

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

LECTURE XII.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Socinian scheme. 5°. On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. Sentiments of the Fathers. The Eucharist contemplated by them, first as a *sacrifice*, not material (except as including an oblation of the fruits of the earth), but commemorative of the sacrifice of Christ; and secondly, as the *spiritual* food of his Body and Blood. Their testimony unfavourable to the Romish as well as to the Socinian views. The benefit not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, but represented as dependent on the fitness of the recipient. Strictness in this particular.

§ 5.

On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

THE Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is estimated as lowly as that of Baptism by the Socinians. They represent it as a mere commemoration of the death of Christ, the most signal of his acts: and not possessing any virtue in itself to serve us; whatever benefits we receive from Christ being independent of it, and enjoyed by us already¹; a doctrine, in both its features different from that of our Church, which maintains that the Lord's Supper is a continual remembrance of the *sacrifice* of the death of Christ; and that in it our souls are strengthened and refreshed by *the body and blood of Christ*. Let us see, then, on which side are the Fathers.

Now, whatever difficulty there may be in fixing with precision the notion of the Eucharist entertained by the Fathers, and reducing the numberless passages in which they speak of it to a perfect whole; this may be safely affirmed, that the entire current of their testimony is as much opposed to the Socinian Catechism as it is possible to imagine testimony to be: it sets quite in another direction. Bearing the Socinian theory in mind, let any man contemplate the following passages of the Fathers, and consider for himself whether they are not altogether conceived in a different spirit.

¹ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. iii.

"We ought to do all things," says Clemens Romanus, "in order, whatever the Lord hath commanded us to do. He hath commanded that our oblations and liturgical offices be at stated seasons, and not be an affair of chance . . . They, therefore, who make these oblations at the stated seasons are accepted and blessed."¹ It is impossible not to suppose that these oblations referred to the Eucharist, and consequently that the term *προσφορὰ* was applied to it even in the time of Clemens in some sense or other. The case is rendered more certain by a similar but fuller expression which occurs subsequently, "It will be no small sin, if we cast out of their Episcopal office men who have *offered their gifts* holily and without blame."²

Justin Martyr, after quoting Malachi i. 11, where God says, that he will not accept the offering of the Jews, but will have in every place incense offered to his name and a pure offering (*θυσία καθαρά*),—explains, that God is here prophesying of the sacrifices which are offered to him by the Gentiles, namely the bread of the Eucharist and the wine of the Eucharist³: moreover, the quotation, and the application of it too, is made three several times in the course of this Dialogue.⁴ Again, after alluding to the type contained in the Paschal Lamb, and that in the scape-goat, and the goat for sacrifice, he adds, "The oblation also of the fine flour, which those who are cleansed from leprosy were required to make, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to offer in remembrance of the Passion which he suffered for men, who have their souls thus purged from all evil; so that at one and the same time we may give God thanks for having created the world and all things in it for man, and for having delivered us from the evil in which we were born."⁵ But in the Apology, addressed to Gentiles, with whom the sacrificial texts of the Levitical law, which give a complexion to his whole argument in the Dialogue addressed to the Jews, would be out of place, he rather advances the other view of the mystical character of

¹ Clemens Romanus, Ad Corinth. I. § xl.

² § xliv.

³ Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπων ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῶν θυσιῶν, τούτεστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχα-

ριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε εἰπὼν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζειν ἡμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ βεβηλοῦν.—Justin Martyr, Dial. § 41.

⁴ § 28, § 117.

⁵ § 41.

the Eucharist, as communicating to us the Body and Blood of Christ; saying, "And this food is called by us the Eucharist, whereof it is not lawful for any to partake except those who believe that the things taught by us are true, and who have been washed in the laver for the remission of sins, and for regeneration, and who live as Christ hath commanded. For we do not receive these things as common bread, or as a common cup; but, as through the word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour becoming incarnate, took flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made through the prayer of that word which came from him—by which food our blood and flesh are nourished, by its conversion into them—is the Body and Blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."¹ Justin did not exclude from his meaning of the word "oblations" the material elements before consecration, which were brought to the altar; and a fragment of Irenæus, to which I shall presently advert, seems to encourage this notion; still the main feature of his picture of the Eucharist is this, that it is a *commemoration* only of the sacrifice of Christ, though itself called, by a common metonymy, a sacrifice. That such is Justin's view, and that he had no intention of representing the Eucharist to be a material sacrifice (whatever he might say of the fruits as a material oblation), is plain from a well-known passage in the Dialogue; where he understands the Eucharist as a sacrifice in no other sense than as prayer is a sacrifice. "That prayers and thanksgivings made by the worthy are the only sacrifices which are perfect and well-pleasing to God, I myself admit, for these are the only ones which Christians have received it in charge to offer, even in the commemoration of their food, dry and liquid, in which *remembrance is made of the Passion which the Son of God suffered for them.*"² But it is obvious that in thus analysing the meaning of Justin, the temptation to rescue him from the Socinian is not the smallest possible. The Socinian, so far from considering the Eucharist a sacrifice, does not even con-

¹ Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.

² Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτὸς φημι. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόναι καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον

ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρὰς τε καὶ ὑγρὰς, ἐν ἧ' καὶ τοῦ πάθους, ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοὺς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, μέμνηται. — Justin Martyr, Dial. § 117.

sider it symbolical of a sacrifice; whilst our only difficulty with respect to Justin is to discover the sense in which he understands it to be a sacrifice; for that he does so understand it in some sense or other is indisputable. The Socinian, so far from teaching that we are partakers of Christ's body really but spiritually, pronounces such opinion to be "out of the question;"¹ whilst in Justin's case, his assertion of Christ's presence in the Eucharist is so marked, that our only care is to show (and it most clearly can be shown) by such expressions used by him as "food liquid and solid,"² "memorials of Christ's Body and Blood,"³ "sacrifice" of the same kind as prayer,⁴ in relation to the Eucharist, that he could have no idea of a corporal presence.

Turn we next to Irenæus, whose language, inartificial as it is, like that of Justin, will be found substantially to convey the same impressions; the argument often drawn from the same premises, and requiring the same construction to be put on it. "The Lord took of his *creatures*, even bread, and gave thanks, and said, This is my Body; and in like manner the cup, another of his *creatures*, he pronounced to be his Blood; and set forth this new *oblation* of the New Testament: an oblation which the Church, having received it from the Apostles, offers up to God the whole world through; to God, who provides us with *food*; these being the *first-fruits* of his gifts under the New Testament, touching which Malachi spake, saying, 'In every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering, for my name shall be great among the Gentiles.'"⁵ And again, "Moreover, oblations are not reprobated in themselves" (Irenæus is here alluding to expressions in the prophets, which he had been quoting, to the disparagement of sacrifice) "for there were *oblations* amongst the Jews, and there were oblations amongst us; *sacrifices* amongst the people, and sacrifices in the Church; only the nature of them is changed."⁶ And again, in a remarkable passage, "This oblation the Church, and the Church only, offers pure to the Creator, when she offers him a portion of his own *creatures with thanksgiving*. For the Jews make no

¹ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetical Office, ch. iii. Locum habere nequit.

² Justin Martyr, Dial. § 117.

³ § 70.

⁴ § 117.

⁵ Irenæus, IV. c. xvii. § 5.

⁶ c. xviii. § 2.

such offering, their hands being full of blood, neither have they received the Word which is offered to God.”¹ Now certain terms in these extracts from Irenæus seem to imply, as before, that the bread and wine brought to the altar, and out of which the elements were to be taken, are to be considered a material offering of the fruits of the earth; an emphasis being laid on them as God’s creatures, and as our food; Irenæus (as was the case with Justin before him, perhaps,) having probably in contemplation the Gnostic heresy, which denied to God his own creation, assigning it to a Demiurgus, and so finding a token of the orthodox Christian’s allegiance to the one true God in his oblation of the first-fruits of the earth. But, however we may admit this partial and subordinate view of the elements to have entered into the contemplation of Irenæus, as it seemed before to do into that of Justin, still the broad light in which he also regarded the Eucharist, was that of a commemorative, not a material sacrifice. And the distinction I am taking appears to be in harmony with a fragment of Irenæus given by Pfaffius, “For the offering of the Eucharist is not carnal, but spiritual; and so, pure. For we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks unto Him for having commanded the earth to bring forth *these* fruits for our food. *And then, having completed the oblation,* we invoke the Holy Ghost that He would render this same *sacrifice*, the bread the Body of Christ, the cup the Blood of Christ; in order that those who partake of these *figures*, may obtain remission of sins and everlasting life. They, therefore, who bring these offerings in remembrance of the Lord, do not approach the opinions of the Jews, but performing a *spiritual service* will be called sons of wisdom.”² Accordingly, the phrase of Ire-

¹ Et hanc oblationem ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creaturâ ejus. Judæi autem non offerunt: manus enim eorum sanguine plene sunt: non enim receperunt Verbum, quod offertur Deo.—Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 4.

² Διότι καὶ ἡ προσφορά τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὐκ ἔστι σαρκική, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ καθαρὰ. Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας εὐχαριστούντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῆ ἐκέλευσεν ἐκφύσαι τοὺς καρπὸς τούτους εἰς τροφήν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν

προσφορὰν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφῆνῃ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων, τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. Οἱ οὖν ταύτας τὰς προσφοράς ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγοντες, οὐ τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δόγμασι προσέρχονται, ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶς λειτουργούντες τῆς σοφίας υἱοὶ κληθήσονται.—Irenæus, Frag. xxxviii. p. 26, Bened. Ed.]

næus in reference to the ulterior progress of the rite is, not merely that the bread and the wine were offered to God as creatures, though this he says, but “as creatures with thanksgiving,” *i. e.* the elements, together with their consecration, were offered; the Eucharist in short was the oblation; but in no material sense: for he himself explains the “incense,” which Malachi couples with the “pure offering,” of the “prayers of the saints;”¹ and “the altar,” to which the gifts are to be brought, as an altar in heaven²; what forbids, then, “the pure offering” to represent the clean heart, the cheerful alms, the grateful service of the communicants; to all which portions of the rite he himself points, in commenting upon the expression of Malachi³; and which must go along with that lively representation or showing forth of the death of Christ, which the Lord himself appointed, and which Irenæus describes by the phrase, “The Lord took of his creatures, gave thanks over them, called them his Body and Blood, and so instituted the new oblation of the New Testament;”⁴ “an oblation,” he afterwards adds,⁵ “which the Jews could not make, because they had not received the Word which is offered;” not, however, in this instance, perhaps, offered in the Eucharist, even commemoratively, though such may be the sense, but offered on the Cross: unless indeed another reading be preferred, *per quod offertur Deo*, “through whom it is offered to God.” So much for the *commemorative* nature of this rite as understood by Irenæus. With respect to the other aspect of it, the communion which it is of the Body and Blood of Christ, this doctrine is asserted plainly enough in the following places: “For if the flesh be not saved, then did not the Lord redeem us by his Blood, neither is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of his Blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of his Body.”⁶ And again, “Christ has declared the cup, which is of the creature, to be *his own Blood* which was shed, wherewith he moistens our blood; and the bread, which is of the creature, to be his own Body, with which he causes

¹ Incensa autem Joannes in Apocalypsi orationes esse ait sanctorum.—*Contra Hæret. IV. c. xvii. § 6.*

² Altare in cœlis, illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur.—*c. xviii. § 6.*

⁴ *c. xvii. § 5.*

³ § 3, § 4.

⁵ *c. xviii. § 4.*

⁶ Si autem non salvetur hæc, videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos; neque calix eucharistiæ communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus, communicatio corporis ejus est.—*V. c. ii. § 2.*

our bodies to grow," *i. e.* not materially through transubstantiation, for he had just before said, it was by God's *creatures* that our bodies were nourished, no substantial change therefore taking place in the elements¹; but, as he himself goes on to tell us in explanation, "the *true man*, consisting of flesh, and nerves, and bones, is nourished by the cup which is his Blood, and is increased by the bread which is his Body. And like as a branch of the vine, put into the ground, brings forth fruit in its season; and a grain of wheat, falling to the ground and there dissolved, riseth again with manifold increase by the Spirit of God which containeth all things; and they afterwards, by Divine wisdom, serve for the use of man, and receiving the Word of God, become the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ; so, also, our bodies being fed by it (*viz.* the Eucharist), and laid in the ground, after dissolving there, shall yet rise in their season by means of the Divine Logos vouchsafing them a resurrection to the glory of God the Father."² That is, the elements after consecration receiving the Word, become the Body and Blood of Christ, and impart by virtue thereof to the flesh a principle of immortality. For the Word communicating through the Eucharist with the soul, is thus brought into connection with the flesh, and so renders the flesh capable of rising again; the spiritual man made "a member of the Body of Christ, of his flesh and of his bones, not by a natural, but by a spiritual union."³ The faulty part of this view of the Eucharist, Dr. Waterland, in a passage I have already applied from him to Baptism, considers to be this, that Irenæus seems to superinduce the Logos upon the symbols themselves, rather than

¹ Ἐπειδὴ μέλη αὐτοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ διὰ τῆς κτίσεως τρεφόμεθα.—Irenæus, V. c. ii. § 2. See Philalethes Cantabrigiensis, p. 118.

² Οὐ περὶ πνευματικῶν τινῶς καὶ ἀοράτου ἀνθρώπου λέγων ταῦτα· τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα οὔτε ὀστέα οὔτε σάρκα ἔχει· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἀνθρώπου οἰκονομίας, τῆς ἐκ σαρκὸς καὶ νεύρων καὶ ὀστέων συνεστῶσης· ἥτις καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, τρέφεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ἀύξεται. Καὶ ὅντιν τρόπον τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου κλιθὲν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ ἐκαρποφόρησε, καὶ ὁ κόκκος

τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθεὶς, πολλοστὸς ἠγέρθη διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ συνέχοντος τὰ πάντα· ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ τῆς σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν ἐλθόντα ἀνθρώπων, καὶ προσλαμβάνοντα τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα ἐξ αὐτῆς τρεφόμενα καὶ τεθέντα εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθέντα ἐν αὐτῇ ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ, τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐγερσιν αὐτοῖς χαριζομένου εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς.—Irenæus, V. c. ii. § 3.

³ Philalethes Cantabrigiensis, p. 110.

upon the recipients. I agree with him, however, in the remark which he subjoins, that the inaccuracy is rather verbal than real; for certainly, when Irenæus was enlarging on the Eucharist in its other character, as a commemorative offering, he insisted on the *purity* of the parties as necessary in order to render the commemorative oblation effective. "It must be made," says he, "with a clean heart, in faith, without hypocrisy, in steadfast hope, in fervent clarity."¹ And he then adds, that the Jews did not make it, nor yet many of the heretics; the rite in both these instances, according to Irenæus, being vitiated by a defective faith.

Clemens Alexandrinus does not happen to enlarge on the Eucharist in its aspect as a commemorative sacrifice. Casual expressions, however, occasionally escape from him, which show that the idea itself was familiar to his mind. For instance, "To those who lack understanding, saith Wisdom, that is to the heretics, I suggest, touch the bread which is secret, for it is pleasant, and the theft of water, which is sweet²; where Scripture evidently speaks of the bread and the water in reference to the heretics who adopt bread and water for an oblation, contrary to the Canon of the Church. For some persons there are who celebrate the Eucharist in water only."³ We have certainly here a sacrificial view of the Eucharist presented to us, and the defect of those pointed out who used water instead of wine, or rather instead of wine and water, for a symbol; that defect consisting in an element being chosen which did not express the blood of the victim that purged away sin; the offenders appearing to have been Humanitarians.⁴ But of the Eucharist in its other character of sacramental or symbolical food, as the Body and Blood of Christ by which our souls are strengthened and refreshed,

¹ Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus gratos inveniri fabricatori Deo, in sententiâ purâ et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firmâ, in dilectione ferventi.—Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 4.

² Prov. ix. 17.

³ Καὶ τοῖς ἐνδεέσι φρενῶν, παρακελεύομαι, λέγουσα, φησὶν ἡ Σοφία, τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὰς αἱρέσεις δηλονότι ἄρτων κρυφίων ἡδέως ἄψασθε, καὶ ὕδατος κλοπῆς γλυκεροῦ ἄρτον καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἐπ' ἀλλῶν τινῶν, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ὕδατι κατὰ τὴν

προσφορὰν, μὴ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, χρωμένων αἱρέσεων, ἐμφανῶς ταυτοῦσης τῆς γραφῆς. Εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ καὶ ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσιν.—Stromat. I. § xix. p. 375.

⁴ Vani autem et Ebionæi, unctionem Dei et hominis per fidem non recipientes in suam animam . . . Reprobant itaque hi commixtionem vini cœlestis, et solum aquam sæculearem volunt esse; non recipientes Deum ad commixtionem suam.—Irenæus, V. c. i. § 3.

Clemens repeatedly tells us: indeed, the temper of his mind would naturally lead him to dwell on such a subject. Thus, in common with the early Fathers in general, and in direct opposition to the Racovian Catechism,¹ he applies our Lord's language in the sixth chapter of St. John to the Eucharist. "But since he said, 'And the bread which I will give is my flesh;' and the flesh is moistened by blood; and wine is figuratively called blood; we must understand that as bread crumbled into the mixed cup appropriates the wine, but rejects the aqueous portion; so the flesh of the Lord, the bread from heaven, absorbs the blood; *i. e.* nourishes heavenly men unto immortality, but rejects carnal lusts, and leaves them to destruction. Thus the Word is expressed by different figures, as meat, flesh, food, bread, blood, milk."² Again, the subject of drinking, one of the themes of the Pædagogus, leads to a still more distinct enunciation of the doctrine of the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood, whereby the soul, as our Catechism affirms, and as the Racovian Catechism denies, is strengthened and refreshed. "The wine is mingled with the water, the Spirit with the man; the one, the mixture, cheers to faith; the other, the Spirit, guides to incorruption. But the mingling of both, that is, of the drink and of the Word, is called the Eucharist, a famous and excellent grace; whereof they who partake in faith, are sanctified by it both body and soul: the paternal will mystically combining man, the divine mixture, with the Spirit and the Word."³ I know not that it is worth while to multiply quotations to the same effect; a large proportion of which would be found, at the same time

¹ Quid vero statuendum est de corporis et sanguinis Christi usu, John vi. 35, 48, 54 . . . ? Non agit eo loco Christus de cenâ suâ.—Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, c. iii.

² Ἐπεὶ δὲ εἶπεν, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἔστιν· σὰρξ δὲ αἵματι ἄρδεταί· τὸ δὲ αἶμα οἶνος ἀλληγορεῖται· ἰστέον οὖν ὅτι ὡς ἄρτος εἰς κρᾶμα καταθρυβεί, τὸν οἶνον ἀρπάξει, τὸ δὲ ὕδατος ἀπολείπει· οὕτω καὶ ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ ἄρτος τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀναπίνει τὸ αἶμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐκτρέφει, ἀπολείπει δὲ νόμον ἐκείνας εἰς φθορὰν, τὰς σαρκικὰς ἐπιθυμίας·

οὕτως πολλαχῶς ἀλληγορεῖται ὁ Δόγος, καὶ βρῶμα, καὶ σὰρξ, καὶ τροφή, καὶ ἄρτος, καὶ αἶμα, καὶ γάλα.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 125.

³ Κίρναται ὁ μὲν οἶνος τῷ ὕδατι, τῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ τὸ μὲν εἰς πίστιν εὐωχεῖ, τὸ κρᾶμα· τὸ δὲ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ὀδηγεῖ, τὸ Πνεῦμα· ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν αὐτῆς κρᾶσις, ποτοῦ τε καὶ Λόγου, Εὐχαριστία κέκληται, χάρις ἐπαινουμένη καὶ καλὴ ἥς οἱ κατὰ πίστιν μεταλαμβάνοντες ἀγιάζονται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν τὸ θεῖον κρᾶμα, τὸν ἀνθρώπον, τοῦ πατρικοῦ βουλεύματος Πνεύματι καὶ Λόγῳ συγκίρναντος μυστικῶς.—II. c. ii. p. 177.

that they assert the real presence, to imply that the corporal presence was not thought of. Thus, "he shall bind his foal to the vine, that is," says Clemens, "he shall bind this simple and infant people (the Christian converts) to the Word, which is called the vine by a figure; for the vine bears wine, as the Word, Blood; and both are drunk by man to his salvation: the wine being for his body's health, the Blood for his spirit's:"¹ where the Blood of Christ is evidently understood in a spiritual and not in a physical sense. "Scripture calls the wine the *mystical symbol* of the holy Blood."² "The holy fluid of joy expresses, in a figure, the Word who was poured forth for many, for the remission of sins."³ "Melchizedek" (whom Clemens appears to regard as a personification of the Saviour himself) "was king of Salem, and Priest of the most high God, and gave wine and bread, *consecrated food*, as a type of the Eucharist."⁴ From such early times, according to the Fathers, was this great mystery of the Eucharist announced, and with such solemnity was the way prepared for it. How altogether unlike the Socinian reading of it!

In Tertullian, who is our next witness, we have both views of the Sacrament upheld—the commemorative sacrifice—the spiritual food. Thus he speaks of the "wine which Christ consecrated to the *memory of his Blood*."⁵ Again, on another occasion, after contending for the Pax or salutation not being withheld under certain circumstances, when some hesitated to admit it, he proceeds to touch on a kindred scruple—whether on the regular service days, Wednesdays and Fridays, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was to be attended, superseding, as it might seem to do, the Office of the day. "Many think," says he, "that on the days of the stations they ought

¹ Καὶ τὸν πῶλον, φησὶ, προσέδησεν ἀμπέλω ἀπλοῦν τούτου καὶ νήπιον λαὸν τῷ Λόγῳ προσδήσας, ὃν ἀμπέλον ἀλληγορεῖ. Φέρει γὰρ οἶνον ἡ ἀμπελος, ὡς αἷμα ὁ Λόγος· ἀμφω δὲ ἀνθρώποις ποτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν ὁ μὲν οἶνος, τῷ σώματι· τὸ δὲ αἷμα, τῷ πνεύματι.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. v. pp. 106, 107.

² Μυστικὸν ἄρα σύμβολον ἡ γραφὴ αἵματος ἁγίου οἶνον ὠνόμασεν.—II. c. ii. p. 184.

³ Καὶ εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν,

Λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου· τὸν Λόγον, τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφῃσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἁγίου ἀλληγορεῖ νᾶμα.—II. c. ii. p. 186.

⁴ Βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἄρτον τῆν ἡγιασμένην διδοὺς τροφήν εἰς τύπον εὐχαριστίας.—Stromat. IV. § xxv. p. 637.

⁵ Quod in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit.—Tertullian, De Animâ, c. xvii.

not to attend the Prayers of the *Sacrifices*, because the station ought to be broken up, when the Body of the Lord has been received. Does, then, the Eucharist break up a Service devoted to God? Nay, does it not rather bind it to God? Will not your station be the more solemn, if you stand *at the altar of God too?* The Body of the Lord received and reserved, both are safe, the participation in the sacrifice, and the performance of the Service"¹—the Eucharist a sacrifice; the place of its celebration an altar. But how do we read elsewhere? "We sacrifice for the safety of the Emperor, but it is to our God and his; and it is after the manner our God prescribes, by *pure prayer*;"² that is, by the prayer for the Catholic Church in the primitive Communion Service, one clause of which was in behalf of the Emperor, as the corresponding clause is still retained in our own; and this is here represented by Tertullian as an integral part of the *sacrifice*.

And, indeed, how far this Father was from seeing the material flesh of Christ in the oblation will be evident from the sense in which he understood the real presence, or the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; the other phase of this Sacrament, to which we will now turn. Thus he speaks of Christ "having consecrated his Blood in the wine;"³ of "feeding on the fatness of the Lord's Body in the Eucharist;"⁴ of "the flesh feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ, that the soul may be fatted of God;"⁵ strong expressions, certainly; the last argument, however, being, that the flesh, for the resurrection of which he is pleading, possessed a dignity which would make it a fit subject for being raised again; a dignity derived to it, as from other circumstances, so from the circumstance of its Sacramental alliance with the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; whereby, whilst the bread and wine are con-

¹ Similiter et stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit, accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resolvit? An magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini, et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii, et executio officii.—De Oratione, c. xix.

² Itaque et sacrificamus pro salute

Imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius: sed quomodo præcepit Deus, purâ prece.—Ad Scapulam, c. ii.

³ Sanguinem suum in vino consecra- vit.—Adversus Marcionem IV. c. xl.

⁴ Atque ita exinde opimitate Domini corporis vescitur, Eucharistiâ scilicet.—De Pudicitia, c. ix.

⁵ Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima Deo saginetur.—De Resurrectione Carnis, c. viii.

sumed by the flesh, the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ are conveyed to the soul through its connection with the flesh. But in the same treatise, when answering an objection to the disparagement of the flesh, deduced from the text, "the flesh profiteth nothing," he contends that the apparent meaning of it is to be qualified; that inasmuch as the Jews thought Christ's saying hard and intolerable, as though he had affirmed *that his flesh was really to be eaten by them*, he premised, in order to refer the state of salvation to the spirit, "the spirit it is which giveth life," and then he added, "the flesh profiteth nothing," that is, so far as giving life was concerned. . . . Thus constituting the Word the giver of life, because the Word is spirit and life, he called the same his flesh, because the Word was made flesh, and so was to be sought after for the sake of life, and to be *devoured by hearing*, and to be *masticated by the understanding*, and to be *digested by faith*." ¹ Tertullian, it is true, does not here speak of the Eucharist in direct terms, but he alludes to the language of the sixth chapter of St. John, which the Fathers in general, as we have seen, interpret of the Eucharist, and which, in the next quotation I shall make, seems to be so understood by Tertullian himself; nor could that Sacrament be out of his thoughts when he was writing; and his reasoning, we see, is, that it was not the material flesh of Christ which was to be eaten to give life; but the Word, which is spirit, to be eaten by the spiritual part of the man, through faith. The passage in which he considers the sixth chapter of St. John as bearing on the Eucharist, and which itself also illustrates his idea of the real presence, and confirms what I have said already, is in his exposition of the Lord's Prayer. The clause, "Give us this day our daily bread," he would have taken in a spiritual sense; "for Christ is our bread, because Christ is life, and bread is life. I am the bread of life, saith he. And a little before, the bread is the Word of

¹ Sic etsi carnem ait nihil prodesse, ex materiâ dicti dirigendus est sensus. Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset; ut in spiritum disponeret statum salutis, præmisit: Spiritus est qui vivificat; atque ita subjunxit, Caro nihil prodest; ad vivificandum scilicet. . . .

Itaque sermonem constituens vivificantem, quia spiritus et vita sermo, eundem etiam carnem suam dixit, quia et sermo caro erat facta, proinde in causam vitæ appetendus et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus.—De Resurrectione Carnis, c. xxxvii.

the living God which came down from heaven. Then again, because in the bread is understood his Body. This is my Body. Wherefore in praying for daily bread, we pray to be perpetually in Christ, and undivided from his Body."¹ The juxtaposition in which Tertullian here places the Lord's appointment of the Eucharist, and his speech in the sixth chapter of St. John, shows that he considers the latter to involve that Sacrament. The passages I have adduced, then, may suffice to prove on the one hand that Tertullian believed in the real presence, on the other that he did not believe in the corporal. Other conclusions against the Romish doctrine I have extracted from him in a former Lecture,² and shall not repeat them now.

Hippolytus, in a fragment of a commentary on Prov. ix. 1, offers us the two views of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which I have been bringing before you, very distinctly in one and the same paragraph. " 'She hath furnished her table,' *i. e.* the knowledge of the Holy Trinity which had been promised; and his precious and unpolluted Body and Blood, which in the mystical and Divine table *are daily sacrificed in remembrance of that first and ever memorable table of the mystical and Divine supper.* 'She hath sent forth her servants,' *i. e.* Wisdom or Christ hath called them together with a loud cry, saying, 'Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither to me;' by those servants meaning the holy Apostles who were to traverse the whole world, and call the nations truly to the knowledge of him by their sublime and divine publication of these things. 'To them that want understanding,' *i. e.* to those who did not yet possess the power of the Holy Ghost, she saith, 'Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled,' *i. e.* his Divine Flesh and his precious Blood, which he hath given us to eat and to drink for the remission of sins."³

¹ *Quoniam panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie, spiritualiter potius intelligamus. Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus, et vita panis. Ego sum, inquit, panis vite. Et paulo supra: Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de cælis. Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur. Hoc est corpus meum. Itaque petendo panem quotidianum, perpetuitatem postu-*

lamus in Christo, et individuitatem a corpore ejus.—De Oratione, c. vi.

² Lecture II. First Series.

³ Καὶ ἠτοιμάσατο τὴν ἑαυτῆς τράπεζαν, τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατεπαγγελλομένην. Καὶ τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μυστικῇ καὶ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιτελοῦνται θυόμενα εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀειμνήστου καὶ πρώτης.

Origen yields a similar testimony to that of the other Fathers on both the features of the Eucharist I am investigating. First, with respect to the commemorative sacrifice. "The divine Scripture saith, 'And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not; and he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward.' This shows how the rite of *propitiation for men to Godwards was celebrated*. But do not you, who are come to Christ, the true High Priest, who hath rendered God propitious to you by his Blood, and reconciled you to his Father, do not you stop short in the *blood of the flesh*; but rather acquaint yourself with the Blood of the Word, and hear him saying unto you, 'for this is my Blood which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.' He who hath been *imbued with the mystery*, knows both *the Flesh and the Blood of the Word of God*. Let us not then pause on these matters, which are known to the initiated, and cannot be laid open to the ignorant. Moreover do not suppose this sprinkling to the eastward had no meaning. The propitiation came to you from the east. For from that quarter came the man whose name is Oriens (*ἀνατολή*), who was made the Mediator between God and man."¹ This passage, it is true, has reached us only

ἐκείνης τραπέζης τοῦ μυστικοῦ θείου δείπνου. Τὸ δὲ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς ἐαυτῆς δούλους ἢ Σοφιά, ὁ Χριστὸς δηλονότι, συγκαλοῦσα μετὰ ὑψηλοῦ κηρύγματος ὃς ἐστὶν ἄφρων, ἐκκλινάτω πρὸς με, φάσκουσα, τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀποστόλους πρόδηλον, τοὺς εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον διαδραμόντας καὶ προσκαλέσαντας τὰ ἔθνη εἰς τὴν ἐκείνου ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθῶς τῷ ὑψηλῷ καὶ θείῳ τούτων κηρύγματι. Τὸ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐνδεέσι φρενῶν εἶπε, τοῖς μήπω κεκτημένοις τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος δύναμιν δηλονότι, ἔλθετε, φάγετε τὸν ἐμὸν ἄρτον, καὶ πῖετε οἶνον ὃν κέκρακα ὑμῖν, τὴν θείαν αὐτοῦ σάρκα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αὐτοῦ αἶμα δέδωκεν ἡμῖν, φησὶν, ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.—Hippolytus, Frag. p. 282.

¹ Ait ergo eloquium divinum, et imponet incensum super ignem in con-

spectu Domini, et operiet fumus incensi propitiatorium quod est super testimonia, et non morietur, et sumet de sanguine vituli, et resperget digito suo super propitiatorium contra orientem (Levit. xvi. 13.) Ritus quidem apud veteres propitiationis pro hominibus, qui fiebat ad Deum, qualiter celebraretur, edocuit: sed tu qui ad Christum venisti, Pontificem verum, qui sanguine suo Deum tibi propitium fecit, et reconciliavit te Patri, non hereas in sanguine carnis: sed discite potius sanguinem Verbi, et audi ipsum tibi dicentem, quia, Hic sanguis meus est, qui pro vobis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Novit, qui mysteriis imbutus est, et carnem et sanguinem Verbi Dei. Non ergo immoremur in his quæ et scientibus nota sunt, et ignorantibus patere non possunt. Quod autem contra orientem respergit, non otiose accipias. Ab ori-

in the Latin translation of Rufinus (for probably his it is¹), but as a part of the second Homily upon Genesis is preserved in the Greek, and as the version is there found to be close to the original, it is to be presumed that it is generally trustworthy in these Homilies on the books of Moses. And the paragraph before us seems to point plainly enough to the Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice. It had the nature of a sacrifice in some sense, for the parallel runs between that and the Levitical one, even to minute matters; and it is expressly denied to be a material sacrifice, for the Christian is enjoined not to take so low a view of it as that. What could it be else, then, but commemorative, and significant of the Passion which it represented? The same conclusion would follow from another place in Origen, where the original text is preserved. “‘God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth:’ by which the Saviour taught that we are not to worship God in the flesh, and by *fleshly sacrifices*, but *in the spirit*. For he would be understood to be a Spirit, in proportion as he is worshipped in spirit and with the understanding: but we must not worship the Father in types” (*i. e.* with carnal sacrifices), “but in truth; which truth came by Jesus Christ, subsequent to the law given by Moses.”² The service which the Christian has to offer is here distinguished from the Judaical in this, that whilst in the one the sacrifices were material, in the other they were spiritual—that of the Eucharist, the very foremost of the Christian offices, of course included, unless Origen, like several of the Fathers before him, may be thought to see in the elements an oblation of fruits; a testimony against the heretics that the earth is the Lord’s and not a Demiurgus’s, and that our food is from him.³

ente tibi propitiatio venit. Inde est enim vir, cui Oriens nomen est, qui Mediator Dei et hominum factus est.—Origen, Homil. ix. in Levit. § 10, vol. ii. p. 243.

¹ See Huetii Origeniana, p. 298, referred to by Dr. Burton, Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 307, 2nd Ed.

² Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνούσας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν δι’ ὧν ἐδίδαξεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν καὶ

σαρκίνας θυσίας τὸν Θεὸν, ἀλλ’ ἐν πνεύματι. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνάλογον ἐν πνεύματι καὶ νοητῶς λατρεύειν τινὰ αὐτῷ πνεῦμα νοηθεῖη ἂν. Ἄλλὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐν τύποις προσκυνεῖν δεῖ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, ἥτις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο, μετὰ τὸ δοθῆναι τὸν νόμον διὰ Μωϋσέως.—Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 70.

³ Ἔστι δὲ καὶ συμβολὸν ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας, ἄριστος εὐχαριστία καλούμενος. Ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ δαίμονες ἔχουσιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς

That Origen further contemplated the Eucharist as conveying to the communicant who received it in faith the Body and Blood of Christ to his soul's health, appears from the following passage. "Let Celsus, then, since he is ignorant of God, render his oblations to demons; we, however, studying to please the Maker of the universe, eat the bread which is presented with prayer and thanksgiving for God's good gifts—the bread, I say, which by reason of the prayer becomes a *certain Body, holy in itself, and making holy those who partake of it with a good purpose of heart.*"¹ And again, the same view, or nearly the same, is maintained in a remarkable paragraph, in which Origen, who is fond of expatiating and losing himself in a mystical subject, endeavours to explain the nature of the faculty by which the prophets are enabled to foretell future events. There may be simple people who interpret mechanically certain scenes of Scripture, as when it is said that the prophets saw the heavens opened or heard the Lord's voice. "But he who searches deeper will say, that whereas there is a *certain generic Divine sense*, as Scripture calls it, which none but the blessed find out, according to the words of Solomon, 'Thou shalt find out a Divine sense' (*αἰσθησιν θεϊαν εὐρήσεις*).² And whereas there are several kinds of this sense—that of sight, which is fitted to discern better things than those which are corporeal, as the Cherubim and Seraphim; that of hearing, which receives words that do not derive their being from the air; that of taste, which *relishes the living bread, the bread which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world*³; that of smell, which smelleth such smells as that which Paul calls a sweet savour of Christ unto God⁴; that of touch, according to which John says, that his hands had handled the Word of life⁵; the blessed prophets, I repeat, finding out this Divine sense, both seeing divinely, and hearing divinely, and tasting divinely, and smelling (so to speak) by this unsensual sense,

ἀνωτέρω ἐλέγμεν, τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῶν πρὸς τὰς ἡμετέρας χρείας δεδημιουργημένων διὸ οὐδ' ἀδικόν τι πράττομεν, μετέχοντες τῶν δημιουργημάτων, καὶ τοῖς μὴ προσήκουσιν αὐτοῖς μὴ θύοντες.—Contra Celsum, VIII. § 57.

¹ Καὶ διὰ τοιαῦτα δὲ Κέλσος μὲν, ὡς ἀγνοῶν Θεοῦ, τὰ χαριστήρια δαιμόσιον ἀποδιδότω· ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ

παντός δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθείσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίωμεν, σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίων τι καὶ ἀγάζον τοὺς μετὰ ὑγιούς προθέσεως αὐτῶν χρωμένους.—VIII. § 33.

² See Prov. ii. 5.

³ John vi. 33.

⁴ 2 Cor. ii. 15.

⁵ 1 John i. 1.

and touching the Word by faith, so that the efflux of it came unto them to heal them, by this means saw what they describe themselves to have seen, and heard what they report themselves to have heard, and were affected in other like ways, as when they eat (so they tell us) the roll of the book that was given them.”¹ Moreover the spirit of this passage will serve to correct that of some previous extracts from other Fathers, where the presence of the Lord in the Eucharist seemed to be assigned to the elements rather than to the recipients, and confirms what was observed on one of those occasions, that the error was rather apparent than real, and that the Fathers meant in general to convey the notion without any technical nicety, that whatever might be the mode, the Body and Blood of Christ were certainly to be found in that Sacrament.

Of all the early Fathers, none, perhaps, are so full and emphatic on the *sacrificial* character of the Eucharist as Cyprian, insomuch that it may be best to place in the forefront of our quotations from that Father passages which clearly prove, that however strong his language, he nevertheless was all the while regarding the Eucharist not as a repetition of the oblation of Christ once offered, but as a lively *commemoration* of that sacrifice. “Know, then,” says he, in a letter to Cæcilius on the Sacrament of the cup, “that we have been admonished, that in offering the cup the tradition of the Lord be observed, and that no other thing be done by us than what the Lord did for us first; to wit, that *the cup which is offered in remembrance of him*, be mixed with wine. For since Christ said, ‘I am the true vine,’ the Blood of Christ is

¹ ‘Ο δὲ βαθέτερον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐξετάζων ἐρεί, ὅτι οὐσης, ὡς ἡ γραφὴ ὠνόμασε, θείας τινὸς γενικῆς αἰσθήσεως, ἣν μόνος ὁ μακάριος εὕρισκει ἦδη, κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον καὶ παρὰ τῷ Σολομῶντι, ὅτι αἰσθησὶν θείαν εὐρήσεις· καὶ ὄντων εἰδῶν ταύτης τῆς αἰσθήσεως, ὁράσεως πεφικυίας βλέπειν τὰ κρείττονα σωματῶν πράγματα ἐν οἷς δηλοῦται τὰ Χερουβὶμ ἢ τὰ Σεραφίμ· καὶ ἀκοῆς ἀντιληπτικῆς φωνῶν, οὐχὶ ἐν ἀέρι τὴν οὐσίαν ἐχουσῶν καὶ γέουσης χρωμένης ἄρωμα ζῶντι, καὶ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβηθηκότι, καὶ ζῶντι διδόντι τῷ κόσμῳ· οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἀσφρήσεως ἀσφραϊνομένης τοιῶνδε, καθὼ Χριστοῦ εὐωδία λέγει εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ

Παῦλος· καὶ ἀφῆς, καθ’ ἣν Ἰωάννης φησὶ ταῖς χερσὶν ἐψηλαφηκέναι περὶ τοῦ Λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· οἱ μακάριοι προφήται τὴν θείαν αἰσθησὶν εὐρόντες, καὶ βλέποντες θείως, καὶ ἀκούοντες θείως, καὶ γεγόμενοι ὁμοίως, καὶ ἀσφραϊνόμενοι (ἵν’ οὕτως ὀνομάσω) αἰσθήσει οὐκ αἰσθητῆ, καὶ ἀπτόμενοι τοῦ Λόγου μετὰ πίστεως, ὥστ’ ἀπορρόην αὐτοῦ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἦκειν θεραπεύουσαν αὐτοὺς, οὕτως ἐώρων ἂ ἀναγράφουσι ἐωρακέναι καὶ ἦκουσι ἂ λέγουσιν ἀκηκοέναι, καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια ἔπασχον, ὡς ἀνεγγραφον, κεφαλίδαι ἐσθίοντες διδομένην αὐτοῖς βιβλίον.—

Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 48.

not water but wine. Nor can his Blood, by which we are redeemed and quickened, seem to be in the cup when there is no wine in the cup, by which the Blood of Christ is set forth.”¹ The purport of this passage is to represent the Eucharist as a *commemorative sacrifice*, but nothing more. And the same is expressed in another paragraph of the same letter still more unequivocally. “If Jesus Christ our Lord and God is himself the High Priest of God, and offered himself first of all a sacrifice to his Father, and commanded this (rite) to be *performed in commemoration of him*, surely that Priest truly discharges his functions in Christ’s stead who copies that which Christ did; and then it is he offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he is found making his oblation as he has seen Christ make it Wherefore, as often as we offer the cup in *commemoration of the Lord and of his Passion*, let us do what it appears that our Lord did;”² with much more to the same purpose; for though the subject of the letter is the necessity of using wine as a symbol in the Eucharist and not water, still the line of reasoning adopted proves very satisfactorily that the whole was regarded as a commemorative act. Taking these passages, then, as keys to others, we shall be able to construe correctly such expressions as the following, of which Cyprian is full—“The Presbyters who *make the oblations* with the Confessors—”³ “We ask God’s ample blessing upon you, both when *in the sacrifice* we make prayers with the congregation, and when we offer up our petitions in private”⁴—“Priests who daily perform *the sacrifices* of God;”⁵ a parallel to,

¹ Admonitos autem nos scias ut in calice offerendo Dominica traditio servetur, neque aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecerit, ut calice qui in commemorationem ejus offertur, mixtus 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, Ep. lxiii. § 2.

² Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui com-

memorationem præcepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesiâ Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse—§ 14.

Quotiescunque ergo calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis ejus offerimus, id quod constat Dominum fecisse faciamus.—§ 18.

³ Presbyteri qui apud confessores offerunt.—Ep. iv.

⁴ Quando in sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus.—xv. § 1.

⁵ Sacerdotes, qui sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus.—liv. § 3.

“daily drinking the cup of the Blood of Christ.”¹ We find the analogy repeatedly drawn between the Levitical sacrifice and the Eucharist.² Mention is repeatedly made of the “altar” in the Church: of “the altar being set up:”³ of “assisting at God’s altar:”⁴ of “the Priestly order being wholly occupied in serving at the altar and at the sacrifice:”⁵ of “the Priesthood offering sacrifices at the altar:”⁶ of one who is “an enemy to the altar, and a rebel against the sacrifice of Christ.”⁷

Again, we discover Cyprian recognising no less clearly the Body and Blood of Christ as spiritually present in the Eucharist, and as serving to strengthen the souls of the communicants. “But now it is not for the weak, but for the strong that the Pax is necessary: it is not to the dying, but the living that we have to give the Communion, in order that we may not leave unarmed and naked those whom we excite and exhort to the battle; but may fortify them by the *protection of the Body and Blood of Christ*. And since the Eucharist is expressly for this, that it may be a defence to those who receive it, let us arm those who wish to be safe against the enemy with the muniment of the fatness (or plenteousness) of the Lord.”⁸ Cyprian too in his turn applies the language of the sixth chapter of St. John to the Eucharist—“We pray that this bread may be given us daily, in order that we who are in Christ, and *daily receive the Eucharist as the food of salvation*, may not be separated from Christ’s body by reason of any grievous sin intervening, so that we should be prohibited from partaking of the *heavenly bread*. For Christ himself tells us, I am the bread of life which came down from

¹ Quotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere.—Ep. lvi. § 1.

² De Lapsis, § xv.; Testimoniorum, III. c. xciv.

³ Considentibus Dei sacerdotibus et altari posito.—Ep. xlii. § 2.

⁴ Ut altari Dei assistat antistes.—lviii. § 2.

Quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant.—lxvi. § 2.

⁶ Aut quia Novatianus altare collocare et sacrificia offerre contra fas nititur, ab altari et sacrificiis cessare nos oportet?

—lxxiii. § 2.

⁷ Hostis altaris, adversus sacrificium Christi rebellis.—De Unitate Ecclesiæ, § xvii.

⁸ At vero nunc non infirmis, sed fortibus pax necessaria est: nec morientibus, sed viventibus communicatio a nobis danda est: ut quos excitamus et hortamur ad prælium, non inermes et nudos relinquamus, sed protectione sanguinis et corporis Christi muniamus: et cum ad hoc fiat Eucharistia, ut possit accipientibus esse tutela; quos tutos esse contra adversarium volumus, munimento dominicæ saturitatis armemus.—Ep. liv. § 2.

heaven: If any one shall eat of my bread he shall live for ever; but the bread which I will give him is my flesh for life eternal.¹ Since then he says, that he who shall eat of this bread, lives for ever; as it is manifest that they live who touch his body and receive the Eucharist by virtue of the Communion (or by being entitled to communicate); so on the other hand is it to be feared that he who is prohibited from the Body of Christ is not in a state of salvation."² This mystical presence in the Eucharist is further represented by Cyprian, as effected through the agency of the Holy Ghost, who is invoked upon it. "For the oblation," says he, "cannot be sanctified where the Holy Spirit is lacking."³

Neither can it be alleged with truth of this Sacrament any more than of the other, that the Fathers regard the *opus operatum* as sufficient to secure the benefits which belong to it. For their language still is, that there must be a fitness in the recipient in order to render its virtues availing. This, indeed, has appeared from quotations already made. According to Justin Martyr, none can partake of it but the faithful and such as are living in obedience to Christ.⁴ According to Irenæus, the heart of the worthy communicant must be clean, his faith without hypocrisy, his hope steadfast, his charity fervent.⁵ Clemens Alexandrinus considers the previous searching of the heart so much a matter of course, that he takes for granted it is submitted to by all who propose to themselves to partake of the Eucharist—persons actually partaking or not, as their conscience, which is the safest guide, directs: and he uses their case in illustration of another which he considers parallel to theirs.⁶ Tertullian expressly calls to the recollection

¹ John vi. 51.

² Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et Eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti et non communicantes a cœlesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur, ipso prædicante et monente: Ego sum panis vitæ qui de cœlo descendi. Si quis ederit de meo pane, vivet in æternum. Panis autem quem ego dederò caro mea est pro sæculi vitæ. Quando ergo dicit in æternum vivere si quis ederit de ejus pane, ut manifestum est eos vivere qui corpus ejus attingunt et Eucharistiam

jure communicationis accipiunt, ita contra timendum est et orandum ne, dum quis abstentus separatur a Christi corpore, procul remaneat a salute.—De Oratione Dominicâ, § xviii.

³ Quando nec oblatio sanctificari illic possi ubi Spiritus sanctus non sit.—Ep. lxiv. § 4.

⁴ Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.

⁵ Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 4.

⁶ Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν ἄμφω τούτω δοκιμάσῃσθαι αὐτοὺς· τὸν μὲν, εἰ ἄξιός τις λέγειν τε καὶ ὑπομνήματα καταλιμπάνειν· τὸν δὲ εἰ ἀκροῦσθαί τε καὶ ἐντυγχάνειν δίκαιος. Ἡ καὶ τὴν Εὐχαριστίαν τιτὲς διανείμαντες, ὡς

of parties, who might be tempted to attend the shows, the manner in which they would forfeit by so doing, the engagement this Sacrament had laid them under; quoting pointedly passages from its Service¹; a use of it in a particular case, which Justin had told us was made of it in general; his testimony being, that Christians were wont to remind one another of their duties by a reference to the Eucharist and the life it pledged them to.² Origen, we saw, gave it a sanctifying power for those only who partook of it "with a good purpose of heart."³ Cyprian insists upon the fear and reverence with which it should be approached, and the purity which should characterize the communicants if they would not draw down upon themselves a curse instead of a blessing.⁴ And on another occasion, after enumerating the preparations which were to be made, if we would not be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, he continues, "If all these precautions be despised; if they partake" (it is of the lapsed he is speaking), "before they have expiated their offences, before they have made confession of their sin, before they have purged their consciences by the prayer and imposition of hands of the Priest; they do violence to the Body and Blood of the Lord, and offend more against him both by their hands and by their mouth, than when they denied the Lord."⁵ So that nothing can be more wide of the mark than to suppose, that because the Fathers, in opposition to the Socinian, assign to the Sacrament of the Eucharist a very high position in the scale of the means of grace, they make the virtue which belongs to it, begin and terminate with the act, instead of considering it an incentive to a good life, a powerful auxiliary to it, and a guarantee that it shall be laboured after.

ἔθος, αὐτὸν δὴ ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν. Ἀρίστη γὰρ πρὸς τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἀρεσὶν τε καὶ φυγὴν ἢ συνειδήσις.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § i. p. 318.

¹ Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xxv.

² Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67.

³ Origen, Contra Celsum, VIII. § 33.

⁴ Cum timore et honore Eucharistiam accipiendam. In Levitico: "Anima autem quæcunque manducaverit ex carne sacrificii salutaris, quod est Domini, et immunditia ipsius super ipsum est, peribit anima illa de populo suo." Item ad Corinthios primâ: "Quicumque ederit

panem aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini."—Cyprian, Testimoniorum, III. c. xciv.

⁵ Spretis his omnibus atque contemptis, ante expiata delicta, ante exomologesin factam criminis, ante purgatam conscientiam sacrificio et manu sacerdotis, ante offensam placatam indignantis Domini et minantis, vis infertur corpori ejus et sanguini, et plus modo in Dominum manibus atque ore delinquant, quam cum Dominum negaverunt.—De Lapsis, § xvi.