

## ARTICLE XXVIII.

*Of the Lord's Supper.*

*De Cæna Domini.*

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 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.

CÆNA Domini non est tantum signum mutuæ benevolentiæ Christianorum inter sese, verum pctius est sacramentum nostræ 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 Scripturæ verbis adversatur, sacramenti naturam evertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur et manducatur in Cæna tantum cœlesti et spiritali ratione. Medium autem, quo Corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Cæna, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferabatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

---

### SECTION I.—HISTORY.

THIS Article treats generally of the Lord's Supper, but more especially of the presence of Christ in that Sacrament, and of the mode in which He is received there. On this mysterious doctrine there have been four principal opinions: 1, Transubstantiation; 2, Consubstantiation; 3, The real spiritual presence; 4, The denial of any special presence altogether.

1. Transubstantiation is the doctrine of the Church of Rome. As stated by school-authors, and other more subtle reasoners among them, it means that in the Eucharist, after the words of consecration, the whole *substance* of the bread is converted into the *substance* of the Body of Christ, and the *substance* of the wine into the *substance* of His Blood; so that the bread and wine no

longer remain, but the Body and Blood of Christ are substituted in their places. This, however, is said to be true only of the *substance*, not of the *accidents*. The accidents (such as colour, shape, taste, smell, consistence, &c.) all remain unchanged. The substance, which is interior to, and not necessarily dependent on these external accidents, is that which is converted. Yet we are not to call it a mere spiritual change, (though some of their writers have allowed even this,) but the change is a real and miraculous conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the very Body of Christ, which was born of the blessed Virgin and crucified on Calvary.

2. Consubstantiation is considered to be the doctrine of Luther and the Lutherans. It differs from transubstantiation, in that it does not imply a change in the substance of the elements. Those who hold this doctrine teach, that the bread remains bread, and the wine remains wine; but that with, and by means of the consecrated elements, the true, natural Body and Blood of Christ are communicated to the recipients.

3. The doctrine of a real, spiritual presence is the doctrine of the English Church, and was the doctrine of Calvin, and of many foreign reformers. It teaches that Christ is really received by faithful communicants in the Lord's Supper; but that there is no gross or carnal, but only a spiritual and heavenly presence there; not the less real, however, for being spiritual. It teaches, therefore, that the bread and wine are received naturally; but the Body and Blood of Christ are received spiritually. "The result of which doctrine is this: it is bread, and it is Christ's Body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the Sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are: each as they can; Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and the wine as they can; and to the same real purposes to which they were designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul as the elements the body." <sup>1</sup>

4. The fourth opinion is that of Zuinglius, who taught that the Eucharist is a bare commemoration of the death of Christ, and that the bread and wine are mere symbols and tokens to remind us of his Body and Blood.

The subject on which we are entering is one which has produced folios of controversy; alas! what should have been for our peace becoming to us an occasion of falling. But a brief view is all that is here possible.

<sup>1</sup> Jer. Taylor, *On the Real Presence*, sect. i. 4.

When we consider the language of the fathers, one or two cautions are necessary. Of course their words were not measured and guarded, as ours have been in our times of trouble. Their writings are often rhetorical, that we say not sometimes turgid. They treat such questions as these practically, not argumentatively. Now in such writings, it may be very difficult to tell the exact intention of the writer, when subsequent ages have drawn subtle distinctions.

Thus much we must premise as unquestionable. The whole primitive Church evidently believed in *a presence* of Christ in the Eucharist. All spoke of feeding there on Christ; eating His Body and drinking His Blood. But then was it a spiritual presence or a carnal presence? Did they teach a carnal eating and drinking of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood? or did they intend a spiritual manducation, — an eating spiritually and a drinking in by the soul of the life-giving efficacy of the Body broken and the Blood shed? Did they believe the bread and wine to be actually and literally transmuted into Flesh and Blood? or did they think the bread and wine still to remain bread and wine, though constituted Sacraments of Christ, means in God's hand of conveying to us Christ's Body and Blood, and so, after Christ's own example, to be called by the *name* of His Body and Blood?

Here is the question; and it must be carefully noted. If there were no other alternative, but that the fathers must have been either Papists or Zuinglians, — must have held either a carnal presence, or none at all; then we must perforce acknowledge that they believed in a carnal presence, and were transubstantialists. For some presence they undoubtedly taught; some mode of feeding on Christ they undeniably believed in. But another alternative is possible, and has been acknowledged as possible, even by eminent scholastic and Romanist divines. They may have believed a spiritual presence. They may have thought, that the Eucharist conveyed Christ really, and yet spiritually, to the recipient; and they may have taught, that the soul was truly nourished by spiritually feeding on His Flesh and Blood, as truly as the body is nourished by carnally feeding upon bread and wine.

Whichever they held, a carnal or a spiritual presence, they may easily have used language which would sound like the carnal presence. There can be little doubt that their faith and feelings inclined them to the mysterious, and there was no controversy, no apparent need of caution. But then we may observe, that *our* clear statement that the presence was spiritual, or that the

substance of the bread and wine remained, must outweigh statements innumerable, which merely sound like a belief in transubstantiation or in a carnal presence. For the latter would naturally occur where people believed in a *real* presence, and had never learned the necessity of guarding their words, lest they should be thought to teach a carnal and natural presence; but the former could never come from the lips or pens of those who acknowledged a literal change of the elements, and that the natural Body of the Lord was actually eaten by all who communicate.

For instance, Roman Catholics will never say, that the bread and wine remain unchanged, and that the feeding is *only* spiritual. But Protestants, of many different communions, have freely declared that Christ's "Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken." Nay! it is acknowledged by them, that the Body of Christ then received is the very Body that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, dead, and buried. For there is no other Body, no other Blood of Christ. Christ's Body is now glorified, but still it is the same Body, though in its glorified condition. It is not even denied that we receive that Body really, substantially, corporally: for although the word "*corporally*" seem opposed to "*spiritually*," yet it is not so of necessity. And, as we acknowledge that it is a Body which we receive, so we cannot deny its presence corporally, *i. e.* after the manner of a Body. Only, when we come to explain ourselves, we say, that, though it be Christ's very Body we receive in the Eucharist, and though we cannot deny even the word *corporal* concerning it; yet as Christ's Body is now a spiritual Body, so we expect a spiritual presence of that Body; and we do not believe, that we *naturally* and *carnally* eat that which is now no longer carnal and natural; but that we spiritually receive Christ's Spiritual Body into our souls, and spiritually drink His life-giving Blood with the lips of our spirit.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it has been abundantly acknowledged, not only by our English divines, but by Protestants of all sorts, that the elements, after consecration, may be called by the name of those things which they represent. But then we call them so, not because we believe them to have lost their original nature, and to have ceased to be what they were, but because, being hallowed to a new and higher purpose, they may be called that which they are the means of communicating.

It was necessary to say thus much, that we might not be startled by strong terms; and so conclude at once that we had found a doctrine, before it had yet entered even into men's dreams.

<sup>1</sup> See this excellently laid down by Bp. Taylor, *On the Real Presence*, sect. 1. 9-11.

With this precaution, we shall readily see in the fathers abundant evidence that the carnal doctrine of transubstantiation had not risen in their days. Let us take one or two of the strongest expressions, and which, if not explained and qualified by other statements, would seem conclusive for transubstantiation and a natural presence.

St. Jerome and others speak of the clergy as making the Body of Christ.<sup>1</sup> Yet, as the words of consecration make the bread the Sacrament of Christ's Body, and so the means of conveying His Body to the communicant, and as it was an acknowledged mode of speech, and fully sanctioned by the language of our Lord, to call the consecrated bread by the name of that of which it was the type and Sacrament; it was not unnatural that the priest, by his consecration, should be said to make Christ's Body and Blood, even by those who believed no more than a spiritual and sacramental communication of them to the faithful.

St. Chrysostom writes, "When you behold the Lord sacrificed and lying, and the priest standing by the sacrifice and praying, and the congregation sprinkled with that precious Blood (καὶ πάντας ἐκείνῳ τῷ τιμίῳ φοινισσομένουσιν αἵματι) . . . are you not immediately transported to Heaven, and dismissing from your soul every fleshly thought, do you not with naked spirit and pure mind see the things which are in Heaven? Oh wonderful! Oh! the love of God! who, seated with the Father above, is held at that moment by the hands of all; and who gives Himself to those who desire to receive Him. And all see this by the eyes of faith."<sup>2</sup> "Behold thou seest Him, thou touchest Him, thou eatest Him. He gives Himself to thee, not only to see, but to touch, to eat, and to receive within . . . How pure should he be who partakes of that sacrifice! the hand that divides His Flesh, the mouth filled with Spiritual fire, the tongue empurpled with His awful Blood!"<sup>3</sup> Now these expressions are so strong that even believers in transubstantiation could hardly use them without a figure. The Roman Catholics allow that the *accidents* of the bread and wine remain unchanged; and would hardly therefore in literal language

<sup>1</sup> "Absit ut de his quidquam sinistram loquar, qui Apostolico gradui succedentes Christi Corpus sacro ore conficiunt, per quos et nos Christiani sumus; qui claves regni cœlorum habentes," &c. — Hieron. *Ad Heliodorum, Epist. v. Tom. iv. part. ii. p. 10.*

<sup>2</sup> *De Sacerdot. III. § 4.*

<sup>3</sup> Ἰδοὺ αὐτὸν ὁρᾷς, αὐτοῦ ἕπτῃ, αὐτὸν ἰσθίεις . . . αὐτὸς δὲ ἐαυτὸν σοι δίδωσιν,

οὐκ ἰδεῖν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄψασθαι καὶ φαγεῖν καὶ λαβεῖν ἐνδόν . . . τίνας οὖν οὐκ ἔδει καθαρώτερον εἶναι τὸν ταύτης ὑπολαίοντα τῆς θύσης; ποίας ἡλιακῆς ἀκτίνας τὴν χεῖρα τὴν ταύτην διατέμνουσαν τὴν σάρκα, τὸ στόμα τὸ πληρούμενον πυρὸς πνευματικοῦ, τὴν γλῶσσαν τὴν φοινισσομένην αἵματι φρικωδεστάτῃ. — Chrys. *Hom. 83 in Matt. c. 26.*

speak of the tongue as assuming the purple colour of Christ's Blood. But hyperbolic expressions are common with St. Chrysostom and his contemporaries; and they use such language, that they may exalt the dignity of the blessed Sacrament; that they may induce communicants to approach it with devotion and reverence; that they may turn their minds from the visible objects before them to those invisible objects which they represent, and which as St. Chrysostom says, they may "see by the eye of faith."

Still more remarkable perhaps are the expressions used by others of the Greek, especially the later Greek fathers, concerning the change (*μεταβολή, μεταστοιχείωσις*) in the Sacraments. So Gregory Nyssen says, "These things He gives by virtue of the benediction upon it, transmuting the nature of the things which appear."<sup>1</sup> And Theophylact (the last of the Greek fathers, A. D. 1077), "Therefore the merciful God, condescending to us, preserves the form of bread and wine, but transforms them into the virtue of His Flesh and Blood."<sup>2</sup> Those who translate *μεταστοιχείωσιν* by *transelementare*, think that we have here the very word made use of, which exactly answers to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, namely, a change of the elements into something different from their original substance. Yet first of all *transelementare* is not certainly, nor probably, a right translation.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, Gregory Nyssen is speaking not only of a change in the Eucharist, but in the Sacraments generally; and whatever sanctifying efficacy may have been attributed to the water in baptism, *no change of its substance* was ever believed to take place. Thirdly, Theophylact only says that the elements are changed into the *virtue* or *efficacy*, not into the *substance* of Christ's Flesh and Blood, — a very notable distinction. Fourthly, he uses the same word (*μεταστοιχείωσις*) of changes very unlike transubstantiation, *e. g.* the change of our bodies to the state of incorruption, and the change that is made in the faithful, when they are united to Christ.<sup>4</sup> Lastly, we shall find abundant proof from Greek fathers, centuries before Theophylact, to show that a conversion of substance was

<sup>1</sup> ταῦτα δὲ δίδωσι τῇ τῆς εὐλογίας δυνάμει πρὸς ἐκεῖνο μεταστοιχείωσας τῶν φαινομένων τὴν φύσιν. — Gregor. Nyssen. *In Orat. Catechet.*

<sup>2</sup> Διὰ τοῦτο συγκαταβαίνων ἡμῖν ὁ φιλόθεος· τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου φυλάττει· εἰς δύναμιν δὲ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος μεταστοιχείοι. — Theophyl. *In Evangel. Marc.* cap. cxiv.

<sup>3</sup> Suidas has *μεταστοιχείωσις, μετασχηματίζουσα, μεταπλάττουσα*. Suicer argues

at length that *transelementare* will not properly express its sense. (See Suicer, ii. pp. 363, 364.) Jer. Taylor (*On the Real Presence*, sect. xii. num. 5) adduces the words of Suarez, the learned Jesuit, in acknowledgment that *μεταστοιχείωσις* does not properly convey the meaning of *transubstantiation*.

<sup>4</sup> Theophyl. *In Luc.* xxiv. *et in Joh.* vi *apud* Jer. Taylor, *ubi supra*.

not believed by the early Greek Church; and therefore, that Theophylact's transelementation must have meant something else, or that he himself must have adopted comparatively modern views.

The same observations apply to the passages cited from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, where he speaks of Christ's changing the water into wine, and then adds, "Let us therefore with full assurance receive Christ's Body and Blood; for His Body is given to thee in the figure of bread, and His Blood in the figure of wine."<sup>1</sup> But here St. Cyril happily explains himself; for soon after he speaks of the Capharnaite Jews as offended at our Lord's sayings in John vi. 53. And this, he says, was from their carnal interpretation of His words: "They, not receiving His saying spiritually, being offended went backward, thinking that He invited them to the eating of flesh."<sup>2</sup> He then compares the Eucharist to the shewbread, and says that, "as the bread is fitted for the body, so the Word for the soul. Look not therefore as on bare bread and wine, for they are, according to the Lord's saying, His Flesh and Blood."<sup>3</sup> The context plainly shows the conversion to be spiritual, not as the Jews had understood our Lord, as indicating a literal *σαρκοφαγία*, or banquet upon flesh.

There is a famous passage, which the Roman Catholic controversialists coupled with the last from St. Cyril, and much insisted on, as plainly in their favour. It comes from the tract *De Cæna Domini*, in former times attributed to St. Cyprian, but which the Benedictine editors assign to Arnoldus, of Bona Vallis, a contemporary of St. Bernard. It speaks of the bread as "changed, not in form, but in nature."<sup>4</sup> The words of our own reformer shall explain that, even if the language were (as it is not) St. Cyprian's, it would not prove him a supporter of transubstantiation. "The bread is changed, not in shape nor substance, but in nature, as Cyprian truly saith; not meaning that the natural substance of bread is clean gone, but that by God's word there is added

<sup>1</sup> ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτον δίδοται σοι σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδοται σοι τὸ αἷμα. — Cyril. Hieros. *Catec. Mystagog.* iv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> ἐκείνοι μὴ ἀκηκοότες πνευματικῶς τῶν λεγομένων, σκανδαλισθέντες, ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, νομίζοντες ὅτι ἐπὶ σαρκοφαγίαν αὐτοὺς προτρέπεται. — Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Μὴ πρόσχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. — *Cat. Myst.* iv. 2.

<sup>4</sup> "Panis iste, quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura, mutatus, omnipotentia Verbi factus est caro." — *De Cæna Domini*. The tract is

usually printed in the Appendix of the works of Cyprian. In the Oxford edition it is in Appendix, p. 39, and the above passage, p. 40. In the edition of Venice, 1729, it is App. p. xcix. There is also a famous passage from St. Ambrose, *De Myst.* ix. § 52, where he speaks of Christ's words as changing the properties of the elements: "valebit Christi Sermo ut species mutet elementorum;" and again, *mutare naturas*. The answer in the text to the passage from the Pseudo-Cyprian equally applies to this from St. Ambrose. See also Bp. Cosin, *Hist. of Transubstant.* ch. vi. 14.

thereto another higher property, nature and condition, far passing the nature and condition of common bread, that is to say, that the bread doth show unto us, as the same Cyprian saith, that we be partakers of the Spirit of God, and most purely joined unto Christ, and spiritually fed with His Flesh and Blood: so that now the said mystical bread is both a corporal food for the body, and a spiritual food for the soul.”<sup>1</sup>

We must not omit one passage from St. Hilary, which contains certainly some startling expressions. He is arguing against heretics, who held that the Unity of the Father and the Son was unity of *will*, not unity of nature. He quotes against them John xvii. 21, 23: “That they may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one.” And he contends, that the unity of the Father and the Son must be an unity of nature, not merely of will; inasmuch as the indwelling of Christ in His people is not by concord of will, but by verity of nature; for He took the nature of our flesh, on purpose that He might dwell in us according to that human nature; and by His human nature He dwelleth in us and we in Him. Hence our union with Him is by unity of nature, *i. e.* human nature. So in like manner, His union with the Father is by unity of nature, *i. e.* Divine nature. In the course of this argument he says, “If Christ therefore really took flesh of our body, and He is truly that Man who was born of Mary, and we truly under the mystery receive His Flesh, by means of which we shall be one; for the Father is in Him and He in us; what room is there for mere unity of will, when the natural property effected by the Sacrament, is the Sacrament of perfect unity? Christ Himself says concerning the truth of His nature in us, *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him.* Concerning the truth of His Body and Blood there is no room for doubt; for now by our Lord’s witness and our own faith, it is truly Flesh, and truly Blood. And these received, and taken in by us, make that we be in Christ and Christ in us.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer, *Remains*, II. p. 340; *Defence of the Catholic Doctrine*, Bk. II. ch. XI.

<sup>2</sup> “Quisquis ergo naturaliter Patrem in Christo negabit neget prius non naturaliter vel se in Christo, vel Christum sibi inesse; quia in Christo Pater, et Christus in nobis, unum in his esse nos faciunt. Si vere igitur carnem corporis nostri Christus assumpsit, et vere homo

ille, qui ex Maria natus fuit, Christus est, nosque vere sub mysterio carnis corporis sui sumimus; (et per hoc unum erimus, quia Pater in eo est, et Ille in nobis;) quomodo voluntatis unitas aperitur, cum naturalis per sacramentum proprietates, perfectæ sit sacramentum unitatis: De naturali in nobis Christi veritate ipse ait: *Curo mea vere est esca, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Qui edit carnem meam,*



The passage, strong as it is, does not stagger those who admit a true but spiritual presence of Christ's Body in the receiving of the Eucharist, and a true but spiritual union of Christians to the human nature of their Lord. "For as concerning the word *truly*," they say, "it setteth not lively forth a real and substantial presence; for Christ is truly in all His faithful people, and they truly eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, and yet not by a real and corporal, but by a spiritual and effectual presence."<sup>1</sup> "And although he saith that Christ is naturally in us, yet he saith also that we be naturally in Him. And nevertheless in so saying, he meant not of the natural and corporal presence of the substance of Christ's Body and of ours; for as our bodies be not after that sort within His Body, so is not His Body after that sort within our bodies . . . And as the union between Christ and us in baptism is spiritual . . . so likewise our union with Christ in His holy Supper is spiritual . . . and therefore Hilarius, speaking there of both the Sacraments, maketh no difference between our union with Christ in baptism and our union with Him in His holy Supper."<sup>2</sup>

Now, although such passages admit of an explanation, whether we adopt the transubstantialist theory or the doctrine of a true but spiritual presence in the Eucharist; yet it must be conceded that, if all the language of the fathers was similar to the above-quoted sentences, there would be just reason to suspect that, from the first, transubstantiation, or something near akin to it, was the doctrine of the Church. But it is easy to bring a chain of testimonies, from the very earliest ages through many centuries, which cannot be interpreted to mean transubstantiation, or a carnal presence, but which declare, though plainly for a real, yet as plainly for a spiritual feeding upon Christ.

The apostolical fathers, for the most part, speak in terms so general, that it is often almost doubtful, whether they speak of the Eucharist, or of that spiritual feeding upon Christ as the bread of life, which all allow to be possible, even without the Eucharist. Thus

*et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo.* De veritate carnis et sanguinis non relictus est ambigendi locus: nunc enim et ipsius Domini professione et fide nostra, vere caro, et vere sanguis est. Et hæc accepta et hausta efficiunt ut et nos in Christo et Christus in nobis sit." — Hilar. *De Trinitate*, Lib. VIII. § 13, p. 222. Edit. Benedict.

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer's *Answer to Gardiner*, Works, III. p. 254.

<sup>2</sup> Cranmer's *Defence of the Catholic*

*Doctrine*, &c. Works, II. pp. 406, 407. N.B. Just before the passage above quoted, Hilary had spoken of the union of Christians to Christ in baptism, as he speaks afterwards of their union in the Eucharist: "Docet Apostolus ex natura sacramentorum esse hanc fidelium unitatem, ad Galatas scribens, *Quotquot enim in Christo baptizati estis, Christum induistis*," &c. — *De Trin.* Lib. VIII. p. 213. Ed. Ben.

Ignatius, "I delight not in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life; I desire the bread of God, which is the Flesh of Christ, and His Blood I desire as drink, which is love incorruptible."<sup>1</sup> Again, "Let no one be deceived; if any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God."<sup>2</sup> His high esteem for the grace of this Sacrament he shows in general expressions, *e. g.* "breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, our antidote that we die not, but live forever in Christ Jesus."<sup>3</sup> One passage in this early father alludes to certain sects of the Gnostics or Docetæ, who not believing that the Saviour had ever taken real human flesh, refused to receive the Eucharist, because they would not acknowledge it to be the Body of Christ. "They abstain from the Eucharist and public prayer, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised from the dead."<sup>4</sup> From which we may fairly conclude, that the fathers called the consecrated bread the Body of Christ, and that some early heretics did not admit the language, or perhaps even the Sacrament, because they disbelieved in the existence of Christ's Body. But even Bellarmine allows, that the question between Ignatius and the heretics was not the doctrine of the Eucharist, but the doctrine of the Incarnation.<sup>5</sup> Whatever may have been the belief of the Church as to the *mode* of receiving Christ's Body in the Eucharist, the heretics would have been equally likely to reject the Eucharist, as not acknowledging that Christ had a body at all. For the Eucharist, which symbolizes, and is the means of receiving His Body, presupposes its reality. Another passage from Ignatius is as follows: "Hasten therefore to partake of the one Eucharist; for there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the unity of His Blood; one altar, as also one bishop,"<sup>6</sup> &c. Here the exhortation is to avoid schism, partaking of the one Eucharist, where is exhibited to us the oneness of the Saviour we receive, and so the unity of the Church.

<sup>1</sup> Ignat. *Ad Roman.* vii. The passage is in the Syriac.

<sup>2</sup> Ignat. *Ad. Ephes.* v.

<sup>3</sup> *Ad Ephes.* xx.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad Smyrn.* vii. The passage is not in the longer epistles, but it is in the shorter (esteemed the genuine) epistles of Ignatius, and it is cited by Theodoret (*Dial.* 3) and is maintained to be genuine by Cotelerius, *Tom.* ii. p. 37, note *in loc.* The Greek is *εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχα-*

*ριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν χρηστότητι ὁ Πατὴρ ἔγειρεν.*

<sup>5</sup> *De Eucharistia*, i. 1, cited by Bp. Cosin, *Hist. of Transubstantiation*, ch. vi. 11.

<sup>6</sup> *Σπονδύσατε οὖν μὴ εὐχαριστία χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἔνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θναυστήριον ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος, κ. τ. λ. — *Ad Philadelph.* iv.*

Justin Martyr describes the Eucharistic feast to the heathen emperor. He speaks first of the bread and wine as blessed by the presiding presbyter; and then says, "This food is called by us Eucharist, which no one is allowed to take, but he who believes our doctrines to be true, and has been baptized in the laver of regeneration, for the remission of sins, and lives as Christ has enjoined. *For we take not these as common bread and common drink.* For like as our Saviour Jesus Christ, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so we are taught that this food, which is blessed by the prayer of the Word that cometh from Him, by conversion of which our flesh and blood are nourished, is the Flesh and Blood of Him, the Incarnate Jesus."<sup>1</sup> There is manifestly in this passage what may be called High Eucharistic doctrine. Justin was plainly no Zuinglian. The Christians of his day took not the consecrated elements "for common bread and common wine." But, if Justin was no Sacramentarian, neither was he a transubstantialist. Whereas he says it is not *common* bread, he evidently believes it to be yet *bread*; otherwise he would naturally have left out the epithet *common*, and have said, that they esteemed it no longer bread *at all*. Moreover, he speaks of the elements as changed into the nourishment of our flesh and blood. But he would never have said this had he believed them to have literally become the unchangeable and incorruptible Body of the Lord. It is evident, therefore, that he held no change in the elements, but a Sacramental change; although he undoubtedly declares, that in the Eucharist the Christians were taught that there was a reception of the Body and Blood of Christ. Dr. Waterland argues, that consubstantiation is as much excluded by this passage as transubstantiation,<sup>2</sup> though Bishop Kaye appears to admit that it sounds not unlike the former.<sup>3</sup> Still he has justly added, that in the Dialogue with Trypho Justin states the bread to be in commemoration of Christ's Body, and the cup of His

<sup>1</sup> οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν πῶμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαρισθεῖσαν τροφήν ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκεῖνον τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδόξαθημεν εἶναι. — Justin. *Apol.* i. p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> "As it appears to me, Justin in this passage does not intend to compare the manner, in which Jesus Christ being

made flesh by the Word of God hath flesh and blood for our sake, with that in which the bread and wine . . . became the Flesh and Blood of Christ; but only to say that, as Christians were taught that Christ had flesh and blood, so were they also taught that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are the Body and Blood of Christ; ὃν τρόπον is merely equivalent to *as*." — Bishop Kaye, *Justin Martyr*, pp. 87, 88, note.

<sup>3</sup> Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. viii

<sup>3</sup> Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 74.

Blood ;<sup>1</sup> and in another place applies to them the expression “dry and liquid food ;”<sup>2</sup> and such language would scarcely have been used by a believer in the natural, though the language of the former passage might be readily adopted by a believer in the spiritual presence.

Our next witness is Irenæus. “As the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer *common bread*, but the Eucharist, consisting of *two* things, *earthly* and *heavenly* ; so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have hope of eternal resurrection.”<sup>3</sup> Here we have evidently the substance of the bread remaining, still an *earthly* element. Yet it is no longer *common* bread, for by consecration there is a *heavenly* or spiritual grace united to it, which makes it not mere bread, but the Eucharist.

Irenæus had to contend against the Gnostics, who denied the reality of the Body of Christ. In more than one place he argues, from the real substantial character of the Eucharistic elements, that the Flesh and Blood of Christ, of which they were the representatives, must be substantial and real. This will make his language sometimes sound as though he believed in a natural presence of that Flesh and Blood ; yet, if we remember his object and attentively observe his words, we shall think otherwise. “That cup,” he says, “which is a creature, He recognized to be His Blood which is shed, with which He imbues (δέει) our blood ; and the bread which is a creature, He affirmed to be His own Body, by which our bodies grow. When, therefore, both the mingled cup and the created bread receive the word of God, and become the Eucharist of Christ’s Blood and Body, and by them the substance of our flesh grows and consists, how can they say, that the flesh is not capable of the gift of God, namely of life eternal, when it is fed by Christ’s Body and Blood, and is a member of Him ?”<sup>4</sup>

In a fragment edited by Pfaff, we have a clear explanation of Irenæus’s view, that, by the Holy Spirit descending on the Eucharist, the Elements become so the Body and Blood of Christ, that, though they yet remain *figures* or *emblems*, still the partakers of

<sup>1</sup> περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσασθαι, κ. τ. λ. — *Dialog.* p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πίνουσι ὃ πέπονθε δι’ αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται. — *Dial.* p. 345.

<sup>3</sup> Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβάνομενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι

κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνα ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα. — *Irenæ. Lib. iv. 32 (Lib. iv. 18, Bened.)*

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. Hæc.* v. 2. Of this passage we may observe, that if Irenæus had meant

those emblems obtain pardon and eternal life.<sup>1</sup> In another fragment quoted from him by Œcumenius, we read, that during persecution some slaves had informed against their masters, having misinterpreted the language used concerning the Eucharist, and so supposing that their masters fed on human flesh. This, Irenæus says, arose from their having heard the divine Communion called the Blood and Body of Christ; "and they, *thinking it was in reality flesh and blood*, gave information accordingly."<sup>2</sup> The inference obviously is, that Irenæus did not think the bread and wine to have become really Flesh and Blood. So he, like Justin Martyr, is a witness against the Roman doctrine, and yet perhaps, as Waterland observes, still more against the mere figurists or memorialists. For it is certain, that he believed the Body and Blood of Christ to be verily and indeed taken in the Eucharist; but still he gives no indication of a belief in a change of the elements, acknowledging them to be *emblems* (ἀντίτυπα), and not thinking that those who partook of them, were indeed feeding upon flesh and blood.<sup>3</sup>

Tertullian says, "The petition, *Give us this day our daily bread*, may be spiritually interpreted. For Christ is our bread. I, said He, *am the bread of Life*: and just before, *The Bread is the Word of the Living God, who came down from Heaven*: and also because His Body is understood in Bread, *This is My Body*. (*Tum quod et Corpus Ejus in pane censetur, Hoc est Corpus Meum*.) Therefore, by asking our daily bread, we seek perpetuity in Christ and to be undivided from His Body."<sup>4</sup> Again he writes, "Our body is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, that our soul may be fattened of God."<sup>5</sup> He speaks of Christ, as *calling* bread His Body.<sup>6</sup> "Bread," again we read, "by which He represents His very Body."<sup>7</sup> So also, "Having taken bread and distributed it to

that the elements were changed in substance into Christ's Body and Blood, he would never have spoken of them as nourishing our bodies, which implies the idea of digestion, acknowledged to be blasphemy.

<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν πρόσφοραν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποθήγη τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σώμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἵνα οἱ μεταλάβοντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. — Irenæi Scripta Anecdota, fragm. 2, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> οἱ ὅποιοι οὗτοι, μὴ ἔχοντες πῶς τὸ τοῖς ἀναγκάζουσι καθ' ἡδονὴν εἶπειν, παρ' ὅσον ἤκουον τῶν δεσποτῶν, τὴν θείαν μετέληψιν αἶμα καὶ σῶμα εἶναι Χριστοῦ, αὐτοὶ νομίσαντες τῷ ὄντι αἶμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι, τοῦτο

ἔξειπον τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσι. — Fragmentum ab Œcumenio in Comment. ad 1 Petri Epist. cap. 3, p. 498, allegatum; Irenæi Op. Grabe, p. 469.

<sup>3</sup> There is an excellent chapter in Beaven's *Irenæus* on the subject of Irenæus's statements concerning the Eucharist.

<sup>4</sup> *De Oratione*, c. 6.

<sup>5</sup> "Caro Corpore et Sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur." — *De Resur. Carn.* c. 8.

<sup>6</sup> "Christus . . . panem corpus suum appellans." — *Adv. Judæ.* c. 10.

<sup>7</sup> "Panem, quo ipsum Corpus suum representat." — *Adv. Marcion.* Lib. I. c. 14.

"Repræsentatio — to exhibit as present;

His disciples, He made it His body by saying, This is my Body, *i. e.* the figure of My Body. But there would be no figure, if there were no true Body. A mere phantom, without substance, would admit no figure.”<sup>1</sup> In the last passage, he is arguing, like Ignatius and Irenæus, against those who denied a Body to our Lord. Now surely this testimony is plain. The bread is not really Christ's Body, but a figure of His Body, with which however He is pleased to recall (*repræsentare*) His Body to His followers. In this bread His Body is understood (*censetur*) or accounted; and so our bodies are fed with His Body, that our souls may be nourished of God. Though the bread then is a figure; yet the feeding on Christ is not merely figurative, but real, and spiritual. He is the Bread of life; and by feeding on Him we receive perpetual and indivisible union to His Body.

Clement of Alexandria, of the same date with Tertullian, says, “The Blood of the Lord is twofold: the one natural or carnal, whereby we are redeemed from corruption; the other spiritual, whereby we are anointed; and this is to drink the Blood of Jesus, to be partakers of the Lord's incorruptibility. Also the Spirit is the power of the Word, as the Blood is of the flesh.”<sup>2</sup> He then goes on to speak of the wine mingled with water; and says, that the mixture of the drink and of the Logos is called the Eucharist — “Blessed and glorious grace, by which those, who partake in faith, are sanctified both body and soul.” “Christ,” he says a little farther on, “partook of wine; for He was a man. He blessed it too, saying, *Take, drink, this is My Blood*, the blood of the vine. He thus calls allegorically the Word, who was poured forth for many for the remission of sins, the sacred stream of gladness . . . He showed that what He blessed was wine, by saying to His disciples, *I will not drink of the fruit of this vine till I drink it with you in My Father's Kingdom.*”<sup>3</sup> Clement was a very mystical writer;

ὑποτυπῶ, præsentem esse facio, ob oculos pono, refero. Repræsentare dicuntur pictores. Item oratores graphicæ quippiam describentes.” — Facciolati.

<sup>1</sup> “Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, Hoc est Corpus Meum, dicendo, id est, figura Corporis Mei. Figura autem non fuisse, nisi veritatis esset Corpus. Cæterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset.” — *Adv. Marcion.* Lib. IV. c. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Διττὸν δὲ τὸ αἶμα τοῦ Κυρίου· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ σαρκικόν, ὃ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικόν, ὃ μέριστιν ὧ κεχρίσμεθα· καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστι πιεῖν τὸ αἶμα

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς Κυριακῆς μεταλαμβάνειν ἄφθοραίας· ἰσχύς δὲ τοῦ Λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς αἶμα σαρκός.— *Pædag.* Lib. II. c. 2, p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> Εὐ γὰρ ἴστε, μετέλαβεν οἶνον καὶ αὐτὸς· καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ αὐτός. Καὶ εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μιν ἔστι τὸ αἶμα, αἶμα τῆς ἡμέτερου· τὸν Λόγον, τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἁγίου ἀλλαγῶρει ἡμᾶς . . . ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων. Οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἡμέτερου ταύτης, μέχρις ἂν πῖω αὐτὸ μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν.— *Pædag.* Lib. II. c. 2, p. 186.

but we can discern this much at least from the foregoing passages : that, whilst he attached great spiritual blessings to the Eucharist; he yet believed the substance of the wine to remain in it, and the Blood received therein to be spiritual, not natural Blood.

In Origen, as in his predecessors, we perceive at the same time deep reverence for the Body of Christ received in the Eucharist, and yet a belief that the reception of that Body was spiritual and heavenly, not carnal and natural. "When ye receive the Body of the Lord, with all caution and reverence ye preserve it; lest any, the least thereof, be lost, or any portion of the consecrated gift pass away."<sup>1</sup> "Acknowledge that they are figures, which are written in the sacred volumes; therefore as spiritual, not carnal, examine and understand what is said. For, if as carnal you receive them, they hurt, not nourish you. Not only in the old Testament is there a letter which killeth; but also in the new there is a letter which killeth him who does not spiritually consider it. For, if according to the letter you receive this saying, *Except ye eat My Flesh and drink My Blood*, that letter killeth."<sup>2</sup>

St. Cyprian, in his 63d Epistle, is very full on the subject of the cup in the sacrament. He is writing there against the Aquarii, who rejected wine as evil, and so used water at the communion. He argues that the tradition of the Lord should be preserved; and that nothing should be done but what Christ did before: that therefore "the Cup, which is offered in commemoration of Him, be offered mixed with wine. For whereas Christ says, *I am the true Vine*, the Blood of Christ is surely wine, not water. Nor can it appear that in the cup is His Blood, with which we are redeemed, if wine be absent, by which Christ's Blood is represented."<sup>3</sup> There is much there to the same purpose. But these words alone prove, that Cyprian, whilst calling the consecrated wine the Blood of Christ, and believing (as is abundantly evident through his writings everywhere) that there was in the Sacrament a real partaking

<sup>1</sup> "Cum suscipitis Corpus Domini, cum omni cautela et veneratione servatis, ne ex eo parum quid decidat, ne consecrati numeris aliquid dilabatur." — *In Exod. Hom. XIII.*

<sup>2</sup> "Agnoscite quia figuræ sunt quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, et ideo tanquam spiritalia et non tanquam carnalia examine et intelligite quæ dicuntur. Si enim quasi carnalia ista suscipitis, lædunt vos et non alunt. Est enim et in evangeliiis litera quæ occidit. Non solum in veteri Testamento occidens litera deprehenditur; est et in novo Testamento litera quæ occidat eum qui non

spiritaliter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est: *Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum, occidit litera.*" — *In Levit. Hom. VII. n. 5.*

<sup>3</sup> "Ut calix, qui in commemoratione Ejus offertur, mixtum vino offeratur. Nam cum dicat Christus; *Ego sum vitis vera*; sanguis Christi, non aqua est utique, sed vinum. Nec potest videri sanguis Ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice, quando vinum desit calici quo Christi sanguis ostenditur." — *Cyprian. Epist. LXIII.; Cæcilio Fratri, p. 148. Oxf.*

of Christ, yet considered that there was still remaining the substance of the wine; for, says he, "The Blood of Christ is wine," *i. e.* that cup which we drink, acknowledging it to be the Blood of Christ, is wine. Moreover, he considered the wine to be a representation or means of showing Christ's Blood, and the cup to be offered in commemoration of Him.

St. Athanasius, quoting John vi. 16-63, observes, "Christ distinguished between the flesh and the spirit, that believing not only what was apparent, but also what was invisible, they might know that what He spake was not carnal but spiritual. For to how many could His Body have sufficed for food that this might be for nourishment to all the world? But therefore He made mention of His ascension into heaven, that He might draw them from understanding it corporally; and that they might understand that the Flesh He spoke of was heavenly food from above, and spiritual nourishment given them by Him. For, says He, *the things that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life.* Which is as though He had said, My Body, which is shown and given for the world, shall be given in food, that it may be spiritually distributed to every one, and become to each a preservative unto the resurrection of eternal life."<sup>1</sup>

We have already heard St. Cyril of Jerusalem, the contemporary of Athanasius, declare his belief, that the Body and Blood of Christ are given us under the figure of bread and wine, and that the Capharnaites were misled by interpreting our Lord carnally, as though He meant a banquet upon flesh, not, as He ought to be interpreted, spiritually.<sup>2</sup> So, in a former lecture, speaking of the unction, which was given with baptism, figuring the anointing of the Holy Ghost, he writes, "Beware of supposing this bare unction. For as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer mere bread (οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς), but the Body of Christ; so also this holy ointment is no longer simple ointment, nor common, after the invocation, but the gift of Christ. . . . While thy body is anointed with the visible ointment, thy soul is

<sup>1</sup> τὸ πνεῦμα πρὸς τὰ κατὰ σάρκα διέστειλεν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον τὸ φαινόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπόστατον αὐτοῦ πιστεύσαντες μάθωσιν, ὅτι καὶ ἔ. λέγει οὐκ ἔστι σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ πνευματικά· πόσοις γὰρ ἤρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρώσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς τοῦτο τροφὴ γένηται; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς διαβάσεως ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ νιοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοῦ ἀφελεῖται καὶ λοιπὸν τὴν εἰρημένην σάρκα βρώσιν ἄνωθεν οὐράνιον, καὶ πνευματικὴν τροφὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ διδομένην

μάθωσιν. ἃ γὰρ λελάληκα, φησὶν, ὑμῖν πνεῦμα ἔστι καὶ ζωὴ. ἴσον τῷ εἰπεῖν, τὸ μὲν δεκνύμενον καὶ διδόμενον ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου δοθήσεται τροφὴ, ὡς πνευματικῶς ἐν ἐκάστῳ ταύτην ἀναδέσθαι, καὶ γίνεσθαι πᾶσι φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου.— Athanas. *In illud Evangelii*, "Quicumque dixerit," *Op.* Tom. i. p. 979.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. *Cateches. Mystag.* iv. 1, cited above.



sanctified by the Holy, life-giving Spirit.”<sup>1</sup> Here is a denial that the bread is *mere* bread, not that it still continues really bread; and a statement that it is the Body of Christ, but so the Body of Christ, as the unction was believed to be the Holy Ghost; *i. e.* not in a natural change of the substance, but in spirit, and power, and life.

St. Jerome clearly distinguishes between the natural Body and Blood of Christ, which were crucified and shed, and the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ, which are eaten and drunken by the faithful.<sup>2</sup> And so we must explain that language of his, which, as we saw above, appeared to savour of the later doctrine of the Latin Church. St. Chrysostom too, who used such glowing terms of the real presence of Christ, elsewhere explains himself, that we should look on all Sacraments, not outwardly and carnally, but spiritually and with the eyes of our souls.<sup>3</sup> And in the Epistle to Cæsarius, which is mostly esteemed to be his, and if not his, was certainly by a contemporary of his, we read that, “before the bread is consecrated, we call it bread; but, when it is consecrated, it is no longer called bread, but is held worthy to be called the Body of the Lord, yet still the substance of the bread remains.”<sup>4</sup>

We must now proceed to St. Augustine, whom all agree to honour. He has so much to the purpose, that how to choose is difficult. “Prepare not thy teeth, but thy heart.”<sup>5</sup> “Why make ready thy teeth and thy belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten.”<sup>6</sup> “Our Lord hesitated not to say, *This is my Body*, when He gave the sign of His Body.”<sup>7</sup> “Spiritually understand what I have spoken to you. You are not to eat that Body, which you see, and

<sup>1</sup> *Cat. Myst.* III. 8.

<sup>2</sup> “Dupliciter vero sanguis Christi et caro intelligitur: vel spiritualis illa et divina, de quo Ipse dixit: *Caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus*: et, *Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et sanguinem meum biberitis, non habebitis vitam æternam*: vel caro et sanguis quæ crucifixa est et qui militis effusus est lancea. Juxta hanc divisionem et in sanctis ejus diversitas sanguinis et carnis accipitur, ut alia sit caro quæ visura est salutare Dei, alia caro et sanguis quæ regnum Dei non queant possidere.” — Hieronym. *In Ephes.* cap. i. v. 7. Tom. IV. pt. I. p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> τί δέ ἐστι τὸ σαρκικῶς νοῆσαι; τὸ ἀπλῶς εἰς τὰ προκείμενα ὄραν, καὶ μὴ πλέον τι φαντάζεσθαι. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι σαρκικῶς. χρῆ δὲ μὴ οὕτω κρίνειν τοῖς ὀρωμένοις, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς ἔνδοξοις ὀφθαλμοῖς κατοπτρῆναι. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι πνευματικῶς. — Chrysost. *In Joann.* c. vi.; *Homil.* XLVII. Tom. VIII. p. 278.

<sup>4</sup> “Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus: divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis; dignus autem habitus Dominici Corporis appellatione, *etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit*, et non duo corpora, sed unum Corpus Filii prædicamus.” &c. — Chrysost. *Ad Cæsarium Monach.* Tom. III. p. 743. On the history and genuineness of this Epistle see Cave, *Histor. Literar.* Tom. I. p. 315; Routh's *Scriptor. Eccles. Opuscula*, p. 479; Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, II. p. 325, note.

<sup>5</sup> “Noli parare fauces, sed cor.” — *De Verbis Domini, Serm.* 33, Tom. V. p. 566.

<sup>6</sup> “Quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti.” — *In Joann. Tract.* 25, Tom. III. pars. II. p. 489.

<sup>7</sup> “Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, cum signum daret Corporis sui.” — *Contra Adimantum*, Tom. VIII. p. 124.

drink that Blood, which they will shed, who will crucify me. I have commended to you a Sacrament. Spiritually understood, it will quicken you. Though it must be visibly celebrated, yet it must invisibly be understood.”<sup>1</sup> “What you see is bread and the cup. But as your faith requires, the bread is Christ’s Body, the cup His Blood. How is the bread His Body? and the wine His Blood? These things, brethren, are therefore called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood. What appears has a bodily form: what is understood has a spiritual fruit.”<sup>2</sup> “The Body and Blood of Christ will then be life to each, if what is visibly received in the Sacrament be in actual verity spiritually eaten, spiritually drunk.”<sup>3</sup>

Theodoret may be our last witness, a witness against transubstantiation, but not against the truth of Christ’s presence, nor the real participation in His Body and Blood. “Our Saviour,” he tells us, “changed the names of things; giving to His Body the name of bread, and to the bread the name of His Body. His object was, that those who partake of the mysteries, should not have regard to the nature of the visible elements, but by the change of names, might believe that change which is wrought by grace. For He, who called His own Body food and bread, and again called Himself a vine, He honoured the visible symbols with the name of His Body and Blood, *not changing the nature, but adding to the nature grace.*”<sup>4</sup> And afterwards he says, “The mystic symbols depart not after consecration from their own nature, for they remain in the former substance; yet we understand what they have

<sup>1</sup> “Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum: non hoc Corpus quod videtis mandicaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquid vobis commendavi. Spiritualiter intellectum, vivificabit vos. Etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi.” — *In Psalm. xciii.* Tom. iv. p. 1066.

<sup>2</sup> “Quod videtis, panis est et calix, quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renunciant: quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est Corpus Christi, calix sanguis Christi. . . . Quomodo est panis corpus Ejus? et calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis Ejus? Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem.” — *Serm. 272 ad Infantes*, Tom. v. pars i. p. 1103.

<sup>3</sup> “Vita unicuique erit Corpus et Sanguis Christi, si quod in sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur. spiritualiter bibatur.” — *Serm. 2, De Verbis Apostoli*, Tom. v. pars i. p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> “Ὁ δὲ γε Σωτὴρ ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐνῆλλαξε τὰ ὀνόματα· καὶ τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα, τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος. οὕτως ἔμπελον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, αἶμα τὸ σύμβολον προσηγόρευσεν.

Δῆλος ὁ σκοπὸς τοῖς τὰ θεῖα μνημένους. ἐβουλήθη γὰρ τοῖς τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταλαγχάνοντας, μὴ τῇ φύσει τῶν βλεπομένων προσέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐναλλαγῆς πιστεῦεν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γεγεννημένῃ μεταβολῇ. ὁ γὰρ δὲ τὸ σῶμα σίτον καὶ ἄρτον προσηγορεύσας, καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν ἔμπελον ὀνομάσας, οὕτως τὰ δρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορία τετίμηκεν, οὐ τῆν φύσιν μεταβάλλων, ἀλλὰ τῆν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθηκώς. — *Dial. 1. ed. Sirmond.* Tom. iv. p. 17.

become, and believe and adore, as though they were what they are believed to be.”<sup>1</sup>

Space and time will not allow us a longer list of authorities. Those already adduced have been fairly chosen, and should be fairly weighed. The Christian student must not argue for victory, but search for truth. That search is seldom unattended by difficulties. Yet may it not in this case be safely concluded, that, weighing all considerations, and notwithstanding some remarkable phrases, the doctrine of the early ages was not in favour of a miraculous change in the consecrated elements, not in favour of a carnal presence of the natural Body of the Lord, but in favour of a real, effectual, life-giving presence of Christ's spiritual Body communicated to the faith, and feeding the souls, of His disciples?

There is, perhaps, another possible alternative. The early Church held firmly Christ's presence in His Sacraments. The tendency was, for the most part, not to explain, but to veil such subjects in a reverential mystery. It may therefore have been that, whereas a spiritual presence was originally and generally recognized, yet some may have suffered their reverence to degenerate into superstition, and have spoken, and perhaps thought, as though there were a carnal presence. There was probably a vagueness of apprehension on the subject among some. Their very religion tended to foster this. But one thing is certain, namely, that the doctrine of a carnal presence was never the ruled doctrine of the primitive ages, was not received, or rather was emphatically denied, by many of the greatest of the fathers, and that it does not come down to us with the sanction and authority of that which was always, everywhere, and by all men, anciently acknowledged (*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*). And another thing is most certain, namely, that, if any of the fathers did contemplate any beside a spiritual presence, it was not in the way of transubstantiation, but rather of consubstantiation. For, let us take the example of St. Hilary, who, if any one, used language most like the language of later ages. Still the very object of his reasoning was to prove, that in Christ's Person there are two natures: one not extinguished, because the other is added. He illustrates this by the bread of the Eucharist, which still retains the nature of the bread unchanged, although the nature of

<sup>1</sup> Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἀγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ καὶ πρότερον ἦν, νοεῖται δὲ ἄπερ ἐγένετο καὶ σύμβολα τῆς οὐκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει πιστεύεται, καὶ προσκυνεῖται ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος ἄπερ πιστεύεται. — *Dial.* 2, ed. Sirmond. καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ δρατὰ ἐστὶ καὶ ἀπᾶ, οἷα Tom. iv. p. 85.

Christ's Body is added to it. Now, interpret this how we may, it is a plain witness against transubstantiation. It may mean consubstantiation; it may mean a spiritual presence; but transubstantiation it cannot mean: for it was an error of Eutyches, not of the orthodox St. Hilary, that the human nature of the Saviour was absorbed and transubstantiated into the Divine.<sup>1</sup>

We must now pass on to the controversies of the Middle Ages. About A. D. 831, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbie, maintained the corporal presence.<sup>2</sup> Whether even he taught the full-grown doctrine of transubstantiation, or only consubstantiation, our divines have questioned. Certainly he speaks some things very unlike the former, and even more resembling the doctrine of spiritual feeding.<sup>3</sup> Yet he says, that "after the consecration nothing but the Body and Blood of Christ are to be believed;" an expression nearly approaching, if not fully expressing, the Roman doctrine.<sup>4</sup>

Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, a divine of the highest credit in the Church, wrote against the statements of Paschasius. The work is lost indeed; but the evidence of its former existence is strong and clear.<sup>5</sup>

Johannes Scotus Erigena, who at this period lived at the court of Charles the Bald, and sometimes with our own king Alfred, and who at his death was esteemed a martyr, and placed in the Roman Calendar, wrote a book by the command of the Emperor Charles, against the substantial change in the Sacraments; a book, which, two hundred years afterwards, was condemned at the council of Verceil, upon the ground that it made the bread and wine to be mere empty signs.<sup>6</sup>

Bertram too, or Ratramnus, a monk of Corbie, wrote, also at the desire of Charles the Bald, concerning this doctrine, which now began to agitate the Church. The book is still extant, and is well worthy to be read. Its genuineness has been attacked by the

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> Cave places him A. D. 841.

<sup>3</sup> "Christus ergo cibus est angelorum, et sacramentum hoc vere caro ipsius et sanguis, quam spiritualiter manducat et bibit homo." — *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> "Quia voluit (Dominus), licet in figura panis et vini, hæc sic esse, omnino nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt." — *Ibid.* cap. 1.

Bishop Cosin gives several specimens of his language (*Hist. of Transubstantiation*, ch. xxv. s. 29), and argues, that there is

nothing in his whole book "that favours the transubstantiation of the bread, or its destruction or removal." However, he quotes Bellarmine and Sirmondus as esteeming him so highly, that they were not ashamed to say that he was the first that had written to the purpose concerning the Eucharist; but there are some spurious additions to his book, which speak a stronger language than the book itself. See also Cave, *H. L.* Tom. i. p. 535.

<sup>5</sup> See Cave, *H. L.* p. 542.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* Tom. i. p. 549.

Roman Catholic writers, but with little success. Others have charged him with heresy; whilst others again have allowed him to be Catholic, but yet, like other Catholics, not free from some errors.<sup>1</sup> The book was finally prohibited by the Council of Trent. Bertram's statements are clear for the spiritual, and against the carnal presence in the Eucharist. "The change," he says, "is not wrought corporally, but spiritually and figuratively. Under the veil of the material bread and wine the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ exist . . . Both (the bread and wine), as they are corporally handled, are in their nature corporal creatures; but, according to their virtue, and what they become spiritually, they are the mysteries of Christ's Body and Blood."<sup>2</sup> "By all that hath been hitherto said, it appears, that the Body and Blood of Christ, which are received by the mouths of the faithful in the Church, are figures in respect of their visible nature; but in respect of the invisible substance, that is the power of the Word of God, they are truly Christ's Body and Blood. Wherefore, as they are visible creatures, they feed the body; but as they have the virtue of a more powerful substance, they do both feed and sanctify the souls of the faithful."<sup>3</sup>

The Middle Ages, if favourable to a reverent, were not less favourable to a superstitious spirit. Hence the principles of Paschasius were more likely to gain ground than those of Bertram; yet there are not wanting testimonies, for some time later, in favour of the spiritual and against the carnal presence. Especially it has been observed that the doctrine of the Anglo-Saxon Church was more than others in accordance with the primitive truth. The famous Ælfric was born probably about A. D. 956, and died about 1051. He was abbot, some say of St. Albans, others of Malmesbury or Peterborough; and afterwards Archbishop of York.<sup>4</sup> Some valu-

<sup>1</sup> *Index Expurgator*. Belgic. jussu et auctoritate Philip. II., cited by Aubertin. *De Eucharist.* p. 930; Cosin's *Hist. of Transubst.* ch. v. § 35; Bishop Taylor, *On the Real Presence*, § XII. 32.

<sup>2</sup> "At quia confitentur et Corpus et Sanguinem Christi esse, nec hoc esse potuisse nisi facta in melius commutatione, neque ista commutatio corporaliter sed spiritualiter facta sit, necesse est ut jam figurata facta esse dicatur: quoniam sub velamento corporei panis, corporeique vini, spirituale corpus Christi, spiritualisque sanguis existit . . . Secundum namque quod utrunque corporaliter continetur, species sunt creaturæ corporeæ; secundum potentiam vero, quod spiritual-

iter factæ sunt, mysteria sunt Corporis et Sanguinis Christi." — Ratramnus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. London, 1686, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> "Ex his omnibus, quæ sunt hactenus dicta, monstratum est quod corpus et sanguis Christi, quæ fidelium ore in ecclesia percipiuntur figuræ sunt secundum speciem visibilem: At vero secundum invisibilem substantiam, i. e. divini potentiam Verbi, Corpus et Sanguis vere Christi existunt. Unde secundum visibilem creaturam corpus pascunt, juxta vero potentioris virtutem substantiæ, mentes fidelium et pascunt et sanctificant." — *Ibid.* p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> See Cave, *H. L.* Tom I. p. 588;

able fragments of his writings remain in Latin and Anglo-Saxon, full of clear statements on the doctrine in question. "This is not," he says, "that Body in which He suffered for us, but spiritually it is made His Body and Blood."<sup>1</sup> "That housel" (*i. e.* the Eucharist) "is Christ's Body, not bodily but ghostly: not the Body which He suffered in, but the Body of which He spake, when He blessed bread and wine to housel, a night before His suffering,"<sup>2</sup> &c.

Not much later than Ælfric was Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers, who appears to have been a man of great piety. He strenuously maintained the doctrine, which had been taught by Bertram, Scotus, and Ælfric, teaching that the bread and wine remained in their natural substance, yet not denying the invisible grace of the Sacrament. It is probable that many of the Gallican Church sided with him. He was condemned, however, and with him the writings of Johannes Erigena, by a Council at Verceil under Leo IX., A. D. 1050, on the ground that they taught the bread and wine in the Eucharist to be only bare signs. Under Victor the Second, another Council was held at Tours, A. D. 1055, at which Hildebrand presided as legate, where Berengarius freely declared that he did not believe the bread and wine to be mere empty shadows. Under Nicholas II., a new council was called at Rome (A. D. 1059); where Berengarius was forced to recant, and to declare that the "bread and wine after consecration became the very Body and Blood of Christ, and that they are touched and broken by the hands of the priests, and ground by the teeth of the faithful, not sacramentally only, but in truth and sensibly." After a time, however, he again maintained the doctrine of the spiritual presence; and Lanfranc, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, entered the lists of controversy against him, in whose work are fragments preserved to us of the writings of Berengarius. At length Hildebrand came to the papal chair, as Gregory VII. He summoned another council at Rome, A. D. 1078; and another A. D. 1079. At the former Berengarius acknowledged, that the real

Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, ch. iv. pp. 218-229. There appear to have been two Ælfrics, one Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other of York. The latter, a friend and disciple of the former, is generally supposed to have been the author of the Homilies. See Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 187.

<sup>1</sup> "Non sit tamen hoc sacrificium Corpus Ejus in quo passus est pro nobis, neque Sanguis Ejus, quem pro nobis

effudit: sed spiritualiter Corpus Ejus efficitur et sanguis." — *Ælfrici Epistola ad Wulfstanum*; Routh, *Opuscula*, p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> From Ælfric's *Epistle to Wulfsine, Bishop of Sherburn*, Routh, p. 528. The passage quoted is from the Old English translation of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Anglo-Saxon is given by Dr. Routh (*loc. cit.*) with the English and Latin versions.

Body and Blood of Christ were present at the Eucharist, without saying anything of transubstantiation ; and it is supposed that the Pope was satisfied with this, and unwilling to proceed further. But at the latter, the enemies of Berengarius prevailed, and he was forced to declare that the bread and wine are substantially converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, which Body after consecration is present, not only sacramentally, but in verity of substance.<sup>1</sup>

It is very doubtful when the term *transubstantiation* was first used. It is said to have been invented by Stephen, Bishop of Augustodunum, about the year 1100, in his book *De Sacramento Altaris*.<sup>2</sup>

Under Innocent III., A. D. 1216, sat the famous Council of Lateran, by which that term, and the full form of the doctrine, were sanctioned and made authoritative. Seventy chapters were drawn up by Innocent himself. When proposed to the Council, they were received without debate, and silence was supposed to imply consent. The first chapter is directed against the Manichæan heresy, and among other things, declares that, in the sacrifice of the Mass, "Christ's Body and Blood are really contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into His Body, and the wine into His Blood."<sup>3</sup> It has been acknowledged by the Schoolmen and Romanists, that before this Council the doctrine of transubstantiation was not an article of the faith.<sup>4</sup> From this time, however, it became established as part of the Creed of the Roman Church. The Council of Constance, A. D. 1415, in the eighth session, condemned Wicliffe for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of the corporal presence. The Council of Florence, A. D. 1439, at which Greek bishops and deputies were present, left the doctrine untouched. But the instruction to the Armenians, which runs only in the name of Pope Eugenius, and was not submitted to the Council, but which Roman Catholic authors often cite as a synodical decree, says, that "by virtue of the

<sup>1</sup> "Corde credo et ore profiteor panem et vinum quæ ponuntur in altari, per mysterium sacræ orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram ac propriam et vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et post consecrationem esse verum Christi Corpus, quod natum est de Virgine, et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce pendit — non tantum per signum et virtutem sacramenti, sed et in proprietate naturæ et veritate

substantiæ." — *Concil.* Tom. x. p. 378. See Cosin's *Hist. of Transubst.* ; also Mosheim, *E. H.* cent. xi. part II. ch. III.

<sup>2</sup> In *B. Patrum*, Tom. x. p. 412. See Jer. Taylor *On the Real Presence*, sect. XII. 32.

<sup>3</sup> *Concil.* Tom. xi. p. 117.

<sup>4</sup> See Bramhall's *Answer to M. de la Milletière*, pt. 1. disc. 1. ; *Works, Anglo-Cath. Lib.* 1. p. 14 ; Jer. Taylor, *On the Real Presence*, § 1. 2.

words of Christ, the substance of the bread and wine is turned into the substance of His Body and Blood.”<sup>1</sup> At length the Council of Trent, A. D. 1551, decreed, that by “consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s Body and Blood.”<sup>2</sup> An anathema is pronounced against all who deny such change of the substance (the forms yet remaining), a change which the Church Catholic aptly calls transubstantiation.<sup>3</sup> Finally in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., (A. D. 1563,) there is a profession of faith, that the Body and Blood of Christ, together “with His Soul and Divinity, are truly and really and substantially in the Eucharist, and that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into His Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into His Blood; which conversion the Church Catholic calls transubstantiation.”<sup>4</sup>

The doctrine then of transubstantiation, and (as it is improperly called) *the real presence*, is the established doctrine of the Roman Church. There is still, however, a room for difference of statement and difference of thought upon the subject. It appears to be ruled, that the substance only, not the accidents, undergo a change. Now it is almost questionable, whether the accidents do not comprise all the properties of matter. If so, the change may still be spiritual rather than material. And here we get a phenomenon by no means without parallel in other Roman Catholic articles of faith. For, as in saint worship some only ask departed friends to pray for them, whilst others bow down to the stock of a tree; so in the Eucharist, the learned and enlightened appear to acknowledge a far more spiritual change than is taught to the equally devout but more credulous multitude. For the latter all kinds of miracles have been devised, and visions, wherein the Host has seemed to disappear, and the infant Saviour has been seen in its room; or where Blood has flowed in streams from the consecrated wafer, impiously preserved by unbelieving communicants. But on the other hand, by the more learned and liberal, statements have been made perpetually in acknowledgment of a spiritual rather than a carnal presence; and such as no enlightened Protestant would cavil at or refuse.

<sup>1</sup> See Cosin, *On Transubstantiation*, Bk. VII. § 30.

<sup>2</sup> Sess. XIII. cap. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Sess. XIII. *De Eucharist.* can. iv.

<sup>4</sup> “Profiteor pariter in missa offerri Deo, verum, proprium et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis, atque in sanctissimo Eucharistiæ sacramento

esse vere, realiter et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem, una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia transubstantiationem appellat.”



St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the immediate forerunner of the schoolmen (A. D. 1115), acknowledged no feeding but a spiritual feeding.<sup>1</sup> Peter Lombard, the famous Master of the Sentences (A. D. 1141), though speaking of the conversion of the bread and wine, declines to determine whether that conversion be formal or substantial, or of some other kind.<sup>2</sup> Aquinas (A. D. 1255) spoke of Christ's Body as present, not bodily but substantially;<sup>3</sup> a distinction not easy to explain. Durandus (A. D. 1320) said that, though we believe the presence, we know not the manner of the presence.<sup>4</sup> Cuthbert Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, said that, "Before the Lateran Council it was free to every one to hold as they would concerning the manner; and that it would have been better to leave curious persons to their own conjectures."<sup>5</sup> Cardinal Cajetan writes, that "The real Body of Christ is eaten in the Sacrament, yet not corporally but spiritually. Spiritual manducation, which is made by the soul, reaches to the flesh of Christ, which is in the Sacrament."<sup>6</sup> And Gardiner, in his controversy with Cranmer says, "The Catholic teaching is, that the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament is spiritual and supernatural, not corporal nor carnal, not natural, not sensible, nor perceptible, but only spiritual, the how and manner whereof God knoweth."<sup>7</sup>

Let us now pass to the doctrines of the Reformation, merely observing by the way, that the dogma of transubstantiation, though formally decreed by the Roman Church, has never been adopted by the Greek. Luther, if not the inventor, has been esteemed the great patron of the doctrine of consubstantiation. Whilst rejecting the idea of a change in the substance of the elements, he believed in a presence *with* the elements, of the material substance of Christ's Body and Blood. He appears to have had recourse to the same illustration which had been used to explain the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ; namely, that, as in red-hot iron there is the nature both of iron and fire, so in the Eucharist

<sup>1</sup> "Eadem Caro nobis, sed spiritualiter utique, non carnaliter exhibetur." — *Sermo. De S. Martino*. See Jer. Taylor, *Real Presence*, § 1. 8; Cosin, *On Transubstantiation*, ch. vii. § 13, who gives several quotations from St. Bernard to this effect.

<sup>2</sup> "Si autem queritur qualis sit illa conversio, an formaliter an substantialiter, vel alterius generis, diffinire non sufficio." — *Sent. iv. Dist. 10*. See Cosin, *as above*, § 15.

<sup>3</sup> See Jer. Taylor, *as above*, § xi. 20.

<sup>4</sup> "Verbum audimus, motum senti-

mus, modum nescimus, presentiam credimus." — Neand. *Synops. Chron.* p. 203, quoted by Jer. Taylor, *as above*, § 1. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Tonstal, *De Eucharist.* Lib. i. p. 46; Jer. Taylor, *as above*.

<sup>6</sup> "Manducatur verum Corpus Christi in sacramento, sed non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter. Spiritualis manducatio, quæ per animam fit, ad Christi carnem in sacramento existentem pertingit." — *Opusc. Tom. II. Tract. 2, De Euch. c. v.*; Jer. Taylor, *as above*, § vii. 8.

<sup>7</sup> Cranmer's *Works*, 111. p. 241, *Answer to Gardiner*.

there is both the bread and the Body of the Lord. Strong as are his expressions in the arguments which he used with the Sacramentarians, still from his less controversial statements, we may almost be led to think that Luther did not much go beyond a faith in the spiritual presence. Controversy often produces extreme statements: and it may have been so with him.<sup>1</sup> He does indeed say in a comparatively uncontroversial tract, that there are "the real Body and Blood of Christ *in* and *under* the bread and wine."<sup>2</sup> But then he speaks of faith as the means whereby we obtain the benefits of the Sacrament, as that to which they are exhibited.<sup>3</sup>

As to the public documents of the Lutherans, the Confession of Augsburg simply declares, that the Body and Blood of Christ are really given with the bread and wine.<sup>4</sup> But the Saxon Confession says, that "In this communion Christ is truly and substantially present, and His Body and Blood are truly exhibited to those who receive."<sup>5</sup>

The great leader among the reformers, of those who took an opposite view to Luther, was Zuingle. He was not satisfied to reject a material presence; but he even denied a presence of any sort. With him the bread and wine were empty signs. Feeding on Christ was a figure for believing in Him. The Communion was but a ceremony to remind us of Him. Spiritual manducation was resting upon the mercy of God.<sup>6</sup> He probably may have modified these statements afterwards; yet they thoroughly belonged to his system.

Calvin took a middle course between Luther and Zuingle. With the former he acknowledged a real presence of Christ in His Supper; with the latter he denied a corporal or material presence. Having stated the view of the Sacramentarians, that to eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of Christ is merely to believe on Him, he says, "But to me Christ appears to have intended something

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, *De Sacramento Altaris*, *Opp.* Tom. i. p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> "Esse verum corpus et sanguinem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, in et sub pane et vino per verbum Christi."—*Catechismus Major*, Tom. v. p. 641.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> "De Cœna Domini docent quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi, vescentibus in Cœna Domini."—*Confess. August.* Art. x.; *Sylloge*, p. 172.

<sup>5</sup> "Vere adesse Christum, et vere exhiberi sumentibus corpus et sanguinem Christi."—*Sylloge*, p. 282.

<sup>6</sup> "Sacramentaliter edere esse aliud

non potest quam signum aut symbolum edere."—*De Vera et Falsa Religione, Opera Zuinglii*, pars 2, Tom. i. fol. 215. He denies that there can be any spiritual Body of Christ, except His Church, fol. 216. Again: "Sacramentum est sacræ rei signum. Cum ergo Sacramentum Corporis Christi nomino, non quicquam aliud, quam panem, qui Corporis Christi pro nobis mortui figura et typus est, intelligo."—*De Cœna Domini*, *Ibid.* fol. 274. "Spiritualiter edere Corpus Christi nihil est aliud, quam spiritu ac mente niti misericordia et bonitate Dei, propter Christum."—*Fidei Christianæ Expositio*, *Ibid.* fol. 555.

more express and sublime in that famous discourse of His, where He commends to us the eating of His flesh; namely, that by a real participation of Him we be quickened; which He therefore designated under the words eating and drinking, lest any should think that the life we derive from Him is received by simple cognition. For as, not the sight, but the eating of the bread gives nourishment to the body, so it is needful that, for the soul to be wholly partaker of Christ, it should be quickened by His virtue to life eternal."<sup>1</sup>

The elements, according to him, receive the name of Christ's Body and Blood, "because they are, as it were, instruments whereby Christ distributes them to us."<sup>2</sup> And, "if we believe the truth of God, we must believe that there is an inward substance of the Sacrament in the Lord's Supper joined to the outward signs; and so, that, as the bread is given by the hands, the Body of Christ is also communicated, that we be partakers of Him."<sup>3</sup> "That Body, which you see not, is to you a spiritual aliment. Does it seem incredible, that we are fed by the Flesh of Christ, which is so far from us? We must remember, that the work of the Spirit is secret and wonder-working, which it would be profane to measure by our intelligence."<sup>4</sup> Thus then to receive Christ in the Eucharist is not merely to believe in Him; yet it is by faith we are enabled to receive Him. By believing we eat Christ's Flesh, because by faith our feeding on Him is effected; and that feeding is the fruit of faith. "With them," (*i. e.* the Zuinglians,) he writes,

<sup>1</sup> *Institut.* iv. xvii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> "Corporis vero et sanguinis nomen eis attributum, quod sint velut instrumenta, quibus Dominus Jesus Christus nobis ea distribuit." — Calvinus, *De Cœna Domini, Opuscula.* Genevæ, 1552, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> "Ita in communione, quam in Christi corpore et sanguine habemus, dicendum est, mysterium spirituale esse, quod nec oculis conspici, nec ingenio humano comprehendere potest. Figuris igitur et signis, quæ sub oculorum sensum cadunt, ut naturæ nostræ imbecillitas requirit ostenditur; ita tamen ut non sit figura nuda et simplex, sed veritati suæ et substantiæ conjuncta. . . ."

"Necesse est igitur nos in Cœna vere corpus et sanguinem Christi recipere, cum utriusque communionem Dominus repræsentet. Quid enim sibi vellet, nos panem comedere ac vinum bibere, ut significant carnem ipsius cibum esse nostrum, et sanguinem potum, si veritate spirituali prætermissa, vinum et panem solummodo præberet. . . ."

"Itaque fatendum est si vera sit repræsentatio quam adhibet Deus, in cœna substantiam interiorem sacramenti visibilibus signis conjunctam esse, et quemadmodum panis in manu distribuitur, ita Corpus Christi, ut Ejus participes simus, nobis communicari. Hoc certe etiam, si nihil aliud esset, nobis abunde satisfacere deberet, cum intelligimus Christum nobis in Cœna veram propriamque corporis et sanguinis sui substantiam nobis donare — ut pleno jure ipsum possideamus, et possidendo in omnem bonorum suorum societatem vocemur." — *Ibid.* pp. 133, 134.

<sup>4</sup> "Corpus, quod nequaquam cernis, spirituale est tibi alimentum. Incredibile hoc tibi videtur, pasci nos Christi carne, quæ tam procul a nobis distat? Meminerimus, arcanum et mirificum esse Spiritus Sancti opus, quod intelligentiæ tuæ modulo metiri sit nefas." — Calvin. *In 1 Cor.* xi. 24, cited by Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, c. viii.

“the feeding is faith: with me the power of feeding comes as a consequence of faith.”<sup>1</sup>

Melancthon, the disciple, friend, and successor of Luther, is supposed to have hesitated between a material and a spiritual presence. In the Confession of Augsburg, which is due to him, we have already seen strong words, which sound like consubstantiation. He is said to have used in earlier days the word *corporaliter*, to express the mode in which Christ communicates His Flesh and Blood in the Eucharist, but to have avoided such expressions, after much intercourse on the question with Œcolampadius.<sup>2</sup> After Luther's death, he had the chief voice and influence among the Lutherans; and through his peaceful counsels in Germany, and Calvin's sound views in Switzerland, much greater concord prevailed on this question among the continental Protestants, than had existed during the lifetime of the great reformer of Wittenberg; the Lutherans and Zuinglians both consenting to modify their views and statements.<sup>3</sup> Insomuch that Hooker observed concerning them: “By opening the several opinions which have been held, they are grown for aught I can see on all sides, at the length to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely, the real participation of Christ, and of life in His Body and Blood by means of this Sacrament.”<sup>4</sup>

From the continental Protestants, we must turn to England. Cranmer and Ridley appear to have retained the doctrines of the corporal presence and of transubstantiation throughout the reign of Henry VIII. The formularies of that reign all seem to teach it. Ridley is said to have been converted to a belief in the spiritual (instead of the natural) presence, by reading the treatise of Bertram or Ratramn, probably about the year 1545.<sup>5</sup> At this time Cranmer was zealous for transubstantiation. But Ridley communicated to the Archbishop what he had discovered in the writings of Ratramn; and they then set themselves to examine the matter with more than ordinary care.<sup>6</sup> Ridley indeed refused to take the credit of converting Cranmer;<sup>7</sup> but Cranmer himself always acknowledged his obligations to Ridley.<sup>8</sup> It has been thought that Cranmer went through two changes: to consubstantiation first, and then to the spiritual feeding; and most probably

<sup>1</sup> “*Illis manducatio est fides, mihi ex fide potius consequi videtur.*” — *Institut.* iv. xvii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See Jer. Taylor, *On Real Presence*, § 1. 9.

<sup>3</sup> See Mosh. *E. H.* Cent. xvi. sect. III. pt. II. ch. 1. 27, and ch. II. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Hooker, *E. P.* Bk. v. ch. LXXVII. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 166.

<sup>6</sup> Burnet, *Hist. of Reformation*, pt. II. Bk. I. p. 107.

<sup>7</sup> *Ridley's Life*, p. 169.

<sup>8</sup> *Cranmer's Remains*, (Jenky 18.) IV. p. 97.

there may have been some gradual progress in his convictions.<sup>1</sup> Yet it was constantly affirmed by him that, before he put forth the translation of the Catechism of Justus Jonas, commonly called Cranmer's Catechism, he had fully embraced the spiritual doctrine, and that the strong phrases there used concerning the real presence and the real feeding on Christ, were intended of a spiritual presence and a spiritual feeding, not of consubstantiation.<sup>2</sup>

After this both Cranmer and Ridley, to whom we are chiefly indebted for our formularies, maintained a doctrine nearly identical with that maintained by Calvin, and before him by Bertram. With the latter Ridley expresses his entire accordance.<sup>3</sup> He constantly declares that, whilst he rejects all presence of the natural Body and Blood, in the way of transubstantiation, he yet acknowledges a real presence of Christ, spiritually and by grace, to be received by the faithful in the Communion of the Eucharist.<sup>4</sup> Cranmer has by some been thought to incline nearer to Zuinglianism; yet, if fair allowance be made for hasty expressions in the irritation of controversy, it will probably appear that he, like Ridley, followed the doctrine of the ancient Church, and held a real reception of Christ in the Spirit. Certainly we find him writing as follows: "I say (as all the holy fathers and martyrs used to say) that we receive Christ spiritually, by faith with our minds eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood: so that we receive Christ's own very natural Body, but not naturally nor corporally."<sup>5</sup> "It is my constant faith and belief, that we receive Christ in the Sacrament, verily and truly . . . But . . . you think a man cannot receive the Body of Christ verily, unless he take Him corporally in his corporal mouth . . . My doctrine is that . . . He is by faith spiritually present with us, and is our spiritual food and nourishment, and sitteth

<sup>1</sup> The subject is discussed by Dr. Jenkyns, note to *Cranmer's Works*, iv. p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> *Cranmer's Works*, ii. p. 440, iii. pp. 13, 297, 344.

<sup>3</sup> See *Enchiridion Theologicum*, i. p. 56.

<sup>4</sup> "I say that the Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, but yet sacramentally and spiritually (according to His grace) giving life, and in that respect really, that is, according to His benediction, giving life. . . . The true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper to be communicated to the godly by grace and spiritually, as I have often showed, and by a sacramental signification, but not by the corporal presence of the Body of His Flesh." — *Works*, Parker Society, p. 286.

"That heavenly Lamb is (as I confess) on the table: but by a spiritual presence, and not after any corporeal presence of the Flesh taken of the Virgin Mary." — *Ibid.* p. 249.

"Both you and I agree in this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which is born of the Virgin Mary . . . . We confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I confess Christ's natural Body to be in the Sacrament by Spirit and grace . . . . You make a proper kind of being, inclosing a natural Body under the shape and form of bread and wine." — Fox, *Martyrs*, ii. p. 1598. Lond. 1597, cited by *Laud against Fisher*, § 35.

<sup>5</sup> *Remains*, iii. p. 5.

in the midst of all them that be gathered together in His Name ; and this feeding is spiritual feeding and an heavenly feeding, far passing all corporal and carnal feeding, in deed and not in figure only, or not at all, as you most untruly report my saying to be.”<sup>1</sup> “I say that the same visible and palpable Flesh that was for us crucified, &c. &c., is eaten of Christian people at His Holy supper . . . The diversity is not in the Body, but in the eating thereof ; no man eating it carnally, but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, that is, figuratively.”<sup>2</sup>

These sentiments of our reformers are undoubtedly embodied in our Liturgy and Articles. One thing indeed has been thought to savour of a tendency to Zuinglianism. The first Service Book of Edward VI., drawn up undoubtedly after Cranmer had embraced the doctrine of the spiritual presence, contained, as did all the ancient Liturgies, an invocation of the Holy Ghost to bless the bread and wine ; “that they might be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ.” This was omitted in the second Service Book ; probably lest the grace of the Sacrament should thus seem to be tied to the consecrated elements. But a still more remarkable departure from the ancient forms was this. Whereas, in the first Service Book, the words of administration were, “The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto eternal life ;” in the second Service Book they were merely, “Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.”<sup>3</sup> This seemed to imply that the reformers believed in no real spiritual reception of Christ’s Body in the Eucharist, but only in a remembrance of His death and passion. Accordingly, in the reign of Elizabeth the two forms were combined together, and have ever since continued in use in the Church. But though this change looked like an inclination on the part of the earlier reformers to the doctrine of the mere figurists, yet it is by no means certain that some of the alterations in the Service Book were agreeable to our leading divines ;<sup>4</sup> and notwithstanding this alteration, there remained numerous statements in our formularies to prove that a real but spiritual presence of Christ was, and is the doctrine of the reformed Church of England.

Thus we are told in the exhortation to communion, that God

<sup>1</sup> *Remains*, III. pp. 288, 289.

<sup>3</sup> *Two Liturgies of Edward VI.* p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 340. See also II. p. 441, IV. Oxf. 1838.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 12, note 1.

“hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament.” It is said that, “if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament . . . we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood.” In what is called the “prayer of humble access,” we ask that God would “give us grace so to eat the Flesh of His dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood.” In the prayer of consecration, we speak of being “partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood;” and in the post-communion we thank God that He doth “vouchsafe to feed us with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.” So likewise in this Article it is professed, that “to them who worthily receive, . . . 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.” All these are expressions in the second Service Book of Edward VI., and in the Articles drawn up in that reign. The latter part of the Catechism is of later date, but in strict accordance with the earlier documents. Its words are, that “the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.”

In this XXVIIIth Article, as first drawn up A. D. 1552, there was a clause stating, that Christ in bodily presence is in Heaven, and therefore that we ought not to confess “the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ’s Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.” This nearly corresponds with the statement of the rubric at the end of our present communion Service.<sup>1</sup> Both the clause in the Article and the rubric were omitted in Elizabeth’s reign, lest persons inclined to the Lutheran belief might be too much offended by it; and many such were in the Church, whom it was wished to conciliate. The rubric was again restored in the reign of Charles II. The meaning of it clearly is, not to deny a spiritual, but only a “corporal presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood,” “and a consequent adoration of the

<sup>1</sup> Concerning that rubric see above, p. 106, note 1, p. 113, note 2.

Luther much insisted on the ubiquity of the human nature of our blessed Lord, derived to it from the union with the Divine nature. But we must not believe the human nature transubstantiated into the Divine, as Eutyches taught.

St. Augustine observes that Christ, according to His human nature, is now on

God’s right hand, and thence shall come to judgment; and according to that nature He is not everywhere. “Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstruamus hominis, ut veritatem Corporis auferamus.” — *Epist.* 187, Tom. II. p. 681, quoted above, p. 113, note 2. See this subject most admirably handled by Hooker, *E. P.* v. 55.

elements, as though they did not remain still in their very natural substances."

The Homilies are very express. "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no *untrue figure of a thing absent* (Matt. xxvi.); but as the Scripture saith, The table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win to their bodies a resurrection to immortality"<sup>1</sup> (1 Cor. x.)

Bishop Jewel, who perhaps was the chief writer of this Second Book of Homilies, says in his Apology: "We plainly pronounce in the Supper the Body and Blood of the Lord, the Flesh of the Son of God, to be truly exhibited to those who believe."<sup>2</sup> And again, after protesting against transubstantiation, he says, "yet when we say this, we do not lower the Lord's Supper, nor make it a mere frigid ceremony. We assert, that Christ exhibits Himself really present in the Sacraments; in baptism, that we may put Him on, in His Supper, that we may feed on Him by faith and in spirit . . . and this we say is not done perfunctorily, nor frigidly, but in very deed and truly."<sup>3</sup>

It appears, then, that our reformers symbolized herein with Calvin; though it is not likely that they learned their doctrine from him. Points of difference may be discovered between them; but in the main, Calvin, Melancthon in his later views, and the Anglican divines, were at one. There have, no doubt, been different ways of explaining the spiritual presence, among those who have agreed to acknowledge such a presence. But perhaps the safest plan is to say, that because it is spiritual, therefore it needs must be mystical. And so Bishop Taylor concludes, that our doctrine differs not from that of ancient writers, who acknowledged Christ's presence, but would not define the manner of His presence. For

<sup>1</sup> *Second Book of Homilies*, "First part of the Sermon Concerning the Sacrament."

<sup>2</sup> "Diserteque pronunciamus in cœna credentibus vere exhiberi Corpus et Sanguinem Domini, carnem Filii Dei."—Juelli *Apologia*. *Ench. Theolog.* p. 126.

<sup>3</sup> "Non tamen cum ista dicimus, extenuamus Cœnam Domini aut eam frigidam tantum cœremoniam esse docemus.

. . . Christum enim asserimus, vere sese præsentem exhibere in sacramentis suis; in baptismo, ut Eum induamus, in cœna, ut Eum fide et spiritu comedamus, et de Ejus cruce et sanguine habeamus vitam æternam; idque dicimus non perfunctorie et frigide, sed re ipsa et vere fieri."—*Ibid.* p. 129. Compare Noel's *Catechism*, *Ench. Theol.* p. 320, where the same doctrine is propounded.



he observes that we say, "the presence of Christ is real, and it is spiritual; and this account still leaves the Article in its deepest mystery; because spiritual perfections are indiscernible, and the word 'spiritual' is a very general term, particular in nothing but that it excludes the corporal and natural."<sup>1</sup>

It would be endless, and it is unnecessary, to say much concerning our divines since the Reformation. Some perhaps, who have followed Calvin in his predestinarian theory, have followed, not him, but Zuingle, upon the Sacraments. And this too may have been the bent of those who afterwards more especially followed Arminius, both here and on the Continent.<sup>2</sup> But from the time of the Reformation to the present, all the great luminaries of our Church have maintained the doctrine which appears in the face of our formularies; agreeing to deny a corporal, and to acknowledge a spiritual feeding in the Supper of the Lord. It is scarcely necessary to recount the names of Mede, Andrewes, Hooker, Taylor, Hammond, Cosin, Bramhall, Usher, Pearson, Patrick, Bull, Beveridge, Wake, Waterland. All these have left us writings on the subject, and all have coincided, with but very slight diversity, in the substance of their belief. They have agreed, as Hooker says, that "Christ is *personally* present; albeit a part of Christ be *corporally* absent;"<sup>3</sup> that "the fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ" — but that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament (*i. e.* in the elements); but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."<sup>4</sup>

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

### I. *The Words of Institution.*

WE know that almost all the sacrifices, among both Jews and Gentiles, were succeeded by a feast upon the body of the sacrificed victim; the persons, who thus fed upon the sacrifice, declaring their interest in the sacred rite, and through it entering

<sup>1</sup> Jer. Taylor, § 1. 2.

<sup>2</sup> There is a very pious work by one of the Arminian writers in the English Church (Horneck's *Crucified Jesus*). It has much to edify and spiritualize, but

if I understand it, its doctrine is purely Zuinglian.

<sup>3</sup> Book v. lxxvii. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Book v. xviii. 6.

into covenant with the God.<sup>1</sup> Now the Passover was the most solemn and significant of all the sacrifices of the Law, the most remarkable of all the types of our redemption. In its first institution, it was ordained that the lamb should be slain, evidently in the way of a propitiatory offering,<sup>2</sup> in order that the destroying angel, which smote the Egyptians, might not destroy those for whom this offering was made. Yet no one had a claim to exemption from the destruction, except those on whose lintels and doorposts the blood of the lamb was sprinkled, and who had partaken of the feast upon the lamb slain, — they and all their households.<sup>2</sup> The feast was, as it were, the consummation of the sacrifice; the efficacy of the latter being assured only to those who partook of the former.

It is not a little observable then, that our blessed Saviour, the night before He suffered, or (if we take the Jewish reckoning from evening to evening) the very day on which He suffered, superseded the typical feast of the Passover by the commemorative feast of the Eucharist. He first, according to the Law, ate the Passover with His disciples. Then, supper being ended,<sup>4</sup> and probably after He had washed the feet of His disciples,<sup>5</sup> He instituted a new rite appropriate to the New Covenant, but with peculiar reference to the rite under the Old Covenant. With the Passover, by Divine ordinance, there had been always eaten unleavened bread; and, by immemorial custom, there had been four cups of wine poured out; over each of which thanks were offered up, “and of which the third cup was specially called the cup of blessing.”<sup>6</sup> Now the bread and the wine, thus eaten and drunk solemnly at the Passover, our Lord adopts, as the signs or elements for the institution of His new Sacrament. The bread at the Passover was blessed and broken, the wine was blessed and poured out.<sup>7</sup> These same ceremonies our Lord now uses. He breaks the bread and blesses it; He pours out the wine and blesses it. In the feast of the Passover the bread and wine had been but subordinate; the latter not even of Divine authority. Our Lord makes them now the chief. Before, the chief place had been occupied by the Paschal Lamb. It was slain and eaten in commemoration of the first Passover, in type and

<sup>1</sup> See Cudworth, *True Notion of the Lord's Supper*, ch. i.

<sup>2</sup> See the true sacrificial nature of the Passover proved, Cudworth, as above. ch. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Exod. xii. 2-13.

<sup>4</sup> μετὰ τὸ δεῖνῆσαι, Luke xxii. 20.

<sup>5</sup> John xiii. 2, seq.

<sup>6</sup> Buxtorf, *De Cæna Dom.* § 22; Lightfoot, *H. H.* on Matt. xxvi. 26, 27.

Lightfoot, *Ibid.*

anticipation of the Saviour Himself. But now that the type was succeeded by the antitype, and that the feast must therefore be commemorative, not anticipatory, our Lord puts the bread and wine in place of the flesh of the Lamb; that, as the latter had been eaten as a type of Him, so the former should be eaten and drunk in remembrance of Him.

It has been observed, that the lamb, when set on the table to be eaten at the Passover, was commonly called by the Jews "the body of the Paschal Lamb;" and it seems not unnatural to suppose that our Lord, as adopting otherwise on this occasion their customs and language, should here also have alluded to their common phrase. They had spoken of eating "the body of the lamb" (נֹבַחַי אֶשֶׁל פֶּקֶדֶשׁ הַפֶּסַח), and when He blessed the Bread, He said of it, "This is My Body;" as though He would say, "Heretofore you ate the body of the Lamb, a type of Me to be delivered to death for you. Now I abrogate this forever; and instead, I give you My Body to be crucified and broken for you; and so hereafter, when you eat this bread, think not of the Paschal Lamb, which, like all types, is now done away in Me; but believe that you feed on My Body broken, to deliver you, not from Egyptian bondage, but from the far worse bondage of death and hell."<sup>1</sup>

Again, when our Lord had broken and blessed the bread, and giving it to His disciples, had called it His Body, He then took the cup, poured it out, blessed it, and called it His Blood. And it is observable that, as when Moses sprinkled the people with the blood of the sacrifice, he said of it, "Behold the blood of the Covenant;"<sup>2</sup> so our Lord and Saviour, in giving His disciples this cup to drink, said of it, "This is My Blood of the New Covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 24).

In almost all respects then, the institution of the Eucharist was likened to the sacrificial feasts of the Jews; most especially to the feast of the Passover.<sup>3</sup> It had only this point of difference:

<sup>1</sup> Buxtorf, *De Cæna Dom.* § 25; Lightfoot, *H. H.* on Luke xxii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xxiv. 8; Heb. ix. 20.

<sup>3</sup> A question has been raised whether our Saviour and His disciples had been eating the Paschal lamb or not, before He instituted the Eucharist; the ground for the question being that other well-known doubt, namely, Was the Thursday or the Friday the day on which the Passover ought to be eaten? However this latter may be solved, there seems no possibility of evading the force of Luke xxii. 15:

"With desire have I desired to eat *this Passover* with you before I suffer." (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 17-19; Mark xiv. 12-16). The true solution of the difficulty has always appeared to me to be this. The commandment was that the Passover should be slain on the 14th day of the month, "between the two evenings," בֵּין הָעֶרְבַיִם (Exod. xii. 6); that is to say, from the evening of the 14th to the evening of the 15th day of the month, according to the common

that, whereas in all the ancient feasts the victim was actually killed, and then its natural body was eaten ; here the feast was instituted (though on the day of His death, yet) before our blessed Lord was crucified, and bread and wine were substituted in the room of His natural Flesh and Blood. Yet the bread and wine He called His Body and Blood ; even as the flesh of the lamb was called the body of the Paschal lamb. And we can scarcely fail to infer that, as the flesh of the old sacrifice was never called the Body of Christ, but (what it really was) the body of the lamb, and as on the contrary the elements in the newly founded feast *were* called the Body and Blood of Christ, so the new festival must have had a closer connection with the great and true sacrifice than had the slaughtered victim, which represented Him in the old festival. The bread and wine were His Body and Blood, in a sense beyond that in which the Paschal lamb was Christ ; that is to say, not merely in a figure, but in more than a figure.

Now this the very nature of the case would lead us to expect. Under the Law were mere lifeless ceremonies ; but under the Gospel there is substance, instead of shadow. Under the Law there were sacrifices of slain beasts ; and the feast was therefore on the flesh of slain beasts. But under the Gospel there is no sacrifice, but of the Lamb of God ; and a feast upon the sacrifice must therefore be a feeding upon Him ; and we may add, that though the Law were true as coming from God, yet emphatically and peculiarly the Gospel is *the truth*. Hence, if in the legal ceremony there was a true feeding upon the victim, we cannot doubt that in the Gospel Sacrament there is a true feeding on the Saviour. And yet once more, the Law was carnal, but the Gospel is spiritual. And so, whereas the Paschal festival involved a carnal eating of the typical sacrifice, we infer that the Eucharistic festival would involve a spiritual eating of the true Sacrifice. And hence, as in all respects the Passover squared well with the place it occupied in its own dispensation, the Eucharist would fall into its place in the higher dispensation. The one a feast on a sacrifice ; the other a feast on a Sacrifice. The one on the lamb ; the other on the Lamb of God. The one true ; the other true.

Jewish mode of counting time. Thus our Lord ate the Passover on the right day, *i. e.* on the evening of the 14th ; yet He was crucified on the same day ; for from evening to evening was but a single day. And this will solve all the difficulty in John xviii. 28 ; for many of the Jews may not have eaten the Passover

on the morning of the Friday, though our Lord had eaten it on the evening of the Thursday. See *Duty of Observing the Christian Sabbath*, by Samuel Lee, D. D., &c. note 15 ; where he quotes the Gemara on the Jerusalem Talmud in confirmation of this interpretation of Exod xii. 6.

But the one carnally true ; the other spiritually, and therefore even *more* true.

There are three things especially to be observed in the form of institution: 1, the blessing ; 2, the declaration ; 3, the command.

1. The blessing. "Jesus took bread and blessed it:" so say St. Matthew (xxvi. 26) and St. Mark (xiv. 22). This was the custom with the Jews. The master of the house pronounced over the bread a form of benediction, placing both his hands upon it. And this blessing, we are told, was by them called *שְׁחֵחַ* *i. e.* sanctification.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not our Lord adopted the common form of words, we cannot tell. At all events, He gave utterance to some words of blessing, whereby He set apart the bread from its common use, to a new, sacramental and sacred purpose.

For *blessed* (*εὐλογήσας*) St. Luke (xxii. 17) and St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24) have *gave thanks* (*εὐχαριστήσας*). The words seem nearly synonymous. They are so used concerning the blessing of the bread, when our Lord fed the four thousand with the seven loaves (Mark viii. 6, 7): the Vulgate translates (*εὐχαριστία*) by *benedictio* (1 Cor. xiv. 16): and the Hebrew word *בָּרַךְ* *to bless*, is rendered indifferently by words which signify either *blessing* or *thanksgiving*. And so, no doubt, our Lord and Saviour, when consecrating this bread to a sacred ordinance, gave thanks to God His Father, and with the thanksgiving joined a blessing; which changed the bread, not in substance, not in quantity, not in quality—but in use, in purpose, in sanctity; so that what before was common, now became sacramental bread; even the sacrament and mystery of the Body of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

2. From the blessing we pass to the declaration:—

"Take, eat; this is My Body." So St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Paul. St. Luke adds, "which is given for you" (xxii. 19). St. Paul, "which is broken for you" (1 Cor. xi. 24).

There is a little more difference in their account of the cup. St. Matthew and St. Mark say, "This cup is My Blood of the new Testament which is shed for many." St. Luke and St. Paul say, "This cup is the new testament in My Blood."

We have already compared these phrases with the Jewish form of speech, and have seen how the one throws light upon the other. We have seen also reason to infer, that the ordinance thus instituted was for the purpose of a spiritual feast upon the one true Sacrifice, a feeding on the Body and the Blood of Christ. But

<sup>1</sup> Buxtorf, as above, § 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* § 48. Compare Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. v. 8.

we have now come to a point, where those who believe in the verity of the feeding upon Christ, branch off from each other into two opposed and unhappily hostile divisions. The Protestant admits that the words of institution assure us of the blessing of feeding upon Christ, and give us ground to call the consecrated elements Christ's Body and Blood. But the Romanist maintains, that they moreover assure us that the bread, when blessed, no longer remains bread, but has become the very natural Flesh of Christ, and in a like manner the wine His natural Blood. The Romanist reasons from the plain meaning of the words, and the duty reverently to believe what Christ has spoken. "This *is* My Body;" therefore it is no longer bread. And to make it clearer, they say that, whereas the substantive "*bread*" (*ἄρτος*) is masculine, the relative "*this*" (*τοῦτο*) is neuter; and that therefore the word *this* means not, "This Bread is My Body;" but on the contrary means, "This, which is no longer bread, is My Body."<sup>1</sup> The grammatical argument is too futile to keep us long. Bread, being a thing without life, though in Greek and Latin it is expressed by a masculine substantive, in wellnigh all languages might be referred to by a neuter pronoun; and though we could not say *Hoc est frater meus*; yet we may say *Hoc est aqua*, or *Hoc est panis*. Nay! would it not have been a more singular mode of speech, if our Lord, when He took the bread in His hand, instead of saying concerning it, *τοῦτο, hoc, this thing*, had said, *οὗτος, hic, he*?

But more weight lies in the verb *ἐστίν, is*; and yet, if no better argument than its use could be adduced, we must admit that the mere figurists have almost as strong ground as the transubstantialists. If the simple use of the substantive verb proves an absolute change of substance, how are we to interpret "The seed is the word; the field is the world; the reapers are the angels; the harvest is the end of the world; I am the door; I am the vine?"<sup>2</sup> We cannot here understand a substantial change, but must admit a figure of speech. And so, in truth, we must admit in the Eucharist; for though we acknowledge Christ's presence, and not only acknowledge but rejoice in it; yet we hold not that presence to be in the material bread; nor can these words prove that it is there. The passage which perhaps most nearly corresponds to this, is that wherein St. Paul says that "That Rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4). It is indeed generally contended that the Rock was Christ by a mere figure of speech; and hence the illustration is urged to support the doctrine of the figurists. But this is scarcely true.

<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine, Lib. i. *De Eucharistia*, ch. x.    <sup>2</sup> See Taylor, *Real Presence*, sect. vii.

If the illustration be correctly interpreted, it will prove the *real* but the spiritual presence of the Body of Christ. The Apostle's argument is strictly this: The Israelites, in their pilgrimage in the wilderness, were like Christians, subjects of grace. Christ followed, and Christ fed them. They had bread from Heaven, and drank out of the rock; and as the literal manna fed their bodies, so there was a heavenly manna prepared for their souls. And as from the rock of stone Moses called forth the stream of water; so there was with them also a spiritual Rock, by which their souls were watered; and that spiritual "Rock was Christ." It was not then, we may observe, that the *spiritual Rock* was a figure of Christ. *The rock of stone* was a figure of Christ; but *the spiritual Rock*— "*that Rock was Christ.*" So it is in the Eucharist. The bread in the Eucharist is an emblem of the Bread of life: but *that* Bread is Christ. As with the natural rock in the wilderness there was present the Spiritual Rock, which is Christ: so with the natural bread in the Sacrament there is present the Spiritual Bread, which is Christ's Body.

And next for the cup. Our Lord calls it, "My Blood of the new Covenant;" or, according to St. Luke, "The new Covenant in My Blood<sup>1</sup> which is shed for you." The reference here to the language of the old Testament, and to the rites of sacrifice, has been already noticed.<sup>2</sup> If we take the words as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, "This is My Blood of the new Covenant," they will mean, "As in the old dispensation God made covenant with Israel with the blood of beasts, so now He makes covenant with Christians through the Blood of Christ; and this wine is the emblem of that Blood, and the means of partaking of its benefits." If we take St. Luke's version (which is also St. Paul's), then we must understand, "The blood of old was the sign and pledge of the Covenant, the medium of its ratification. This cup is the sign and pledge of the new Covenant, which is now to be ratified in My Blood."

In either case we see obviously in the Eucharist a federal rite.

<sup>1</sup> I unhesitatingly translate *Covenant*, not Testament, believing that *διαθήκη* should always in the Bible be rendered Covenant. The only apparent exception is in Heb. ix. 15-20. Even here, however, Covenant will probably make the more pertinent sense. See Professor Scholefield's *Hints for a New Translation*, ad h. l.

<sup>2</sup> τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον (Luke xxii. 20). The participle prop-

erly agrees with ποτήριον, though it may by a solecism refer to αἷμα. Lightfoot *H. H. in loc.* says, "This seems to have reference to that cup of wine which was every day poured out in the drink-offerings in the daily sacrifice, for that also was poured out for the remission of sins. So that the bread may have reference to the body of the daily sacrifice, and the cup to the wine of the drink-offering."

As sacrifices, and especially feasts on sacrifices, were the means of ratifying covenants between man and man, or between man and God; so the Eucharistic feast upon the Sacrifice is the means of ratifying the covenant between the Lord and His people. The Blood of the covenant was shed upon the cross. So peace has been made. But the peace is accepted, and the covenant assured by this sacred banquet; where we are God's guests, and where the spiritual food spread for us is the Lamb slain for our sins, and where our souls may be washed by His most precious Blood.<sup>1</sup>

3. The third thing to be observed in the institution of the Eucharist is the command, "This do in remembrance of Me" (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25).

This do, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. *Hoc facite*. Do what? Make My Body? Sacrifice Me? If our Lord had commanded them to make His Body, why did He say "in remembrance of Me?" Remembrance and actual bodily presence are scarcely compatible ideas. Besides, did our Lord then sacrifice Himself? Surely not. It was the next morning that He offered up Himself a Sacrifice; not then, when He sat with them at meat. But, just as, when the first Passover was instituted, the Israelites were commanded "to keep this feast by an ordinance for ever" (Exod. xii. 14; xiii. 10),—to sacrifice the lamb and eat it, as they had been instructed by Moses: so the disciples are commanded to observe this new feast, even as they were instructed by their Master and Lord. "Do this," *i. e.* "Do what you now see Me do." Break the bread, bless it, and consecrate it; then distribute among yourselves, and eat it; and likewise with the wine. And this all is to be done "in remembrance of Me." The Passover was in remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt and from the destruction of the first-born; and when it was kept, the Israelites were to tell their children what the ordinance meant (Exod. xiii. 8). But this Sacrament is a remembrance of greater deliverance, and of that gracious Master who wrought the deliverance; and "as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do shew the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). In all ways therefore it may be a remembrance of Christ; but specially it is a remembrance of His death. It is a memorial, a showing forth of that sacrifice which He offered on the cross, and which we feed upon in our souls. As it is a commemoration of the sacrifice, so may it be called a commemorative sacrifice. But, as Christ was Himself present alive when He instituted the ordinance, and as He did not *then* offer up Himself a sacrifice on the

<sup>1</sup> See Cudworth, as above, ch. vi.



cross, nor hold in His own sacred hands His own crucified Body; so we believe not, that we are commanded to offer Him up afresh, or that we are to expect to feed upon His natural Flesh and Blood. His Body has been offered up once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice. We may present the remembrance of that sacrifice to God, may tell it out to the world, may believe that, whilst we eat the symbols with our mouths, we feed upon the Saviour in our spirits; but we have no warrant to believe, and we could find no greater comfort in believing, that Christ was to be newly sacrificed every day, and His very Flesh and Blood to be eaten and drunk by our bodily mouths.

## II. *Our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum.* John vi.

A great many, both of the Roman Catholic divines and of the mere figurists, have denied that the discourse in the sixth chapter of St. John has any reference to the grace of the Eucharist. The motive of such denial is obvious; for it is next to impossible to admit that the Eucharist is there referred to, without also admitting that no material presence is tenable, and at the same time, that some real spiritual feeding of the soul is promised. It is said indeed that the discourse was delivered before the Eucharist was instituted, and therefore could not have applied to it: an argument, which must surely seem very strange, if we consider how very much our Lord's discourses are anticipatory and prophetic. Indeed almost all His teaching seems suitable to instruct His followers in "the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God," the things that were to be in His Church and reign upon earth, rather than suitable to the time of His bodily presence. So His discourse with Nicodemus was as much anticipatory of the institution of baptism, as this discourse at Capernaum was of the institution of the Holy Communion. And, to bring but one more example, if our Lord be never supposed to speak and to teach but concerning things already revealed and manifested, what could have been His meaning in His many declarations that Christians "must *take up their Cross*, and follow Him;"<sup>1</sup> when as yet all those who heard Him knew not for certain that He would die at all, and most assuredly understood not "what death He should die?"

It is quite clear then, that the mystery of the discourse in St. John vi. required something to make it intelligible. Many even of our Lord's disciples were so offended at it, that they at once "went back, and walked no more with Him" (ver. 66). What

<sup>1</sup> See Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34, x. 21; Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27.

so sorely puzzled them must doubtless have sunk deep into their memories; and when next our blessed Saviour used the same language as He had used on this memorable occasion, is it not certain, that His first words would recur with all their force, and that the teaching of the first discourse would be coupled with that of the second? Now the only occasions on which we read that Jesus said anything about eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, were, first in this instance at Capernaum, secondly at the last Passover, when He instituted the Eucharist. How the disciples who heard both discourses could fail to couple them together, it is hard to conceive. In the former, inestimable blessings were said to accompany the eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood: in the latter, a special mode appeared to be pointed out, by which His Body and Blood might be eaten and drunken. Both, no doubt, sounded strange and wonderful. Those who wondered at them both, would naturally compare the one with the other, to see if the one would not explain the other.

And surely the one does explain the other. In the sixth chapter of St. John we read that our Lord had just fed five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes. They who had seen the miracle, on the next day followed Jesus; but as He well knew, not for spiritual blessing, but that they might again be fed and be filled (v. 26). To this carnal and unbelieving multitude He enjoins, "that they should labour not for earthly, but for spiritual food, which endureth unto everlasting life" (v. 27); and taking occasion of their own reference to the manna in the wilderness (v. 31), He tells them, that, as God gave their fathers manna, so now He would give them "true bread from Heaven" (v. 32). He then declares Himself to be "the Bread of life:" and adds, "he that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst" (v. 35), *i. e.* neither hunger nor thirst, because, thus coming and believing, he shall be fed upon the Bread of life. The Jews, who were present, now begin to murmur. They disbelieve the Saviour's saying, that He had come down from Heaven, supposing that they knew both His father and His mother. He then goes on, not to explain His statements, but to enforce, and rather put them with more mystery and difficulty. He tells them that, not only had He come down from Heaven, that not only was He the Bread of life, but that, whereas the fathers ate manna and died, yet those who should eat that Bread, should never die. And then most startling words of all, He says that the bread which He should give was His Flesh, which he would give for the life of the

world (v. 51). And when this saying caused fresh striving amongst them, He adds, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you. . . . My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed. . . . As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me" (vv. 53-57).

Now those who tell us that this had no reference to the Eucharist, say that nothing is here meant but that faith in the death of Christ is the great means of union to Christ, and that which raises us to life and immortality. But surely Calvin's belief, that something more express and sublime is intended by such striking language, must commend itself to our reason. It is not the way of Scripture to expound to us simple doctrines by such mysterious language; but rather by simple figures and analogies to bring down deep doctrines in some degree to the level of our capacities. Yet, if all this discourse be merely to teach us that we must believe in the death of Christ, we have an example of most difficult language, and, we may add, language most likely to give offence, in order to express what requires no figures to make it intelligible, when simply and plainly stated. But if it be true, that to those who believe in Christ, to those who come to Him believing, He, in some manner far above our comprehension, so communicates His blessed Self, so joins them to Him by an ineffable union, that they may be said to be one with Him, and He with them, that He dwelleth in them and they in Him, that as He liveth by the Father so they live by Him; — if this and the like of this be true, then can we understand, that some deep language, some strong metaphors, may be needful to express the doctrine, and that the greater and more mysterious the blessing, the stranger and more hard to understand may be the language.

Now, certainly it is true that the faithful Christian lives by union to the glorified, divine humanity of His Lord. Christ, who is one with the Father by His Godhead, becomes one with His disciples by His manhood: and by an union with us, which is ineffable, and to be comprehended only by a devout and reverent believing, He supports, sustains, and feeds that spiritual life which He creates in us. That this is one chief fruit of His incarnation, all Scripture bears witness. That this, and perhaps much more than this, is taught in the chapter we are considering, there can be no reasonable question. And, although faith is an essential instrument for enabling us to receive such blessing (see v. 35); yet

something much deeper and sublimer than the mere act of believing is plainly intended by it, — even that in spirit we are truly joined to the Man Christ Jesus, our great Head and Lord; that our whole spiritual man is sustained and nourished by Him; that by His life we live; by His might and power our weakness is upheld and strengthened. We do not presume to say that this is all the mystery conveyed to us by the language of our Lord. But this we may boldly affirm is the character, though it be not the sum of the mystery. And when we come to find the like language used by Him concerning the holy ordinance which He established at His passion, can we fail to infer, that with that ordinance, rightly and faithfully partaken of, are communicated those very blessings which in the discourse at Capernaum are so marvellously expressed?

Such thoughts must free us from the frigid notions of the disciples of Zuinglius; but will they lead us to the carnal notions of the transubstantialists? Most surely, No! There are two statements, in the chapter we are considering, quite fatal to the doctrine of the material presence. One is, where our Lord tells us that whosoever eats of the bread of life shall “not die” (ver. 51), “shall live for ever” (ver. 58): that “he who eateth His Flesh and drinketh His Blood, hath eternal life” (ver. 54). Now, if the bread and wine in the communion are changed into the substance of the Body and Blood, then every unworthy partaker, notwithstanding his unworthiness, partakes of Christ's Body and Blood; and hence, according to this chapter, eating the bread of life shall “not die” — “shall live for ever” — “hath eternal life.” He cannot, as St. Paul says, eat to condemnation, but must eat to salvation. The other statement is stronger still. When those who heard murmured at our Lord's promise to feed them with His Flesh and Blood, Jesus said unto them, “Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see (ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε) the Son of Man ascend where He was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (vv. 61–63). Do my words offend you? If ye see Me ascend where I was before, how then will ye judge? Will ye then be still more offended, thinking my words still more impossible? Or will ye then begin to understand the truth, and to know that they must be spiritually interpreted? The mistake ye have made, is that ye have interpreted them carnally. But it is the spirit which profiteth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. Such

was the obvious meaning of our Lord's reply ; and it penetrates to the very depths of the difficulty. The meaning of the discourse was all spiritual. The feeding on Christ's Body and Blood is a spiritual feeding. No other feeding profits. It would do no good. To eat the material substance of His Flesh, and drink the material substance of His Blood, would be useless. It is the spirit only which gives life ; and the words which He had spoken, were spirit and life. And be it noted, whether the discourse did, by anticipation, concern the Eucharist, or whether it did not, yet this much is clear : we have it revealed in the unfailing and unerring words of our Redeemer, that carnally to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood would profit us nothing ; and therefore we may be assured infallibly, that such a carnal feeding, being profitless, would never have been ordained by Him in a Sacrament for His Church.

### III. *The statements of St. Paul.*

These occur in 1 Cor. x. and 1 Cor. xi.

The argument from the former chapter (1 Cor. x.) is of this nature. The Christians of Corinth, living among idolaters, were tempted to join in idol-feasts, at which meats that had been offered in sacrifice were solemnly and religiously eaten. However innocent it may be to eat meat of any kind, St. Paul points out that it is no longer innocent when the eating it implies a participating in an idolatrous ceremony, especially an idolatrous sacrifice. He that partakes of a sacrificial feast declares thereby his respect for the sacrifice, and his interest in it. He claims to be a partaker of the sacrifice. The Apostle illustrates this in three ways : first, by our participation of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist (vv. 16, 17) ; secondly, by the Jews' participation in the sacrifices of which they eat ; thirdly, by the heathen's participation of the sacrifices of demon-gods. To take the last two illustrations first. He observes with regard to " Israel after the flesh," that " they which eat of the sacrifices are partakers (*κοινωνοὶ*) of the altar." That is to say, by eating of the meat of the sacrifice they have a share, a participation in the benefit of that which is offered on the altar (v. 18). As for the Gentiles, he says, that they offer sacrifice, not to God, but to demon-gods (*δαμονίου*) ; and it is unbecoming in Christians to be partakers or communicants (*κοινωνοὶ*) of demon-gods. Nay ! it is altogether inconsistent to drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup of demon-gods ; to partake of the Lord's table, and the table of demon-gods (vv. 20, 21) ; the " table of demon-gods " here meaning the feast upon the

heathen sacrifices, "the table of the Lord" meaning the banquet of the Holy Communion, and probably alluding to Malachi i. 7, 12; where the expression "table of the Lord" is used in immediate connection with the word "altar," and refers to the sacrificial feasting connected with the Jewish sacrifices. In juxtaposition then, and immediate comparison with these feasts on Jewish and heathen offerings, St. Paul places the Christian festival of the Eucharist; and as he tells the Corinthians, that the Israelites in their feasts were partakers of the altar, and the heathen partook of the table of devils, so he says, Christians partake of the Lord's table. But more than this, he asks, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a joint-partaking (*κοινωνία*) of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a joint-partaking of the Body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread" (vv. 16, 17). The natural signification of the word *κοινωνία*, and the sense deducible from the context, require that it should be rendered, as above, *joint-partaking* or *joint-participation*.<sup>1</sup> The parallel is between partaking of idol sacrifices, partaking of Jewish sacrifices, and partaking of the Christian Sacrifice, *i. e.* Christ. And the 17th verse is added to show, that by such participation there is a joint fellowship, not only with Christ, the Head, but with His whole Body the Church.

Now, what must we infer from this teaching? Does it not plainly tell us, that the feeding at the Lord's table corresponds with the feeding at the Jewish altar and the heathen idol-feasts. That, as the latter gave them participation in their sacrifices and their demon-gods, so the former gives us participation of Christ's Body and Blood! This much we cannot, and we would not deny. The bread and wine are to us means or instruments, whereby, through God's grace, we become partakers of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. But, on the other hand, must we therefore infer, that we partake of Christ's Body, naturally and materially? The very words appear to teach us otherwise. If there were a real change of the elements into Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, it seems altogether unaccountable, that the force of the argument should have been weakened by the introduction of the word *κοινωνία participation*. If the bread be literally and substantially

<sup>1</sup> *κοῖνος* common, *κοινῶς* to make common, impart, *κοινωνός* a partaker, *κοινωνία* participation. This is the natural meaning. *κοινωνία* means also close communion or joint partnership. St. Paul ordi-

narily uses *κοινωνία* for *partaking*. See 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 3. Comp. *κοινωνοὶ* ix. 18. In Rom. xv. 26, Heb. xiii. 16, *κοινωνία* is *communication*.

the Body, it would have been more natural to say, "Is not the bread which we break, Christ's Body?" And the inference would be immediate; Can we eat Christ's Body and demon-sacrifices together? The word *κοινωνία*, on which the peculiar strength of the passage depends, whilst it clearly points to the Eucharistic elements as ordained means to enable us to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet shows too that they are *means of partaking*, not themselves changed into the substance of that which they represent. They are ordained, that we may partake of Christ; but they are not Christ themselves.

The other passage of St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 19-30) has the same object as that which we have just considered; namely, to increase our reverence for "the dignity of this holy mystery." The early Christians appear to have joined with the reception of the communion an *agape* or love-feast. In such a feast it was seemly, that the rich should provide for the poor, and that all things should be in common. But in Corinth, a city long famous for luxury, the richer Christians appear to have overlooked the Christian principle, and to have made their feasts of charity minister to their own indulgence, rather than to their poor neighbours' wants. This was in itself wrong; it was not, as the Apostle says, to eat the Lord's supper;<sup>1</sup> and it was despising the church of God, — shaming those who had no houses to feast in. And what made it worst of all was this, that with these feasts of charity was joined a reception of the Holy Communion; and to receive that at a time when some were feasting gluttonously, and others suffering from hunger, was to treat contemptuously the most sacred and blessed ordinance of the Lord. It was receiving that Sacrament unworthily. It was not only treating the *agape* as a private feast, and one in which self-indulgence was permissible, but it was making the Eucharist itself a common thing.

To enforce his lesson on this subject, the Apostle reminds the Corinthians of the mode and the words in which our Lord had instituted the Eucharist. This part of his teaching we have already considered. But he goes on to reason that, as our Lord had instituted bread and wine as Sacraments of His Body and Blood, "therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood

<sup>1</sup> *κυριακὸν δείπνον φαγεῖν*, v. 20. This probably does not refer to the Eucharist, but to the *Agape*, the feast of charity, which was joined with it. See Hammond and Whitby, *in loc.*; Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. i. § 8; Suicer, s. v. 'Αγαπαι; Cave, *Primitive Christianity*, pt. i. ch. ii.; Bingham, *E. A. Bk. xv. ch. vii. §§ 6, 7, 9.*

of the Lord," ver. 27. He then exhorts to self-examination, ver. 28, and adds, ver. 29: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh to himself condemnation, not setting apart as holy the Body of the Lord" (*κρίμα ἐαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ Σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου*).<sup>1</sup> The Lord's own words of institution pointed to this Sacrament as the means of participating in His Body and Blood; he therefore who received that Sacrament, not as a thing most sacred and venerable, but as part or adjunct of a common feast, was guilty of great and heinous impiety, because he did not set apart as a holy thing the Body of the Lord. This is the plain meaning of the passage, according to the obvious rendering of the original; and it certainly teaches a lesson of deep reverence, and speaks home plainly to our faith. It seems an unanswerable argument against those who esteem the Eucharist as "a bare sign of a thing absent." We, of the Church of England, who believe Christ really present in His Sacraments, and spiritually there feeding our souls, as much as those who look for a natural reception of Him, can feel the truth and awfulness of such apostolic warnings. We do not differ with the believers in transubstantiation, so far as their statement goes, that in the Eucharist there is a real presence of the Lord. And therefore we feel, as they do, that to receive unworthily is to do dishonour to the Body of Christ. Our difference with them is not concerning the truth of Christ's presence, which the Apostle's words seem forcibly to teach us; but we differ with them only concerning the mode. That they define carnally, whilst we believe it mystically. And herein we can scarcely use words more apposite than the words used long ago by Calvin: "If any ask me concerning the mode, I am not ashamed to confess the mystery to be more sublime than my intellect can grasp, or than words can tell; and, that I may speak more openly, I essay rather than understand. Therefore here I embrace without controversy the truth of God, in which I may safely acquiesce. He pronounces His Flesh the food of my soul, His Blood the drink. I offer my soul to be fed with such aliments. In His sacred Feast He bids me, under symbols of bread and wine,

<sup>1</sup> *διακρίνων*, *discernens*, *separating*, *setting apart as holy*. So the Syriac, ܕܠܩܝܢܐ. *To discern*, as we in modern English use that word, is only a secondary and improper sense of *διακρίνειν*, as it is also of *discernere*. The natural meaning is *to separate, to make a distinction of one thing from another*. It is used in classical as well as in Hellenistic Greek,

with the sense of *to set apart for holy purposes*. So Pindar, *Olymp.* x. 54-56: *Περὶ δὲ πάσαις ἄλτιν μὲν δγ' ἐν καθαρῷ διακρίνει*. The plain meaning therefore of St. Paul is, that people who mixed up the Eucharist with a profane feast, treated the Lord's Body, which is given us there, as no better than a common thing, not as sacred and holy.



to take His Body and Blood, to eat and to drink. I doubt not but that He really offers, and that I receive. All I reject is what is in itself absurd, unworthy of the heavenly majesty of Christ, or alien from the verity of His nature as man."<sup>1</sup> So Calvin; and so our own Hooker: "What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not. It is enough that *unto me that take them* they are the Body and Blood of Christ. His promise in witness hereof sufficeth. His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant; but, O my God, Thou art true: O my soul, thou art happy?"<sup>2</sup> It is in this way that the Scriptures have left it: so the devout soul has ever embraced it: and so we may safely and thankfully receive it, — not speculate curiously, nor expound carnally; but believe and live.

<sup>1</sup> *Institut.* iv. xvii. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *E. P. Bk.* v. ch. LXVI. 12.

#### NOTE.

I HAVE confined myself in this Article almost wholly to the presence in the Eucharist, and the mode of receiving Christ's Body and Blood. The latter part of the Article has thereby been deprived of its due attention. It is, however, but a simple corollary. Elevating the host resulted from a belief in transubstantiation. If that doctrine be rejected, we shall not believe the wafer to have been really transformed into Christ's Body, and so shall not worship it, nor elevate it for worship. There is evidently no Scriptural authority for the elevation of the Host, the command being, "Take, eat." The Roman ritualists themselves admit, that there is no trace of its existence before the 11th or 12th centuries; and no certain documents refer to it till about A. D. 1200. See Palmer, *On the Church*, Vol. I. part I. ch. XI p. 311.

[Two particulars of the Tridentine doctrine of Transubstantiation are especially to be noted for their contrast to the Anglican doctrine of the real Spiritual Presence in the Eucharist.

(1.) The annihilation of the elements. With regard to which, remember: —

(a.) The absence of Scriptural proof.

(b.) The patristic teaching that the elements remain in their original substance; especially the use by Gelasius and others of the accepted Eucharistic doctrine as an argument against the Eutychians. See Pearson *On the Creed*, p. 247, and note.

(c.) That if this view is correct, it is a solitary instance of a miracle which contradicts the senses, instead of appealing to them.

(2.) The identification of the consecrated elements not with the Body and Blood of Christ, but with His entire Personality by affirming the presence in them of His Human Soul. With regard to which, remember: —

(a.) The absence of Scriptural proof. The language is, "this is my Body," "this is my Blood," not "this is I-myself;" the sole exception being St. John vi. 57: "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me," where the manner of feeding upon Christ had been explained in the preceding verse to be the eating of His flesh and drinking of His Blood.

(b.) The language of the Fathers is similar.

(c.) So also is the statement of the Orthodox Eastern Church, Guettée, *Exp. de la Doctrine*, p. 135.

On the subject of the Eucharistic Presence, see the invaluable Introduction to Part II. of the *Principles of Divine Service* by Archdeacon Freeman. — H. A. Y. — J. W.]

## ARTICLE XXIX.

*Of the Wicked which eat not 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 *St. Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise 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 improbus 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 tantæ rei Sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad iudicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

### SECTION I. — HISTORY.

IF the last Article be true, this most probably follows on it. There are but two possible views of the question. Either the wicked and unbelieving do not eat Christ's Body and Blood, but only their sacred symbols; or they eat the Body and Blood, but to condemnation, not to salvation. The former alternative has generally been held, in latter times, by the advocates of a spiritual feeding; the latter, by the believers in transubstantiation, and, I suppose, by most believers in consubstantiation. The fathers' teaching is naturally obscure on this point. They so constantly called the symbols by the name of that they symbolized, that they would commonly speak of eating the Body of Christ, when they meant only the consecrated bread, the Sacrament of His Body. Yet plain passages occur, which are strongly in favour of the view taken by our reformers in this Article.

Origen speaks concerning "the Word who was made flesh, the true food, which no wicked man can eat. For, if it were possible that one continuing in wickedness should eat Him who was made flesh, the Word, the living bread; in vain would it have been written, *whoso eateth this bread shall live forever.*"<sup>1</sup> Cyprian tells

<sup>1</sup> Πολλὰ δ' ἔστιν περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσι τοῦ Λόγου, ὅς γεγόνη σὰρξ καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρωσις, ἢν τινα ὁ φάγων πάντως ζῆσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαῦλον ἐσθίειν αὐτήν· εἰ γὰρ αἰὼν τε ἦν ἐτι φαῦλον μένοντι

ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα Λόγον ὄντα, καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐγγράπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φάγων τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζῆσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Origen. *In Matt. xv. Comment.*

a story of the Eucharistic bread becoming a cinder in the hands of one who had lapsed, as a proof that Christ could not be received by the unworthy communicant.<sup>1</sup> So St. Hilary, "The bread that came down from Heaven, is not taken but by him who hath the Lord, and is a member of Christ."<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine is quoted in the very words of the Article. Some part of the passage is thought by the Benedictine editors to have been interpolated; which I will put between brackets. What remains, however, is fully sufficient to serve the purpose for which it is adduced. "By this, he who abides not in Christ, nor Christ in him, without doubt eats not [spiritually] His Flesh, nor drinks His Blood; [though he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the Sacrament of His Body and Blood]; but rather he eats and drinks, to his condemnation, the Sacrament of so great a thing."<sup>3</sup> So elsewhere, he clearly distinguishes between sacramental eating and real eating: "*Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him.* Here our Lord shows what it is, not only sacramentally, but really, to eat Christ's Body and drink His Blood; even to dwell in Christ and Christ in him. And He said this, as much as to say, Whosoever does not abide in Me and I in him, let him not say, nor think that he eats My Body or drinks My Blood."<sup>4</sup> So Jerome also says, that "lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God eat not the Flesh, nor drink the Blood of Jesus."<sup>5</sup>

It has been argued indeed, that the prayer in the ancient Liturgies, for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elements, implied of necessity a belief that after that descent the elements of themselves become so truly the Body and Blood of Christ, that the com-

<sup>1</sup> "Et quidem alius, quia et ipse maculatus sacrificio a sacerdote celebrato partem cum cæteris ausus est latenter accipere, sanctum Domini corpus edere et contractare non potuit: cinerem ferre se, apertis manibus invenit. Documento unius ostenditur, Dominum recedere cum negatur, nec immerentibus ad salutem prodesse quod sumitur, quando gratia salutaris in cinerem, sanctitate fugiente, mutatur." — Cyprian. *De Lapsis*, p. 133, Fell.

<sup>2</sup> "Panis qui descendit de cælo, non nisi ab eo accipitur qui Dominum habet, et Christi membrum est." — Hilar. *De Trinit.* Lib. viii.

<sup>3</sup> "Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat [spiritualiter] carnem Ejus, nec bibit Ejus sanguinem [licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat denitibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi:] sed magis tantæ rei sacramen-

tum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit." — *In Joan. Tract.* 26, Tom. iii. pars ii. p. 500.

<sup>4</sup> "Denique Ipse dicens *Qui manducat Carnem meam, et bibit Sanguinem meum, in Me manet, et Ego in eo*; ostendit quid sit non sacramento tenuis, sed re vera Corpus Christi manducare, et Ejus sanguinem bibere: hoc est enim in Christo manere, ut in illo maneat et Christus. Sic enim hoc dixit, tanquam diceret, Qui non in me manet, et in quo Ego non maneo, non se dicat aut existimet manducare Corpus meum aut bibere sanguinem meum." — *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. xxi. c. 25, Tom. vii. p. 646.

<sup>5</sup> "Omnes voluptatis magis amatores, quam amatores Dei . . . nec comedunt carnem Jesu, neque bibunt sanguinem Ejus; de quo Ipse loquitur: *Qui comedit carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, habet vitam æternam.*" — Hieronym. *In Isai.* c. 66, ver. 17. Tom. iii. p. 606.

municants, whether worthily or unworthily receiving, must necessarily partake of the Body and Blood. This, if it means anything of the kind, means the full doctrine of transubstantiation. But no such conclusion can be deduced from the fact of the invocation. For first, the like invocation of the Spirit was made in baptism; and of this we hear much earlier than of the invocation in the Eucharist.<sup>1</sup> Now, though the fathers believed, as the English reformers did, that the Holy Ghost “would sanctify the water to the mystical washing away of sin;”<sup>2</sup> yet they neither believed in a change of the substance of the water, nor in an admixture of the Holy Spirit with the water;<sup>3</sup> nor that an unworthy recipient obtained the blessing of the Spirit’s sanctification. We must suppose the same principle to apply to the sanctification of the symbols in the Eucharist. As the minister was to consecrate, so the fathers looked for the Spirit to bless the elements to a sacred use. “We beseech the merciful God,” says St. Cyril, “to send the Holy Ghost upon the elements; that He may make the bread Christ’s Body and the wine His Blood. For, undoubtedly, whatever the Holy Ghost touches, that is sanctified and changed.”<sup>4</sup>

But, though the Holy Spirit sanctifies and changes, it follows not that the change is a change of substance. The sanctification of the elements is to a sacred use and office, — to a new relation, not to a new nature. Accordingly, St. Cyril speaks afterwards of the illapse of the Holy Spirit, as making the elements holy, and at the same time making the communicant holy. “Holy also are ye, being now endowed with the Spirit.”<sup>5</sup> So, some of the ancient Liturgies have a prayer for the descent on the communicants first, and then on the elements.<sup>6</sup> And so, in several Liturgies, and especially in the Gregorian Sacramentary,<sup>7</sup> from thence derived to the canon of the mass, the words “to us,” are inserted; thereby restricting the blessing upon the elements to their effects on the recipient. Nay! that transubstantiation could not have been intended, has been admitted by many Romanist divines; inas-

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. *De Baptismo*, c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Office of Public Baptism*.

<sup>3</sup> *μυόντων τὰ ἕμικτα*, says Basil, of those who spoke of the mixture of the Spirit and water. Basil, *De Sp. S.* Tom. III. p. 30. See Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. x.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril Hierosol. *Catech. Mystag.* v. c. 7. This is the oldest certain mention of the custom; *i. e.* in the middle of the fourth century. The next oldest form is in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Lib. VIII. c. 12: “We beseech Thee, O God, to send Thy Holy Spirit on this Sacrifice . . .

that He may make this bread to become the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup to become the Blood of Thy Christ.” — See Waterland, as above.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* c. 19.

<sup>6</sup> “Super nos et super hæc dona.” (See the Liturgies in Fabricius and Renaudotius, cited by Waterland, as above.)

<sup>7</sup> “Quam oblationem Tu, Deus, in omnibus quæsumus benedictam facere digneris, ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat,” &c. — Cited by Waterland.

much as, in the Greek Liturgies, the invocation of the Spirit followed the words of institution. Now, the Latin divines fix the consecration to the words of institution. Hence, if there be any truth in transubstantiation, the change must, according to them, have taken place before the invocation, and could not therefore be the effect of the invocation.<sup>1</sup> In short, "all circumstances show, that the true and ancient intent of that part of the service was not to implore any physical change in the elements, no, nor so much as a physical connection of the Spirit with the elements, but a moral change only in the elements, as to relation and uses, and a gracious presence of the Holy Spirit upon the communicants."<sup>2</sup>

But, when a belief arose in the *opus operatum*, and in the absolute change of substance in the elements, then, naturally, it was held, that not only the faithful, but even the unbelieving, must receive the very Body and Blood of Christ, though of course the latter, only to condemn them. And then too, the fathers (who spoke freely of the elements under the name of that they signified; and, no doubt, believed in a sanctification of them to holy purposes) were cited as holding the same language, and as witnesses to the same doctrine.

It seems by no means necessary that the like result should follow from the doctrine of *consubstantiation*. Indeed Luther greatly abhorred the *opus operatum*. Still, I suppose, the Lutherans rather inclined to the belief that the wicked eat the Body of Christ, yet impiously, and to their ruin. And so this Article was, for a time, expunged by Queen Elizabeth and her Council;<sup>3</sup> probably as not agreeable to those members of the Church who were of Lutheran sentiments. All other branches of the Reformation seem to have agreed that, as the presence of Christ was not in the elements, but only vouchsafed with the elements "to the faithful," so His presence would be withheld from those who were unfaithful and impenitent.

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

**I**N one sense of the words, then, we may admit that every communicant eats Christ's Body and drinks His Blood; because he eats the symbol which is called His Body (*corpus, h. e. figura*

<sup>1</sup> Waterland, as above, p. 407. (Cambridge, 1737.) The subject is very fully discussed in this place by Dr. Waterland.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> See above, Introduction, p. 15

*corporis*), and drinks the symbol which is called His Blood. But all that has been said in former Articles to disprove the doctrine of the *opus operatum*, applies here. The actual reception of Christ's Body and Blood is the reception, not of the outward sign, but of the inward grace. Now, the inward grace of the Sacraments belongs only to the faithful, not to the impenitent and unbelieving. Of course, if we admit a physical change in the elements, we must believe Christ's Body to be eaten, not only by the wicked, but, as has been often argued, by mice or dogs, or any other animal, that may accidentally devour a portion of the consecrated bread. Hence the contrary position to the statement of this Article follows, of necessity, on the doctrine of transubstantiation. But then, the opposite doctrine of an efficacious, spiritual presence, and that rather in the recipient than in the element, seems inevitably to issue in the doctrine here propounded.

As for the direct statements of the new Testament, we must lay aside the words of institution ; which will not aid us, until we have determined whether they imply a spiritual or a carnal presence ; and confine our attention to the eleventh chapter of 1 Cor. and to the sixth chapter of St. John. In the former we are told, that "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord" (ver. 27) ; and that "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, not setting apart as holy the Lord's Body" (ver. 29). Perhaps the first view of this passage rather appears to favour the doctrine of the *opus operatum*. The unworthy communicant is "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord," which he pollutes ; and he eats and drinks condemnation because he does not set apart and treat with reverence the Lord's Body. At least, candour may oblige us to admit that there is nothing in St. Paul's words thus cited, which will not square with the hypothesis that every recipient equally eats the Flesh and drinks the Blood of Christ. But, on the other hand, we are justified in contending that there is nothing inconsistent with our own belief, that the wicked do not eat Christ. In the former case, we can see how great the profanation would be ; but in the latter, it is still very fearful. The feast provided for the faithful is doubtless a spiritual feast on the Lord's Body and Blood ; hence, the profane receiver is unquestionably "guilty concerning Christ's Body and Blood" (*ἐνοχος τοῦ σώματος, κ. τ. λ.*). And again, as the bread and wine are the means of communicating to us the Body and Blood of Christ ; so he, who treats the Eucharist as part of a mere com-

mon feast, (which the Corinthians did,) does clearly refuse to treat with reverence, and to set apart as holy the Body of the Lord.

But if there be any ambiguity in the words of St. Paul, there can be none in the words of our Lord. He plainly tells us, "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him" (John vi. 56). "He that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me" (ver. 57). "He that eateth of this bread shall live forever" (ver. 58). "Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (ver. 54). Now all this is plain, that the real feeding on Christ is to salvation, not to condemnation. All are agreed, that the wicked do not profit, but rather suffer loss by eating in the Eucharist. But then, if they do not profit, we inevitably infer from the words of our Lord, that they have not eaten His Flesh nor drunk His Blood; for those who do so, "live by Him," — "live forever," — "have eternal life," — have Him dwelling in them, — "have eternal life, and are raised up at the last day."

The only escape from the inference seems to be in an assertion, that John vi. does not refer to Eucharistic feeding, but to spiritual feeding apart from the Eucharist. But whatever conclusion we may come to on that head, the statement seems clear and general, "He that eateth Me shall live by Me" (ver. 57). Now, granting that this eating of Christ may be apart from the Eucharist, yet is it not quite clear that, *howsoever it be*, it is life-giving? The proposition is perfectly universal. Though, therefore, we may admit that it may be applicable to a mere spiritual feeding by faith, yet we must contend that, if in the Eucharist it be *real*, then it must bring life with it. "He that eateth shall live." The only question is therefore — who eateth? Whosoever eateth, if the eating be real eating, eateth life. If, therefore, in the Eucharist a man really feeds on Christ, he lives by Him. Hence, those who eat and drink unworthily, cannot really feed on the Lord's Body; though, "to their condemnation, they do eat and drink the Sacrament of so great a thing." And this seems, at the same time, to prove the proposition of our Article, and to disprove the whole theory of transubstantiation, and of the natural presence.

## ARTICLE XXX.

*Of both Kinds.*

*De utraque Specie.*

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.

CALIX Domini laicis non est denegandus, utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti ex Christi institutione et præcepto, omnibus Christianis ex æquo administrari debet.

### SECTION I. — HISTORY.

IT is not so much as pretended by the more candid Roman Catholics, that there is patristic authority for withdrawing the cup from the laity.

In the earliest account we have of the ministration of the Eucharist, that of Justin Martyr, we read that "the deacons gave to every one that was present to partake of the bread, over which thanks had been offered, and of wine mixed with water, and that they carried them also to those not present."<sup>1</sup> This is fully confirmed by St. Cyprian, who speaks of the deacons as "offering the cup to those who were present."<sup>2</sup> St. Chrysostom especially notices, that there was no distinction between priests and laymen in this respect: "Whereas under the old Covenant the priests ate some things, and the laymen others; and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things, of which the priest partook; it is not so now, but one Body is placed before all, and one cup."<sup>3</sup>

These and similar expressions of the fathers are fully borne out by the language of the ancient liturgies; from which we infer, not only that both elements were administered alike to clergy and laity, but that they were ministered separately. The fear of spilling the

<sup>1</sup> Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προσετύτου καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος πίντος τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλοῦμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδώσιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. — Justin. *Apol.* i. p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> "Ubi solemnibus adimpletis calicem

diaconus offerre presentibus cœpit." — Cyp. *De Lapsis*, p. 94, Fell.

<sup>3</sup> Οὐ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τὰ μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἴσθαι, τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος· καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ὡν μετείχεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σώμα προκεῖται καὶ ἐν ποτήριον. — Chrysost. *Homil.* xiv. in 1 *Cor.*



consecrated wine (of right to be regarded reverently, but in the course of time regarded superstitiously) led to the administering the two elements together, by dipping the consecrated bread into the cup; which custom still continues in the Eastern Churches. But the doctrine of transubstantiation naturally led to the belief that, inasmuch as the elements were wholly changed into the substance of Christ, therefore whole Christ, Body and Blood, was contained in either element; and hence that, if only one element was received, yet Christ was fully received under that one element.

It was not at first without opposition, both from councils and from eminent divines, that the custom which this belief gave rise to, gradually gained ground. Thus the xxviii<sup>th</sup> canon of the Council of Clermont (A. D. 1095) decrees, that all, who shall communicate at the altar, shall receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ under both kinds, if there be no provision to the contrary.<sup>1</sup> And in the next century, Geoffrey, Abbot of Vendome, censures the custom of a certain monastery, where both species were not administered separately, but the bread was steeped in the wine.<sup>2</sup>

In the time of the schoolmen, however, the question was pretty much discussed, whether it was lawful to receive in one kind only. They were by no means agreed that either element could be dispensed with. But the temptation to withhold the cup was great. Thereby the danger was avoided of spilling on the ground the sacred Blood of Christ. Thereby too, it was left in the power of the priesthood to dispense only so much as they chose, even of the ordinance of Christ.<sup>3</sup>

There was scarcely any corruption of Popery so much complained of by Wickliffe, Huss, and other early reformers, as this withholding from the faithful what they cherished, as a portion of their birthright. It was one of the abuses which, it was fondly

<sup>1</sup> See Dupin, Cent. xi. Vol ix. p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> Dupin, Cent. xii. Vol. x. p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> It is a remarkable acknowledgment of Cardinal Bona, that "always, everywhere, from the very first foundation of the Church to the 12th century, the faithful always communicated under the species both of bread and wine."

"Certum est omnes passim clericos et laicos, viros et mulieres sub utraque specie sacra mysteria antiquitus sumpsisse, cum solemniter eorum celebrationi aderant, et offerebant et de oblatis participabant. Extra sacrificium vero, et extra ecclesiam semper et ubique sub

una specie in usu fuit. Primæ parti assertionis consentiunt omnes, tam Catholici quam sectarii; nec eam negare potest, qui vel levissima rerum Ecclesiasticarum imbutus sit. Semper enim et ubique, ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum, sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles: cæpitque paulatim ejus sæculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo interdicens ob periculum irreverentiæ et effusionis." — Bona, *Rev. Liturg.* Lib. ii. c. 18, n. 1, quoted by Bingham, *E. A.* xv. v. 1.

hoped, the Council of Constance (A. D. 1415) would reform and eradicate. But so far from reforming it, that famous Council decreed that, as the reception of one element was sufficient for the receiving wholly both the Body and Blood of Christ, so the Eucharist should be received by the laity in one kind only.<sup>1</sup>

This decree led to serious results in Germany. The sects of the Calixtines and Taborites sprang up in opposition to it; the former protesting against the depriving them of an inalienable right and privilege, the latter not satisfied with protesting, but having recourse even to arms and violence.<sup>2</sup>

It is only further necessary to add, that, whilst every reformed Church in Christendom restored to the laity the cup in the Eucharist, the Council of Trent, following the Council of Constance, decreed anathemas against all who held, that both kinds were necessary to all the faithful — against all who denied that the Catholic Church had been led by just causes to order the laity and the non-ministering clergy to communicate under the species of bread alone — and against all who denied that whole Christ was received according to His own institution under one kind.<sup>3</sup>

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE only passages in Scripture which can be appealed to, are those which relate to the institution of the Eucharist. In all of these there appears no difference between the bread and the cup, save only this: that in St. Matthew (xxvi. 27) our Lord is specially related to have used, concerning the latter, the words “Drink ye *all* of it,” and in St. Mark (xiv. 23) it is specially recorded, that “they *all* drank of it;” whereas, concerning the bread, it is only said, “Take, eat.” If therefore we can at all infer that one should be of more universal extent and applicability than the other, our inference should surely be rather in favour of the cup, than in favour of the other element.

But I believe it is never argued that Scripture gives authority for the withdrawing of the cup. The mode of argument is this. It is true, all the Apostles received both elements. But

<sup>1</sup> Concil. Constant. Sess. XIII. See also Mosheim, Cent. xv. ch. ii. § 8.

<sup>2</sup> Mosheim, Cent. xv. pt. II. ch. III. §§ 5, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Sess. XXI. Cap. I II. III

then all were priests. This therefore is not sufficient ground for assuming that the laity are of necessity to receive both elements. It is granted, that it is not a matter *de fide* and of absolute obligation to withdraw the cup from laymen, but merely a Church-ordinance, for greater decency and edification. It is indeed necessary to consecrate both bread and wine, in order to follow our Lord's example; and, for the same reason, necessary that some one should receive them both. Hence the officiating priest always communicates in both kinds. But it is no injury to the rest, that they receive but in one kind, for whole Christ (Body and Blood and Spirit and Godhead) is received perfectly under either species; and therefore he who receives but one, has no need to receive more. It is a similar case to that when our Lord said to St. Peter, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (John xiii. 10).

Now this is surely very unsafe reasoning. It is true, the Apostles were all ministers of Christ. But if this be ground for withdrawing the cup, it might be as well pleaded for withdrawing the Sacrament altogether from the laity. There were at that memorable Passover none present but our Lord and His Apostles. But surely the example was intended for all the Church. Besides which, the Church of Rome withholds the cup, not only from the laity, but even from all the clergy, except the consecrating priest; which clearly is inconsistent with the original institution, wherein our Lord did not drink of it Himself alone, but said, "Drink ye *all* of it," and "they *all* drank."

If we take St. Paul's statements and reasonings in 1 Cor. x. xi., we shall find much ground to conclude that not only presbyters, but the people too, partook of the two elements. His addresses, warnings, exhortations in those two chapters are evidently general. We should almost infer, that they were rather to the laity, than to the clergy. It is more likely that laymen, than that clergymen, should have been guilty of partaking of idol feasts, and of neglecting to hallow the feast of the Eucharist. Now one argument by which he tries to persuade the Corinthian Christians not to eat what had been offered to idols is, "Ye cannot drink *the cup of the Lord* and the cup of devils" (1 Cor. x. 21). This would be no great argument to laymen, unless they were permitted to drink "the cup of the Lord." And in the following chapter he presses on them the duty of self-examination before communion, and of reverently partaking of that holy Sacrament, in terms which show clearly that all those whom he addresses, *i. e.* both clergy and

laity, were wont to receive both the bread and the cup: "As often as ye eat this bread *and drink this cup*, ye do show the Lord's death till he come; wherefore *whosoever* shall eat this bread and *drink this cup of the Lord* unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let a man (*i. e.* any man, whosoever receives the Sacrament) examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread *and drink of that cup*" (1 Cor. xi. 27-29).

*With such strong evidence, that the cup was not only instituted by our blessed Lord, but also received by all His people, it is surely very hazardous to conclude from certain inductions of reason, that one half of His ordinance may be withheld from the great body of His Church. On what do we rest, as an assurance that we shall receive blessing in the use of Sacraments, but on our knowledge that we are acting in obedience to our Lord's commands, doing as He has ordained that we should do, and therefore have a right to expect that He will give that grace which He has promised to give in the due administering of his ordinances? But if we, resting on our own fallible judgments, curtail His ordinances, and administer but half of what He has enjoined, what right have we to expect a blessing to rest upon us? A Sacrament is no Sacrament without these three requisites: the minister, the ordained elements, and the words of consecration. We should not think baptism valid, if we substituted sand for water; nor the Eucharist valid, if we substituted water for wine, or meat for bread; although the rite which of old answered to the Eucharist, was celebrated with the flesh of lamb. It leaves therefore a very serious question, whether the Sacrament is a valid Sacrament when there is only ministered one half of what Christ ordained, of what the Apostolic Christians received, and of what the Catholic Church administered for very many centuries after the Apostles.*

It is quite clear that only one thing can give even a colour of pretence for this mutilation of the ordinance: namely, the hypothesis that the elements are transubstantiated, each element into the entire substance of the Saviour. If this hypothesis fail, the alternative remains, that the Sacrament is not as Christ ordained it, and that (unless He, of His mercy, supplies the deficiency) it is not such as to warrant us in the assurance that it is more than a piece of will-worship and human invention. We do not indeed wish to deny that those who, in faith and ignorance, receive a mutilated Sacrament, may receive the full blessing. We trust that such is the case, because we believe our gracious Lord will

give the food of everlasting life, His own blessed Body and Blood, even through imperfect means (or, it may be, without means at all) to those who come to Him in faith and penitence, not with perverse neglect, but in unwilling ignorance. But this does not prevent us from saying, that the Eucharist without the cup is not the Eucharist ordained of Christ.

[It is worthy of remark that the Councils of Constance (Sess. XIII.) and Trent (Sess. XXI. chaps. I. III.) both admit, that our Lord instituted and administered in both kinds.

Constance also admits that the Primitive Church exhibited in both kinds; while Trent (Sess. XXI. chap. II.) says, that "the use of both species has, from the beginning of the Christian religion, *not been infrequent.*"

Constance appears to justify its action on the ground that as our Lord instituted after supper, and it was afterwards the rule to receive fasting, so the Church may also change Christ's actual institution, and — *quoad recipientem* — the matter of the Sacrament. Surely, to state such reasoning is to answer it.

See Sir Humphrey Lynde's *Via Tuta*, Sec. IX. Par. 6. — J. W.]

## ARTICLE XXXI.

—◆—

*Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*

*De unica Christi oblatione in cruce perfecta.*

THE Offering of Christ once made is that 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 Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

OBLATIO Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus; neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio: unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pœnæ, aut culpæ, pro vivis et defunctis, blasphemia figmenta sunt, et perniciosæ imposturæ.

### SECTION I.—HISTORY.

IT cannot be doubted that, from the very first, the fathers spoke of the Eucharist under the name of an offering or sacrifice. Clement of Rome writes of the bishops of the Church, as “unblamably and holily offering the gifts;”<sup>1</sup> where he is evidently alluding to the Eucharist. The gifts were the bread and wine, and the other offerings presented on the table of the Lord. The verb made use of is προσφέρειν; so that Clement calls the Eucharist by the name προσφορά, *offering*. Justin Martyr not only calls it προσφορά, *offering*, but moreover θυσία, *sacrifice*. He quotes Malachi (i. 10, 11) as prophesying, “Of the *sacrifices* to be offered by us Gentiles in every place, *i. e.* the bread of the Eucharist, and the cup of the Eucharist.”<sup>2</sup> Irenæus cites the same prophecy, and applies it to the same Sacrament; saying that the prophet foretold “the new oblation of the new Testament, which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the world to God.”<sup>3</sup> Tertullian

<sup>1</sup> ἀμέμπτως καὶ δότως προσενέγκοντας τὰ ὄψαρα. — Clem. 1 *Ad Corinth.* c. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Περὶ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, ποιήσати τοῦ ἁγίου τῆς Εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε εἰπὼν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζειν ἡμῶν. — *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 260; cf. pp. 344, 345.

<sup>3</sup> “Novi Testamenti novam docuit ob-

lationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo.” — Lib. iv. c. 32, p. 323, Grabe.

So quoting Matt. v. 23, 24: “Cum igitur offers munus tuum ad altare,” &c., he says, “Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturæ” Lib. iv c 34, p. 325.

constantly speaks of oblations and sacrifices, using the word *offer* (*offerre*),<sup>1</sup> and so probably *oblation*<sup>2</sup> of the Eucharist; though the word *sacrifice* is applied by him rather to the sacrifice of prayer or praise.<sup>3</sup>

These are all authorities of the first two centuries; all witnesses within little more than a century from the Apostles. The question which occurs concerning them is, in what sense do they speak of offering and sacrifice?

Justin Martyr says: "The offering of fine flour, for those who were cleansed of leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which the Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to offer, in remembrance of His suffering."<sup>4</sup> Clemens Romanus speaks of "offering the gifts." Justin and Irenæus both refer to the "pure offering" of Malachi, which, though Justin after the LXX. translates it by *θυσία*, *sacrifice*, is in the Hebrew *מִנְחָה*, *mincha*, i. e. an oblation. Now the *mincha* was an offering of meal or flour baked, or of parched corn. It is a "meat-offering," according to the English version; but, as Joseph Mede observes, we might more correctly call it a *bread-offering*.<sup>5</sup> Again, Tertullian speaks of the Christian sacrifice as a sacrifice of "pure prayer;" as Justin Martyr also had done before him.<sup>6</sup>

We have very similar witness from Clement of Alexandria and Origen. The former calls the sacrifice of the Church, "Speech exhaled from holy souls, whilst the whole understanding is laid open before God together with the sacrifice."<sup>7</sup> And the holy altar, he says, is the righteous soul.<sup>8</sup> Origen, in like manner, frequently spiritualizes; but specially concerning the Eucharist he says, that "Celsus would give first-fruits to demons, so we offer first-fruits to God."<sup>9</sup>

In all these fathers, then, we find no certain reference to any

<sup>1</sup> "Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed nec docere, nec tinguere, nec offerre." — *De Velud. Virginitus*, c. 9.

<sup>2</sup> "Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitibus annua die facimus." — *De Corona Militis*, c. 2.

<sup>3</sup> "Sacrificamus pro salute imperatoris sed Deo nostro et ipsius, sed quo modo præcepit Deus, pura prece. Non enim eget Deus, Conditor universitatis, odoris aut sanguinis alicujus." — *Ad Scapulam*, c. 2. Cf. *Cont. Marc.* Lib. IV. c. 1, where he calls *Sacrificium mundum*. . . . simplex oratio de conscientia pura. So *De Orat.* 28. "Hæc (i. e. oratio) est hostia spiritualis, quæ pristina sacrificia delet." <sup>4</sup> "Ἡ τῆς σεμδύλεως προσφορά ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν

καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσαι, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν. — *Dial.* pp. 256, 260.

<sup>5</sup> Mede, *On the Christian Sacrifice*, ch. III.

<sup>6</sup> "Ὅτι μὲν σὺν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὑπὸ τῶν ἄξιων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι καὶ αὐτὸς φημι. — *Dial.* p. 345.

<sup>7</sup> "Ἡ θυσία τῆς ἐκκλησίας, λόγος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ψυχῶν ἀναθυμῶμενος, ἐκκαλυπτομένης ἅμα τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῆς διανοίας ἀπίσης τῷ Θεῷ. — *Clem. Strom.* VII. p. 848.

<sup>8</sup> βρωμὸν δὲ ἀλλθῶς ἅγιον, τὴν δικαίαν ψυχὴν. — *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Contra Celsum*, Lib. VIII. c. 33.

offering in the Eucharist, except the offering of the bread and wine in the way of gifts or oblations to the service of God; as the fine flour and the meat or bread-offerings were presented by the Jews, and with them a sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving. The use of the word *θυσία*, *sacrifice*, gives no contradiction to this statement: for besides that it is the rendering of the Hebrew *mincha* by the LXX. translators, it has been clearly proved that the word by no means of necessity implies an offering of a slain victim, though such was its primary signification; but that it is also applicable to all other kinds of offerings and oblations, whether it be in classical or biblical Greek.<sup>1</sup>

Very early we have express mention of a Christian altar.<sup>2</sup> But we can infer no more from the use of the word *altar*, than from the use of the word *sacrifice*. A sacrifice (*θυσία*) implies an altar (*θυσιαστήριον*). If the offering of the bread and wine, as first-fruits to God, be esteemed a sacrifice, then that whereon it is offered would be esteemed an altar. If the offering of prayer and praise be a sacrifice, the soul, from which they rise up to God, would be the altar. We need not question that these early fathers, as undoubtedly those after them, believed that the bread and wine offered to the Lord were offered in remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ, and so, that the Eucharist was a commemorative sacrifice. But it is remarkable, that even this view of the Eucharistic sacrifice does not expressly appear before the time of Cyprian. If the earliest fathers really believed that Christ in the Eucharist was offered afresh for the sins of the quick and dead, it is certainly a most extraordinary example of silence and reserve, that, for two centuries after Christ, they should never once have explained the sacrifice of the Eucharist in any manner, but either as an offering of first-fruits to God, like the *mincha* or fine flour of the Israelites, or else as an offering of praise and thanksgiving and spiritual worship.

In Athenagoras indeed (A. D. 150) occurs, I believe, the first example of that remarkable expression, so universally adopted by later fathers, the *unbloody sacrifice*. "Of what service to me are whole burnt-offerings, of which God has no need? Although it be

<sup>1</sup> See Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice*, ch. 1. sect. 1. He shows, from classical authorities, that "to sacrifice is to give to the gods" (*θύειν δωρεῖσθαι ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς*); and especially, that *θυσία* in the Greek, and *sacrificium* in the Latin, are the common rendering of *קָרְבָּן* in the Hebrew.

The Apostle calls Cain's offering of fruits

a *sacrifice*, *θυσία*, as well as Abel's offering of cattle. Heb. xi. 4. Hence, the Christian and theological application of the term, not only to animal, but also to inanimate offerings.

<sup>2</sup> *θυσιαστήριον*. See Ignat. *Ad Ephes.* 1. 5; *Magnes.* 7; *Trall.* 7; *Philadelph* 4, &c.



right to offer an *unbloody sacrifice*, and to bring the reasonable service." <sup>1</sup> Mr. Johnson sees "no occasion to doubt, that he means the oblation of material bread and wine." <sup>2</sup> It may be so; though we cannot with certainty say that he had the Eucharist in view at all. If he had, the very term, "unbloody sacrifice," takes us back to the distinction among the Israelites between offerings of slain beasts, *bloody sacrifices*, and offerings of bread, flour, and fruits, *unbloody sacrifices*. And so the very name by which the Eucharist was so constantly called afterwards, and which possibly Athenagoras first applied to it, seems to place it, as a material offering, rather with the *mincha*, or bread-offering, than with the *ὀλοκαύτωμα*, the burnt-offering, or bloody sacrifice of the Jews.

From the time of Cyprian, however, it is a fact too plain and notorious to need demonstration, that the fathers speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, with special reference to the Body and Blood of Christ, commemorated and spiritually present in that holy sacrament. St. Cyprian, referring to the priesthood of Melchizedek as a type of Christ's priesthood, says, that "in the priest Melchizedek we see prefigured the Sacrament of the Lord's sacrifice." <sup>3</sup> "Who was more a priest of the most High God, than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father? and He offered the same which Melchizedek had offered, *i. e.* bread and wine, even His own Body and Blood." <sup>4</sup> He then goes on to argue for the use of wine in the Eucharist, and not of water merely, which he considers essential for the perfect following of Christ, in His first institution of the sacrament. He says, that "therefore *Christ's Blood is not offered*, if there be no wine in the cup." <sup>5</sup> "If Jesus Christ our Lord and God is Himself the High Priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a sacrifice to His Father, and then commanded this to be done in remembrance of Him, then that priest truly performs the part of Christ, who imitates what Christ did, and then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, if he so begin to offer, as he sees Christ to have offered before." <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> τί δὲ μοι ὀλοκαυτώματων ὧν μὴ δέεται ὁ Θεός; καὶ τοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀνάμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν ἱεργικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν. — *Legatio pro Christianis*, 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Unbloody Sacrifice*, ch. II. sect. 1.

<sup>3</sup> "Item in sacerdote Melchisedec sacrificii Domini sacramentum præfiguratum videmus." — *Epist.* 63, p. 149. Oxf. 1682.

<sup>4</sup> "Num quis magis sacerdos Dei Summi quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus? qui sacrificium Deo Patri

obtulit; et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est panem et vinum, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem." — *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> "Unde apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici." — *Ibid.* p. 151.

<sup>6</sup> "Nam si Jesus Christus, Dominus et Deus noster, ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris; et sacrificium Patri se ipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem præcepit; utique ille

This is the first use of such language ; but it was common from this time. The Roman Catholics claim it, as clearly proving that a true sacrifice and offering up anew of Christ in the Eucharist was believed in the earliest time. Protestants have, on the contrary, asserted that no material sacrifice is intended at all ; that there is allusion only to a spiritual sacrifice, wherein the whole Church considered as Christ's Body is offered to God.<sup>1</sup> We may be so said symbolically to offer up in sacrifice *ourselves* ; and that is all.<sup>2</sup> Time and space will not permit a full investigation of the many passages which would elucidate this question, nor a full examination of the arguments. Against the Romanist theory the following facts appear to me fatal. First, there is the already noticed silence of all the fathers, till the middle of the third century, on so essential a part, if it be a part, of the Eucharistic doctrine. That Justin, Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, and Origen, should never have known of it, or, knowing, should never have mentioned it, seems utterly incredible, if the doctrine were from the beginning. Secondly, if there were always offered in the Church a real sacrifice of Christ Himself, then no other sacrifice could be compared with it. It must far exceed in glory and in value everything besides. Yet we find the fathers preferring spiritual sacrifices even to the oblation in the Eucharist. "Will they drive me from the altars?" says Gregory Nazianzen. "But I know there is another altar, whereof these visible altars are but the figures. . . . To that will I present myself ; there will I offer acceptable things, sacrifice and offering and holocausts, better than the one now offered, as much as truth is better than a shadow. From this altar no one can debar me."<sup>3</sup> Is it possible that any one should prefer an altar and a sacrifice, "all," as he says, "the work of the mind" (*ὄλον τοῦ νοῦ τὸ ἔργον*), before the very offering up of the Saviour of the world? We may add, that the fathers too frequently speak of the sacrifice of Christians as spiritual sacrifices,<sup>4</sup> for us to imagine that

sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur; et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesia Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse." — Ibid. p. 155.

<sup>1</sup> This undoubtedly was one of the views which the fathers took of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. "Hoc est sacrificium Christianum; *multitumum Corpus in Christo*. Quod etiam sacramento altaris fidelibus nota frequenter Ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re quam offert, ipsa offeratur." — Augustin. *De Civit. Dei*, Lib. x. c. 6, Tom. vii. p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> This seems to be Waterland's opinion. See *On the Eucharist*, ch. xii.

<sup>3</sup> *Θυσιαστηρίων εἰρέσουσι; ἄλλ' οἷδα καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, οὐ τύποι τὰ νῦν δρώμενα. . . . τούτῳ παραστήσομαι, τούτῳ θύσω δεκτῷ, θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν καὶ ὀλοκαυτώματα, κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, ἕσω κρείττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια. . . . τούτου μὲν οὐκ ἀπάξει με τὸν θυσιαστήριον πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος.* — Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xxviii. Tom. i. p. 484, cited by Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. xii.

<sup>4</sup> See for instance Euseb. *Dem. Evangel.* Lib. i. c. x., cited by Waterland, as a love. Cyril of Jerusalem calls the

they held a literal offering up of a literal sacrifice (that sacrifice being Christ's Body and Blood) on the altar in the Eucharist.

But, on the other hand, it seems to me that we cannot at once dismiss the whole question without farther inquiring in what sense the fathers did see in the Eucharist the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, for the propitiation of our sins. Their language, from the time of Cyprian, is both too uniform and too strong, for us to doubt that it had a pregnant significance.

The Eucharist undoubtedly succeeded to, and corresponded with the Passover. The latter was the type; the former is the memorial of the death of Christ. One typical of the great sacrifice; the other commemorative of the same. The one was the great federal rite of the Jews; the other is the great federal rite of the Christians. In this view the fathers much considered it. And so, as they viewed the Passover as a typical sacrifice, they viewed the Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice. We have already heard Chrysostom imagining and depicting, in his own fervid language, "the Lord sacrificed and lying, the priest standing by the sacrifice and praying,<sup>1</sup> &c." And it is admitted by most persons, that the Lord's Supper, if not a sacrifice, is yet (spiritually of course) a feast upon a sacrifice. Now the sacrifice feasted on is undoubtedly the Lord Jesus, the Lamb of God. Our ordinary idea of offering a sacrifice, when that sacrifice is a living victim, is that it must be slain when it is offered. But the early Christians appear to have understood that, although Christ was once for all slain, and so did once for all offer up Himself to God; yet, that every time His sacrifice is commemorated, and that sacrifice spiritually fed upon, we do, as it were, present before God, plead before the Father, the efficacy of that great offering, the all-prevailing merits of His precious Blood. The same is true, more or less, in every act of devotion. No well-instructed Christian ever prays to God, without pleading the atonement and the death of Christ. So, in effect, at every prayer we present to the Father the sacrifice of His Son. But more especially, and with most peculiar significance, we may be said to plead His merits, to present His efficacious passion, and so, in a certain sense, to offer His all-prevailing sacrifice before the

Eucharist "a spiritual sacrifice, an unbloody service," *τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀνὰ ἱμακτον λατρείαν.* — *Cat. Mystagog.* v. c. 6. St. Augustine describes the Christian sacrifice as the Sacrament or sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice. "Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, hoc est, sacrum

signum est." — *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. x. c. 5, Tom. VII. p. 241.

All such language is quite inconsistent with the notion of an actual offering up of Christ afresh for the sins of the world.

<sup>1</sup> Chrysost. *De Sacerdotio*, III. quoted under Art. XXVIII.

mercy-seat of God, when with the consecrated symbols of His Body and Blood before us, we approach the Table of the Lord, to be fed by Him with the food of everlasting life.

In this sense then, most especially, the fathers seem to have esteemed the Eucharist, not only a sacrificial feast, but also a sacrifice. It was indeed by a *metonymy*. The Eucharist was a remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) of the great sacrifice on the cross. And so it was called by the name of that which it recorded. But it was not only a remembrance to ourselves, it was also esteemed a special mode of pleading it before God; and therefore it was named a sacrifice. And as the sacrifice of the cross was the propitiatory sacrifice, so this too was called a sacrifice of propitiation, both because of its recalling that great propitiatory sacrifice, and because by enabling us spiritually to feed on, and to take the blessed fruit of that sacrifice to ourselves, it was the means of bringing home to our souls the pardoning efficacy of Christ's death, the propitiation for sins which He has wrought.<sup>1</sup>

No doubt, the other notions concerning the oblations in the Eucharist were kept in constant view. First, the fathers esteemed it an offering or presenting of the gifts of bread and wine, and of the alms of the faithful to the service of God; secondly, as an offering of the sacrifice of prayer and praise; thirdly, as a presenting of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and so of the whole mystical body of the faithful, to the Lord; but, fourthly, they esteemed it a memorial of Christ's sacrifice, a recalling of the efficacy of that sacrifice, and a pleading of its efficacy for the salvation of their souls.

This last notion it is which makes them use such solemn and awful language concerning it, which could not be applicable to the other views of it. Thus the Liturgy of St. James calls it the "tremendous and unbloody sacrifice." St. Chrysostom calls it "the fearful and tremendous sacrifice."<sup>2</sup> So also "most tremendous sacrifice."<sup>3</sup> Yet the same father, when he enters into an explanation, tells us that it is not a new sacrifice, or an offering up of Christ afresh; for he says, "There is but one sacrifice; we do not offer another sacrifice, but continually the same. Or rather we make a memorial of the sacrifice."<sup>4</sup> And so St. Augustine,

<sup>1</sup> Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, in the passage just cited. *Cat. Mystagog.* v. c. 6, speaks of the "spiritual Sacrifice, and the bloodless service over that sacrifice of propitiation," ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας τοῦ Ἰλασμοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> φοβερὰ καὶ φρικώδης θυσία. — *Homil.* XXXIV. in 1 ad Corinth.

<sup>3</sup> φρικωδεστάτη θυσία.

<sup>4</sup> Οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰετι ποιοῦμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. — *Homil.* XVII. in *Epist. ad Hebraeos*. See Suicer, s. v. θυσία, II. 2, Tom. I. p. 1421.

“Christians celebrate the memorial of the same fully finished sacrifice, by sacred oblation and participation of Christ’s Body and Blood.”<sup>1</sup>

It is easy to see that, when the doctrine of transubstantiation had once been invented and defined, the doctrine of the fathers concerning the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice in the Eucharist would be perverted into the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass. That doctrine is plainly enough expressed in the canons of the Council of Trent. Therein it is forbidden to deny, that a true and proper sacrifice is offered to God, — that Christ made His Apostles priests, on purpose that they might offer His Body and Blood, — that there is a propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, — that it profits others as well as the partakers,<sup>2</sup> &c.

From the belief, that in the mass there was a true offering up of Christ, not only for the benefit of the receiver, but anew for the sins of all the world, came naturally the custom, that the priest should offer the sacrifice, but the people should not communicate. Among the early Christians, all who did not communicate, left the Church. But, when the doctrine of the mass was once established, the people stayed to witness the offering up of the sacrifice, which they believed to be profitable both to them and to *all* the world, though the priest alone offered it, and the priest alone received. The Eucharist had, in fact, ceased to be a Sacrament. It had become, in the belief of the majority, a propitiatory offering, not a covenanting rite.

There was perhaps nothing against which the reformers generally were so strong in their denunciations, as against this. They deemed it derogatory to the one, full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, once offered on the Cross. “Christ,” says Luther, “once offered Himself; nor did He will to be offered up anew by any; but He willed that a memorial of His sacrifice should be observed.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “Hebræi in victimis pecudum quas offerebant Deo . . . prophetiam celebrabant futuræ victimæ, quam Christus obtulit. Unde jam Christiani peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione, et participatione Corporis et Sanguinis Christi.” — *Contra Faustum*, Lib. xx. c. 18, Tom. viii. p. 335.

<sup>2</sup> Sess. xxii. Can. i. “Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium . . . anathema sit.”

Can. ii. “Si quis dixerit . . . in illis verbis *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, Christum non instituisse Apostolos sacer-

dotes, aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi aliique sacerdotes offerrent Corpus et Sanguinem suum; anathema sit.”

Can. iii. “Si quis dixerit missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non propitiatorium, vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit.”

The Creed of the Council has: “Profiteor in missa offerri Deo verum, proprium et propitiatorium sacrificium.”

<sup>3</sup> “Christus semel seipsum obtulit, non

Calvin, after explaining the meaning of the word *sacrifice* as applied to the Eucharist by the fathers, does not blame them for the use of that term, but still regrets that they should have approached too near to Jewish notions. "Now that the sacrifice has been offered and completed," he says, "God gives us a table where we may feast, not an altar on which the victim is to be offered. He has not consecrated priests to immolate, but ministers to distribute."<sup>1</sup> He calls the sacrifice of the mass, the greatest abomination of all those erected against the Eucharist.<sup>2</sup>

The language of the English reformers is of still more interest to us. Let us hear Ridley, the most esteemed among them. "The whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that sacrifice upon the altar of the Cross; that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which, once only and no more, was offered as the price of our redemption."<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere he acknowledges, that "the priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice, if it be rightly understood;" which he explains by saying, that "It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner and in a mystery, and as a representation of that bloody sacrifice."<sup>4</sup> But the mass he calls, "a new blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins, both of the dead and of the quick, to the great and intolerable contumely of Christ our Saviour, His death and passion; which was, and is the only sufficient and everlasting, available sacrifice, satisfactory for all the elect of God, from Adam the first, to the last that shall be born to the end of the World."<sup>5</sup>

The dread of the mass, which has prevailed generally among the reformed Churches, has made the majority of their members fear to speak at all concerning an Eucharistic sacrifice. Yet there have not been wanting, in the English Church especially, men of profound learning, deep piety, and some of them by no means attached to peculiar schools of doctrine, who have advocated the propriety of speaking of *the Christian sacrifice*, and of adopting, in some measure, the language of the primitive Church concerning it.

voluit denuo ab ullis offerri, sed memoriam sui sacrificii voluit fieri." — *De Abroganda Missa Privata*, Tom. II. p. 249.

<sup>1</sup> "Mensam ergo nobis dedit in qua epulemur, non altare super quod offeratur victima; non sacerdotes consecravit, qui immolent, sed ministros qui sacrum epulum distribuant." — *Instit.* IV. c. iii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Instit.* IV. xviii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Disputations at Oxford, *Works*, Parker Society, p. 211.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 250.

<sup>5</sup> *A Piteous Lamentation*, *Works*, p. 52. Compare Cranmer, *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine*, Bk. V., *Works*, II. pp. 447–468.

The first who spoke strongly and clearly to this effect, was the learned Joseph Mede (A. D. 1635). His discourse was originally a Sermon on Malachi i. 11, which he maintained to be prophetic of the Eucharistic offering. And the offering in the Eucharist he defines to be an oblation of prayer and praise, of bread and wine, analogous to the *mincha* of the old Testament, and a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice on the cross.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Cudworth shortly after wrote his treatise on *The true notion of the Lord's Supper*, wherein he denied to the Eucharist the name of a sacrifice; but especially insisted that it was "a feast upon a Sacrifice." Grabe, in the notes on his edition of Irenæus (A. D. 1702) maintained the sentiments of Joseph Mede; for which he was attacked by Buddeus, a learned Lutheran,<sup>2</sup> who accused him of advocating the sacrifice of the mass, and afterwards by others, though he was defended by Pfaffius, also a Lutheran.<sup>3</sup> Sentiments in accordance with Mede's, and not much diverse from Grabe's, were undoubtedly adopted by a large number of our divines: *e. g.* by Hammond,<sup>4</sup> by Archbishop Bramhall,<sup>5</sup> by Bishop Patrick,<sup>6</sup> by Bishop Bull,<sup>7</sup> by Hickes,<sup>8</sup> by John Johnson,<sup>9</sup> and many others.

Bishop Bull's words may express the view which most of these divines have taken: "It is true, the Eucharist is frequently called by the ancient fathers *an oblation, a sacrifice*; but it is to be remembered that they say also, it is *θυσία λογική καὶ ἀναίμακτος, a reasonable sacrifice, a sacrifice without blood*: which how can it be said to be, if therein the very Blood of Christ were offered up to God? . . . In the holy Eucharist we set before God bread and wine, 'as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ, shed for us, and of His precious Body' (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy);<sup>10</sup> and plead to God the merit of His Son's Sacrifice once offered on the cross for us sinners, and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching Him for the sake there-

<sup>1</sup> See Mede's *Works*, p. 355. London, 1677. The discourse is most valuable, and deserving of all attention.

<sup>2</sup> Buddeus, *De Origine Missæ Pontificiæ*.

<sup>3</sup> Pfaffius, *Irenæi Fragm. Anecd.*

<sup>4</sup> *Practical Catechism*, p. 413. London, 1700.

<sup>5</sup> *Epistle to M. De la Milletière, Works*, i. p. 54, Edit. *Anglo-Cath. Library*. "We do readily acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of prayers and praises; we profess a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross; and, in the language of Holy Church, things commemorated are related as if they were then acted . . . We

acknowledge a representation of that action to God the Father: we acknowledge an impetration of the benefit of it: we maintain an application of its virtue. So here is a commemorative, impetrative, applicative sacrifice . . . To make it a suppletory sacrifice, to supply the defects of the only true Sacrifice of the Cross, I hope both you and I abhor."

<sup>6</sup> *On the Christian Sacrifice*.

<sup>7</sup> *Answer to the Bishop of Meaux, Lect. III. Works*, II. p. 251. Oxf. 1827.

<sup>8</sup> *Treatise on the Christian Priesthood*, ch. II.

<sup>9</sup> *On the Unbloody Sacrifice*.

<sup>10</sup> *Constitut. Apostol.* VII. 25.

of to bestow His heavenly blessing on us. . . . The Eucharistical sacrifice thus explained is indeed λογική θυσία, a reasonable sacrifice, widely different from that monstrous sacrifice of the mass taught in the Church of Rome.”<sup>1</sup>

---

## SECTION II. — SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. **W**E have seen, that in the mass the priest is said to offer up Christ afresh, as a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of quick and dead. That is to say, the mass is a repetition or iteration of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross.

This is in direct contravention of a large portion of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There (from ch. v. 1 to the end of ch. x.) St. Paul is showing the superiority of Christ's priesthood to that of the Levitical priests; the superiority of the sacrifice of Christ over the sacrifices offered under the Law. Now the very line of argument which he takes, all rests upon the permanency of Christ, His priesthood, and His sacrifice. “They truly were *many* priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death. But this Man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood . . . . who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for His own sins, and then for the people's: for this He did once for all (ἐφάπαξ) when He offered up Himself” (Heb. vii. 23, 24, 27). So, again, having observed that the Jewish high-priest entered into “the Holiest of all *once every year*, not without blood” (Heb. ix. 7): he adds, that Christ, “not by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own Blood entered in *once for all* (ἐφάπαξ) into the holy place, having obtained *eternal* redemption for us” (ver. 12). And again, “Christ is not entered into the holy places . . . . that He should offer Himself *often* . . . . but now *once for all* (ἅπαξ) in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many,” &c. (Heb. ix. 24, 26, 27, 28).

The first twenty-two verses of the 10th Chapter are devoted to farther insisting on this truth. The repetition of the Jewish sacrifices, St. Paul tells us, resulted from their imperfection. If

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Bull, as above.



they could have made “the comers thereunto perfect . . . would they not have ceased to be offered?” (vv. 1, 2). But “it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin” (v. 4). Hence, “every priest” under the Law “standeth *daily* ministering and offering *oftentimes* the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But He, after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God . . . For by *one* offering He hath perfected FOREVER them that are sanctified” (vv. 11, 12, 14). And the conclusion which is drawn is, that, as Christ has obtained remission for our sins, and “where remission of these is there is no more offering for sins” (v. 18); therefore we may “draw near with a true heart with a full assurance of faith” (v. 22); plainly, as being assured, that the one sacrifice, once offered, has been fully sufficient for all our sins.

Now, nothing can be plainer than this argument; and if it proves anything, surely it must prove, that to believe in the repetition of Christ's sacrifice is to believe in its imperfection. And if it be imperfect, in what a state are we! — we, who are lost sinners, and who have no hope but in the efficacy of the atoning Blood of Christ. If that atoning Blood be not of infinite value, we are of all creatures most miserable. But if it be of infinite value, and if the Sacrifice be perfect, and “able to make the comers thereunto perfect,” then the Apostle assures us, that it cannot need, that it will not admit of, repetition. “The worshippers once purged shall have no more conscience of sins” (ch. x. 2). “We are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all” (ver. 10). There is “a new and living way consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His Flesh” (ver. 20). And not only may we know, to our eternal comfort, that the one sacrifice has been full, perfect, and all-sufficient; but to our warning too we are told, that, “if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, *there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins*” (ver. 26). All combines to assure us, that the one Sacrifice has been once offered, that it admits no addition, that it can never be renewed. It is once for all, as man's death is but once. It is one and forever, as God's judgment is one and to eternity (Heb. ix. 28).

We may therefore confidently adopt the strong language of our Article, that “the sacrifices of masses were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”

II. Yet the Christian Church is said to be “an holy priesthood;” and is “to offer up *spiritual sacrifices* acceptable to God through

Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5). Those spiritual sacrifices are, 1. The sacrifice of prayer and praise: "By Him let us offer the *sacrifice* of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of the lips, giving thanks to His name" (Heb. xiii. 15). 2. The sacrifice of alms and of the first-fruits of our substance: "To do good and to communicate forget not; for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16). 3. The sacrifice of ourselves to the Lord: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (*τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*), Rom. xii. 1.

Hence, though the propitiatory sacrifice of our blessed Saviour has been offered once for all, never to be repeated; it is still our privilege and duty to offer Eucharistic sacrifices or thank-offerings — "a reasonable ministration" — "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." Such Eucharistic offerings correspond, as we have already seen, with the thank-offerings, the wave-offerings, the meat-offerings, the unbloody sacrifices of the Jews; not with the bloody sacrifices, or offerings of atonement.

It was the belief of the whole ancient Church, that the Lord's Supper consisted of two parts: one from God to us, God feeding us with the spiritual Body and Blood of His dear Son; the other from us to God, we sending up to Him the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, consecrating to Him of the fruits of our increase, and "presenting ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Him." Hence the whole ordinance was esteemed, not only as a feast, but also as an Eucharistic sacrifice, or thank-offering.

And moreover the Apostle has declared it to be a "showing forth (*καταγγελία*) of the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). It was therefore, as we have seen, esteemed by the fathers a commemoration, or "continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ." And, not only did they think of it as reminding *themselves* of God's infinite mercy to their souls, but also they believed it a proper occasion for pleading the greatness of that mercy before Him, from whom it comes down. It was a telling forth of Christ's sacrifice to man, a supplicatory representing of it to God.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There has been much questioning as to the propriety or impropriety of calling the Lord's Table an *Altar*. The word appears to have been used by the fathers, even from the time of Ignatius. See Ign. *Ad Ephes.* v.; Tertullian, *De Orat.* xix. &c. The only name by which we are certain that it is called in the new Testament, is *τράπεζα Κυρίου*, "the table of

the Lord," 1 Cor. x. 21. This, however, is put in opposition to the "table of demongods," which was probably an altar. Also in Mal. i. 7, 12, "altar" and "table of the Lord" seem to be synonymous. In Matt. v. 23, whether our Lord speaks of things as they were under the Jewish economy, or prophetically of what should be in the Christian Church, cannot certainly be re-

Lastly, they believed the prophecy in Malachi (that “among the Gentiles, in every place, incense should be offered to God’s name, and a pure offering,” *mincha purum*, Mal. i. 11) to have especial reference to the spiritual sacrifices thus offered in the Holy Communion. And we, in accordance with the saints of old, and with the chief lights of our own communion, adopt such language in such a sense; though the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, as suppletory to the sacrifice of the cross, we may reject as monstrous, and fear as profane.

solved; and therefore it cannot be concluded, whether he calls the Eucharistical table an *altar* or not. In Heb. xiii. 10, St. Paul says, “We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.” This is by many thought conclusive in favour of the use of the term *altar* for the Lord’s table; for, though we may speak of the cross, on which the great Sacrifice was offered up, as the Christian altar, yet the Apostles could not have spoken of *eating* of the

cross. The Christian feast is at the Eucharist, though the great Sacrifice was offered at the crucifixion. Hence it is contended, that the *altar*, at which Christians have a right to eat, must be the table of the Lord. The English reformers seemed, latterly at least, determined to give up the word *altar*, for fear of appearing to give sanction to the sacrifice of the mass. But the general language of Christians, both early and late, has been favourable to the use of it.