ARTICLES XXVIII–XXXI

THE HOLY COMMUNION

ARTICLE XXVIII

Of the Lord's Supper

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death. Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

De Coena Domini

Coena Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis.

Atque adeo, rite, digne, et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest. Sed apertis Scripturae verbis adversatur, Sacramenti naturam evertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Coena, tantum coelesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem, quo corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Coena, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

The original Article of 1553 on the Lord's Supper coincided with the low-water mark of sacramental teaching in the Church of England. It was contemporary with the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI containing the 'Black Rubric',

which in its original form denied any 'Real and Essential Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood' in the sacrament. In its present form, as restored in 1662, it only denies the ' "corporal" presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood', a most important change.

So the third paragraph of the Article denied 'the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper'. In 1563 this Article was altered to correspond with the changes made in the Prayer-Book of 1559. The original third paragraph was struck out and the present one substituted. The author of our present paragraph, Bishop Guest, expressly stated that it was drawn up not to 'exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof.' The rest of the Article remained unaltered, except that the second paragraph was strengthened by the addition of 'overthroweth the nature of a sacrament'.

The Article excludes:

(i) Anabaptist views which made the Lord's Supper a mere love feast;
(ii) Zwinglian views which made it a bare memorial of Christ's death;
(iii) The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation.

ARTICLE XXIX

Of the wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ: yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

De manducatione corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare

Impii, et fide viva destituti, licet carnaliter et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) corporis et sanguinis Christi Sacramentum dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantae rei Sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad judicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

Composed in 1563, but omitted before publication probably by the personal intervention of Elizabeth in order not to hurt the feelings of the Papist party. But it was passed by Convocation in 1571 and hence-forward is found among the rest of the Articles.

§ 1. All over the world men have expressed their fellowship with one another by a common meal. Further, these common meals have often had a religious significance. One of the earliest ideas underlying primitive sacrifice was that of communion between the god of the tribe and his people. The god was regarded as present as an honoured guest at the feast made upon the sacrificial victim. Among many tribes the god was also identified in some sense with the victim slain and it was supposed that by feeding upon the flesh of the god the divine life shared by him and the tribe was renewed and strengthened.

This idea of communion with God through a common sacrificial meal was not absent from the religion of Israel. After the exile, with a fuller realization of the holiness of Jehovah and a deeper consciousness of sin, this aspect of sacrifice became less prominent. Stress was laid more on the propitiation and atonement that was needed before communion with God could be restored than on the communion itself. But the older idea survived. So, too, among the Gentiles sacrificial meals were quite common. Other ideas of sacrifice, such as that of a gift to the gods, are found, but the conception of fellowship was never lost. In the world into which our Lord came the ideas of communion with God by a sacred meal, of the receiving of divine life through participation in the sacrificial victim, of the perfecting of human fellowship through such participation and the like were perfectly familiar. Just as Jesus Christ summed up in Himself the fulfilment of the highest ideals alike of Jewish prophecy and Gentile morality, so in the Holy Communion He summed up the fulfilment of the highest ideals of worship, both Jewish and Gentile.

(*a*) The institution of the Holy Communion is recorded by the three Synoptists and by S. Paul (1 Cor 11). The title 'Lord's Supper' comes from 1 Cor 11[20].[1] It is noticeable that the accounts of Mt and Mk contain no command for its repetition. In Lk 22[19] the words 'This do in remembrance of me' are absent in the Western text and may have been inserted from the account in 1 Cor. So the only undisputed evidence in Scripture for our Lord's command to celebrate it is that of S. Paul. But behind his words there stands the universal and continuous practice and tradition of the Church. Attempts have been made to assign the repetition of the Eucharist either to the Church or to S. Paul. For such views there is no real positive evidence.[2]

(*b*) When we turn to the evidence of Scripture it is by no means easy to give any very certain account of the practice of the first Christians in reference to the Eucharist. In 1 Cor 11[17–34] it is clear that at Corinth it was celebrated after and in close connexion with a common meal. The word δεῖπνον may include both. There is no suggestion that this combination was wrong or an innovation on the part of the Corinthians. S. Paul's own words 'This do as oft as ye drink' (the Greek contains no 'it') may mean 'as often as ye hold a common meal together'. When we turn to the Acts we find evidence of a similar custom. The familiar title the 'Last Supper' reminds us that eating together had all through His ministry been a bond of union between our Lord and His disciples. At such common meals doubtless He was accustomed to break bread and give thanks even as He did at the feedings of the multitude (Mk 6[41] and 8[6]). His performance of these acts at the Last Supper was only in accordance with His regular habit. It was by the manner in which He performed these same acts, that He made Himself known to His disciples at Emmaus after His Resurrection, even though they had probably not been present at the Last Supper (Lk 24[30–31 and 35], cp. Jn 21[13]). So, after the Ascension, it was only natural that the disciples should continue to meet for the breaking of bread, the outward sign of fellowship. At first it would seem that the common meal of the Christian brotherhood was held daily. In Acts 2[42] we read that the first Christians 'continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship (or 'in fellowship' R.V. mg. καὶ ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ) and in the (τῇ) breaking of bread and the prayers' (the Bezan text has 'the fellowship of the breaking of the bread'). Again, in v. [46], 'And day by day continuing stedfastly with one accord in the temple and breaking bread at home (κατ' οἶκον) they did take their food (τροφῆς) with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people.' The probability is that by 'the breaking of the bread' is meant a common meal held in conscious imitation of the Last Supper and concluding with the Eucharist. The mention of food (τροφή) in v. [46] shows clearly that a meal is meant. The use of the article (τῇ κλάσει) in v. [42] suggests that the phrase 'the breaking of the bread', in itself applicable to any meal, was beginning to acquire a technical meaning in the mouths of Christians. In such early days of Church life all was inchoate and unformed. The Church was feeling her way towards organized life and worship.

Such a daily common meal and Eucharist was not possible everywhere. It is doubtful whether it could have existed apart from the peculiar conditions of common life at Jerusalem. Accordingly, as the Church spread abroad such daily reunion was found to be impossible. The common meal became part of the distinctive worship of the first day of the week. It was doubtless so at Corinth. In Acts 20[7–13] this is expressly stated. S. Luke gives a typical instance at Troas. 'Upon the first day of the week when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them.' Then follows the incident of Eutychus. Finally, when Paul 'had broken the bread and eaten (γευσάμενος) and had talked with them a long while even till break of day, so he departed.' The order would seem to be a common meal,

[1] It is questionable whether the phrase 'The Lord's Supper' was used by S. Paul as a formal title. On the one hand, the use of the adjective κυριακόν instead of τοῦ κυρίου suggests this (cp. κυριακή for Sunday in Rev 1[10]). On the other hand, the words in the context may only mean that where division and selfishness are, a supper may indeed be taken, but it will never be the Lord's.

[2] The words of 1 Cor 11[23] 'For I (ἐγώ) received of the Lord (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου) that which I also delivered unto you' hardly warrant us in supposing that S. Paul claims to have received a special revelation on the subject. If the emphatic ἐγώ might be taken to favour such a view, the use of ἀπό (not παρά) and the use of the words 'the Lord Jesus' no less forcibly suggest that he received his information mediately through the Apostles. In any case, it is incredible that the Church should have received a new sacrament from S. Paul without any hint of enquiry or opposition. He was not such a universally popular person, especially among Jewish Christians. Further, Acts 2[42 and 46] imply that the Eucharist was being celebrated at Jerusalem long before S. Paul's conversion.

after which S. Paul took the opportunity of all the Christians being assembled to deliver a lengthy discourse, then the Eucharist (γευσάμενος, meaning, as we should say, 'having communicated'), followed by a final discourse.[1] The meal would thus be held on Saturday evening, since, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, the first day of the week began at 6 P.M. on Saturday: the Eucharist would begin after midnight. We have only to imagine an interval for sleep between the two parts to get to the later custom of observing Saturday night as a preparation for Sunday and holding the Eucharist early on Sunday.

In Acts 27[33–36], just before the shipwreck, we find an account of a meal. 'When Paul . . . had taken bread, he gave thanks to God in the presence of all: and he brake it and began to eat. Then were they all of good cheer and began to eat.' The language is strangely Eucharistic, but the meal clearly did not include the Eucharist.[2] The company consisted almost entirely of unbelievers, and the confusion of a storm at sea is hardly the moment for such a celebration. The important point is that the passage shows that 'to break bread' could be used of an ordinary meal. In Jude [12] and the parallel passage in 2 Pet 2[13] we find the title 'Agape' or 'love-feast' definitely given, according to the best reading, to the common meals of Christians. These are in danger of being polluted by the presence of immoral members. Probably the misbehaviour of such and drunkenness (1 Cor 11) brought these love-feasts into bad reputation among the heathen. No light is thrown on their relation to the Eucharist. We conclude, then, that in apostolic times as a general rule the Eucharist formed the conclusion of a common meal or agape and was not sharply distinguished from it. The whole was considered sacred as being a representation of the Last Supper. Whether an Agape was ever held without a Eucharist or *vice versa* we cannot be certain. There is nothing improbable in such a separation. The phrase 'breaking bread' is in itself quite vague and might be applied either to a meal or to the Eucharist or to the combination of the two.

Outside Scripture the earliest evidence has been very differently interpreted. It is probable but not certain that in the *Didache* the Agape preceded the Eucharist, and indeed is included under the title εὐχαριστία. So, too, Dr. Lightfoot held that in the time of Ignatius the two had not yet been separated.[3] In his letter to the Smyrnaeans he writes, 'It is not permitted without the bishop either to baptize or hold a love-feast.' The Eucharist is clearly included under the title

[1] Others, however, hold that the Eucharist preceded the meal. On this view in v. [11] 'breaking bread' refers to the Eucharist and γευσάμενος to the meal. It is true that S. Luke uses γεύομαι in the sense of 'taking food' but the reversal of the order of the Last Supper is most improbable so long as the meal and the Eucharist were still combined.

[2] 'The similarity is due, not so much to the fact that the Holy Eucharist is a meal, as that every meal has a sacred character and food "is sanctified by the word of God and prayer" ' (Rackham, *Acts*, p. 490).

[3] Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, vol. ii. p. 313, and vol. i. p. 386.

Agape. It is inconceivable that it should be omitted, especially as it has been mentioned earlier in the letter. The first clear evidence for the separation of the two is in Pliny's letter to Trajan (*Ep.* 96).[1] This makes it clear that in Bithynia by A.D. 112 Christians had come to hold two meetings on Sunday (*stato die*). At the first they met 'before day and sang a hymn to Christ antiphonally as to a God and bound themselves by an oath (*sacramento*)' not to commit certain crimes. This seems to be a somewhat vague account of the Eucharist, possibly mixed up with a confused recollection of the baptismal vow. At the second meeting later in the day they met 'to take food' but that 'ordinary and innocent food' (*promiscuum tamen et innoxium*—a refutation of pagan slanders); but in consequence of Trajan's edict forbidding the existence of clubs or guilds, these last meetings had been abandoned. This last statement would refer to the Agape. Whether the separation of Eucharist and Agape had taken place before Trajan's edict or in consequence of it is not certain, but it is clear that the Eucharist had been transferred to the morning. Many authorities hold that the result of Trajan's edict was a general separation of the Eucharist from the Agape and a giving up of the latter as being unessential.[2] This need not have taken place everywhere at the same time. At any rate, Justin Martyr (150) describes the Eucharist without any mention of the Agape.[3] But the Agape still continued to exist. It tended to assume the character of a charity supper contributed by the rich: possibly from the earliest days it had been a means of providing sustenance for the poorer members of the society. It became increasingly distinct from the Eucharist and gradually lost its sacred character and became a common meal and nothing more. Hence by the canons of various councils it was forbidden to hold it in churches. It lingered on in Africa as late as the Trullan Council in 692.[4]

§ 2. We may now turn to the inner meaning of the Eucharist. This is determined by the position that Jesus Christ holds in the Church and by the closeness of union between Christians and Christ.

(*a*) As we have seen, eating together is everywhere a sign of fellowship. *The Supper of the Lord is . . . a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another.* This meaning is included in the title 'Holy Communion'. No one has ever attempted to deny it. This unity is symbolized by the one bread[5] and the one cup.

[1] Lightfoot, *op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 52–53.

[2] S. Augustine held that the separation was one of the reforms introduced by S. Paul when he came to Corinth. It is most probable that abuses connected with the Agape favoured the separation.

[3] Irenaeus never mentions the Agape. Tertullian speaks of the Eucharist as celebrated before daybreak (*De Cor.* c. 3) and treats the Agape as quite distinct.

[4] This account in the main follows Lightfoot. For a more recent discussion of the early Agape and Eucharist, see Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*.

[5] The Eastern Church still preserves the full symbolism of 'one bread' by using one (leavened) loaf which is divided.

'Seeing that there is one bread (or loaf), we who are many are one body: for we all partake of the one bread' (1 Cor 10^{16}, R.V. mg., cp. Jn 13^{35} and 15^{12}). The name 'Agape' which could include the Eucharist, was probably derived from our Lord's command 'to love one another', given on the same night as the institution of the Eucharist.[1] The many clubs existing under the Roman Empire showed their unity by common meals. But just as the Church is more than a mere human society, so her common meal is more than a bare symbol of fellowship. Hence this view by itself is inadequate.

(*b*) Accordingly the Article proceeds: It is *not only* a sign of love; *but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death.* As the Catechism says, it was ordained 'For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ and of the benefits which we receive thereby'. It constitutes a proclamation before the world of the Lord's death (1 Cor 11^{26}) and also a means of bringing it home to ourselves. Whether the Last Supper was in detail a Passover meal or not is doubtful. The evidence of S. John's Gospel makes it clear that it took place the evening before the actual Passover.[2] But it was in the closest connexion with the Passover and was instituted to take its place in the new Israel. The Passover was a means of keeping in mind and a public thanksgiving for Jehovah's redemption of Israel from slavery in Egypt. So the Eucharist was to be kept 'in remembrance of' Christ (1 Cor 11^{25}), and as a thanksgiving[3] for the redemption wrought by His death. Further, the deliverance from Egypt was but the prelude to the renewing of the Covenant at Sinai. At the Passover-meal the individual Israelite claimed his share in the Covenant made by God with Israel. Christ's words 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for you' (Mk 14^{24}) look back to Exodus 24^{8} and suggest that a new covenant was about to be ratified by the blood of a better Sacrifice. Every Eucharist is a memorial of this new Covenant made by God with a new and greater Israel, and each Christian who partakes of the Eucharist claims his share in the blessings won by Christ's death. The very term for the Passover liturgy, Haggadah, or 'showing forth', is that used by S. Paul (1 Cor 11^{26}). So, too, the 'cup of blessing' was the regular name for the third cup at the Paschal meal (cp. 1 Cor 10^{16}), at least in later times.[4] In short, the Eucharist is the Passover of the Christian Church.

[1] Cp. the beautiful prayer in the *Didache* (9): 'As this broken bread 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' (Gwatkin's *Selections*, p. 21).

[2] But see J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.*

[3] The actual title, *εὐχαριστία*, is not found in the New Testament, though it occurs in Ignatius and the *Didache*, but *εὐχαριστεῖν* is used of our Lord's own giving of thanks (1 Cor 11^{24}). Possibly, too, in 14^{16} *εὐχαριστία* is used of thanksgiving at the Lord's Supper.

[4] For an account of the Passover as now celebrated in a Jewish home, see Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.*

(*c*) *Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.* This statement is based on 1 Cor 10^{16}, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion (*κοινωνία*) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?' It asserts the reality of the gift bestowed on those who receive the sacrament rightly (*rite*), worthily (*digne*), and with faith. The Holy Communion is an 'effectual sign', not only representing but conveying spiritual food. 'Rightly' here refers to the due observance of all that Christ commanded, the right matter and form. 'Worthily' refers to the right inward disposition of the recipient. It would include 'with faith'.

What is meant by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ?

(i) We turn first to Jn 6. This was spoken exactly a year before the institution of the Eucharist, at the previous Passover. Moreover, by the time that the Gospel was composed, the Eucharist had been the centre of the life of more than one generation of Christians. Hence we can hardly exclude all reference to the Eucharist. The true relation between this discourse and the Eucharist would seem to be that in the former Christ speaks primarily of the gift of His own life which men needed and which was to be bestowed through the Eucharist: a year later He instituted the Eucharist to be the means of bestowing that life. The gift is spoken of as future, not present (6 $^{27 \text{ and } 51}$). Christ connects it with the time after His Ascension and the coming of the Spirit (vv. $^{62-63}$). Throughout the discourse, step by step, greater stress is laid on the absolute need not only of Christ's teaching but of Christ's life. Our Lord begins with a contrast between the 'meat that perisheth', the ordinary food of the body, and 'the meat that abideth unto eternal life', which He will give (v. ^{27}). The condition of receiving it is faith (v. ^{29}). Such bread can only come, like the manna, by the direct gift of God (v. ^{33}), and He Himself is this bread (v. ^{33}). In v. ^{51} this bread is further defined as 'my flesh'. In v. ^{53} the objection of the Jews is met by an increased claim, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves. . . . 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.' With such language we compare 1 Cor 10^{16-17} and 11^{27}. Throughout, the thought is of identity of life between the believer and Christ. His 'body and blood' primarily represent His perfect humanity. The living Christ bestows upon His members the strength of a perfect human life, offered in sacrifice and triumphant over sin and death, in order to cleanse and refresh our weak and tainted lives. In eating and drinking by a deliberate and voluntary act we take into ourselves something that is outside ourselves, in order that it may become part of ourselves and so our bodies may be strengthened. So in the Holy

Communion by a deliberate and voluntary act we receive the life of Christ into our souls that it may become our life. The feeding of the 5000 which preceded the discourse was an acted parable of the spiritual truth laid down in the discourse. So in the Holy Communion our Lord took bread and wine, the typical ordinary daily food of the Galilean peasant, to be the outward sign of the normal food of the Christian soul. The visible reception is at once the parable and the means of the inward reception by faith. In each case the goodness is there first in the food outside ourselves and by the appropriate act we take it into ourselves. Again, all food corresponds to the nature of the life that it is to sustain. Our bodies can be strengthened by bread and wine, because bread and wine contain just those elements out of which the body is composed. In like manner the spiritual food of the Christian must correspond to the life of the Christian. But the life of the Christian is, as we have seen, none other than the life of Christ: we are members of His body, branches in the vine. So the food of the Christian must be Christ. The Christ-life can only be fed by new supplies of Christ. He alone can be the bread of life. Accordingly, in the Holy Communion the Christian, as a member of Christ, receives by faith through the outward and visible sign of the bread and wine the inward and spiritual grace of the perfect humanity of Christ. Partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ can mean no less than this.

(ii) The further question may be asked: 'Why are the body and blood spoken of in separation, and symbolized by the bread and the wine respectively?' The answer is that our Lord's language and that of S. Paul is borrowed from the picture of a sacrificial feast. The reference to the body and blood in separation recalls the act of sacrifice in which the blood was poured out. In the Holy Communion we feed on the life of the living and glorified Christ who has become all that He is through death.[1] He is eternally 'the Lamb as it hath been slain'. The life that He imparts to us is life that has passed through death. Hence it is fitly mediated through bread and wine.

(iii) As partaking of the perfect humanity of Christ, we also partake of all the blessings won by His sacrifice. 'What merit, force or virtue soever there is in His sacred Body and Blood, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this Sacrament.'[2] We enjoy the manifold privileges of the new Covenant ratified by His death (Mk 14^{24}). So, by a right reception of the Holy Communion we are filled with all the fruits of His redemption. These blessings are not something apart from Christ, but in so far as our life in Christ grows, we enter more fully into their meaning.

§ 3. So far almost all Christians would agree. The language used

[1] We must resolutely put away the revolting idea that in any sense we feed on the body and blood of a dead Christ.

[2] Hooker, v. 67, § 7.

might vary, but all are at one in holding that through the Holy Communion our union with Christ is deepened and strengthened, by faith we receive new life from Him and enter into the fulness of the heritage won by His death. Controversy has arisen on the question of the relation of the inward gift to the outward elements. The first thing that we must grasp is that this further question is relatively less important. In an age of bitter controversy Hooker could write: 'Shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament and less to dispute of the manner how?' 'What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ.' 'Let it therefore be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise.'[1]

For 800 years there was no formal dispute on the subject. The earliest controversial treatise was by a certain Paschasius Radbert in 831, which was the beginning of a long and unedifying wrangle, leading up to the formal statement of the doctrine of transubstantiation at the Lateran Council in 1215. The attempts made to state the relation of gift in Holy Communion to the outward elements may be summed up as follows:

(*a*) The 'Receptionist' view. On this theory the bread and wine in the Holy Communion are merely tokens not channels of the inward grace that is given. They are like the water in baptism, outward signs ordained in order to assist faith, but brought into no vital relation to the divine realities that they represent. The devout communicant does indeed by an act of faith receive the body and blood of Christ at the moment that he receives the bread and wine, but in no real sense by means of them. Thus Christ is present only in the hearts of the faithful recipients. His coming is connected not with the consecration of the elements but with the reception. This view was taught by Calvin: it was the necessary corollary of his doctrine of grace. If grace is given only to the few elect, it clearly cannot be possible for all to receive it who receive the bread and wine. So its reception must be essentially independent of the reception of the visible elements. The theory has been largely held in the Church of England[2] and was ex-

[1] Cp. the whole passage, v. 67, §§ 5–7 and 12–13.

[2] Hooker is usually claimed as a receptionist. He certainly writes, 'The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament' (c. 67 § 5). But other passages qualify this statement. He also writes, 'This bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold' (c. 67 § 12), and 'The power of the ministry of God . . . by blessing visible elements, . . . maketh them invisible grace' (c. 77 § 1). Further, Hooker's great object was to allay contention by fixing the minds of all Christians on those great truths concerning the Eucharist about which they were all agreed. He refused to join in a bitter and barren controversy about the mystery of the Eucharist. Accordingly, as Bishop Paget wrote, 'He should have the credit of having really meant what he said. On the ground of some passages in his argument he is claimed as supporting one side

pounded at length by Waterland. It represents one side of the teaching of S. Augustine and can be supported by isolated sentences of other Fathers. It is perfectly tenable by loyal members of the Church of England. There is nothing in the Prayer-Book that definitely contradicts it. Quite rightly the Church of England excludes only a Zwinglian view of the Sacrament—a view, that is, which is not only inadequate, but positively denies a part of the truth.†

(*b*) The Real Presence. On this view we hold that we receive through the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ, because in answer to the prayers of His Church and in fulfilment of His own promise, He has brought the elements into a mysterious union with Himself. He has, as it were, taken them up into the fulness of His ascended life and made them the vehicle of imparting that life to His members. Thus He is in a real sense present not only in the devout communicant but in the consecrated elements. Of the manner of this union we affirm nothing. The Presence is spiritual, not material.

This, in some form, is the teaching of the Roman and Eastern Churches, of Luther, of the Fathers and early liturgies, and has always been held by many within the Church of England. It would appear to be the most consistent with Scripture and the tradition of the Church, and also to be a safeguard of certain great Christian principles.

(i) Let us turn first to Scripture. An enormous amount of labour has been wasted in attempting to get back to the actual words spoken by Christ and to interpret the meaning of 'is' in 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood'. In Aramaic the word 'is' might, or might not be definitely expressed. The important point is that S. Paul understood these words to contain a promise of a divine gift. He bases on them the solemn warning 'Wherefore (ὥστε) whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord' (1 Cor 11[27]). If the existence of the gift is made conditional upon the faith of the individual communicant, as receptionists teach, the unworthy recipient can hardly be said to be 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord'. If the presence of Christ is to be sought only in the heart of the faithful recipient, there can have been no presence for him to profane. As being unworthy he has drawn near only to bread and wine. Further, if the words mean only 'This represents my body', we have only a parable, not a promise: they contain no pledge of any sacramental gift. The words are not really parallel to such allegorical statements as 'I am the bread' or 'the door'. These last couple together an idea and a concrete reality. But the words of institution couple together two concrete realities of the external world. Again, in 1 Cor 10[16] S. Paul connects the 'communion of the body' and 'the blood' not with reception but with consecration. He speaks of 'The cup which we bless' and 'the bread which we break', 'we' being the minister as the organ of the assembled Church.

in the very controversy from which he urged men to refrain. . . . Those who know Hooker's ways and do him justice will not easily think him so careless or so disingenuous as to break the bounds which he was strenuously appealing to other men to keep' (see Paget, Introduction to Hooker, bk. v. p. 176).

(ii) Again, if we turn to the Church as the interpreter of Scripture, the main stream of Christian teaching is quite clear. We find a singular absence of theological controversy about the Eucharist, but the general line of thought may be exemplified by these words of Irenaeus, 'The bread which is 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.'[1] No doubt certain individuals or schools of thought exhibit a tendency to lay a one-sided emphasis on particular aspects of the truth, as, for instance, to dwell on the Eucharist as imparting the gift of bodily immortality, but such teaching did not express the mind of the Church as a whole and was corrected by the corporate consciousness. The early liturgies all attest a belief in the Real Presence. There is a marked difference between the treatment that was accorded to the water in Baptism and the elements in the Eucharist. No special care was taken of the water. Indeed, baptism was often administered in streams. But the consecrated elements were by a natural instinct always treated with the utmost reverence.[2] In Baptism there are no words that in any way are the counterpart of the words of institution.[3]

(iii) The Sacraments are an extension of the Incarnation, in so far as through them the Incarnate Lord still offers His own saving grace to men. But the Incarnation was an event discerned by faith but in no way produced by faith. When Christ walked on this earth, those who discerned the divine in Him, discerned what was really there. Their faith enabled them to see and grasp the truth. It was quite possible for men to be blind to His divinity and to miss the blessings that He brought within their reach through lack of faith, but that does not prove their unreality. In other words, faith is a capacity for intuition or apprehension. It can recognize and respond, but not create. It can rest upon and surrender itself to what already exists, but it calls nothing into being. So with the gift promised in the Holy Eucharist. It is contrary to all analogy to make the existence of the gift in any

[1] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* iv. 18, § 5.

[2] Cp. Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 76 and note 5.

[3] It is worth noting that when the Fathers speak of the bread and wine as 'signs' or 'symbols' of the body and blood of Christ, they do not in any way imply a merely receptionist view. To us a 'symbol' at once suggests that the reality symbolized is absent. To them a 'symbol' was rather 'the evidence to the senses of a divine reality actually present'. 'The really heavenly element lay either in or behind the visible form without investing itself with it' (Gore, p. 89, quoting Harnack). The Fathers do indeed avoid any such language as would speak of Christ as present in or under the bread and wine. They rather speak of the bread and wine as 'types' or 'symbols' of spiritual realities invisible to the eye of sense, but most truly present. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, for instance, writes: 'Under the sign (ἐν τύπῳ) of bread is given thee the body, under the sign of wine is given thee the blood.' (*Cat.* xxii. 3.)

sense dependent on faith. Rather the gift is there, objectively: those who approach with faith discern and appropriate it, those who have not faith are, as it were, blind to the gift, and fail to claim it.[1]

Again, the Incarnation was God's gift to His people as a whole. Some availed themselves of it, others did not. So the Holy Eucharist, like all the blessings bestowed through Christ, is primarily a gift not to the individual Christian but to the whole body of Christ. The individual as a member of the body is bidden to claim and appropriate his share of it. This truth is of the highest value as emphasizing the corporate nature of all true Christianity. We may compare the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The fire first appeared as one and then as 'tongues parting asunder'[2] (Acts 2^3). The receptionist view weakens the social aspect of the Eucharist by making it a number of separate donations to individuals. The doctrine of the Real Presence vindicates the unity of life which is to be realized in brotherhood.

The opposition to any such phrase as 'real presence' is due in the main to the fear that it means presence in space and involves materialistic ideas. Let us admit that the primary idea of the Eucharist is that of Christ active rather than of Christ present, of Christ as bestowing a gift rather than of the gift bestowed. But it still remains true that our imaginations are unable to conceive of Christ as active unless He is in some sense present and of the gift as bestowed unless it is there to be bestowed. No doubt Christ is present always and everywhere, behind all the processes of nature and human life. But that was not inconsistent with a presence in a new way and for a new act of divine grace in the Incarnation. Again, Christ promised to be with His Church 'all the days' (Mt 28^{20}), yet He could say, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them' (Mt 18^{20}). That promise does not imply a previous absence, but rather a presence in a special way and for a special purpose. So, too, in the Holy Communion Christ acts in fulfilment of a special promise and vouchsafes to His Church a special presence of Himself. Christ is still Man. He did not lay aside His human nature at the Ascension. Nor yet was His body then removed to an infinitely distant part of the universe, rather it was raised above the limitations of space altogether. It became the perfect self-expression of spirit. Heaven is a manner of life, not a place. So in His Heavenly life Christ still possesses all the capacities of perfect manhood. He can still render His humanity active at will and act through it in our world of space and time. Only the Lutherans have ever pictured Christ's manhood as, so to say, automatically and unconditionally omnipresent. It is nearer

[1] Cp. the words of Thorndyke, 'The eating and drinking of it' (*i.e.* the Lord's Body and Blood) 'in the sacrament, presupposes the being of it in the sacrament . . . unless a man can spiritually eat the flesh and blood of Christ in and by the sacrament, which is not in the sacrament when he eats and drinks it, but by his eating and drinking of it comes to be there.'

[2] Not 'cloven' as A.V., an impossible sense for the present participle.

to truth to assert that Christ can act through it at will, and make it a present power in the world wheresoever He is pleased to do so.

Now in the Holy Communion He gives us His Body and Blood. Here, if anywhere, He acts through His glorified humanity. We must try therefore to conceive of Him as present not only as God but as Man, present by an act of will to bestow upon us the gift of His own Manhood. This act, or this presence—in whichever way we view it, is no fresh humiliation. It is in no way on a level with the submission to the limitations of our present world made at the Incarnation. Rather it is on a level with the ascended life: it is Christ's very heavenly presence itself.[1] There is no opposition between a 'real' and a 'spiritual' presence. The most 'real' things are not those that belong to the material world. A 'spiritual' presence is presence in the manner of a Spirit, a manner outside our earthly experience, but not therefore imaginary or unreal, any more than Heaven is unreal.

The manner of this Presence and its relation to the outward elements we cannot define, except in so far as we reject certain attempts of our imagination to picture it. Thus, it involves in no sense a movement in space.[2] Nor is it in any sense comparable to the chemical changes to be viewed in our laboratories. It is rather analogous to the spiritual changes that take place in ourselves. If we say that Christ is present 'in' the sacrament, we use 'in' metaphorically, as when we say that Christ abides in the Christian and the Christian in Christ. Wherever we study the relation between spirit and matter, whether between God and the world, or our souls and our bodies or here, our reason and our imagination are always baffled. We can only speak in symbolical language borrowed from space. It is a real source of strength to the Church of England that she refuses to speculate on the question or to make the acceptance of human speculations a condition of membership.[3]†

[1] The early liturgies use language both about the Body and Blood of Christ as being present at our earthly altars and of our oblations of bread and wine as being carried up to the heavenly altar and there united with His Body and Blood. (Cp. Gore, *op. cit.* pp. 84–85, and Fr. Benson, *Letters*, vol. i. p. 273.)

[2] Cp. the words of Cardinal Newman (*Via Media*, vol. ii. p. 220): 'If place is excluded from the idea of the Sacramental Presence, therefore division or distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. Our Lord then neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how; we have no parallel to the "how" in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but *sacramentally*. His Presence is substantial, spirit-wise, sacramental; an absolute mystery, not against reason, however, but against imagination, and must be received by faith.'

[3] Cp. the lines attributed to Queen Elizabeth:

His was the Word that spake it:
He took the bread and brake it:
And what that Word did make it,
I do believe and take it.

Indifferent poetry, but admirable theology.

(*c*) The Roman doctrine of 'Transubstantiation', condemned in our Article, is an attempt to define the relation of the gift to the elements in the Eucharist. As a formal definition it has its roots far back in Church history. Just as Monophysitism was the culmination of a tendency to exalt our Lord's divinity at the expense of His humanity and to reduce the latter to a mere semblance, so we find a tendency among certain early writers to exalt the divine gift in the Eucharist in such a way as to minimize or even explain away the reality of the bread and wine after consecration. This appears first in the East: in the West it was kept in check by the influence of S. Augustine, who unmistakably believed in the permanence and reality of the elements.[1] A new stage began with the treatise of Paschasius Radbert composed in 831. He taught beyond all doubt a doctrine of 'transubstantiation'. By consecration the natural substance of the elements is annihilated: there is on the altar 'nihil aliud quam corpus et sanguis Domini'. Only the appearance of bread and wine remains to test faith and afford a screen to the awful realities. This teaching was opposed at the time, especially by Ratramnus, a monk of Corbey, but the controversy died down for some two centuries. Then it was rekindled by the teaching of Berengar, Archdeacon of Angers, who attacked the crude popular language about the Eucharistic presence. He himself held the doctrine of an objective but spiritual presence in the elements. In 1059 Berengar was forced to recant, and the decree which was forced upon him at Rome in the presence of the Pope is sufficient evidence of the dangerously materialistic view taken by the Church as a whole at that time. He was made to assert that 'The bread and wine after consecration are not only a sacrament but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and are sensibly not only in sacrament but in truth touched and broken by the hands of the priests and bruised by the teeth of the faithful.' Berengar's opponents asserted even that the body and blood of Christ were physically eaten with the mouth.

But his protest had not been in vain. The gross and superstitious teaching was at once defended and refined by the teaching of the Schoolmen. They took advantage of the current philosophical distinction between substance and accidents[2] to formulate a theological statement of transubstantiation. The philosophy of the day held that our senses can only perceive the qualities or 'accidents' of things. Beneath these qualities or 'accidents' there is an underlying reality, the thing itself, to which was given the technical name of 'substance'. For instance, bread possesses certain 'accidents' of which our senses

[1] In the East it became common from the fourth century onwards to speak of the bread and wine as being 'changed into' the Body and Blood. This 'conversion' language appears in S. Ambrose, but did not come into general use in the West until much later.

[2] Berengar had known of this distinction and had combated in advance any use of it for this purpose. He held that 'accidents' could not exist apart from the 'substance' in which they inhered. That was also Wycliffe's argument.

inform us, hardness, colour, taste, smell, etc. But these are not the bread itself. Behind them is the 'substance' of bread in which they cohere. This 'substance' is beyond the range of all our senses, touch included. So the Schoolmen laid down that through consecration the 'substance' of the bread and wine was by the almighty power of God changed into the 'substance' of the body and blood of Christ. No change can be detected by the senses. The 'accidents' of the bread and wine remain in order to veil the divine gift.

No doubt this philosophical speculation does not necessarily involve a materialistic view of the sacrament. 'Substance', as so used, is intangible. But it could do nothing to correct the debasing influence of popular superstition, and there can be no denying that the ordinary view of transubstantiation in the Middle Ages was absolutely carnal and materialistic, as, indeed, it is in popular Romanism to-day. The actual word 'transubstantiation' is first found in use in the eleventh century. It received official sanction at the Lateran Council in 1215. It is employed however in a less definite sense than in Tridentine theology. Despite the obvious misunderstandings and abuses that attached to it, it was retained and re-asserted at the Council of Trent,[1] and has remained as an article of faith in the Roman Church.

Our Article rejects the doctrine on four grounds:

(*α*) *Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ.* Scripture knows nothing of any philosophical distinction between 'substance' and 'accidents'. The words of institution may reasonably be interpreted as the promise of a divine gift, but they throw no light whatever on the manner in which that gift is related to the outward sign. Roman controversialists have indeed admitted that transubstantiation cannot be proved from Scripture. It is at best one explanation of Scripture.

(*β*) It is *repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.* That is to say, Scripture speaks of the Bread after consecration as still bread (1 Cor 11[26 and 28]). We may add that the Canon of the Roman Mass does the same, since it goes back to an age that knew nothing of transubstantiation.

(*γ*) It *overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.* In the words of the Catechism a sacrament has two parts: 'the outward visible sign,' here bread and wine, and the 'inward spiritual grace', the body and blood of Christ. But if, as on the Roman view, the substance of the bread and wine is annihilated, the reality of the outward sign is

[1] *E.g.* 'If anyone shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, the appearance only of the bread and wine remaining, which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most fittingly calls Transubstantiation, let him be anathema' (Council of Trent, Session xiii. Canon 2).

destroyed, *i.e.* the nature of the sacrament is overthrown as lacking one of its two parts.

(δ) It *hath given occasion to many superstitions.* As Dr. Gore has truly said, 'The atmosphere in which the doctrine of transubstantiation grows into a dogma is calculated to send a shiver through one's intellectual and moral being.' Paschasius Radbert drives home his teaching by recounting a series of miracles in which drops of blood flowed from the consecrated Host as the form of the infant Christ appeared. A similar miracle was opportunely registered in order to forward the institution of the Festival of Corpus Christi in 1264. The gross imagination of mediaeval theologians did not shrink from discussing the precise relation of the reception of the Lord's Body to the processes of physical digestion. In answer to the objections of opponents, miracles were lavishly postulated. It was supposed that the more contradictions that were offered to reason, the greater was the opportunity given for the meritorious exercise of faith.

As against the popular idea of transubstantiation as held and taught in the Roman Church both in the Middle Ages and to-day, these objections are conclusive. Attempts, however, are made by educated Romanists to escape them. They point to the fact that the Canon of the Mass calls the Host after the recital of the words of institution 'bread', as S. Paul does, and therefore claim that the Roman Church still in some sense recognizes it as bread. Again, they argue that the 'accidents' that remain are real and therefore constitute a true outward visible sign. Further, as we all should admit, the fact that anything has given rise to superstition is not conclusive against it. The Bible itself has given rise to many superstitions, but that is no reason for abolishing it or denying its value.

In this way it is possible to get a refined doctrine that is not open to the charge of materialism. But although it may be held in this form by subtle and educated minds, we must repeat it is not the ordinary teaching of popular Romanism. Further, it practically explains away the mediaeval doctrine altogether. 'Thus the modern Roman theologians allow to the consecrated bread and wine all the reality which anyone believes any bread and wine to possess, or, in other words, explain away transubstantiation, till it remains a verbal incumbrance due to an inopportune intrusion into Church doctrine of a temporary phase of metaphysics.'[1] Further, in however refined a form it is held it is open to very grave objections.

(α) It not only attempts to define what Scripture leaves mysterious, but binds men down to one particular form of philosophy. At best it is a pious opinion. We should not wish to condemn those who choose to hold it or to expel them from the unity of the Church. But the Church has no authority to add to the divine revelation a mere philosophical opinion.

[1] Gore. *op. cit.* p. 120.

(β) It 'detracts from the kingdom of nature in order to magnify the kingdom of grace'. On the Roman view the natural is destroyed to make room for the supernatural: the bread and wine are not really consecrated to be the vehicle of divine blessings, they are annihilated. Such a view as this is at bottom akin to Gnosticism, not Christianity. Christianity has always taught that the material attains to its highest end in becoming the means and expression of the spiritual. The supernatural completes and perfects the natural. In the Incarnation our Lord's manhood was not absorbed or destroyed by His divinity. Rather He alone was perfect man. In the controversies about the Incarnation the Fathers use the analogy of the Eucharist in order to prove this. According to the Roman doctrine the analogy of the Eucharist would prove just the opposite. 'Transubstantiation' is in its whole conception essentially unspiritual. It treats our Lord's ascended and glorified Humanity as on a level with the things of earth which must needs make room for its coming.[1]†

§ 4. The third paragraph affirms the great truth that safeguards and is the complement of the doctrine of the 'Real Presence'. *'The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.'*

Just as Christ's body and blood are present without being made subject to space and movement, so when we eat and drink them they are not made subject to any physical process. We can no more eat and drink them physically than we can eat bread and butter by faith. Each food, the natural nourishment and the spiritual nourishment, has its own means of reception. If, by faithful reception of the body and blood of the Lord, 'the body and soul' of the communicant are 'preserved unto everlasting life' such reception can be 'only after an heavenly and spiritual manner'.[2]

(α) This truth is further explained by Article XXIX, *'Of the wicked which do not eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.'* The phrase *'eat the body'* clearly refers to the spiritual eating spoken of in Article XXVIII. *'The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as S. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation*

[1] Some mention must be made of the unhappy doctrine maintained by Roman theologians of repute that the presence of Christ bestowed in the Eucharist is withdrawn as soon as the elements begin to be digested. By a second miracle transubstantiation is reversed. The 'substance' of Christ's Body is withdrawn. The 'substance' of the bread is replaced. So the coming of Christ is only a temporary visit, for about a quarter of an hour, not a permanent deepening of that union with Christ that only sin can weaken or destroy. This flatly contradicts the true Christian teaching as given by S. Augustine, 'What you see in the Sacrament passes away, but the invisible thing signified does not pass away but remains.' Christ abides in us and we in Him.

[2] For the meaning attached to this Article by its author, Bishop Guest of Rochester, see p. 383 above. His statements are quoted in full in Stone, vol. ii., pp. 210 ff.

do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.' The wicked and the faithful alike receive the elements that have been brought into union with the body and blood of Christ. Neither wicked nor faithful *carnally and visibly press with their teeth* more than the bread and wine. But only the faithful receive the body and blood of Christ, since only they possess that faith which is the indispensable means of receiving them. This Article does not in any way deny the 'real presence', it only rules out any carnal view of it. To give an illustration: when our Lord was on earth He possessed healing power quite independently of the faith of men: but only those who possessed faith could get into touch with it. Many touched His garments, but only the woman who had faith was healed (Mk 5^{30} ff.). The healing power was there: the touch of faith did not create it, but faith, as it were, opened the channel to appropriate the blessing. So in the Eucharist, Christ in all His saving power is present. The wicked are only capable of receiving the visible and material signs of His presence. But those who approach with faith can receive the inward grace and become partakers of Christ by feeding on His Body and Blood. Attempts have, indeed, been made to distinguish between 'eating the body of Christ' and 'partaking of Christ'. It has been claimed that the wicked do the former to their soul's peril, but cannot do the latter. No such distinction, however, can be drawn, and Scripture seems to know of no feeding upon Christ that is not unto life (cp. Jn 6^{53} ff.). The wicked only receive the outward 'sign or sacrament' that has entered into the closest relation with the divine gift. The gift itself is withheld or withdrawn, we know not how.[1]

(*b*) *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped.* This last section of the Article is carefully worded. It is based on a sound and intelligible principle. The Holy Communion was given to us by Christ for a definite purpose. We can only be secure of its blessings so long as we respect the limits of that purpose. The faithful Christian is assured that in receiving the Holy Eucharist he is brought face to face with Christ. The Lord's presence is guaranteed by the Lord's promise. But it is a spiritual presence: and a spiritual presence, however real, is not necessarily controlled by the same laws as an earthly presence. The appearances of our Lord after His Resurrection during the great forty days did not obey the same laws as those that limit and govern our present earthly humanity. Though He condescended to use material means, He was not subject to them. So we must not presume to argue about our Lord's presence in the Eucharist as if it were in any way an earthly presence. We are sure that He is present

[1] It is universally agreed that the unworthy communicant does not enter into that union with Christ which is the ultimate end of receiving the sacrament. It might, however, be held that S. Paul's reference to those who are 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord' and 'eat and drink judgment' to themselves (1 Cor $11^{27, 29}$) suggests that the unworthy receive a divine gift, but for judgment and not salvation.

to bestow His body and blood. We cannot be certain that that Presence abides when we use the consecrated bread and wine for a new and entirely different purpose, a purpose not ordained by Christ, but prompted by the fallible logic of human devotion. If our Lord could at will enter or withdraw Himself from the Upper Room, so at will He comes to fulfil His promise in the Eucharist and at will He can depart when that promise has been fulfilled. We cannot, as it were, bind Him to earth by our treatment of the elements. Such thoughts lie behind the very cautious statements of the Article. The practices mentioned are not condemned as sinful. No anathema is levelled at those who retain them. All that is asserted is that they are precarious, as going outside the ordinance of Christ.[1] The Church of England, therefore, was perfectly justified in abolishing them. At best they are practices enjoined by a part of the Catholic Church.

(i) Reservation purely for the communion of the sick or absent is thoroughly primitive and natural. It is in full accord with the spirit of Scripture and the revealed purpose of Christ and was the custom of the primitive Church. Justin Martyr tells us that a portion 'is sent to them that are absent, by the deacons'. In an age of persecution, and when perhaps the majority of Christians were slaves, members were often unavoidably prevented from being present. So, too, the Communion was sent to Christians in prison. Again, we read of Christians taking away the consecrated elements in order to communicate themselves at home during the week or carrying them with them when on a journey. Tertullian speaks of a Christian woman at home 'secretly, before all food' tasting the Lord's Body.[2] So, too, as late as the time of S. Basil the monks in the desert, where there was no priest, communicated themselves with the reserved sacrament. In times of persecution such a practice of private communion was necessary. But it was liable to abuse, and from the fourth century onward the Church took steps to suppress it.[3] We hear also of the Eucharist being sent as a sign of fellowship to distant churches. This custom was familiar to Irenaeus. In the East it was forbidden by the Council of Laodicea in 365, but lasted on longer in the West. Such practices did not commend themselves to the mature judgment of the Church. The practice of reservation continued, but under due restrictions in church. The canon law required that it should be kept under lock and key. According to the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI the sick

[1] Cp. the similar statement of Article XXV: 'The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about.'

[2] 'Ante omnem cibum' must surely mean 'before all food', not 'before every meal', though great names can be cited to support the latter translation. There is no evidence for communicating ordinarily more than once a day.

[3] Was the sacrament always or ever reserved in both kinds? Probably, as a rule, only the Bread was reserved, but at the time of receiving a fragment was placed in a cup of wine, which was thus regarded as consecrated. This certainly was the usage in some places. (See Wordsworth, *Holy Communion*, p. 266 and the references to reservation in Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*.)

might be communicated with the reserved sacrament on the same day as a celebration in church. In the second Prayer-Book this permission was withdrawn: there was a very real danger of conveying the sacrament away and using it for superstitious purposes.[1] In 1662 the present rubric was added enjoining the consumption in church of all the consecrated elements at the close of the service. The primary object of this was to forbid not reservation but the irreverent carrying of the elements out of church for ordinary consumption, which the Puritans were quite capable of doing. But indirectly the rubric forbids all reservation, and even the primitive custom of taking away their portion to the sick. This is a real loss, since every communion of the sick involves a separate private celebration. Happily many bishops have allowed reservation for this purpose under proper conditions—a great relief in crowded parishes, especially as all sick-rooms are not adapted for private celebrations.

The Article is aimed at reservation when practised not only for purposes of communion, but in order to provide a localized object of worship. This is a comparatively modern and entirely distinct practice. It is a use of the sacrament that diverges widely from the declared intention of Christ. It arose in the dark ages and received a great impulse through the assertion of Transubstantiation. The Pyx, or receptacle, at or above the altar containing the reserved sacrament, came increasingly to take a prominent place in the eyes of worshippers. In 1264 the festival of Corpus Christi was instituted and the Blessed Sacrament was exposed for worship. So the central act of the modern Roman service of Benediction is the blessing of the congregation by the priest with the consecrated Host.

(ii) Carrying about the Host in procession is only an extension of the same practice. Such a procession came soon to be one of the chief ceremonies of Corpus Christi, though it appealed too largely to the popular taste to be confined to that day.

(iii) The lifting up or elevation of the Host after consecration in order to be adored by the people was first introduced about A.D. 1100 and is on a level with the previous practices. This elevation must not be confused with the manual acts during the prayer of consecration, when the priest solemnly reproduces the action of Christ at the Last Supper and takes up the bread and the cup. Nor yet again has this elevation any connexion with that usually found in oriental liturgies, where, after the Lord's Prayer and before the Fraction, the priest lifts up the elements with the words 'holy things for holy men', as a preliminary to communion. Elevation for adoration was supposed to signalize the actual moment of consecration. It was expressly forbidden in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.[2]

[1] Cp. the last rubric at the end of the Communion Office of 1549.

[2] In the silent Canon of the mediaeval Mass the Elevation did at least direct the attention of the people to what was being done at the altar. But it gave rise to the unfortunate consequence that for the people the main motive of eucharistic worship became the desire to see the Host. The Reformers rightly regarded this as a perverted piety.

(iv) If Christ is present in the Eucharist, most certainly He is then as always to be adored. But this, as we have seen, is quite different from adoration of the Blessed Sacrament divorced from Eucharistic worship. We have no ground for believing that He gave us the Eucharist in order to dwell among us to-day by an abiding external presence as during His earthly life or to afford a visible object of adoration. Nor, again, are we justified in that absolute identification of our Lord with the outward sign that is implied in modern Roman devotions.

Finally, let us gladly admit that in these practices as allowed by the Church of Rome to-day we do find the expression of very deep and real devotion to our Lord. But we maintain that that devotion is purchased at a great cost.

Since there is a vigorous movement to introduce not only individual, but corporate devotions before the reserved Sacrament, including Benediction, into the Church of England, we will develop more fully the objections to such practices felt by many who believe wholeheartedly in the Real Presence in the Sacrament and are in full sympathy with the general Catholic position. These innovations are defended on two main grounds, first that they are a natural development of Reservation for the sick and have behind them the authority of the Western Church, and secondly that experience both on the Continent and in England shows that they promote devotion and win many to Christ.

In reply we protest that these practices are not so much practices of the Catholic Church as of the Counter-Reformation. They have no authority in Scripture or primitive custom. Even the learned Roman Catholic, Father Thurston admits that 'In all the Christian literature of the first thousand years, no one has apparently yet found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the Body of Christ which was kept upon the altar.'[1] So, too, the Orthodox Churches of the East reserve the Sacrament, usually on the Altar, with a lamp burning before it. Not only does the intervention of the Screen and the Holy Doors shut it out from any possibility of adoration by the people, but even those who enter the Sanctuary make no sign of reverence as they pass before it. No one can deny the belief of the Eastern Churches in the Real Presence, but here, as so often, they preserve ancient tradition. Only in the West has the cult of the reserved Sacrament been developed. The beginnings of this are to be found in the Middle Ages, but the full growth was accelerated by reaction against the minimizing views of Protestant reformers in lands which did not accept the Reforma-

[1] Note in Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, p. 170. On the case of Gorgonia (Gregory of Nazianzum, *Orat.* viii. 18), which Father Thurston regards as irrelevant, see *C.Q.R.*, April, 1918, p. 119 ff.

tion. Thus these practices are relatively a late development, at least in the form in which we are asked to accept them to-day, and the authority behind them is not that of the Catholic Church but of the Roman Church since the Reformation.

This is not in itself a ground of condemnation. They may be healthy and legitimate developments, a fresh adaptation of old forms of worship to meet new demands and circumstances. We must examine them in the light of reason and of the fruits that they produce.

Theologically it is hard to find a satisfactory defence. We hold that the Christian religion has a twofold foundation, Christian experience and historic fact. Both are necessary. Each reinforces the other. In order that experience may be kept Christian, it needs constantly to be tested by the New Testament. In support of the doctrine of the Eucharist, we can appeal not only to Christian experience throughout the ages and to the intrinsic moral and spiritual value of its symbolism, but also to the mind and promise of Christ as revealed in the historical facts of its institution. The sense of His presence and of the new life that He imparts is no mere product of collective imagination. It is guaranteed by His actual word and act. But there is nothing in His institution or in the outward signs to suggest in any way that He gave us the Eucharist in order that through the consecrated elements He might dwell among us to-day by an abiding external presence comparable to His presence during His life on earth. 'The Presence is given under a form which indicates that it is to be received.' Any other use is not only unauthorized and goes beyond the declared purpose of Christ, but is in danger of obscuring that purpose by suggesting that 'the value of the Sacrament is intended to reside in itself'.[1] No doubt certain critics hold that the Eucharist was not instituted by Christ Himself, but by the Christian Church, in imitation of mystery cults, though under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. On this view it is quite possible to argue that the Church may be equally inspired to adapt it to new uses, and the appeal to historic fact falls to the ground. Benediction may be defended, as it is by certain Modernists, as a piece of edifying symbolism, but no more. This is perfectly consistent Modernism, but will hardly commend itself to most advocates of these practices. It is precisely because we uphold both the importance of historic facts and also the objective nature of the Eucharistic Presence, that we hesitate to support these developments. In the Church of Rome they are defended by an appeal to the infallible authority of the Church. This is a dangerous argument for Anglicans, since the same authority pronounces that their orders are no orders and their sacraments are no sacraments. Judged by the principles for which the Church of England stands, the theology of these practices is precarious.

[1] W. Temple, *Christus Veritas*, p. 241.

Attention must be called to another theological danger. While it is plain that they do not necessarily presuppose transubstantiation, yet as a matter of history their development was largely due to the promulgation of that doctrine, and the arguments commonly used by Roman Catholics to urge their value are bound up with transubstantiation. The practice of visits to the Tabernacle is advocated on the ground that the Presence granted to the recipient in communion is withdrawn at a certain stage of the digestion of the elements. Thus a writer in the Month can say, 'Of course to have Him in our hearts in Holy Communion is more in itself than to have Him near to us in the tabernacle. But we have Him in Holy Communion only for a few minutes at a time, and in proportion as we believe this and take it to heart is our desire to seek His Presence in the tabernacle again and again.' Such theology is a denial of the truth that the sacred Humanity of Christ dwells in all true believers. It is a practical contradiction of the teaching of S. John's Gospel that union with the ascended Christ through the Holy Spirit maintained and deepened through the Sacraments is a better substitute for the relationship that the disciples enjoyed during His earthly ministry.

Again the Eucharist has many aspects. It embraces in one glorious complexity the many-sided richness of Christian grace and truth. It is the meal of God's family, the means of fellowship both with Christ and with one another through Him, the Christian sacrifice, the commemoration of His redeeming victory on the Cross and so on. It includes both the feeding of our souls and our self-oblation to the Father through Him. The extra-liturgical use of the Sacrament tends to abstract and isolate one element, the Presence of Christ, and to destroy the proportion of truth so as to suggest a local and material Presence. The whole conditions suggest a Presence on a level with the visible and material order. 'The Prisoner of the Tabernacle' is a phrase that sums up this tendency and is hard to reconcile with S. Paul's vision of a Christ who fills all things. The inevitable result of this emphasis is that a church where the Sacrament is not reserved is regarded as an 'empty' church, a place where prayer is less effective and God further off. All services, not only Mattins, but Evensong, which do not bear on the use of the Sacrament are to be depreciated. The divine omnipresence is in danger of being forgotten. It is one thing to regard the sacraments as the means by which One who is always present, becomes present in a unique and supremely characteristic manner for a special purpose. It is quite another thing to limit His effective presence to the Sacramental presence. There is a danger of encouraging a view of God which is less than Christian, and of ignoring His active presence in the universe. We must always remember that the most fundamental question of all religion is our idea of God.

When we pass on to the fruits of these practices in life and devo-

tion, from the nature of the case the evidence is less clear. It cannot be denied that many find these forms of worship attractive, though their attraction seems to be limited to certain temperaments, and they repel many, where they are not enforced and where all criticism is not forbidden by the iron discipline of the Church of Rome. Even though piety is stirred and the love of Christ deepened, as indeed we should expect from any forms of devotion that led men to contemplate Him, this does not prove that they are the best way. History shows that the degradation of religion has often been the fruit of the surrender to the popular desire for forms of worship that roused the maximum of emotion with the minimum of moral and spiritual, not to say intellectual effort. When we turn to the wider results of Counter-Reformation piety, while we gladly find much to admire, we do not believe that the very limited type of Christianity that is produced represents the highest Christian ideal. One important and objective piece of evidence is the quality of the devotional literature that the cult has inspired. If we take away those forms that are in origin Eucharistic, it is strangely sentimental and childish. The worship of God demands all our faculties, reason included, and where reason is ignored poverty of worship must in the long run result. The whole devotional atmosphere of modern Romanism is too often alien from that of the New Testament. Not only do these innovations in worship tend as it were to swallow up and depreciate the recitation of the divine office until the whole of Christianity seems to centre round the Blessed Sacrament, but reason and conscience are starved. Just as theology, if it is to remain alive and human, must keep in the closest touch with devotion and practical Christian effort, so devotion if it is not to become one-sided and relaxed, must not be divorced from the activity of the mind and the moral sense.[1]

[1] The following considerations, among others, would probably now be urged by those who take a different view of extra-liturgical devotions from that maintained in the text. (1) In the later Middle Ages the desire to see the Host at the elevation and the extra-liturgical use of the sacrament became dominating elements in popular eucharistic piety and tended to displace completely the participation of the people in the whole eucharistic action, especially since the reception of Holy Communion was very infrequent. This represented a fundamental perversion of eucharistic doctrine and practice, and fully explains the strictures of the Reformers on any use of the sacrament outside the liturgy and their positive desire to insist on the participation of the people in the whole rite, to emphasize the reception of communion as integral to it, and to encourage more frequent reception. In the situation then existing these measures were salutary and necessary. (2) At the present day in the Church of England the question of extra-liturgical devotions arises in a context very different from that of mediaeval times. In quarters where the desire for such devotions exists, frequent communion is usual and is not, according to the evidence available, endangered where these devotions are practised. (3) If reservation be conceded, the devotional use of the reserved sacrament is not mainly, and certainly not exclusively, a doctrinal issue. 'The real question is, is the devotional use of the reserved sacrament a good and desirable kind of prayer?' Can it be so ordered as to promote a right total eucharistic practice and not to disturb its true balance? Much will depend not only on the whole context of teaching and practice in a particular parish in which the sacrament is used devotionally outside the liturgy, but also on the character of the prayers and hymns used in the special service. If these are restricted to what is sound and healthy, it is unlikely that this form of devotion to our Lord can produce undesirable effects or lead to distorted views.

A distinct question is that of church discipline. Even if we grant that the extra-liturgical use of the Sacrament is desirable, it cannot be said that it is essential. It falls within the power of the local church to regulate it. All who by their own free choice are admitted to minister in the Church of England promise on oath to use only the services of the Book of Common Prayer or such as are ordained by lawful authority. By Catholic custom the use of the reserved Sacrament falls under the control of the Bishop. To hold Exposition or Benediction in defiance of the Bishop of the Diocese is an Anglican peculiarity for which there is nothing to be said from the standpoint of Catholic order. It is indeed often argued that the parish priest has the inherent right to reserve for the sick in virtue of ancient canon law which has never been repealed. Even this however is disputable in face not only of the long desuetude of the custom, but of the independent legislation in another sense, through the deliberate provision in the Prayer-Book of the office for private communion. Even here if we are to have reservation, it should be by the authority of the episcopate.[1]†

ARTICLE XXX

Of both Kinds

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people. For both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

De utraque specie

Calix Domini laicis non est denegandus, utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti, ex Christi institutione et praecepto, omnibus Christianis ex aequo administrari debet.

Composed by Archbishop Parker in 1563.

§ 5. There is no evidence whatever to support the present Roman custom of denying the cup to the laity either in Scripture or in the use of the primitive Church. At the Last Supper those present all drank of the cup (Mk 14^{23}). At Corinth all alike received in both kinds. S. Paul could write, 'Let a man prove himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup' (1 Cor 11^{28}). The account of Justin Martyr is conclusive for the custom of the Church in the second century. Indeed, it is admitted by Roman theologians that

[1] Provision for reservation under severe restrictions was made in Proposed Prayer-Book of 1928 (cp. the Book as proposed in 1927). A parish priest who wishes to reserve continuously for the purpose of communion does not now in general find that episcopal assent is withheld.

till the twelfth century communion in Church was always given in both kinds.[1] The only possible exception was when the sacrament was reserved for the absent or the sick. But even here it is doubtful whether there is any decisive evidence for communion in one kind only. Justin Martyr makes it quite clear that in his day the deacons carried both elements to those who were not present. Jerome at the end of the fourth century speaks of a certain bishop who carried about 'The Lord's body in a wicker basket and His blood in a vessel of glass'.[2] Whether this refers to his practice when visiting the sick or when on a journey, we cannot tell. The more common custom was to consecrate wine afresh for the communion of the sick by adding to it a particle of the consecrated bread. Sometimes the consecrated bread that was reserved for this purpose had been moistened before reservation with consecrated wine from the chalice. More often it was reserved by itself.[3] But in either case the fresh wine was deemed to be consecrated by the intinction of the consecrated bread. Usually the sick man's communion was made in a single act. We find words of administration for this purpose, such as 'The Body and Blood of the Lord be unto thee remission of all thy sins'. It is going too far to say that we can prove that in early days communion was always given in both kinds. But the prevalence of such customs as these proves that such was the desire of the Church where possible. They have been retained in the Eastern Church.[4]

Further, communion in one kind, so soon as it appeared, was vigorously denounced by the highest authorities of the Church. In the middle of the fifth century certain Manichaeans refused to drink of the cup and Pope Leo commanded that they should be excommunicated. At the close of the same century Pope Gelasius, hearing that some after receiving the Body, from some motive not explained, 'abstained from the cup,' ordered that they should 'either receive the Sacraments entire or be repelled from them altogether because the division of the one and the same Mystery cannot take place without a huge sacrilege'. This utterance was inserted in Gratian's collection of canon law and at a later date had to be explained away. The Schoolmen were equal to the task, and Aquinas boldly refers it to the consecrating priest alone.

At the close of the eleventh century the custom of communicating in one kind only began to be adopted unofficially. The motive was probably convenience, the avoidance of any danger of spilling the wine. It was condemned by the Council of Clermont in 1095, and again by Pope Paschal II in 1118. But the practice spread during the next two centuries and was defended by ecclesiastical writers. The

[1] *E.g.* Cardinal Bona, quoted by Wordsworth, *Holy Communion*, p. 268.
[2] Ep. 125, § 20.
[3] See Freestone, *The Sacrament Reserved*, and the comments on his conclusions by Harris in *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 548.
[4] For evidence see Wordsworth, *Holy Communion*, p. 263 ff.

change was made gradually. Aquinas, who died in 1274, only speaks of it as the custom of many churches. Evidence of the survival of primitive practice is found as late as the middle of the fourteenth century. When the Council of Constance met in 1415 it was widely hoped that the abuse would be checked. Unhappily communion in one kind was formally adopted as the official practice of the Church. The Council claimed for the Church the power of ordering that the sacrament should be given to the laity in one kind only. 'Though in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received under both kinds, yet has this custom been introduced . . . that it should be taken by the celebrants under both kinds and by the laity under the kind of Bread only. . . . Wherefore since this custom has been introduced by the Church and the holy Fathers on reasonable grounds and has been very long observed, it is to be accounted for a law.'

The reason alleged for the denial of the cup to the laity was commonly the risk of irreverence. Another reason was the danger of giving the simple occasion to 'think that Jesus is not entire under each species'. When the practice had become general, this last was the theological defence attempted for it. It was held that 'as much is contained under either kind as under both', for the whole Christ, both body and blood, is received under both. This doctrine, known as 'Concomitance', is, to say the least, the purest speculation. It makes assertion about matters that are clearly outside our knowledge. It can claim no support from Scripture or early teaching.

At the Reformation the restoration of the cup to the laity was demanded in the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg. In England it was restored immediately after the death of Henry VIII. But the Roman Church refused to abolish the existing custom. At the Council of Trent the doctrine of 'Concomitance' was distinctly affirmed. It was asserted that communion in one kind was sufficient and that the Church had power to ordain it. All who denied these assertions were anathematized. It is true that a section was added to the canons on this subject promising that at the earliest opportunity the Council would consider whether some relaxation of the rule might be allowed. But the opportunity has never arrived. At this day the Church of Rome is fettered by the decrees of Trent.

The practice is utterly indefensible. Not only does it rest on a precarious theological speculation, but it is in open disobedience to the express command of Christ. It is defended as a useful ecclesiastical regulation. The Church has, indeed, authority to decree rites and ceremonies, but not in contradiction to Scripture and to our Lord's own words. It cannot be denied that the practice has a certain practical convenience. But we cannot set that against the plain direction of Christ. The danger of irreverence can be reduced to a minimum. The Church of England in company with the Churches of the East is

content to hold fast to the primitive and Scriptural practice.[1] *Both parts of the Lord's Sacrament by Christ's ordinance and commandment ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.*

ARTICLE XXXI

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross

The offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

De unica Christi oblatione in cruce perfecta

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque praeter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae, aut culpae, pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosae imposturae.

In substance dates from 1553. Only slightly altered later. The decrees of Trent on this subject were not issued till 1562, hence the doctrine attacked is not official Roman teaching but popular mediaeval ideas. It asserts

(i) The uniqueness and all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of the Cross;

(ii) The falsity of any view that made each Mass a sacrifice independent of or additional to the sacrifice of the Cross.

§ 6. The Eucharistic Sacrifice

(*a*) The New Testament says very little in detail about the Eucharist as a sacrifice, but it leaves no doubt, wherever it is mentioned, that the Church regarded it as such. In 1 Cor 10^{14-21} S. Paul's argument rests upon an identity of principle between the Christian Eucharist and the sacrificial meals of the Jews and heathen. He speaks of the 'table of the Lord', which in Old Testament language is simply a synonym for 'altar' (Mal $1^{7 \text{ and } 12}$, Ezek 41^{22}, 44^{16}). In the Eucharist no less than in these sacrifices, those who eat, have communion with the altar, that is with God, who is represented by the altar. Hence the inconsistency of attendance at the Christian Eucharist and at idolatrous sacrifices. 'Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils.' So, again, in the Epistle to the Hebrews we read, 'We have

[1] To attempt to suggest what loss of grace the Church of Rome inflicts upon its laity would be to indulge in speculation as unprofitable and unprovable as that on which the doctrine of concomitance is based.

an altar whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the tabernacle' (13^{10}). A sound scholarship forbids us to limit 'altar' here to the actual table. But the reference to the Eucharist is unmistakable, and the words imply a sacrifice present comparable to those of the old covenant, of which the members of the new Israel partake as Israel after the flesh did of theirs. So, too, when we turn to the accounts of the institution the whole tone and structure are sacrificial. It is true, indeed, that the words 'Do this' (*τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*) in themselves mean no more than 'perform this act'. Attempts have been made to press the translation 'sacrifice this'. In the Septuagint *ποιεῖν* is undoubtedly used in the sense of 'sacrifice' or 'offer'; but only when the context demands it. In itself it is as vague as the English verb 'do'. None of the early Fathers, with the single exception of Justin Martyr, understand the words here as meaning in themselves more than 'do this'. Again, the word 'remembrance' (*ἀνάμνησις*) is employed in the Septuagint in a sacrificial sense (cp. Heb 10^{3}). But in this case also the word in itself is quite indeterminate. Who is reminded and of what he is reminded, depend solely upon the context. The fact, however, still remains that both the manner and circumstances of the institution leave no doubt of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. The 'Body' and 'Blood' mentioned in separation recall the pouring out of the blood in sacrifice. They are given not simply 'to' you, but 'for you' (*ὑπερ ὑμῶν*), *i.e.* on your behalf. It is clear that our Lord's Body and Blood are not only our spiritual food: they are that because they are first the sacrifice that prevails for us.[1] The words 'This is my blood of the covenant' (Mt 26^{28}) or 'This is the new covenant in my blood' (1 Cor 11^{25}) are an echo of the words of the covenant-sacrifice of Exodus 24 (quoted Heb 9^{20}). The whole service is the Passover of the new Israel.

In the early Church the Eucharist is from the first spoken of in sacrificial language.[2] It is called the 'spiritual' and 'un-bloody' sacrifice. It is viewed by Irenaeus and the Fathers generally as the 'pure offering' foretold by Malachi (1^{11}). The heathen world was full of sacrifices. The Church could hardly have avoided explaining her worship in terms of sacrifice. The question still remains in what sense she employed them. Gradually the Church made clear to herself all that was implicit in the Eucharist from the first. She found in it at once the fulfilment and the correction of those imperfect ideas and aspirations that were embodied in Jewish and heathen sacrifices.

(*b*) As we have already seen, several distinct ideas underlay the sacrificial worship of the Jews and heathen, and these ideas were not sharply defined. Sacrifice was a gift or tribute, an expression of homage. It was also a means of propitiation and a means of com-

[1] The phrase the 'bread of God' (Jn 6^{33}) may in itself be sacrificial (cp. Lev 21^{6}, etc., where it refers to the sacrifice as a whole, originally perhaps regarded as the actual food of Jehovah).

[2] See, for instance, Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 157.

munion. Through the common sacrificial meal the union between the worshippers and their God was strengthened. All these ideas run into one another and find their expression in the Christian Eucharist.

(i) What the Church offers to God in the first instance is simply bread and wine, as a token of homage and dependence upon Him, and an act of thanksgiving for His mercies of creation and redemption. In Old Testament sacrifices thoughtful Jews had come to discern that the worth of a sacrifice in the eyes of God lay not in its intrinsic value, as if God needed man's gifts, but in the spirit of the man who offered it (*e.g.* Ps 50^{5-17}, 51^{16-17}, 69^{30-31}). In early days the people brought their offerings to God in kind as an expression of thanksgiving. The bread and wine actually used in the Eucharist were taken from these offerings of the faithful. So to-day the oblations of bread and wine and the collection of money which takes place at the same point in the service are in origin and significance one and the same act. The connexion between them is preserved in so far as the bread and wine are the gifts of the whole congregation as being bought out of the alms.

(ii) Then in the prayer of consecration the Church in obedience to our Lord's command performs in remembrance of Him those acts that He Himself performed at the Last Supper. We pray that our earthly oblations of bread and wine may, by the power of the Holy Spirit, be united with the heavenly oblation of our Lord. God, so to say, shows His acceptance of our offerings by giving them back to us charged with the fruits of our Lord's passion, to be the spiritual food of His body and blood. In the early liturgies the effect of consecration is expressed indifferently either as the descent to earth of the Heavenly Presence of our Lord or as the lifting up to Heaven of our gifts, there on the heavenly altar to be united with Him. The truth that they strive to express is that heaven and earth are made one.[1] So in the Holy Eucharist our Lord is present in His Heavenly glory, to be the food of our souls, and since He is present, His sacrifice is present too. Our Lord presides at the Board not only as Host but as Priest. 'He pleads by what He is.' His presence in Heaven eternally intercedes for us, and His presence in the Eucharist is no less a presence of intercession. We, as His members, join with Him in presenting His sacrifice before the Father.

> 'Having with us Him that pleads above,
> We here present, we here spread forth to Thee,
> That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,
> The one true pure immortal sacrifice.'

Thus, what the Church does in the Eucharist is on a level, not with what our Lord did once for all on Calvary, but with what He is now

[1] Cp. the language of the Leonine Sacramentary:
'On Thy altars, O Lord, we thankfully offer earthly gifts that we may win heavenly: we give earthly things that we may receive eternal.'

doing in Heaven. That death can never be repeated. Through it He has become all that He now is. Our Lord's historical acts 'had value only as expressing and perfecting His will, and they live eternally in the will expressed and "perfected" through them: so that He offers Himself for ever. Through the commemorative thanksgiving the Church co-operates with the eternal act of His will and offers Him to the Father.'[1] Our Lord, as the 'Lamb that hath been slain', is an eternal and abiding sacrifice, interceding for us by His presence in Heaven. In the Eucharist we on earth join with Him in pleading His sacrifice, even as He pleads it above.[2]

> 'His manhood pleads where now it lives
> On Heaven's eternal throne,
> And where in mystic rite (*i.e.* the Eucharist) He gives
> Its presence (*i.e.* the presence of His manhood) to His own.'

As His members we identify ourselves with our Head. As 'in Christ', we hold up before the Father His Cross and Passion, as

[1] Article 'Sacrifice in N.T.' by F. E. Brightman, p. 768*b*, Murray's *Bible Dictionary*. The whole article should be studied.

[2] It is important to notice two ambiguities that lurk under the expression 'the finished sacrifice of Christ'. The word 'sacrifice' may mean either 'the act of sacrificing' or 'the victim sacrificed'. If it is used in the first sense our Lord's sacrifice is an act that lies in the past. If it is used in the second sense, 'our Lord is our sacrifice', He is the 'Lamb as it had been slain'. Again, the word 'finished' may mean no more than 'past', 'no longer going on,' as, *e.g.* a day is 'finished' when it comes to an end. But it may also mean 'completed', 'able to do its work,' as, *e.g.* a house is finished when we can live in it. More than half the controversies about the Eucharistic sacrifice have turned on a confusion in the use of these two words. In one sense we rightly speak of the finished sacrifice of Christ, meaning that He has died and risen and ascended and will never die again. In another sense, no less rightly, we regard our Lord Himself as an abiding sacrifice. Through all that He has accomplished, He has become the perfect instrument of our redemption. He is for all eternity 'the Lamb that hath been slain' (ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, Rev 5^{6}), *i.e.* alive through death. 'He is' (not was) 'the propitiation for our sins' (1 Jn 2^{2}). It is through the living and glorified Christ, not simply through what He once did, but through what He now is, that we have access unto the Father (Eph 2^{16-18}). In other words, His sacrifice is finished in that we can now enjoy all its benefits. The one view that contradicts all Scripture teaching is to maintain that our Lord's death is in any sense repeated.

Certain teachers of very different schools of thought have used language that implies that in the Eucharist we feed on the Body and Blood of the dead Christ: that we go, in the words of Bishop Andrewes, 'ad cadaver,' or in the words of a leading Evangelical teacher, that 'The *res sacramenti* is not Christ as He now is, but Christ's Body and Blood as separated in Sacrificial Death for our sins.' In other words, at each communion 'by the omnipotency of Christ's word the actual moment of His redemptive death upon the Cross is made to be present again to faith'. Such a view would seem to demand a new miracle at each Eucharist no less than the doctrine of Transubstantiation demands it. Further, it rests on an unreal distinction between the sacrificed and the glorified Body. There is but one Body of Christ, that which has passed through death to glory. His Body is not νεκρόν but ἐσφαγμένον. The view in question is anxious to safeguard the immediate connexion between the Eucharist and Calvary. But it rests on a false antithesis. The Crucifixion and the Ascended Life of our Lord are in the most intimate connexion. The latter derives its saving potency solely from the former. It is as He that 'became dead and liveth' (Rev 1^{18}) that Christ is our Saviour. Just as the saving efficacy of the Cross lives on in the living Christ, so in the Eucharist our faith rests not on a single act of past time but on an eternal present. (For a full discussion see Moberly, *Problems and Principles*, No. 5.)

being the realization of that antagonism to sin and filial obedience to the Father's will, which we would fain attain, but from which we know ourselves to fall short. We claim the forgiveness won for us. We thank God for the great act of redemption. We ask God, as it were, to look upon Christ as being that which by His grace we hope one day to become. Thus, through Christ we dare to enter into communion with the Father. He is our at-one-ment. Through Him we can enjoy that fellowship with God which ancient sacrifices aspired to achieve. And through Christ we offer our prayers and thanksgivings for our fellow-members in His Body and plead His death for all the faithful living and departed.

(iii) Not only do we commemorate all that our Lord has done for us, but in and through Him we offer ourselves to the Father. Our Lord in Heaven presents to the Father not only Himself but His Body, the Church. We, as parts or 'members' of Christ, filled anew by the act of communion with His life, join with Him in offering ourselves, 'our souls and bodies.' We in and with Him intercede for the whole Church, and offer to God the whole body of the faithful living and departed and ourselves as part of it. This is the culmination of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Not the mere presentation of Christ's sacrifice as something done for us or outside us, but rather our own self-identification with that sacrifice. In the language of S. Augustine, 'The whole redeemed city . . . is offered as a universal sacrifice to God by the high priest, who offered nothing less than Himself in suffering for us, that we might become the body of so glorious a head.' The priest who celebrates the Eucharist does not act simply as an individual, but as the minister and representative of the whole Body of Christ—not only the particular congregation gathered within the walls of a building, but the whole body of the faithful living and departed. Without our own self-oblation the Eucharistic sacrifice is incomplete. 'This is the Christian sacrifice, the many become one body in Christ. And it is this that the Church celebrates by means of the Sacrament of the Altar . . . when it is shown to her that in what she offers she herself is offered.'

(*c*) In such thoughts as these we find the Church making explicit to herself the wealth of meaning contained in her chief act of worship. It was her supreme act of homage, the commemoration of the atoning sacrifice of Calvary, the means of Communion. All that the old sacrifices prefigured found its fulfilment here. There is little or no attempt to construct any formal theological statement of the Eucharistic sacrifice till quite a late date. Even the earlier Schoolmen refrained from precise definitions on the subject. The corruption of doctrine attacked in our Article may be said to start from certain informal statements of Thomas Aquinas. These combined with current tendencies of popular religion to produce a debased and disproportionate teaching of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Not only did he

define sacrifice as 'something done for the honour properly due to God in order to appease Him',[1] but he asserted that it involved a change of some kind in the object offered, as 'that animals were killed, that bread is broken and eaten and blessed.'[2] This a priori view is quite out of touch with history. It isolates the act of sacrifice and attempts to treat it independently of the results attained by sacrifice. We can hardly wonder if the fruit of such treatment is an abstract and one-sided theology. The study of the Eucharistic sacrifice got, as it were, shunted on to a very barren side-track. The absorbing question came to be, if Christ is the victim in every Eucharist, what change does He undergo in each offering, so that it may rightly be termed a sacrifice? Thomas Aquinas was far too good a theologian to suppose that the sacrifice of Calvary was in any sense repeated or added to in the Eucharist, but his definition of sacrifice was the parent of theories that came dangerously near such teaching.

Again, current practice lent itself to a distorted theology. By every analogy communion is an essential part of sharing fully in the Eucharistic sacrifice. In the first days of the Church every Christian attended the Eucharist as a matter of duty at least every Sunday and communicated. We hear first of non-communicating attendance at the close of the second century. Tertullian mentions those who on days other than Sunday did not wish to break their fast, and so were present at the service and took away the Lord's Body for private communion at home. Again, Clement of Alexandria contemplates its being left to the conscience of persons present to receive or not: but he states that such permission was only the practice of some. The habit of non-communicating attendance only became general when Christianity had become popular and the world had invaded the Church. Many Christians no longer desired to make the effort of frequent communion, nor indeed were spiritually capable of it. S. Chrysostom found it necessary to condemn the habit of substituting mere attendance at the Eucharist for communion, and allowed it only to those in the final stage of ecclesiastical penance. Otherwise he insisted that those who felt themselves unworthy to communicate ought to go out with the penitents. The same condemnation is found elsewhere, as, for instance, in the 'Apostolical Canons'. It is clear that the Church was being faced with a real problem, how to deal with the lowered standard of personal holiness in ordinary Christians, The problem was solved by allowing non-communicating attendance. This, at least, preserved the Lord's service as the chief service on the Lord's Day. Even so, those present were said to 'assist at the prayers' rather than 'assist at the Sacrifice'. As time went on infrequency of communion on the part of the lay-folk tended to increase. The well-meant attempt of the Lateran Council to enforce a minimum of once a year was perverted into a restriction of communion to once a year.

[1] *Summa*, III. 48. 3. [2] *Summa*, IIa, IIae. 85. 3. *ad.* 3.

This inevitably tended to thrust into the background the great truth that the Eucharistic sacrifice culminates in the self-oblation of the whole Church. Stress was laid rather on the priest's part, and the priest was no longer regarded as the representative of the whole priestly body, but only as the representative of Christ. This tendency was furthered by the withdrawal of the cup from the laity.

Again, the Eucharist was at the first the common sacrificial meal of the united Christian brotherhood. Not till the fifth century do we hear of the possibility of more than one Eucharist in the same Church on the same day with rare exceptions. About 445 Pope Leo wrote to Bishop Dioscorus of Alexandria, pointing out that this rule might prevent some from offering the sacrifice, and urging him to bring Alexandria into line with Rome, where there was more than one celebration in a day in the same Church—'as often as there was a congregation to fill the Church.' The condition is worth notice. Gradually in the West there developed the ordinary method of the Middle Ages. Many priests celebrated daily. In many churches Masses were multiplied.[1] This development was partly due to a desire to suit the convenience of the congregation, more largely to the growing custom of saying Masses for special purposes. It received a great impetus by the growth of the doctrine of Purgatory. The whole system of chantries and the traffic in 'solitary Masses' were the result of this doctrine. The Mass came to be viewed chiefly as a means of delivering souls from Purgatory. Once again this increase in the number of Masses led to a diminution in the number of persons required to take part, until in 'Low Mass' all that remained was concentrated in the hands of the priest.[2]

So the idea of the Eucharist was externalized. The neglect of communion fixed attention on the moment of Consecration. Excessive attention was paid to the question of the relation of the elements to the presence of Christ. The consecration itself became regarded as the sacrificial act performed by Christ through the priest. The words of consecration were in danger of being viewed as a magical charm in obedience to which the miracle of transubstantiation took place. The priest came to be regarded, not as the organ of the whole priestly body, but as an individual possessed of certain wonderful powers. So the corporate aspect of the Eucharist was obscured. Again, as a result of the mechanical view of sacrifice, each Eucharist was regarded as having, so to say, a special value of its own and as purchasing an instalment of salvation. The more Masses that were offered, the greater amount of benefit was secured. Here again the influence of Thomas Aquinas was unfortunate. He asserted that the Sacrifice of

[1] In the East every church has still only one altar. The Eucharist is celebrated on Sunday and festivals.

[2] Here again the East shows its conservatism. Low Mass is unknown. The East preferred to maintain the full dignity of the Eucharist and to be content with fewer celebrations.

the Mass was efficacious in winning blessings for all who had a right disposition. This is capable of a perfectly right interpretation, but it was perverted into the teaching that the sacrifice of the Mass apart from Communion could automatically obtain blessings for those on whose behalf the priest intended to offer it, whatever their moral state. So attainment of salvation became little more than a question of getting sufficient Masses offered for oneself either in one's lifetime or after death. To meet the demand a worthless class of priests sprang up who earned their living simply by saying Masses.

Again, in later mediaeval teaching we find an idea that, while the sacrifice of the Cross availed only for the forgiveness of original sin, that of the Mass was instituted to make satisfaction for actual sins. This opinion was condemned in the Confession of Augsburg, which had influence on our Article XXXI. The Roman party repudiated any such teaching, and certainly after attention had been drawn to it the doctrine was not repeated. But the idea in question is found in sermons ascribed wrongly to Thomas Aquinas and was probably held by Catharinus, a bishop who was present at Trent. The existence of the sermons, whoever composed them, is proof that such a doctrine was taught.

The Church of England at the Reformation endeavoured to get back to a truer view of the Eucharist, one that preserved the due proportion of things, and was in complete accord with Scripture and primitive teaching. Hence the emphasis on communion as an integral part of Eucharistic worship, and the attempt, not altogether successful, to restore frequent communion. So this Article has its eye throughout on mediaeval abuses and on the attempt of the Council of Trent to shelter them as far as possible.

The offering of Christ, once made, is the perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual: and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. This assertion of the atonement, similar in language to the opening words of the Prayer of Consecration, is only made here, as the structure of the Article shows, to be ground of the subsequent condemnation. It is based on Heb 7^{27}, 9^{14}, $^{26-28}$, 10^{10}, where the death of Christ once for all (ἐφάπαξ) is contrasted with the repeated sacrifices of the Jewish system (cp. Rom 6^{9-10}). *Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses in the which it was commonly (vulgo) said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.* The language is most carefully chosen. There is no denial of the Eucharistic sacrifice, but of current popular perversions of it, as embodied in the practical system of worship during the Middle Ages. The plural 'sacrifices' condemns any idea that each Eucharist is in any sense a repetition of the sacrifice once offered on Calvary or an addition to it, or that by multiplying Eucharists blessings could automatically be multiplied.

So, too, the plural '*Masses*' makes plain that the idea condemned is that each Mass possesses a supplementary value of its own. Again, the plural '*priests*' emphasizes the condemnation of this idea. So it is not 'the sacrifice of the Mass' but the '*sacrifices of masses*' that is condemned: not any formal theological statement of doctrine,—for such did not exist,—but popular errors (*quod vulgo dicebatur*).

The decrees of the Council of Trent bear evidence of a double purpose. As theologians they wished to preserve themselves from making the sacrifice of the Mass a repetition of that of Calvary. As ecclesiastical statesmen they did not wish to upset established ideas and practice. Hence on the one hand they distinguished between the bloody oblation of Calvary and the unbloody oblation of the Eucharist. The latter was instituted to be the representation of the sacrifice on the Cross, till Christ should come. Through this unbloody offering the fruits of the bloody offering are received. On the other hand, they spoke of the sacrifice of the Mass as 'truly propitiatory', a phrase capable of an innocent but also of a perverted meaning,[1] especially as it is elsewhere called 'a true and proper sacrifice' (*verum et proprium sacrificium*). From this dubious teaching of the Council of Trent have arisen two types of Roman teaching, the one minimizing, the other exalting, the Sacrifice of the Mass. Both, however, are hampered by the unsound tradition based on the teaching of Aquinas, which regards the destruction or physical modification of the victim as the essential part of sacrifice and connects the Eucharistic sacrifice, not with our Lord's Heavenly priesthood, but with His death on the Cross placed in an unreal isolation. The dominant school in the Church of Rome hold that in some sense Christ suffers change or destruction in each Mass and that the Eucharist is in virtue of this act a distinct sacrifice in itself. Christ is regarded as in each Mass undergoing a new humiliation, a new self-emptying.[2] As we saw, the latest Roman denial of our orders is based on our rejection of any such view which makes the sacrifice of the

[1] 'Now undoubtedly there are two senses in which an act may be said to be propitiatory. The act of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross had an original propitiatory power . . . all the power that any action of man can have for this end is a derived power, derived from Christ's sacrifice, from which any other sacrifice, the Eucharistic one included, borrows its virtue and without which it would be wholly null and void. There is then an original propitiation and a borrowed propitiation, a first propitiation and a secondary one. Why did the Fathers of Trent, when they had all human language at their command, deliberately choose to call the sacrifice of the Mass *vere propitiatorium*? They may have said that it was *vere propitiatorium* in the secondary sense; but no man can fail to see the misleading effect of such language and that nothing could have been easier to the divines of Trent, had they chosen, than to draw a far more clear distinction than they did between the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice on the Cross' (Mozley, *Lectures and Theological Papers*, p. 216).

[2] Cp. Gore, *R.C. Claims*, p. 175, and Dom Chapman's reply. The statements of the Council of Trent appear to be the only definitions of the eucharistic sacrifice officially binding on Roman Catholics. Some modern Roman writers (*e.g.* de la Taille, Masure, Vonier) expressly reject the view that the eucharistic sacrifice involves any kind of 'immolation' of Christ other than that once made on the Cross.

Eucharist additional to that of Calvary. As long as it is taught, in however refined a form, the protest of our Article will not be out of date.

We need to get back to broader and truer notions of sacrifice. As we have seen, the culminating point of animal sacrifice was not the death of the victim but the presentation of the 'blood which is the life' before God. The death was not the climax, but rather the means through which the life was set free. So, too, a sacrifice does not necessarily involve a change or destruction of anything. The 'meal offering' and the shewbread were both sacrifices, and they are typical of a multitude of similar sacrifices found all over the world. The root idea of sacrifice is found to be communion rather than propitiation. The Roman interpretation of the sacrifice of the Eucharist rests on the later and debased mediaeval theology. Against it we appeal to a nobler and wider conception of sacrifice, more faithful alike to history and to Scripture.†