lost

¹ Col. i. 19, 20.

because of the disobedience of our first parent and in heaven was lessened because of the fall of the apostate angel. Our priest in the sacred mysteries, as if within the veil, imitates this sprinkling of the blood of Christ, as often as, turning to the East, whence the Saviour came to us, naming the mysteries themselves by their typical or proper names, He signs them with the sign of the cross. For what is the meaning of placing the sign of the cross on the things that have been consecrated or are to be consecrated in the mysteries themselves except to commemorate the death of the Lord? . . . When the sprinkling of the blood of Christ has been commemorated in the Lord's words, the words of the rite follow, commemorating the same sprinkling of the blood by the mouth of the priest raising his prayer to the Father, 'Wherefore also, O Lord, we Thy servants, mindful of the passion and resurrection and ascension of Thy Son, offer to Thy majesty,' that is, we commemorate as offered in these visible gifts, 'a pure offering,' that is, without the leaven of malice; 'holy,' that is, consecrated; 'stainless,' that is, such as the animals signified which were sought for sacrifice without blemish. And this commemoration of the real sacrifice the priest prays may be accepted by God the Father as were accepted the gifts of Abel and Abraham and Melchizedek. . . . Since they could not hurt His Godhead, they sent Christ living into the wilderness, because they let Him go, free by the death of the flesh to ascend to that glory which He had alone with the Father, by the hands of a prepared man, that is, Himself, carrying the sins of the children of Israel, that is, taking away the sins of the world, not possessing them. This our priest commemorates when he says to God the Father, 'Command these to be borne by the hands of Thy angel to Thy altar on high'. Who is that angel but the Angel of great counsel, who by His own hands, that is, by works endowed with unique worth, merited to ascend into heaven, and to raise Himself to the altar on high, that is, to the right hand of the Father, making intercession for us? Then the high priest returns to the camp, and the Lord says to the disciples, instructing them about His ascension, 'I am with you always even to the end of the world'.¹ Both of these acts the priest imitates. First, by his prayers he raises the body of Christ above the whole height of heaven. Then as if returning to the camp he says, 'That all we who shall have received from this participation of the altar the most holy body and blood of Thy dearly beloved Son may be filled with all heavenly blessing'. Lo, there come to the mind the words

¹St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

of Blessed Andrew the Apostle, in which he says both that the body of the Lord is in heaven and that the body of the Lord can be taken from the altar. . . . If you ask how this can be, I will shortly answer, It is a sacrament of faith; search can be made into it healthfully, but not without danger. . . . We have Christ whole in heaven making intercession to the Father for us through the showing forth of His flesh; we have also His body whole in the Sacrament of the altar."¹

William of Champeaux was a philosopher and scholastic theologian of great reputation in the early years of the twelfth century. He was Archdeacon of Paris and afterwards Bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne. In 1113 he founded the famous school of St. Victor at Paris. In 1121 he died. A fragment only of his work *On the Sacrament of the Altar* exists. It may be worth while to quote from it a clear expression of the doctrine of concomitance and of the spiritual character of our Lord's risen body:—

"He who receives either species receives the whole Christ. For Christ is not received limb by limb or bit by bit but whole in one kind or in the other. Wherefore infants just baptised receive the cup only, because they cannot take bread, and in the cup they receive the whole Christ. . . . Though there are the separate parts according to breaking and smell and warmth and taste, yet in each species is the whole Christ, who after His resurrection is wholly invisible and impassible and indivisible, so that neither is there the blood without the flesh, nor the flesh without the blood, nor either without the human soul, nor the whole human nature without the Word of God personally united to it."²

William adds that the two kinds of the Sacrament are retained in the Church as one of those things which cannot be changed, because the object of the institution in two species was in order that there might be preserved the memory of the body which hung on the cross and of the blood which flowed from our Lord's side.³

Alger of Liège was born about 1070, was appointed a canon of Liège about 1101, became a monk of Cluny in 1121, and died about 1131. His reputation as a theologian stood very

¹ *Serm. v.* (P.L. clxii. 556-58).

² *De sacram. alt.* (P.L. clxiii. 1039, 1040).

³ *Ibid.*

high, and his treatise *On the Sacraments of the Lord's Body and Blood* was greatly esteemed in the Church. At the outset of this treatise Alger mentions six errors about the Eucharist which it is his purpose to refute. The six errors are, first, that the bread and wine are not really but only figuratively the body of Christ; secondly, that Christ is impanated in the bread; thirdly, that the bread and wine are changed into the flesh and blood not of Christ but of some son of man accepted by God; fourthly, that the conversion of the elements does not take place if the consecrating priest is a bad man; fifthly, that the consecrated elements again become only bread and wine if they are received by wicked communicants; and sixthly, that the flesh of Christ when taken in Communion is subject to the ordinary processes of digestion.¹ In distinction from these six errors Alger develops the doctrine which he himself holds. He is careful to show the connection of his teaching on the subject of the Eucharist with other doctrines. Thus, he emphasises the truths of the Incarnation, the Virgin-birth, the resurrection, the ascension, and the union of Christians to Christ in His mystical body the Church.² He is evidently desirous of avoiding confusions of thought which had arisen through want of care in defining terms, and explains that the word "Sacrament" is used to denote both "the Sacrament" and "the reality of the Sacrament" (*res sacramenti*), and the phrase "body of Christ" to denote both "the Sacrament" and "the body of Christ".³ He explicitly asserts that at the consecration the substance of the elements is converted into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ, so that "what is there is not seen, and what is seen is not there," and that "the flesh itself, since it is local,⁴ is really and substantially present both in heaven and on earth," and "the flesh and blood of Christ are really eaten and drunk by the people, while Christ Himself abides living and whole in His kingdom".⁵ This conversion of substance is held to involve

¹ Prol. (*P.L.* clxxx. 739, 740).

² i. 1-3 (*P.L.* clxxx. 743-51).

³ i. 4 (*P.L.* clxxx. 752).

⁴ The word "local" is probably here used in the sense of not ubiquitous, as distinct from the sense of circumscribed by dimensions in which later Western theologians denied a local presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

⁵ Prol. (*P.L.* clxxx. 741); cf. i. 5, 6, 9 (*P.L.* clxxx. 752, 755, 763).

that the substance of the elements ceases to exist; "in the Sacrament the body of Christ comes to be and is where bodily it was not, not only by way of Sacrament but also by a miracle, since there the bread ceases to be that which it was".¹ Yet while the substance of the elements is thus converted, they retain "certain qualities," "the accidents do not cease to exist," "the form and solidity and colour and taste of the bread" are "real" and not "phantasms".² Since the body of Christ is thus really present on earth, as in heaven, He is adored in the Sacrament.³ With these explicit assertions of the conversion of the substance of the elements into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ Alger links much emphatic teaching of the spiritual manner of the presence. He supposes that at the institution of the Sacrament our Lord gave His "incorruptible and immortal" body to the disciples by an anticipation of the spiritual character of His risen body in some way parallel to His manifestation of His body after the resurrection with the marks of the wounds and susceptible of touch, the properties of the body after the resurrection being in the one case vouchsafed before it, and the properties of the body before the resurrection being in the other case vouchsafed after it.⁴ Following out this line of thought, he teaches that the body of Christ is taken in the Eucharist, "by faith, with the mind, with the hand of the heart, by inner drinking, spiritually," that it is "spiritual and incorruptible and invisible" as well as "substantial"; that it is "not carnal but spiritual food and drink"; and that Christ remains "whole and undivided and unbroken".⁵ Alger regards the Eucharistic sacrifice as a commemoration of the death of Christ. Though Christ does not again die, yet in the Sacrament there is a memory and presentation of His death; the sacrifice on the altar is the same as that on the cross.⁶ While thus a commemoration of Christ's death, the Eucharistic sacrifice is also a means of union with His offering in heaven, as it is with His heavenly life; and in an incidental reference to the words of the canon of the Mass Alger writes:—

¹ i. 8 (*P.L.* clxxx. 761).

² i. 6, 7 (*P.L.* clxxx. 756, 757, 759).

³ i. 14 (*P.L.* clxxx. 780).

⁴ i. 9 (*P.L.* clxxx. 768).

⁵ i. 11, 15 (*P.L.* clxxx. 771, 772, 774, 783).

⁶ i. 16 (*P.L.* clxxx. 786, 789).

"The priest, consecrating the body of the Lord on the earthly altar as the minister of Christ (*vice Christi*), and yet not assigning anything to his own merits but all to the power and grace of God, prays in the canon to God the Father, saying, 'Command that these oblations be borne to Thee by the hands and power of Thy Son, Thy Angel, who is the Angel of great counsel, not to this lowly and visible altar, where now He is, but to Thy altar on high, that is, Thy Son, whom Thou hast exalted to Thy right hand, in the presence of Thy majesty, that there may be to us the body and blood of Thy beloved Son,' showing that the Son Himself, by the command of the Father, is in heaven offering sacrifice and is the sacrifice which is offered and is that on which it is offered; because we lean altogether on His faith and grace for our belief that the earthly elements are converted into Christ, and that He Himself, sitting in the heavenly places at the right hand of the Father, intercedes for us, and is consecrated and is in the Sacrament of the altar."¹

In the glosses which Alger adds to the words of the canon of the Mass in this passage he, like other mediæval writers, notably Ivo of Chartres, interprets the "holy angel" by whom the offering is borne to heaven to denote our Lord, and, like Odo of Cambrai and others, explains the "altar on high" as a description of Him.

Alger of Liège also wrote a much shorter work entitled *On the Sacrifice of the Mass*. It is a brief explanation of the mystical significance of the words and ceremonies of the Mass on much the same lines as the more elaborate treatise by Odo of Cambrai. The object of the celebration of the Mass from this point of view is described as being to "set forth the memorial of Christ coming in the flesh and represent His passion in mystery."² Among the details mentioned, the explanations of the use of the sign of the cross on the elements and on the priest, of the kiss on the altar after the consecration, and of the prayer for the bearing of the offering to the heavenly altar, are of interest.

"Our priest begins 'Thee therefore,' and as it were entering the Holy of Holies pours forth general prayer for the whole Church, and marking the sign of the cross sprinkles that oblation with the blood of Christ; and as often as he makes the sign of the cross on the heavenly sacrifice, so often he sprinkles with the blood of Christ the oblation that is set forth. . . . The priest humbly prays the

¹ i. 14 (*P.L.* clxxx. 781).

² *P.L.* clxxx. 853.

Lord to command these to be borne by the hands of the holy angel to His altar on high, so that in this hour the mystery may be clear of the union of the bread to the Lord's body and the communication to it of the one substance. Also he then kisses the altar, that he may show his desire to become a partaker of the same Sacrament; and, guarding himself with the sign of the cross, prepares himself to receive the mystery".¹

Here the idea of the commemoration of the passion is so prominent that the signing of the elements with the cross is regarded as the mystical sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and the union of the earthly rite with the heavenly offering is so clearly in view that the priest is said as it were to enter the Holy of Holies on beginning the canon and the elements on the altar are described as the "heavenly sacrifice".

Gregory of Bergamo, who after being a monk at Asti became Bishop of Bergamo in 1134, wrote a treatise entitled *On the Reality of the Body of Christ*. He mentions that there had been a revival of Berengarianism in the form of denials that the Sacrament of the altar is more than a figure of the body and blood of Christ. From his treatise some of the arguments used by the advocates of this revived Berengarianism are known. Our Lord's words, "Ye have the poor always with you; but Me ye have not always,"² were said to be inconsistent with the continued presence of His real body in the Sacrament. The words "This do for My memorial"³ were said to show that He would not be actually present until He should come again at the end of the world. St. Paul's statement, "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more,"⁴ was held to refute the belief that in the Eucharist there is a sacrifice of Christ. "The flesh profiteth nothing"⁵ was urged against the teaching that in the Sacrament His flesh is given. "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more"⁶ was similarly used. Other arguments were based on teaching in the fathers that in the Eucharist there is a likeness of Christ, and that the sayings about His flesh and blood are to be spiritually understood, which were taken to mean that there is a likeness only without actual presence, and that there is no bodily gift of His flesh and

¹ P.L. clxxx. 855, 856.

² St. Luke xxii. 19.

³ St. John vi. 63.

⁴ St. Matt. xxvi. 11.

⁵ Rom. vi. 9.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 16.

blood. To these arguments Gregory replies in detail. "Me ye have not always" he regards as stating the fact that we have not Christ to talk with us, to be seen by the eyes of the body, to be the ordinary companion of our usual life. "This do for My memorial," "The flesh profiteth nothing," "Now we know Him so no more," do not, he maintains, really militate against the actual presence of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament. It is part, he says, of the ordinary teaching in regard to the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist that He does not again die but abides whole and unbroken and unhurt in His heavenly life.¹ Incidentally Gregory mentions another argument of his opponents, to the effect that the words "This is My body" are to be interpreted figuratively to correspond with "The seven good kine are seven years"² and "The reapers are angels,"³ an argument which he meets by pointing out that the circumstances in which these phrases were spoken were altogether different, and by saying that the right parallels are with "This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded to you-ward"⁴ and "This is My beloved Son"⁵ and "This is the Son of God"⁶ in each of which cases an actual identification is denoted.⁷ In stating his own position Gregory maintains that there is an actual conversion of substance at consecration, that the Sacrament is the body and blood of Christ "not only in that which it is believed actually to be within but also in the outward species of bread and wine," that the Sacrament is itself the body of Christ and as a figure denotes the Church, that in this actual conversion the species are retained to avoid horror and to give opportunity for faith and to prevent scandal to the heathen, and that there is both the bodily eating of the flesh and blood of Christ in the reception of the Sacrament and the spiritual eating of the inner union of the soul to Christ.⁸ He sums up the main points of his doctrine in the following passage:—

"The whole Church of God dispersed throughout the world holds that the visible creatures, the bread and the wine of the altar,

¹ *De verit. corp. Christi*, Prol. 1-9 (Hurter, *SS. Patr. Opusc. Sel.* xxxix. 1-38).

² Gen. xli. 26.

³ St. Matt. xiii. 39.

⁴ Heb. ix. 20; cf. Ex. xxiv. 8.

⁵ St. Matt. iii. 17.

⁶ St. John i. 34.

⁷ *De verit. corp. Christi*, 22 (Hurter, xxxix. 86-91).

⁸ Cc. 18, 19, 27, 30, 31 (Hurter, xxxix. 73-80, 107, 113-19).

are at the solemn consecration of the priestly act converted by the ineffable and incomprehensible power of God who thus orders into the essence of the Lord's body and blood, the species of the aforesaid things remaining with certain other qualities; and that the real body and blood of Christ is itself taken by communicants from the Lord's Table not only with the mouth of the heart but also with the mouth of the body, the body of Christ itself being unhurt and unmarred in the heavenly places."¹

The main features of the belief of Gregory of Bergamo are the same as those of Alger of Liège; but a reader in passing from one to the other misses in Gregory the insistence on the spiritual character of the presence and gift in the Eucharist as being of the risen body of Christ which is so marked in the more famous and influential writer.

VI.

Hildebert of Tours was born in 1057. He became Bishop of Le Mans in 1097 and Archbishop of Tours in 1125. In 1133 or 1134 he died at Tours. Hildebert's writings are rich in teaching about the Eucharist. One of his *Sermons* incidentally contains as a description of the act of consecrating the noticeable phrase, "When I utter the words of the canon and the word of the Transubstantiation".² His treatise *On the Exposition of the Mass*, in explaining the words of the ordinary and canon of the Mass, states that the bread and wine are made the flesh and blood of Christ at the consecration by the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Ghost; that this flesh is that which was born of the Virgin; that, when the Sacrament "is broken and eaten, Christ is offered and eaten and yet remains whole and living"; that "the nature of the bread and the wine is turned into the spiritual (*rationabilem*) nature of the body and blood of Christ"; and that the ceremonial acts connected with the words of the canon in the signing of the elements with the cross are parts of the mystical representation of the passion of Christ.³ The poems *On the Mystery of the Mass*, *On*

¹ C. 21 (Hurter, xxxix. 58).

² *Serm. xciii.* (P.L. clxxi. 776). This appears to be the second instance of the use of the word Transubstantiation, if that in the treatise *An Exposition of the Canon of the Mass* ascribed to St. Peter Damien is reckoned as the first: see p. 260, *supra*.

³ *De expos. missæ* (P.L. clxxi. 1156, 1165, 1168, 1172, 1173).

the New Sacrifice which Abrogates the Old, and *On the Holy Eucharist* contain like doctrine. The Mass is throughout regarded as a mystical representation of Christ's passion, which is viewed as fulfilling the types of the Old Testament and particularly that of the Day of Atonement, and having its issue in the presentation by Christ in heaven of the blood which He shed on the cross. In it are commemorated His passion, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension; in it through His blood, which is sprinkled by Him on the Father in heaven and on men on earth, heaven and earth are joined by the ministry of angels; in it Christians are in close contact with the abiding intercession of Christ in heaven, and receive Him who remains unbroken as they partake of that flesh in which there is "nothing carnal and nothing bloody".¹ The same doctrine as regards the presence and gift is expounded in Hildebert's *Short Treatise on the Sacrament of the Altar*, in which he says:—

"What understanding can grasp in what way the flesh of Christ comes to us daily from heaven to the altar, and from the altar into us, and yet leaves not the heaven from which it comes? For as of old the Godhead of Christ came to us from heaven, so also now His manhood comes thence to us; and as He came from heaven with His Godhead and yet did not depart thence, so also now He comes from heaven with His manhood, which nevertheless always abides there. And as the Godhead came by means of the manhood, so also the manhood comes thence by means of the Godhead. At that time God came openly by means of His manhood; and now Man comes invisibly by means of His Godhead. Then God came in a way known to the senses; now Man comes in a way which the senses cannot discern. Then God came in human fashion; and now Man comes after the method of God. Nor is it Man only in His spirit but also in His flesh; neither is it without His Godhead but with and in and by reason of His Godhead; and therefore the whole work is divinely done. For what is more divine than that the body of Christ, since it is flesh and not spirit, is nevertheless the food not of the flesh and the body but of the spirit and the mind? It is indeed the food of the inner man; and yet it is not human but divine, entering into the spirit in a spiritual and divine manner, not converting itself into spirit but feeding the spirit

¹ *De myst. missæ, De nov. sacrif. vet. abrog., De sacr. Euch., passim*, especially *P.L.* clxxi. 1184, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1194, 1198, 1201, 1212.

spiritually and divinely, entering spiritually, working spiritually, coming by a spiritual way from heaven, returning to heaven by a spiritual way. This body is among us, and it is in heaven; it is among us also in different places, on different altars, at a time not different. Nor is it divided into parts, but it is on every altar whole and complete. Nor is it in number more than one, but it is one only. Nor is it imaginary, but it is real. Nor is it only by way of Sacrament, but it is of the body itself. For it is itself in one place only after a natural manner, but it is in many places after a manner of power. It is in one place by way of nature; it is in many places by way of divine grace and power. It is in one place after a bodily manner; it is in many places after a spiritual manner. For to be at the same time in more places than one is not an attribute of body but of spirit, though not perhaps of any other spirit than divine spirit, that is, of uncreated and uncircumscribed spirit, not also of spirit that is created and therefore circumscribed. . . . Not only is the body of Christ wholly present after the manner of a spirit at the same time in different places, that is, on many altars; but it also has on each separate altar a certain spiritual way of existing. For, although it is everywhere in itself an object of sense because of the properties of body, yet it is present to us on the altar not as an object of sense in the form which it takes. Wherefore also it can be said to be there both as an object of sense and not as an object of sense. As an object of sense indeed because of the real property in body of being sensibly perceived, and because the species of the Sacrament is subject to the senses; but not as an object of sense so far as concerns the manifestation of form and the perception of our sense. . . . When the Sacrament is divided into parts, nevertheless the body is not severed into parts, so as to be taken with division and in parts; but it is received whole and undivided under the divided parts in each part by each one who receives. . . . The force of human reason seems to fail more in the Sacrament of the Lord's body and blood than in any other work of divine power. In others perhaps it can be of some avail; but what can it avail here? Is it able to grasp in what way the substance of the bread and wine is converted into the substance of the body and blood of the Lord, while nevertheless the accidents of the bread and wine are not in like manner converted but remain unchanged without the substance of bread and without the substance of wine? How are there accidents without a subject, or these accidents without the subject in which they had their origin? In these things is a way unknown to reason but not altogether unknown

to faith. Reason here is ignorant of all, but faith seizes on what reason grasps not.”¹

Hildebert is perhaps more hindered than helped by the philosophical terminology which he is careful to use in speaking of the Eucharistic presence; and, unlike Alger of Liège, he does not seem to have effectively realised the bearing of the spiritual character of the body of our Lord after His resurrection. In spite of any such difficulties in the way of elucidating the doctrine which he held, his insistence on the spiritual method of the presence of our Lord’s body and blood is both clear and powerful.

Honorius of Autun was a priest of Autun, famous as a commentator on the liturgy and office books of the Church, who died after the beginning of the Papacy of Innocent II. in 1130. His *Sacramentary or Book on the Reasons and Mystical Meaning of the Rites of the Divine Office in the Church* refers to details in the prayers and ceremonies of the ordinary and canon of the Mass as forming parts of the mystical commemoration of the stages of the passion and resurrection of Christ on the same lines as those customary in the other liturgical writers of the twelfth century. There are incidental allusions to the change of the bread and wine at the consecration into the flesh and blood of Christ; our Lord’s offering in heaven, with which the Eucharistic sacrifice is regarded as being united, is described as His “supplication to the Father for us, in which He ever shows forth what kind of death He bore for the life of men”; there is a reference, like those in earlier writers, to the “threefold body of Christ.”² In the work by Honorius entitled *Eucharistion or Book on the Body and Blood of the Lord* this idea of the “threefold body” is more fully explained. In its first sense the body of Christ is “that body which was taken from the Virgin in the Incarnation, which was offered for us on the altar of the cross, which was raised to heaven after the victory over death, and is set on the right hand of God”. In its second sense the body of Christ is “that body which by the consecration of the Holy Ghost is daily made out of the substance of bread and wine in the priestly mystery, and by the power of God is made into the body which was born of the Virgin, and, though it is eaten by all the people, is declared by the

¹ *Brev. Tract. de sacram. alt.* (P.L. clxxi. 1149-53).

² Cc. 31, 88, 89, 90 (P.L. clxxii. 763, 793, 795, 796).

Catholic faith to remain whole". In its third sense the body of Christ denotes the whole Church, which being Christ's body eats His body and in eating it is made into it and becomes "one flesh with Him".¹ In this treatise Honorius deals at some length with the question of what is received by those who communicate unworthily. The consecration of the Sacrament, he says, is not affected if the consecrating priest is a bad man. Christ Himself is really the consecrator; and His action is not impaired by the unworthiness of the priest who is His minister. But unbelievers and wicked persons who communicate are not "partakers of Christ," "do not abide in Christ, who is life, but are far from Him, and therefore do not take the body of Christ, but eat and drink judgment to themselves". In "this spiritual food" "the wicked receive the outward species of the Sacrament, but the inward quickening virtue is withdrawn from them, as the manhood of Christ was crucified by the Jews, while His Godhead suffered no injury".² Some of these statements might seem to deny the reception of the body of Christ by the wicked; but, as Honorius proceeds further in his argument, he definitely accepts the more usual doctrine that the body of Christ is received by those who communicate unworthily, although they derive no benefit from it but eat and drink it to judgment; for he writes:—

"Since this bread at consecration is substantially turned into the body of Christ, a question is asked whether in the mouth of those who take it unworthily, it is changed again into a different nature. As Christ 'being raised from the dead dieth no more,'³ so His flesh made from bread will not be changed into any other nature. It will be the same thing in the mouth of the worst of men as it is in the mouth of the most holy, as He was the same in the hands of those who cruelly crucified Him as He was in the hands of those who devoutly buried Him. But, as the sun is the same in its heat and in its brightness, and yet produces different results in these two aspects, namely, burning the earth by its heat and giving light by its brightness, so the flesh of Christ remaining the same produces different results in different persons, incorporating the righteous with Himself, separating the unrighteous from His life. And, again, as the same ordinary bread strengthens men but chokes infants, so the same thing

¹ Cc. 1, 3, 4, 5 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253).

² Cc. 6-8 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1253-55).

³ Rom. vi. 9.

is the cause of glory to the worthy and the cause of punishment to the unworthy.”¹

Stephen of Autun was appointed Bishop of Autun before 1112. At some later time he resigned his bishopric and became a monk at Cluny. He died in 1139. His treatise *On the Sacrament of the Altar* contains the same doctrine as is usually found in this period. The earthly oblations are said to be converted by the blessing of God into that body of Christ “which hung on the cross, which was glorified in the resurrection, which was divinely honoured (*deificatum*) in the ascension”; the prayer offered by the Church in the Eucharist is “that the food of angels may become the food of men, that is, that the oblation of bread and wine may be transubstantiated² into the body and blood of Jesus Christ”; the consecration takes place at the recital of the words “This is My body,” “This is My blood”; “the bread and the wine pass not into divine nature but into the human substance”; “the whole Christ is under each species and under each particle of each species”; “there are two ways of taking the body and blood of the Lord, sacramental and spiritual; good and bad share in the sacramental taking; only the good partake in the spiritual way”; “the flesh of Christ is twofold: there is that which was born of the Virgin and is taken in the Sacrament, and there is that which is eaten when there is faithful belief, without which the sacramental taking does not profit”; “to take the flesh” of Christ and “to drink” His “blood bestows no benefit unless it is received with faith and love,” and “so to eat the flesh of Christ is to take it in spirit and in truth”; the presence of Christ is spiritually discerned by faith and is of that spiritual body with which He rose from the dead.³

“It is our faith and must really be believed that when the priest says the words, ‘This is My body,’ there is no longer earthly bread but that Bread which came down from heaven, the Mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ. Also by the power of the words, ‘This is the cup of My blood,’ the wine is converted into His blood. Under

¹ C. 9 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1255).

² The verb *transubstantiare* occurs twice (cc. 13, 14; *P.L.* clxxii. 1291, 1293) in this treatise. This is the second instance of the use of it, if that in the treatise *An Exposition of the Canon of the Mass*, ascribed to St. Peter Damien, is reckoned as the first: see pp. 260, 275, *supra*.

³ Cc. 13-17 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1287, 1291, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1296, 1297).

each species and under each particle of each species Christ Jesus is and is taken whole. He who dwells in heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father is Himself really in this Sacrament, is crushed by the teeth, and remains unbroken. He is eaten and is not corrupted; He is offered, and dies not. He gives Himself to us for our Communion in such a way as He gave Himself to His disciples for them to eat, since He who made Himself capable of being touched by the disciples after the resurrection when He had become incorruptible and not susceptible to touch could give Himself to them in His immortal state when He was still mortal. . . . What is hidden from our senses is revealed to faith. Human reason asks and says, What is this? How is this? It understands not how, it rises not to this secret; faith alone believes and acknowledges. The senses see bread and wine in taste and colour; faith beholds under each species its Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The senses see that which is not; faith beholds that which is. What the senses see they think inanimate, and to the senses of all living it seems a bodily food; faith beholds the living Bread which came down from heaven, the Bread of angels, the living Fount of water springing up to eternal life. Faith in love believes it is He through whom it hopes to receive the forgiveness of sins and the gift of pardon and re-creation and satisfaction in His glory.”¹

“O wonderful miracle! O marvellous and most divine Sacrament! What mind fears not? What intellect fails not? Every sense is dull; all processes of reasoning disappear. Let the searching of dialecticians be gone. It is proved and acknowledged by faith alone that the food of angels becomes the food of men. That which the priest lifts up, he lays not down. That which is lifted up and that which is laid down appear to be the same in species, in colour and taste; yet one thing appears, and another thing lies hid. It was lifted from the altar ordinary bread; it is laid down the immortal flesh of Christ. That which was natural (*animalis*) food has been made spiritual food. That which was the temporary refreshment of men has been made the eternal and unfailing satisfaction of the angels.”²

Stephen speaks of the rite itself and the details of the prayers and ceremonial as the mystical commemoration of the acts of Christ, of His passion, death, burial, resurrection, ascension and heavenly work.³ Christ once died, and is daily offered by the

¹ Cc. 15, 16 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1293, 1294).

² C. 13 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1293).

³ Cc. 12, 13, 17, 18 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1283-92, 1300-3).

Church in the presentation of His passion. That presentation is joined with Christ's own offering of Himself.

"He Himself sacrifices and is sacrificed, He Himself is the offering and the priest, because He is God and Man. His minister, because he is only man, only sacrifices and is priest. Christ the Mediator of God and man reconciles men to God; His minister makes the people acceptable to God. Christ intercedes for us at the right hand of the Father; His minister prays for the flock entrusted to him. Christ forgives sins; His minister binds and looses. Christ on the altar of the cross offered Himself to the Father a holy offering well pleasing to God; His minister offers the very same Christ on the Table of the altar. . . . So we recall His passion, resurrection, and glorious ascension." ¹

"Our redemption was accomplished when Christ suffered once for all on the cross. For by the passion of Christ we have been redeemed and delivered from the hand of hell. When through the pressure of our faults we daily fall, we rise again from this fall and are renewed by the continual (*iterata*) offering which takes place on the altar. The act of offering is repeated (*immolatio iteratur*); Christ does not die, but His passion is commemorated by His presence. . . . This oblation is not only of the priest but of the whole family, that is, the clergy and people, and not only of the congregation who are present but of the whole Church." ²

"Let us not offer our heart to God in unrighteousness, but let us lay down our heart on the altar on high, that is, in the presence of the divine majesty; and, if we live soberly and devoutly and righteously, we shall find Him gracious and propitious to us. This is that which we pray in the words which follow, 'Command that these be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel,' not that Christ by a change of place may ever be ascending to the Father, since He stands before the Father interceding for us, but that our devotion may be borne by the hands of the holy angel, that is, by Thy Son, who is Thy right hand, through whom Thou workest all things, and the Angel of great counsel, through whom Thou dost order and appoint and create and sanctify and bless all things. He is the presence of the Father, that is, the Wisdom through whom the Father acts and orders. And therefore through Him and in Him and before Him we pray that our offerings may be borne." ³

¹ C. 9 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1280, 1281).

² C. 13 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1290).

³ C. 17 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1298).

“Christ sprinkles when He sanctifies us by the pouring out of His blood. The priest sprinkles when he appeases God by this sacrifice, and the grace of pardon is bestowed. By naming the altar on high he commemorates the Holy of Holies of the Jewish law, and that Holy of Holies in which Christ once entered even by His own blood.”¹

There is much doubt whether a Sermon ascribed to Otto of Bamberg, the Apostle of Pomerania, who was appointed Bishop of Bamberg in 1103 and died in 1139, as having been delivered to him to his Pomeranian converts about 1125, is really by Otto, or is earlier than the latter half of the twelfth century; but a passage from it may be cited here as showing the teaching which either Otto himself or a later biographer thought suitable for the instruction of those who had recently been converted to Christianity. While giving instruction as to the reception of Communion and attendance at the Eucharist, it does not define the doctrine further than by saying that this Sacrament is “the true food of the soul, having in it eternal life”. The passage occurs in the course of a list of the seven Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Unction of the Sick, the Eucharist, Penance, Matrimony, and Orders.² It is as follows:—

“The fourth Sacrament is the body and blood of the Lord. This Sacrament is necessary for those who are to live and those who are to die; whether we live or die, we must always use this food for the way (*viatico*). For it is the true food of the soul, having in it eternal life. Wherefore Masses must be frequently celebrated, and you ought to assemble at them with devotion, that with some frequency (*saepius*) you may partake of this food for the way (*viatico*). If you cannot, because you are carnal, partake of this most holy thing yourselves at all Masses, at least partake through your mediator, that is, the priest, who communicates for you, by hearing Mass faithfully and reverently and devoutly. Yet you yourselves, if it cannot be more often, ought to make your confessions and communicate of the Sacrament itself at least three or four times in the year.”³

VII.

Hugh of St. Victor was born about 1097. He became Canon of St. Victor at Marseilles in 1118, and Master of the

¹ C. 18 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1302).

² For the restriction of the word Sacrament to these seven rites, see the present writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 150, 151, 318, 319.

³ *Serm. ad Pomer.* (*P.L.* clxxiii. 1358).

School of St. Victor at Paris in 1133. He died in 1141. He may rightly be regarded as the most eminent theologian of the University of Paris and of Western Christendom in general of his time. The doctrine of the Eucharist is dealt with at some length in his works *The Sum of the Sentences* and *On the Sacraments*. In *The Sum of the Sentences* he describes the Eucharist as the Sacrament in which "is taken not only grace but also He from whom all grace comes," and as the means of union with Christ and of being freed from daily sins.¹ There are three things in the Sacrament, first, the visible species of bread and wine; secondly, the real body of Christ which hung on the cross and lay in the tomb and is at the right hand of the Father; and, thirdly, the efficacy (*efficacia*) of the Sacrament, namely, the spiritual flesh of Christ and the virtue of the Sacrament.² The "form," or words by which the Sacrament is consecrated, he defines as the recital of the words "This is My body," "This is My blood".³ For the consecration three things are necessary, first, that there be a priest; secondly, that the priest say these words; and thirdly, that he apply the saying of the words to the consecration of the Sacrament as distinct from, for instance, saying them as part of an instruction. After the consecration, at which the substance of the bread is converted into the body of Christ without any increase being made in that body, the elements are not material bread and material wine but the real body and blood of Christ, though the species and taste remain as subsistences hiding the body of Christ, "which in its own form and nature really exists under them," "lying hid invisibly on the altar under a form other than its own".⁴ It is an error to hold either that the Eucharist is only a Sacrament of Christ's body and not the very substance and reality of His body or that the substance of the bread is annihilated by the body of Christ coming to be under the species of bread, the truth being that the substance of the bread is not annihilated but is converted into the substance of the body of Christ.⁵ In each species Christ is whole, and there cannot be His body without His blood or His blood without His body; and, while the two species mystically show the twofold effect of the reception of the Sacrament in availing for both body and soul, the receiving

¹ VI. 2.² VI. 2, 3.³ VI. 4.⁴ VI. 2, 4.⁵ VI. 5.

in the two kinds must not be regarded as the making of two Communion and involving a repetition of the Sacrament.¹ When the Sacrament is broken, Christ is not broken, since His body is now incorruptible and immortal and impassible; but those are not right who say that the breaking is in appearance only, it being better to say that the breaking is in regard to the species.² All communicants, whether good or bad, receive the body and blood of Christ; but only the good receive the efficacy (*rem*) and virtue of it.³ Contrary to the opinion which afterwards became usual, Hugh inclines to the view that an excommunicate or avowedly heretical priest cannot validly consecrate. In discussing this question, he incidentally calls attention to the plural number used by the officiant in not saying "I offer" but "We offer," and mentions that the offering is made "in the name (*ex persona*) of the whole Church".⁴ The method of treatment adopted by Hugh in the treatise *On the Sacraments* is somewhat different; but the doctrine taught is the same. At the institution of the Sacrament Christ by His divine power changed the bread and wine into His own body and blood; and this same change takes place through the acts of His ministers.⁵ In reply to the question whether it was His passible or impassible, His mortal or immortal, body which Christ gave to His disciples, Hugh said that in matters of this kind it was better to reverence than to search into the secrets of God; that it ought to be enough for simple faith to know that He who is almighty gave what and as in His wisdom He willed to give; but that he inclined to the belief that, though the institution was before the resurrection, yet our Lord then gave His body in that immortal and impassible state which was ordinarily to belong to it after the resurrection, the ordinarily mortal state before the resurrection being taken by Him not of necessity but of will.⁶ As in the treatise already referred to, Hugh here speaks of the three things in the Sacrament, the visible species, the reality of the body and blood, and the virtue of the spiritual grace; and of the faith and love without which the virtue and efficacy (*res*) cannot be received; and declares that "the mere reception of the body and blood without the effect" which depends on receiving worthily does not "impart salvation".⁷ The Sacrament

¹ VI. 6.² VI. 8.³ VI. 7.⁴ VI. 9.⁵ II. viii. 2.⁶ II. viii. 3.⁷ II. viii. 5, 7, 8.

is the "sign" and "image" and "figure" as well as the "reality" of the body of Christ; "under the species of bread the real flesh of Christ is taken, and when His flesh is taken worthily there is also the gift of the reception and communion and participation of His Godhead"; at the consecration "the real substance of bread and the real substance of wine are converted into the real body and blood of Christ, the species only of the bread and wine remaining, the substance passing into substance"; the conversion is "not after the manner of union but after the manner of transition," and the substance of the bread and wine is converted not annihilated.¹ Christ remains unbroken and undivided though the species is broken and divided; and He is not hurt if the species is corrupted or defiled.² In regard to questions such as those of an earlier time as to whether the body of Christ, after being received by the communicants, is subject to the ordinary processes of digestion, Hugh writes:—

"Perhaps again you inquire in thought what becomes of the body of Christ after it has been taken and eaten. Such are the thoughts of men that they are ill disposed to rest where search should least be made. Your heart then asks you, What happens to the body of Christ after I have taken and eaten it? Listen then. Do you seek for the bodily presence of Christ? Seek it in heaven. There is Christ sitting at the right hand of God the Father. He willed to be for a time with you when and as long as was necessary. He granted to you for a time His bodily presence that He might raise you to His spiritual presence. He came to you bodily and for a time gave you His bodily presence in order that through it His spiritual presence might be found, which should not be taken away. So through the flesh which He took He came of old into the world, and according to His bodily presence for a time lived among men, that He might rouse them to seek and find His spiritual presence. Afterwards, when the dispensation was completed, He departed according to His bodily presence and remained according to His spiritual presence. . . . So now in His Sacrament He comes to you for a time, and He is in it with you bodily, that you through the bodily presence may be roused to seek the spiritual presence, and may be helped to find it. When you hold His Sacrament in your hands, He is bodily with you. When you take it in your

¹ II. viii. 6-9.² II. viii. 11, 12.

mouth He is bodily with you. When you eat and taste it, He is bodily with you. Lastly, while you exercise sight and touch and taste on it, He is bodily with you. As long as the natural senses are bodily met by the Sacrament, His bodily presence is not taken away. When the bodily sense has ceased to perceive the Sacrament, then His bodily presence is no longer to be looked for, but His spiritual presence is to be kept. . . . Hereafter if you seek the bodily presence of Christ, seek it in heaven. Seek it there where it was before He began to be with you bodily through His Sacrament, and whence He did not depart when He came to you." ¹

In *The Mirror of the Mysteries of the Church*, a work formerly ascribed to Hugh of St. Victor but now usually thought to be by some other writer, the teaching on the conversion of the elements in the Eucharist into the real body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin and suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb and ascended to the right hand of the Father, is much the same as in the writers of the twelfth century generally; and the doctrine of Hugh of St. Victor on the different effects of the reception of the body and blood of Christ in good and bad communicants, and on the gift of the bodily presence being a means towards the realisation of the spiritual presence, is closely reproduced.² There are passages of some interest on both species being the one body of Christ, on the failure of logic in regard to the Eucharist, and on the sprinkling of Christ's blood, the last of these resembling language used by Hildebert of Tours.³

"Both bread and wine are converted into body and blood. But it is beyond me to define whether each is converted into both. Yet it is safer to say that the bread is converted only into the body, and the wine into the blood, than that each is converted into both, unless this should seem to contradict our belief that under each species both are taken. But this is not a difficulty, if we examine the matter more closely. For under the species of bread both body and blood can be and can be taken, not because the bread has passed into both, but because, where the body is, it is one and is not divided and is not taken in a divided fashion, and yet the species under which it is taken are separate, but they are at the same time both the body and the blood, though we speak in a divided fashion in regard to the different species. . . . Though it is usually said that the body of Christ is taken, yet whole Christ is

¹ II. viii. 13.

² C. 7 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 364-66).

³ See p. 276, *supra*.

taken, and not a part under the species of bread and a part under the species of wine, but whole here and whole there, not a part in a part but whole in a part. . . . However many parts you make, it is whole in each separate part. Marvel not at this; it is the work of God.”¹

“It was His own body and His real body which He then gave to His disciples and which is now taken and eaten at the altar, the same, I say, as that which was born of the Virgin and is now immortal in glory at the right hand of God. A marvel indeed! The flesh which is eaten below remains unbroken in the heights. Why are you springing up with your logic? What are you thinking of in this, you sophist? Why are you here hunting for arguments? That would be to sprinkle dust on the stars. Your logic does not reach so high.”²

“The high priest of old entered the Holy of Holies with blood once in the year; and Christ ‘through His own blood entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption’.³ So the minister of the Church enters with blood into the Holy of Holies as often as, bearing in mind the memory of the blood of Christ, he begins the mystery, who recalls the passion of Christ not only in mind but also by the sign of the cross, when he marks the sign of the cross at the beginning of the canon. . . . The high priest, as the law ordered, sprinkled both the altar and the outward sanctuary with the appeasing blood; and Christ sprinkles the Father with blood as often as He appeases Him through the flesh which He took. He sprinkles the altar as long as He is restoring the number of the angels. He sprinkles the outward sanctuary while He marks men and reconciles to the Father the things which are on earth. The priest also sprinkles men, because by means of this sacrifice he appeases God and pleads for pardon and so sprinkles on us. For when he cleanses us he increases the number of the citizens of heaven. And when he names the altar on high he makes mention of the Holy of Holies.”⁴

The book entitled *On the Ceremonies, Sacraments, Offices, and Observances of the Church*, which was formerly ascribed to Hugh of St. Victor, is now usually thought to have been written by Robert Paululus about 1178. As in other writings of this period, the prayers and ceremonies of the ordinary and canon of the Mass are here regarded as the mystical representation of the Incarnation

¹ C. 7 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 361, 362, 364).

² C. 7 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 362).

³ Heb. ix. 12.

⁴ C. 7 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 369, 370).

and death and resurrection and heavenly life of Christ. The signing of the elements with the cross is mostly taken as a mystical reference to the work of the Holy Trinity in effecting the consecration, towards which this action is partly an instrument and partly a witness, though not without allusion also to Christ and His wounds.¹ The bread and wine are said to be changed and transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ.² It may be worth while to quote passages on the effect of consecration, on some aspects of the offering of the sacrifice, and on the mystical meaning of the ceremonies of the elevation and covering of the consecrated elements and the commixture.

“At these words ‘This is My body’ the food of the body is made spiritual food by the operation of divine power and human love, surpassing all human reason; the power of boundless majesty descends on the bread and wine; we receive the real divinity and humanity of Christ, who reigns in heaven, as truly as we can obtain from the sun the real substance of fire by a small ball containing crystal.”³

“The golden altar [in the Jewish tabernacle] signifies the altar of faith in the heart that is purged by penitence, and bright and clear with the testimony of a good conscience. . . . On this altar the priest, now dead to the world but living to God, no longer the old Melchizedek, flesh born of flesh, but the new man, spirit born of spirit, offers the invisible offering of flesh and blood through the oblation of earthly food. For what is more fittingly said to be offered on the altar of faith than that most holy sacrifice which is perceived only by faith, and only through faith profits, and through the merit of faith is accepted? . . . Beyond the veil was the ark of the covenant, and on it the mercy seat. . . . The ark signifies the manhood of Christ, which is beyond the veil, because Christ has ascended beyond the heaven and sits on the right hand of the Father. . . . The mercy seat on the ark is the propitiation of God on Christ. . . . Or the mercy seat is the mercy of God by which He is propitious to His people. . . . To this ark, to this mercy seat, the new priest . . . earnestly desires to approach. . . . The priest with his mind raised to heaven, but recognising his own weakness, seeing with the eyes of his heart the angels standing on the mercy seat as ready to aid, prays that his sacrifice may so be uplifted thither that he himself

¹ II. 29, 31, 37 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 430, 431, 434).

² II. 11, 36 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 416, 434).

³ II. 32 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 431).

may be joined and united to God, and through spiritual union may be made one spirit with Him." ¹

"After the oblation of the real and perfect sacrifice on the same altar of faith he offers the sacrifice of prayer, and seeks something still higher, for whom nothing is enough until he is united to God in heaven through the body of Christ and joined to the Godhead through the manhood. For he who has set up a ladder for himself desires to ascend it. . . . Since to that supreme altar on high of the invisible mercy seat, as being in the presence of the majesty of God, where the eternal High Priest stands before God the Father, he cannot yet ascend as he would, as he himself shows when he bends himself before the visible altar, he prays that by the hands of the angel, that is, his own guardian angel, his sacrifice may be borne thither, so that he may receive the virtue of the Sacrament itself, and through the body of Christ, which is in heaven and is received on earth from the visible altar, he may attain to the supreme mercy of God and may be counted worthy to be united with Him." ²

"That the priest may show how through Christ the minds of the faithful attain to the glory of the Trinity, he depicts as fully as he can the mystery of the passion. After the signs of the cross he raises on high with both his hands the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and then puts it down, which signifies the raising of the body of Christ on the cross and the laying of the same body in the tomb. Wherefore also he covers the cup with the pall of the corporal, which signifies the wrapping in the linen cloths. For up to this point the cup has been covered for the sake of security, but now it is covered for the sake of the mystical significance." ³

"The third part [that is, of the consecrated bread when broken at the solemn fraction at the close of the Lord's prayer], which is placed in the cup, is the propitiation for the living; and that flesh mingled with the blood atones for the work of flesh and blood. Of the other two parts one is the propitiation for the faithful departed, who need our prayers, who are still detained in penalties; the other is the giving of thanks for those who are already triumphing. Yet Pope Sergius speaks differently on this. For he considers that the commixture of the body and blood signifies the union of the body and soul of Christ which took place at the resurrection." ⁴

Another book formerly ascribed to Hugh of St. Victor but now usually thought to be by a different writer is that entitled

¹ II. 27, 28 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 428, 429).

² II. 33, 34 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 432).

³ II. 38 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 435).

⁴ II. 39 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 436).

On the Canon of the Mystic Libation and its Parts. This book may be by John of Cornouailles, and, if so, may have been written about 1170. In it the bread and wine are said to be translated and transformed into the body and blood of Christ; the substance of the bread and wine is said to pass into and become His real body and blood; our Lord is described as consecrating and making His flesh and blood from bread and wine.¹ The need of receiving worthily, if there is to be spiritual profit, is very strongly emphasised; and the last sentence of the book is that "we shall be counted worthy to be delivered by the healthful sacrifice after death, if before death we ourselves have been a sacrifice to God".² The Eucharist is viewed as a commemoration of the passion and resurrection and ascension;³ and the prayers and ceremonies of the canon of the Mass are interpreted with a wealth of mystical significance indicative of the attributes and acts and gifts of God and the qualities needed in those who are to communicate worthily. To give one instance of this mystical interpretation, the bread and wine and water are said to be significant of "the efficacy (*res*) and virtue" of the Sacrament as denoting faith and hope and love, without which there cannot be profitable reception; of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost; and of purity, strength and activity, and a right intention, which again are needed for a right approach to the altar.⁴

VIII.

Rupert of Deutz, after being a monk at Liège, became Abbot of Deutz in 1120, and died there in 1135. His most important works are expositions of Holy Scripture of a highly mystical character, which are marked by great spiritual insight and power. In addition to statements of an ordinary kind as to the change and translation of the bread and wine into the real flesh and blood of Christ, which hung on the cross and flowed from His side,⁵ they contain passages of some importance on the relation

¹ Cc. 2, 5, 10 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 459, 462, 463, 469, 470).

² Cc. 2, 10 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 459, 470). Cf. a different way of expressing a similar thought in St. Gregory the Great, *Dial.* iv. 60, quoted on p. 196, *supra*.

³ C. 6 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 463). ⁴ C. 2 (*P.L.* clxxvii. 559).

⁵ See, e.g., *In Lev.* i. 16; *In S. Spir.* iii. 21; *Comm. in Cant. Cant.* i; *Comm. in Ioan.* vi. vii. (*P.L.* clxvii. 760, 1662, clxviii. 860, 861, clxix. 468, 481, 495).

of the elements to Christ's body and blood, and of the Eucharistic presence and sacrifice to the passion of Christ.

"In the mount of vision, that is, in the Holy Catholic Church, outside which no one will ever see God, the same Son is continually offered to God the Father, and yet remains immortal and impassible. For in this way of offering there is a resemblance to the sacrifice of the holy and faithful patriarch [that is, Abraham in the sacrifice of Isaac], because as in that case so also in this case there is no blood poured forth of a son slain by the hands of cruel men but the same Son abiding living and unbroken is presented to God the Father by the hands of the faithful, and is received in their mouths. . . . He [that is, Abraham] carries fire and sword, because without the fire of the Holy Ghost no one is worthy to approach so great a mystery, and without the sword of the word this sacrifice of salvation is not offered. Christ is present as was Isaac according to His own words of truth, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them'.¹ . . . Whole is He present, whole He lies on the sacred altar, not that He may suffer again but that His passion may be presented as a memorial (*memoriter repræsentetur*) to faith, to which all past things are present. Christ is again offered and yet remains impassible and living, as Isaac was offered and yet was untouched by the sword. The bread is broken for Him and is eaten; but, though that bread is now Christ Himself, yet Christ remains whole and living. How is it, you ask, that the bread which is seen is Christ? I reply: As any kind of metal, for instance gold or silver, when it is melted and liquid by strong fire, is really gold and is also said to be and is fire. For it appears to be gold, and it is what it was; and yet it is most truly called fire, and it is what it was not. Therefore assuredly the bread which is brought to and plunged in the fearful and ineffable mystery of the passion of Christ still appears to be the bread which it was, and yet in reality it is Christ, which it was not. . . . As Isaac was offered, and yet was not slain, so also Christ is offered, but He is sacrificed after an impassible and immortal fashion."²

"Roast with fire,"³ that is, burnt by the travail of the passion. Wherefore, because the very force of the passion gives greater strength for the resurrection, the psalmist says in the person of Christ, 'My strength is dried up like a potsherd'.⁴ For what is a potsherd before it goes through the fire but soft mud? But from

¹ St. Matt. xviii. 20.

² *In Gen.* vi. 32 (*P.L.* clxvii. 430-32).

³ Ex. xii. 9.

⁴ Ps. xxii. 15.

fire it gains solidity. Thus the power of Christ's manhood as a potsherd was dry, because from the fire of the passion it grew to the power of incorruption. More fully, because the Virgin conceived Him of the Holy Ghost, who is eternal fire, and He Himself through the same Holy Ghost, as the Apostle says, offered Himself a living sacrifice to the living God,¹ by the same fire is the roasting on the altar, for by the operation of the Holy Ghost the bread becomes the body and the wine the blood of Christ. This cannot human wisdom understand. . . . You must assign all to the operation of the Holy Ghost, whose work is not to destroy or corrupt any substance which He takes for His own uses but, while the good of the substance remains what it was, to add invisibly what it was not. As God did not destroy human nature when, by His operation in the Virgin's womb, He united it to the Word, so He does not change or destroy the substance of bread and wine according to the outward species of which the five senses are cognisant, when He unites it to the body of the Word which hung on the cross and to the blood which He shed from His side. Again, as the Word sent down from on high was made flesh not by being changed into flesh but by taking flesh, so the bread and wine raised on high from below become the body and blood of Christ not by being changed into the taste of flesh or into the horror of blood but by taking invisibly the reality of each part, that is, the divine and the human, of the immortal substance which is in Christ. Therefore, as we, according to the true and Catholic belief, acknowledge that the Man who had His nature from the Virgin and hung on the cross is God, so we truly say that what we receive from the holy altar is Christ, and we proclaim it as the Lamb of God."²

"He who approaches unworthily does not partake of the sufferings of Christ, and does not hold with the mouth of his mind that which he receives with the mouth of his body. . . . This visible Sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, which he receives with the mouth, for his unworthiness cannot destroy the worth of so great a consecration, but he does not obtain the efficacy (*rem*) of the Sacrament, because he does not regard the passion of Christ with his mind and with faith working by love."³

"All water, whether of the sea or of rivers or of springs or of cisterns or of lakes, all water, I say, whencesoever it has been taken or produced, is one according to substance. When, therefore,

¹ Eph. v. 2 ; Heb. ix. 14.

² *In Ex.* ii. 10 (*P.L.* clxvii. 617, 618).

³ *De S. Spir.* iii. 22 (*P.L.* clxvii. 1664).

whencesoever it has been taken, it is brought to the Sacrament of the crucified Lord, the reason of the faithful does not doubt that it is the very same as that which, as I said before, our Lord shed from His side. But what is it according to substance except water? Water drawn up by the roots ascends through the vines, and, gradually invigorated by the heat of the sun, becomes wine. Again, since man is made up out of the four elements, blood is in him from the substance of water. And so wine and blood are from the same substance of moisture, and to neither of these is the element of fire lacking. For blood is warm and wine is glowing. Only in colour and taste do they differ, and, since these are accidents, they are of no importance in divine acts. For substances, not accidents, are reckoned in the number of creatures." ¹

"It is possible for one to eat unworthily, but no one ought to eat unworthily. For the bread which has once been consecrated never afterwards loses the effect of consecration or ceases to be the flesh of Christ, but it does not in any way profit one who is unworthy." ²

Rupert's treatise *On the Divine Offices* contains comments on the prayers and ceremonies of the ordinary and canon of the Mass in which the rite is represented as a memorial of the Incarnation and passion and resurrection and ascension of our Lord. As in his expositions of Holy Scripture, he speaks of the consecrated bread and wine as the real body and blood of Christ.³ The same illustration of the production of the real substance of fire from the sun by a crystal as is used by Robert Paululus⁴ occurs here.⁵ The following passages are of some special interest:—

"The holy Church, offering the new and real sacrifice, offers not only the bread and wine, which are bodily seen, but also that which is not seen except by the eyes of faith, the Word of God, the Son of God." ⁶

"The matter or substance of the sacrifice which was then and now is in the hands of our High Priest is not simple, as our High Priest Himself is not of divine substance only or of human substance only. For both in the High Priest and in the sacrifice there is a divine substance and there is an earthly substance. In each there is an earthly substance, that which can be seen in a bodily or local way.

¹ *Comm. in Ioan.* vi. (P.L. clxix. 462).

³ I. 23, II. 2 (P.L. clxx. 26, 33, 35).

⁵ II. 5 (P.L. clxx. 38).

² *Ibid.* 470.

⁴ See p. 289, *supra*.

⁶ II. 2 (P.L. clxx. 34).

In each there is a divine substance, the Word invisible, who in the beginning was God with God. For when the same High Priest, holding bread and wine, said 'This is My body,' 'This is My blood,' it was the voice of the Word incarnate, the voice of the eternal beginning, the Word of ancient counsel. The Word who had taken human nature, that is, remaining in the flesh, took the substance of bread and wine with His life as instrument and united the bread to His flesh and the wine to His blood. . . . The Word of the Father coming between the flesh and blood, which He took from the Virgin's womb, and the bread and wine, which He took from the altar, makes one sacrifice. When the priest distributes this to the mouths of the faithful, the bread and wine are consumed and pass away. But the Son of the Virgin with the Word of the Father united to Him both in heaven and among men remains whole and unconsumed. But he who is without faith obtains nothing from the sacrifice besides the visible species of bread and wine. . . . He who eats the visible bread of the sacrifice and drives away from his heart that which is invisible by his want of faith, slays Christ, because he separates life from that which has been made alive, and with his teeth tears the dead body of the sacrifice, and in this way is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." ¹

"He commands these to be borne by the hands of His holy angel to His altar on high and to be in the presence of His divine majesty unlocally and invisibly. For the unlocal and invisible majesty is everywhere, His altar on high is everywhere, which is the faith of the Catholic Church." ²

IX.

Peter Abelard was born at Pallet near Nantes in 1079 and after a career of strange and varied vicissitudes died at the Abbey of St. Marcel near Chalons-sur-Saone in 1142. A man of great genius and intellectual subtlety, he was one of the most famous philosophical teachers of his time. As a theologian he was held in ill repute, and some of his opinions were condemned at councils held at Soissons in 1121 and at Sens in 1140 and afterwards by Pope Innocent II. In his treatise *Christian Theology* he says incidentally that "it is not yet clear that there

¹ II. 2 (P.L. clxx. 40, 41).

² II. 13 (P.L. clxx. 44). See also the account of the miraculous preservation of the Sacrament among the ruins from the fire in *De incendio oppidi Tuitii*, 5 (P.L. clxx. 337).

has been an end of that supreme controversy concerning the Sacrament of the altar, whether the bread which is seen is only a figure of the Lord's body or is also the reality of the substance itself of the Lord's flesh".¹ In the book entitled *Yes and No* he arranged statements of earlier Christian writers on 158 subjects with the intention of showing that there had been wide diversities in Christian thought, and placed a large number of passages under the heading "Concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, that it is essentially the reality itself of the flesh and blood of Christ, and the contrary".² In the *Epitome of Christian Theology*—which, if not by Abelard himself, probably represents his opinions—there is a chapter entitled "Concerning the Sacrament of the altar". It contains statements that the Sacrament was instituted to keep Christians in mind of the passion and death of Christ; that after consecration the bread is the "real body of Christ, or rather Christ Himself"; that at the institution and at subsequent celebrations the gift to each communicant is of the whole and unbroken body of Christ; and that "many are of Christ's body who do not receive this Sacrament, while many receive it who are not His members". There is a brief reference to the question whether the body which our Lord gave to the disciples at the institution was in the passible or the impassible state; and it is said that on this point there is nothing defined by authority, and that Christ "gave it such as He willed; for, if He willed to give it to them in the immortal state, He could well even at that time assume impassibility".³ In regard to the fraction of the Sacrament the words are:—

"Concerning that fraction which is there seen a doubt is sometimes raised whether the body of Christ itself, as it is really there, so also is broken in reality. But we say that as there seems to be bread and is not, and as there seems to be wine when nevertheless there is not wine, so the body of Christ seems to be broken, though it undergoes no breaking and suffers no division. Neither is it the case that this appearance is a phantasm, because its object is not to promote deception or an error of faith, but to bestow the Sacrament."⁴

¹ Lib. iv. (*P.L.* clxxviii. 1286).

² C. 117 (*P.L.* clxxviii. 1518-37).

³ C. 29 (*P.L.* clxxviii. 1740-43).

⁴ *Ibid.* 1742.

This somewhat obscure statement was probably meant to express the same opinion as that held by Hugh of St. Victor¹ and others, that, when the Sacrament is broken, the fraction is not of the body of Christ but of the species.

A different, and apparently more unusual, view was maintained in a book called *On the Fraction of the Body of Christ* by Abbaud, the abbot of an unknown monastery, which is thought to have been published about 1130. Abbaud contends that it is involved in the reality of the presence of the real body of Christ that it is really broken in the Sacrament on earth, though it abides whole and unbroken in heaven. In reply to the objection that such a position is self-contradictory, "since it predicates of one and the same body that it abides unbroken and that it is broken," he dwells on the marvellous capacities of Christ's body and on the power of God:—

"The weakness of man is not able to set the bounds of the power of God, though rash attempts to do so are made. For the things which are impossible with men are possible with God. Is this the only thing which is asserted about the body of Christ that is contrary to human reason, and impossible according to the law of human bodies? Is it not asserted of the same body that in the mystery of His birth He came forth to the eyes of men from the closed womb of the Virgin, and in His resurrection entered in to His disciples when the doors were shut, and showed Himself to them as susceptible of touch and also incorruptible? Lo, here are three marvels, that this one may not be alone but may be a fourth of those which reason grasps not, while faith allows them to the power of God. Let others think as seems well to them; but to me it is devout and good to think that the body which the great and incomprehensible height of Deity willed to make its own very far excels not only mortal bodies but even immortal and heavenly bodies by a certain ineffable and unique and divine power. To wish to reason about that body according to the law of other bodies is to seek the living among the dead."²

"As with God in regard to time a thousand years are as one day, and one day is as a thousand years, so also in regard to place it is truly said that a thousand places or as many as you will or even all places are with God as one place. For Him, who is always and everywhere wholly present, local absence can make nothing

¹ See pp. 271, 285, *supra*.

² P.L. clxvi. 1344.

absent, local distance can make nothing distant, local division can divide nothing. That then which is broken with us, because it is locally divided, remains unbroken with God, to whom all places are one place."¹

A book against the teaching of Abelard in general, entitled *Disputation against Peter Abelard*, was written by William of St. Thierry, who was a native of Liège, became Abbot of the Cluniac Monastery of St. Thierry near Reims in 1119, resigned that office and joined the Cistercian Order in 1134, and died at Signy in 1148. One chapter of it refers to the doctrine of the Eucharist. In this chapter a view ascribed to Abelard,² that on the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ "the accidents of the former substance remain in the air," is rejected, and it is suggested that the accidents of the bread and wine

"are in the body of the Lord, not forming it but by the power of the wisdom of God working in them fitting and shaping it, so that according to the rite of the mystery and the way of a Sacrament it may be able to be moved and handled and tasted in a different form, which could not happen in its own form, the accidents working outwardly so that it may be handled and taken bodily, and grace working inwardly so that it may be taken incorruptibly and may have a savour to the believer and may spiritually quicken and nourish him who has love."³

William adds that anything which may befall the Sacrament through carelessness or ignorance happens to the accidents and not to the body of Christ; and that the body of Christ is far removed from the possibility of any such injury.⁴

William of St. Thierry also wrote a treatise *On the Sacrament of the Altar* addressed to Rupert of Deutz in protest against one element in his teaching about the Eucharist. William asserts with the greatest explicitness against Rupert that the substance of the bread is wholly changed into the substance of the body of Christ; that, though the species remain, the bread ceases to be bread; and that the accidents of the bread and wine are without

¹ P.L. clxvi. 1346.

² See *Capitula Hæresum Petri Abelardi*, 9, inter opp. S. Bern. (P.L. clxxxii. 1052).

³ C. 9 (P.L. clxxx. 280)

⁴ *Ibid.* 281.

a substance of their own in the consecrated Sacrament.¹ The most prominent parts of the treatise are those in which William writes on the manhood of our Lord, and on the need of receiving the Eucharist worthily if there is to be the spiritual and profitable partaking of that body of Christ which is taken in Communion. From these parts the following quotations may be made:—

“ In considering the flesh of Christ in the mysteries we ought not to be wise after the flesh. For ‘ though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more ’.² And again we ought not so to lessen the reality of the flesh by a kind of spiritual search as by a sort of reasoning to seem to destroy His nature which was united to the Word of God but yet was not changed into the Word. For ‘ Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever ’;³ and He glorified that nature, in which He partook of flesh and blood so as to be made like unto His brethren in all things as a merciful High Priest, in such a way that He did not destroy it; He advanced it in such a way as not to empty it. For the body of God must be thought of as it is, of our nature but of another glory. For, if the body of our lowliness will be made glorious and spiritual in the resurrection, inasmuch as it will be dignified by spiritual power and incorruption and glory, how much more is that body in which dwells bodily all the fulness of Godhead glorious and spiritual, the body of Him who rose the first fruits from the dead, even Christ? If in us it will hereafter be, that whatever is mortal will be removed from our life, and whatever is human will be changed to a better state of its own nature, so that what is now spirit and soul and body will then be all spiritual or spirit, how much more did He, who from the natures united together is the substance (*res*) of both natures, lacking neither, being Christ God and Man in both, when by the power of His resurrection He made an end of those things in Him which belonged to the passible and mortal man, advance that form which was to be enriched with the increase of so great glory to such a point in Himself that, as the Apostle says, He exalted it and gave it ‘ the name which is above every name ’.⁴ . . . If the power of authority and the devotion of faith have made it credible that that body entered in and passed out through ways that were closed, I do not see what can make it incredible that that body has been and is capable of other things which are beyond the nature

¹ Pref., c. 3 (*P.L.* clxxx. 341, 342, 349, 350).

² 2 Cor. v. 16.

³ Heb. xiii. 8.

⁴ Phil. ii. 9.

of bodies. . . . Why is it difficult to believe that the nature of flesh, which is so united to that supreme nature that the possessions of the one belong to the other, is able through divine power especially after the glorifying of the resurrection to be in different places at a not different time? . . . Although His bodily elevation, whereby that nature was raised above the heavens, is undoubtedly to be believed, yet the exaltation, whereby He is believed to have been exalted above the heaven of heavens, is to be understood as so great a verity that He be believed to be glorified in dignity and glory and power above all heavenly beings. For He has sat down, as the Apostle says, 'on the right hand of the majesty on high, having become by so much better than the angels as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they'.¹ Now this right hand is to be understood in no other way than those better things which that majesty possesses. Yet I do not say that that nature of the Lord's body is everywhere, because there is no need for it to be except where He wills, and where by a fixed Sacrament of the faith He accomplishes the work for which it was taken and glorified, namely the mystery of the salvation of men. . . . God alone is necessarily everywhere, because, since all things consist in Him, nothing could be where He was not, and therefore there is an inevitable necessity that the presence of His substance and power is everywhere. . . . At one moment the Lord Christ, while He was resting in the tomb, was in heaven and on earth and everywhere, but according to His Godhead; at the same moment of time He was resting in the tomb, but according to the flesh alone; at the same time He was in Hades delivering His own, but according to the soul alone; at the same time He was sitting in heaven at the right hand of the Father, but according to the Godhead alone; and, if we should ask about any one of these things, it must be plainly answered that the Lord Christ did it, but according to the peculiar nature of each substance. But the present question is not about this presence of His body. According to that presence of which we had begun to treat, the Lord is present at one time in different places in His body, by an incomprehensible and indescribable way made certain to faith, wherever the need of human salvation requires."²

"From His flesh He brings to our souls so great resources for loving Him, and supplies them with great and wonderful and living nourishment. We take this nourishment with eager feeding when we sweetly remember and hide in our memory what Christ did and suffered for us. And this is the banquet of the flesh and blood of

¹ Heb. i. 3, 4.

² C. 1 (*P.L.* clxxx. 345-48).

Jesus, from which he who partakes of it has life abiding in him. And we partake of it when with burning faith which works through love we lay on the Table of the Lord such things as we have received thence, namely, that, as He gave Himself for our salvation without any necessity constraining Him, so we commit ourselves wholly to His faith and love as our salvation demands. . . . The good guest of Christ abides in Christ through the affection of devout love, and has Christ abiding in him through the effect of the holy rite. . . . The more one loves, the more he eats this food ; and again by loving more he eats more and more, and loves more and more, though of this love in this life we only receive a pledge, waiting for the fulness of it as the reward in the future world. Lo, this is to eat that flesh of which Jesus says, ' He that eateth My flesh abideth in Me, and I in him '.¹ . . . Without doubt the body of the Lord always becomes present on the Table of the altar when that solemn rite is duly celebrated ; but He does not always come to those through whom He comes. . . . Not all who eat bodily are filled spiritually with that heavenly blessing and grace."²

X.

The writings of St. Bernard, the famous Abbot of Clairvaux, who was born in 1091, became a monk at Citeaux in 1118, founded the monastery of Clairvaux in 1115, and died in 1153, considering their large amount, contain surprisingly few allusions to the Eucharist. But there is sufficient to show his agreement with the writers of his time in general in their insistence on the reality of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist and on the spiritual character of this presence. In one of his *Letters* he speaks of the effect of consecration being to make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, and expresses his opinion that in a case where through forgetfulness there was no wine in the chalice the bread had none the less been made Christ's body by the consecration.³ In his *Life of St. Malachy*, the Archbishop of Armagh, he refers incidentally to the celebration of the Eucharist as the offering of "the living Bread from heaven" ; and tells of the refutation by St. Malachy of one who had "presumed to say that in the Eucharist there is only a Sacrament and not the fact (*rem*) of a Sacrament, that is, only the blessing and not the reality of the body".⁴ In his *Sermons* he says that

¹ St. John vi. 56.² Cc. 5-7 (*P.L.* clxxx. 352, 353).³ *Ep.* lxi. 2, 3.⁴ Cc. 5, 26.

“the Bread which came down from heaven and gives life to the world, namely the body of the Lord Jesus,” “the new flesh of the resurrection,” is received in Communion; that “the flesh of the Lamb” “is given to us spiritually not carnally”; that “the real substance of the flesh itself is undoubtedly present to us in the Sacrament”; and that, though in the Sacrament we have the Word in the flesh and as a reality, yet “without spirit even the Sacrament is taken to judgment, and the flesh profits nothing, and the letter kills, and faith is dead”.¹

Robert Pulleyn, afterwards Cardinal and Chancellor at Rome, was teaching at Oxford in 1133. The eighth book of his *Sentences* contains some discussions about the Eucharist. It is spoken of as a sacrifice.² At the institution our Lord consecrated bread and wine to be His body and blood.³ As then given, the Sacrament was the mortal body of the Lord, but was possessed of the qualities of His immortal body.⁴ At the consecration the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood of Christ, so that they pass into a different nature. The substance of bread and wine ceases to be, but the properties which the senses can discern remain. Christ is taken whole in each part of each species. At the breaking of the consecrated Sacrament, the body of Christ is not broken.⁵ The special significance in the blood is of the soul.⁶ The reception by the laity in one kind only is a matter within the competence of the Church to decide; and in receiving the flesh of Christ they receive also His blood.⁷

Peter the Venerable became Abbot of Cluny in 1122 and died in 1156. Among his writings is a treatise against the followers of Peter of Bruis, who had denied that the Eucharist is a rite of value which ought to be retained in the Church. The substances of the bread and the wine, it is here said, are converted into the real body and blood of the Lord.⁸ This change of substance takes place by the power of the Word of God; it does not involve a change of species or form.⁹ The Sacrament is a sign which is what it denotes, a reality and

¹ *In vig. nat. Dom. serm.* i. 6; *In fest. S. Martini Episc. serm.* 10, 11; *In Cantica serm.* xxxiii. 3.

² VIII. 2.

³ VIII. 2.

⁴ VIII. 4.

⁵ VIII. 5.

⁶ VIII. 2.

⁷ VIII. 3.

⁸ *P.L.* clxxxix. 799, 801-6.

⁹ *Ibid.* 804-6.

not a shadow or figure.¹ By it Christ is present not only as God but also as man.² When His flesh is eaten, He remains unbroken, immortal, incorruptible, the Object of adoration, and by means of His immortal body He leads those who are mortal to immortality.³ The reality of His flesh and blood remains hidden in the species of bread and wine.⁴ He gives His flesh and blood not only to be honoured and adored but also to be eaten and drunk, so that this spiritual food and drink may enable men to attain to a blessed immortal life.⁵ In this Sacrament the Church has a sacrifice, and in it offers the body and blood of its Redeemer.⁶ The sacrifice of Christians throughout the world is one; and the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, is the only Victim on Christian altars.⁷ It is a presentation of the passion and death of the Lord.⁸ It was once for all offered on the cross, and is ever offered on the altar.⁹ It was instituted in order that there might be a means to preserve the memory of Christ.¹⁰ Although He is offered on the altar, and although there is a presentation of His death, He does not suffer pain or death.¹¹ If it asked why it is a presentation of His death rather than of His resurrection or ascension, the answer is that by His death He restored life to the dead and saved the world.¹² The presentation is made through the presence on the altar of the flesh which suffered on the cross, and the blood which then was shed.¹³ There is in it a renewal of redemption, and a daily remission of sins to those who are penitent.¹⁴

XI.

The *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the "Master of the Sentences," who became Bishop of Paris in 1158 and died in 1160, was one of the most famous and one of the most influential of mediæval works. It bears the marks of a conviction that, while authority must decide as to matters of faith, Christian theology is able, if rightly considered, to approve itself to the deeper instincts of human reason; and that objections to it

¹ *P.L.* clxxxix. 814.

² *Ibid.* 812.

³ *Ibid.* 814.

⁴ *Ibid.* 815.

⁵ *Ibid.* 816.

⁶ *Ibid.* 789, 808.

⁷ *Ibid.* 796.

⁸ *Ibid.* 796.

⁹ *Ibid.* 798.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 811.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 812.

¹² *Ibid.* 813.

¹³ *Ibid.* 813.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 813.

and difficulties in the way of accepting it are matters for discussion and argument. Concerning the Eucharist, Peter Lombard carried further and gave the support of his influence to the attempt, found among writers of the Church from the time of Lanfranc downwards, to use "the realistic distinction between the substance—the impalpable universal which was held to inhere in every particular included under it—and the accidents or sensible properties which came into existence when the pure Form clothed itself in Matter,"¹ in the interests of a doctrine which should at the same time maintain the traditional teaching that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ and avoid carnal notions which tended to impair the spiritual character of the presence thus affirmed. Apart from the direct quotations from the fathers which form a large part of his work, much which he says reproduces the thought and the language of earlier writers already referred to; but his special importance justifies a brief statement as to the whole of his teaching in regard to the Eucharist. The Eucharist, he says, "gives spiritual refreshment"; in it "He who is the fount and source of all grace is wholly taken"; "this heavenly food leads to heaven the faithful who are passing through the desert of this world, and is rightly called food for the journey (*viaticum*) because it refreshes us on the way and brings us to our country".² At the recital of the words "This is My body," "This is My blood," "the conversion of the bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ takes place".³ "The thing which is signified and contained is the flesh of Christ, which He took from the Virgin, and the blood which He shed for us," as distinct from "the thing which is signified and not contained," namely, "the unity of the Church"; and a distinction must be made between "the Sacrament and not the thing," that is, "the visible species of bread and wine," "the Sacrament and the thing," that is, "Christ's own flesh and blood," and "the thing and not the Sacrament," that is, "the mystical flesh of Christ".⁴ There are "two ways of eating" the Sacrament, the "sacramental," by which both good and bad partake, and the "spiritual," by which only the good partake;⁵ so that "the flesh of Christ which was

¹ Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 47.

² *Ibid.* viii. 1.

³ *Ibid.* 3.

⁴ *Ibid.* 4.

⁵ *Ibid.* ix. 1.

taken from the Virgin, and the blood which was shed for us, are taken by the good not only sacramentally but also spiritually, while they are taken by the bad only sacramentally, that is, under the Sacrament, that is, under the visible species";¹ and "it is clear that the body of Christ is taken by good and bad, but by the good to salvation, by the bad to destruction".² Peter Lombard emphatically condemns the view that "on the altar there is not the body of Christ or His blood, and that the substance of the bread and wine is not converted into the substance of flesh and blood," and that "the body of Christ is there only by way of Sacrament, that is, by way of sign, and is eaten by us only by way of sign".³ "The body of Christ is in one place," that is, "in heaven," "visibly in human form"; "His reality, that is, His divinity, is everywhere"; "His reality, that is, His real body, is on every altar where the Sacrament is celebrated".⁴ "The real body and blood of Christ are on the altar, or rather the whole Christ is there under each species; and the substance of the bread is converted into the body, and the substance of the wine into the blood."⁵ Whether the conversion at the consecration is "formal" or "substantial" or "of some other kind" Peter Lombard says that he is unable to define, but that he cannot regard it as "formal" since the species remain, and that the teaching of authority seems to point to it being "substantial".⁶ He rejects the views that "the bread passes into the body of Christ" in such a way that "the substance of bread and wine" "is resolved into pre-existing matter or is reduced to nothing," and that "the substance of the bread and wine remain" so that it is there as well as the substance of the body and blood of Christ; on the contrary, after consecration "there is no substance there except that of the body and blood of Christ," "though the species remain".⁷ The reason why, when Christ is wholly received under either kind, the Sacrament is taken in two kinds is as a sign that He "took the whole of human nature in order to redeem the whole; for bread is related to flesh, and wine to the soul, because wine makes blood, in which the scientists say is the seat of the soul"; "though Christ is received whole in either kind, yet the conversion of the

¹ IV. ix. 2.² IV. ix. 3.³ IV. x. 1.⁴ IV. x. 2.⁵ IV. x. 4.⁶ IV. xi. 1.⁷ IV. xi. 4.

bread is only into flesh, and the conversion of the wine is only into blood".¹ At the institution of the Sacrament our Lord gave to His disciples "such a body as He then had, that is, mortal and passible; but it is now taken by us immortal and impassible".² In considering the question in what subject the accidents, which remain after the consecration, are, Peter Lombard inclines to the opinion that "they exist without a subject rather than that they are in a subject".³ He regards it as a misunderstanding of the declaration imposed on Berengar⁴ to suppose that the body of Christ itself is broken and divided; the fraction is real and not apparent only, but is of the species of bread not of the substance of the body of Christ, "since the body of Christ is incorruptible".⁵ In the mystical significance of the ceremonies of the rite "the fraction is a representation of the passion and death of Christ".⁶ Evil priests validly consecrate, because "the consecration is effected not by the merit of the consecrator but by the word of the Creator"; but Peter Lombard differs from the opinion that has been usual in saying, like Hugh of St. Victor, that an excommunicate or avowedly heretical priest cannot validly consecrate; like Hugh of St. Victor again he alludes to the use of the plural number "we offer" not the singular "I offer" as marking that the priest consecrates "in the person of the Church". He holds it a possible view that, if the Sacrament is eaten by an irrational animal, "the body of Christ is not taken," though he can only answer the inquiry as to what in that case is taken and eaten by saying "God knows".⁷ It may be well to quote the passage in which, in addition to the brief reference to the mystical commemoration of the passion in the ceremonies of the rite already mentioned, Peter Lombard treats of the sacrifice in the Eucharist:—

"It is next inquired whether that which the priest does is properly called a sacrifice or offering, and whether Christ is daily offered or has been offered once only. To this it can be said shortly that what is presented and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and an oblation, because it is the memorial and representation of the real sacrifice and holy offering which was made on the altar of the cross. On the cross Christ died once, and there was He offered

¹ IV. xi. 6.² IV. xi. 8.³ IV. xii. 1.⁴ See p. 247, *supra*.⁵ IV. xii. 2-5.⁶ IV. xii. 6.⁷ IV. xiii. 1.

in Himself; in the Sacrament He is offered daily, because in the Sacrament there is the commemoration of that which was done once. . . . This commemoration is not repeated for the sake of His weakness, for He perfects human nature, but for the sake of ours, because we sin daily. Hence it is gathered that what is done on the altar is and is called a sacrifice; and that Christ has been offered once and is offered daily, but in one way at that time, in another way now. And also it is shown what is the virtue of this Sacrament, namely, the remission of venial sins and the perfecting of virtues."¹

It is important to notice that, though thus preserving the teaching that the Eucharistic sacrifice is a commemoration of the passion of Christ, Peter Lombard does not refer to the commemoration mentioned by many writers of our Lord's whole incarnate life including His resurrection and ascension or to the connection of the Eucharist with His heavenly offering.

XII.

Peter of Poitiers was a disciple of Peter Lombard. He was appointed Chancellor of Paris in 1193. He died in 1205. He wrote a treatise of five books of *Sentences*, in which four chapters relate to the Eucharist. In these chapters Peter of Poitiers teaches that the bread and wine are changed at the consecration into the body and blood of Christ which He took of the Blessed Virgin, while their properties remain. He uses the words "Transubstantiation" and "transubstantiate" freely. He explains that the body of Christ in the Sacrament is held and eaten and crushed by the teeth and broken in the same sense in which it is said to be seen "because the form of bread under which it is veiled is seen". The body itself "remains whole and incorruptible": it is the glorified body in the immortal and impassible state which ensued on the resurrection.² On the Eucharistic sacrifice Peter of Poitiers practically reproduces the statement of Peter Lombard which has been quoted.³ He says:—

"It is inquired whether that is a real sacrifice which is daily made on the altar by the priest and whether Christ is daily sacrificed, and daily slain, and so whether one death of Christ is not enough. In answer to which it must be said that Christ is sacrificed in the Sacrament, and this sacrifice is called a sacrifice simply for

¹IV. xii. 7. ²V. 10-13 (*P.L.* ccxi. 1241-57). ³See pp. 306, 307, *supra*.

the reason that it represents the real sacrifice which was once made with extended hands on the cross. As a picture represents that of which it is an image, and as an image is called by the name of the thing which it signifies, as the image of Achilles is called Achilles, so this sacrifice is called by the name of the real sacrifice, which was once made."¹

An interesting feature in this treatise is in the record which it supplies of discussions and divergent opinions on minute points, as whether the prayers of the rite and the invocation of the Holy Trinity are necessary to the consecration, whether the water mixed with the wine is turned into the blood or into the water which flowed from the side of Christ or remains unconverted, whether the consecration of the bread is effected at the words "This is My body" or not until the words "This is My blood,"² and whether Christ consecrated the Sacrament when He gave the elements to the disciples with the words "This is My body" and "This is My blood" or at the act of blessing which preceded. On this last point Peter's own view appears to have been that our Lord said "This is My body" at the act of blessing and that the Transubstantiation then took place, and that He said the same words again to the disciples when He gave them the Sacrament but simply as asserting what the Sacrament was and not as then consecrating.³

Lothair Conti, of the family of the Counts of Segni, was born at Anagni in 1160 or 1161, was made a cardinal in 1190, and became Pope with the title of Innocent III. in 1198. He died in 1216. His book *On the Holy Mystery of the Altar* was written before he was Pope, and may be taken as representative of the doctrine held to be true in the closing years of the twelfth century. In this book there is but little explicit teaching about the Eucharistic sacrifice, though the rite as a whole is viewed as a commemoration of the passion and resurrection and ascension of Christ, the ceremonies of the ordinary and canon of the Mass are regarded as a mystical representation of the passion and burial and resurrection,⁴ and the union of earthly and heavenly worship is referred to by the quotation of the words of St. Gregory the Great about it⁵ and by the explanation of the double sense of

¹ V. 13 (*P.L.* ccxi. 1256).

³ V. 11 (*P.L.* ccxi. 1245).

⁵ Quoted on p. 195, *supra*.

² See pp. 312, 313, *infra*.

⁴ V. 1-4, 7, 8, 12.

the four kinds of altars, whereby the "higher altar" denotes the Holy Trinity and the Church triumphant, the "lower altar" the Church militant and the "Table of the temple," the "inner altar" a clean heart and faith in the Incarnation, the "outward altar" the altar of the cross and the Sacraments of the Church, in the comment on the words "Command these to be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on high," in which "these" is explained to denote "the offerings and prayers of the faithful," and the "holy angel" is interpreted to mean the created angels.¹ Like Hugh of St. Victor and Peter Lombard, Innocent III. lays stress on the use of the plural number in the phrase "we offer," and explains that "though one only offers the sacrifice, yet he says 'we offer' in the plural number because the priest does not offer sacrifice only in his own person but in the person of the whole Church," and that "not only priests but also all the faithful offer, for that which is specially accomplished by the ministry of the priests is done generally by the offering of the faithful".² The offering is primarily directed to God the Father as the first principle of the Godhead, "yet the sacrifice of praise is offered equally to the undivided Trinity, as to the Father so to the Son and to the Spirit of Both, for as the majesty is indivisible so the worship is indivisible".³ The treatment of the Eucharistic presence and gift, as distinct from that of the sacrifice, is very full and explicit and detailed. Many difficult questions are discussed at some length, and in regard to most of them Innocent, in spite of frequent assertions as to the limitations of human thought, pronounces with some confidence. The main lines of his teaching closely follow what has been observed in earlier writers. At the consecration the species remain, but the substances of the bread and wine are converted so that under the different species the one body of Christ is contained.⁴ In the Sacrament is the real body of Christ.⁵ The conversion into the flesh and blood of Christ has analogies with the exercise of the power of God in the creation, in the miracles of the Old Testament, in the Incarnation, and in the miracle at Cana of Galilee.⁶ The flesh in the Eucharist is that which was taken from the Virgin, and the blood is that which was shed on the

¹ V. 5.² III. 5, 6.³ III. 8.⁴ III. 3.⁵ IV. 2.⁶ IV. 7.

cross; but when it is eaten in the Sacrament the flesh is not divided or torn but remains whole and unbroken, since "He who is eaten lives because after death He rose, and being eaten He dies not because He rose to die no more".¹ "There is no material formation of flesh and blood from the bread and wine, but the matter of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of flesh and blood, nor is any addition made to the body, but the elements are transubstantiated into the body."² Innocent repeats the ideas and the phraseology of St. Peter Damien³ on the questions whether "parts pass into parts or the whole into the whole," and about local distance and position, saying that such questions must be left to God, but asserting that the whole Christ is in both species and in every fragment.⁴ When the substance of the bread and wine is converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, the accidents remain, and with the accidents "the natural properties appear to remain, the quality of bread which removes hunger by satisfying and the quality of wine which destroys thirst by refreshing".⁵ The declaration to which Berengar assented at the Council of Rome in 1059,⁶ containing the statement that "the real body of Christ is in reality handled and broken by the hands of the priests and is crushed by the teeth of the faithful," is accepted by Innocent with the explanation that "the body of Christ is not divided into parts or torn by the teeth, since it is immortal and impassible,"⁷ an explanation which shows that he regarded the wording of the declaration as a clumsy way of saying that the Sacrament which the priests handle and the faithful receive is the body of Christ. In the event of the profanation of the Sacrament by an animal the body of the Lord miraculously ceases to be there.⁸ Though it is the immortal body of Christ which is now received in the Sacrament, it is perhaps more likely that at the institution He gave His body in its mortal state than that the qualities of the risen body were then anticipated; yet each of the four qualities which are now characteristic of the risen body had on some occasion been manifested before the resurrection, "the subtlety when He was born of the Virgin, the glory when He was transfigured on the mount, the agility when He

¹ IV. 7.² IV. 7.³ See pp. 259-61, *supra*.⁴ IV. 8.⁵ IV. 9.⁶ See p. 247, *supra*.⁷ IV. 10.⁸ IV. 11.

walked on the sea, the impassibility when He was eaten at the Supper".¹ "The real body of Christ is eaten sacramentally, that is, under the species; but the mystical body is eaten spiritually, that is, in faith under the species of bread, in faith of heart."² "Both good and bad eat the body of Christ, but the good to salvation, the bad to judgment."³ The teaching and words of Hugh of St. Victor⁴ on the bodily reception being a means to the spiritual presence, which enables the soul to lay hold of Christ at the right hand of God, are reproduced.⁵

"If it be asked whether Christ locally descends from heaven or ascends into heaven, when He conveys or withdraws His bodily presence, or otherwise begins or ceases to be under the species of the Sacrament, I reply that we ought not to be curious in such matters. . . . I do not know how Christ approaches, I am ignorant also how He departs, He knows who is ignorant of nothing."⁶

"When the first part of the words of consecration is said, the bread is changed from its nature into the body, and when the second part of the words is said, the wine is changed into the blood, yet the body is never without the blood, and the blood is never without the body, as neither is without the soul, but under the form of bread the blood is in the body when the bread has been changed into the body. So also it is in regard to the species of wine. Not that the bread is changed into the blood, or the wine changed into the body, but because neither of these can be without the other. Therefore the blood is under the species of bread not from the power of the Sacrament but from a natural concomitance."⁷

"One and the Same both then and now, both here and elsewhere, is offered by all, whole in heaven, whole on the altar, at the same time sitting at the right hand of the Father and abiding under the species of the Sacrament. . . . Christ is one in different places as He is whole in different portions."⁸

"Christ gives Himself wholly to us for food, that as He renews us by His Godhead, which we taste spiritually with the heart, so He may renew us by His manhood, which we eat bodily with the mouth, that so He may lead us from things visible to things invisible, from things temporal to things eternal, from things earthly to things heavenly, from things human to things divine."⁹

¹ IV. 12.² IV. 14.³ IV. 14.⁴ See pp. 286, 287, *supra*.⁵ IV. 15.⁶ IV. 16.⁷ IV. 17.⁸ IV. 27.⁹ IV. 44.

“By the mystery of the cross He delivered us from the power of sin. By the Sacrament of the Eucharist, He sets us free from the desire to sin; for, if the Eucharist be worthily taken, it frees from evil, it strengthens in good, it blots out venial sins, it protects from mortal sins.”¹

“Christ in His divine nature is in things in three ways, locally in heaven, personally in the Word, sacramentally on the altar. For, as in His Godhead He is essentially whole in all things, so in His manhood He is whole sacramentally in many places. By the power of this Sacrament it becomes possible that they who are of earth ascend to heaven.”²

In one of the passages just quoted—in the words “When the first part of the words of consecration is said, the bread is changed from its nature into the body”—Innocent III. expresses his own opinion that the consecration of the bread is completed before the consecration of the chalice. While so writing he refers to the contrary opinion of others, possibly alluding to Peter the Eater,³ who was Chancellor of Paris from 1168 to 1178, or to Peter the Chanter, who was Precentor of Paris from 1184 to 1197.⁴ At a later point in his treatise he again expresses the same opinion; but says that in the event of a priest being unable to proceed to the consecration of the chalice after consecrating the bread, or of the discovery after the consecration of the bread that there was no wine in the chalice, it is better for the sake

¹ IV. 44.

² IV. 44.

³ Petrus Comestor or Manducator. Father Herbert Thurston has suggested (*Tablet*, 26th October, 1907, p. 644) that this name might be translated “Peter the Bookworm,” since it was given him in consequence of the way in which he devoured all the literature which he could find.

⁴ For Peter the Eater’s advocacy of the view that the consecration of the bread was not completed till the consecration of the chalice, see Giraldus Cambrensis, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, i. 8 (*Opera*, ii. 27, 28, Rolls Series, vol. xxi. b). For the acceptance of the same view by Peter the Chanter, see Cæsarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus*, ix. 27; *Miracula*, i. 4, in Meister, *Die Fragmente der Libri Octo Miraculorum des Cæsarius von Heisterbach*, pp. 10, 11. See also Father Thurston’s article in the *Tablet* of 26th October, 1907, and his note on p. 98 of his edition of Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*. Peter the Eater in his *Historia Scholastica*, Evang. 152 (P.L. cxviii. 1618), suggests, like Peter of Poitiers (see p. 308, *supra*), that our Lord may have said “This is My body” twice at the institution of the Sacrament.

of security, since there are two opinions on the point, that the consecration of the bread should be repeated.¹

XIII.

The Fourth Lateran Council was held in 1215 during the papacy of Innocent III. Its first chapter, headed "On the Catholic Faith," contained the following statement about the Eucharist:—

"There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside which no one at all is in a state of salvation (*salvatur*). In this Church Jesus Christ Himself is both priest and sacrifice; and His body and blood are really contained in the Sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood by the power of God, so that, to effect the mystery of unity, we ourselves receive of that which is His what He Himself received of that which is ours. And, moreover, no one can consecrate this Sacrament except a priest who has been duly ordained according to the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself gave to the Apostles and their successors."²

It may be observed that in this statement, while it is said that Christ's "body and blood are really contained in the Sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine" and while the word "transubstantiated" is used, there is no explicit definition as to the change of substance or as to the retention of the accidents. In this respect the declaration of the council is more guarded than the writings of some of the theologians of the time, a feature probably due to the care exercised in a document the acceptance of which might be required as a matter of faith. Further, it did not contain any statement as to the nature of the presence and could be accepted either by any who might hold a carnal view or by those who followed the theologians of the twelfth century in their emphasis on the spiritual character of the body of Christ present in the Sacrament.

¹ IV: 22, 24. For a statement on this matter in a letter of St. Bernard, see p. 301, *supra*. Cf. p. 308, *supra*.

² Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 15-18.

CHAPTER VII.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PART III.

THE thirteenth century was marked by the extended use of the writings of Aristotle and by the development of the Dominican and Franciscan theologies, and also by the growth of practical instructions in regard to Eucharistic adoration.

I.

Alexander of Hales was a native of Hales in Gloucestershire. After filling various ecclesiastical offices in England, he studied and taught at Paris. In 1222 he entered the Franciscan Order, and in his work as lecturer had much to do with the growth of learning in that Order. He died at Paris in 1245. He was the first schoolman to use the whole of the writings of Aristotle which were then accessible; and he used also parts of the writings of the Arabian philosophers. He did much to promote Realism. His *Sum of Theology* was completed after his death by his scholars about 1252; but probably represents his opinions even where it is not wholly his work. In its general method it exhibits the characteristics of scholastic theology which had by this time become marked. Abelard had placed different opinions on the same subjects side by side as expressed in quotations from earlier writers in his *Yes and No*. Peter Lombard had to some extent stated the views which he himself rejected. Alexander of Hales gives at length in all cases the position differing from his own, fully stating the arguments by which it may be defended, and answering them one by one. The book contains a long and elaborate treatment of the Eucharist. This affords an excellent instance of the way in which at this time the interest in the theology of the Eucharistic sacrifice had been to a

large extent crushed out by the interest in the elaboration of the doctrine of the presence and gift. On the sacrifice the teaching is but scanty. One of the five causes of the institution of the Sacrament is "the commemoration of the death of Christ," and another is "the pardon of daily sins"; but this "commemoration" seems to be referred to more as a reminder to Christians than as a memorial before God, and the "pardon" is viewed rather as a gift in Communion than as an effect of a sacrifice.¹ The prayers and ceremonies of the ordinary and canon of the Mass are regarded, as in earlier writers, as a mystical presentation of the incarnate life, passion, and resurrection of our Lord.² The interpretation of Peter Lombard that the fraction of the consecrated bread is a representation of the passion, is followed;³ and the two species are said to show the passion and sacrifice of Christ.⁴ The frequent celebration of the Mass is a means of repairing the daily faults of living Christians and also of mitigating the penalties of the souls in purgatory.⁵ The Eucharistic sacrifice is not further explained. In regard to the presence and gift, on the other hand, the treatment is most full. When writing on the subject of the Sacraments in general, before entering on the discussion of separate Sacraments, Alexander describes a Sacrament as a "real sign" which effects and contains what it denotes,⁶ which has virtue attached to it through "the institution of the Saviour," "the form of words" appointed by Christ and used in the Church, "the due action of ministers," "the passion and resurrection of Christ," and "the faith of the Church."⁷ The consecration of the Eucharist is effected by the recital of the words "This is My body," "This is My blood";⁸ and may be validly accomplished by a wicked or heretical or schismatical or degraded priest.⁹ At the consecration the bread and the wine are converted by Transubstantiation into the body and blood of Christ, and do not remain under the signs together with the body and blood.¹⁰ In

¹ IV. x. 2 (2); cf. IV. x. 8 (1, i.). The other three causes are "the ministration of the food of life," "the invitation to the taste of Godhead," and "the fulfilment of the Scriptures".

² *Tract. de offic. miss.* in IV. x. 5.

³ IV. x. 9 (4).

⁴ IV. x. 3 (1).

⁵ IV. x. 5 (1, iii.).

⁶ IV. v. 3 (4, iii.).

⁷ IV. v. 3 (5, vii.).

⁸ IV. x. 5 (1, ix.).

⁹ IV. x. 5 (1, iv. v.).

¹⁰ IV. x. 5 (3, i.).

this conversion only the accidents remain.¹ The bread is not annihilated, but is changed for the better.² The conversion of substance is marvellous and supernatural, and is accomplished by the power of the Holy Ghost.³ Through it Christ is whole and indivisible under each species by concomitance, though the bread is changed into the flesh and the wine into the blood.⁴ In the change there is no local movement, and the body of Christ does not descend from heaven.⁵ The accidents remain without a subject.⁶ They retain their own properties and are still the objects of sense.⁷ The accidents do not possess the property of nourishing; but by a return of the substance of bread and wine they nourish and are corrupted.⁸ As there is no local descent of the body of Christ when the elements are converted into His flesh and blood, so His presence is not of a limited kind or local or circumscribed.⁹ It can be grasped by the minds of mortals when illuminated by faith.¹⁰ The real body of Christ, into which the bread has been converted, is not broken when the species is broken, because it is incorruptible and indivisible and remains whole and unbroken in every part of the divided species; and Alexander maintains that the declaration of Berengar, as accepted by the Church, was intended to affirm that the consecrated bread is really the body of Christ, not that the body itself is broken.¹¹ This real fraction of the species is possible because of the retention of the accident of quantity.¹² At the institution of the Sacrament Christ gave His body in the immortal and impassible state in which it is now received in Communion by an anticipation of the spiritual endowments of His risen body.¹³ When received worthily the Sacrament conveys forgiveness of venial sins and protection against and sorrow for mortal sins; it increases virtues; it has greater efficacy when taken sacramentally and spiritually than when taken spiritually only.¹⁴ The good and the bad communicants alike receive the body of Christ sacramentally; ¹⁵ but it has no efficacy and is not eaten spiritually unless it is received worthily,¹⁶ and it cannot be taken by irrational

¹ IV. x. 5 (3, ii.).² IV. x. 5 (3, iii.).³ IV. x. 5 (3, iv.).⁴ IV. x. 3 (2), 5 (3, v.).⁵ IV. x. 5 (3, iv.).⁶ IV. x. 7 (1, i. ii.).⁷ IV. x. 7 (2, i.).⁸ IV. x. 7 (2, ii. iv.).⁹ IV. x. 7 (3, vi. vii.).¹⁰ IV. x. 7 (3, viii.).¹¹ IV. x. 9 (1).¹² IV. x. 9 (2).¹³ IV. xi. 2 (1, iii.).¹⁴ IV. x. 8 (1, i. 2, 3, iii.).¹⁵ IV. xi. 1 (1).¹⁶ IV. x. 8 (3, i. ii.), xi. 1 (1).

creatures or by angels.¹ In the event of it ceasing to be under the sacramental species there is no local movement, as there is no local movement or descent at the consecration.² Before the institution of the Sacrament the faithful ate Christ spiritually.³ Since Christ is wholly taken in Communion under either kind, it is lawful to receive the Sacrament in the species of bread only, "as is done almost everywhere by the laity in the Church".⁴ On the whole it may be said that the tendency of Alexander's statements, though his elaborate and detailed discussion of minute points is painful reading, is to continue the attempt of earlier writers to use the philosophical treatment of Eucharistic doctrine to preserve a spiritual way of regarding the presence of the body and blood of Christ. There are parts of his work, however, which tend in a different direction, as when he discusses whether, if the body had been reserved when Christ died on the cross, the body so reserved would have been dead,⁵ and whether, if the body had been consecrated during the three days between our Lord's death and His resurrection, it would have been body without soul,⁶ and in his lengthy dissertation on the body of Christ passing into the stomach,⁷ though his view of the return of the substances of bread and wine enables him to avoid supposing that it suffers corruption.⁸ Consideration of his work suggests the thought that by his time the use of the realistic philosophy to protect the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence and gift had overshot the mark.

William of Auvergne became Bishop of Paris in 1228 and died in 1249. In his philosophical teaching he made great use of Aristotle and of much Arabian philosophy, although himself in some respects a Platonist. On the subject of sacrifice in general and of the Eucharistic sacrifice there are notable passages in his writings. Many of the elements in sacrifice, according to his teaching, involve the acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God and the dedication of man to Him; another element is that of communion with God, as the bodily refreshment in the sacrificial meal denotes the spiritual communion of the soul with Him; another is that of the association of one who offers sacrifice with the rest of the family of God through the sacrificial meal.⁹ The

¹ IV. xi. 2 (2, i.).² IV. xi. 2 (2, i.).³ IV. xi. 2 (2, i.).⁴ IV. xi. 2 (4, iii.).⁵ IV. xi. 2 (1, v.).⁶ IV. xi. 2 (1, vi.).⁷ IV. xi. 2 (4, iii.).⁸ IV. x. 7 (2, iv.).⁹ *De legibus*, 24.

sacrifice which is required from men is of themselves; it has its inner side in the offering of a humble and contrite heart, and its outward side in external works of doing and suffering. The perfect sacrifice is that of Christ, who offered Himself on the cross for the reconciliation of the world, and made atonement to God.¹ The priestly work of Christ is carried on in heaven in the presence of God the Father; but in order that the Church on earth may have a sacrifice the offering of the Eucharist has been ordained; and Christ is no less acceptable to the Father on the altar than He was on the cross, when He paid the price of the deliverance of the world, and "the oblation which was made on the altar of the cross and that which is daily made on the altar are of the same merit," since the Victim is the same.² Thus, the Eucharist, on its sacrificial side, has the element of appeasing God and of turning away His wrath.³ On the side of Communion, it is the means by which God supplies the soul with the needed food of spiritual life;⁴ and it sanctifies those who receive rightly. At the consecration "the material and visible bread gives place to the coming of the life-giving Bread, paying honour to the Creator," "the form, that is, the variety of the accidents, being preserved for the ministering of the Sacrament"; "in the Transubstantiation nothing at all remains of the bread except" "the variety of the sensible accidents or sensible form".⁵ The body of Christ into which the bread is transubstantiated at the consecration has the spiritual gifts of the risen life; and its presence in the Sacrament is accomplished by the change of the elements, not by its movement from heaven to earth.⁶ William of Auvergne suggests a different solution of the problem presented by the impossibility of the spiritual body of Christ being a power of bodily and material nourishment and by the absence of the substance of bread in the consecrated Sacrament than that suggested by Alexander of Hales. Like Alexander, he holds that the accidents cannot nourish substance; but, while Alexander regarded the Sacrament as having the power of nourishing the body through the return of the substance of bread and wine,

¹ *De legibus*, 28; *De sacram. Euch.* 2; *Cur Deus homo*, 7; *De rhet. div.* 33.

² *De sacram. Euch.* 5.

³ *Ibid.* 3.

⁴ *De sacram. Euch.* 3; *Cur Deus homo*, 7.

⁵ *De sacram. Euch.* 1.

⁶ *Ibid.* 4.

William maintains that the Sacrament does not possess the power of nourishing the body, although the accidents can remove hunger and relieve thirst.¹ William's method is much less elaborate and argumentative than that of Alexander; his work presents the same general features of an earnest desire to use the Aristotelian philosophy as a support to the doctrine of the Eucharist, and to protect the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence of Christ; in him, though to a less extent than in Alexander, may be marked the hampering effects of the application of a philosophic system to spiritual realities.

II.

The use of the Aristotelian philosophy as an aid to theology was carried still further by the Dominicans Albert the Great and his pupil St. Thomas Aquinas. Albert the Great was born at Lauingen in 1193, joined the Dominican Order about 1222, was famous as a teacher at Paris and Cologne, became Bishop of Ratisbon in 1260, but resigned that see two years later, and died at Cologne in 1280. His voluminous works include treatises *On the Sacrifice of the Mass* and *On the Sacrament of the Eucharist*; and parts of his commentaries on the Gospels refer to the Eucharist in connection with the accounts of the institution and with the discourse at Capernaum recorded by St. John; but the most complete and clearest statements of his Eucharistic doctrine are in his comments on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. The book of these comments exhibits in a highly developed form the scholastic method of setting out at length an adversary's case, and proceeding to refute it step by step; in the main the appeal is to authority, but the whole work is pervaded by the idea of the essentially rational character of the revealed religion, and a good instance of the general point of view in this respect is afforded by a statement in connection with the Eucharist that—

“In this Sacrament and in all other articles of the faith there are many things above reason but there is nothing in them contrary to reason, because God would be contrary to Himself if He had given us reason and yet acted in the Sacraments against the dictates of reason.”²

¹ *Op. cit.* 1.

² IV. x. 9.

The Eucharist is described as spiritual food.¹ There are said to be three ways of receiving the real body of Christ, first, that which is sacramental but not spiritual, or a Communion made unworthily; secondly, that which is both sacramental and spiritual, or a Communion made worthily; and, thirdly, that which is spiritual and not sacramental, in which some receive Christ spiritually and not sacramentally by uniting themselves with Him by the memory of His passion and sacrifice.² Hence there are three ways of spiritual Communion, first, that which may be used from the beginning of Christian life, when there is union with "the mystical body of Christ and with Christ the Head not by means of the Sacrament but by means of the faith and love of the Head and the members"; secondly, "the tasting of the sweetness of the grace of Communion with the body in meditation" on the part of those who have already become communicants; and, thirdly, that which is sacramental as well as spiritual.³ On questions about the relation of the body of Christ to the body and mind of those who communicate sacramentally, Albert states that it does not pass into the stomach and undergo the processes of digestion after the manner of ordinary food, but that in another sense it does pass into the stomach because "it passes to every place to which the species of bread and wine go, under which is contained the whole Christ in actual reality"; and that it does not pass into the mind by way of a substantial entrance, but that it does pass into the mind by producing sacramental grace in the mind.⁴ Evil communicants receive the real body of Christ, and thus the body of Christ, which itself is good, has evil effects in those who receive it unworthily.⁵ The change at consecration is of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ.⁶ This Transubstantiation is neither natural nor miraculous but is marvellous.⁷ It does not resemble any movement or change of a natural kind.⁸ The substance of the bread and wine is not destroyed when it is thus converted, but neither does it remain so as to co-exist together with the body of Christ.⁹ Christ is whole in each part of each species as the spiritual food of the soul, since His body cannot be without

¹ IV. viii. 1.⁴ IV. ix. 5.⁷ IV. xi. 4.² IV. ix. 1.⁵ IV. ix. 7, 12.⁸ IV. xi. 5.³ IV. ix. 2.⁶ IV. xi. 1, 2.⁹ IV. xi. 7.

His blood, and His blood is contained in His body; but this is not by the force of the Sacrament but because of the union between body and blood.¹ At the institution of the Sacrament Christ gave His body to His disciples in its impassible and immortal state by an anticipation of the prerogatives of the risen body.² On the question whether, if the body of Christ had been reserved or consecrated during the three days between His death and His resurrection, it would have been His dead body, the answer is given that this could have happened as an abstract possibility but that it would have been unfitting.³ In the consecrated Sacrament the accidents remain without a subject.⁴ They all retain their real existence; and, when the consecrated species of bread is broken, there is a real fraction in them, though the body of Christ is not broken.⁵ Like Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great explains the language of Berengar's declaration at the Council of Rome of 1059, as accepted by the Church, to have been an assertion of the presence of the body of Christ on the altar, not that the body itself is broken.⁶ There are different ways of the presence of Christ. In His divine nature He is present, like the Father and the Holy Ghost, in all things by way of essence and power; like the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the saints by grace; and differently from the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the human nature which He united to His divine Person. In His human nature He has a local and circumscribed presence, such as that in the Virgin's womb or on the cross; and He has also that presence whereby "He Himself, full of grace, in His deity and in His humanity, is the reality of the Sacrament and the spiritual food of the Church after a supernatural manner, and after such a manner He is in the Sacrament," in regard to which presence considerations of place have no force.⁷ Thus, as regards that way of presence which is circumscribed by place, Christ is now in one place only, that is, in heaven; but in an accidental way He is in a place in the

¹ IV. xii. 4, xiii. 11; *In Ev. Matt.* on xxvi. 26; *In Ev. Joan.* on vi. 63.

² IV. xii. 13; *In Ev. Joan.* on vi. 63.

³ IV. xii. 14.

⁴ IV. xii. 16; *De sacram. Euch.* III. iii. 1 (8).

⁵ IV. xiii. 1, 2, 4, 6; *In Ev. Matt.* on xxvi. 26; *In Ev. Marc.* on xiv. 22; *In Ev. Luc.* on xxii. 19.

⁶ IV. xiii. 10.

⁷ IV. xiii. 7.

Church and on the altar, because the sacramental species in which He is have a local presence there.¹ Wicked priests can validly consecrate;² and so can an excommunicated priest, and Peter Lombard in denying this would be right only if he meant to refer to an excommunicated priest who did not retain what is essential in the Church's method of celebrating.³ As to the question whether an animal can receive the body of Christ, an animal is not capable of union with Christ; nevertheless "so long as the species are discernible, the body of Christ is there".⁴ On the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice the teaching of Albert the Great is much less systematised and complete. The prayers and ceremonies of the rite are commemorative of the passion;⁵ there is a union of earthly and heavenly worship;⁶ the Sacrament is a memorial;⁷ the fraction signifies the passion;⁸ the connection of the blood is with the soul;⁹ the Sacrament has its "special effect" "through the oblation which Christ made on the cross," "which every priest continually makes by way of commemoration when he celebrates Mass".¹⁰

"Christ is most really offered every day, when the sacrifice is presented to God the Father; for offering means an act of oblation so far as the thing which is the oblation is concerned, and sacrifice means the same act so far as the effect is concerned. Wherefore, since, so far as the thing which is the oblation is concerned, the oblation always abides offered and to be offered for us, we always offer and always sacrifice. But it is not so about the crucifixion; for this means not the act of the thing offered but rather the unjust act of the Jews or the passion, so far as it was brought about by them. So it could never be repeated."¹¹

A passage in the *Sermons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist*, attributed to Albert the Great but probably not by him, which has also been ascribed to St. Thomas Aquinas, will be quoted later in connection with the teaching of St. Thomas.¹²

St. Thomas Aquinas was born at Roccasecca in the kingdom of Naples in 1226. As a boy he was taught at the Abbey of

¹ IV. xiii. 12.² IV. xiii. 29.³ IV. xiii. 30.⁴ IV. xiii. 38.⁵ *De sacrif. miss.* III. xv. 1, and *passim*.⁶ *Sent.* IV. xi. 9; *In Ev. Luc.* on xxii. 19; *De sacrif. miss.* III. xv. 1.⁷ *Sent.* IV. xii. 2.⁸ *Ibid.* xiii. 15.⁹ *Ibid.* xii. 3.¹⁰ *In Ev. Joan.* on vi. 63.¹¹ *Sent.* IV. xiii. 23; *cf. De sacram. Euch.* V. iv.¹² See p. 328, *infra*.

Monte Cassino, and afterwards studied at the University of Naples. In 1243 he became a member of the Dominican Order. He was a pupil of Albert the Great. He was a teacher at Paris, Cologne, Rome, Bologna, and Naples. He died in 1274. Like his master Albert the Great he applied the Aristotelian philosophy as a whole to theology on a large scale; and one chief aim of his work was the reconciliation of theological and spiritual truth with philosophic thought, of the demands of reason as understood in his time with the inherited beliefs of the Church. His treatment of the Holy Eucharist is harmonious with the rest of his theology. Ends evidently in view are the preservation of the traditional doctrine that the consecrated species are the body and blood of Christ, the avoidance of carnal conceptions of that body and blood as thus present, the gaining of support against unbelief from the Aristotelian philosophy, and the statement of the doctrine accepted so as to be in accordance with what were believed to be the true lines of philosophic thought. The *Sum of Theology*, the last work of his life, may be taken as affording, in conjunction with his book on the *Sentences*, the best representation of his teaching. The treatment of the Eucharistic sacrifice is less voluminous than that of the Eucharistic presence and gift; but it contains suggestions which had a very important influence on the later history of the doctrine in the West.

In regard to sacrifice in general and to the sacrifice in the passion of Christ, the teaching of St. Thomas contains the following points. "It is a result of the natural reason for man to use certain objects discernible to sense, offering them to God as a sign of due submission and honour," so that "the offering of sacrifice belongs to natural law".¹ The offering of sacrifice includes both "the sacrifice which is offered outwardly" and "the inner spiritual sacrifice whereby the soul offers itself to God"; and "as we ought to offer to the Most High God alone the spiritual sacrifice, so also to Him alone we ought to offer the outward sacrifices".² The "inner sacrifice" is the "first and chief sacrifice"; and the offering of it is an obligation to which "all are bound". As regards external sacrifices, the Jews were bound to those of their religion, and others are bound to those

¹ *S.T. II.* lxxxv. 1.

² *Ibid.* 2.

acts which their obligation requires. "Priests offer the sacrifices which are specially ordained for divine worship not only for themselves but also for others"; and "there are certain other sacrifices which any one can offer to God for himself".¹ In replying to an objection to the statement that a sacrifice is an act of a specific kind, St. Thomas says:—

"Sacrifices are properly so called when something is done in regard to things offered to God, as that animals were slain and burned, or that bread is broken and eaten and blessed. And this the name itself signifies; for a sacrifice is so called because man makes something sacred. But an offering is directly so called when something is offered to God, even if nothing is done in regard to it; as money or bread is said to be offered on the altar, in regard to which nothing is done. Wherefore every sacrifice is an offering, but not every offering a sacrifice. Now first fruits are offerings, because they were offered to God, as we read in Deuteronomy xxvi.; but they are not sacrifices, because nothing sacred was done in regard to them."²

Carrying further the idea of a sacrifice as an offering to God in which "something is done," St. Thomas says that the name sacrifice is properly applied to "something done that is properly due to God for His honour to appease Him"; and that, since our Lord's voluntary bearing of the passion was "in the highest degree acceptable to God as the outcome of the greatest love," "it is clear that the passion of Christ was a real sacrifice".³ As mediator between God and man, and as offering the prayers of the people to God, and as making satisfaction for sins, Christ is a Priest;⁴ "insofar as He was Man, He was not only Priest but also a perfect sacrifice";⁵ His priesthood has "complete power of making expiation for sins";⁶ "the consummation of the sacrifice, which consists in those for whom the sacrifice is offered obtaining the end of the sacrifice," "was pre-figured in the entrance of the Jewish high priest into the holy of holies once in the year with the blood of a goat and a bullock"; "and in like manner Christ entered into the holy of holies, that is, heaven itself, and prepared for us a way of entrance through the power of His blood, which He shed for us on earth";⁷ the Jewish

¹ S.T. II. 2 lxxxv. 4.

² *Ibid.* 3.

³ S.T. III. xlvi. 3.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxii. 1.

⁵ *Ibid.* 2.

⁶ *Ibid.* 3.

⁷ *Ibid.* 5.

high priest, though thus a type of Christ, was an inadequate and incomplete type, since Christ as Priest actually cleanses away sins, and has an eternal priesthood after the order of Melchizedek.¹

The teaching of St. Thomas on the Eucharistic sacrifice must be considered in the light of the ideas of sacrifice in general and of the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ which have been mentioned. "In the new law" of the Christian religion "the real sacrifice of Christ is communicated to the faithful under the species of bread and wine," fulfilling the type of the offering of bread and wine in the priestly work of Melchizedek.² As a sacrifice the Eucharist "has the power of satisfaction".³ "By way of sacrifice it benefits others than those who receive it, inasmuch as it is offered for their salvation."⁴ "In the work of satisfaction the mind of the offerer is of more moment than the amount of the offering"; and "therefore, although this offering from its amount is sufficient to make satisfaction for all penalty, yet it effects satisfaction for those for whom it is offered and also for those who offer it according to the amount of their devotion and not for all penalty".⁵ It is the "representation of the passion of the Lord," the "memorial of the passion of the Lord," the "commemoration of the passion of the Lord, which was a real sacrifice," the "sacrifice of the new law instituted by Christ so as to contain Christ Himself who suffered not only in signification or figure but also in actual reality".⁶ "It is called a sacrifice insofar as it represents the passion itself of Christ; and it is called a victim insofar as it contains Christ Himself who is the saving Victim."⁷ The separate taking of "the bread as the Sacrament of the body and the wine as the Sacrament of the blood," forms part of the "memorial" of "the passion of Christ, in which the blood was separated from the body".⁸ The prayers and ceremonies of the rite combine to form a mystical presentation of the passion and the resurrection of Christ.⁹ The consecrating words

¹ *S.T.* III. xxii. 6.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.* lxxix. 5; *cf. Sent.* IV. xii. 2 (3), xiii. 1 (3, 2).

⁴ *Ibid.* lxxix. 7.

⁵ *Ibid.* 5.

⁶ *Ibid.* lxxiii. 4, 5, lxxiv. 1, lxxv. 1, lxxix. 1, lxxxiii. 2, 3.

⁷ *Ibid.* lxxiii. 4.

⁸ *Ibid.* lxxiv. 1; *cf.* lxxvi. 2, ad 1, lxxviii. 3, ad 2, ad 7, lxxx. 12, ad 3.

⁹ *Ibid.* lxxxiii. 5; *cf. Sent.* IV. viii. 2.

are said by the priest, "in the person of Christ Himself," and "the priest offers and takes the blood in the person of all," and "in the prayers speaks in the person of the Church," so that in offering the sacrifice he is the representative both of Christ and of the Church, and the sacrifice is completed when he has received the Sacrament in both kinds.¹ Each of the three following passages is of some special importance.

"In a twofold way the celebration of this Sacrament is called the offering of Christ. First, it is so called because, as Augustine says to Simplicianus, 'symbols are usually called by the names of those things of which they are symbols, as when looking on a picture or wall painting we say, This is Cicero, This is Sallust.'² Now the celebration of this Sacrament, as has been said before, is a kind of representative symbol of the passion of Christ, which is the real offering of Him. And therefore the celebration of this Sacrament is called the offering of Christ. Because of this Ambrose says, 'In Christ the offering was once made, powerful for eternal salvation. What, then, of us? Do not we offer sacrifice every day? Yes, but for the commemoration of His death.'³ In another way the celebration of this Sacrament is called the offering of Christ so far as concerns the effect of the passion of Christ, because by means of this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the passion of the Lord. Wherefore in a certain Secret Prayer for Sunday it is said, 'As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is made, the work of our redemption is carried on'. So far as concerns the first method then, it could have been said that Christ was offered even in the figures of the Old Testament. Whence also it is said, 'Whose names have not been written in the book of life of the Lamb, who has been slain from the foundation of the world'.⁴ But so far as concerns the second method, it is peculiar to this Sacrament that in the celebration of it Christ is offered."⁵

"The Eucharist is not only a Sacrament but also a sacrifice. Insofar as it is a Sacrament, it has effect in every one who is alive [that is, spiritually], in whom it needs that life [that is, spiritual life] already exists. But insofar as it is a sacrifice, it has effect also in others for

¹ S. T. III. lxxviii. 1, lxxx. 12, ad 3, lxxxii. 1, 3, 4, 7, ad 3, lxxxiii. 1, ad 3.

² St. Augustine, *De divers. quaest. ad Simplicianum*, ii. 3 (2).

³ From the commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews formerly ascribed to St. Ambrose, on x. 1.

⁴ Rev. xiii. 8.

⁵ S. T. III. lxxxiii. 1.

whom it is offered, in whom it does not need that spiritual life should already exist in fact but only in possibility; and therefore, if it finds them disposed, it obtains grace for them by the power of that real sacrifice, from which all grace has flowed into us, and in consequence it blots out mortal sins in them, not as an immediate cause, but insofar as it obtains for them the grace of contrition. And as for the argument to the contrary that it is not offered except for the members of Christ, we must understand that it is offered for the members of Christ when it is offered for any that they may be members. . . . Insofar as it is a sacrifice, it possesses a method of satisfaction; and according to this it takes away penalty in part or in whole, as also do other satisfactions, according to the measure of penalty due for sin and of the devotion with which the Sacrament is offered. Yet the whole penalty is not always taken away by the power of this Sacrament.”¹

In explanation of the words in the canon of the Mass, “Command these to be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on high,” he writes:—

“The priest does not seek either that the sacramental species be taken to heaven or that the real body of Christ, which does not cease to be there, should be taken thither; but he seeks this for the mystical body, which is signified in this Sacrament, that is, that the angel who stands by in the divine mysteries may present to God the prayers of priest and people, according to the words, ‘The smoke of the incense from the offerings of the saints went up out of the angel’s hand’.² Now by the altar of God on high is meant either the Church triumphant itself, to which we seek to be transferred, or God Himself, to partake of whom we seek. . . . Or by the angel is meant Christ Himself, who is the Angel of great counsel, who joins His mystical body to God the Father and to the Church triumphant.”³

In considering this teaching of St. Thomas on the Eucharistic sacrifice, it may be noticed that the connection with the heavenly worship and the heavenly offering of Christ, though referred to, is little emphasised; that the commemoration of the passion is prominent; that the two separate species are mentioned in connection with the separation of our Lord’s body and blood in the passion; that the idea of a sacrifice as an offering in which

¹ *Sent.* IV. xii. 2 (2, 2, ad 4), (3).

² *Rev.* viii. 4.

³ *S.T.* III. lxxxiii. 4, ad 9.

“something is done” “to appease” God is strongly expressed; that the priest offers the sacrifice “in the person of all” as well as consecrates “in the person of Christ”; that as a satisfaction it takes away penalty which is due for sin; and that the sacrifice may be offered with good results to those who at the time are not in grace. All these points are important in their bearing on the later history of the doctrine of the sacrifice.

A passage from the treatise *Of the Venerable Sacrament of the Altar*, which has been printed with the works of St. Thomas, which is a later form of the *Sermons on the Eucharist* attributed to Albert the Great,¹ though probably neither by Albert nor by Thomas, may be quoted here for the sake of convenience, since it will be necessary to refer to it subsequently. It is as follows:—

“The second reason for the institution of this Sacrament is the sacrifice of the altar, against a certain daily ravage of our sins; that, as the body of the Lord was once for all offered on the cross for original sin, so it should be offered continually on the altar for our daily sins, and that in this the Church should have the precious and acceptable office of appeasing God beyond all sacrifices of the law.”²

On the subject of the Eucharistic presence and gift St. Thomas writes with elaborate fulness and characteristic clearness. The Eucharist is “spiritual nourishment”;³ in it are “spiritual food and spiritual drink”;⁴ the reception of it is “the end of all the Sacraments”;⁵ “through it we have communion with Christ, and partake of His flesh and Godhead, and through it we have communion with and are united to one another”; it “really contains Christ”.⁶ “In this Sacrament are the real body and blood of Christ”; but they “cannot be discerned by the senses or the understanding but only by faith, which rests on the authority of God”. Though Christ “promises to us His bodily presence as a reward,” “yet neither has He deprived us of His bodily presence in our pilgrimage on earth, but by means of the reality of His body and blood joins us to Himself in this Sacrament”. To say that “the body and blood of Christ are in this Sacrament only by way of sign,” is to maintain what

¹ See p. 322, *supra*.

² S.T. III. lxxiii. 1.

³ *Ibid.* 3.

⁴ *Opusc.* xxi. (al. lviii.) 1.

⁵ *Ibid.* 2.

⁶ *Ibid.* 4.

is "heretical, as being contrary to the words of Christ".¹ The consecration is effected by the recital of the words "This is My body," "This is My blood" by the priest "speaking in the person of Christ"; the substances of the bread and wine are then converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ; the consecrated Sacrament, as being the body of Christ, is to be adored; the opinion that "after the consecration the substance of bread and wine remains in the Sacrament" "cannot be maintained," and "is to be rejected as heretical";² the substances of bread and wine are not "annihilated" and are not resolved into some more elementary material condition, but are converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, so that "by the power of God the whole substance of the bread is converted into the whole substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of the blood of Christ" by a conversion which is "not formal but substantial," which "by a distinctive name can be called Transubstantiation".³ In this change "all the accidents of bread and wine remain," and "are there in actual reality," and "are discerned by the senses," while the substance is the object of the mind;⁴ but "the substantial form of the bread does not remain".⁵ "The Catholic faith requires the acknowledgment that the whole Christ is in this Sacrament";⁶ He is "whole under each species of the Sacrament," so that "under the species of bread is the body of Christ from the power of the Sacrament, and His blood," as also "His soul and Godhead," "from real concomitance," and "under the species of wine is the blood of Christ from the power of the Sacrament, and the body," as also His "soul and Godhead," "from real concomitance"; this concomitance is the result of the present inseparable nature of the body and blood of Christ, and if the Sacrament could have been celebrated at the time of the death of Christ, "under the species of bread would have been the body of Christ without His blood, and under the species of wine would have been His blood without His body".⁷ By this concomitance "Christ is whole under each part of the species," and the bulk and all the accidents of

¹ S. T. III. lxxv. 1.

² *Ibid.* lxxv. 3, 4.

³ *Ibid.* lxxv. 6.

⁷ *Ibid.* 2.

² *Ibid.* 2; lxxviii. 1-6.

⁴ *Ibid.* 5.; cf. I. lxxviii. 3.

⁶ *Ibid.* lxxvi. 1.

His body are in the Sacrament.¹ When in the Sacrament there is a miraculous appearance of flesh or blood or of Christ Himself, this is not due to the reality of Christ being seen, but either to an effect in the eyes of those who see the appearance or to a miraculous change in such accidents as shape and colour.² The accidents which remain in the Sacrament after consecration are "without a subject";³ the accident of "dimensive quantity" is as a subject to the other accidents;⁴ the sacramental species "can perform, when the substance of bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Christ, every action which they could perform while the substance of bread and wine existed";⁵ they can become corrupted, and possess the power of imparting physical nourishment, because "at the consecration" "the property of matter" "is miraculously attached to the dimensive quantity of the bread and wine".⁶ The sacramental species can be broken; and, when the fraction of the consecrated Sacrament is made, it is of them, not of the body of Christ, for "the real body of Christ cannot be broken, first because it is incorruptible and impassible, and secondly because it is whole under every part" of the Sacrament.⁷ On the problems, which had often proved puzzling, how the sacramental species, which are the body of Christ, can be corrupted and can nourish and can be broken, although the body of Christ is incorruptible and spiritual and impassible, St. Thomas thus reached a solution which he deemed satisfactory; on connected problems he taught that, if a beast should eat the consecrated Sacrament, "it would eat the body of Christ by way of accident and not sacramentally, as one might eat it who should take a consecrated host not knowing that it was consecrated";⁸ and that wicked and heretical and schismatical and excommunicated and degraded priests can validly consecrate.⁹ On the question whether it was the glorified or the mortal body of Christ which He gave to His disciples at the institution of the Sacrament, St. Thomas decided that at that time "there was under the species of the Sacrament in an impassible way that which in itself was passible, as there

¹ *S.T.* III. lxxvi. 3.² *Ibid.* 8.³ *Ibid.* lxxvii. 1.⁴ *Ibid.* 2.⁵ *Ibid.* 3.⁶ *Ibid.* 4, 5, 6.⁷ *Ibid.* 7.⁸ *Ibid.* lxxx. 3.⁹ *Ibid.* lxxxii. 5, 6, 7, 8.

was in an invisible way that which in itself was visible".¹ On the subject of beneficial reception, he, like earlier writers, says that all communicants alike receive sacramentally the body of Christ, but distinguishes between the reception which profits and that which is to judgment, and between reception which is merely sacramental and that which is both sacramental and spiritual, and refers to the possibility of Spiritual Communion when the Sacrament is not actually received by one who desires to receive it.² Following the main lines of earlier writers, St. Thomas writes in many places fully and explicitly on the nature of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. The body of Christ is in the Sacrament "spiritually" and "invisibly" "by the power of the Holy Ghost"; it is not in the Sacrament "as a body in a place" but "in a certain special way, which is peculiar to this Sacrament".³ The presence is not effected by a "local movement".⁴ The change in consecration is not like any "natural change" but is "wholly supernatural".⁵ "The body of Christ is in this Sacrament by way of substance and not by way of quantity,"⁶ or by way of "dimensions,"⁷ or so as to be "limited" or "circumscribed".⁸ "So far as concerns place, Christ in Himself according to His own being is not moved" in the Sacrament, "but only by way of accident, because He is not in this Sacrament as in a place," and "that which is not in a place is not moved in itself in place but only in relation to the movement of that wherein it is".⁹ "The body of Christ is not locally in the Sacrament of the altar."¹⁰

"It does not pertain to the body of Christ, insofar as it is a body, nor insofar as it is united to deity, to be in many places; but it has this by reason of consecration and of Transubstantiation, insofar as different pieces of bread, which are transubstantiated into it, are in different places. And because the substance of the bread passes into the body of Christ, the accidents remaining, therefore the quantity of each piece of bread remains, and in consequence the place of each piece of bread."¹¹

¹ *S.T.* III. lxxx. 3.

² *Ibid.* lxxx. 1, 3, 4, 5, 11.

³ *Ibid.* lxxv. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.* 2.

⁵ *Ibid.* 4.

⁶ *Ibid.* lxxvi. 1.

⁷ *Ibid.* lxxvi. 3.

⁸ *Ibid.* 5.

⁹ *Ibid.* 6.

¹⁰ *Sent.* IV. xlv. 2 (2, 5, ad 1); *Quaest. Quodlib.* I. xxii. ad 1.

¹¹ *Sent.* I. xxxvii. 3 (2, ad 1).

"No body is in relation to a place except through the mediation of the dimensions of quantity; and therefore any body is in a place where its dimensions are commensurate to the dimensions of place; and in this way the body of Christ is in one place only, that is, in heaven."¹

"The body of Christ according to its own dimensions is in one place only, but, by the mediation of the dimensions of the bread which is changed into it, it is in as many places as those in which this conversion is effected, not indeed by way of division into parts but whole in each case, for every piece of bread that is consecrated is converted into the unbroken body of Christ."²

"All pairs of places are distinguished in relation to one another according to some contrariety of place, those which are above and below, those which are before and behind, those which are to the right and to the left. But God cannot make two contraries to be at the same time, for this involves contradiction. Therefore God cannot make the same body to be locally in two places at the same time. . . . For any body to be in any place is nothing else than for the body to be circumscribed and included in the place according to the commensuration of its own dimensions. But that which is included in any place is in that place in such a way that none of it is outside that place: wherefore to maintain that it is locally in one place and yet that it is in another place is to maintain that contradictories are at the same time. Therefore it follows from what has been said that this cannot be done by God."³

"Two bodies cannot be at the same time in the same place. . . . It is not possible according to nature for two bodies to be at the same time in the same place, whatever kind of bodies they are."⁴

A further instance of like teaching may be cited from the treatise *On the Sacrament of the Eucharist* ascribed to St. Thomas, since, though probably by some other and much inferior writer, it represents to a large extent his lines of thought on this subject as shown in the foregoing quotations and elsewhere.

"The body of Christ is really in heaven and is really on earth on every altar and at every place where there is wheaten bread consecrated by a priest with the required form. In this then is the chief miracle, that a body identically one and the same is in different places. . . . We see that one and the same thing can be in different

¹ *Sent.* IV. x. 1 (1, ad 5).

³ *Quaest. Quodlib.* III. ii.

² *C. Gent.* IV. lxiv.

⁴ *S.T.* I. lxxvii. 2.

places in different respects and different ways, as our Lord speaks in the Gospel when He says, 'Where your treasure is, there is your heart,'¹ . . . as the Apostle spoke, saying, 'Our citizenship is in heaven'.² . . . In such a sense it is easy to understand a statement that the body of Christ is in heaven according to its natural existence, and is on earth according to its sacramental existence. But that a body identically the same should be in different places in one and the same existence, this seems altogether impossible by the common law of nature. And yet we believe that the body of Christ according to its sacramental existence is in more places than one and in different places, that is, wherever bread is duly consecrated. And this seems to be altogether contrary to the reason of a real body. But still it can be said that the reason why one body cannot be in different places is that a body which is naturally in any place is limited and circumscribed by that place, and is commensurate to it, so that the whole body is superficially in the whole place, and the parts of the body are commensurate to the parts of the place, so that separate parts of that which is in the place are allotted to the separate parts of the place. And thus the body of Christ is in the pyx or in the host, yet it is not there locally in the way which has just been described, that is, according to the condition and measure of that which is in a place and the place. For the body of Christ, though it is in a place, yet is not there under its own dimensions or under its own quantity, but under the quantity and the dimensions under which the bread was. . . . Christ is whole not only in each host but also in each cognisable part of any host, which certainly could not be if He were localised there; and none the less the whole body of Christ, which was offered on the cross, is there most really and substantially, as the whole soul is most really in the whole body and in any part of it. . . . The body of Christ always remains in heaven, and yet is really on the altar and in the mouth of every one who receives. . . . Though the body of Christ itself, so far as it is of itself, is in one place only according to its corporal nature, nevertheless, because the bread which is converted is in more places than one, therefore it necessarily follows that the body itself is in more places than one, and this not through any change in itself but through the conversion of what is different into it. . . . The real glorious body of Christ, identically the same, which was born of the Virgin, and suffered on the cross, and rose from the dead on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, is really and essentially in this Sacrament."³

¹ St. Matt. vi. 22.² Phil. iii. 20.³ *Opusc. xx.* (al. lix.) 8, 11.

Different minds will estimate differently the soundness of the arguments and conclusions of St. Thomas in accordance with differences of natural temperament and experience and philosophic opinions; it might well be agreed by all scholars that with the methods of his age and with the light that was possible to him he strove earnestly to preserve belief in the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence of the body of Christ. The significance of this fact will be seen when it is remembered that his was the most powerful theological influence in the West in the Middle Ages.¹

III.

It is of interest to turn from the great Dominicans Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas to the Franciscan doctors who inherited the traditions of Alexander of Hales. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries there were marked differences in the general temperament and outlook of Franciscans and Dominicans. In mental severity, in pure intellect, in calm and controlled reasoning faculties, in caution, the advantages for the most part lay with the Dominicans. The Franciscans were superior in originality, in freedom of thought, in intellectual sympathy. It would be a misrepresentation of a very grave kind to say that the Dominicans were not zealous or devout, or that the Franciscans were not disciplined; but it is true that restraint is a chief characteristic of the Dominican writers, and enthusiasm of the Franciscan. Among the Franciscans St. Bonaventura in the thirteenth century and Duns Scotus at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth to some extent fill the places which are filled among the Dominicans by Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas.

St. Bonaventura was born at Bagnorea in 1221. He became a member of the Franciscan Order in 1243 and General of that Order in 1257. In 1265 he declined the Archbishopric of York, offered to him by Pope Clement IV. In 1273 Pope Gregory X. made him Cardinal-bishop of Albano. He died at the Council of Lyons in 1274. He is known as the Seraphic Doctor. The doctrine which he held on the subject of the Eucharist may be seen in his treatise on the *Sentences*, and his book *On Preparation for Mass*. With these may be considered some passages in

¹ For the devotional attitude of St. Thomas as shown in his Eucharistic hymns, see pp. 346-52, *infra*.

On the Instruction of the Priest in Preparing Himself for Celebrating Mass, and *The Exposition of the Mass*, works of doubtful authorship, which have been ascribed to St. Bonaventura by some writers.¹ Considering the differences between the Dominican and Franciscan schools of theology, the agreement of the teaching of St. Bonaventura with that of St. Thomas Aquinas about the Eucharist is remarkable. On the questions, which furnished constant perplexity during the Middle Ages, whether the body of Christ could be eaten by a beast in the case of some accident to the consecrated elements and whether the accidents nourish the body, his decisions differ from those of St. Thomas. While it is true, he says, that the body of Christ "is inseparably united to the species so long as they can be considered a Sacrament and can be used by man," in the event of the species being eaten by a beast they cannot be applied to human use, and "thus the Sacrament ceases to be, and the body of Christ ceases to be there, and the substance of the bread returns"; and he describes this opinion as "the more usual and certainly the more honourable and the more reasonable".² As to physical nourishment by reception of the Sacrament he thinks it the more probable opinion that the substances of the bread and wine return for that purpose.³ On other matters which relate to the presence and gift, his decisions so closely resemble those of St. Thomas that it is unnecessary to go through them in any detail; and it may be sufficient to quote as instances of his lines of thought and method of treatment passages on the effects of Communion and frequency of Communion, a short positive statement of his belief as to the presence of Christ, a prayer for use at the time of Communion, and a statement about the life of our Lord in the Sacrament.

Of the effects of Communion St. Bonaventura writes:—

"This Sacrament has not its efficacy in any one who does not approach it worthily. And to approach worthily consists in a man preparing himself as he ought.⁴ . . . Since this is the Sacrament of union, its first effect is . . . to unite more closely those who are already united. . . . It is said to unite more closely, because it makes him who approaches worthily more fervent, as a glowing

¹ On the improbability of these two treatises being by St. Bonaventura, see the edition of his works published at Quaracchi, 1882-1902, vol. x. p. 22.

² *Sent.* IV. xiii. 2 (2, 1). ³ *Ibid.* xii. 1 (2, 2). ⁴ *Ibid.* 2 (1, 1).

coal, and also stronger, as good food. And, since it makes love more glowing, it aids in removing the ill effects of venial sin. Since it strengthens, it affords help for avoiding all wicked deeds. And, for both reasons, it helps in the increase of virtues and of love most of all." ¹

On frequency of Communion, he says:—

"If any one were always prepared, it would always be useful for him to receive this Sacrament, since in that case he would have a clean habitation for it, and would eat this food spiritually with honour and devotion. Because in the time of the primitive Church Christians were clean by their baptismal innocence and glowing with love through the gifts of the Spirit, it was right that they should communicate daily. When in many love grew cold and the baptismal purity was lost through sin, it was left to the decision and conscience of each one that he should receive when he saw himself to be rightly disposed, lest otherwise he should eat to his own condemnation. And, because men began to become negligent, it was needful that frequency should again be established by the supreme Pontiff. But, because many communicated frequently without preparing themselves well, Fabian established the custom that men should communicate on the three yearly festivals on which they are better prepared, and which they more eagerly look for, namely, Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.² And because as time went on men still prepared themselves carelessly at these three times, this was at last reduced to the Easter Communion, which is preceded by the time of preparation, namely, Lent. If, therefore, inquiry is made whether any one ought to communicate frequently, it should be said that, if he see himself to be in the condition of the primitive Church, it is praiseworthy that he communicate daily; if in the condition of the Church as it came to be, that is, cold and sluggish, that he communicate rarely; if he is in a middle state, he ought to act in a middle way, and sometimes to abstain so as to learn reverence and sometimes to approach so as to be inflamed with love, because honour and love are due to such a guest; and then he ought to incline in that direction in which he sees that he makes the better progress, which a man learns only by experience."³

¹ *Sent.* IV. xii. 2 (1, 3).

² A decree to this effect is ascribed to Pope Fabian in the canon law: see *Decret.* III. ii. 16.

³ *Sent.* IV. xii. 2 (2, 2). Substantially the same position is shortly expressed by St. Thomas Aquinas in *S.T.* III. lxxx. 10, where he says, "because

On the presence of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament, he says :—

“When the words of Christ are uttered, the material and visible bread, giving honour to the coming of the life-giving and heavenly Bread as its true Creator, leaves its own place, that is, the visible species of the accidents, to perform the office of sacramental service ; and as soon as it ceases to be there really exist under those accidents in a wonderful and ineffable way :—First, that most pure flesh and sacred body of Christ which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, was the offspring of the womb of the glorious Virgin Mary, was hung on the cross, was laid in the tomb, was glorified in heaven. Secondly, since flesh does not live without blood, that precious blood which with happy result flowed on the cross for the salvation of the world is necessarily there. Thirdly, since there cannot be true man without rational soul, the glorious soul of Christ, exceeding in grace all virtue and glory and power, in which are stored all the treasures of wisdom and of the knowledge of God, is there. Fourthly, because Christ is true God and true Man, it follows that God is there, glorious in His majesty. All these four at the same time, and each wholly at the same time, are perfectly contained under the species of bread and wine, not less in the cup than in the host, and not less in the host than in the cup.”¹

A prayer for silent utterance in the heart at the moment of Communion is as follows :—

“My Lord, who art Thou, and who am I, that I should presume to place Thee in the foul sewer of my body and my soul? What hast Thou done to me that I should inflict this dreadful injury on Thee? A thousand years of tears would not suffice for once worthily receiving so noble a Sacrament. How much more am I unworthy, wretched man, who daily sin, and continue without amendment, and approach in sin. But Thy mercy is infinitely greater than my misery. Therefore, trusting in Thy goodness, I presume to receive Thee.”²

On the life in the Sacrament he says :—

in most men many hindrances to this devotion often occur through want of the right disposition of body or soul, it is not useful for all men to approach this Sacrament daily, but as often as a man finds himself prepared for it”.

¹ *De prep. ad miss.* 1.

² *Ibid.* 13 ; cf. *De instruct. sacerdot. ad se prep. ad celebr. miss.*

“The body of Christ is living; and, if living, organic; and, if organic, of quantity; therefore, if on the altar it be not withdrawn from life, neither is it from bulk. . . . The body of Christ or Christ there sees and hears, though He does not speak so as not to be outwardly discerned. . . . The external senses presuppose bulk: therefore He is there in bulk. . . . The body is in the host with its completeness and has its size in such a way that it is not there after the manner of size.”¹

On the elevation of the consecrated Sacrament immediately after consecration there is the following passage in the treatise *The Exposition of the Mass*:—

“It must now be considered why the priest in the Mass lifts on high the body of the Lord and shows it to the people who are present. The body of our Lord Jesus Christ is lifted up by the priest in the Mass for many reasons. Of these reasons, the first and chief is to obtain the grace of God the Father, which we have lost by our sins. . . . The priest then at the altar lifts up the body of Christ, as if to say: O heavenly Father, we have sinned, and we have provoked Thee to anger. But now look on the face of Christ Thy Son, whom we present to Thee, and we call Thee from anger to pity. . . . The second reason why it is elevated is to obtain every good thing of which we are in need in the present life and in that which is to come. . . . The priest lifts up the body of Christ as if to say to those who are present, If ye wish to obtain what ye desire, have peace among yourselves, and love one another with mutual affection, because Christ by His death reconciled us to God and the angels, and through love He prepared for us eternal joys. Thirdly, the body of Christ is elevated to claim our right, which we have in heaven now in hope, and are to have at length in fact. Our right which we have in heaven is eternal life. . . . The priest at the altar lifts up the body of Christ as if to say, O ye angelical spirits, who are here present, be ye witnesses that eternal life is our right; and to establish this we lift up Him who gives us the right, Christ, who suffered for us. The fourth reason why the body of Christ is elevated is to show the power of God. For great is the power of God, because at the utterance of the words, This is My body, the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ. This is a change of the right hand of the Most High, and transcends all perception. Therefore the priest lifts up the body of Christ as if

¹ *Sent.* IV. x. 1, 2, 4. Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* III. lxxvi. 3; see pp. 329, 330, *supra*.

to say, Before ye saw bread on the altar, but now after the consecration ye see the real body of Christ. If therefore God has with so great power been able to make such a change, He is able to change us from guilt to grace, and afterwards to glory. The fifth reason why the body is elevated is to declare the wisdom of God; for by a wonderful and ineffable wisdom Christ shows Himself to us hidden. . . . Sixthly, the body of Christ is elevated at the altar to show His bounty. For what bounty is greater than that man should eat the bread of angels. Therefore the priest lifts up the body of Christ at the altar as if to say, O faithful ones of Christ, rejoice and behold; for this is the heavenly food of the angels, which the most bounteous King of heaven has granted to us, that ye may be filled with all grace and blessing. . . . Seventhly, the body of Christ is elevated to show the goodness of Christ. For what greater goodness is there than that Christ deigns to be a prisoner on the altar. . . . The priest lifts up the body of Christ at the altar as if to say, Lo, He whom the whole world cannot contain is our prisoner; therefore we must not let Him go until we obtain that for which we seek. Eighthly, the body of Christ is elevated to gladden the holy Church by the standard of the army. . . . The priest lifts up the body of Christ at the altar as if to say to the elect, . . . Behold our standard which for our sakes was emblazoned and portrayed on the cross. Behold, the Lord Jesus is in our midst. Ninthly, it is elevated that we may imitate and follow Christ. . . . The priest lifts up the body of Christ as if to say to sinners and other Christians, Behold the Son of God, who for us was stretched and raised on the gibbet of the cross; follow Him, that ye may suffer at least something for Him who suffered so much for us."¹

The explanation of the elevation before the commixture in the same treatise is:—

“By the raising of the body of Christ above the cup and the signing of the cup with it is to be understood that by Christ death is conquered, life is restored, and glory is given.”²

On the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the actions of the priest are described in the treatise *The Exposition of the Mass* as mystically representing the actions of Christ;³ and in this treatise and in the writings of St. Bonaventura the prayers and ceremonies of the ordinary and canon of the Mass are viewed as a commemoration of the Incarnation and passion and resurrection

¹ *Expos. miss.* 4.

² *Ibid.*
22 *

³ *Ibid.* 1.

of Christ, of the mysteries of the divine life, and of the union of the Church with Christ;¹ by means of the Eucharistic rite the Church on earth is united to the worship in heaven and to the heavenly life of Christ;² the bread and the wine are said to be significant of the body which suffered and the blood which was shed in the passion;³ the fraction of the consecrated host is described as a commemoration of the passion.⁴

John Duns Scotus may have been a native of Northumberland or of Scotland or of Ireland. The date of his birth is uncertain. He was a member of the Franciscan Order. At the beginning of the sixteenth century he was teaching at Oxford. He was afterwards a teacher at Paris and at Cologne, where he died in 1308. He is known as the Subtle Doctor. The parts of his writings which treat of or bear on the doctrine of the Eucharist, like those which deal with other subjects, are marked by great complexity and subtlety, and a noticeable feature is the skill and care with which he elaborates arguments in support of positions which he does not himself adopt. As regards the Eucharist, there is little disagreement on points of importance between him and St. Thomas, although the minds of the two writers were evidently remarkably different. His reluctance to describe any notion as impossible may be illustrated by the facts that, though he himself accepts the doctrine of Transubstantiation as being the doctrine of the Church, he allows the abstract possibility of the presence of the body of Christ together with the bread in the consecrated Sacrament,⁵ and that, though he distinguishes between the natural mode of the presence of Christ in heaven and the sacramental mode of His presence in the Eucharist and describes the Eucharistic presence as not quantitative or dimensive or local, he maintains that it is possible in the abstract for the same body to be at the same time present locally in two different places,⁶ and for the body of Christ to be at the same time both in heaven and in the Eucharist in a natural manner.⁷ His lines of argument might often at first sight suggest that he looked on the Eucharistic presence as being of a carnal character; but such an impression is not supported by an examination of his

¹ *Sent.* IV. xii. 2 *init.*; *De prep. ad miss.* 6; *Expos. miss.* 2, 4.

² *Expos. miss.* 4.

³ *De prep. ad miss.* 2.

⁴ *Sent.* IV. xii. 1 (3, 3).

⁵ *Ibid.* x. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.* 2; *Quaest. Quodl.* x.

⁷ *Ibid.* 3.

own position and definitions, as may be seen by his statements that the body of Christ is present without any local movement and not carnally or locally but spiritually and by a different mode of existence than His natural existence in heaven.¹ Some special interest attaches to his opinions about the words of consecration, the relation of the priest to the Church, and the relation of our Lord to the act of sacrifice in the Mass.

On the words of consecration, after saying that the words of the consecration of the body are "This is My body" with their meaning shown by their position in the rest of the canon, and alluding to a doubt about the difference of "This is the cup of My blood" from "This is My blood," he writes:—

"There is a second doubt whether all the words from 'In like manner' to 'Wherefore also mindful' belong to the form which we use. It is commonly held that the words 'Do this for My memorial' do not in this way belong to the form. And this is proved because the words 'Take this' do not refer more to the blood than to the body; for Christ ordered the consecration to be made of the body as of the blood; therefore, if the words 'Do this for My memorial' belong to the consecration of the blood, by like reasoning they are part also of the consecration of the body;² and in consequence, when the host is elevated, the body of Christ is still not there, and so there is idolatry, which is not to be said. . . . Perhaps there is no one who knows for certain, neither the bishop nor the ordained, what are the exact words of ordination to be a priest; and yet we must not say that no one has been ordained to be a priest in the Church. In like manner different priests use different words in administering the Sacrament of Penance, and it is not certain about any words exactly which they are, yet we must not say that no one is absolved in the Church. What advice, then, shall there be? I say that the priest intending to do what the Church does, reading distinctly the words of the canon from the beginning to the end, really consecrates; nor is it safe for any one, thinking himself very skilled in his own knowledge, to say, I wish to use exactly these words for the consecration of the blood; but it is safer to be simple and say, I wish to utter these words with the intention with which Christ ordained that they should be uttered, so that I say as of the

¹ *Sent.* IV. x. 1, 3, 4; *Quaest. Quodl.* x.

² In the canon of the Mass known to Scotus, as in the present Roman canon, the words "Do this for My memorial" did not occur after the consecration of the host, but only after the consecration of the chalice.

form those which are of the form by Christ's appointment, and for reverence those which are for reverence. But what is to be done if it happen that the priest dies before all the words have been uttered? Is the blood to be reckoned as really consecrated? I say here—as I said in a case previously considered, whether if some priest begins at this point 'This is My body' without saying completely the words that precede—that in all such cases we must adore only with a condition, if it is really consecrated. And are the words to be repeated? I say that they are not to be repeated without condition. But are they to be repeated with a condition? I say that in this case there is no such necessity as there is in the case of Baptism; because in that case, when there is a doubt about the baptism, there is a doubt about salvation. Therefore in that case it is sometimes lawful to baptise with a condition. But in this matter, if there is good ground for a doubt in any one of the cases mentioned whether the consecration has been completed, there is no danger threatening salvation if there is no repetition whether without condition or with a condition. What then is to be done? Is that matter to be kept for ever? I say that it is not, because it would become corrupted; but the priest after his Communion in his own Mass can receive that matter with a conditioned intention of this kind, If this is consecrated, I receive it as consecrated, but, if it is not consecrated, as not consecrated, as that about which there is uncertainty; and in this plan there is no danger, because he is fasting until he receives the wine of the ablution, and if it is not blood which he receives, he does no irreverence to the body and blood which he has already received, because immediately after the reception of the blood we receive mere wine at the altar."¹

The following passages bear on the relation of the priest to the Church and of our Lord to the act of sacrifice.

"The Mass avails not only by virtue of the merit or work of him who works but also by virtue of the sacrifice or work wrought. Or, it avails not only by virtue of the personal merit of the priest who offers but also by virtue of the merit of the whole Church, in the person of which the sacrifice is offered by means of the minister of all; otherwise the Mass of a bad priest, who has no personal merit in that act but only demerit, would be of no avail to any one in the Church, which is unfitting by the common judgment, and rightly, according to the words 'The bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world';² for, whenever Christ offers as

¹ *Sent.* IV. viii. 2.

² *St. John* vi. 51.

High Priest, the bread which He gives, that is, His flesh, is the life of the world.”¹

“The good to be rendered by virtue of the sacrifice does not correspond exactly to the good contained in the Eucharist; for that good is equal when the Eucharist is reserved in the pyx; and yet it is not then of equal value to the Church as when it is offered in the Mass, whether this be called indefinitely the offering of the Eucharist or the consecration or the reception or the oblation or some action of the priest in the person of the Church. Therefore beyond the good contained in the Eucharist the offering of the Eucharist is required. This is not accepted unless there be the acceptance of one who offers. . . . As the Eucharist is not fully accepted exactly by reason of what is contained in it, but there is need that it be offered, so neither is it fully accepted when offered except by reason of the good will of some one offering it, yet not exactly by reason of the will of the celebrant himself, for this pertains to personal merit, not to the virtue of the sacrifice, nor immediately by reason of the will of Christ Himself offering, for, though Christ is here offered willingly in the sacrifice, yet He does not here immediately offer sacrifice, as is said ‘Nor yet that He should offer Himself often’ and ‘Christ was once offered,’² that is, by Himself offering; otherwise it would seem that the celebration of one Mass would be of equal value to the passion of Christ, if He who offered immediately and He who is offered were the same in the Mass as in the passion. But it is certain that the Mass is not of equal value to the passion of Christ, though it has a very special value in so far as there is in it a very special commemoration of the offering which Christ made on the cross. . . . The Mass is both a representation of the offering on the cross and a means of pleading through it, that is, that through the offering of the passion God will accept the sacrifice of the Church. . . . The Eucharist when offered is accepted not by reason of the will of Christ as immediately offering but by reason of the will of the whole Church, which has a finite power of merit. So let it be that it is accepted by reason of the will of Christ as offering, that is, ordaining the offering, and giving to it value and acceptance, yet that it is not of equal value to the passion of Christ and is not accepted as the passion of Christ, and so that its merit is finite, to which the good which is due by virtue of the sacrifice corresponds. But, since it is accepted by reason of the will of the whole Church, is it of both the Church triumphant and the Church mili-

¹ *Quaest. Quodl.* xx.

² *Heb.* ix. 25, 28.

tant? Not so; rather, the sacrifice is peculiar to the Church militant, as also is the Sacrament in which it is a sacrifice.”¹

In this teaching of Duns Scotus about the Eucharistic sacrifice may be observed some of the characteristic features of the Franciscan theology, a revolt against what seemed hardness and stiffness in the Dominican doctrines, a desire to bring together the acts of the priest and the acts of the Church, a keen regard for the value of human merit which was thought by the divines of the Thomist school to amount to a tendency to Pelagianism. There may also be seen an eagerness to protect the unique character of the death of our Lord on the cross. It may be suggested that, if the Scotist theologians had kept more clearly in view the connection of the Eucharistic sacrifice with the heavenly offering of our Lord, they might have been saved from some difficulties which led them to dissociate the offering of the Mass from the acts of Christ.

IV.

The doctrine held in the thirteenth century may be further illustrated by the Bull of Pope Urban IV. relating to the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi, the Eucharistic hymns of St. Thomas Aquinas, practical instructions in regard to adoration, some devotional acts and instructions, and the mystical interpretations of William Durand.

1. A local observance of the feast of Corpus Christi in the diocese of Liège appears to have been sanctioned by Robert Bishop of Liège in 1246; and in 1264 Pope Urban IV. commanded this feast to be kept throughout the whole Western Church. In the Bull containing this command the Pope said:—

“When about to leave this world and to go to the Father, our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ . . . instituted the supreme and wonderful Sacrament of His body and blood by giving His body for food and His blood for drink. . . . This is the most sweet memorial, the saving remembrance, in which we renew the pleasant memory of our redemption, in which we are drawn back from evil, and strengthened in good, and advance to increase of virtue and grace, in which we make progress by the bodily presence of the Saviour Himself. . . . In this sacramental memorial of Christ, Jesus Christ is present with us, under a different form indeed, but in His own sub-

¹ *Quaest. Quodl. xx. ; cf. Sent. IV. xiii. 2.*

stance. . . . O worthy memorial, never to be omitted, in which we call to mind that our death is dead, that our destruction has been destroyed, that the life-giving Wood nailed to the cross has brought to us the fruit of salvation. . . . Though His bounty to us has been so great, yet still wishing to show in us His abounding love in His great generosity, He has bestowed Himself on us, and surpassing all fulness of rich gifts, exceeding every way of love, He has made Himself our food. O unique and wonderful generosity, when the Giver comes as the Gift, and that which is given is the same as He who gives. O great and splendid bounty, when He gives Himself. He has given Himself for food, that, as man fell through death, by food also he may be restored to life. Man fell through the food of deadly wood; man has been raised through the food of life-giving Wood. In the one was the means of death; in the other was the nourishment of life. . . . If any one shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. This is the food which fully refreshes, which really nourishes, which highly sustains, not the body but the heart, not the flesh but the spirit,¹ not the belly but the mind. For man, therefore, who needed spiritual nourishment, the merciful Saviour Himself in the goodness of His mind provided for the refreshment of the soul from this noble and powerful sustenance. . . . This bread is taken but in truth it is not consumed; it is eaten, but it is not changed; because it is in no way transformed into him who eats it, but, if it is worthily received, he who receives it is conformed to it. O most excellent Sacrament, to be adored, to be venerated, to be worshipped, to be glorified, to be extolled with highest praise, to be exalted by worthy oratory, to be honoured with all zeal, to be celebrated with devout observance, to be held fast by pure minds. . . . This memorial ought to be continually celebrated, that we may be ever mindful of Him whose memorial we know it to be, because, the more often His gift is seen, the more firmly is the memory of Him retained. Therefore, although this memorial Sacrament is already celebrated in the daily observance of Mass, yet we think it fitting and worthy that at least once in the year, specially to overthrow the perfidy and madness of heretics, there be a more solemn and notable memory. For on the day of the Supper of the Lord, on which Christ Himself instituted this Sacrament, the Universal Church . . . is not able to be fully at leisure for the commemoration of this chief Sacrament. For in regard to the saints, whom we venerate throughout the year, the Church observes this, that, although we often renew the memory of them in

¹The Latin texts have "food" (*escam*), but "spirit" (*spiritum*) appears to be required by the sense.

litanies and Masses and in other ways, yet none the less the Church keeps their birthdays more solemnly on fixed days in the course of the year by celebrating special feasts on these days. And because on these feasts some due solemnity is omitted through negligence, or through occupation in private affairs, or in some other way through human weakness, our Mother the Church has appointed a fixed day, on which there may be a commemoration of all the saints together. . . . Therefore this should most of all be observed in regard to the life-giving Sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, who is the glory and crown of all the saints, that it should shine forth with a special festival and solemnity. . . . Moreover, when we held a lower office, we knew that it had been divinely revealed to certain Catholics that a feast of this kind ought to be generally observed in the Church. Therefore, to confirm and exalt the Catholic faith, we have worthily and reasonably determined to appoint that concerning so great a Sacrament, besides the daily memorial which the Church makes of it, there be celebrated yearly a more solemn and special memorial, appointing for this purpose a fixed day, namely, the Thursday after the Octave of Pentecost, that on this day the devout bands of the faithful may flock in joy to the churches. . . . We exhort in the Lord, and command . . . that you keep so great and glorious a feast every year on the aforesaid Thursday with devotion and solemnity, . . . carefully exhorting either yourselves or through others those who are committed to your charge on the Sunday immediately preceding the aforesaid Thursday that by means of genuine and honest confession, giving of alms, earnest and careful prayers, and other works of devotion and piety, they may strive so to prepare themselves that they may be counted worthy to become partakers of this most precious Sacrament on that day, and may be able to receive Him with reverence, and through His power to obtain an increase of grace."¹

2. At the bidding of Pope Urban IV. the office for use on the feast of Corpus Christi was written by St. Thomas Aquinas. A literal translation of the hymns contained in it will show how St. Thomas expressed in devotion the doctrine which has already been illustrated from his theological writings.²

¹Cherubini, *Bullarium Romanum*, i. 146-48; Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 547-52. Cf. the Bulls of Martin V. and Eugenius IV. in 1429 and 1433 respectively; see Cherubini, *op. cit.* i. 327, 328, 342, 343; Hardouin, *op. cit.* viii. 1490, 1491.

²See pp. 322-34, *supra*.

"Tell, my tongue, the mystery of the glorious body,
And of the precious blood, which for the ransom of the world
The King of the nations, the Fruit of the noble womb, shed.

Given for us, born for us from a pure virgin,
And dwelling in the world, and sowing the seed of the word,
In wondrous fashion He ended His patient sojourn.

On the night of the Great Supper, sitting at meat with His
brethren,
When He has fully observed the law by the appointed foods,
He gives Himself with His own hands as food to the twelve.

The Word made flesh makes real bread flesh by word,
And wine becomes the blood of Christ, though sense fails;
Faith alone is able to strengthen the pure heart.

Therefore, bowing, let us revere so great a Sacrament,
And let the ancient pattern give way to the new rite;
Let faith supply what the senses lack."¹

"At the holy feast let there be joy,
And from the heart let songs resound,
Let things of old depart, let all be new,
Hearts, voices, and deeds.

The night of the Last Supper is called to mind,
When Christ is believed the lamb and the unleavened bread
To have given to His brethren according to the law
Declared to the ancient fathers.

After the typical lamb and the completed feast,
The Lord's body given to His disciples,
Whole to all and whole to each,
By His hands we confess.

He gave to them in their weakness the stay of His body,
He gave to them in their sadness the cup of His blood,
Saying, Take the cup which I give,
Drink ye all of it.

¹ *Opuscula*, xvii. (al. lvii.). There is a metrical translation of this hymn in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (No. 260, new edition, "Now, my tongue, the mystery telling"), *The English Hymnal* (No. 326, "Of the glorious body telling"), and other hymn-books.

So did He institute this sacrifice,
 Of which He willed the office to be committed
 To priests alone, to whom thus it pertains
 That they should take, and give to the rest.

The bread of the angels becomes the bread of men,
 The bread of heaven makes an end of types.
 O marvel, he eats the Lord
 Who is the poor and lowly servant."¹

"The Word of heaven proceeding forth,
 Yet leaving not the right hand of the Father,
 Going to His work,
 Came to the evening of life.

For death by a disciple
 To be given to His foes,
 First in the food of life
 He gives Himself to His disciples.

To whom under two kinds
 He gave flesh and blood,
 That of twofold substance
 The whole man He might feed.

In birth He gave Himself as a fellow,
 While sharing their meal He gave Himself for food,
 Dying He gave Himself for a ransom,
 Reigning He gives Himself as a reward.

O saving Victim,
 Who openest the gate of heaven,
 Wars from our enemies press on,
 Grant strength, bring aid."²

 "Praise, Sion, the Saviour,
 Praise the Leader and Shepherd,
 In hymns and songs.

¹ *Opuscula*, xvii. (al. lvii.).

² *Ibid.* There is a metrical translation of this hymn in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (No. 261, new edition, "The heavenly Word proceeding forth"), *The English Hymnal* (No. 330, "The Word of God proceeding forth"), and other hymn-books.

Dare all thou canst,
 For He is greater than all praise,
 Nor canst thou praise Him enough.

A special theme of praise,
 The living and life-giving bread,
 Is set forth to-day.

Whom on the table of the holy Supper,
 To the band of the twelve brethren,
 To have been given we doubt not.

Let praise be full and sounding,
 Pleasant and seemly be
 The gladness of mind.

For a solemn day is kept,
 On which is called to mind
 The first institution of this Table.

On this Table of the new King
 The new passover of the new law
 Ends the ancient passover.

That which is old, the new,
 The shadow, the reality puts to flight.
 Light dispels night.

That which Christ did at the Supper,
 He ordained to be done
 For His memorial.

Taught by the ancient precepts,
 Bread and wine we hallow
 As the sacrifice of salvation.

The doctrine is given to Christians
 That bread is turned into flesh,
 And wine into blood.

What thou dost not grasp, what thou dost not see,
 Bold faith makes sure,
 Beyond the order of nature.

Under different kinds,
 Signs only and not things,
 Precious things lie hidden.

Flesh is food, blood is drink,
 Yet the whole Christ remains
 Under each kind.

Not separated by him who takes Him,
 Not broken, not divided,
 Whole He is taken.

One takes Him, a thousand take Him,
 The one takes as much as they,
 Nor being taken is He consumed.

To the bad He is death, to the good He is life,
 See from equal taking
 How different is the result.

When the Sacrament is broken,
 Doubt not, but remember
 As much is under a fragment
 As is covered by the whole.

Of the reality there is no division,
 Of the sign only is the breaking,
 Whereby neither state nor stature
 Of Him whose is the sign is diminished.

Lo, the bread of the angels
 Is made the food of the sojourners,
 Really the bread of the sons,
 Not to be given to dogs.

In figures it is foretold,
 When Isaac is sacrificed,
 The lamb of the passover chosen,
 The manna given to the fathers.

Good Shepherd, very Bread,
 Jesu, have mercy on us,
 Thou feed us, Thou protect us,
 Thou make us to see what is good
 In the land of the living.

Thou who knowest and canst do all things,
 Thou who here feedest us mortals,
 There to sit at Thy table,
 Co-heirs and partners
 Of the holy saints make us." ¹

Another Eucharistic hymn composed by St. Thomas Aquinas but not included in the office for the feast of Corpus Christi is the following :—

“Devoutly I adore Thee, unseen Godhead,
 Who under these signs really liest hid ;
 To Thee my whole heart submits itself,
 Because contemplating Thee it wholly fails.

Sight, touch, taste, in Thee are deceived,
 But to the hearing alone is trust safely accorded.
 I believe whatever the Son of God has said,
 Nothing is more true than this word of truth.

On the cross lay hid only the deity,
 But here lies hid also the humanity ;
 Yet believing and confessing both,
 I seek what the penitent robber sought.

Thy wounds as Thomas I do not behold,
 Yet I confess Thee as My God ;
 Make me always to believe Thee more,
 In Thee to have hope, Thee to love.

O memorial of the death of the Lord,
 Living Bread, giving life to man,
 Grant to my mind to live of Thee,
 And of Thee always sweetly to be wise.

Pelican of goodness, Jesu Lord,
 Cleanse me unclean in Thy blood,
 Of which one drop could save
 The whole world from all guilt.

Jesu, whom I now see veiled,
 May that be which I so long for,

¹ *Opuscula*, xvii. (al. lvii.). There is a metrical translation of this hymn in *The English Hymnal* (No. 317, “Laud, O Sion, Thy salvation”) and other hymn-books.

That beholding Thee with unveiled face,
I may be blessed in the sight of Thy glory."¹

3. Mention has already been made of the eleventh century instructions for the carrying of the Sacrament in the procession on Palm Sunday in the statutes of Lanfranc, and for the adoration in connection with the procession.² The *Acts of the Abbots of St. Albans*, probably the work of Matthew Paris in the first half of the thirteenth century, record that the Abbot Simon, who was Abbot of St. Albans from 1166 to 1183, had a vessel of gold adorned with precious stones made in which to keep the Sacrament over the high altar; that King Henry II., on hearing of this, sent to St. Albans a very costly cup in which was to be placed "the case immediately containing the body of Christ"; and that the Abbot Simon also had made a shrine of peculiar beauty, in which "the body of the Lord" might be carried in the procession on Palm Sunday, and brought back to the Church "with the greatest reverence, that the faithful may see of how great honour the most holy body of the Lord is worthy, which at this time suffered itself to be scourged, crucified, and buried".³ Before the end of the twelfth century there is a provision in the *Synodical Constitutions* of Odo, the Bishop of Paris, that is, Eudes de Sully, that "the laity are to be frequently admonished that, whenever they see the body of the Lord carried out, they are to genuflect as to their Lord and Creator, and to pray with joined hands until it has passed by".⁴ In the course of the thirteenth century there are very numerous instances of practical instructions for the adoration of our Lord in the Eucharist. Like the eleventh century statutes of Lanfranc,⁵ and in accordance

¹ *Opuscula*, xvii. (al. lvii.) There is a metrical translation of this hymn in Dr. Pusey's edition of the *Paradise for the Christian Soul*, p. 405, and in a less complete and exact form in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (No. 266, new edition, "Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour"), *The English Hymnal* (No. 331, "Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour"), and other hymn-books.

² See pp. 249, 250, *supra*.

³ *Gesta Abb. S. Alb.* i. 190-92 (Rolls Series, vol. xxviii. 4 a). The practice of carrying the Sacrament in the Palm Sunday procession at St. Albans may have been due to the adoption of the statutes of Lanfranc by the Abbot Paul, the first Abbot after the Norman Conquest: see *Gesta Abb. S. Alb.* i. 52, 61.

⁴ *Syn. Const.* v. 6; see Hardouin, *Concilia*, vi. (2) 1940.

⁵ See pp. 249, 250, *supra*.

with the practice in use at St. Albans in the twelfth century,¹ a thirteenth century manuscript of Irish origin now in the Bodleian Library, which gives the usage of the Church of Sarum, contains provisions for the carrying of the Sacrament in procession on Palm Sunday, and for adoration in connection with the procession.² The English historian and theologian Gerald de Barry, usually known as Giraldus Cambrensis, who was born about 1147 and died about 1223, says that the Eucharist ought to be carried to the sick "with due honour and reverence," and "adored and worthily venerated by the people" when so carried.³

It is recorded of Cardinal Guido that, when he was at Cologne in 1203, he ordered that "at the elevation of the host⁴ all the people in the church should prostrate themselves at the sound of the bell, and remain prostrated until after the consecration of the chalice"; and that, when the Sacrament was carried out of doors for the Communion of the sick, "all the people both in the streets and in the houses should adore Christ".⁵ The *Constitutions* approved in 1208 by William, Bishop of Paris, contain an injunction that "in the celebration of Mass, when the body of Christ is elevated, at the elevation itself or a little before a bell is to be rung, as has been appointed elsewhere, so that the minds of the faithful may be roused to prayer".⁶ In 1217 it was decreed in one of the *Constitutions* of Richard Poore, Bishop of Salisbury, that "the laity are to be admonished to act reverently at the consecration of the Eucharist, and to kneel, especially at the time when, after the elevation of the Eucharist, the sacred host is put down".⁷ In 1219 Pope Honorius III. ordered the

¹ See p. 352, *supra*.

² Rawl. MS. c. 892, fo. 44 a, 46 b. The author is indebted to Mr. Charlton Walker for calling his attention to this MS. Cf. the *Sarum Consuetudinary* in Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, i. 59-61.

³ *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, i. 6 (*Opera*, ii. 20, Rolls Series, vol. xxi. b).

⁴ The direction for the elevation of the host immediately after the consecration of the bread may have been due originally to the controversy whether the consecration of the bread was completed before the consecration of the chalice. See pp. 308, 312, *supra*, and cf. the article by Father Thurston referred to in note 4 on p. 312, *supra*.

⁵ Cæsarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus*, ix. 51; cf. Raynald, *Ann. Eccl.* s. a. 1203, xlii.

⁶ *Const.* 15; see Hardouin, *Concilia*, vi. (2) 1979.

⁷ *Ibid.* 38; see Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 100.

Irish bishops to provide that the people should "bow reverently" at the elevation of the host in the Mass, and when the Sacrament was taken to the sick.¹ Under his successor Pope Gregory IX. this injunction became part of the canon law.² The Council of Durham in 1220, in connection with the statement that Christ "really refreshed" His disciples "with His body and blood under the species of bread and wine transubstantiated by the power of God, the bread into His body and the wine into His blood," and that communicants "receive without doubt under the species of bread that which hung for us on the cross," and "in the cup that which was poured from the side of Christ," ordered that "the people should be taught to act reverently and kneel at the consecration of the Eucharist, especially at that time when, after the elevation of the Eucharist, the sacred host is put down".³ The Council of Oxford of 1222 ordered that "lay people are to be frequently taught that, wherever they see the body of the Lord to be carried, at once they genuflect as to their Creator and Redeemer, and with joined hands pray humbly while it passes by, and that this most of all is done at the time of the consecration at the elevation of the host, when the bread is transformed into the real body of Christ, and that which is in the cup is transformed into His blood by the mystic blessing".⁴ The *Constitutions* of Walter de Cantelupe, Bishop of Worcester, issued in 1240 gave instructions that, when the Sacrament was carried to the sick, the people should "on their knees adore their Saviour by the way".⁵ In the *Ancient Statutes of the Carthusians*, which are probably of the middle of the thirteenth century, it is said that "when 'This is My body' has been said, the host is elevated so that it can be seen, and a bell is rung. . . . At the elevation of the host, if we are praying standing, we fall down to the ground, as when 'And was made Man' is said, and we do not rise until the chalice is put down."⁶ In the *Statutes* of Archbishop Peckham of 1280 it was ordered that the people should "prostrate themselves, or at least pray humbly, wherever it might happen that the King of glory was carried under the covering of bread".⁷ The Council of Exeter of 1287 provided that

¹ *Ep.* iii. ; see Mansi, *Concilia*, xxii. 1100.

² *Decret. Greg.* III. xli. 10.

³ Wilkins, *Conc.* i. 578, 579.

⁴ *Ibid.* 594.

⁵ *Ibid.* 667.

⁶ See Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* I. iv. 12 (25).

⁷ Wilkins, *Conc.* ii. 48.

the host should not be elevated till the words "This is My body" had been fully said, "lest the creature should be adored by the people instead of the Creator"; and that "the faithful" should "adore the body of the Lord by humbly bowing and if possible on bent knees" when the Sacrament was carried to the sick.¹ Passing by similar instructions elsewhere, some provisions of the Council of Cologne of 1280 may be cited as affording an illustration of what were held to be the practical consequences of the doctrine about the Eucharist.

"No priest is to elevate the host to show it to the people until he has said the words 'For this is My body'. And the bell is to be struck with three strokes on one side, that the faithful who hear, wherever they may be, may come and adore. . . . If any part of the blood or body of the Lord has fallen on the covering of the altar, that part is to be cut out and burnt, and the ashes are to be placed in a sacred place or the piscina. And, if a part of the corporal has been stained with the blood, it is to be carefully washed three times, and the water is to be taken by the priest or some other religious person fasting. And after being washed the afore-said cloth can be used as before. Also, if a drop of the blood has fallen on a vestment, that part is to be cut out and burnt, and the ashes are to be placed in a sacred place, as was said before. If the blood has fallen on wood or stone or solid earth, that part, if it can conveniently be, is to be licked by the priest, and afterwards scraped, and what is scraped off is to be placed in a sacred place or the sacred piscina. . . . Priests are to place a decent covering over the vessel in which the body of the Lord is carried, and to carry it to the sick with reverence and raised. If the sick man frequently and easily suffers from sickness, the body of the Lord is not to be given to him; but let him believe, and it is enough that he receives spiritually.² Also, we enjoin that any priest, before he communicates the sick man, is to ask him whether he believes that under this form and species of bread is the body of the Lord, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and on the third day was raised. If the sick man has confessed this by word or evident sign, the priest is to give him Communion, if there is no other hindrance. . . . When the body of the Lord is carried, the faithful who are present, if it can fittingly be, are to genuflect and smite their breasts and reverently adore with bowed heads and joined and uplifted hands. And horse-

¹ Wilkins, *Conc.* ii. 132, 133.

² Cf. *York Manual* and *Sarum Manual* (Surtees Society, lxxiii. 52, 50*).

men are not to disdain to come down from their horses to adore Him who for them came down from heaven."¹

4. Further illustrations of the way in which practical effect was given to the doctrine ordinarily held in the thirteenth century may be derived from *The Lay Folks Mass Book* and the *Ancren Riwle*.

The Lay Folks Mass Book was written by Dan Jeremy, who may have been Canon of Rouen and afterwards Archdeacon of Cleveland, in French probably in the twelfth century and was translated into English in the thirteenth century. It describes the "housel" as being "both flesh and blood". At the ringing of the bell at the consecration the people are directed to kneel down and behold the elevation and "do reverence to Jesus Christ's own presence," holding up both hands, and, in default of prayers in their own words, to say:—

" Praised be Thou, King,
And blessed be Thou, King,
Of all Thy giftes good
And thanked be Thou, King.
Iesu, all my joying,
That for me spilt Thy blood,
And died upon the rood,
Thou give me grace to sing
The song of Thy praising."

In the later texts the instructions are the same; but the words given to be addressed to our Lord at the elevation are different:—

"Welcome, Lord, in form of bread,
For me Thou didst suffer hard deed.
As Thou didst bear the crown of thorn,
Suffer me not to be forlorn."²

The *Ancren Riwle*, that is, the rule of the anchoresses or recluses, is a document of the thirteenth century, which is thought by some to have been written by Bishop Richard Poore, who was Bishop of Chichester from 1214 to 1217, Bishop of Salisbury

¹ Hardouin, *Conc.* vii. 823-26.

² See *The Lay Folks Mass Book*, edited by Canon Simmons for the Early English Text Society, pp. 20, 21, 38-41. The modernised forms as quoted above are on p. xxix.

from 1217 to 1228, and Bishop of Durham from 1228 to 1237, and died at Tarrant in Dorset in 1237, though the citation of Dominican prayers and the doubt expressed as to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin have led others to think it to be the work of a Dominican writer.¹ It contains several allusions to the Eucharist.

“When ye are quite dressed, . . . think upon God’s flesh, and on His blood, which is over the high altar, and fall on your knees towards it, with this salutation, ‘Hail, Thou Author of our creation! Hail, Thou price of our redemption! Hail, Thou who art our support during our pilgrimage! Hail, O reward of our expectation!’

Be Thou our joy,
Who art to be our meed.
Our glory be in Thee
Through endless time.
Abide with us, O Lord!
Remove dark night;
Wash off all guilt;
Grant godly balm.
Glory to Thee, O Lord,
Thou Virgin’s Son.

Thus shall you do also when the priest elevates it at the Mass, and before the confession, when you are about to receive the host.”

“In the Mass, when the priest elevates God’s body, say these verses, standing, ‘Behold the Saviour of the world; the Word of the Father; a true sacrifice; living flesh; entire Godhead; very Man’; and then fall down with this greeting, ‘Hail, cause of our creation! Hail, price of our redemption! Hail, our support during our pilgrimage! Be Thou our joy, who are about to be our reward. May our glory be in Thee, for ever and ever. Abide with us, O Lord. Remove our darkness. Wash from us all our guilt. Grant a holy remedy. Glory be to Thee, O Lord. But is there any place in me into which my God may come, who made heaven and earth? Is it so, O Lord my God? Is there in me anything which may contain Thee? Wilt Thou indeed come into my heart and inebriate it? And do I embrace Thee, my good wine? What art Thou to me? Pity me, that I may speak. The

¹ See pp. xi. xii. of the Essay on *The Spiritual Life of Mediæval England*, by the Rev. J. B. Dalgairns, prefixed to his edition of Walter Hilton’s *The Scale of Perfection*. The sentence relating to the Immaculate Conception is on p. 30 of the edition of the *Ancren Riwe* cited below.

house of my soul is too narrow that Thou shouldest come into it. Let it be enlarged by Thee. It is in ruins, repair it. I confess and know that it contains what is offensive to Thine eyes. But who shall cleanse it, or to whom but Thee shall I cry? Cleanse Thou me, O God, from my secret faults; and from the sins of others spare Thy servant. Have mercy, have mercy, have mercy upon me, O God, according to Thy great mercy, and so the whole psalm to the end, with Gloria Patri; 'O Christ, hear us' twice; 'Lord, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us'; 'Our Father'; 'I believe'. 'O my God, save Thy servant, who putteth his trust in Thee. Teach me to do Thy will, for Thou art my God. Lord, hear my prayer, and let my cry come unto Thee.' 'Let us pray: Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that Him whom we see darkly, and under a different form, on whom we feed sacramentally on earth, we may see face to face, and may be thought worthy to enjoy Him truly and really, as He is, in heaven, through the same.' After the kiss of peace in the Mass, when the priest consecrates, forget there all the world, and there be entirely out of the body; there in glowing love embrace your beloved Saviour, who is come down from heaven into your breast's bower, and hold Him fast until He shall have granted whatever you wish for."

"Believe firmly that all the power of the devil melteth away through the grace of the holy Sacrament, which ye see elevated above all as oft as the priest saith Mass, and consecrateth that Virgin's Child, Jesus, the Son of God, who sometimes descendeth bodily to your inn, and humbly taketh His lodging within you. God knoweth, she is too weak, and too evil-hearted, who with the aid of such a guest fighteth not bravely. Ye ought to believe truly that all that the holy Church readeth and singeth, and all her Sacraments, give you spiritual strength, but none so much as this; for it bringeth to nought all the wiles of the devil."

"Men esteem a thing as less dainty when they have it often; and therefore ye should be, as lay brethren are, partakers of the Holy Communion only fifteen times a year. . . . And, if anything happens out of the usual order, so that ye may not have received the Sacrament at these set times, ye may make up for it the Sunday next following, or, if the other set time is near, ye may wait till then."¹

¹The *Ancient Riwle* was edited for the Camden Society by the Rev. James Morton in 1853. The above quotations are from pp. 13, 14, 25-27, 200, 201, 312, 313 of the edition edited by Abbot Gasquet in the series "The King's Classics".

5. A belief was current during much of the middle ages that some of the devout were sustained by the reception of the Eucharist without partaking of any other food. An instance of this belief from the early part of the thirteenth century may be seen in the account given by Cæsarius of Heisterbach of a woman who was accustomed to communicate frequently and had received leave from her parish priest to receive the Sacrament every Sunday, who "was sustained without hunger from Sunday to Sunday by her Communion".¹

6. The *Rationale of the Divine Offices* was the work of William Durand, who was born at Puymoisson in Provence about 1230. He was a teacher of the canon law at Modena, was sent as legate to the Council of Lyons by Pope Gregory X. in 1274, was appointed Bishop of Mende in 1286, and died at Rome in 1296. The doctrine postulated in the elaborate ceremonial instructions and mystical interpretations is that which is characteristic of the time. Durand details eleven miracles in regard to the body of Christ, first, that "the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood"; secondly, that "the bread is daily transubstantiated into the body, and yet there is no increase in God"; thirdly, that "it is daily taken and eaten, and yet there is no diminution in it"; fourthly, that "being indivisible, it is divided, and remains whole and complete in each part of the Eucharist"; fifthly, that "when taken by the wicked, it is not defiled"; sixthly, that "the body of Christ, which is the food of life, is deadly to sinners"; seventhly, that "being taken by the priest or by others, from the shut mouth it is carried up to heaven"; eighthly, that "the measureless body is in so small a host"; ninthly, that "the same body is whole in different places, and is received by different persons"; tenthly, that "when the bread is transubstantiated, the accidents of the bread remain"; and eleventhly, that "under the species of bread the body and blood of Christ, even the whole Christ, exist and are received, and likewise under the species of wine both are received, and yet there is not a double reception of the body and blood of

¹*Miracula*, ii. 36, in Meister, *Die Fragmente der Libri Octo Miraculorum des Cæsarius von Heisterbach*, p. 115. Some English instances are mentioned in Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, pp. 238, 239 (edition 1908).

Christ".¹ The reasons which he gives for the elevation of the host immediately after the consecration are that "all who are present may see it, and may pray for what is profitable to salvation"; that the superiority of this sacrifice to all other sacrifices may be observed; that there may be a sign of the exaltation of Christ, the true Bread; that there may be a sign of the resurrection; that the people may know the moment of consecration, "and that Christ has come to the altar, and may prostrate themselves to the ground with reverence".² Elsewhere he says the elevation later in the canon represents the taking down of our Lord from the cross, and His being laid in the tomb.³ In its sacrificial aspect, he speaks of the Eucharist as the offering of the body of Christ;⁴ as being wholly sacrificial, though one of the special points of sacrifice is the consecration;⁵ and as being the memory of the passion and death and burial and resurrection and ascension.⁶ He explains in great detail the commemoration of the incarnate life made in the rite and ceremonies of the Mass by the acts in which the Church remembers Christ and thereby makes a mystic presentation to God.⁷

¹ IV. xli. 16-27.² IV. xli. 51.³ IV. xlvi. 22.⁴ IV. xl.⁵ IV. i. 16.⁶ IV. i. 21.⁷ IV. *passim*. For this idea, see also pp. 168, 169, 210, 267-69, 272, *supra*, and vol. ii. pp. 120-24, *infra*.

CHAPTER VIII.

WESTERN THEOLOGY FROM THE SIXTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PART IV.

As has been seen in the last chapter, the doctrine that the substances of the bread and wine are wholly changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ at the consecration of the Sacrament had become the ordinary doctrine held in the Western Church by the end of the thirteenth century. Whatever differences there might be as to some details, and however Thomist and Scotist theologians might dwell on different aspects of the Sacrament, there was a very general acceptance of this central point; and it appears to have been the usual view that the Church was committed to it by the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. In the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries instances are found of positions differing to a greater or less extent from this ordinary doctrine.

I.

John of Paris was a Dominican theologian of eminence, who was a Professor of Theology in the University of Paris at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century. About 1300 he wrote a treatise entitled *On the Mode of the Existence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar*, the following quotation from which shows the characteristic point in his teaching on this subject:—

“I intend to defend the real and actual presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar, and that it is not there only as by way of sign. And, though I hold and approve the usual opinion that the body of Christ is in the Sacrament of the altar by means of the conversion of the substance of bread into itself, and

that the accidents remain there without a subject, yet I do not dare to say that this is of faith; but the real and actual presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar can be securely held otherwise. Nevertheless, I solemnly declare that, if it be shown that the aforesaid method has been positively affirmed by a sacred canon or by the Church or by a General Council or by the Pope, whose power is that of the whole Church (*qui virtute continet totam ecclesiam*), I do not wish anything which I say accounted as said, and am ready to withdraw it at once. And, if it has not yet been positively affirmed but shall come to be so affirmed, I am ready to assent to it at once. . . . For the substance of the bread to remain under its own accidents in the Sacrament of the altar can be understood in two ways. First, the substance of the bread may be held to remain in the Sacrament of the altar under its own accidents in a subject of its own; and this is untrue, because in this case there would not be association of properties (*communicatio idiomatum*) between the bread and the body of Christ, nor would it be true to say, The bread is the body of Christ, or 'My flesh is really food'.¹ Secondly, the substance of the bread may be held to remain under its own accidents, not in a subject of its own, but in relation to the being and subject of Christ, so that in this way there would be one subject in the two natures. And this is true."²

The purport of this somewhat obscure passage appears to be that, provided it were secured that in the Eucharist there is only one subject, it might be asserted that the substance of the bread remained after consecration. On such a view, the subject in the Eucharist would correspond to the one Person of our Lord in His incarnate life, and the two substances of the earthly elements and of His body and blood would correspond to the two natures of manhood and Godhead. According to this treatise of John, the same view was held by other divines at Paris besides John himself.³ His book, however, was condemned by William, the Bishop of Paris, who deprived John of his professorship. He determined to appeal against this deprivation to Pope Clement V., but died at Bordeaux in 1306 without having done so.

Like John of Paris, Durand of St. Pourçain was a Dominican and a Professor of Theology at Paris, where he taught early

¹ St. John vi. 55.

² Pp. 85, 86, ed. London, 1686.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 97.

in the fourteenth century. He became Bishop of Limoux in 1317, Bishop of Puy-en-Velay in 1318, and Bishop of Meaux in 1326. He died in 1334. His treatise on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard contains some discussion of the nature of the Eucharistic presence. He asserts that "the conversion of the substance" of the bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ is true and is taught by the Church. At the same time he allows that in the abstract it is possible for the substance of the bread to remain together with the substance of the body of Christ, basing this view largely on his rejection, very noticeable in a Dominican writer, of the Thomist opinions about place;¹ and observes that the difficulties as to the capacity of corruption and the power of nourishing the body in the consecrated Sacrament would be solved if it were held that the substance of the bread and wine remains after consecration.² On the way in which the "conversion of the substance" is effected, he writes:—

"Saving a better judgment, it can be thought that, if in this Sacrament there is a conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ, this takes place in this way, that the form of the bread ceases to be, but that the matter of the bread is under the form of the body of Christ suddenly and by the power of God, as the matter of nourishment is under the form of the person nourished by the power of nature. . . . Now it is clear that the aforesaid method of the conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ is possible; but the other method, which is commonly held, is unintelligible; neither has either of these been more approved or condemned by the Church than the other."³

William of Ockham was one of the most famous of the advocates of Nominalism in the fourteenth century. He was born in 1280 at Ockham in Surrey. He became a member of the Franciscan Order. Like the Dominicans John of Paris and Durand of St. Pourçain, he was a Professor of Theology at Paris. In 1322 he became the English Provincial of the Franciscans. In 1328 a condemnation was passed on his Nominalistic opinions by the University of Paris; and from that time until 1347, when he died at Munich, he took refuge from the hostility of Pope John XXII. at the court of Lewis, the King of Bavaria. In his theology in general the most noticeable feature is his

¹ See pp. 331, 332, *supra*.

² *Sent.* IV. xi. 1.

³ *Ibid.* 3 (5).

assertion of the authority of Holy Scripture and the beliefs of the Universal Church as distinct from the possibility of error on the part of individual teachers however eminent or a General Council or the Pope. On the subject of the Holy Eucharist he claimed that he had no intention of diverging from the current doctrine taught at Rome, saying, "Whatever the Church of Rome believes, this alone and nothing different I believe either explicitly or implicitly"; and he appears to have departed from his general principle of the absolute validity of the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Universal Church alone on the ground of a supposed revelation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation to the Church at some later time than the period of the Fathers. He observes that, "although it is expressly found in the New Testament that the body of Christ is to be taken under the species of bread, yet it is not there expressed that the substance of bread does not remain," and that on this latter point "there have been different opinions from early times". He regards the view that "the substance of bread and wine remains, and in the same place and under the same species is the body of Christ," as "very reasonable apart from a decision of the Church to the contrary," "as avoiding all the difficulties which result from the separation of accidents from their subject," as "not contrary to anything in the canon of the Bible," as "not repugnant to reason"; and he says that "there is no more contradiction in the body of Christ co-existing with the substance of bread than in it co-existing with the accidents of bread". But he accepts the ordinary doctrine on the ground of Church authority.

"The substance of the bread and the wine ceases to be, and the accidents alone remain, and under them the body of Christ begins to be. This is clear to the Church by some revelation, as I suppose; and therefore the Church has so decided."¹

John Wyclif was at one time Master of Balliol College. Afterwards, he was the incumbent of several benefices in succession. The last of these was the rectory of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, where, after ten years' residence, he died in 1384. He resembled Ockham in the intensely scholastic character of his mind and in the importance which he attached to the authority of Holy Scripture. Unlike Ockham, he was a Realist; and he

¹ *Quodl. sept.* iv. 34, 35.

went far beyond Ockham in his rejection of the authority of the Church.

In or before¹ 1381 Wyclif began his attack on the doctrine of Transubstantiation by publishing a series of statements on the Holy Eucharist. The most important of its twelve propositions are the following:—

“The consecrated host which we see on the altar is neither Christ nor any part of Him but an effectual sign.”

“The Eucharist has, by virtue of the sacramental words, both the body and the blood of Christ really and actually in every part of it.”

“Transubstantiation, identification, and impanation . . . are not to be established from Scripture.”

“It is contrary to the opinions of saints to assert that there is accident without subject in a real host.”

“The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in its nature bread and wine, containing, by virtue of the sacramental words, the real body and blood of Christ in every part of it.”

“The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the body and blood of Christ, into which the bread and wine are transubstantiated, of which some being (*aliquiditas*) remains after consecration, although, as the faithful believe, laid asleep.”

“The existence of accident without subject is not tenable.”²

The publication of these statements was followed by the declaration known as the *Confession*. In it Wyclif said:—

“I have often confessed, and do still confess, that the bread in the Sacrament, or consecrated host, which the faithful perceive in the hands of the priest, is really and actually the very same body of Christ and the same substance as was taken from the Virgin and as suffered on the cross and lay dead in the tomb for the holy three days, and rose on the third day, and after forty days ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father. The proof of this is, that Christ, who cannot lie, so declares. Nevertheless, I do not dare to say that this bread is the body of Christ essentially or substantially or corporally or identically (*identice*). . . . For we believe that there is a threefold way in which the body of Christ is in the consecrated host, namely, virtual, spiritual, and sacramental. Virtual,

¹ See Matthew in *English Historical Review*, April, 1890, pp. 328-30. Cf. *De Benedicta Incarnatione* (written before 1378), cap. xi. (pp. 186, 189-91, edition Harris), where Wyclif appears to accept Transubstantiation.

² *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Series, vol. v.), p. 105.

whereby throughout His whole rule He benefits in the good things of nature and grace. The spiritual way is that whereby the body of Christ is in the Eucharist and in the saints by means of grace. And the third way, the sacramental, is that whereby the body of Christ is in the consecrated host after a unique manner. . . . But, besides these three ways of being, there are three other ways more actual and more real, which the body of Christ fitly has in heaven, namely, substantially, corporally, and by dimensions. And men of gross ideas understand no other way of the being of a natural (*naturalis*; al. material, *materialis*) substance besides these. But they are not at all fit to grasp the mystery of the Eucharist and the subtlety of Scripture.”¹

Further on in the same *Confession* Wyclif repudiated the idea of “accident without subject,” and affirmed that there is “real bread and wine” in the consecrated sacrament.²

It is possible that the statements of belief ascribed to Wyclif at the Council of London of 1382 are an accurate representation of his teaching. Those on the subject of the Eucharist are the following:—

“The substance of the material bread and wine remains in the Sacrament of the altar after consecration.”

“The accidents do not remain without a subject in the same Sacrament after consecration.”

“Christ is not in the Sacrament of the altar identically (*identice*), really, and actually in a proper bodily presence.”

“If a bishop or a priest is in mortal sin, he does not ordain or consecrate or baptise.”³

Like teaching occurs in the works of the latter part of Wyclif's life generally, and in particular in the detailed treatment in the *Trialogus* and the very lengthy discussions in *De Eucharistia*. The elaboration and subtlety of the arguments prevents either work from lending itself easily to quotation; but the following short extracts may give some idea of the doctrine taught.

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 115-17.

² *Ibid.* p. 131.

³ Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 1890, 1891. The theory that a bishop or priest in mortal sin cannot ordain or consecrate or baptise formed part of Wyclif's doctrine of “dominion,” that is, the view that “dominion is founded in grace,” and that no one whom mortal sin excludes from grace is capable of receiving any spiritual gift or performing any spiritual action or owning any temporal possession.

"This venerable Sacrament is in its own nature real bread, and is sacramentally the body of Christ."¹

"It is not to be understood that the body of Christ comes down to the host which is consecrated in any Church, but it remains above in heaven fixed and unmoved; therefore it has spiritual being in the host and not dimensional being and the other accidents which are in heaven."²

"In the words of Christ Elijah denotes that prophet of the ancient law; and in consequence the predication is to be said to be of relation (*habitudinalis*) but not of identity (*identica*), since Christ perceived that the Baptist is Elijah figuratively, and the Baptist perceived that he is not Elijah personally. . . . And so I understand other predications of relation (*habitudinales*) in Holy Scripture. And if you ask when the Baptist began to be Elijah, it seems to me that it was when he had that relation (*habitudinem*) to Elijah by the appointment of God, and that so the Baptist at least naturally was Elijah before Christ uttered those words. But concerning the Sacrament of the altar it seems probable that the bread is the body of the Lord when the sacramental words are uttered, and not before, so that by virtue of the words of Christ the bread has at the same time the name of the Sacrament and the name of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ."³

"It is not inconsistent that Christ is sacramentally in the wine mixed with water or other liquid, and even in the midst of the air, but pre-eminently in the soul, since the end of this Sacrament is that Christ dwell in the soul by means of virtues, so that the layman who remembers the body of Christ in heaven brings about better and more effectually than the priest who consecrates, and equally really, though in a different manner, that the body of Christ is with him. But the common people believe most faithlessly and blasphemously that this sacramental sign of the body of Christ is actually Christ Himself. And in this heresy clergy and prelates are involved."⁴

"It appears that the second opinion—the Thomist opinion that the same thing can be in two places at once only by being in one place dimensionally and in other places potentially and sacramentally, as against the Scotist opinion that the same thing can be dimensionally in more places than one at the same time—is to be held, since it is impossible for the same body to be at the same

¹ *Triologus*, iv. 4 (p. 258, edition Lechler). ² *Ibid.* 8 (p. 272).

³ *Ibid.* 9 (p. 275). See also iv. 1-10 (pp. 244-81), *passim*.

⁴ *De Eucharistia*, cap. 4 (pp. 111, 112, edition Loserth).

time in different places by way of locality and dimensions. . . . It is clear concerning the body of Christ that it is dimensionally in heaven, and potentially in the host as in a sign."¹

Wyclif's statements that the body of Christ is not present in the consecrated Sacrament "essentially or substantially or corporally or identically," or "identically, really, and actually in a proper bodily presence," and that "the consecrated host" "is neither Christ nor any part of Him but an effectual sign of Him," and that "the Sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the body and blood of Christ," have often been understood as meaning that the consecrated bread and wine are only symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and not the body and blood themselves. Such an interpretation has much to support it; yet a comparison of different statements with one another and a careful examination of his exact phraseology tend to sustain the view that he was endeavouring in a scholastic fashion to assert the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament, while distinguishing the way in which He is present on the altar from the way in which He is present in heaven, and maintaining the real character of the bread and wine after consecration, and attempting to avoid what seemed to him the insuperable logical contradictions of the current explanations; that his phrase "The consecrated host which we see on the altar is neither Christ nor any part of Him but an effectual sign of Him" was intended to apply to the outward part; and that in like manner the statement "The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the body and blood of Christ" was an effort to express the doctrine that the consecrated elements are symbols of the body and blood of Christ which contain and convey that which they denote.²

In 1395 a Bill was presented in Parliament incorporating twelve *Conclusions* representing the opinions of the Lollards, which were also affixed to the doors of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral. Of these *Conclusions* the fourth referred to the Eucharist in the following terms:—

"The feigned miracle of the Sacrament of bread leads all men but a few into idolatry; for they think that the body of Christ,

¹ *De Eucharistia*, cap. 8 (pp. 232, 233, 268, 271); see also the whole treatise *passim*, and *cf.* *De Apostasia*.

² See pp. 29-31, 61-67, *supra*.

which is never out of heaven, is by the power of the words of the priest in its essential being enclosed in a small piece of bread, which they show to the people. But God would that they would believe what the evangelical doctor says in his *Trialogus*,¹ that the bread of the altar is by way of relation (*habitualiter*) the body of Christ; for we suppose that in this way any man or woman who is a believer in God's law can make the Sacrament of this bread without any such miracle."²

In 1402 a statement about the opinions of the Lollards was laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury by Sir Louis de Clifford, who had for some time favoured them. In this statement they were said to hold—

“That the seven Sacraments are only dead signs, and are of no value in the way in which the Church uses them.”

“That the Church is nothing but the synagogue of Satan; and therefore they will not go to it to worship the Lord, or to receive any Sacrament, least of all the Sacrament of the altar, because they maintain that it is nothing but a morsel of dead bread and a tower or pinnacle of Anti-Christ.”³

The doctrine that in the Sacrament there is real bread and also the body of Christ is found in the *Confession* and subsequent explanation of the Lollard Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, made in 1413. It is there said:—

“The most worshipful Sacrament of the altar is Christ's body in form of bread, the same body that was born of the Blessed Virgin, our Lady Saint Mary, done on the cross, dead and buried, the third day rose from death to life, the which body is now glorified in heaven.”⁴

“As Christ when dwelling here on earth had in Himself Godhead and manhood, yet the Godhead veiled and invisible under the manhood, which was open and visible, so in the Sacrament of the altar there is real body and real bread, that is, the bread which we see, and the body of Christ veiled under it which we do not see.”⁵

¹ See p. 367, *supra*.

² See *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Series, vol. v.), pp. 361, 362.

³ See Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series, vol. xxviii. b), ii. 252, 253.

⁴ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 438. The *Confession* was in English. The spelling has been modernised above.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 444.

In the description of the tenets of the Lollards given about 1449 by Reginald Pecock, the Bishop of St. Asaph, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, some of them were charged with holding that the Sacraments and the Church's use of them were "points of witchcraft and blindness," and with abhorring "the Sacrament of the altar," "insomuch that they not only scorn it, but they hate it, miscall it by foul names, and will not come for its sake into the bodily church while this Sacrament is hallowed, treated, and used in the Mass".¹

There is some doubt as to the opinions held in regard to the Eucharist by John Hus and Jerome of Prague. It is clear that the influence of the teaching of Wyclif was very great in Bohemia in the early part of the fifteenth century.² Yet, whatever may be the facts as to the earlier teaching of Hus, he himself explicitly denied having taught that the material bread remains after consecration or that a priest in mortal sin cannot consecrate, and acknowledged the term Transubstantiation and the doctrine denoted by it, though deprecating close inquiries as to the manner of the change effected by consecration, and saying that for simple Christians it was enough to recognise that the body and blood of Christ are really present after consecration.³ Jerome of Prague was charged at the Council of Constance in 1415 with holding that "the bread is not transubstantiated into the body of Christ," and that "the body of Christ is not in the Sacrament by way of presence and body but only as a sign," and that "Christ is not really in the host or the Sacrament of the altar," and that "the host is not Christ";⁴ but there is some evidence of his having said that the Sacrament is bread before the consecration and the body of Christ after the consecration, though according to the same authority he evaded the question whether the bread remains in the consecrated Sacrament.⁵ The statements ascribed to Wyclif about the Eucharist were included in the propositions of Wyclif which he repudiated; and when before

¹ *The Repressor of over much blaming of the clergy*, c. 15 (Rolls Series, vol. xix. a), ii. 563.

² See Loserth, *Johannis Wyclif de Eucharistia*, Introduction, pp. xlv-lx.

³ *De sac. corp. et sang. Dom.* 2, 3 (*Hus et Hieronymi Prag. Hist. et Mon.*, Nuremberg, 1558, i. 39, 40); cf. *De corp. Christi* (*op. cit.* i. 163-167).

⁴ Von der Hardt, *Magn. Conc. Const.* iv. 648.

⁵ Poggio, *Ep. ad Aretin.* (in von der Hardt, *op. cit.* iii. 66).

his death he retracted his abjuration of Hus and Wyclif, he may have meant to except from the retractation his denial of Wyclif's statements about the Eucharist in saying that "he did not follow or hold anything which" Wyclif and Hus "had taught against the doctors of the Church concerning the Sacrament of the altar," and that he "believed and held all that the Church believes and holds, and gave more credence to Augustine and the other doctors of the Church than to Wyclif and Hus".¹

One of the leading opponents of Hus and Jerome of Prague was Peter d'Ailly, who was appointed Chancellor of the University of Paris in 1389, became Bishop of Puy-en-Velay in 1395 and of Cambrai in 1396, was made a cardinal in 1411, and died in 1420. His great distinction and his opposition to Hus and Jerome of Prague make it the more noticeable that in his treatise on the *Sentences*, while accepting the doctrine that the substances of the bread and wine cease to be in the Sacrament at consecration, he had spoken of the contrary opinion as "possible," as "not repugnant to reason or to the authority of the Bible," and as in itself "easier to understand and more reasonable" than any other view, and did not appear to regard it as actually precluded by any binding decree.

"The fourth opinion is more common, that the substance of bread does not remain but simply ceases to be. The possibility of this is clear. For it is not impossible to God that substance should suddenly cease to be, though it is not possible through created power. And, though it is not clearly involved in Scripture that this is so, nor even, so far as I can see, in the decision of the Church, yet because the Church favours it rather than any other opinion as being the common opinion of saints and doctors, therefore I hold it. And it is according to this way that I say that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ in the meaning set forth in the description of Transubstantiation."²

An instance of rejection of the current doctrine which seems to go beyond the teaching of Wyclif is found in the book of John Wessel *On the Sacrament of the Eucharist*. Wessel was born at Groningen about 1429, was educated under the Brethren

¹Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii. 457, 563, 565; *Hus et Hieronymi Prag. Hist. et Mon.*, Nuremberg, 1558, ii. 352, 353; Von der Hardt, *Magn. Conc. Const.* iv. 761, 771; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. 276; cf. p. 377, *infra*.

²IV. vi. 2.

of the Common Life at Zwolle, studied at the University of Cologne, and taught at Paris and afterwards at Heidelberg. He died in 1489 after some years of retirement at Groningen. In early life he was a Realist but afterwards became a Nominalist. He appears to have taught that there is no essential difference between the presence of Christ in the Sacrament and that which may be found elsewhere; and this not in the sense in which the mediæval teachers had explained that by means of Spiritual Communion those who were hindered from actual Communion might receive the body of Christ,¹ and in which the mediæval office books directed the priest to say to a sick man who was unable to receive Communion, "Brother, in this case real faith is sufficient for thee, and good intention: only believe, and thou hast eaten,"² but in the very different sense which made the Eucharistic gift of no other character or degree than that which may at any time be in the devout prayer of a believer. The following are among the passages in his book which appear to indicate this meaning.

"Expressly must the word of the Lord be observed, 'Except ye shall have eaten, ye will not have life in you'. But they who believe in Him have real life. Therefore they who believe in Him are those who eat His flesh."³

"Wheresoever His Name is blessed . . . there is He really present not only with His Godhead and goodwill, but also corporally. . . . I do not say that it is granted to every Christian man that he can have Christ sacramentally present by means of the Eucharist whenever he wishes; for this is granted to priests only. But I say that the Lord Jesus is really present to one calling on His Name, really present not only with His Godhead but also with His flesh and blood and whole manhood. For who will doubt that the Lord Jesus is often corporally present to His faithful ones in their agonies, though His session at the right hand of the Father is not left because of this? Who will doubt that this can happen simultaneously in such a way outside the Eucharist as in the Eucharist?"⁴

"So did the Magdalen eat of Him when she sat at the feet of Jesus, whom she loved much. . . . So to partake of His flesh and blood is rather to eat than if ten thousand times we should receive

¹ See pp. 320, 331, *supra*.

² *York Manual* and *Sarum Manual* (Surtees Society, lxiii. 52, 50*). See also St. Augustine, *In Joan. Ev. Tract.* xxv. 12, xxvi. 1; *cf.* p. 92, *supra*.

³ C. 10.

⁴ C. 24.

the Eucharist at the altar from the hand of the priest with a dry heart and a cold will, even though in a state of salvation."¹

II.

Throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the authorities of the Western Church consistently aimed at suppressing any attempts to find or assert a doctrine of the Eucharistic presence other than that which had become usual by the end of the thirteenth century. It has already been mentioned that John of Paris was deprived of his professorship by the Bishop of Paris at the beginning of the fourteenth century for his guarded statements on the subject of the substance of the bread and wine in the consecrated Sacrament.² And the controversy with Wyclif led to very explicit utterances on the part of the Church authorities.

In 1381 a solemn declaration was made by the Chancellor and doctors of the University of Oxford against the opinions of Wyclif on the Sacrament of the altar. In the formal document issued by the Chancellor it was said—

“Certain persons, . . . endeavouring to rend the coat of the Lord and the unity of our holy Mother the Church, renew, alas! in these days certain heresies formerly solemnly condemned by the Church, and publicly teach them both in the University and outside it, saying two things among their other pestilential assertions, first, that in the Sacrament of the altar the substance of material bread and wine, which were before consecration, remain after consecration; secondly, which is dreadful to hear, that in this venerable Sacrament the body and blood of Christ are not essentially or substantially or corporally, but figuratively or symbolically (*tropice*), so that Christ is not really there in His own proper bodily presence; from which assertions the Catholic faith is endangered, the devotion of the people is lessened, and this our Mother University is to no small extent defamed. We therefore . . . have summoned many doctors of sacred theology and professors of canon law, whom we believed to be of great skill, and, when the aforesaid assertions had been openly explained and carefully discussed in their presence, it was at length finally decided and declared by their judgment that the assertions are erroneous and opposed to the decisions of the Church and contrary to truths which are Catholic and plainly result from the words of the saints and the decisions of the Church, namely, that by the

¹ C. 28.

² See p. 362, *supra*.

sacramental words, duly pronounced by a priest, the bread and wine on the altar are transubstantiated or substantially converted into the real body and blood of Christ, so that after consecration there do not remain in the venerable Sacrament the material bread and wine, which were there before, in the two substances or natures, but only in the species of the same, under which species the real body and blood of Christ are actually contained, not only figuratively or symbolically (*tropice*), but essentially, substantially, and corporally, in such a way that Christ is really there in His own proper bodily presence.”¹

At the Council of London of 1382 each of the four statements about the Eucharist already mentioned as ascribed to Wyclif at this council² was separately declared to be “heresy,” and the four statements were placed in the group of errors described as “heretical and contrary to the decision of the Church.”³

In 1401 a priest named William Sawtry was burnt at Smithfield after maintaining, among other opinions, that “after consecration duly made by a priest the bread remains in the same nature as before.”⁴

Statements made by, and a recantation received from, a priest named Richard Wyche early in the fifteenth century are of very considerable interest. Wyche was accused of false doctrine before the Bishop of Durham, probably in the year 1401;⁵ and one of the subjects about which he was questioned was that of the Eucharist. An account of his examination contained in a letter by Wyche himself has been preserved in a manuscript which was found in the University Library at Prague by Professor Loserth of Czernowitz. His first statement during his examination was that he believed that “the consecrated host is after consecration the real body of the Lord,” and that, after it is divided, “each part is the real body of the Lord in the form of bread”. On being asked whether he believed that “after consecration the real flesh and the real blood of Christ are there,” he answered,

¹ Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, p. 59 (iii.), edition Oxford, 1679.

² See p. 366, *supra*.

³ Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 1890-93.

⁴ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Series, vol. v.), p. 411.

⁵ See Matthew in *English Historical Review*, July, 1890, p. 530. If this date is accepted, William, given in Wyche's recantation in *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Series, vol. v.), p. 501, as the name of the Bishop of Durham must be a mistake for Walter, Walter Skirlawe having been Bishop of Durham from 1388 to 1406.

“I believe that the host is the real flesh and the real blood of Christ”. To the further question, “Is bread there after consecration?” he replied after some hesitation, “I believe that the host is the real body of Christ in the form of bread”. He refused to accept the correction that the consecrated host “is the body of Christ in the species of bread, not in the form”; and when asked, “Is material bread there or not?” answered, “Holy Scripture does not call the host material bread, therefore I am unwilling¹ to believe the same as an article of faith”. In subsequent examinations, in reply to similar questions whether the bread remains after consecration, he answered on different occasions, “I am not bound to believe otherwise than Holy Scripture says”; “I have never seen the term ‘material’ in Holy Scripture”; “It is enough for any believer to believe as Christ said without adding to His words”. As a result of the examinations Wyche was excommunicated, and imprisoned, with a view to his degradation and the confiscation of his property.² Eventually, he signed a recantation, which contained fourteen retractions and six positive statements. The affirmations on the subject of the Eucharist were:—

“The bread made of flour derived from corn and of water, which is placed on the altar to be consecrated by the ministry of the priest, after the words of consecration duly uttered by the priest does not remain the bread of corn which was before placed there, but is transubstantiated into the real body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and suffered on the cross; and the accidents of material bread remain there, being set there without any substance of the same;”

“The wine which is placed on the altar to be consecrated by the ministry of the priest, after the words of consecration uttered over it by the priest is not wine, but is transubstantiated, and it is transubstantiated into the real blood of Christ which was shed for our redemption on the cross; and there remain only the accidents of wine without any substance of the same.”³

¹Reading “nolo” for “volo” in the MS.

²A copy of this letter, which is headed in the MS. “Gesta cum Richardo Wycz presbytero in Anglia,” was sent by Professor Loserth to Mr. F. D. Matthew, and was printed by him in the *English Historical Review*, July, 1890, pp. 530-44.

³Appendix VI. to Shirley’s edition of *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Series, vol. v.), pp. 503, 504.

Years after, Wyche was known to teach contrary to this recantation, and he was tried and degraded and burnt for heresy. A proclamation of King Henry VI., dated 15th July, 1439, set forth the facts of his trial and abjuration "many years now past," and of his more recent teaching and trial before the Bishop of London, and degradation and execution; and prohibited the making of pilgrimages to the place where he had been burnt, or other devotion to him on the plea of miracles worked by him.¹

In a letter addressed to Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury and the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury in the year 1412, the University of Oxford placed among condemned propositions the statements that "as Christ is at the same time God and Man, so the consecrated host is at the same time the body of Christ and real bread, because it is the body of Christ at least in representation (*in figura*) and is real bread in nature," that "the consecrated host" "is real bread by way of nature and the body of Christ by way of representation (*figuraliter*)," and that "a Catholic says that the sacramental bread is the body of Christ, and the wine in the cup is His blood, in such a way" as the expressions "the seven kine are seven years,"² and "the rock was Christ,"³ and "this is Elijah,"⁴ are used in Holy Scripture.⁵

In 1413 Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury delivered to Sir John Oldcastle a statement of doctrine declared to be obligatory, in which it was said:—

"The faith and the determination of Holy Church touching the blissful Sacrament of the altar is this, that after the sacramental words be said by a priest in his Mass the material bread that was before is turned into Christ's very body, and the material wine that was before is turned into Christ's very blood, and so there leaveth

¹ The proclamation is printed in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, iii. 703 (edition 1843-49). Since the above was in type the author has read Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, i. 171-84.

² Gen. xli. 26.

³ 1 Cor. x. 4.

⁴ St. Matt. xi. 14.

⁵ Wilkins, *Conc.* iii. 342; *cf.* iii. 302 for a document of the University of Oxford in 1406 in which it is said that Wyclif had not been convicted of heresy, and that the bishops had not ordered the exhumation and burning of his body: see also Gairdner, *op. cit.* i. 55, 56.

on the altar no material bread nor material wine, the which were there before the saying of the sacramental words.”¹

The doctrine of the Eucharist was prominent among the matters considered at the Council of Constance in 1415 and 1416. The representation of Wyclif’s teaching in the propositions in which the Council of London of 1382 stated it, and which that council declared to be heretical, was condemned;² and these propositions were among the statements which Jerome of Prague was required by the council to repudiate.³ It was asserted that “the whole body and blood of Christ are really contained both under the species of bread and under the species of wine”.⁴ One of the reasons given for the condemnation of Jerome of Prague was that, though “he professed that he held and believed what the Church holds about the Sacrament of the altar and the Transubstantiation of the bread into the body,” yet he “adhered to the condemned propositions and errors of Wyclif and Hus”.⁵ Among the questions which the council required Hus to answer were the following :—

“Whether he believes that after the consecration by the priest there is not in the Sacrament of the altar under the veil of bread and wine material bread and material wine, but wholly the same Christ who suffered on the cross and sitteth at the right hand of the Father.”⁶

“Whether he believes and asserts that, when the consecration by the priest has taken place, under the species of bread alone by itself and apart from the species of wine there is the real flesh and blood and soul and deity of Christ and the whole Christ, and the same body absolutely and under each one of those species severally.”⁷

One of the chief literary opponents of the teaching of the followers of Wyclif was Thomas Netter or Notter, usually known as Thomas Waldensis. He was born at Saffron Walden about 1380, was a member of the University of Oxford, and became a Carmelite. He died in 1430 at Rouen on his way to Paris.

¹ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 441, 442; Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 355. The statement was in English. The spelling has been modernised above.

² Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii. 299, 302, 909. ³ *Ibid.* 457.

⁴ *Ibid.* 381.

⁵ *Ibid.* 565; cf. p. 371, *supra*.

⁶ *Ibid.* 915.

⁷ *Ibid.*

Besides whatever share he may have had in the collection of the documents in the treatise *Bundles of Tares of John Wyclif*,¹ he wrote an elaborate treatise on the doctrine of the Catholic Church, one part of which, begun in 1425 and finished in 1427, is entitled *On the Sacraments*. In this, the teaching of Wyclif is very fully and severely criticised. The positive doctrine and the general lines of thought are those inherited from the middle ages. A point of interest is in the assertions that the body of Christ is received in the Eucharist bodily (*corporaliter*) and in the flesh (*carnaliter*) as well as spiritually. These assertions are subject to the ambiguity which has often to be noticed² whether the meaning is that the reception is of the real body and flesh of Christ or that the body of Christ is received in a natural and carnal way. The question is difficult to decide, and the alternatives would not present themselves to a fifteenth century writer in quite the same way as at the present time; but the probability seems to be that the point intended to be emphasised was that what is in the Sacrament and is received by the communicant is actually the real flesh and blood of Christ which He took of the Virgin and which suffered on the cross and rose from the dead and ascended into heaven. Some of the passages which bear on this question are the following:—

“Let us lay down and assert that the venerable consecrated host is the sacred flesh of Christ in its nature under the sensible form of bread.”³

“That Christ is to be adored not only in His Godhead but also in the fleshly portion of His manhood, Ambrose proves,⁴ because the Apostles adored Him, rising in the glory of the flesh, that is, the flesh rising in glory. If then the faithful adore on the altar this same flesh, this consecrated host alone existing in the same glory, why are they to be called idolators? There we neither know nor revere any other consecrated host. Our chief Sacrament and the consecrated host of all Christians is simply the living and divine flesh of Christ.”⁵

“The mystery and Sacrament of the altar is simply the body

¹ See pp. 365, 366, 374, 376, 377, *supra*. Cf. Shirley in his edition of the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Series, vol. v.), Introduction, pp. lxx-xxxvii.

² See p. 258, *supra*, and vol. ii. pp. 168, 169, *infra*. ³ XXI. 3.

⁴ Evidently an allusion to *De Spir. Sanc.* iii. 76-80, quoted on p. 108, *supra*.

⁵ XXVI. 6.

and blood of the Saviour substantially in reality of nature, but veiled by the figure of bread and wine."¹

"We have to prove the absence of material bread in the consecrated host."²

"The Church of Christ declares and teaches that the words of the Gospel³ are to be understood concerning bodily and fleshly eating, and naturally and yet also spiritually, as the object in the Sacrament is flesh that according to its essential being is natural and naturally, although also spiritually, as it is in heaven in glory."⁴

"The body of Christ is not carnal (*carnalis*) food, but spiritual; yet it has not been made spirit, and it has not ceased to be a fleshly (*carnale*) body."⁵

"Christ abides in us bodily through this Sacrament, but not bodily by the bodily character of bread, . . . but of the flesh, in which the Word was made flesh. And according to this flesh also He abides in us naturally, and not only by the consent of the will. Do I sin then if I add, Therefore not only spiritually, but also bodily, naturally, and carnally He is eaten? For, as you [that is, Wyclif] said above, to eat this food spiritually is to abide in Christ by love; but Christ is eaten not only in this way by the consent of the will, but also corporally and carnally; therefore He is eaten carnally and not only spiritually."⁶

"The flesh of Christ, of which the species is not there seen, is believed to be there substantially; and the species of bread, the substance of which is not believed to be there, is there seen; and the real body of Christ, which hung on the tree, is there under the species of bread, and is not only signified by the bread."⁷

The matters before the Council of Florence in 1439 were very different from those discussed at Constance in 1415 and 1416; but the fact already stated in a different connection⁸ that the *Definition* of that council included incidental statements that "the body of Christ is really consecrated" and that "the holy sacrifices" benefit the departed⁹ may also be mentioned here; and the following passage may be quoted from the *Decree* of Pope Eugenius IV. to the Armenians, which was a result of the proceedings of the council.

"The words of the Saviour, by which He consecrates this Sacrament, are the form of this Sacrament; for the priest consecrates

¹XXX. 3. ²XXXV. 2.

³*I.e.* St. John vi. 53.

⁴LVIII. 3. ⁵LVIII. 4.

⁶LVIII. 6.

⁷LIX. 2. ⁸See p. 172, *supra*.

⁹Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix. 421, 422.

this Sacrament speaking in the person of Christ. For by the power of these words the substance of the bread is converted into the body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into His blood, nevertheless in such a way that the whole Christ is contained under the species of bread and the whole Christ is contained also under the species of wine. Also, under any part of the consecrated host and the consecrated wine, when a division is made, is the whole Christ. The effect of this Sacrament which it produces in the soul of one who receives it worthily is the uniting of the man to Christ. And, because through grace man is incorporated in Christ and united to His members it follows that through this Sacrament grace is increased in those who receive it worthily; and every effect which material food and drink produce for the bodily life by sustaining and increasing and restoring and delighting it, this Sacrament produces for the spiritual life; and in it, as Pope Urban says, we recall the pleasant memory of our Saviour, we are held back from evil, we are strengthened in good, and we advance to growth in virtues and graces.”¹

III.

Some of the practical aspects of the beliefs and teaching of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries may be illustrated from the writings of Mother Juliana of Norwich, John Myrc, and Thomas a Kempis, and from Langforde's *Meditations*.

1. The book entitled *Revelations of Divine Love* was the work of Mother Juliana, a Norwich anchoress, who lived from the first half of the fourteenth century to the first half of the fifteenth. It contains an account of sixteen revelations or visions seen by Mother Juliana in the year 1373, when she was thirty years old. One of the characteristic ideas in the teaching of the book is that of the Motherhood of God and of Christ. In connection with the Motherhood of Christ there is an allusion to the Eucharist.

“The mother's service is nearest, readiest, and securest. Nearest, for it is most of nature; readiest, for it is most of love; and securest, for it is most of truth. This office nor might nor could never none have done to the full but He alone. We wit that all our mothers bear us to pain and dying. What is that but our very Mother Jesus? He alone beareth us to joy, and to endless living, blessed may He be. Thus He sustained us within Him in love and

¹ Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix. 439.

travail unto the full time that He would suffer the sharpest thorns and grievous pains that ever were, or ever shall be, and died at the last. And when He had done, and so borne us to bliss, yet might not all this make satisfaction to His marvellous love. And that He showed in these high overpassing words of love, 'If I might suffer more, I would suffer more'. He might no more die, but He would not cease working. Wherefore Him behoveth to find us, for the dear worthy love of Motherhood hath made Him debtor to us. The mother may give her child to suck her milk, but our precious Mother Jesus He may feed us with Himself, and doth full courteously and full tenderly with the Blessed Sacrament, that is the precious food of very life. And with all the sweet Sacraments He sustaineth us full mercifully and graciously. And so meant He in these blessed words, where He said, 'I it am, that holy Church preacheth thee and teacheth thee'; that is to say, all the health and the life of the Sacraments, all the virtue and all the grace of My word, all the goodness that is ordained in holy Church to thee, 'I it am'. The mother may lay her child tenderly to her breast, but our tender Mother Jesus, He may homely lead us into His blessed breast by His sweet open side, and show us there in part of the Godhead, and the joys of heaven, with ghostly secureness of endless bliss."¹

2. John Myrc was a canon of Lilleshall in Shropshire in the early part of the fifteenth century. In his *Festival Book* he writes thus about the Eucharist:—

"The fourth is the holy Sacrament of the altar, the which is Christ's own body, His flesh and blood in form of bread, the same that was born of the Virgin Mary, and done on the rood; this is made through the virtue of God's words of the priest that hath power, which power neither angel nor archangel hath, but only man in mind of Himself. This Sacrament is every man and woman bound by the law once a year as at Easter, if he be fourteen years of age and have discretion to receive it, when they been with shrift and penance made clean of their sins, and else to be put out of the Church and of Christian burial, but if it be for sickness or for some reasonable cause, which cause he must certify his curate of. For

¹ The *Revelations of Divine Love* was edited by the Benedictine Dom Cressy in 1670. It was reprinted in 1845. The above quotations are from pp. 228-30 of the edition edited by Mr. Henry Collins in 1877 in the *Medieval Library of Mystical and Ascetical Works*.

he that unworthily receiveth this Sacrament receiveth his damnation."¹

In his *Instructions for Parish Priests* John Myrc includes in the teaching to be given to the people that they are to believe that they receive "God's body" "in form of bread," and that the consecrated wine is "God's blood that He shed on the rood"; that they are to kneel down and hold up their hands and say words of prayer to our Lord when the bell rings at the consecration; that when they meet the priest carrying the Sacrament out of doors, they are to kneel down and "worship Him that all hath wrought"; that the "sight" of "God's body" leads to earthly benefits and protection to him who has seen it on any day.² If a sick man is unable to receive the Sacrament, he is to be told that "God alloweth his heart and his will".³

3. The book entitled *The Music of the Church*, usually known as *The Imitation of Christ*, was probably written by Thomas Hammerken of Kempen, Thomas a Kempis, an Augustinian monk who died in 1471 at the age of ninety-one. The main subject of the first two books is the moral and spiritual discipline by means of which a Christian may become a true follower of Christ; the third book, often wrongly placed as the fourth, deals with the Eucharist as the means of union with Christ; the fourth book, regarded in its right order, which the ordinary editions displace, is on the mystical union of the soul with Christ, to which sacramental Communion leads those who use it well. Some passages from this well-known treatise may be quoted as affording instances of the devotional aspects of the mediæval doctrine of the Eucharist on its highest sides.

"Thou art present with me here upon the altar, my God, Holy of Holies, Creator of men, and Lord of angels."⁴

"Here in the Sacrament of the altar Thou art wholly present, my God, the Man Christ Jesus; here too a rich harvest of eternal salvation is reaped as oft as Thou art worthily and devoutly received."⁵

¹ See Appendix II. of the Early English Text Society's edition of *The Lay Folks Mass Book*, p. 121. The spelling has been modernised above.

² Pp. 8, 9, 10, 17, 29, Early English Text Society's edition. There is much information as to the importance attached to seeing the Sacrament in an article by Father Thurston in *The Month* for June, 1901.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 61.

⁴ III. i. 9.

⁵ III. i. 9.

“O the admirable and hidden grace of this Sacrament, which only the faithful ones of Christ do know, but the unbelieving and slaves of sin cannot experience. In this Sacrament spiritual grace is conferred, and lost virtue is restored in the soul, and the beauty which sin had disfigured returns. This grace is sometimes so great that out of the fulness of devotion here given not the mind only but the weak body also feels great increase of strength bestowed on it.”¹

“Thou, O Lord my God, true God and Man, art contained wholly under the small species of bread and wine, and art eaten yet not consumed by him who receives Thee.”²

“As often as thou callest to mind this mystery and receivest the body of Christ, so often dost thou enact the work of thy redemption, and art made partaker of all the merits of Christ. For the love of Christ is never diminished, and the greatness of His propitiation is never exhausted.”³

“None but priests duly ordained in the Church have power to celebrate and to consecrate the body of Christ. The priest is indeed the minister of God, using the word of God by God’s command and appointment. Nevertheless God is there the principal Author and invisible Worker, to whom all that He wills is subordinate, and all that He commands is obedient. Thou oughtest then to trust God Almighty in this most excellent Sacrament more than thine own sense or any visible sign.”⁴

“There is no worthier oblation nor greater satisfaction for the washing away of sins than to offer oneself unto God purely and wholly with the oblation of Christ’s body in Mass and Communion.”⁵

“Every devout person every day and every hour can profitably and unimpeded draw near to Christ in Spiritual Communion, and yet on certain days and at time appointed he ought to receive the body of his Redeemer sacramentally with affectionate reverence, and rather seek the honour and glory of God than his own comfort.”⁶

“In this Sacrament I have Thee really present, though hidden under another species. For to look upon Thee in Thine own divine brightness, mine eyes could not endure, nor could the whole world exist in the splendour of the glory of Thy majesty. Herein then Thou hast compassion on my infirmity, that Thou dost veil Thyself under a Sacrament. Him do I really possess and adore whom angels adore in heaven; I for a while as yet by faith, but they by sight and without a veil.”⁷

“Simple and chaste should be the eyes that are wont to behold

¹ III. i. 11.

² III. ii. 5.

³ III. ii. 6.

⁴ III. v. 1, 2.

⁵ III. vii. 4.

⁶ III. x. 6.

⁷ III. xi. 1, 2.

the body of Christ. Pure and lifted up to heaven should be the hands that are wont to touch the Creator of heaven and earth.”¹

“Beware of curious and unprofitable searching into this most profound Sacrament, if thou wilt not be plunged into the depths of doubt. ‘He that pries into majesty shall be overpowered by glory.’² God can work more than man can understand. . . . Human reason is feeble and may be deceived, but true faith cannot be deceived. All reason and natural inquiry ought to follow faith, not to go before or break in upon it. For faith and love do here especially take the lead, and work in hidden ways in this most holy, most supremely excellent Sacrament. . . . If the works of God were such that they might be easily comprehended by human reason, they could not be called marvellous or ineffable.”³

4. Langforde’s *Meditations for Ghostly Exercise in the Time of the Mass* may be a fifteenth century work. In it the details of the rite are described as a mystical representation of the passion and resurrection of Christ. At the consecration the people are directed to pay “due reverence to the blessed body of our Lord,” and to say at the elevation of the host, “Hail, Light of the world, King of kings, Glory of heaven, who didst gladly bear the penalty of death for us. Hail, our Salvation, true Peace, Redemption, Power,” and at the elevation of the chalice, “Hail, price of our Redeemer. Hail, pledge of our eternal inheritance. Hail, glorious blood of Christ. Blessed be the Lord my God, Jesus Christ, from whose side Thou wast poured for the redemption of the world.”⁴

IV.

In the attitude of devotion of which illustrations have been given the presence of Christ is closely connected with the consecrated elements. It is because the bread and wine are regarded as being after consecration the body and blood of our Lord that the devout worshipper is able to speak and pray in the manner which has been described. Other consequences of the same belief in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and in the early part of the sixteenth may be seen in the *Hereford Missal*, the *Customary* of St. Augustine’s Abbey at Canterbury, the *Sarum Missal* and *Processional*, the *York Processional*, and the *Sarum Cantels of the Mass*.

¹ III. xi. 7.

² Prov. xxv. 27.

³ III. xviii. 1, 4, 5.

⁴ In *Tracts on the Mass* (Henry Bradshaw Society), p. 24.

1. The fourteenth century manuscript of the *Hereford Missal* provides, like earlier documents already quoted, showing practices of the eleventh and twelfth and thirteenth centuries,¹ for the carrying of the "body of Christ" in procession on Palm Sunday, and for acts of adoration in connection with the procession. It is directed that relics be carried as well as the Sacrament.²

2. In the manuscript of the *Customary* of St. Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury, which was apparently written in the first half of the fourteenth century, there are directions for carrying the "body of Christ" in procession on Ascension Day above the reliquary of St. Letard.³

3. In the *Sarum Missal* the priest is directed after the consecration of the host to "incline himself to the host,⁴ and afterwards elevate it above his forehead so that it can be seen by the people," and after the consecration of the chalice to "elevate the chalice to his breast or above his head".⁵

In the same *Missal* the following directions are given for the Communion of the celebrant:—

"After the peace has been given the priest is to say the following prayers privately before he communicates himself, holding the host in both hands.

"O God the Father, Fount and Source of all goodness, who in Thy pity didst will that Thine only-begotten Son shouldst descend for us to this lower world, and take flesh, which I unworthy hold here in my hands.

"Here the priest is to incline himself towards the host, saying,

"I adore Thee, I glorify Thee, I praise Thee with the whole purpose of my mind and heart, and I pray Thee not to forsake us Thy servants, but to forgive our sins, so that we may be able to serve Thee, the one living and true God, with pure heart and chaste body. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

¹ See pp. 249, 250, 352, 353, *supra*.

² See Henderson, *Missale ad usum percelebris ecclesie Herefordensis*, pp. 79-81. The author has to thank Mr. Charlton Walker for freshly collating for him the MS. belonging to University College, now in the Bodleian Library (MS. Univ. Coll. 78A).

³ *Customary of St. Augustine's Canterbury*, i. 115, ii. 285 (Henry Bradshaw Society edition).

⁴ A later *Missal* adds "and adore it with bowed head".

⁵ Like provisions are in the *Sarum Missals* of all dates, as also in other *Missals*. The sentences quoted above are on col. 617 of the *Burntisland edition*, published in 1861-83.

“O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the living God, who of the will of the Father and by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost hast given life to the world by Thy death, deliver me, I beseech Thee, by this Thy most holy body and blood from all my iniquities and from every evil; make me always to obey Thy commands, and suffer me never for ever to be separated from Thee, O Saviour of the world. Who with God the Father and the same Holy Spirit livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen.

“Let not the Sacrament of Thy body and blood, O Lord Jesu Christ, which I albeit unworthy receive, be to me for judgment and condemnation; but by Thy goodness may it be profitable to the health of my body and soul. Amen.

“Bowling low, he is to say to the body, before he receive it,

“Hail for evermore, most holy flesh of Christ, to me before all and above all the greatest joy. The body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me a sinner the Way and the Life, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“Here he is to receive the body, first making a cross with the body itself before his mouth. Then with great devotion he is to say to the blood,

“Hail for evermore, heavenly drink, to me before all and above all the greatest joy. The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be profitable to me a sinner for an abiding healing unto eternal life. Amen. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

“Here he is to receive the blood; and, when he has received it, the priest is to incline himself, and to say with devotion the following prayer.

“I give Thee thanks, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, who hast refreshed me with the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ; and I pray that this Sacrament of our salvation which I, an unworthy sinner, have received may not turn to me for judgment or for condemnation according to my deserts, but may be profitable for the health of my body and soul unto eternal life. Amen.”¹

The *Sarum Missal* and *Processional* provide for the carrying of the Sacrament in the Palm Sunday procession by the following directions:—

“While the palms are being distributed, a shrine with relics is to be prepared, in which the body of Christ is to hang in a pyx;

¹ Col. 625-27 (Burntisland edition).

. . . a light is to be borne before it in a lantern, and an unveiled cross and two banners are to be carried in front. Then the procession is to go to the place of the first station. . . . After the Gospel three clergy of the second grade . . . are to turn to the people, and standing on the west side of the great cross are to sing together, Behold the King cometh to thee, O Sion, mystic daughter, meek, lowly, sitting on beasts, whose coming the prophetic lesson has already foretold. After each verse the officiant is to begin the antiphon 'Hail,' turning to the relics, and the choir are to take it up from him, genuflecting and kissing the ground. The officiant is to genuflect first, and the choir are to genuflect with him. . . . Then the procession is to go to the place of the second station; and the shrine with the case of relics is to be borne with the light in the lantern between the sub-deacon and the thurifer, the banners being on either side; and the cantor is to begin the antiphon, Worthy art Thou, O Lord our God, to receive glory and honour. Then the antiphon, 'The multitudes meet'. . . . They are to enter the church by the same door under the shrine with the case of relics held up across the door, singing, When the Lord entered the holy city, the Hebrew boys proclaimed the resurrection of life; with branches of palms they cried, Hosanna in the highest; when they heard that Jesus had come to Jerusalem, they went out to meet Him; with branches of palms they cried, Hosanna in the highest. Here the fourth station is to be, before the cross in the church; and at the station the officiant, the cross being now uncovered, is to begin the antiphon, and the choir is to take it up, genuflecting and kissing the ground. . . . When this is done, they are to enter the choir." ¹

The Sarum directions further appointed a like manner of treating the Sacrament on Good Friday and the following days, whereby the Sacrament was placed together with the cross in the Sepulchre on Good Friday, remained there throughout Holy

¹ Col. 258-62 (Burntisland edition): *cf.* Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* IV. xx. ordo 7. See also the fifteenth century direction for this procession in *Credo Michi*, p. 50 (Henry Bradshaw Society edition). For this procession on Palm Sunday at Rouen, see Martene, *op. cit.* IV. xx. 11, and ordo 5; and *cf.* p. 250 note 1, *supra*. For the carrying of the Sacrament in the procession on Corpus Christi Day, see the Bulls of Pope Martin V. (1429 A.D.) and Pope Eugenius IV. (1433 A.D.), the Letter of the Council of Basle (1434 A.D.), and the Statutes of the Provincial Council of Cologne (1452 A.D.), in Cherubini, *Bullarium Romanum*, i. 328, 342; Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii. 1489-91, ix. 1368.

Saturday, and on Easter Day was brought in procession to the altar.¹

4. In the *York Processional* instructions are given that after the Gospel in the blessing of the palms on Palm Sunday and before the procession goes round the church—

“The body of the Lord is to be brought out by another priest vested in an alb and silk cope with a silver cup through the eastern part of the church, with a pall held over it by two deacons and two acolytes, two clergy going before with torches to the aforesaid station. Then the priest is to bless, genuflecting three times and saying, Worthy art Thou, O Lord our God, to receive glory and honour. Afterwards the choir are to do the same, and to take up the antiphon. Then the priest is to return with the body into the church by the same way that he came.”²

5. The *Sarum Cantels of the Mass* provide with elaborate care for the bodily and spiritual preparation of the priest before saying Mass, for his reverent demeanour and precise performance of the prayers and ceremonies, for securing that the elements are of the right matter and in proper condition, for certain emergencies in the celebration, and for the steps to be taken in the event of any accident befalling the Sacrament. It may suffice to give one instance of the last-mentioned provisions.

“If a drop from the chalice has fallen on the altar, the drop must be sucked up, and the priest is to do penance for three days. But, if the drop has penetrated through the linen cloth to the second linen cloth, he must do penance for four days; if to the third linen cloth, for nine days; if the drop of the blood has penetrated to the fourth cloth, he must do penance for twenty days. And a priest or deacon must wash the linen cloths which the drop has touched three times over a chalice; and the washing is to be preserved with the relics.”³

V.

Gabriel Biel was a professor of theology at Tübingen in the latter half of the fifteenth century, and died at that place in

¹ *Missale*, col. 332, 333 (Burntisland edition); Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, i. 153; cf. p. 250 note 2, *supra*.

² P. 149 in the edition in vol. lxiii. of the publications of the Surtees Society.

³ Col. 655 (Burntisland edition).

1495. He may be regarded as the most famous of the Scotist theologians of the time. On the Eucharistic presence he accepts the ordinary teaching of his age. At the consecration the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, so that "the body of Christ, which was taken from the Virgin Mary, which suffered and was buried, which rose and ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, in which the Son of God will come to judge the living and the dead, is really and actually contained under the species of bread".¹ "The substance of bread does not remain but is actually and really converted or transubstantiated or changed into the substance of the body of Christ."² Both "matter" and "form" of bread cease to be, "perchance by the withdrawal of the conservation of God"; "the accidents are preserved in their own being without a subject"; "the real body of Christ by real presence comes into the place of the substance of the bread under the same accidents, so that the bread is no longer there (*ad panis destinationem*)".³ On the effects of Communion, after pointing out that good material food injures some by reason of the unhealthy state of their bodies, and that in like manner the "spiritual food" of the Eucharist does harm to those who receive it "irreverently and unworthily," Biel goes on to say:—

"I think that no mortal being can fully describe the fruits of the offering and reception of it by those who approach or offer worthily. . . . In this most sacred food, when worthily received, the real body of Christ is joined by a unique union to His mystical body, which is denoted in this Sacrament, and from it there comes to the members of the mystical body a whole inflow of blessed life. Christ the Bridegroom is joined to the Church His bride; and from Him she receives the adornment of perfection according to the measure of each member until she comes to the measure of the fullness of Christ. . . . This food kindles love, keeps up the memory of the Lord's passion, sustains for the performance of good, strengthens for the preservation of holy desire, increases hope, cleanses venial sin and sometimes mortal sin, refreshes with eternal consolation him who eats it spiritually, gives the life of grace, unites firmly to Christ, establishes faith without error, fortifies against the falls which are the result of human weakness, and lessens the burning fire of fleshly lust in the face of the assaults of the devil."⁴

¹ *Sacri canonis missae expos. lect. xxxix. lit. C.*

² *Op. cit. lect. xl. lit. A.* ³ *Ibid. H.* ⁴ *Ibid. lxxxv. lit. A, B.*

In view of later controversies, the teaching of Biel about the Eucharistic sacrifice is of some importance. He explains that the Eucharist is called a sacrifice because it was "instituted to be a memorial of the supreme sacrifice offered on the cross".¹ He speaks of the priest as "the instrument and minister of the Church"; and says that the sacrifice is "the sacrifice of the whole Church," and that "the Church offers it through the priest as through a minister appointed and ordained for this purpose," and that the holiness of the Church secures the acceptance of the sacrifice even when the priest who offers is not pleasing to God because he is sinful. Yet the priest is "not only an instrument" but also "an administrator," and "in offering the sacrifice in the person of the Church, he can apply its fruit and virtue specially to some one person or to certain persons," and he can "determine his own intention as to those for whom he will specially offer it".² In connection with the consecration Biel says incidentally that "Jesus Christ Himself is priest and sacrifice".³ On the merit of the sacrifice he writes:—

"It is clear that the merit of the Mass is not infinite so far as the merit of the Church which offers it and the personal merit of the priest who celebrates are concerned. For neither grace which is the root of merit nor the acts of the creatures, the Church and the priest, which are elicited by grace, are infinite. Therefore neither is the merit infinite. For merit is commensurate to grace and to act. . . . The merit of the offering of Christ in the sacrifice of the Mass is far less than was the merit of His offering on the cross. For on the cross Christ offered Himself immediately, being made a real sacrifice, dying once for the effectual redemption of all the predestined. . . . In the service of the Mass there is the same sacrifice and oblation, not by a repeated death but by the commemorative representation of the once suffered death. . . . Wherefore He suffered once only; and yet we daily present the memorial of His one death in this sacramental sacrifice. . . . The Mass is not of equal value with the passion and death of Christ as regards merit, because in the sacrifice of the Mass Christ does not again die, though His death, and therefore all its merit, is specially commemorated in it. . . . If the Mass were of equal value with the passion and death, then, as Christ suffered once only for the redemption of the whole world, so

¹ *Sent.* IV. viii. 1.

² *Sac. can. miss. exp.* lect. xxvi. lit. B, E, H.

³ *Op. cit.* lect. xl. lit. A.

also one Mass would suffice for the redemption of all souls from all the pains of purgatory, and for obtaining from God all good, which is not to be said."¹

Elsewhere Biel writes of the effects of the sacrifice of the Mass:—

“The Sacrament of the Eucharist, as a sacrifice offered to the Most High Father, takes away not only venial but also mortal sin, I do not say simply of those who receive it, but, of all those for whom it is offered, so far as concerns guilt and penalty, to a greater or less degree according to the disposition of those for whom it is offered.² . . . And therefore this service is offered for the living and for the dead.”³

In most of the doctrine thus taught about the Eucharistic sacrifice Biel follows closely the lines of the theology of Duns Scotus.⁴ The last quotation, like a passage previously quoted from a treatise ascribed to Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas,⁵ has some special importance in regard to the controversies about the Eucharistic sacrifice which it will be necessary to discuss in considering the theology of the sixteenth century.

VI.

The Guild of Corpus Christi in the city of York was founded in the year 1408. The register book of the Guild, now in the British Museum, contains a discourse on the text “This is My body” prefixed to the list of members. This discourse may be cited as an instance of teaching given popularly in the fifteenth century. In it the following passage occurs:—

“‘The Father of mercies, and Lord of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our affliction’⁶ ‘sent His only begotten Son,’⁷ who humbled Himself by taking our flesh, and most meekly bore all kinds of insults to increase our merit, and as time went on wrought many miracles in the glory of His pity, so that at last He restored the whole human race to the unity of peace by the most health-giving suffering of His body. Therefore, because the one body of Christ, offered in sacrifice for our sins, sustained by the light of the

¹ *Op. cit.* lect. xxvii. lit. K, L.

² Biel here quotes the passage from St. Thomas Aquinas, *Sent.* IV. xii. 2 (2, 3), which has been cited on pp. 326, 327, *supra*.

³ *Op. cit.* lect. lxxxv. lit. L.

⁴ See pp. 340-44, *supra*.

⁵ See pp. 322, 323, *supra*.

⁶ 2 Cor. i. 3, 4.

⁷ St. John iii. 16.

majesty of God, scourged and crucified by the Jews, was a most fitting means, and because . . . we daily fall by the weight of sin, this body, now impassible, is daily consecrated in the Church under the species of bread and wine for the cure of sins, and is left to all Christians as a memorial sign. . . . This offering is repeated daily, though Christ by once for all suffering in the flesh once for all saved the world by His one and the same endurance of death. From this death He rose to life, and 'death shall no more have dominion over Him';¹ and because we daily fall, Christ is daily sacrificed in mystery, and the passion of Christ is mystically set forth as of Him who once for all conquered death by His death and daily pardons our recurring offences and sins by means of this Sacrament of His body and blood. Moreover, this precious Sacrament is daily repeated to keep in mind the prayer that, as Christ united the members with the Head by His precious passion, so we may be united by faith and hope and love."²

VII.

It is no easy task to summarise so complicated a history as that of Western Eucharistic theology from the sixth century to the fifteenth. Yet an attempt must be made to gather up the threads of the preceding account.

The evidence afforded by the sixth and seventh and eighth centuries shows little more than the preservation of the tradition that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and that those only benefit by Communion who partake of the Sacrament worthily. The sacrifice is connected with both the passion and the heavenly life of our Lord. The power of obtaining specific results as the direct outcome of the offering of the sacrifice is more clearly taught by St. Gregory the Great than by any earlier writer except St. Augustine. Isidore of Seville lays stress on the presence of Christ in the Sacrament being the presence of His glorified body, and on the corollary that Christ is wholly present with both body and blood in each species.

The ninth and tenth centuries were marked by the controversies which arose from the teaching of Amalarius of Metz and

¹ Rom. vi. 9.

² The register and the discourse are printed in vol. lvii. of the Surtees Society's publications; the passage quoted above is on p. 3.

Paschasius Radbert. Amalarius appears to have been the first Western writer to put in clear and detailed form the idea of the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass as parts of a great drama of mystic representation of the life and death and resurrection of Christ. Some of his explanations were thought to suggest a gross and carnal view of the presence of Christ and of the offering of the sacrifice, and consequently led to his being attacked; but, though some of his statements are confused, the probability is strong that he, like his opponents, was keenly desirous of maintaining the spiritual aspects of both presence and sacrifice. Both parties in the controversy lay stress on the commemoration of the passion of Christ and the union with the heavenly worship as elements in the sacrifice. The controversy raised by Paschasius centred round the nature of the change effected by the consecration of the Sacrament. In the mind of Paschasius the elements were wholly made the body and blood of Christ, and this body and blood were those with which Christ was born of the Virgin. Others denied this identification of the Eucharistic body with that of our Lord's earthly life; and to a greater or less extent questioned the actual character of any change in the elements. Both Paschasius and his opponents emphasise the spiritual nature of the presence of Christ's body; both attach importance to the records of miracles which on the surface may suggest carnal ideas of a body in the natural state of the pre-resurrection life. All alike regard the Eucharist as a commemoration of the passion; Paschasius in particular expounds with great beauty and power the union of the earthly sacrifice with the heavenly actions of our Lord. By all alike the benefits of Communion are restricted to those who receive worthily. At the end of the tenth century the explicit teaching of Paschasius appears to have been widely accepted.

The marked feature of the eleventh century was the Berengarian controversy. The course of it shows two tendencies at work in regard to the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, both probably derived from the theology of Paschasius. The first of these tendencies is in the direction of naturalistic language and thought. This was a not unnatural result of emphasis on the actual character of the change effected by consecration coupled with but little attention to the spiritual nature of the risen body of Christ. The second tendency was of an opposite kind, to

insist on the spiritual nature of the presence to the extent of impairing conviction that it was of the real body of our Lord. In the working out of these two tendencies, some of the language used by leading theologians and some of that imposed on Berengar are likely to suggest the idea of a carnal and naturalistic presence, and some of Berengar's own statements incline towards a denial that our Lord is really present under the consecrated species. Among his followers there appear to have been those who went further than he did himself in this direction. If both parties are viewed at their best, the anxiety of those who were influenced by the second tendency seems to have been lest the chief Sacrament of the Christian religion should be degraded into a mechanical and carnal rite, and the dread of their opponents was evidently lest the value of the Sacrament as a means of real union with Christ Himself should be destroyed. In this dread, parts of the legislative acts of the authorities of the Church were marked by panic with the unsatisfactory results which usually accompany such legislation. But it would be very unfair to suppose that those who were active against Berengar were always affected by panic or that they were unmindful of the higher considerations which supplied the best elements in his thought. The later councils avoided the naturalistic language which had been used in earlier stages of the controversy; and Lanfranc and others who acted with him were explicit in affirming the spiritual character of the Eucharistic realities. As so often in controversies there were dangers in two directions; and it is not surprising that at times individuals failed to hold in their right relation two co-ordinate truths.

In the latter part of the eleventh century and in the twelfth, consequences of the Berengarian controversy may be observed in the care taken to maintain that the Eucharistic presence is actually of the real body and blood of Christ, and at the same time to emphasise the spiritual nature of the body and the presence. One feature of the time was the use made of the realistic philosophy, with its theory of an impalpable substance, to protect Eucharistic doctrine from carnal notions. Instances of ways of regarding the problems of the subject different from those usually accepted are found in the teaching of Rupert of Deutz and Abelard. The same period is marked by the emphasis laid by the liturgical writers on the aspects of the Euchar-

istic sacrifice in which it is viewed in union with the heavenly offering of Christ.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw the great development of the subtleties of the scholastic theology. Dominican and Franciscan theologians, in spite of the great differences of their thoughts and aims, strove almost equally to present the doctrine of the Eucharist so as to be in harmony with reason. Their habit of raising every question and dealing with every objection that acute and subtle minds knew of or could imagine makes much in their voluminous writings wearisome and even repulsive to a modern reader; their use of reason, the problems they devised, their lines of argument, are all apt to suggest that they look on the phenomena of the Eucharist in a naturalistic fashion; their way of finding a solution of every difficulty may often be repellent to those who have a keen sense of the mysteries of God's working. These features of their works have led many superficial readers to fail in appreciating what they really meant. The patient student may find at the back of all their strange arguments, all the limitations of their age, all their bondage to philosophic theories, all their delight in gathering arguments from every sphere, two great convictions about the Eucharistic presence, which in the circumstances of their own time they successfully maintained,—first, that the real body and blood of the crucified and risen Lord, once slain and now living and glorious, are present under the species of bread and wine to be the spiritual food of those who worthily partake of the Sacrament; and, secondly, that this presence is of a spiritual kind, not effected by any natural law, not of a body in any natural condition, uniquely wonderful, without true parallels elsewhere, though in harmony with the principles set up by the incarnate life of the divine Redeemer. In the pains taken in developing their doctrine of Transubstantiation, they failed to take equal care about the doctrine of the sacrifice; and, while some aspects were discussed, there appears to have been little remembrance of the association with our Lord's heavenly life, which had been prominent at some earlier times, and which might have helped to a better understanding of the actually sacrificial character of the commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross.

Side by side with the theological teaching of these centuries came some development of ceremonial and devotional practice.

It was marked by the maintaining of the aspect of the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass as being from one point of view a dramatic representation of the highest and most mystic kind of the life and death and resurrection of Christ, and the sense that Christ, "the Creator," "the King of glory," being in His Sacrament, was to be adored.

It is impossible to estimate the effect on the ignorant multitude of the teaching and actions of the theologians and authorities of the Church. In the absence of evidence it is easy to conjecture that many of the ignorant may have utilised the power they often possess of realising spiritual truths, and have had ideas which, however imperfect, were not false; and that many others, on hearing of the presence of the body of Christ, would be unable to rise to any higher conception than that of an earthly and carnal body, just as to the ignorant to hear of the love and care and actions of God often suggests anthropomorphic conceptions of deity. In like manner, it is easy to interpret, according as the mind of the interpreter is disposed, the legends of devout persons sustained by the reception of the Eucharist without other food as examples of a grossly superstitious view of a carnal presence of the body of Christ or as signs of an intensely spiritual belief transcending the things of sense. But it is well to remember that, whether in one direction or in the other, these are conjectures and not ascertained facts.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there were questionings of the more philosophic aspects of the received doctrine. To some extent these led to questioning of parts of the doctrine itself. Wyclif used the subtleties of a schoolman to attack the subtleties of the schoolmen. The Lollards uniformly asserted that the bread and wine remain after consecration; and some of them are said to have denied that the consecrated Sacrament is anything besides bread and wine. Wessel pushed the truth of the abiding spiritual communion of the Christian with Christ to the denial of the specific gift of the Eucharist. In dealing with all such movements the attitude of the authorities of the Church was to maintain the traditional doctrine in the form in which they had inherited it from the theologians of the thirteenth century.

Thomist and Scotist theologians had their different ways of looking at the Eucharistic sacrifice. There may have been elements in the teaching of both which paved the way for a

separation between the sacrifice of the altar and the sacrifice of Calvary, and to mechanical notions of satisfaction for sin; and the Thomist idea of a sacrifice as that "in which something is done" may have helped to cramp and limit the conception of what sacrifice means. Yet it was fundamental to both Thomists and Scotists that the personal work of Christ in His own redemptive acts is of unique value, and that nothing must be said to impair the conception of man as a moral being. Many questions closely connected with these points will need consideration in connection with the controversies of the sixteenth century.

As a student surveys the long course of writings—many of them of large extent and full of elaborate detail—on the subject of the Eucharist from the sixth century to the fifteenth in the Western Church, the most impressive fact of all is a fact which touches intimately the morality of the Christian religion and the sacramental system. It is the constant emphasis on the doctrine that, if Communion is to benefit the soul, the body of Christ must be spiritually as well as sacramentally received; and that a reception which is spiritual as well as sacramental is possible only for those who communicate worthily. Of scarcely less importance from the moral point of view is the insistence on the possibility of Spiritual Communion for those who desire to receive the body of Christ sacramentally and are unable to do so. How far in practice these conceptions of the Eucharist were cut across by lax administration of the Sacrament of Penance, or by the theory of Biel and others that the sacrifice of the Mass might benefit those in mortal sin by helping to lead them to repentance, or by popular teaching that to behold the elevated Sacrament was a means to spiritual and temporal benefit, is a question difficult, if not impossible, to answer. However that may be, they serve, like much else, to illustrate the truth that a close study of the literature does not support the theory that the Eucharistic doctrine of the mediæval Western Church was wholly or mainly mechanical and carnal. Rather, the facts show that it was part of the work of the greatest and most representative and most influential teachers, while taking care that the central points of their sacramental beliefs were not refined away, to maintain the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence and gift.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

- ACCIDENTS, i. 172, 174, 181-83, 185, 271, 277, 298, 299, 306, 310, 316, 318, 321, 329, 359, 362, 365, 366, 375, 389, ii. 10, 11, 12, 101, 160, 222, 368, 413-15, 441, 544-47, 592, 593, and *passim*.
- Adoration, Eucharistic, i. 37, 38, 106-109, 132, 173-75, 178, 182, 183, 249, 250, 262, 271, 345, 346, 351-60, 382-88, ii. 18-21, 65, 77, 83, 90, 92, 160, 222, 223, 265, 307, 340, 353, 365, 526-32, 540-42, 553-59, 583, 584, and *passim*.
- Altar on high, in canon of Mass, i. 120.
- Altar on high, in fathers, i. 51, 52, 116, 117, 118, 120, 153, 154.
- Altar on high, in middle ages, i. 220-22, 265, 266, 268, 272, 290, 295, 327.
- Angel, in canon of Mass, i. 120.
- Angel, in fathers, i. 120.
- Angel, in middle ages, i. 220-22, 265, 266, 268, 272, 290, 309, 327.
- Anticipations of Eucharist in Old Testament, i. 3, 12.
- Anticipations of Eucharist among Pagans, i. 2, 3, 12.
- Ascension, i. 116-21, 132, 155, and *passim*.
- CHURCH, body of Christ, i. 14, 15, 94-96, and *passim*.
- Concomitance, i. 140, 181, 184, 198, 269, 280, 281, 284, 287, 288, 305, 311, 316, 317, 320, 321, 329, 337, ii. 77, 78, 83, 84, 90-92, 160, 533, 535, and *passim*.
- Consecration, moment of, i. 41, 42, 84-88, 131, 197, 198, 301, 308, 312, 313, and *passim*.
- Corpus Christi, Institution of Feast of, i. 344-46.
- DOMINICAN theology, i. 319-34, and *passim*.
- EPIKLESIS: see Holy Ghost, Invocation of.
- FIGURE, i. 29-33, 61-67, 131, 137, 142, 148-50, 226-33, 237, 245, 253-56, 365, 367-69, 376, ii. 40, 41, 314, and *passim*.
- Franciscan theology, i. 314-17, 334-44, and *passim*.
- GREAT Entrance, Veneration at, i. 167, 168, 171-75.
- HEAVENLY life of Christ, i. 50-52, 116-21, 132, 152, 153, 159, 160, 161, 318, ii. 587-89, 595, 598-603, and *passim*.
- Heightened efficacy of elements, i. 67-70, 131, 239.
- Holy Ghost, Invocation of, i. 42, 85-87, 131, 138, 167, 171, and *passim*.
- ICONOCLASTIC controversy, i. 143-50.
- Institution of Eucharist, i. 4-12.
- Institution of Eucharist, state of our Lord's body when given at, i. 271, 285, 306, 310, 311, 321, 330, 331.
- LUTHERANISM, ii. 9-37, 105, 635-39.
- MOVEMENT in sacramental presence, i. 331, ii. 422.
- "NATURAL body," the phrase, ii. 37, 57, 111, 112, 117, 118, 135, 154, 162-79, 190-95, 198, 205, 206, 318, 319, 609.
- Nonjurors' doctrine, one form of, ii. 482-87, 514, 609-14, 617-24.
- Nourishment, how effected by reception of Sacrament, i. 310, 316, 318, 319, 330, 335, ii. 103, 541, 544, 547.
- ORIGINAL Sin, whether cross only for, ii. 26, 69-75.
- PASSION of Christ, i. 50, 114-16, 132, 195, and *passim*.
- Priesthood of Christian community, i. 16, 17, 21, 52-54, and *passim*.
- REASON, Recognition of by schoolmen, i. 303, 304, 314, 319, 323.
- Receptionism, ii. 43-61, 105, 249, 250, 355, 514, 559-62, and *passim*.

- Resurrection of Christ, i. 50, 51, 116-21, 132, 155, 156, and *passim*.
- SACRIFICE, i. 8-17, 21, 42-54, 109-124, 128, 132, 152-56, 306-308, 317, 318, 323-28, ii. 77-80, 93-100, 105, 106, 160, 161, 250, 355, 356-411, 514, 548, and *passim*.
- Sacrifice, for whom offered, i. 326-28, 390, 391, ii. 405-11, 602.
- Senses, use of in sacramental presence, i. 338, ii. 411, 420.
- Spiritual character of Eucharistic union, i. 92-94, 286, 287, 311, and *passim*.
- Spiritual character of body of Christ in Eucharist, i. 88-92, 96-98, 131, 188-91, 214-16, 217, 237, 251, 264, 271, 280, 281, 331, 332, ii. 90, 105, 170, 173, 420-25, 586-89, 593, 594, 598-600.
- Spiritual Communion, i. 316, 320, 331, 372, 383, 397, ii. 91, 105, 138.
- Symbol. See Figure.
- TRANSUBSTANTIATION, i. 102-106, 132, 172, 174, 177-92, 260, 275, 280, 304, 305, 313, 315-33, 340, 361-68, 370, 371, ii. 10, 11, 65, 66, 90, 91, 160, 249, 250, 355, 412, 416, 417, 592, 593, and *passim*.
- Trinity, Invocation of, i. 85, 87, 88, 131.
- UBIQUITY of manhood of Christ, Lutheran theory of, ii. 22, 23, 35, 638.
- VIRTUALISM, ii. 127-29, 249, 250, 355, 501-06, 514, 562-64, and *passim*.
- WICKED, question as to reception by, i. 83, 93, 94, 196, 197, 304, 305, 331, 350, ii. 140, 209-13, 221, 222, 524-28, 533, 534, 539, 540, and *passim*.
- Word, Invocation of, i. 84-87, 131.
- ZWINGLIANISM, ii. 37-43, 105, 250, 309, 315, 355, 488-95, 514, 515, and *passim*.

INDEX OF PASSAGES IN HOLY SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO.

Genesis—

- ii. 24. ii. 231.
- iii. 19. i. 240.
- xiv. 18. i. 3.
- xvii. 10. ii. 300, 301.
- xviii. 13. ii. 290.
- xxxiii. 20. ii. 231.
- xii. 26. i. 274.
- xliv. 11, 12. i. 62.

Exodus—

- vii. 12. ii. 108.
- xii. i. 3.
- xii. 9. i. 292.
- xix. 13. i. 240.
- xxiv. 1-11. i. 8.
- xxiv. 8. i. 274.
- xxix. 12. i. 12.
- xxix. 21. i. 12.
- xxix. 39. i. 9.
- xxix. 43-46. i. 3.
- xxx. 25. i. 45.

Leviticus—

- iii. 11, 16. i. 3.
- iv. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34. i. 12.
- iv. 17. i. 12.
- v. 9. i. 12.
- vii. 15-21. i. 3.
- viii. 11. i. 12.
- viii. 15. i. 12.
- ix. 7. i. 9.
- ix. 9. i. 12.
- xiv. 16, 27. i. 12.
- xvi. 14, 15, 19. i. 12.
- xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22. i. 3.
- xxii. 25. i. 3.
- xxiv. 7. i. 10.

Numbers—

- x. 10. i. 10.
- xix. 4. i. 12.
- xxviii. 2. i. 3.

1 Samuel—

- vii. 6. i. 12.

Psalms—

- xxii. 15. i. 292.
- xxiii. 5. i. 110.
- xxxiv. 1. i. 82.
- xxxiv. 8. i. 26.

Psalms (*continued*)—

- xxxviii. 1. i. 10.
- xl. 6. ii. 257.
- l. 5. ii. 260.
- l. 14, 15. i. 110.
- li. 16. i. 122, 123.
- li. 17. i. 110, 122, 123, ii. 394.
- li. 19. i. 43.
- lxvi. 15. i. 9.
- lxx. 1. i. 10.
- xcix. 5. i. 108, 109.
- cxli. 2. i. 110, 111.
- cxlviii. 5. i. 80.

Proverbs—

- ix. 1, 5. i. 3, 39, 197.
- xxv. 27. i. 384.

Isaiah—

- i. 11-13. i. 42.
- vii. 14. ii. 257.
- lvii. 7. ii. 327.
- lvii. 6. i. 12.

Jeremiah—

- vii. 22, 23. i. 42.
- xxxi. 31-34. i. 8.

Ezekiel—

- xli. 22. i. 3.
- xliv. 16. i. 3.

Zechariah—

- viii. 17. i. 42.
- ix. 9. i. 62.

Malachi—

- i. 7, 12. i. 3, ii. 263.
- i. 8. ii. 317.
- i. 11. i. 49, 110, ii. 75, 327.
- iv. 5. ii. 620.

Wisdom—

- xvi. 6. i. 10.

Ecclesiasticus—

- xxiv. 19-21. i. 3.
- l. 15. i. 12.

St. Matthew—

- i. 23. ii. 257.
- iii. 17. i. 265, 274.
- vi. 21. i. 333.
- vii. 6. i. 24, 60.
- ix. 20-22. i. 106, 107.
- xii. 32. i. 89.

St. Matthew (*continued*)—

- xiii. 39. i. 274.
 xiv. 19, 20. i. 3.
 xv. 17. i. 212.
 xv. 36, 37. i. 3.
 xvii. 12, 13. ii. 620.
 xviii. 20. i. 292, ii. 129, 257, 636.
 xix. 6. ii. 231.
 xx. 28. ii. 18.
 xxii. 40. i. 123.
 xxvi. 11. i. 273.
 xxvi. 26-29. i. 4-12, and *passim*.
 xxviii. 20. i. 268, ii. 129, 636.

St. Mark—

- iii. 29, 30. i. 89.
 v. 25-34. i. 106, 107.
 vi. 41, 42. i. 3.
 vii. 18, 19. i. 212.
 viii. 6-8. i. 3.
 ix. 13. ii. 620.
 x. 45. ii. 18.
 xiv. 22-25. i. 4-12, and *passim*.

St. Luke—

- i. 17. ii. 620.
 i. 35. i. 146, ii. 291.
 ii. 12. ii. 257.
 ii. 27. i. 9.
 vii. 38. i. 107.
 viii. 43-48. i. 106, 107.
 ix. 16, 17. i. 3.
 xii. 10. i. 89.
 xii. 49. i. 53.
 xxii. 14-20. i. 4-12, and *passim*.
 xxiv. 30-35. i. 4.

St. John—

- i. 13. ii. 191.
 i. 14-16. ii. 557.
 i. 32, 33. i. 18.
 i. 34. i. 274.
 iii. 5, 6, 8, 34. i. 18, 69.
 iii. 13. ii. 23.
 iii. 16. i. 391.
 iv. 23, 24. i. 117, 118, ii. 33.
 vi. 11, 12. i. 3.
 vi. 26-63. i. 17, 18, 65, 73, 91-94,
 210, 301, 379, ii. 66,
 129, 557, and *passim*.
 vi. 35. i. 18, 19.
 vi. 41. i. 19.
 vi. 48. i. 18, 19.
 vi. 48-58. i. 3.
 vi. 51. i. 18, 19, 89, 342, ii. 256.
 vi. 55. i. 362.
 vi. 61-63. i. 88, 90, 92, 230, 273, ii.
 232, 333, 516.
 vii. 39. i. 18.
 viii. 12. i. 19.
 ix. 5. i. 19.
 x. 7, 8, 11, 14. i. 19, ii. 290.
 xiv. 6. i. 19.
 xiv. 17, 26. i. 18.
 xiv. 27. ii. 124.

St. John (*continued*)—

- xv. 1. i. 19, 62, ii. 290.
 xv. 4. ii. 31.
 xv. 5. i. 19.
 xv. 26. i. 18.
 xvi. 13. i. 18.
 xvii. 23. ii. 31.
 xx. 22. ii. 259.
 xx. 23. i. 118.

Acts—

- ii. 42, 46. i. 4.
 iii. 21. ii. 299.
 xx. 7, 11. i. 4.
 xxvii. 35. i. 4.

Romans—

- i. 4. i. 18.
 i. 20. ii. 434.
 v. 8. i. 162.
 vi. 4. ii. 290, 379.
 vi. 9, 10. i. 273, 392, ii. 326.
 viii. 9. ii. 492.
 viii. 11. ii. 492.
 ix. 5. ii. 338.
 xii. 1, 4, 5. i. 15.
 xii. 16. i. 236.
 xv. 16. i. 15, ii. 327.

1 Corinthians—

- ii. 14. i. 240.
 iii. 16. ii. 492.
 v. 8. ii. 260, 261.
 viii. 4. ii. 334.
 x. 3, 4. ii. 259, 290.
 x. 16-21. i. 4, 13, 95, ii. 27, 108,
 109, 255, 259, 290, and
passim.
 xi. 23-29. i. 4-15, and *passim*.
 xi. 25. ii. 260, 465, and *passim*.
 xi. 28, 29. ii. 27, 103, 212, 285.
 xii. 12, 13, 27. i. 15, 95.
 xii. 12-14. i. 15.
 xv. 35-54. i. 98.
 xv. 44. ii. 387.
 xv. 45. i. 18.

2 Corinthians—

- i. 3, 4. i. 391.
 iii. 18. i. 18.
 iv. 7. i. 183.
 v. 16. i. 273, 299.
 v. 17. i. 81.
 xiii. 5. ii. 492.

Galatians—

- iii. 27, 28. i. 78.
 iv. 9. ii. 258.
 v. 6. ii. 103.
 v. 21. i. 121.

Ephesians—

- iii. 17. ii. 51.
 v. 2. i. 293.

Philippians—

- ii. 6. i. 31.
 ii. 7, 8. i. 115, 116, ii. 389.
 ii. 9. i. 299, ii. 18.

Philippians (*continued*)—

- ii. 17. ii. 327.
- iii. 20. i. 333.
- iv. 18. i. 15.

Colossians—

- i. 15, 18. ii. 388.
- i. 19, 20. i. 267.
- ii. 9. ii. 296.

1 Timothy—

- i. 3, 4. ii. 292.
- ii. 1. ii. 348.
- iv. 5. i. 72.

Hebrews—

- i. 3, 4. i. 300.
- ii. 14. ii. 255.
- v. 6, vii. 17. i. 196, ii. 100, and *passim*.
- vii. 27. i. 162.
- ix. 12. i. 288, ii. 384.
- ix. 14. i. 293.
- ix. 15-20. i. 8.
- ix. 20. i. 274.
- ix. 22. ii. 451, 452.
- ix. 25, 28. i. 343, ii. 326, 471, 610.
- x. 3. i. 11.
- x. 5. ii. 257.
- x. 10. i. 162, ii. 256, 471.
- x. 12. ii. 194, 199, 326, 471.

Hebrews (*continued*)—

- x. 14. i. 162, ii. 69, 80, 186, 341.
- x. 18. ii. 71.
- x. 26. ii. 72.
- xi. 1. ii. 452, 454.
- xii. 20. i. 240.
- xii. 22-24. i. 16.
- xii. 23. i. 112.
- xiii. 8. i. 299.
- xiii. 9, 11, 12. i. 16, 156, 157.
- xiii. 10. i. 16, ii. 68, 261, 327, 348, and *passim*.
- xiii. 15, 16. i. 16, 123.
- 1 St. Peter—
- ii. 5, 9. i. 16, 53, 112, and *passim*.
- ii. 24. ii. 610.
- 2 St. Peter—
- i. 4. i. 16, 103, ii. 255.
- 1 St. John—
- ii. 1, 2. i. 17, ii. 100, 283.
- iv. 13. ii. 492.
- Revelation—
- i. 6. ii. 56.
- v. 6, 8-10. i. 17, ii. 398, 548.
- viii. 4. i. 327.
- xiii. 8. ii. 79.
- xxi. 2. i. 112.

INDEX OF AUTHORS, COUNCILS, AND BOOKS REFERRED TO.

- ABBAUD, i. 297, 298.
 Abelard, i. 295-97.
 Abercius, Epitaph of, i. 22, 23, 38.
 Acacius of Constantinople, i. 128, 129.
 Adamantius, i. 56, 62.
 Adamson, R. M., ii. 642-45.
 Adelman of Liège, i. 245.
 Ælfric, i. 236-38.
 Albert the Great, i. 319-22.
 Alcuin, i. 199-202.
 Alexander of Hales, i. 314-17.
 Alexandria, Council of (339), i. 59.
 Alger of Liège, i. 269-73.
 Amalarius of Metz, i. 203, 210-13.
 Ambrose, i. 57, 79, 80, 86, 91, 105, 108, 113, 115, 119, 120, 122.
 American *Prayer Book*, ii. 608.
 Anastasius of Sinai, i. 136-38, 153, 154.
Ancren Riwle, i. 356-58.
 Andrewes, L., ii. 255-66.
 Anselm, i. 261-63.
Antididagma, ii. 83-86.
 Aphraates, i. 124, 125.
Apologetical Defence, An, ii. 494, 495.
Apostolical Constitutions, i. 56, 58, 64, 75, 85, 86, 112, 113, 115, 119, ii. 602.
 Aquinas. *See* Thomas Aquinas.
 Aristides, i. 43.
 Arles, Council of, i. 57, 113.
Articles, Six, Law of, ii. 117, 118.
Articles, Ten, ii. 113, 114.
Articles, Thirteen, ii. 115, 116.
Articles, Forty-five, ii. 143, 144.
Articles, Forty-two, ii. 145, 146.
Articles, Eleven, ii. 207, 208.
Articles, Thirty-eight, ii. 208, 209.
Articles, Thirty-nine, i. 94, ii. 209-13.
Articles, Irish (1615), ii. 312, 313.
 Arundel, T., i. 376, 377.
 Athanasius, i. 56, 58, 59, 60, 70, 89, 90, 98, 111, 114.
Athanasius, Canons of, i. 134.
 Athenagoras, i. 22, 23, 43, 44.
 Atzberger, L., ii. 393.
Augsburg, Confession of, ii. 25-30.
Augsburg, Confession of, Reply to, ii. 68, 69.
 Augustine, i. 57, 64, 65, 82-84, 91-96, 98, 108, 109, 113, 115, 116, 120, 121, 122-24, 372, ii. 209, 602.
 Autun, Inscription at, i. 22, 35, 36.
 BAKER, J. F. Bethune, i. 99, 115.
Bangor, Antiphonary of, i. 208, 209.
Barnabas, Epistle of, i. 22, 23, 42, 43, 44.
 Basle, Council of (1434), i. 387.
Basle, First Confession of, ii. 48.
Basle, Second Confession of, ii. 48-50.
 Batiffol, P., i. 102, 209, ii. 426.
 Bayma, J., ii. 416, 417.
 Bayne, Ralph, ii. 167.
 Bayne, Ronald, ii. 244.
 Becon, T., ii. 235-38.
 Bede, Venerable, i. 198, 199.
Belgic Confession, ii. 57, 58.
 Bellarmine, R., ii. 364-67, 374.
 Benedict XIV. *See* Lambertini.
 Bennett, W. J. E., ii. 553, 554.
 Benson, R. M., ii. 586-89.
 Berengar, i. 244-59.
 Bernadakis, Catechism of, i. 188.
 Bernard, i. 301, 302, 313.
 Bethlehem, Synod of. *See* Jerusalem, Council of.
 Beveridge, W., ii. 450-55.
 Biel, G., i. 388-91.
 Birkbeck, W. J., i. 185.
 Bishop, E., i. 205.
Bishops' Book, ii. 114, 115.
 Bona, J., i. 203.
 Bonaventura, i. 334-40, ii. 411.
 Bonner, E., ii. 164-67.
 Bordeaux, Council of (1080), i. 257.
 Box, G. H., i. 9.
 Bracciolini, Poggio, i. 370.
 Bramhall, J., ii. 337-42.
 Breton, G., ii. 405.
 Brett, T., ii. 493, 494.
 Bridgett, T. E., i. 312, 359.
 Bright, W., i. 55, 56, 77, 194, 198, 199, ii. 556-59.
 Brightman, F. E., i. 151, 155.
 Brionne, Council of (1050), i. 246.
 Bucer, M., ii. 43-49, 81.
 Buckeridge, J., ii. 266, 267.
 Bull, G., ii. 443-50.
 Burbidge, E., i. 203.
 Burkitt, F. C., i. 126.
 Burnet, G., ii. 319, 320.
 CABASILAS, Nicholas, i. 166-70.
 CÆSARIUS of Heisterbach, i. 312, 353, 359.
 Cajetan, ii. 65-68.

- Calvin, J., ii. 50-61.
 Campbell, A., ii. 253.
 Cano, Melchior, ii. 71, 356-59, 405, 406.
 Canon of Mass, i. 120, 203-205, ii. 602.
Canons of the Apostles, i. 28, 29, 39, 42.
 Canons, English (1640), ii. 253, 254.
 Cantelupe, Walter de, i. 354.
Canterbury, St. Augustine's, Customary of, i. 385.
 Canterbury Convocation, ii. 113, 129, 136, 145, 159-63, 202, 253, 254.
 Carson, W. R., ii. 651.
 Carter, T. T., ii. 555.
Carthusians, Ancient Statutes of, i. 354.
 Cassander, G., ii. 304, 466.
Catechism, Prayer Book, ii. 251, 252.
Catechism, A Short, ii. 146, 147.
Catechism of Trent, ii. 100-106.
Catechism, Scottish (1552), ii. 156-58.
 Catharinus, A., ii. 70-75.
 Cheetham, S., ii. 408.
 Chalcedon, Council of (451), i. 55.
 Chelsea, Council of (816), i. 250.
 Cheke, J., ii. 146, 167, 168.
 Cheyney, R., ii. 162, 210, 211.
Christian Letter of Certain English Protestants, ii. 243.
 Chrysostom, i. 56, 74, 75, 85, 87, 91, 96, 104, 107, 112, 114, 117-19, 122, 123.
 Chrysostom, Pseudo, i. 101.
 Cienfuegos, A., ii. 411.
 Clement of Alexandria, i. 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 37, 38, 43, 44, 45, 53, 54.
 Clement of Rome, i. 22, 23, 51.
 Colet, J., ii. 2-7.
 Collins, T., ii. 168.
 Cologne, Council of (1280), i. 355, 356.
 Cologne, Council of (1452), i. 387.
 Cologne, Council of (1536), ii. 76, 77.
Communion Office (Nonjurors), ii. 479-81.
Communicant Instructed, The, ii. 488.
Communicant, The Orthodox, ii. 487, 488.
Communicant, The Reasonable, ii. 487.
 Coudren, C. de, ii. 377-80.
 Constance, Council of (1415), i. 377.
 Constant, M., ii. 420.
 Constantinople, Council of (381), i. 55.
 Constantinople, Iconoclastic Council of (754), i. 148-50, ii. 623.
 Constantinople, Council of (1642), i. 179.
 Constantinople, Council of (1727), i. 184, 185.
 Conti, Lothair. *See* Innocent III.
 Conybeare, F. C., i. 129.
 Cook, F. C., i. 11.
 Corpus Christi, York Guild of, i. 391, 392.
 Cosin, J., ii. 321-28, 470.
 Crakanthorp, R., ii. 280-83.
 Cranmer, T., ii. 112, 114, 125-29, 134, 135, 177-84.
Crede Michi, i. 387.
 Cudworth, R., ii. 315, 316.
 Cyprian, i. 22, 23, 31, 40, 41, 47, 48, 49, 50, 58.
 Cyril of Alexandria, i. 56, 69, 75-77, 99, 105, 113, 161.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, i. 56, 64, 66, 67, 68, 71, 85, 90, 91, 102, 103, 106, 112, 114.
 Cyril Lucar, i. 175-80.
 DALGARNS, J. B., i. 357, ii. 411, 420.
 Damien. *See* Peter Damien.
 Day, G., ii. 135.
De aleatoribus, i. 40.
De sacramentis, i. 57, 64, 66, 80-82, 86, 87, 105, 120.
De spectaculis, i. 40.
 Deacon, T., ii. 481-83.
Declaration and Confession (1559), ii. 206, 207.
Defence of the Plain Account, ii. 494.
 Delitzsch, Franz, i. 10.
 Denison, G. A., ii. 526, 527, 555.
Didache. See Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.
Didascalia of the Apostles, i. 28, 46.
 Dimock, N., ii. 253, 319.
Diognetus, Epistle to, i. 22, 23, 43.
 Dionysius of Alexandria, i. 22, 23, 39, 40.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, Pseudo, i. 138-40.
Directory for the Public Worship of God, ii. 308, 309, 311, 312.
Discourse against Transubstantiation, ii. 465, 466.
Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, ii. 465, 466.
 Dixon, R. W., ii. 145, 207.
Doctrine of the Church of England, ii. 521.
 Dorner, J. A., ii. 635-38.
 Dositheus, i. 179-83.
 Dowden, J., i. 183, ii. 506, 603, 605, 617, 618.
 Driver, S. R., i. 11, 49.
 Dudden, F. H., i. 194.
 Duns Scotus, i. 340-44.
 Durand of Mende, i. 359-60.
 Durand of St. Pourçain, i. 362, 363.
 Durand of Troarn, i. 250-52.
 Durham, Council of (1220), i. 354.
 Eck, John Maier von, ii. 68-70.
Egbert, Pontifical of, i. 250.
 English Church Union, ii. 558, 559.
 Ephesus, Council of (431), i. 55.

406 INDEX OF AUTHORS, COUNCILS, AND BOOKS

- Ephraim of Antioch, i. 135, 136.
 Ephraim the Syrian, i. 124-28.
 Erasmus, ii. 61-65.
 Eudes de Sully. *See* Odo of Paris.
 Eugenius IV., Pope, i. 346, 379, 380, 387.
 Eusebius of Alexandria, i. 136.
 Eusebius Bruno, i. 258, 259.
 Eusebius of Casarea, i. 56, 62, 63, 88, 89, 109-111.
 Eusebius of Emesa, i. 129-31.
 Euthymius Zigabenus, i. 159-61.
 Eutychius of Constantinople, i. 70, 140, 141, 153.
 Exeter, Council of (1287), i. 354, 355.
- FABER, F. W., ii. 419.
 Faber Stapulensis, ii. 7-9.
 Faustus of Riez, i. 129.
 Feckenham, J., ii. 204, 205.
 Field, E., ii. 302-305.
 Fisher, J., ii. 109.
 Florence, Council of (1439), i. 172, 379.
 Florus of Lyons, i. 213-16.
 Floss, H. J., i. 245.
 Forbes, A. P., ii. 624-32, 651.
 Forbes, G. H., ii. 623, 624.
 Forbes, R., ii. 618-20.
 Forbes, W., ii. 305-308.
Formula of Concord, ii. 34-36.
 Frankland, W. B., i. 5.
 Franzelin, J. B., ii. 388, 389, 411, 413, 414, 421.
 Frazer, J. G., i. 3.
 Frère, W. H., ii. 136, 506, 605.
 Frith, J., ii. 109-12.
 Fulbert of Chartres, i. 242-44.
 Fuller, J., ii. 166.
- GABRIEL of Philadelphia, i. 173-75.
 Gairdner, J., i. 376, ii. 145.
Gallican Confession, ii. 56, 57.
 Gallican Masses, i. 205, 206.
 Gardiner, S., ii. 114, 147-56, 163.
 Gardner, Alice, i. 245.
 Gauden, J., ii. 320, 459.
 Gee, H., ii. 202.
Gelasian Sacramentary, i. 203-205, 207.
 Gelasius, Pope, i. 57, 101, 102.
 Gennadius, i. 172, 173.
 Georgel, ii. 418.
 Gerbert, i. 235, 236.
 Germain of Paris, i. 198.
 Germanus II. of Constantinople, i. 165, 166.
 Gibson, E. C. S., ii. 145.
 Gilpin, B., ii. 219, 220.
 Giraldus Cambrensis, i. 312, 353.
Godly Exhortation, A, ii. 203.
 Goode, W., ii. 559-62.
 Gore, C., i. 60, 134, 245, ii. 586, 589-98.
Gothic Missal, i. 206, 207.
 Goudge, H. L., i. 20.
- Grafton, C. C., ii. 601-603.
 Gregory of Bergamo, i. 273-75.
 Gregory of Nazianzus, i. 56, 64, 71, 106, 107, 112, 114, 116, 121, 123.
 Gregory of Nyssa, i. 56, 68, 69, 71-73, 80, 103, 104.
 Gregory the Great, i. 194-96, 203, 291.
 Gregory IX., Pope, i. 354.
 Grindal, E., ii. 230, 231.
 Groepper, J., ii. 76-78, 83, 99, 100.
 Guest, E., ii. 201, 202, 210-13.
- HADDON, J., ii. 161, 162.
 Hagenbach, K. R., i. 30.
 Haldane, A. C., ii. 632-34.
 Hales, J., ii. 313-15, 494.
 Halifax, Lord, ii. 585, 586.
 Hamilton, J. *See* *Catechism*, Scottish (1552) and *Godly Exhortation*.
 Hamilton, W. K., ii. 552, 553.
 Hammond, H., ii. 297-302.
 Harding, T., ii. 227, 228.
 Harnack, A., i. 30, 104.
 Harrison, J., ii. 564, 565.
 Hatch, E., i. 3.
 Haymo, i. 234, 235.
 Headlam, A. C., i. 15.
 Hebert, C., ii. 565, 566.
 Hedley, J. C., ii. 391, 392, 414, 415, 424, 425.
 Hefele, C. J., i. 144.
Heidelberg Catechism, ii. 58, 59.
Helvetic Confession, First, ii. 48-50.
Helvetic Confession, Second, ii. 60, 61.
 Henry VIII., King, ii. 107-109.
 Herbert, G., ii. 275-80.
Hereford Missal, i. 385.
 Hermann von Wied, ii. 76-83.
 Hewet, A., ii. 112, 113.
 Hilary of Poitiers, i. 57, 77-79.
 Hildebert of Tours, i. 275-78.
 Hincmar of Rheims, i. 233, 234.
 Hippolytus, i. 22, 38, 39.
Hippolytus, Canons of, i. 23, 39, 45, 58.
 Hoadly, B., ii. 488-90, 514, 515.
Homilies, Elizabethan, ii. 213-15.
 Honorius of Autun, i. 278-80.
 Honorius III., Pope, i. 353, 354.
 Hooker, R., ii. 239-49.
 Hooper, J., ii. 142, 143.
 Horneck, A., ii. 460-62.
 Horstius, J. M., ii. 378.
 Hort, F. J. A., i. 30.
 Hugh of Langres, i. 245.
 Hugh of St. Victor, i. 283-87.
 Humphrey, L., ii. 209, 210.
 Hunt, W., i. 236.
 Hurter, H., ii. 420.
 Hus, J., i. 370, 371.
- IGNATIUS, i. 22, 23, 24, 25, 33, 46, 47, 50.

- Illingworth, J. R., i. 3.
 Innocent III., i. 308-13.
 Irenæus, i. 6, 7, 22, 23, 34, 35, 42, 43, 47, 49, 51.
 Irish *Catechism*, ii. 615.
 Irish *Constitutions and Canons*, ii. 615, 616.
 Irish *Form of Consecration of Churches*, ii. 614, 615.
 Irish *Prayer Book*, ii. 616, 617.
 Isidore of Pelusium, i. 57, 77, 105.
 Isidore of Seville, i. 196-98.
 Ivo of Chartres, i. 266-69.
- JACKSON, J., ii. 515
 Jackson, T., ii. 293-97.
 Jacobson, W., ii. 354.
 Jerome, i. 57, 96-98.
 Jerome of Prague, i. 370, 371.
 Jerusalem, Council of (1672), i. 179-83.
 Jevons, F. B., i. 3.
 Jewel, J., ii. 70, 210, 211, 225-30.
 John, *Acts of*, i. 24.
 John of Cornouailles, i. 290, 291.
 John of Damascus, i. 144-47, 150, 152, 154.
 John the Scot. *See* Scotus Erigena.
 John of Paris, i. 361, 362.
 John of Rouen, i. 250.
 Johnson, J., ii. 474-77.
 Jolly, A., ii. 620-23.
 Juliana of Norwich, i. 380, 381.
 Julius I., Pope, i. 59.
 Justin Martyr, i. 6, 7, 22, 23, 34, 43, 44, 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58.
- KAY, W., i. 11.
 Keble, J., ii. 248, 519, 520, 526-34.
 Kempis. *See* Thomas a Kempis.
 Ken, T., ii. 455-57, 514, 515.
 Khomiakoff, i. 191, 192.
 Kidd, B. J., ii. 75, 145.
 King's Book, ii. 118-20.
 Kirkpatrick, A. F., i. 10.
 Knox, A., ii. 253, 515-19.
 Knox, E. A., ii. 570.
 Kyriakos, Catechism of, i. 188.
- LAMBERT, J. C., ii. 641, 642.
 Lambert, J. *See* Nicholson.
 Lambertini, P. L., i. 203, ii. 420.
 Lanfranc, i. 248-50.
 Langforde, i. 384.
 Lapede, C. a., ii. 418, 419.
 Lateran Council, Fourth (1215), i. 318.
 Latimer, H., ii. 114, 195-99.
 Laud, W., ii. 267-74.
 Law, W., ii. 496-501, 514.
 Lay Folks Mass Book, i. 356.
 Leclercq, H., i. 36.
 Leibnitz, G. W., ii. 635.
 Leo I., Pope, i. 57, 61, 113.
- Leo XIII., Pope, ii. 418.
 Leonine Sacramentary, i. 205.
 Leontius of Byzantium, i. 134, 135.
 Lepin, M., ii. 401-405.
 Leray, R. P. A., ii. 420.
 Lessius, L., ii. 371-73.
 Letter to a Lord in answer to his late Book, ii. 491, 492.
 Liber Pontificalis, i. 203.
 Liddon, H. P., ii. 555.
 Lightfoot, J. B., ii. 219.
 Littledale, R. F., ii. 555, 556.
 Liturgy of St. Basil, i. 151, 152, 155, 156, 161.
 Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, i. 151, 152, 155, 161.
 Liturgy of St. James, i. 154.
 Liturgy of the Presanctified, i. 152, 168.
 Lock, W., ii. 520.
 Lockhart, W., ii. 418.
 Loisy, A., ii. 427-33, 438-40.
 Lollards, *Conclusions of*, i. 368, 369.
 Lombard. *See* Peter Lombard.
 London, Council of (1382), i. 374.
 Lords, House of, Discussion in (1548), ii. 134, 135.
 Lothair Conti. *See* Innocent III.
 Loserth, J., i. 370, 374, 375.
 Lugo, J. de, ii. 373-77, 407, 408.
 Luther, M., i. 9-24.
- MACARIUS Magnes, i. 56, 65, 67, 73, 74.
 Macarius of Egypt, i. 56, 60, 64.
 Maclear, G. F., ii. 649.
 Macmillan, M., i. 9.
 Maignan, E., ii. 413.
 Makarios, i. 190, 191.
 Manning, H. E., ii. 421.
 Marcion, i. 32.
 Marburg, Conference at (1529), ii. 43.
 Martene, E., i. 250, 387.
 Martensen, H., ii. 638, 639.
 Martin V., Pope, i. 346, 387.
 Matthew, F. D., i. 365, 374, 375.
 Matthew Paris, i. 352.
 Maurice, F. D., ii. 570-75.
 Maximus the Confessor, i. 141, 142.
 Mayor, J. B., i. 26, 30.
 Mede, J., ii. 447.
 Melancthon, P., ii. 24, 25, 27, 30, 34, 35, 43, 46, 81.
 Melchior, Cano. *See* Cano.
 Merlo, J. *See* Horstius.
 Meyrick, F., ii. 566, 567.
 Milligan, W., ii. 646.
 Mirror of the Mysteries of the Church, i. 287, 288.
 Monod, A., ii. 649.
 Morando, G., ii. 418.
 Morton, T., ii. 283-89.
 Moschakis, Catechism of, i. 188.
 Moule, H., ii. 584, 585.

- Mountague, R., ii. 275.
 Mozarabic Liturgy, i. 208.
 Mozley, J. B., ii. 575-80.
 Myrc, J., i. 381, 382.
- NEALE, J. M., i. 185.
Necessity of Reformation, ii. 465, 466.
 Nektarios, *Catechism of*, i. 189.
 Nelson, R., ii. 477, 478.
 Nestorius, i. 98, 99, 115.
 Netter. *See* Thomas Waldensis.
 Newman, J. H., ii. 420, 422.
 Nicæa, Council of (325), i. 55, 58, 59, 109.
 Nicæa, Council of (787), i. 148-50, 154, ii. 623.
 Nicetas of Chonæ, i. 162-64.
 Nicephorus of Constantinople, i. 150, 151, 154.
 Nicholson, J., ii. 116.
 Nicolas I., Pope, i. 238, 239.
 Nicholas of Methone, i. 164, 165.
 Nonjurors' Communion Office. *See* Communion Office.
 Nonjurors, Correspondence of with Easterns, i. 183, 184, ii. 478, 479.
 Noort, G. van, ii. 390, 391, 409-11, 414, 422-24.
 Notter. *See* Thomas Waldensis.
 Nowell, A., ii. 215-19.
- OCKHAM. *See* William of Ockham.
 Odo of Cambrai, i. 263-66.
 Odo of Paris, i. 352.
 Oecolampadius, ii. 40, 48.
 Oecumenius, i. 156, 157.
 Oldcastle, Sir J., i. 369.
 Olier, J. J., ii. 380, 381.
 Optatus, i. 57, 79, 113.
Order of Communion, ii. 132-34.
 Origen, i. 22, 23, 26-28, 30, 38, 42, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54.
Orthodox Confession, i. 177-79.
 Oswald, H., ii. 419, 420.
 Othlon of St. Emmeran, i. 244.
 Otto of Bamberg, i. 283.
 Overall, J., ii. 252, 253.
 Oxenham, H. N., i. 20, ii. 501.
 Oxford, Council of (1222), i. 354.
 Oxford, University of (1381), i. 373, 374.
 Oxford, University of (1406), i. 376.
 Oxford, University of (1412), i. 376.
- PAGET, F., ii. 245, 248.
 Palladius of Helenopolis, i. 142, 143.
 Palmer, W. (Magdalen College), i. 185.
 Palmer, W. (Worcester College), i. 185, ii. 522-26.
 Paris, Council of (1050), i. 246.
 Paris, Matthew. *See* Matthew Paris.
- Parliament, Acts of, ii. 129-31, 135, 136, 139, 203, 204, 318.
 Paschasius Rabbert, i. 216-22.
 Paululus. *See* Robert Paululus.
 Peckham, J., i. 354.
 Peacock, R., i. 370.
 Pelargus, A., ii. 100.
 Perrone, J., ii. 389, 390.
 Perry, G. G., ii. 116.
 Peter Abelard. *See* Abelard.
 Peter d'Ailly, i. 371, ii. 10.
 Peter Damien, i. 259-61.
 Peter Lombard, i. 303-307.
 Peter Mogila, i. 177.
 Peter Mongus, i. 128, 129.
 Peter of Poitiers, i. 307, 308, 312.
 Peter the Chanter, i. 312.
 Peter the Eater, i. 312.
 Peter the Venerable, i. 302, 303.
 Philips, W., ii. 161.
 Phillpotts, H., ii. 547, 548.
 Philpot, J., ii. 162.
 Pighi, A., ii. 70.
 Pistoia, Council of (1786), ii. 408, 409, 412.
 Pius VI., Pope, ii. 409, 412.
 Pius X., Pope, ii. 437, 438.
Plain Account, A. *See* Hoadly.
 Poggio Bracciolini. *See* Bracciolini.
 Poitiers, Council of (1075), i. 257.
 Pole, R., ii. 163, 164.
 Politi, L. *See* Catharinus.
 Poore, R., i. 353.
 Pope, W. B., ii. 640.
Pore Help, A., ii. 132.
 Pourrat, P., ii. 426.
 Poynt, J. *See* *Catechism, A Short.*
Prayer Book (1549), ii. 136-39.
 " " (1552), ii. 139-42.
 " " (1559), ii. 203, 204.
 " " (1662), ii. 318-21.
 " " Scottish (1637), ii. 270-73.
See also Scottish Communion Office.
 Proclamation of Edward VI. (1547), ii. 181, 182.
Proper Answer to a Late Abusive Pamphlet, ii. 494.
 Pullan, L., ii. 319.
 Pulleyn. *See* Robert Pulleyn.
 Pusey, E. B., ii. 520, 521, 524, 527, 534-47, 555, 651.
- Quæstiones veteris et novi testamenti*, i. 60, 203.
Quello che Vogliamo. *See* *What we Want.*
- RABANUS MAURUS, i. 222-26.
 Rashdall, H., i. 304, ii. 2.
 Ratherius, i. 239-41.
Rationale, ii. 120-25.

- Ratramn, i. 226-33.
 Ratray, T., ii. 617, 618.
 Regkmann, H., ii. 75.
Remarks on a Book lately published,
 ii. 491.
 Remi of Auxerre, i. 235.
 Rickaby, J., ii. 417.
 Ridley, N., ii. 125, 135, 184-95.
 Robert Paululus, i. 288-90.
 Robert Pulleyn, i. 302.
 Robertson, J. N. W. B., i. 176.
Roman Order, First, i. 203, 209.
 Roman Missal, i. 203, ii. 602.
 Rome, Council of (370), i. 31.
 " " " (1050), i. 246.
 " " " (1059), i. 246, 247.
 " " " (1078), i. 257.
 " " " (1079), i. 257.
 Rosmini, A., ii. 417, 418.
 Rouen, Council of (1063), i. 247.
 Roy, E. le, ii. 434-36.
 Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical
 Discipline, Report of (1906), ii.
 596, 597.
 Rupert of Deutz, i. 291-95.
 Russian Holy Synod (1838), i. 185.
Russian Longer Catechism, i. 185-87.
 Russian Office for Consecration of a
 Bishop, i. 187.
- Sacrament of the Altar, The*, ii. 493.
 Saint Maixent, Council of (1076), i. 257.
St. Albans, Acts of the Abbots of, i. 352.
 Salmeron, A., ii. 359-61.
 Salmon, G., i. 39.
 Sampson, R., ii. 135.
 Sampson, T., ii. 209, 210.
 Sanday, W., i. 5, 15.
 Sandys, E., ii. 232-35.
 Sanderson, R., ii. 354.
 Saphir, A., ii. 649.
 Saravia, A., ii. 220-25.
Sarum Consuetudinary, i. 250, 353,
 388.
Sarum Manual, i. 372.
Sarum Missal, i. 385-88.
Sarum Processional, i. 386, 387.
 Savoy Conference, ii. 316-18.
 Sawtry, W., i. 374.
Saxon Confession, ii. 30-33.
Saxon Visitation Articles, ii. 36, 37.
 Scannell, T., ii. 393-97, 414.
 Schanz, P., ii. 393.
 Scheeben, J., ii. 393.
Schmalkalden, Articles of, ii. 27.
 Scott, C., ii. 204, 205.
 Scottish Provincial Council (1559), ii.
 202, 203.
Scottish Communion Office, ii. 603-08.
Scottish Pastoral Letter (1858), ii. 626-
 27.
 Scotus, Duns. *See* Duns Scotus.
- Scotus Erigena, i. 245, 246.
 Seabury, S., ii. 608-14.
Second Letter to the Author of a Book,
 ii. 491.
 Seneca, i. 31.
 Serapion of Thmuis, i. 56, 63, 66, 70,
 84, 85, 111, 112, 114.
 Serbati. *See* Rosmini.
 Severus, Gabriel. *See* Gabriel of
 Philadelphia.
 Shakespeare, W., i. 9.
 Simpson, D. C., 128.
 Somnius, F., ii. 99.
 Soterichus Panteugenus, i. 161-64.
 Spurdance, T., ii. 199.
 Strawley, J. H., i. 104.
 Staley, V., ii. 244.
Statutes of the Apostles, i. 28, 29, 39,
 42, 48, 49.
 Steinly, M., ii. 75, 76.
 Stentrup, F., ii. 400, 401.
 Stephen of Autun, i. 280-83.
 Stone, D., i. 3, 4, 9, 283, ii. 602.
 Storch, A. *See* Pelargus.
Stowe Missal, i. 209.
 Strauss, D. F., i. 30.
 Stubbs, W., i. 199.
 Suarez, F., ii. 71, 367-71, 407, 411.
 Sutton, C., ii. 289-93.
 Sylvester II. *See* Gerbert.
 Symeon of Thessalonica, i. 171, 172.
- TAYLOR, J., ii. 328-37, 381.
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, i. 22,
 23, 24, 46, 49.
 Temple, F., ii. 581-84.
 Tertullian, i. 22, 23, 25, 29-33, 36, 37,
 41, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53.
Testament of our Lord, i. 87, 88.
 Thalhofer, V., ii. 397-400.
 Theodoret, i. 56, 57, 64, 67, 96, 99-101,
 107, 108.
 Theodulf of Orleans, i. 202.
 Theophilus of Alexandria, i. 85.
 Theophylact, i. 157-59.
 Thiel, A., i. 102.
 Thirlby, T., ii. 135.
 Thomas, W. H. G., ii. 567-69.
 Thomas a Kempis, i. 382-84.
 Thomas Aquinas, i. 322-34, 336, 337,
 346-52, ii. 602.
 Thomas Waldensis, i. 377-79.
 Thomassin, L., ii. 382-87.
 Thorndike, H., ii. 342-53.
 Thurston, H., i. 312, 353, 359, 382.
 Tillotson, J., ii. 462-65.
 Tixeront, J., ii. 426.
 Tomlinson, J. T., ii. 319.
 Tours, Council of (1054), i. 246.
 Trent, Council of (1545-1563), ii. 86-
 100, 105, 106, 441, 442.
 Trott, T., ii. 488.

- Tunstall, C., ii. 114, 134, 169-71.
 Turner, C. H., i. 31.
Two-penny Faith. See *Godly Exhortation*.
 Tyrrell, G., ii. 440, 441.
- URBAN IV., Pope, i. 344-46.
- VASQUEZ, G., ii. 71, 361-64, 406, 407.
 Vega, C. de, ii. 419.
 Velde, Francis van den. See Somnius.
 Vercelli, Council of (1050), i. 246.
 Vernet, F., i. 246.
Vindication of the Bull "Apostolica Curæ", ii. 392, 393.
 Vogan, T. S. L., ii. 562-64.
- WAGGETT, P. N., ii. 598-601.
 Wake, W., ii. 467-73.
 Walafrid Strabo, i. 222.
 Waldensis. See Thomas Waldensis.
 Waterland, D., ii. 501-506, 515.
 Watson, T., ii. 171-77.
Week's Preparation (Old), ii. 457-59, 514, 515.
Week's Preparation, New, ii. 506-09.
 Wesley, C., ii. 510-14.
 Wesley, J., ii. 510-14.
 Wessel, J., i. 371-73.
 Westcott, B. F., i. 9, 11, 17, 138, ii. 649.
Westminster Confession of Faith, ii. 308-10.
Westminster Larger Catechism, ii. 308, 310, 311.
Westminster Shorter Catechism, ii. 308, 310.
- What we Want*, ii. 433, 434.
Whole Duty of a Communicant, ii. 459, 460.
 Wied, Hermann von. See Hermann.
 Wilberforce, R. L., ii. 549-51.
 Wilhelm, J., ii. 393-97, 414.
 William of Auvergne, i. 317-19.
 William of Champeaux, i. 269.
 William of Ockham, i. 363, 364.
 William of Paris, i. 353.
 William of St. Thierry, i. 298-301.
 Wilson, T., ii. 483-87.
 Wilson, H. A., i. 205.
Winchester Convents, The, ii. 492, 493.
 Wittenburg, Convention at, ii. 46, 47.
 Witmund of Aversa, i. 252-54.
 Wobbermin, G., i. 30.
 Wolphem, i. 261.
 Woodhead, A., ii. 466, 467.
 Woodman, R., ii. 199.
 Wordsworth, Christopher, i. 11.
 Wordsworth, J., ii. 73, 602.
 Wren, M., ii. 353, 354.
Wurtemberg Confession, ii. 33, 34.
 Wyche, R., i. 374-76.
 Wyclif, J., i. 364-68.
- YORK Convocation, ii. 253, 254.
York Manual, i. 872.
York Processional, i. 388.
 Young, E., ii. 199, 200.
- ZANCHI, H., ii. 304.
 Zwingli, H., ii. 37-43.