CATHOLIC FAITH IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

Papers from the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, July 24—29, 1922

Edited by

The Rev. C. LATTEY, S.J.

(M.A., Oxon)

Professor of Holy Scripture at St. Beuno's College, North Wales, Editor of *The Religion of the Scriptures*, *of Moses and the Law*, of the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, etc.

Nihil illo ditius,
qui Corpus Domini canistro vimineo,
Sanguinem portat in vitro.

(St. Jerome, *Epist.* 125 *ad Rusticum Monachum.)*

SECOND EDITION (Revised and Enlarged)

1923

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

Dépôt for America:

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

17, SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, Mo.

Nihil illo ditius,
qui Corpus Domini canistro vimineo,
Sanguinem portat in vitro.

(St. Jerome, *Epist.* 125 *ad Rusticum Monachum.}*

CATHOLIC FAITH IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

Papers from the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, July 24—29, 1922

Edited by

The Rev. C. LATTEY, S.J.

(M.A., Oxon)

Professor of Holy Scripture at St. Benno's College, North Wales, Editor of *The Religion of the Scriptures,* of *Moses and the Law>,* of the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, etc.

SECOND EDITION (Revised and Enlarged)

I923

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

Dépôt for America :

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

17, SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, Mo.

Printed in Great Britain.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

The present volume represents the substance of all the lectures delivered at the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, July 24-29, 1922. The general subject was the Holy Eucharist. Most of the lectures follow chronological (which is also logical) sequence. The present writer judged it best to devote the whole of the time available for a Biblical treatment of the matter to the gospels. Outside the gospels the New Testament evidence is to be found mainly in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, evidence which he has treated in some detail in editing that epistle for the Westminster version, and on broader lines in *Back io Christ* (New York, 1919)· The most important evidence from the Old Testament is the prophecy of Malachy, which is admirably expounded by the Rev. E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., now at the Biblical Institute, Rome, in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for May, 1922.

Following upon the consideration of the gospel evidence comes the lecture upon the Pre-Nicene Church, after which East and West are handled separately, the former upon more general lines, the latter with almost exclusive attention to St. Augustine, by reason of his unique influence and, one may add, difficulty. The scholastic, like the patristic, treatment is also divided, but this time between Sacrament and Sacrifice; under the former comes a special study of St. Thomas Aquinas, while under the latter Père de la Taille sets forth the view of the Sacrifice which he has done so much to

revive, and which is fully explained in that magnificent scholastic monograph, *Mysterium Fidei.* The subject of the Liturgy is then opened out in skilful summary, and also the subject of Reservation, while Catholic Devotion finds apt expression and stimulus in a lecture on the fruits of the Sacrament.

For all these papers, and still more for the delivery of the corresponding lectures, the editor, who was also immediate organizer of the lectures, offers his most hearty thanks, and in the rendering of these thanks he may safely associate with himself the Cambridge Committee and those who attended the School. He also wishes to offer his sincere thanks to Father Hugh Morrisey for devoting time and trouble, amid a press of other occupations, to the welcome appendix on the Fish Symbol. To him also is due the apt quotation from St. Jerome *{Epist.* 125 *ad Rusticum Monachum),* which accompanies the representation of the Fish on the title-page: "Nothing richer than he, who carries the Body of the Lord in a wicker-basket, His Blood in a glass." This text shows how plain, even in St. Jerome's time, might be the vessels in which the Holy Eucharist was carried; and the earlier use of them doubtless exercised some influence upon the fresco here reproduced. For the reproduction itself thanks are due to Father Parkinson, S.J., who also designed the head of St. Jerome (after old masters) for *The Religion of the Scriptures.* Fr. Morrisey touches upon this fresco of the Fish with the Eucharistic species in the course of his appendix. For the sake of clearness it has been thought best to over-define the sketch, and to some extent to sacrifice absolute accuracy in order to secure an easy understanding of the symbolism.

A few words may be added on the subject of the Summer School of Catholic Studies in general. It is little else than a repetition upon a more modest scale of the Catholic Bible Congress, held at Cambridge in July, 1921. The success of that Congress, recorded in the second edition of *The Religion of the Scriptures,* naturally led to the suggestion that something similar should be established permanently, series of lectures dealing in turn with all the various subjects of which a right understanding is vital to the Catholic position. An arrangement has been arrived at whereby the Catholic Conference of Higher Studies, the only organized body representing Catholic higher studies in this country, undertakes to support, and through its committee to organize, these lectures, for which the best available lecturers will be secured; while a local committee, consisting of the Cambridge clergy and certain laymen, whose aid has already proved invaluable, makes all arrangements upon the spot and has ultimate control. His Lordship the Bishop of the Diocese (Northampton) has from the first taken the warmest interest in the scheme, and has graciously accepted the office of President of the whole institution.

It is hoped that the School will prove of great help and importance primarily for Catholics themselves, for priests and religious, for all engaged in religious training and teaching, and for the educated laity. The fact that the School will normally be held, as it is hoped, during vacation term at Cambridge, encourages the further hope that it may prove of interest to members of that and of other universities. Those who are not of the Catholic body, needless to say, whatever their position, will always be welcome to come and hear

Catholic belief and practice explained by reliable Catholic lecturers. In order to secure stability, a permanent guarantee fund has been opened, for which a hundred pounds or so is desired, whereof about a thin! has been already subscribed. Further contributions may be forwarded to the Rev. J. B. Marshall, M.A., M.C., The Catholic Rectory, Cambridge.

Like *The Religion of the Scriptures,* the present volume should prove of lasting value as a summary of the Catholic position, indicating at once the massive simplicity of Catholic faith and love, and the rich variety wherein these find their natural expression. Following upon the explanation and defence of Holy Writ and of the Holy Eucharist will come that of the Holy See. The general subject decided upon for the Summer School next year is the Papacy, in all its bearings. The School will proceed upon the lines which have already proved successful, but it may be hoped that every year will see it increase in efficiency and become more widely appreciated.

C. L.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The welcome extended to the present work has been no less cordial than the reception of *The Religion of the Scriptures,* and encourages the hope that the Summer School, valuable above all for formal and informal discussion, may also have led to the founding of a series of wide and permanent utility. It has been thought advisable, after all, to complete the present volume by adding a brief summary of the biblical evidence for the Sacrifice, and also an index. The Holy Eucharist has come to take an ever more dominant position in the religious life of Catholics, as they have come to realize more vividly the privilege of Sacrifice and Sacrament and Abiding Presence; and whatever helps them to understand the Holy Eucharist better must of necessity put a deeper and diviner meaning into that life. Others will thus most quickly come to understand the inward spirit of that life also; for it is indeed the Mass that matters, and all that comes of it.

C. L.

CONTENTS.

I.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE GOSPELS.

By the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., M.A.

One whose task it is to pursue biblical studies in Wales can hardly fail to be struck by a certain resemblance which exists between New Testament conditions and those of the Principality. The natural features of the country themselves suggest the Holy Land, valley and mountain and sea; in area, Palestine is but a little larger than Wales, being smaller than Belgium; and if we find something in the biblical Jew even of the character of the typical Welshman, "impulsive and wayward," as his latest historian describes him, "but susceptible to the influence of music and religion may not that be due to the pre-Celtic Iberian or Mediterranean or Berber type, which appears to dominate in Wales, being related to the equally long-headed type of slight build and stature that appears to furnish an early stratum of the population of Palestine? The hewers of wood and drawers of water in a country are apt to conquer their conquerors and determine the physical type against them[1].

It is not to speculations of this kind, however, that I invite attention, but to a more obvious and certain parallel. Roughly we may say that about the time of

[1] *A History of Wales,* by J. E. Lloyd, M.A., Vol. I., p. 15.

[2] With Mr. Lloyd's first chapter compare Prof. Macalister's *Excavation of Gezer,* Vol. I., chap. III.

Our Lord the Greek and Aramaic languages were related to each other in Palestine as are English and Welsh in Wales to-day. Greek, like English, was the world-language, known practically by all, and especially dominant in the towns. After their return from exile the Jews picked up the Aramaic speech, which is very closely related to Hebrew, from neighbours and strangers, and also the Aramaic letters, to which Our Lord refers in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 18). Not a jot or tittle of the Law is to pass away unfulfilled; the jot or *yodh* is much the smallest letter in the Aramaic alphabet, but is large in the old Hebrew alphabet, so that there would have been no point in any reference to this latter. And a mere "tittle" or small stroke is all that distinguishes some of the Aramaic letters from each other. But to return to the spoken language. Our Lord would doubtless speak both Greek and Aramaic, the former to Pilate and other gentiles, the latter to His apostles, or to the Jewish multitude that heard the Sermon on the Mount. When the Jews or Jerusalem realized that St. Paul was addressing them in their own Aramaic, they listened to him all the more attentively (Acts xxii. 2), though they were prepared to listen even to Greek. And so it would be with many a Welsh crowd; though mostly able to understand English, they attend all the more gladly to Welsh.

At the Last Supper, then, it is Aramaic that we hear; and Aramaic, like Hebrew, is a very peculiar language, chiefly because very defective. We have practically no Aramaic representing exactly the time of Christ, but only the before and after. Parts of the books of Daniel and of the First Book of Esdras (The Book of Ezra in the Protestant Bible) are in Aramaic, a fact due in some

measure at least to the loss of the corresponding Hebrew text. This Aramaic may be dated a century before Christ, or perhaps much earlier; and the oldest Aramaic Targum or paraphrase on Holy Scripture, the Targum Onkelos, is a few centuries later than Christ. These paraphrases were doubtless introduced for the benefit of those who did not sufficiently understand the Old Testament Hebrew; much, however, was inserted that had no place in the original Hebrew, in praise of the Messiah, for example, but there is also matter indicating less praiseworthy rabbinical tendencies. Strike a rough mean between the Biblical Aramaic and that of the Onkelos Targum, and you have something very like the Aramaic spoken by Our Lord; and it is possible at times to check this evidence in some other ways.

"This is My Body"; for this I would suggest *d'na* or *den gishmi,* or possibly *gushmi.* In any case the main points are clear and certain. We begin with the demonstrative pronoun, "this." The word "is" would have no equivalent in the Aramaic, any more than it would in Hebrew. In these languages the word "is" as the mere copula, joining adjective to noun, is regularly omitted, just as is often the case in Greek. That does not mean to say that there would be the slightest ambiguity in the sense, which in this case is also guaranteed by the Greek rendering in the New Testament. Finally, the possessive pronouns are suffixes, attached to the noun, so that we can represent Our Lord's sentence in Aramaic English, so to speak, by two words, "This, Body-my." Two simple words, but of tremendous import for all generations! Christ meant what He said; the more one examines the attempts to evade His words, the more their simple force comes

home. "Compare, I am the door" (John x. 7), wrote the late Dean Farrar in his note on these words in his edition of St. Luke for the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.* Compare it we do, but we find little likeness. Christ explains in what sense He is the door, and is understood; nor is it the same thing to use the first person in a clearly metaphorical sentence, and to take a loaf in one's hands and to say, *This.* No near parallel to the words of consecration has ever yet been found, such as would justify explaining them away. I admit that we cannot leave the question of the Person of Christ wholly out of account. If He was a very ordinary man, who went about preaching that honesty is the best policy, then we should have to strain every word and every syllable in order to be quit of this portentous meaning, this purpose of changing bread into His Body. But there is no justification whatever for making such a one as this of the Christ presented to us in the historical evidence. This is a question which lies outside the immediate scope of the present paper; perhaps I may mention that I have treated it on broad lines in my little book, *Back to Christ* (New York, 1919), or it may be seen admirably handled in Father Martindale's contribution to the Bible Congress book, *The Religion of the Scriptures* (second edition, Cambridge, 1921).

Coming now to the consecration of the Cup or Chalice, we find in the New Testament two forms of the words of institution, the one in St. Matthew and St. Mark, "This is my blood, of the covenant," the other in St. Luke and St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 25), "This cup is the new covenant, in my blood." Both these versions truly represent the same sense, the sense intended by Our Lord, and both

contain the clear reference to Exodus xxiv. 8, to which I shall return; but we may legitimately ask, which is it that seems to represent more exactly the very words that left Our Lord's mouth? While there can be no doubt that St. Luke furnishes us with a true historical report of what took place, we hardly expect from him such extreme minuteness in the reproduction of Our Lord's words as would warrant our preferring his formula to that of the first two evangelists. In point of fact, St. Luke's version presents more than one difficulty. It is not very easy either to identify the cup mentioned in Luke xxii. 20, with that of Luke xxii. 17, or to distinguish them. If we identify them, so as to make the order to partake refer to the consecrated cup, then the arrangement is a little surprising, and it may be noticed here that St. Luke also puts the reference to the betrayer after the institution of the Blessed Sacrament (whence some think that he partook of it), whereas the other two evangelists put it before. Indeed, the difficulty as to the two mentions of the cup has been considered by some so formidable that they have preferred to follow some manuscripts of what is called the Western family and to omit Luke xxii. 20, with part of the preceding verse, regarding the passage as an interpolation from St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24-25). This is unnecessary, and against the far greater weight of evidence; but it illustrates the difficulty of taking St. Luke as a guide in minute details, in regard of which he doubtless never intended to commit himself. His narrative is a faithful summary, and faithful *as* a summary.

There is even a difficulty in the Lucan formula itself, which makes against our regarding it as the primitive form. In full it runs, "This cup is the new covenant

in my blood, which is shed for you." But grammatically these last words are something of a problem. In the Greek, "which is shed" is a passive participle, and cannot be taken grammatically with "blood," which is in a different case; grammatically it might belong to "cup," but it seems improbable that the cup is spoken of as shed; more probably the participle is intended to go with "blood," but ungrammatically, and the departure from strict grammar is accounted for by the Matthew-Mark formula, in which it certainly goes with "blood," and the grammar is quite straightforward. In other words, the Lucan formula itself points to that of the other evangelists, and requires the latter for its full and adequate explanation. The simple words, "This is my blood," corresponding to "This is my body," seem more primitive than the double elaboration, "This cup is the new covenant"; and even in the addition, "This is my blood, *of the, covenant,"* we have a simpler reference to Exodus xxiv. 8, than in the version, "This cup is the new covenant, in my blood." I have spoken mainly of St. Luke; in St. Paul we have very little in the way of exact narrative appertaining to the life and words of Christ, and I suppose that no Scripture scholar, of whatever school, would look to him for a more meticulously accurate reproduction of such words than we find in the first two gospels. Taking, then, the formula, "This is my blood, of the covenant," we may suppose Christ to have said something like this: *d'na* or *den,* once more, "this"; "is," to be supplied; *d'mi,* "my blood," or, as we saw, "blood-my"; *diq'yama,* "of the covenant," one word, wherein the prefix *di* represents "of," and the case-ending *a* indicates the emphatic case, corresponding to our definite article "the."

If we ask how this simple declaration, "This is my blood, of the covenant," came to be changed to, "This cup is the new covenant, in my blood," the answer is tolerably clear. The mention of the cup made the transition from the one species to the other easier to follow *in the reading* than a mere repetition of the word "this"; while in the second half of the sentence, the main sense being presupposed as clear, the full significance of the reference to the covenant, the very founding of a new covenant, was brought out with emphasis. And if we ask why Christ Himself added those words, "This is my blood, *of the covenant,*" the answer appears to be that, having affirmed the Real Presence, He had something of moment to add. Why be content simply to duplicate the word and action? Even so St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Roman Church at the beginning of the second century, first of all declares unmistakably his faith, "I desire God's bread, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who was of David's seed," but then pours out burning words to show something of the meaning of that faith to him, "and for drink I desire His Blood, which is love incorruptible."

But what did Christ mean to declare further, when He added those words, "This is my blood, *of the covenant*"? When we think of the scene in Exodus xxiv. 8, here referred to, the sprinkling by Moses of the sacrificial blood upon the people from the victims just sacrificed, in token of a covenant now made with Jehovah; when we reflect that here once more we have the victim, here also the blood, here also a new covenant fulfilling the old; how easy to conclude that wherever and whenever such a rite is enacted, there also we have a true sacrifice! It needs but the offering to God, I think my

friend Père de la Taille would maintain, to make it such. I should hesitate to say that in the gospels alone we have an absolutely clear proof that the Holy Eucharist was intended by Christ to be a sacrifice; but at least His mind and purpose are clear from the Old and New Testaments as a whole, for St. 1'aul never doubted that his faith was the faith of the whole church, and what we have in the gospels naturally finds its explanation in the prophet Malachy and the Epistles and the Early Fathers. The history of the doctrine, too, is significant; speaking broadly, we may say that a clear and firm belief in the Real Presence has always had for accompaniment the belief in the Sacrifice, and *vice versa.* Finally, we should remember the sacrificial atmosphere in which Our Lord moved. You cannot have it both ways; take away His Divinity (which God forbid!) and you make Him, not a twentieth-century professor in a German university, but rather all the more the creature of His own time, to whom therefore the eating of flesh and drinking of blood to initiate a covenant would naturally and without difficulty suggest sacrifice.

If the Synoptic gospels are borne out by the rest of the New Testament, most of all in the matter of the Real Presence they are borne out by St. John. St. Paul presupposes the Real Presence, just as he presupposes other important doctrines as familiar to his Christians; but St. John, alone of New Testament writers, not only represents Christ as foretelling the Institution, but also shows us the doubt and difficulty and conflict ensuing upon such a prediction. This is not the experience of a dreamy allegorizer of a later age, but the tale of one who had lived through the agony of that great crisis. No wonder that, having narrated in some detail the

momentous story of Christ's promise of His Flesh and Blood (John vi.), St. John saw no need to repeat that of the fulfilment of the promise; where, on the other hand, he found only the great promise made to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 18-19), he supplemented it by showing how the promise was kept (John xxi. 15-17). The Synoptics show Christ leaving Galilee because of failure, even as they show Him entering Jerusalem in triumph a few days before His Passion. Both the failure and the enthusiasm would surprise us, unless we had the Fourth Gospel to explain them; the latter was due in large measure to the raising of Lazarus shortly beforehand (John xii. 17-18), the former to lack of faith in Christ as the future Food of man.

We need the sixth chapter of St. John's gospel, then, to explain what is evidently an important crisis in Christ's life and ministry, followed as it is in the Synoptics by the journey to the north and the final departure from Galilee. Nor can there be any serious doubt that the evangelist intends his sixth chapter to be taken as fact. This is a point on which it is necessary to insist at some length. If some modern critics have represented him as sublimely indifferent to questions of fact, this is not due to any want of effort on his own part to make plain the contrary. Indeed, no book of Holy Scripture is so emphatic in this regard. Faith itself is constantly represented as the outcome of fact. Almost at the outset of the gospel we find a strong assertion of the historical witness to Christ of St. John the Baptist; Nathanael is won by a sign, though we are not given the details (John i. 48-51); Christ's disciples believe in Him because He has changed the water into wine (ii. 11); the Jews are to have the Resurrection for

their sign (ii. 18-22); Nicodemus declares that no one could do the signs which Christ works, unless He were from God (iii. 2); the Samaritan woman sees that He is a prophet, because He knows all her career (iv. 17-18, 29, 39); the officer or official believes because of the cure of his son, and all his household believes likewise (iv. 53). And so one might go on; but let us pass at once to the climax, to the most striking confession of faith that is to be found in the gospel, which may indeed have been the last episode narrated in the gospel, and in any case points back to the opening words, "The Word was God." At a somewdiat later time St. John may have added what is now the last chapter to dispel the notion that he was to live for ever, and to bid the faithful look rather for sure and perpetual guidance to the prerogative of Peter. But before this need had manifested itself, the crown and the finish of the gospel may well have been the cry wrung from St. Thomas by the very fingering of Christ's wounds, still remaining in His glorified Body, "My Lord and my God!" Well had the evangelist taken in those words of the Master, "If I had not done among them the WOrks which none other hath done, they would not have sin" (John xv. 24). Even in the sixth chapter itself Christ complains that the Jews arc following Him because they have had their fill, not because they have seen signs, not, that is, because they recognize these signs as a proof that He is sent of God (vi. 26). Christ had given a sign, and desired faith based upon that sign, faith that was to pass from type and figure and first rehearsal and anticipation to the great and supreme reality, from the multiplication of earthly bread to the multiplication of the true Bread from Heaven, even as later it was the divine purpose that

belief in the raising of Lazarus should develop into belief in the Resurrection of Christ Himself. Men may disbelieve these things, but to say that the evangelist himself did not intend them to be taken as facts is to misread the internal evidence of the Fourth Gospel from beginning to end.

Not, indeed, that it is only in this more direct way that the Evangelist has shown his mind and intent. It is clear also from a study of the harmony of the gospels, which shows us the Fourth Gospel as essentially a supplementary gospel, supplementary more especially in what concerns the beginning and end of the ministry, and Jerusalem. Supplementing of this kind presupposes a historical purpose, based upon special historical knowledge. If we find as a unique feature the story of a Galilaean miracle already narrated in the Synoptic gospels, that in itself is a sufficient sign that it is not inserted for its own sake, but as an introduction to something further, which in this case is a no less unique discourse, delivered as it is to the Galilaean multitude. The historical significance of that discourse has already been pointed out; it is the key to a real problem in the life of Christ. No doubt the difference in style between the Fourth Gospel and the others, a difference manifest even in translation, extends to their reports of Christ's discourses; but the fact still remains that the discourses of the Fourth Gospel in general, and that of the sixth chapter in particular, arc true and faithful reports. In this connection I may quote the words of Fr. Leopold Fonck, S.J., former President of the Biblical Institute at Rome, in the article upon St. John's Gospel in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia:* "We must remember that all the discourses and colloquies had to be translated from

Aramaic into Greek, and in this process received from the author their distinctive unity of style. Besides, in the Gospel, the intention is by no means to give a verbatim report of every sentence and expression of a discourse, a sermon, or a disputation. The leading ideas alone arc set forth in exact accordance with the sense, and in this manner also they come to reflect the style of the Evangelist. . . . A satisfactory explanation of the dogmatic character of John's narrative, as compared with the stress laid on the moral side of the discourses of Jesus by the Synoptics, is to be found in the character of his first readers," and to this cause also Fr. Fonck ascribes a further difference, that while St. John's gospel is mainly concerned with the Person of Christ, the theme of the other gospels is rather the kingdom of God. I think, then, that we shall not be misinterpreting Fr. Fonck if we claim that St. John is both summarizing and selecting, but in his own style and for his own purposes; we might add that he is supplementing, and supplementing from sources scarcely tapped by the Synoptics, such as would of necessity be more dogmatic, from Christ's arguments with the learned at Jerusalem, from His intimate discourses to His disciples, and from this discourse, in every way crucial, upon the Holy Eucharist. No doubt some would like to make of St. John little more than an echo of St. Paul; but if once we realize how soon after the Ascension we find St. Paul's doctrine fully developed, and how entirely he believed himself in harmony with the rest of the apostles, we shall refuse this evasion also. Either we must admit Johannine features (so to call them) in Christ Himself, or else to explain away the mystery of John will be but to make the more inexplicable the mystery of Paul.

In reality the evangelist claims intimate knowledge of Christ's words and deeds as part and parcel of his knowledge of Christ's life in general, and justifies that claim. That is the really vital point; but it is not a thesis that can be set forth in full, even with reference to the sixth chapter. I shall only venture here to add two general considerations to those already indicated. In the first place, I would refer to an article which I wrote in the *Journal oj Theological Studies* (July, 1919) upon "The Semitisms of the Fourth Gospel"; I believe we may infer with reasonable certainty that the writer was familiar with Hebrew and Aramaic, a crucial point, if we are bidden see in him no more than a second-century dreamer of hellenistic Ephesus. This view has quite recently received striking confirmation from Dr. Burney, who in his book, *The Aramaic Origin ofthe Fourth Gospel,* even maintains that the gospel was written originally in Aramaic. In the second place, let us protest once more, the critics cannot have it both ways. If, as some would have, the Fourth Gospel is perpetually correcting the Synoptic gospels in matters of detail, that does not look as though it were entirely indifferent to such details. Catholics prefer to say that John is correcting what might be a false conclusion from the previous gospels; but for those who go farther, the argument to his regard for fact is all the stronger. One supposed discrepancy I should perhaps touch upon, because it concerns the Holy Eucharist, but only briefly, because in this short space I cannot develop farther what I have already written elsewhere. In the appendix to St. Mark's gospel in the Westminster Version, I have tentatively followed the view that at the Last Supper Christ did not eat the Jewish Passover, and I would refer the reader

to that, as well as to an article in the *Month* (July, 1920) by Fr. Nairne, S.J., entitled, "Was the Last Supper a Jewish Pasch?" The view adopted by Fr. Nairne and myself still seems to me the most likely to be true, and to suit the Synoptic evidence best, no less than that of the Fourth Gospel. Preparations for the Passover were not begun an hour or two beforehand; and the Holy Eucharist itself was evidently the Passover whereof Christ longed to partake with the Apostles (Luke xxii. 15).

It may seem that we have been a long time in coming to the sixth chapter itself; but the difficulty is not to interpret what St. John has written, for his report is as clear as it is emphatic, but to win for the discourse a fair hearing, to ensure that it be taken seriously. Christ proclaims that He is the Bread of Life (John vi. 35); no doubt of itself this might refer to the food of His doctrine, or something of that kind, but in the context He is clearly leading up to something more, to His offering His own Flesh to be the spiritual Food of the soul, an outward sign of inward grace; a nourishing which is to maintain and strengthen the life of grace. So great is the truth, so hard the saying for any but perfect faith, that beforehand He utters the solemn warning, "No one can come to Me unless the Father draw him" (John vi. 44); the merely natural powers of man avail not, he must be "taught of God." Not that there is any ambiguity in Christ's words; beyond question man must eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. This He says, and for all the trouble it causes He will not explain it away. True, some have sought to make a perverse application of His words, "The flesh availeth nothing" (John vi. 63); but to make this signify that to eat His Flesh really avails nothing is to put Christ in flagrant contradiction with

Himself. It is perverse to take Christ to be referring to His own Flesh at all, for where He means His own Flesh He says so, five times in the chapter; on the other hand, the use of "the flesh" in general for what is purely natural in man is a common New Testament expression, found twice besides in this very gospel (John i. 13, viii. 15). In the first passage, as here, it is in the neighbourhood of a reference to Christ's own Flesh; so small was the danger of confusion. Against such a perverse evasion we might also urge, if further argument were needed, that the Jews evidently do not understand Our Lord to have retracted in any way, or to have modified His meaning, indeed, it is *after* His saying that "the flesh availeth nothing" that many of His disciples abandon Him. He was harking back to His own warning, already quoted; the deserters show with how much cause.

Christ, therefore, is our Food, the Food that sustains our supernatural life. That Body should come to body is not the greater mystery, nor is it more than a means to a far more mysterious, far more intimate, far more glorious union. Who shall set a term to the divine penetration of the human soul, when Christ Himself prays that we may be one, one in each other and one in the Father and the Son, even as the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father (John xvii. 21)? The outward unity of the Church is in that prayer, but is itself contained in unity far deeper and more divine. For those who believe in that perfecting of unity, Christ in us, even as the Father is in Christ (John xvii. 23), it is a lesser thing to believe in the symbol and instrument of that unity, that divine and real presence commingled only with our flesh and blood. And they who denied the lesser mystery found naught but folly in the greater.

IJ.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE PRE-NICENE CHURCH.

By Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., B.A.

The result of an examination of the teaching of the Ante-Nicene Church as to the Blessed Sacrament will depend on the method followed. The old-fashioned method of disbelievers in the Real Presence, especially in Germany, has been roughly this: after explaining away the literal teaching of the New Testament on the subject, they come to the Patristic period with the necessity of finding in it some simple doctrine of a commemorative meal, gradually developing into the mediaeval dogma of Transubstantiation. Hence it is important to explain away with great care all the realistic expressions of the earlier Fathers; ambiguous sayings must be emphasized, and any use of allegory must be pushed into the foreground.

This is a cumbrous and uncomfortable method. The theory comes first, and then the evidence. Sometimes it refuses to go in; and there is nothing for it but to show that the author says the opposite elsewhere, and is therefore inconsistent, or else to prove that the passage or the whole work is not genuine.

A simpler method has been used by non-Catholic writers, such as orthodox Lutherans and Anglican High-churchmen, who believe in the Real Presence, but reject the Catholic doctrine of the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, holding that they are

not changed, but that the Body and Blood of Christ become present in or under them. The Lutherans call this Consubstantiation or Impanation, and regard this presence as ceasing at the end of the service. The latter view is regarded as rather Low-Church by Anglicans; but they are more vague than the Lutherans, preferring to speak of a spiritual Presence, which is ambiguous.[1] All these writers are ready to accept the plain meaning of the early writers to be the true one, except where they find expressions favourable to belief in transubstantiation.

The Catholic method is different.[2] We have not to prove our doctrines from the Fathers, but simply to defend them. For us personally it is enough that the Church teaches them. As St. Vincent of Lerins pointed out, universal consent—*quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—is the test of the truth; it is only when this universal consent is challenged that antiquity—*quod semper*—need be invoked; and by "antiquity" St. Vincent meant merely the period before the challenge was made.[3] We go to the Fathers, therefore, with a more open mind than others can. Our dogmas are all perfectly safe. We know that some of them are held to-day more explicitly, that is, with fuller understanding of their whole significance, than was once the case. Hence we are not put out if we find inadequate or even incorrect expressions

[1] Their large collections of patristic citations are very valuable, *cf.* Pusey, *The Real Presence,* 1855, and especially Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Real Presence,* 1909.

[2] Among innumerable Catholic works must be noted the Controversies of Bellarmine and *La perpétuité de la foi,* by Antoine Arnauld, Nicole and Renaudot (1669-1713).

[3] I do not hold that St. Vincent's altogether admirable tract was intended mainly as an attack on St. Augustine. I see no solid ground for this ingenious hypothesis.

in early times or in the greatest Fathers. In general we have small difficulty in defence. The great complaint of outsiders against the Catholic Church is her conservatism, her rigidity, her intolerance, whether in the first centuries or to-day; for this intolerance of error has admittedly had an unbroken life. No one pretends to have found any sudden innovations or reversals in the history of Catholic dogma. When the innovators of the sixteenth century accused their Mother the Church of having innovated, even gradually innovated, the accusation was a real innovation, and was immediately condemned as such. But it was a paradox as much as an impiety.

Hence, when we look back[1] through our unbroken tradition, we expect to find a certain amount of contrary evidence, which we can take candidly at its face value, and need not explain away, because we know that individual Catholic writers are not infallible. On the other hand, we can take equally at its face value all the plain enunciations of ordinary Catholic doctrine in ordinary Catholic words which we find continually. We are able to interrogate antiquity with a mind quite open with regard to the evidence. I am no more bound to find the Real Presence in the Apostolic Fathers than I am bound to find the Immaculate Conception in St. Thomas Aquinas. Just as it is an interesting historical fact that the Angelic Doctor denied that doctrine, so it might happen to be an interesting fact that St. Ignatius of Antioch denied the Real Presence.

Let us start our examination with the letters of this illustrious martyr. They were all written in the course of his last journey, as he was taken from Antioch to

[1] This is what Mgr. Batiffol well calls *la méthode régressive* (*L'Eucharistie,* 5th ed., Paris, 1913, p. 2).

Rome to be there thrown to the wild beasts. This was in 107, or a few years later, under Trajan. He was writing probably about ten years, certainly less than twenty years, after St. John wrote his Gospel. He was an old man, and is consequently a witness to the first century rather than to the second. From this we see the immense importance of his testimony for German criticism.

To the Ephesians (chap, xx.) he writes: "That you may obey the bishop and the priesthood with inseparable intention, breaking one Bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote against death, giving life for ever in Jesus Christ." Here St. Ignatius is interpreting St. John's sixth chapter of the Eucharist, an exegesis which Zwinglians and the Low Church have consistently denied. Harnack[1] admits the reference, and infers that Ignatius "thinks after a Johannine manner"; otherwise, that he considers that "the flesh profiteth nothing," and that both the apostle and his follower mean a purely spiritual eating and drinking! Again, the saint writes to the Trallians (chap. viii. 1): "Recreate yourselves in Faith, which is Flesh of the Lord, and in love which is His Blood." The German critics are delighted; Ignatius takes Flesh and Blood metaphorically. But independent critics have seen that he is referring to the Docetae, who said that our Lord's Body was a sham; he means by "faith which is Flesh of the Lord," that faith which assures us of the reality of His Flesh; and "love which is His Blood," signifies that the shedding of His Blood is the proof of His love. Any other interpretation will make the Flesh of Christ into a metaphor, an unreality, which is precisely what the Saint is concerned to deny; there

[1] *Dogmengeschichte,* Vol. I., p. 334 (4th ed., 1909).

is no direct reference to the Eucharist at all. Again he writes to the Philadelphians (chap. v. i): "taking refuge in the Gospel as the Flesh of Christ." Here again the critics rejoice; only they cannot show that the Eucharist is meant! The great scholars, Lightfoot, Zahn, Funk, find the obvious meaning to be: "the gospel where the truth of Christ's Flesh is so plainly taught." There is no direct or necessary reference to the Eucharist in another passage on which the critics have laid much stress: "The Blood of Christ, which is joy eternal and permanent" (Phil. i.). Lastly, in the letter to the Roman Church, which is one long cry of desire for martyrdom, we find (chap, vii.): "I delight not in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life. I long for the Bread of God, which is the Flesh of Jesus Christ, who was of the seed of David, and the drink I desire is His Blood, which is Love incorruptible." Here, the critics exclaim, the Eucharist is certainly meant, and he takes it in a metaphorical sense, since he says the Blood of Christ is love. Yes, he says the Blood of Jesus Christ is love, in or out of the Holy Eucharist, and precisely because it is real Blood. If he did not mean real Flesh, why did he add, "of the seed of David"?

I conclude, that had St. Ignatius written only these passages the critics would have an uncomfortable time; whereas, according to the Catholic method, we should conclude that St. Ignatius expresses himself in an ordinary Catholic manner, and that there is no reason for doubting that he held the traditional Catholic doctrine.

But there are two other passages which are much more explicit. To Smyrna (chap, vii.) he wrote of the Docetic heretics: "They abstain from Eucharist and

prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father raised up again by His loving-kindness. They, therefore, ^peaking against the gift of God, die in their dissension." This is plain enough. The Eucharist is the gift of God, it is the actual Flesh of Christ which suffered and rose again, and the heretics are damned for not believing, and refusing to receive it. It is difficult to see how the Protestant doctrine could be more strongly condemned. So a great critic, Loofs,[1] inferred that we cannot tell what St. Ignatius meant, as he is elsewhere so spiritual, here so materialistic! Axel Andersen, on the contrary, boldly says that neither here nor elsewhere is there any reference to the Holy Eucharist in St. Ignatius, and that he had never heard of such a rite.[2] Eucharist means thanks-giving, so that we can understand that the heretics deny thanksgiving to be the gift of God and the Flesh which suffered and rose! But the ground on which all other critics translate Eucharist in the technical sense, is not merely in order that St. Ignatius should not be made to talk nonsense—Lachmann pitied him as a poor fool—but because St. Justin, who lived as a Christian at Ephesus in 132, if not before, tells us that the word was so used by Christians. A yet more radical method has found favour. Until Zahn and Lightfoot, it was accepted in Germany that the letters of St. Ignatius must be later forgeries in all their different forms, and there are still critics there who regard them as doubtful, since an Apostolic Father cannot have talked about bishops and priests and deacons and the Real Presence. So awkward

1 Art. *Abendmahl* II., in *Real-Enz. Prot. Theol.,* Vol. I.
a In *Zeitschrift für N.T.* HTss., 1902, pp. X15 foil.

is it to have a cut-and-dried method when dealing with the history of dogma.

I quote one more passage (Phil iv.): "Be careful to use one Eucharist. For there is One Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Chalice unto union with His Blood, one Altar, as there is one bishop together with the priests and deacons, my fellow-servants." Here you can take the Flesh and Blood and Altar allegorically, if you like, but then you must take the bishop and presbytery and deacons allegorically also, if you can. If not, you will find St. Ignatius teaching a Christian Altar in connexion with the Holy Eucharist.

I have dealt at great length, considering the time at our disposal, with this Apostolic Father, because it seemed best to start with a good example of the method of the Protestant critics. If they have failed to get rid of St. Ignatius's testimony to a "realistic" doctrine of the Eucharist, it will be quite useless for them to try to trace a development by finding Protestant doctrine in any later Fathers.

The *Didachc* is a document probably written about the year 140, purporting to give the doctrine of the twelve Apostles according to the conjectures of its unknown author.[1] It is scarcely a witness to its own period. But it contains short suggestions for the Eucharistic prayer which are of great beauty, and it calls the Eucharist a sacrifice, identifying it with the "clean offering" prophesied by Malachy (i. 11).

St. Justin was a philosopher of Greek parentage, born in Palestine, in one of the last years of the first century,

[1] I accept the view of its origin put forward by Dean Armitage Robinson and Dom Connolly, and I withdraw the opinion I expressed in the *Caih. Encycl.,* art. "Didache."

and martyred at Rome about 163. He is the first Roman martyr whose Acts are extant. His first Apology was addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius about 150. His dialogue with the Jew Trypho was published soon afterwards; but he represents the conversation as having occurred at Ephesus as early as the year 132, at which time he had evidently been for some years a Christian. His witness makes a bridge from St. Ignatius well into the second half of the second century. I will take a difficult passage first. He has argued that God refused the sacrifices of the Jews, and he represents the Jew Trypho as likely to object that, though this is true, yet God "*does* accept the prayers of the Jews who are in the Dispersion, and that he calls their prayers sacrifices." Justin answers: "I also say that prayers and thanksgivings are the only sacrifices which are well-pleasing to God. For these alone have Christians been instructed to offer *(ττοιεἶν),* even in the memorial of food and drink, in which they commemorate the Passion which the Son of God suffered for them" *(Dial,* cxvii. 2).

Here it might seem that Justin regards the Eucharist as a commemoration of the Passion, but not as a sacrifice, the accompanying prayers being the sacrifice. He has written carelessly; but owing to his rooted habit of repeating himself, we have but to turn back a page, and we find his whole thought on the subject:

"The offering of flour . . . was a type of the Bread of the Eucharist which Jesus Christ our Lord prescribed that we should offer *(ποιάν)* in memory of the Passion which He suffered. . . He quotes the prophecy of Malachy, and explains it: "With regard to the sacrifices offered to Him in every place by us who are Gentiles, that is to say, the Bread of the Eucharist and likewise the

Chalice of the Eucharist, he prophesies, saying also that we honour His Name, whereas you profane it" (xli. 3). Again, he quotes Isaias xxiii. 13-19: "Isaias clearly speaks in this prophecy of the Bread which our Christ prescribed that we should offer *(iroieiv)* as a memorial of His being incarnate for the sake of those who believe on Him, for whose sake He became passible, and of the Chalice, which He prescribed that we should offer *(πονεiν)* with thanksgiving as a memorial of His blood (Ixx. 4). All the sacrifices in His name, which Jesus Christ prescribed to take place, that is, those of the Eucharist of Bread and the Chalice, which are performed in every place of the world by Christians, God witnesses beforehand that they are well-pleasing to Him; but those which are offered by you and by your priests He refuses" (cxvii. 1).

St. Justin is thus perfectly explicit. The Eucharist is the pure sacrifice which God through the true Messiah has substituted for those of the Jewish Temple. But the Jew might ask: why should simple bread and wine be better than the complicated and expensive offerings we used to make, with their symbolism of sin and death? And how can you speak of your oblation as merely thanksgiving (Eucharist) and prayer?

The answer could not be given without betraying secret doctrines to the Jew. But the Apology had made the whole public, in popular and simple language. For the esoteric teaching of the Christians had got abroad, and it was rumoured that in their secret reunions they slew a human child, and fed on human flesh. Could the report have arisen because the Christians used realistic language in their liturgy with a merely symbolical meaning? If so, it would have been easy to refute the

report by stating that mere bread and wine with water were taken in common as a sign of fellowship; nay, the heathen might well have been invited to come and see what was done. But it appears that the Christians never took this line. On the contrary, they made their mysteries more mysterious and private than ever; they hid them from the eyes of all but the instructed and baptized, and refused to publish any explanations. St. Justin's Apology offers us the one exception to the rule of secrecy. But the hope of getting the excellent Emperor Pius to change the laws against Christians had no result, and the attempt seems never to have been repeated. Consequently St. Justin's candid exposition is of unique interest.

He describes the secret meetings of Christians, he implies that only believers who have been baptized can be present, and declares that they are taught that what they eat is the Body and the Blood of Jesus Christ. It is obvious that if he could possibly have said that it was ordinary bread and wine, he must have seized the opportunity of proclaiming the fact. The truth obliges him to say it is not.

He first describes a Mass at which the newly baptized receive their first Communion (chap. lxv.), and then repeats himself by describing the regular Mass of Sunday, the day when light was created and Christ rose from the dead, on which day all Christians from town and country assemble (lxvii.). Putting together the two accounts, we find, first, reading from the prophets and from the memoirs of the apostles which are called gospels. Then bread and mixed wine and water are brought to him who presides; he makes a long prayer of thanksgiving—Eucharist—to the best of his ability,

and then the bread and wine and water are distributed by men called deacons to all who are present, and are carried by them to the absent. There is also a collection for those in want.

"And this food," he explains, "is called by us Eucharist, of which none is permitted to partake except one who believes that what we teach is true, and has been washed with the washing of the forgiveness of sins and for new birth, and lives according to the teaching of Christ. For we do not receive it as ordinary bread, or ordinary drink, but just as Jesus Christ our Saviour, incarnate by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so now as to the food which has been made Eucharist *(Ευχαριστηθάσαν)* by the word of prayer, which is His word, by which our flesh and blood are nourished by change, we have been taught that it is both the Body and the Blood of the incarnate Jesus. For the apostles in the Memoirs which they composed, which are called Gospels, have handed down that they were thus instructed; that Jesus took bread and gave thanks, saying: 'Do this as a memorial of Me, this is My Body'; and in like manner taking the Chalice, gave thanks, and said: 'This is My Blood,' and gave it to them alone" (r *Apol.,* Ixvi., i).

This is simply the ordinary Catholic doctrine, very simply expressed. But there are some points worthy of note. The bread is no longer common bread, it has *become* the Body of Christ. This is all that is meant by "transubstantiation," though it is so long a word. The change is made, so St. Justin implies, by the prayer of him who presides, "which is Christ's word"—this seems to mean that he attributes the change to the recital by the bishop of the words of institution which

he quotes from the Gospels. We sec, therefore, how he was able, first, to tell the Jew that the clean oblation offered in every part of the world in the fore-vision of Malachy, was the Christian offering of bread and wine, and yet to say that it was but prayers offered with the memorial which were the sacrifice; for the real sacrifice he meant was not the bread and wine and water, but the words of Christ changing them into the Body and Blood of Christ and offering them.

All this seems plain enough. Harnack has admitted that Justin was a "realist."

The second half of the second century is admirably represented by St. Irenaeus, a disciple in his youth of the Apostolic Father St. Polycarp, and eventually bishop of Lyons. He has a long disquisition on the sacrifice of the New Law, which he connects, as did the Didache and Justin, with the prophecy of Malachy. I would quote it but for pressure of time, which forces me to give short extracts only.

"Christ took the created bread, and gave thanks and said: 'This is My Body,' and in like manner the Chalice, which is a creature as we are, He declared to be His Blood, and taught the Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church has received from the Apostles, and throughout the world offers to God" *{Adv. Haer.* iv. 17.5). This is a clear paraphrase of the words of institution, which he tells us the Apostles took literally.

His great book is against the Gnostic heretics and Marcionites. He assumes that they have the same belief in the Blessed Sacrament as his own. He appeals to this belief as a proof that their denial of the resurrection of the flesh is illogical. "How do they say that the flesh runs to corruption and partakes not of life, since

it is nourished by the Body of the Lord and by His Blood? They must either change their opinion, or else cease to offer these. As for us, our doctrine agrees with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our doctrine. We offer to Him what is His own, in harmony therewith announcing our fellowship and union, and confessing the resurrection of flesh and spirit. For as the bread which comes from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two elements, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of resurrection unto eternity" *(Adv. Haer.* iv. 18.5). This passage is quite explicit. The common bread " becomes," that is to say, is changed, and that at a given moment, when it receives the invocation of God. Even Loofs, who declared the teaching of Ignatius and of Justin to be too vague to warrant any conclusions, acknowledges that the bread and wine, according to Irenaeus, do not merely "receive" something, but "become" something. The admission is important, for this passage has been the great stronghold of the Lutherans in favour of Impanation, and of the Anglican High Church school for their practically identical doctrine. They have argued that St. Irenæus held that after the consecration there are two substances, an earthly and a heavenly, that is to say, the bread and the Body of Christ. This view makes the common bread become a bread which contains the Body of Christ. This is not the obvious meaning of St. Irenæus's words. He does not say "two substances," but "two -ττράγ/ιατα." What are these two *πράγματι* On this point Catholic authors are divided. The Benedictine editor, Dom Massuet, explains that the earthly

element is the Body and Blood of Christ, and the heavenly element is His Divinity. The common bread has become Eucharist, that is to say, the incarnate Christ. Mohler and Dollinger followed this interpretation, so did Franzelin, and lately M. Bareille and Mgr. Batiffol have preferred this view.[1] Personally, I must say I feel that the context is altogether in favour of the other view, that the Eucharist consists of an earthly element—the appearances of bread and wine, which are no longer common bread and wine—and the heavenly element, the risen Body and Blood of Christ, which is at the Right Hand of God. This has been the view of Bellarmine, Feuardent, Le Nourry, and more recently of Schwane and Struckmann.[2] For St. Irenæus also says: "He confessed the Chalice, which is from a creature, to be His own Blood, and He declared that the created Bread is His own Body, from which He strengthens our bodies. Therefore when the mixed Chalice and the made bread receive the word of God, and become the Eucharist, the Body of Christ, and by these the substance of our flesh is strengthened, how do they say that flesh is not receptive of the gift of God, which is everlasting life, since it is nourished by the Body and Blood of the Lord, and is a member of Him, as Blessed Paul says to the Ephesians, 'because we are members of His Body and of His Flesh and of His Bones'?" *(Adv. Haer.* v. 2.3). And again he speaks of "our

[1] Mohler, *Symbolik·*, Dollinger, *Lehve von der Euch. in den drei ersten Jahrh.,* 1826; Bareille, Art. *Eucharistie* in *Did. de Théol. Cath.;* P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie,* 5e ed., Paris, 1913.

[*] I wish here to acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. A. Struckmann's careful work: *Die Gegenwart Christi in dev hl. Eucharistie nach den Schriftstellevn der Vornic&nischen Zeit* (in *Theol. Sludien dev Leo-gesellschaft),* Vienna, 1905.

bodily economy, which is nourished by His Chalice, which is His Blood, and is strengthened by the Bread, which is His Body." There is no idea of bread or wine containing or conveying His Body; it *is* His Body, and not the bread which it appears to be.

One of St. Irenaeus's opponents, Marcus, used to make the wine, by some jugglery, appear purple or scarlet, during the course of a long prayer of invocation[1]. This illustrates three interesting points; Marcus used white wine, or, more probably, plain water, he used a glass chalice, and his followers believed in a change of the wine or water into the Blood of Christ. Tertullian, like Irenaeus, argues with the Gnostics on the assumption that they believed in the Real Presence. But some of them had strange doctrines. Tatian the Encratite, who, like the modern Americans, repudiated the use of wine, celebrated the Eucharist with bread and water; he was anticipated by the Docetae, as we find from the Acts of St. John, written by Leucius in the first half of the second century. The same custom is found in the somewhat later Acts of Thomas, and the Acts of Peter with Simon Magus. A fragment of the heretic Theodotus says that bread and oil, sanctified by the power of the Name, do not remain the same, but are changed by this power into a spiritual power. The same idea of a change is found in the Ophite work *Pistis Sophia,* wherein we find a wild story of an offering of fire, water, wine and blood—the wine is changed into water by Christ, and then used by Him to baptize with.[2]

We have evidence of greater value from paintings and inscriptions. The celebrated fresco known as

[1] *Ircnæus,* I. 13, 2; also Hippol., *Philos.,* VI., 39.

[2] Details and references in Struckmann and in Batiffol, *op. cit.*

Fractio panis, in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, is referred to the first half of the second century. Seven persons are seated at a table, on which is a two-handled cup, a plate with two fish, and a plate with five loaves—a manifest reference to the miracle of the multiplication of five loaves and two fishes; the presence, at the side, of seven baskets of bread is a further allusion. But the scene is at a table, and it is therefore an allegorical representation. The fish represents our Lord, as always; and He is also the Bread of life; He multiplies Himself to be the food of the faithful. A similar picture, not much later in date, is found in the cemetery of SS. Peter and Marcellinus; others are found of much the same type of the third and fourth centuries. The fish as a symbol is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, and is explained by Tertullian—both on the border of the second and third centuries.

The most interesting reference to the Fish is on the tomb erected by the second century Christian Abercius of Hieropolis in Phrygia. He describes his journey to Rome and the East, probably undertaken in the interests of the doctrine of the Church against the Montanists, of whom he was a vigorous opponent.[1] Faith, he says, "led me everywhere, and everywhere gave me as food a fish from the fount, very great and pure, which was caught by a pure Virgin." This inscription was very annoying to Protestants, and a certain Ficker was put up to write an essay proving the tomb to be a pagan one. Duchesne treated this lucubration as a joke, to Hamack's great annoyance. The latter tried to show *(Texte u. Unt.,* Vol. XII.) that the inscription was at

1 To "Abircius Marcellus" was dedicated a tract against the Montanists by an unknown writer (Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.,* V. 16).

least half pagan. Dieterich declared it pagan from a new point of view, and Salomon Reinach was delighted. But scholars in general have been unable to take this view seriously. A similar inscription at Autun, that of a certain Pectorius, was the subject of Cardinal Pitra's earliest study. *I* quote from it the remarkable words: "Thou boldest the tish in Thy hands," an allusion to the custom of receiving the Holy Eucharist on the open palms.

We now come to the great leaders of the Catechetical school of Alexandria, Clement and Origen. The writings of Clement begin at the end of the second century. Origen died in 252 A.d. in consequence of his sufferings in the persecution of Decius. Both carefully avoid publishing the teaching of the Church as to the sacraments; the latter from time to time explicitly says it was not allowed to do so. But their habit of explaining Holy Scripture in an allegorical sense made them take the sacraments also in an allegorical sense. Hence they make constant allusions to them. Here is one of Clement's: to believers in Catholic doctrine his meaning is not far to seek:

"Women, when they become mothers, give milk; but the Lord Christ, the fruit of the Virgin, did not bless the paps of women, nor judge them as best for nourishing; but when the loving Father rained down the Logos, the Logos Himself became spiritual food for the prudent. O mystical wonder! There is one Father of all, and one Logos of all, and one Holy Ghost, who is everywhere; and one only Virgin Mother, for so I love to call the Church. This Mother alone had no milk, since she alone is not a woman, for she is at once maid and mother, pure as a maid, loving as a mother. And she calls her

children, and suckles them with milk, that is, with her infant the Logos. Wherefore she had no milk; for her own beautiful child was milk, the Body of Christ, which nourishes the young for the Logos. The Lord brought them forth with pain of the flesh, the Logos Himself wrapped them in His own Precious Blood. O holy swaddling clothes! The Logos is all to the babe, father and mother and teacher and nurse. 'Eat My Body,' He says, 'and drink My Blood'; such is the nourishment, Himself, which the Lord gives us. He hands us His Flesh, He pours out His Blood; and nothing is wanting for the growth of the children. O astonishing Mystery! He orders us to put off our ancient fleshly corruption together with our old nourishment, and receiving another new diet of Christ—receiving Him, if it be possible, in us, to lay Him up in ourselves, to have the Saviour in our breasts, that we may set in order the passions of our flesh."

This is a beautiful passage, in spite of the metaphors being both strange and mixed. The Protestant commentators are unanimous in seeing in it a description in figurative language of receiving the teaching of Christ; all this poetical description is merely an elaborate way of saying that the Church's doctrine is good nourishment for the mind. Why then these exclamations—"O mystical wonder," "O astonishing mystery"? It is indeed an astonishing mystery that anyone should be so stupid as to suppose Clement to be so stupid. But the passage goes on—I must premise that in it "the Spirit" and "the Holy Spirit" mean the Divinity of Christ, for the reference is to our Lord's contrast of the flesh and the Spirit:

"Listen to this explanation also. The Holy Spirit

is allegorically the Flesh, for the Flesh was created by Him. The Logos is typified by the Blood, for the Logos is infused into life like rich blood; the mingling of the two is the Lord, the nourishment of the little ones, the Lord is Spirit and Logos. The nourishment (that is, the Lord Jesus; that is, the Logos of Cod) is Spirit made Flesh, sanctified heavenly Flesh. The nourishment is milk from the Father, with which alone we little ones are suckled. For the Logos, the beloved and our nurse, Himself poured out His Blood for us, saving mankind, through whom believing on God, we take refuge at the paps of the Father, by which we forget all care."

Clement could run on like this at any length, with the impression to himself and to his ancient hearers that he was saying something very deep. He did not always manage to keep within the strict limits of orthodoxy. But unless he believed that in the Eucharist he received the Body and Blood of Christ together with His Divinity, and that Holy Communion gives us the Logos within our breasts, his words are devoid of reason. Not that he cannot use the Eucharist as a metaphor. Explaining the metaphor of Hebrews, milk and strong drink, in another place, he says: "Catechesis is milk, contemplation is meat; these are the flesh and blood of the Logos, that is to say, the understanding of the Divine power and essence."

The German Protestants have always insisted that this is Origen's doctrine of the Eucharist. In fact, he frequently says that the Body and Blood of Christ mean the words of Christ. But he does not regard this as the only meaning, else he could not speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice—you cannot "offer" doctrine

to God.[1] But Origen's allegorizing would equally make the Incarnation itself nothing but the Divine Word becoming human speech, if we took it literally.[2] It would take a long time to discuss his expressions about the Holy Eucharist. Many of them arc realistic enough, and there is no reason for explaining them away. Origen taught that the spiritual meaning of Holy Scripture is much higher than the literal meaning, and is for the perfect. But the doctrine of the Real Presence was also for him an esoteric doctrine,[3] not to be spoken of except in veiled language, understood by the initiated. It is clear that he regarded as something higher even than the most spiritual teaching, the actual union with God attained by His indwelling by grace, by Holy Communion, by mystical contemplation. There is no time to develop this. I pass on to the Western Church.

In the last years of the first century the letter of St. Clement, Pope and disciple of the Apostles, does not speak of the Holy Eucharist, but contains a long Eucharistic prayer, apparently modelled on the form of extempore prayer used by the celebrant at Mass. St. Irenaeus is a witness for the West as well as the East. The writings of Tertullian are the first Latin theology we possess. His thought is not always clear, and his language is always extraordinarily difficult, and on our subject, as on many others, his views have been

[1] He says we are said to "drink the Blood of Christ" *not only* in the rite of the Sacraments, *but also* when we receive His words (Hom. 16. 9 in *Num.).*

[2] I refer especially to a curious passage found in two MSS. of the old Latin translation of the Comm, on Matt. *(In Matt. Series,* 85).

[3] "He who is initiated into the mysteries knows both the Flesh and the Blood of the Word of God" *(Hom.* 9. 10 *in Levit.).*

matter of debate. There is really not much difficulty. Three or four words of his have seemed ambiguous, and have been elaborately studied, with plain results.

First: he speaks of the bread *quo corpus suum repraesentat {Adv. Marc.,* I. 14). *Repraesentare* in Tertullian nearly always means "to make present," so that we must translate, "bread by means of which Christ makes His Body present."

Secondly, Tertullian explains that we can take the petition "give us this day our daily bread" in a spiritual sense, for Christ is our Bread, and also because *corpus eius in pane censetur {De Orat.,* 6). *Censeri* in Tertullian means usually to be placed in a given class or category, so we must render: "Because His Body comes under the heading of Bread." The meaning is that in the Lord's prayer we can pray that we may receive our Lord's Body.

Thirdly, we find a very curious use of *consecrari* in Tertullian, to mean "to be invisibly situated," to be hidden in a place.[1] Hence the sentence, *lia et nunc sanguinem suum in uino consecrauit, qui tunc uinuin in sanguine figurauit {Adv. Marc.,* IV. 40, 8) must apparently have the unexpected meaning: "So now also He who then in the Old Testament used wine as a figure for Blood, has now hidden His Blood in wine."

We have to thank a Lutheran, Leimbach, for the careful investigation of these three cases.[2] On a fourth case he has somewhat wasted his time—the word

[1] *De Anima, 15; De resurr.,* 15; *adv. Marc.,* V. 11.

[2] Carl L. Leimbach, *Beitrage zur Abendmahlslehre Tertullians,* Gotha, 1874. Leimbach naturally finds "Impanationslehre" in *repraesentat* and in *consecrauit.* His very careful lists have been taken over and revised by Père D'Alès in his excellent *La Théologie de Tertullien.*

figura. For in the passage he wished to elucidate, the meaning of the word is perfectly certain, and quite ordinary; it occurs over and over again in the context, and each time means an Old Testament figure or type. The whole passage is most interesting. I cite the crucial words only: "Taking Bread and distributing it to His disciples, He made it His Body by saying 'This is My Body,' that is, 'the figure of My Body'." The argument continues thus: By the words of institution Christ showed that bread in the Old Testament was a figure of His Body; now a figure represents a reality, you cannot have a figure of an empty phantasm; therefore our Lord had a real Body. Naturally critics have jumped to the conclusion that *figura* here means a real shape—a phantasm cannot have a real shape—but this gives no sense to the context; and the continuation makes it certain that Tertullian meant that only a reality could be prefigured in the Old Testament. Therefore the Zwinglian interpretation is excluded, "This is My Body, that is, the figure of My Body," as though Tertullian thought the Blessed Sacrament was only a figure; on the contrary, he means the Old Testament figure, as opposed to the new reality. He says Christ took bread and made it His Body by saying —*dicendo,* not *dicens*—" This is My Body," that is to say, the Old Testament figure of My Body is My Body. Tertullian never interrupts a quotation by an explanation, but employs hyperbaton, as: "Christ is dead, that is Anointed," for "Christ, that is, anointed, is dead"; or "I will open in a parable my mouth—that is, a similitude," meaning " I will open in a parable—that is, in a similitude—my mouth."[1] So here he means:

1 C. *Prax.* 29 and *Adv. Marc.,* IV. 11 *fin.*

"This, the ancient figure of My Body, is My Body."

Later he refers back to this argument: "By the sacrament of bread and wine we have already proved the truth of the Lord's Body and Blood against Marcion" *(Adv. Marc.,* V. 8).

I will refer to a few of the many interesting passages of this strange and brilliant controversialist. He tells us that some Christians avoided Mass on fast days, for fear of breaking their fast by receiving Holy Communion. "Does the Eucharist relax your devout service to God? Does it not bind you to Him more closely? Will not your fast be more solemn if you stand before the altar of God? If you receive the Body of Christ and reserve It, you will omit neither the participation of the sacrifice nor the accomplishment of your devotion" *(De Orat.,* 19). The w'ord used for altar is *ara,* a stronger one than *altare.*[1] Notice that Holy Communion is a participation of the sacrifice of this altar. The practice of taking away the Blessed Sacrament, and communicating daily at home, remained at Rome for more than a century after the days of persecution, and among the Egyptian monks for much longer still. If a Christian woman should marry a pagan: "Will he not know," asks Tertullian, "what is that which you taste before all other food? And if he knows it is bread, will he not believe it is what it is called?"—mere bread *(Ad uxorem,*

1 It is only fair to add that Tertullian *(ad. Scapulam,* 2) says also, "We sacrifice for the health of the Emperor, but as God has ordered, *by pure prayer,"* just as Justin had said. Christian altars were quite different to look at from heathen altars, and had a different use; so that Minucius Felix (3rd cent. ?) represents pagans as complaining that the Christians have no temples or altars; he does not say tiffs was accurate (10. 2, and 32. 1),

II. 5). He tells us that oblations for the dead, and on their anniversaries, were regarded as an apostolic tradition *{De Cor. Mil.,* 3). He speaks of the paschal solemnities lasting all the night *{Ad uxor.,* II. 5). He takes the restoration of the Prodigal Son to mean that of the penitent to Communion: "Shall even an apostate receive back his first robe, the garment of the Holy Spirit, and the ring, the sign of Baptism? And shall Christ be again slain for him, and shall he sit at meat in the seat whence those unworthily vested are carried off by the torturers? . . . and then he feeds on the fatness of the Lord's Body, that is to say, the Eucharist" *{De Pudic.,* 9). The reference of the slaying and eating of the fatted calf to Mass and Communion is striking.

Let us turn to another African, of even greater eloquence, the incomparable St. Cyprian. His writings carry us just beyond the middle of the third century. His teaching is quite plain, and raises no difficulties. It is the office of a bishop, he says, "to serve the altar, and to offer the divine sacrifices" *{Ep.* 67. 1), and he did so daily. Christians received Holy Communion daily, unless on account of some more grievous sin *{De Dom. Orat.,* 18). When those who had sacrificed in the persecution were admitted to Communion without public penance, he says: ''Violence is done to Christ's Body and Blood, and they sin more against the Lord with their hands and their mouth, than when they denied the Lord" *{De Lapsis,* 16). They are furious with the bishops "because they do not at once receive the Body of the Lord in their sacrilegious hands, or drink the Lord's Blood with their polluted mouth" *{ibid.,* 22). He tells how a woman who had sacrificed

to idols was tortured by the sacrificial food; and when she opened the box wherein she kept the Sacrament, fire came out of it, and she dared not touch. A lapsed man who dared to receive from the hand of the priest, found he held only a cinder on his open palms *(ibid.,* 2fi).

"Listen," he says *(ibid.,* 25), "to what happened in my presence. An infant girl was left by her parents, who fled inconsiderate in their haste, to be nourished by a nurse. The nurse took the deserted child before the magistrates. There, before the idol, where the people were assembling, because she could not eat flesh on account of her age, they gave her bread dipped in wine, which was left over from the sacrifice of perishing things"—notice this expression—the Christian sacrifice is of what is imperishable, the risen Body of Christ. "The mother afterwards took back her child. But the girl could as little speak and explain the deed, as she could before understand it or guard against it. In ignorance therefore the mistake was made, that whilst I was sacrificing, the mother brought her in with her. The girl, mingled with the good people, could not bear the prayer and supplication I was making, but was now shaken with sobs, now restless with suppressed excitement, as though her infant soul in the simplicity of its early years was being obliged by the torturer to confess its knowledge of the deed by such signs as it was capable of. But when after the completion of the solemnities, the deacon began to give to those present, and the others received, when he came to her place the child turned away her head, by a feeling of the Divine Majesty, pressed her lips firmly together, and refused the Chalice. The deacon persisted, however, and in spite of her resistance poured into her mouth the sacrament of the

Chalice. Then followed retching and vomiting. In a body and a mouth which had been defiled, the Eucharist could not remain; the drink sanctified in the Blood of the Lord burst away from the polluted stomach. So great is the power of the Lord, such is His majesty."

Space forbids me to quote more from St. Cyprian. I have omitted some interesting evidence from Hippo lytus of Rome and St. Dionysius the Great of Alexandria. After St. Cyprian comes a break of forty years, with scarcely any Christian writings—no other such barren period occurs in the history of the Church. The fourth century I leave alone. The inference I draw from the evidence I have put before you is that we have no reason to doubt that the belief of the Church from the time of the Apostles until the middle of the second century was quite definite as to the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice.

III.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE GREEK FATHERS: ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA AND NESTORIUS.

By the Very Rev. Canon Edward Myers, M.A.

To compress the Eucharistic teaching of the Greek Fathers into the limits of a short address is an impossible task because of the richness and variety of material. Some attempt, however, can be made to bring into relief their special Eucharistic theology.

The culminating point in the world's history is the Incarnation, Life, and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Redemption of fallen man by the life-work of Christ, crowned by the supreme act of willing and perfect sacrifice on Calvary. This is the one perfect act of worship ever offered on earth to God. That central fact of human history has ever loomed large in the Church of Christ. When Christians met to worship God they were ever mindful of what Our Lord did on the eve of His Passion, and of His command to do as He did in commemoration of Him, "showing the death of the Lord until He come" (i Cor. ii. 26); "knowing that Christ risen again from the dead dieth now no more: death shall no more have dominion over Him" (Rom. vi. 9); the chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord?" (1 Cor. x. 16). Now it is against the background of the full scriptural teaching of the New

Testament, and of the liturgical practice of Eucharistic worship that we must consider the special teaching of the Greek Fathers. The sacrificial reality yields on consideration the implied truth of the Real Presence; that Presence being brought about by the unique change which in far later years was appropriately termed Transubstantiation. We see clearly from the beginning that the Church's practice in her public worship was the great means whereby that revelation of Christ was brought home to Christians at large.

The group of ecclesiastical writers, known as the "Greek Fathers," are divided over long periods and wide areas. They differ in their lives, surroundings and centuries. Some English parallel of this grouping would be found in all the ecclesiastical writers of the English-speaking world who have written since 1400 in the English tongue. Just as heresy has broken the unity of the Church in English-speaking lands, so, too, had it ravaged the Greek-speaking lands. In spite of all, the unity of teaching on the Holy Eucharist, both in its sacrificial and its sacramental aspects, survived—even inconsistently—the assaults of error. The great outstanding names of Greek Fathers are St. Athanasius, the great Bishop of Alexandria (293-373), the closely linked group of the Cappadocians, St. Basil the Great (330~379), St. Gregory Nazianzen (330-390), and St. Gregory of Nyssa (331-395). We may group together as liturgically connected St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386), and St. John Chrysostom (344-407). To this list we add St. Cyril of Alexandria, the great opponent of Nestorius (died in 444). The long and glorious list of Greek patristic writers is closed in 754 by the name of St. John Damascene.

The Greek bathers have everything in common with us except the medium used in expressing the teaching of the Church. They had the advantage of the authoritative and inspired record of the traditional teaching of the Church handed down to them in their own tongue as it came from the pens of Apostles and Evangelists. Furthermore, that inspired scriptural record was known and interpreted in its true, living context, the Divinely-founded, Divinely-safeguarded Church of Christ. Only when torn from that context do the truths of revelation become the playthings of heresy.

Eucharistic practice was from the first so identified with the normal Christian life that the Greek Fathers presuppose it all as familiar. They see no need for elaborating what is known to all, is denied by none. In their works, therefore, a passing allusion to some aspect of the Eucharist in harmony with the subject in hand is all that we find; but the sum-total of these frequent passing allusions, whether in sermons or in scriptural commentaries, is so great as to furnish material for a considerable number of monographs on the Greek Fathers' Eucharistic teaching. Their meaning fortunately leaves no room for doubt, even when we set out to classify them in those groups which had not occurred explicitly to the minds of the writers in those pre-controversial days.

Eucharistic fact is ever anterior to Eucharistic theory, even as dogmatic fact is anterior to dogmatic theory. It is always well to keep in our own minds a very clear distinction between (i) discussions concerning terminology, (2) discussions concerning the truths set forth in that terminology, (3) and the truths and realities themselves. Jesus Christ is true God and true man. The

Holy Eucharist is Christ's true Body and Blood. That is true in the beginning as it is true now. All the discussion, the controversy, the heresy, the blasphemy poured out by mankind in the course of two thousand years has left those realities in themselves exactly where they were. The thoughts of men are not always expressed in the same manner, nor in the same language, nor under identical conditions. The minds of some men have more insight and greater depth than others. In the new expression of old truths error may easily creep in. From such error the Church of Divine purpose must safeguard her faithful. She has faithfully to keep and infallibly to declare the doctrine and faith delivered to Her as a Divine deposit.

The Eucharistic realities are unchanged throughout the ages, are identically the same for the Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers, for Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, as for Pope Pius XI, for you and for me; they do not change, though the verbal expression of the Eucharistic truths is conditioned by many circumstances of time and place. Gregory of Nyssa could speculate without fear of encountering later and then undreamed-of heresies. The Catholic who has ever been surrounded by fervent and well-instructed members of the Church will have an insight into the Eucharistic realities which may leave many other less-favoured Catholics far behind. The plain Eucharistic belief of a good practising Catholic may call for all the metaphysical skill in analysis of a Cardinal Billot, and all the erudition of a Père de la Taille to elaborate; but all the learning of all the theologians will never take him beyond the simple revealed facts themselves.

In the Eucharistic teaching of the Greek Fathers, references to the Blessed Sacrament are mainly incidental or illustrative. Thus the writers are instructing new Christians or defending the Christian religion as a whole against the heathen or the heretic, and not formally explaining or discussing this particular doctrine in view of any controversy about it amongst Christians themselves.

I am not going to say that the Greek Fathers taught the doctrine of the Real Presence, of Transubstantiation, and of the sacrificial character of the Mass in the explicit terms defined by the Council of Trent. The reason, too, is simple. The definitions of Trent were positive statements directed against current heresies and negations which the Greek Fathers had never to meet; the Fathers in question, moreover, spoke and taught in Greek, not in Latin, and their terminology, not having been fixed by conciliar definitions, may be less technical than the need of guarding against heresy has rendered our own. But allowing for those facts and for all that has happened in the history of the human race, of the human mind, of the Church in the course of the past 1500 years—it is surely nothing less than amazing from a human point of view, that a modem 20th century Catholic can pick up a book written in a dead language in the 4th or 5th century, and find stated the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, which he cannot fail to recognise as one and the same with the doctrine which he holds. The technical definitions are absent, but the fundamental identity of the truths stands out in bold relief. And yet there is perhaps less to wonder at than at first sight appears. The Greek Fathers took the words of Our Lord and of the New Testament writers in their plain, simple

meaning, just as we to-day take them without attenuation or unnecessary explanation. When we read St. Cyril of Jerusalem's address to the recently baptised converts in the year 348, explaining the doctrine "concerning Christ's Body and Blood," the lapsing centuries seem to disappear. We sit at his feet and listen and recognise the teaching of the Church of God throughout the ages: " 'For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you' and the rest (1 Cor. xi. 23). Even this teaching of the Blessed Paul is sufficient to give you full assurance concerning the Divine mysteries, of which when found worthy you have become one in-Body and one in Blood with Christ. For he has just proclaimed aloud that 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night in which He was betrayed, having taken bread and given thanks, broke and gave to His disciples, saying, *Take, eat, this is My Body,* and having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, *Take, drink, this is My Blood.* He Himself, therefore, having declared and said concerning the bread, 'this is My Body,' who shall dare to doubt henceforward? And He Himself having supped, and said 'this is My Blood,' who shall ever doubt, saying, 'this is not His Blood'? He once, at Cana of Galilee, changed water into wine—which is akin to blood—and is He undeserving of belief when He turned wine into blood? Invited to the earthly marriage, He miraculously wrought that wonderful work, and shall He not much the rather be confessed to have bestowed the fruition of His Body and Blood on the children of the bride-chamber? Wherefore with the fullest assurance let us partake as of Christ's Body and Blood; for in the type of bread is given to thee the Body, and in the type of wine is given to thee the Blood, in order that

having partaken of Christ's Body and Blood thou mightest become one in body and one in blood with Him. For thus also hail we become Christ-bearers: His Body and Blood being diffused through our members: and thus do we become, according to the Blessed Peter 'partakers of the Divine nature' (2 Pet. i. 4). . . . Wherefore do not contemplate the bread and wine as bare (elements), for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, Christ's Body and Blood; for even though sense suggests this to thee, yet let the faith stablish thee. Judge not the thing from the taste, but from faith be fully assured without mistake, that thou hast been vouchsafed Christ's Body and Blood."

From the far-off decades of the 4th century the message of St. Cyril of Jerusalem re-echoes in the 20th century—it might well be a catechetical instruction given in a modern London Church. The appeal to the plain words of Our Lord, their face value reinforced by the parallel of the miracle of Cana, where water was changed into wine, whereas in the Eucharist on the assurance of Christ's word wine is changed into blood—the untrustworthiness of sense unguided by faith, these are Cyril's method of teaching. Here are to be found no technical terms, but we cannot fail to recognise all that is conveyed without their use.

Anything approaching a catena of the Greek Fathers is obviously out of the question, but let us remember that the greater number of these Greek Fathers were Bishops, that in their lives the Eucharistic sacrifice occupied a central position, that consequently their words are not those of speculative theologians, but of men very familiar with every detail of the purpose and value of the Eucharistic rite. Furthermore, it may be

well also to bear in mind that there was a traditional state of conflict existing between Antioch and Alexandria, In particular there was an inherited conflict between St. Cyril and St. John Chrysostom; yet nothing suggests the slightest divergence in fundamental Eucharistic teaching between the two, whatever may be the difference in stress or emphasis on this or that particular aspect of the doctrine. The true sacrificial character of the Eucharist, and its close connection with the sacrifice of the Cross, is a common possession of the Greek Fathers. Whether we listen to St. Cyril, or St. John Chrysostom, or to St. Gregory Nazianzen, the fundamental teaching is the same. St. John Chrysostom has been spoken of as the Doctor of the Eucharist, so full is his teaching of the subject. In the sacrifice of the Mass we are concerned with the Body of the historical Christ, Who is now in Heaven, the self-same Body that was in the manger. Listen to his words in his Homily on the Baptism of Christ (No. 4) : "That pure and spotless Body is now at the right hand of the Father. And seeing that I have made mention of the Lord's Body I must conclude this discourse by addressing a few words to you concerning it: ' I know that many amongst us, as is usual at this feast, are hastening to this sacred table. It were indeed befitting, as I have often before said to you, not to celebrate feasts when we are about to communicate, but to cleanse the conscience and then touch that sacred sacrifice, for whoso is defiled and unclean is not fit, even on a feast, to partake of that holy and awful flesh."

In his 24th Homily on the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians he writes: "Let us therefore approach unto Him with fervour and burning love, and let us not have to endure

punishment, for in proportion as we were greatly benefitted, in the same way we are more exceedingly punished when we show ourselves unworthy of the benefit. This is the Body which even lying in the manger, Magi reverenced. . . . Wherefore let us imitate, if it be but these barbarians, who are the citizens of Heaven. For they indeed when beholding Him in the manger and in a shed, and seeing nothing such as thou dost now, approach with great awe; but not in a manger dost thou see Him, but on an altar; not a woman holding Him, but a priest standing by; and the Spirit with great beneficence hovering over the things that lie before thee. Not simply that very same Body dost thou gaze on, as they, but thou knowest both its power and the whole economy, and art ignorant of none of the things done by it, having been initiated with care into all things. Let us therefore rouse ourselves, tremble, and exhibit a piety far greater than that of those barbarians, that we may not heap fire on our own heads by approaching inconsiderately and at hazard. But I say these things, not that we approach not, but that we approach not inconsiderately."

The spirit in which to receive Holy Communion he sets forth in his sermon on the Birthday of Jesus Christ (No. 7). "When you are about to approach to the dread and Divine table, and to the sacred mystery, do it with fear and trembling, with a pure conscience, with fasting and prayer. . . . Reflect, O man, what a sacrifice thou art about to touch; what a table thou art going to approach; think that, though dust and ashes, thou receivest Christ's Body and Blood. Were even a King to invite you to a banquet, you recline at table with fear, and receive the food that is before you reverently

and silently, whilst when God invites you to His own table, and sets before you His own Son—the Heavenly powers standing about with fear and trembling, and the Cherubim hiding their faces and the Seraphim crying out with dread, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord'—dost thou approach with shouting and confusion to this spiritual banquet?"

In his 1st Homily on the Treachery of Judas he says: "But it is, at length, time to approach to this awful table. Wherefore let us come unto it with becoming sobriety and watchfulness; and let no one be any longer a Judas, no one wicked, no one envenomed, no one bearing one thing on his lips and another on his mind. Christ is present, and now He that set forth that table (at the Last Supper) the same sets forth this now. For it is not man that makes the things that lie to open view become Christ's Body and Blood, but that same Christ that was crucified for us. The Priest, fulfilling his office, stands pronouncing those words; but the power and the grace is of God. 'This is My Body,' He says. This word transmutes the things that lie to open view. And as that word that said, 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth,' was pronounced indeed but once, but through all time is actually operative on our nature for the procreation of children; so also that word uttered but once makes from that time to this, and until His own coming, the sacrifice perfect at every table in the Churches."

The sacrifice that is offered is the self-same sacrifice, whoever is the offering priest, or whatever be the season of the year, "the oblation is the same whether a common man, or whether a Pqt^r.or a Paul offer it. It is the same that Christ gave, to His disciples, and which the priests now perform" (2nd, Homily,, gnd Epistle to

Timothy). "Why indeed is time to be considered in this matter? Let the time for our approaching be (when) the conscience is pure. The mystery at Faster is nothing greater than that which is now celebrated. It is one and the same, the same grace of the Spirit; it is always a Passover. You that are initiated understand what is said. Both on the Friday and on the Sabbath and on the Lord s Day, and on the day of Martyrs, the same sacrifice is celebrated. 'For as often as you eat this bread or drink this cup you show forth the death of the Lord,' not by any limit of time did He circumscribe the sacrifice."

One more quotation from St. John Chrysostom, which I will take from his 17th Homily on the Epistle to the Hebrews; "What then? Do not we offer up daily? We offer indeed, but making a commemoration of His death, and this commemoration is one, not many. 'How one and not many?' Because it was offered once, as that which was offered in the Holy of Holies. This is the type of that, and that of this. For we always offer up the same; not in sooth to-day one shape and to-morrow another, but always the same thing; so that the sacrifice is one. 'According to this reasoning, as He is offered up in many places, are there many Christs?' But not so; but one Christ everywhere; both here entire and there entire—one Body. Wherefore as He that is offered up in many places is one Body, not many bodies, so also is the sacrifice one. Our High Priest is He that offered up that sacrifice which cleanses us; that same sacrifice do we offer up now also—that which was then offered—that .sacrifice which, cannot be consumed. This takes place .for/a' cehiifiêmoration of that which then took place. 'This do you in remembrance of Me!'

Not a different sacrifice, as did the High Priest of those (Jewish) days, but the same do we always celebrate, or rather we make a commemoration of a sacrifice."

It was with a similar sense of the sacrificial reality that St. Gregory Nazianzen wrote to Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (letter 171): "And do not thou, O servant of God, think it too much to pray and intercede for me, when by a word thou drawest down the Word, when with the voice for a sword thou dividest with a bloodless cutting the Lord's Body and Blood."

And not dissimilar are the words of Nestorius himself: "To the faithful even as to soldiers there is offered that royal pay which the holy mysteries are; but the army of the faithful is nowhere to be seen; like a straw the wind of neglect has swept them away, together with the Catechumens: and Christ is symbolically crucified, slain by the sword of the priestly prayer; but, as on the day of His Passion, His disciples have fled" (Loofs: *Nestoriana,* p. 241).

Nestorius became Bishop of Constantinople in 428, and was deposed on account of his heretical Christology at the Council of Ephesus in June, 431. Nestorius would have looked upon himself as a man of sound philosophical common sense; experience, he would contend, shows us that wherever we meet with a rational nature there we have a person. The rational nature of the Word was therefore a human person. In the Word incarnate there is a man, a human *ego,* a human person. The very incommunicability of that human person makes it other than the person of the Word; the union between them is a moral union; a union of wills so close that we may assert that from those two natural personalities *(prosopa)* there results a single

moral personality, which Nestorius terms the "*j>roso[>on* of union." Now it is that purely nominal, artificial personality, that single mask covering the face of God the Word and the man Jesus, that is designated by the terms "Son," "Christ," "Lord." Hence Nestorius even asserts that there is only one Christ, one Lord, one Son; but in the Nestorian mind each of those terms awakens the idea of two persons, the divine and the human, remaining distinct and unconfused. That fictitious unity misled many of Nestorius's contemporaries, and not a few later writers too; the ambiguity of his terminology rendered it hard to nail his error down; but St. Cyril did succeed in making it clear that Nestorius's teaching involved the repudiation of the revealed and traditional teaching of the Christian Church; that in Jesus Christ there was only one person, the person of God the Son.

But so strong was the grip of practical Eucharistic teaching, that when Nestorius had formulated his purely human "common-sense" teaching concerning the person of Christ, he still clung to the reality of the presence of Christ's human Body in the Holy Eucharist; and was prepared to maintain that the Body of the man Christ was really present. In attacking him, St. Cyril falls back immediately on the vivifying effect of the Eucharistic Body and Blood; God alone, he says, can restore and increase the spiritual life of the soul; the Eucharist vivifies the soul, consequently in the Eucharist we receive not a mere man whose body could not vivify; but the God-man, the Word Incarnate, Who can and does give life to the soul.

Nestorius's sacrificial teaching is sound, and his teaching as to the Real Presence is sound, in so far as the

traditional Eucharistic teaching was so strong that Nestorius keeps to it as closely as his Christology allows him. But when he sets out to explain the analogy between his conception of the Real Presence and his conception of the Incarnation, he brings out clearly and forcibly the orthodox and traditional character of the teaching ascribed to St. Cyril, and causes the unsoundness of his own theory to stand out beyond all question. So much so, that after quoting from Nestorius's discussion in his recently discovered work, Professor Bethune-Baker in his book on *Nestorius and his Teaching* (Cambridge, 1908, p. 146), says: "The view of the Eucharist which is represented as that of Cyril's school, it is evident, approximates closely to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the ousia of the bread and wine becoming the ousia of the Word of God, and ceasing to remain real bread and wine; whereasNestorius champions the view that they remain in their own ousia, though inasmuch as that ousia is the same as the ousia of His human nature, they are His Body and Blood."

Just as St. Cyril's teaching is the same as was afterwards designated as Transubstantiation, so is Nestorius's teaching akin to that later described as "Impanation," with of course the added consequences of his unsound Christology.

In the third letter to Nestorius, drawn up at the Council of Alexandria in November, 430, St. Cyril writes: "Showing forth the death according to the flesh of the Only Begotten Son of God—that is, Jesus Christ—and fusing His Resurrection from the dead and His Ascension into the Heavens we celebrate the unbloody sacrifice in the Churches; we approach to the mystic Eucharist and are sanctified, having become partakers

of the Holy Flesh and Precious Blood of Christ the Saviour of us all. And receiving It not as common flesh, God forbid! nor as that of a man sanctified and joined to the Word in unity of dignity, or having a divine indwelling, but as truly life-giving and the flesh of the Word Himself. For He, as God, being by nature Life, when He became one with His flesh, made it life-giving. So though He say to us 'Amen, Amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood' we shall not count it as the flesh of one of us (for how shall the flesh of man be, by its own nature, life-giving?), but as having become truly the own flesh of Him, who for us, became and was called, the Son of Man."

Towards the end of the third letter to Nestorius the Anathematisms were appended, the eleventh of which, dealing with the Holy Eucharist, was subsequently explained in these terms by St. Cyril himself: "We celebrate the holy, life-giving, and unbloody sacrifice in the Churches, not believing thekoffering to be the body of one of us, and of a comn^n man; likewise also the precious Blood; receiving them rather as being the own Body and also Blood of the Word, Who giveth life to all things. For common flesh cannot quicken: and our Saviour himself witnesses this, saying, 'the flesh profiteth nothing; it is the spirit that quickeneth.' For since it became the own flesh of the Word, it is so understood and is life-giving, according as the Saviour Himself says, 'As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me.' Since Nestorius and they who agree with him do ignorantly destroy the power of the mystery, therefore and reasonably, is this anathema."

The teaching of St. Cyril is in the fullest harmony with the teaching of the Bishops of the Christian Church throughout the Greek-speaking world. In his commentary on St. Matthew he writes: "Administratively, He declared, 'This is My Body,' and 'This is My Blood,' so that you should not think that what appears is a figure, but in some inexplicable way is transformed by Almighty God into the Body and Blood of Christ, truly offered, of which, when we share, we receive the life-giving sanctifying power of Christ."

Many passages as strong and definite in their Eucharistic sacrificial teaching could be quoted, both from St. Cyril and from other Greek Fathers whose names have not been mentioned; but enough has been brought forward to enable us to realise the strength of their hold on the central teaching of the doctrine of the sacrifice offered to God through the ministration of His priests, the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the historical Christ, the self-same Body that was born in Bethlehem, died on the Cross, and now reigns in glory in Heaven. This is the sacrifice offered by His command, whereby until His coming we will show forth His death, and commemorate His Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven.

IV.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE LATIN FATHERS: ST. AUGUSTINE.

By the Rev. J. B. Jaggar, S.J., B.A.

"And in the midst of the Church she shall open his mouth, and shall fill him with the spirit of wisdom and shall clothe him with a robe of glory."—*Eccli.,* XV. 5.

Among the Doctors of the Church and the Latin Fathers, St. Augustine (354-430) holds the first place, on account of the greatness of his intellect, his ardent zeal for truth, and the wideness of his human sympathy. *Humani nihil a me alienum puto* is characteristic of this saint. In the West the Fathers and writers who came after him embraced whole-heartedly his tenets in the main, for to them his teaching was authoritative. Whence to know the opinions of St. Augustine is to know also what was held generally in the Western Church, so that the study of his works is of paramount importance to the student of Patristics. This is especially true of his teaching on the Holy Eucharist, since Rationalists and Protestants for the most part assert that he never held the Catholic doctrine of the substantial presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. He taught, at most, they allege, a virtual presence only, by which the bread and wine remaining bread and wine after consecration are symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, and acquire a power before reception or in reception to communicate to those who receive them with faith the fruits of the Passion of Our Lord.

What, then, was the teaching of St. Augustine on this crucial point in Eucharistic doctrine? *There is a presumption* in the first place that it did not differ from that of the Church of his day, from the fact that he held the *Discipline of the Secret* as regards the Eucharist. In his writings he used such expressions as "the faithful know," "it is not fitting that we call this to mind because of the Catechumens." (Serm. 307, *n.* 3. *Cf.* Serm. 131, *n.* 1; Ep. 140, *n.* 48, etc.) Surely if to St. Augustine the Eucharist is nothing more than a symbol of Chiist's Body and Blood, it is very difficult to explain this secrecy. Moreover, our saint regarded St. Ambrose, who had baptised him, as his teacher in the faith. St. Ambrose most undoubtedly taught in his works on the Holy Spirit and the Mysteries the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and transubstandation; therefore we may suppose that his disciple taught something similar. In all the works of St. Augustine there is not the slightest intimation that he held divergent views from his contemporaries, or was ever accused of holding such views. But it may be said that all this is at most an extrinsic argument, and that it seems to be contradicted by the theories on the Eucharist put forward by the saint in his writings.

We are told that *St. Augustine admitted nothing more than a figurative eating of our Lord's Body,* or what Protestants call a spiritual eating, opposing it to a real reception of Christ's Body. Certainly not a few passages can be cited which seem at first sight to bear out this interpretation, *e.g.* " Why do you make ready your teeth and stomach? Believe, and you have eaten" *(In Joann.,* Tract 25, *n.* 12). "This is the bread coming down from heaven, so that it anyone eat of it, he may

not die. Yes, he who eats what belongs to the virtue of the Sacrament, not to the visible sacrament; he who eats within, not without; he who eats in the heart, not he who presses (the Sacrament) with his teeth" *(Ibid.* Tract 26, *n.* 12). "If the words of a precept forbid what is disgraceful or a crime, or order what is useful and beneficial, they are not by way of figure or metaphor. But if they appear to enjoin what is disgraceful and sinful, or hinder what is useful and beneficial, they are by way of figure. 'Unless you eat,' he says, 'the flesh of the Son of Man, you shall not have life in you.' He seems to enjoin what is disgraceful and a crime, therefore it is a figure, ordering communication with the Lord's Passion and the need of turning over sweetly and usefully in the memory that for us His flesh was crucified and wounded" *(De Doctf. Christ* III., 16). "Not this body which you see are you going to eat . . . I have commended to you some Sacrament, spiritually understood it will quicken you. Although it must be visibly celebrated, yet it must be invisibly understood" *(In Psalm* 98, *n.* 9).

The reply to this difficulty cannot be given in a word, but requires the consideration of several points in the teaching of St. Augustine. He is quite right in rejecting any material eating of Christ's Body in the sense of those at Capharnaum: "They received it (Christ's statement) stupidly . . . and thought that the Lord was going to cut off some particles from His Body" *(In Psalm* 98, *n.* 9). This is the only error he singles out and rejects. *(In Joann.,* tract 27, *n.* 12; *De Doctr. Christ,* 1 c.) The eating with the heart, not with the teeth, is exactly what the Church demands of the communicant to-day. That is, we must approach the Holy Table with acts of

faith, hope, love, etc., if our communions are to be fruitful to us. Though our Lord under the species of bread is really received through the mouth into the breast of the communicant, though there is a real eating of the species, still the Body of Christ cannot be acted upon or altered by the digestive organs, and in that sense it is by the soul alone that Christ is assimilated to us and His Body in this sense may be said to be eaten in figure. Most decidedly this spiritual eating does not exclude the real reception of Christ's Body, for in the very passage from which this objection is drawn St. Augustine insists on the duty of adoring the Body of Christ there present. His one end is to exclude all dismemberment of the Body of Christ, and to explain that "He is not consumed by bites" *{In Joann.,* tract 27, *n.* 3). Again: "You think that I am going to make parts of this Body which you see and that I am going to rend my members and give them to you." Christ replies, not by a denial of our reception of His Body, but, while maintaining the integrity of the Body, by a spiritual eating. "And so He shortly solves the great question of His integrity—let them eat life—let them drink life . . . and intact is life if what is visibly received in the Sacrament, in its very truth *ipsa veritate}* is spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk." "Of His Body and Blood He has given us a healthful refection" (Serm. 131, *n.* 1, etc.).

Against the interpretation of a spiritual eating, as opposed to a real reception of Christ's Body, is the insistence by St. Augustine on Communion for infants. A mere material eating in this case would be useless, and as spiritual eating by faith is impossible, it must be a sacramental eating by the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. In another place *{In Joann.,* tract 27,

n. 11) he seems to understand by spiritual eating an *approach in innocence* to the Altar. "See, therefore, brethren, eat spiritually the heavenly bread, *bring innocence to the altar."* Surely the following passage shows that this eating with the heart in no way excludes in the mind of St. Augustine a real eating of Christ's Body through the mouth. "We receive with a faithful heart *and the mouth (ore)* the Mediator of God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gives us His Body to be eaten, and His Blood to be drunk, although it may seem more horrible to eat human flesh than to destroy it, and to drink human blood than to shed it" *(Contra advers. leg. et prophet.* 1.2, *n.* 34).

Some assert that St. Augustine teaches that the *bread and wine are mere signs or figures of Christ's Body and Blood.* To substantiate such an interpretation the following passages are set forth: "For the Lord did not hesitate to say, 'This is My Body,' when He gave a sign of His Body" *(Contra Ardmant.,* chap. 17, *n.* 3). "The figure of His Body and Blood He commended and delivered to the disciples" *(Enarr. in Psalm* iii. *n.* 1). "As therefore in some manner the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ, the Sacrament of His Blood is the Blood of Christ, so the Sacrament of faith is faith" (Ep. xcviii., *n.* 9). Let us say at once that this last passage neither affirms nor denies the real presence. A comparison is made between the Eucharist and Baptism, the Sacrament of Faith, under a special aspect, viz., that just as Baptism gives faith and so may be called faith, so the Sacrament of the Body of Christ may be called the Body of Christ because it incorporates us with Christ, makes us members of His Mystical Body, and is therefore the Body of Christ. Ostensibly the

comparison is according to the *res* or *virtus,* i.e. *the effect* of the Sacrament.

To understand in what sense the Eucharist is a sign or figure of the Body and Blood of Christ after the mind of St. Augustine, we must remember that for St. Augustine the word sacrament was the exact synonym of sign. In the fourth century it denoted the visible element in the Eucharist, the bread or species which is visible. We do not touch or break, etc., the Body of Christ, but the species of bread beneath which the Body is present. Hence it is not surprising that St. Augustine should say the Sacrament of the Eucharist is the sign y of His Body. Many passages could be quoted to show that St. Augustine understood the word Sacrament in this sense, e.g. "Take away the word, and what is the water but water? The word comes to the element (water) and it becomes a sacrament" *(In Joann,* tract 83, *n.* 3). "Signs when they pertain to divine things are called Sacraments" (Ep. 138, *n. jg. De Doctr. Christ.* III. 13). "The Sacrament is one thing, another is the virtue of the Sacrament" *(In Joann,* tract 26, 11). The visible elements of the Eucharist—the species of bread and wine—are not the Body and Blood of Christ, but signify, denote, and contain them. Therefore, rightly after his mode of speaking, the *Sacrament* of the Eucharist is said by St. Augustine to be a figure or sign of Christ's Body and Blood.

A leading idea in the theology of St. Augustine is that the *Eucharist signifies the Mystical Body oj Christ, which is His Church,* so that according to him the Eucharist is the Sacrament of perfect incorporation with Christ. St. Augustine and St. Paul see in the Eucharist a twofold mystery: (1) that of the real Body and Blood of Christ

and incorporation through the species of bread and wine with Christ Himself, Who by virtue of the Sacrament becomes the principle of the divine life of the soul; and (2) the Mystery of the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church, and the incorporation of the faithful in this unity. The bread formed from many grains, and the wine from many clusters of grapes, are symbolic of this unity of the mystical body. This symbolism he has taken over from St. Cyprian, and it is found also in the *Didache.* This second mystery, so far from excluding the first, supposes it, is derived from it, and stands or falls with it. Hence in the sermons to the Neophytes, St. Augustine always begins by affirming the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, and then without further explanations passes on straightway to the second. "You ought to know what you have received, what you are going to receive, what you ought to receive daily. That bread which you see on the altar, hallowed by the word of God, is the Body of Christ. That Chalice, rather what the Chalice contains, hallowed by the word of God, is the Blood of Christ. By these the Lord Christ wished to hand over to us His Body and Blood, which He has shed for remission of sins." Certainly so far this Body and this Blood shed for us is not the Church, but the real Body of our Lord. Here is the first and literal sense of the Holy Eucharist. Immediately afterwards He gives the figurative sense, which is the unity of the Church: "If you have well received, you are what you have received. For the Apostle says: 'One bread, one body are we many' (1 Cor. x. 17). Thus he set forth the Sacrament of the Lord's Table: 'One bread,' etc. In that bread commendation is made to you how you should love unity. Is

that bread made of one grain? Were there not many grains of wheat? But before they came to be bread, they were separated; they are joined by water and after a certain bruising" (Sermon 227). In this same sermon we have the same symbolism of the Church in two Sacraments—Baptism and Confirmation. Would any one maintain that Baptism and Confirmation are only the symbols of the unity of the Church?

For Dorner and Loofs and others the Eucharistic Body and Blood are not the real Body and Blood of Christ, but His Mystical Body, the Church only. Hence, according to them, "This is my Body," and all the Eucharistic passages signify only the Church. If this were so, they would make St. Augustine say that the Flesh bom of Mary, which we adore in the Eucharist, the Body He carried in His hands at the Last Supper, is the Church. Such an interpretation is refuted in its very statement.

Having shown that the teaching of St. Augustine on the Eucharist, brought forward by those who maintain he held only a virtual presence, does not vindicate their assertion, we pass on to other passages in his writings, which demonstrate clearly his belief in the presence of the real Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist.

When speaking of the *Sacrifice of the New Law* which succeeds all the ancient sacrifices, *he tells us that it is offered by Jesus Christ Himself, and what is offered is His Body and Blood.* "The Priest Himself, the Mediator of the New Testament, offers according to the order of Melchisedech His Body and Blood. Wherefore we acknowledge also that voice of the Psalm xxxix., of the same Mediator speaking by prophecy: 'Sacrifice and oblation Thou wouldest not, but a body Thou hast

fitted to me': because for all those sacrifices and oblations, His Body is offered and ministered to those who participate (in the Sacrifice)" *(De Civil. Dei,* Book xvii. chap. 20, *n.* 2). So the Body which is offered and distributed is that to which lie was united at the Incarnation and assumed for this end (cf. *Enarr.* in Ps. xxxiii. 6). Even here Dorner maintains the Body is the Church, which would mean that it was the Church which was formed in the womb of His Mother, offered to the Father, and distributed. A truly impossible interpretation.

In *C. Faust,* xx. i8 we read: "Christians celebrate the memorial of the same accomplished Sacrifice by the most holy oblation and participation in the Body and Blood of Christ." Speaking of the fatted calf slain at the return of the prodigal, he says: "That calf is offered to the Father, in the Lord's Body and Blood, and feeds the whole house" *(Quaed. Evangel.* Book ii. chap. 23, *n.* 5). Harnack protested that St. Augustine never spoke of our Lord's Body being offered anew to the Father. Do not the words just cited contradict this assertion? (Harnack, *Hist, of Dogma,* Vol. V. p. 159, n·) "This is the Priest, Himself offering, Himself also that which is offered. Of this thing He willed the Sacrifice of the Church to be the daily Sacrament; and the Church, since she is the body of the Head Himself, learns to offer herself through Him" *(De Civit. Dei. X.* 20).

Again, could one who denied the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist compare the Blood of Christ received in Holy Communion with that of Abel in the following manner? "The Blood of Christ on earth hath a loud voice, when on its reception is answered by all

nations *Amen.* This is the clear voice of the Blood which (voice) the Blood itself *expresses from the mouth ofthefaithful* redeemed by *the same Blood" (Contra Faust. Man.,* Book xii. chap. 10). Or in these terms urge on the impure the obligation of chastity because of the Eucharist? *"Now you know your price,* now you know whither you approach, what you eat, what you drink, rather *whom* you eat, *whom* you drink, restrain yourself from fornications" (Sermon 9, *n.* 14).

Hamack *(ibid.* Vol. V. p. 159, *n.)* and Dorner *(Augustinus,* p. 272) say that St. Augustine never speaks of transubstantiation. In so many words this of course is true. Nowhere has he set down any precise opinion on the change of the elements, and we cannot prove transubstantiation from St. Augustine; but he has passages which easily fall in with this doctrine, e.g., ''Not all bread, but bread receiving the benediction of Christ *becomes the Body* of Christ" (Sermon 234, *n.* 2). "By a certain Consecration the bread is made to us mystical, it is not bom so" *(Contra Faust. Man.,* Book xx. chap. 13). It does not suffice to say that this is only a moral change such as takes place in the other Sacraments. For in the *De Trinitate* III. 4. 10, he represents the mysterious Consecration of the Eucharist as a transcendent miracle, beside which the other miracles of God have nothing astonishing in them. Man can make bread and wine, but to change them into so great a Sacrament the Holy Spirit must operate: "When (the bread) by the hands of man is brought to that visible species, it is not sanctified that it be so great a Sacrament save the Holy Ghost operate invisibly." If it is only a question of a figurative presence, why require this very special intervention of the Holy Spirit, why

count it among the great works and marvels of God, why insist on it with so much emphasis *(n.* 21) and point to it as a marvel of which the Catechumens are ignorant?

Again *he calls on us to adore the Eucharist because it is the Flesh of Christ:* "Being in doubt, I turn to Christ, and I find how without impiety the earth may be adored . . . flesh is from the earth and from the flesh of Mary He has received flesh, and because *in flesh itself He has walked here,* and h^s given *flesh itself* to us to be eaten unto, salvation.; but no one *eats that flesh unless he shall first have adored* we have found how the footstool of the Lord may be adored, and not only how we do not sin in adoring it, but sin in not adoring it" (In Ps. xcviii. *n.* 9). Compare this passage with the following in St. Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto,* III. 11. 79. "Therefore by the footstool the earth is understood, but by earth the *flesh of Christ which to-day also in the Mysteries we adore* and which the Apostles in the Lord Jesus adored."

Again he writes: *"And he was carried in His own hands* (1 Kings xxi. 13). Who understands how this could come to pass in a man? For who is carried in his own hands? A man can be carried in the hands of others, no one is carried in his own hands. We have not understood how this may be understood literally of David himself; but we have discovered (how it is fulfilled) in Christ. For Christ was carried in His own hands when delivering His very Body He says: 'This is My Body' (Matt. xxvi. 22; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19). *For He was carrying that Body in His own hands" (Enarr. in Ps.* xxxiii. I, 10). It is alleged that He was carrying a sign or figure of His Body, the sign receiving the name of the thing signified. But if this is so, where is the

wonder and portent. "No one is carried in His own hands." He returns to this theme again in *Enarr. in Ps.* xxxiii. ii. 2: 'How was He carried in His hands? Because when He gave His own Body and His own Blood, He took in His hands what the faithful know; and in a certain manner *{quodam modo)* He carried Himself when He said, 'This is My Body'."

The presence of the Lord's Body in His hands is qualified by the words "in a certain manner." For it was present, as St. Thomas would say, not "after the manner of quantity," but "of substance," *i.e.* after the manner of a spirit, as some modem theologians say. In other words, the Body is present wholly and entire in every part of the species of bread, and is not extended in space. St. Augustine, to some extent, has discussed the mode in which the real Body of Christ is present in the following passage: "(The flesh) profiteth nothing, but as they understood (the people of Capharnaum); they forsooth so understood the flesh as it is cut up in a corpse or sold in the market, not as it is given life by the Spirit. . . The flesh profiteth nothing, but that is the flesh alone; let the Spirit be added to the flesh, and it profiteth much . . . as they understood the flesh, not so do I give my flesh to be eaten" *{In Joann.,* Tract 27.5).

The identification of the elements is so complete with the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist that *even the wicked and unworthy recipients receive the Body and Blood of Christ* really, though with different effects. Thus he writes: "For as Judas, to whom the Lord gave the sop, not by receiving what was evil, but receiving in an evil manner, afforded a place in himself to the devil, so each one who receives the Sacrament of the Lord

unworthily does not bring it to pass that it is evil, because he is evil, or that he has received nothing because He has not received unto salvation. For it is the Body and Blood *of* the Lord no less even to those of whom the Apostle said, ‘ Who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself'" *{De Baptismo, V. (j).* No Sacramentarian, no one who holds the Calvinistic doctrine of a virtual presence only, could use such language as this. For to approach without faith is, according to such, to come unworthily, and to receive only the symbols, but in no sense the Body and Blood of Christ.

This doctrine, and the teaching that the Eucharist is profitable to infants, peremptorily establish, according to 'fixeront *{History of Dogmas,* Vol. II. p. 417), that St. Augustine held that the real Body and Blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist. ‘‘They are infants, but they become sharers in His table, that they may have life in themselves" (Sermon 174.7). What life can they, being infants, have in themselves, unless our Lord's Body and Blood are substantially present in the Sacrament

Lastly, though the Eucharistic teaching of St. Augustine shows that he taught that the real Body and Blood are present in the Eucharist, and that it is a sacrifice in which Christ Himself is the priest or offerer, and that what is offered is His real Body and Blood; yet he does not give us any clear and definite statement of the nature of the operation by which the consecrated elements become the Body and Blood of Christ. How the real Body of Christ is present under conditions which are not those of a material extended body, he thought, as we have seen, was explained by our Lord's words:

"It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." But above all he is most anxious to set forth *the spiritual fruit* which the communicant should obtain from the divine reality he receives, and he is ever insisting on the moral practical effect of the Holy Eucharist, rather than on its speculative aspect.

Catholics to-day hold that Christ is present in the Eucharist, not merely as in a sign or figure or by virtue and power, but that His very Body and Blood are substantially present, though not extended in space, under the species of bread and wine, to sanctify the recipients of this august Sacrament. They hold also that Christ is the principal priest or offerer ; and that what is offered in the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the real Body and Blood of Christ. St. Augustine held exactly the same, and among all the Fathers he is a witness *omni exceptione maior* and the most illustrious spokesman of the Western Church.

tv

V.

THE PERIOD OF THE SCHOOLMEN: THE SACRAMENT.

By the Rev. J. B. Reeves, O.P., B.A.

(i) The Catholic Doctrine.

The deposit of faith committed by Christ to His Church remains always the same; and the simple supernatural act of assent by which Catholics accept it is, in this twentieth century, just what it was in the first. Faith is a virtue easy and necessary to little ones—to children, to the inexperienced, and to all whose vision of truth is not yet direct and full. We are all little ones, both naturally and supernaturally; and it is both easy and necessary for us to accept on the word of another, wiser than ourselves and well-disposed towards us, many vital truths which are not yet immediately evident to us.

Faith leads normally to knowledge, to understanding and to vision, and is accidentally affected by these as they grow from less to more. In our natural life a well-placed faith is confirmed as its objects become better known and understood; a child's confidence in a good mother and acceptance of her teaching is intensified as experience of its mother's goodness increases, and is corroborated as the child's independent understanding of her teaching grows. An ill-placed faith, on the other hand, is diminished and finally extinguished as the believer progresses in knowledge and understanding of

the unworthy person and the unsound teaching to whom his first faith was unhappily given.

When, however, in place of knowledge there comes ignorance and error, and instead of understanding misunderstanding, even a well-placed faith is in danger of being diminished; and it may happen that an ill-placed faith gains from ignorance and error and misunderstanding a confirmation which the truth would not give.

It is therefore characteristic of the wise and good, who both claim and merit the faith of little ones, to exhort these same little ones to pursue knowledge and understanding, and at the same time to regard every advance in knowledge and understanding with jealous suspicion, lest there be error in it; to approve authoritatively of all true knowledge and right understanding whenever these are achieved; to condemn authoritatively all ignorance and error and misunderstanding, especially when these are used by unworthy rivals to seduce the little ones to a pernicious faith.

There is no opposition between nature and supernature, except when nature is already in conflict with itself. Grace transfigures perfect human nature without impairing it, and repairs that nature when it is imperfect.[1] We may therefore expect to find supernatural Faith exhibiting all the characteristics of natural human faith at its best.

This is precisely what we do find, not only in our own spiritual experience, but also in the history of the Faith as a whole. The more we know of the Church and the more we understand her doctrines, the more we are

[1] Cf. St. Thomas Aq., *Summa,* I. q.1. a.viii ad 2m. and q.2, a.ii ad ini.

confirmed in our Faith in her and in all her teaching. Whenever the truth is discovered, by natural inquiry or by private supernatural revelations, the Church is always prompt to approve of it, and even to restate her old truths in terms of the new discovery. Wherever error appears, or ignorance threatens to lead to misunderstanding, the Church is equally prompt to expose the error, to correct the misunderstandings, and to denounce the rivals who would bolster up their spurious authority by means of these.

This explains why the Catholic Church does not present her deposit of Faith to the twentieth century in precisely the same form as that in which she offered it to the first. No jot or tittle of her original teaching is changed, diminished or increased; but the old truths are in constant process of verbal expansion. The cause of this is not to be sought in the Church herself so much as in the world in which she is at work. In those countries where a continuity of civilization (the result of the continuity of the Church in their midst) has led to an increase of knowledge and understanding, there has occurred the phenomenon which we have learned to call the development of doctrine. The advance outside the Church has rarely, if ever, been achieved without incidental lapses into error—into abortive science and premature philosophy. The Church has thus been kept continually busy; now restating her old doctrines in terms of some new and sound scientific or philosophical achievement; now condemning quasi-scientific or quasi-philosophic travesties or contradictions of the truths committed to her keeping. Throughout this has meant restatements of her original doctrine ever more and more explicit. Generally speaking, the chronological order of her

definitions has been a logical order also. First she defined the fundamental questions necessary to be understood before others could be rightly apprehended; then she passed on to definition of these in their turn. She began with the deeper questions of the Deity, the Incarnation, Grace and the like; she has now arrived abreast of the psychological and introspective thought of our time, at definitions of herself, her own character and powers.

The Holy Eucharist has from earliest times been called by the Church *mysterium fidei*—the mystery *par excellence* of our Faith. What is true of Catholic doctrine in general is conspicuously true of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. It has continued unchanged since Christ first delivered it to His Apostles. Yet the official statement of it to-day and its place in the thought, as distinct from the life, of Catholics, is very different from anything we find in the early centuries of the Church's history. There is no explicit mention of it in the early creeds; in the professions of Faith prescribed since the tenth century it almost overshadows every other article of Catholic belief. Yet this is only in strict accordance with what the foregoing considerations would lead us to anticipate.

During the ten centuries that the Church was defining the doctrines of primary importance for the proper understanding of the rest, no question was raised about the doctrine of the Eucharist; she was thus able to rely upon her ancient tradition and practice to make it sufficiently clear to all what her mind was in this matter. This is proved by the retort she gave to those who first challenged her to speak of it explicitly. In 1053 Michael Caerularius is rebuked by St. Leo IX. for

"uprooting and overthrowing the ancient faith by human arguments and conjectures."[1]

The point raised by the Greek was one of minor importance—the use of unleavened bread in the Latin Church. The first serious challenge to the traditional doctrine of the Eucharist came from Bercngarius of Tours in the middle of the eleventh century. From then onwards for five hundred years the Church was engaged in the clearer and clearer definition of her ancient doctrine, and in defending it against the attacks made upon it, principally by the Waldensians and Albigensians, and by Wyclif, Hus, and the Protestant Reformers. The five centuries of controversy, development and dogmatic utterance included the whole period during which Mediaeval Scholasticism flourished, and culminated in the pronouncement of the Council of Trent, which may be regarded as the Church's official and final statement of her Eucharistic teaching. Such heresies as have arisen since then have been mere variations of old ones, and have been met by the Church with a mere reference to the doctrine as defined at Trent. Neither Quietists, Jansenists nor Modernists have elicited any further definitions of importance concerning the Blessed Sacrament, although their heresies have often been aimed at vital parts of the doctrine.

It is not possible or desirable here to recount in detail either the heretical theories or the scholastic developments that have contributed in different ways to the statement of the doctrine as we have it to-day. A brief synopsis of the official teaching is all that can be attempted now. Though the works of private theologians

[1] Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (1920), no. 350.

and recognized doctors cannot be neglected if the full significance of the actual definitions are to be fully appreciated, all mention of their contributions, as distinct from the Church's official declarations, must be omitted for the present, a momentary exception being made, however, in honour of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom the Church owes the form of her doctrine of Transubstantiation (she apparently owes the word to Hildebert of Tours), and of St. Thomas Aquinas, to whom she is indebted for her use of the scholastic philosophy of Accidents (which term, however, we have only once found in an infallible decree[1]).

The Blessed Eucharist is one of the seven Sacraments[2] instituted by Jesus Christ.[3] The Scriptural accounts of its institution are understood by the Church in their literal, not in a figurative, sense.[4] The matter of the Sacrament is wheaten bread, which may be baked on the day of consecration, or earlier—provided it remain substantially bread;[5] and wine of the grape, to which before consecration a little water must be added.[6] To prevent corruption the wine may be heated to 65° C., or there may be added to it while fresh sufficient pure alcohol extracted from the fruit of the vine to increase the percentage to 12 per cent., or if it is already this, to 17 per cent, or 18 per cent.[7] The form in the consecration of

[1] Council of Constance, Sess. VIII. 4 May, 1415: Denz. 582.

[2] Florence, 22 Nov. 1439: Denz. 698. In 1341 Benedict XII condemned the Armenians for holding that Baptism is incomplete without the Eucharist: Denz. 532.

[3] Trent: Denz. 874.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Denz. 698 and 715.

[6] *Ibid.* 698.

[7] Holy Office, 8 May, 1887 and 30 July, 1890: Denz. 1937.

the bread is, *Hoc est Corpus mourn,* of the wine, *Hu est calix Sanguinis mei, novi el aeterni testamenti, mysterium field, qui pro vobis et pro multis offundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*1 The words *mysterium fidei* do not mean that the Sacrament is merely a symbol of the Body and Blood of Christ.2

The Blessed Sacrament was instituted to be a memorial of Christ until He come again; to be our spiritual food; to free us from our daily faults and preserve us from grave sins; to be a pledge of our future glory and a symbol of our unity as members of one Body of which Christ is the Head.3 It is to be sacramentally (as distinct from merely spiritually) received, in a state of grace, and with due preparation,4 at least once a year, and that at Easter, by all who have attained the years of discretion.6 It is not necessary before that age.6 Neither is its frequent reception a distinct obligation by divine law,7 though the faithful who can profit thereby, far from being deterred from frequently receiving,8 are to be urged thereto,9 daily communion being the wish of our Lord and the Church.10 At every public mass it is desirable that the faithful should communicate.11 Still, in those who lead worldly lives, frequent communion should not be considered a sign of predestination.12 Priests, when celebrating, communicate themselves; the laity do not communicate themselves, but receive from the priest.13

1 Florence: Denz. 715. « Innocent III.: Denz. 414.
» Trent: Denz. 874. « *UM*. 880, 881.
• IV. Lateran: Denz, 437. Pius X. fixed the age of discretion at about seven years. « Trent: Denz. 933.
7 Innocent XI: Denz. 1147. β *ifad.* · Trent; £)enz 882.
10 Pius X, 1905: Denz. 1981. u Trent: Denz. 944.
17 Innocent XI: Denz. 1205. « Trent: Denz. 881.

The effect of the Holy Eucharist is not the mere nourishment of the body,1 but the spiritual nourishing of the soul in all the ways that the body is nourished by material food; namely, sustenance, growth, repair, delight.2 It also unites us to Christ, so that we become partakers of His Divinity, as He is of our humanity.3

The doctrine of the Real Presence was first formulated against Berengarius, and is repeated in various forms in almost every declaration and definition concerning the Blessed Sacrament, until it receives its full and final statement at Trent. This repetition is explained by the fact that it is the heart of the mystery of the Eucharist, against which every heresy is in reality directed, and upon which depend the other parts of the doctrine—Transubstantiation and the rest.

"In the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist," says the Council of Trent, " after the consecration of the bread and wine, there is contained truly, really, and substantially, under the appearance of these things of sense, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man. For it is not inconsistent that our Saviour should sit for ever in heaven at the right hand of the Father, according to the natural mode of His existence, and that His substance should nevertheless be present with us sacramentally in many other places, by a mode of existence which, though we can scarcely express it in words, we can apprehend with minds enlightened by faith, and which we ought most steadfastly to believe."4

Prior to this definition the Church had already at various times insisted that the Body and Blood of Christ are present, not by representation, appearance or

1 Benedict XII: Denz. 546. * Florence: Denz. 698.
8 *Ibid.,* and IV. Lat.: Denz. 430. * Denz. 874.

figure,[1] but in their reality, identically the same as they were born of the Virgin Mary and sacrificed for us on the Cross.[2] In answer to the question how one thing could be there apparently yet another really, the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been defined as early as the Berengarian controversy, and repeated many times afterwards. This is the Tridentine statement of it: "By the consecration of the bread and wine there takes place the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood. This conversion is aptly and properly called Transubstantiation by the Holy Catholic Church/'[3] The appearances which remain, it is elsewhere insisted, are not accidents of our Lord's Body and Blood; and though they are accidents naturally proper to bread and wine they are not any longer the accidents of bread and wine, for these substances are no longer there; the accidents remain without a substance to sustain them.[4] Innocent III. in 1202 had declared it more probable that the water mixed with the wine is also substantially changed.[6]

The heresies of Wyclif and Hus had very important doctrinal results. Their denial of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation led to nothing new, as these doctrines had already been affirmed by the Church. But their condemnation of communion under one kind led to a momentous declaration by the Council of Constance.

[1] Innocent III.: Denz. 414.

[2] Rome, 1079: Denz. 355; IV. Lat.: Denz. 430; Benedict XII.: Denz. 544; Constance: Denz. 666.

[3] Denz. 877.

[4] Denz. 582; see p. 71, note 1. St. Thomas shows that it is not against the nature of an accident to exist without a subject.

[6] Denz. 4x6

"Although Christ instituted this venerable Sacrament after the Supper, and administered it to His disciples under both kinds, nevertheless, notwithstanding this, the praiseworthy authority of the Sacred Canons, and the approved custom of the Church maintained and does still maintain, that such a Sacrament be not celebrated after supper. . . . And similarly, though in the early Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds, this custom (viz. reception by the laity under one kind only) was introduced to avoid certain dangers and scandals. For it is most firmly to be believed that the whole Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained as much under the species of bread as under the species of wine."[1]

This doctrine was more explicitly developed by the Council of Trent.

"This was ever the belief of the Church, that immediately after the consecration there is present, under the appearances of bread and wine, the true Body and the true Blood of our Lord, together with His Soul and Divinity. But His Body is under the species of bread, and His Blood under the species of wine *by reason of the words used;* whereas the Body is under the species of wine, and the Blood under the species of bread, and the Soul under each, *by reason of the natural connection and concomitance* by which the parts of Christ, 'Who is risen from the dead, no more to die' (Rom. vi. 9) are united together; furthermore, the Divinity is there *by reason of its hypostatic union* with the Body and the Soul. Therefore it is absolutely true that as much is contained under one species as under both. The whole and undivided Christ is under the species of bread, and under

[1] Denz. 626.

every part of it; likewise He is wholly under the species of wine, and under every part of that."[1]

The Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist is not transient, but permanent. He begins to be there at the moment of consecration, and continues as long as the species remain incorrupt. Hence this Sacrament excels all others in that they only give grace at the moment of their reception, whereas this contains the Author of grace before it is received.[2] Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament is thus a practice based on sound doctrine, as was recognized long before the doctrine was defined. It was a custom in the early days of the Church, and is mentioned by the Council of Nicaea. The Council of Trent makes it of obligation, in order that the Sacred Host may be carried to the sick,[3] and borne in procession on the Feast of Corpus Christi.[4]

The sick to whom Holy Communion is taken in their homes are allowed certain exemptions from the Eucharistic fast. This in ordinary cases is a natural (that is a complete) fast from all food and drink, unbroken from the preceding midnight. Invalids unable to fast, who have been bedridden for a month, and who are not likely to be well very soon, are allowed to take food in liquid form before communion, and to receive in this way twice in each week. Other invalids, not bedridden but wholly and perpetually incapable of the Eucharistic fast, must have their individual case submitted to the Holy See, by whom alone a dispensation can be granted them.

To persons in danger of death the Blessed Sacrament is administered as Viaticum, for which special ceremonies are prescribed. Fasting is unnecessary, and Holy

[1] Denz. 876. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* 879. [4] *Ibid.* 878.

Viaticum may be administered on the same day that the recipient has communicated in the ordinary way. There is no other case where Sacramental Communion is permitted more than once on the same day, except when a priest is allowed to celebrate two or more Masses.

It follows from the doctrine of the Real Presence that the Blessed Eucharist must be adored with the supreme worship *(latria)* which is paid to God alone. This is distinctly laid down by the Council of Trent,[1] for it was the chief stumbling-block of the Protestant heretics, as it had been of others who preceded them. "We banish from the Church of God," said the Second Council of the Lateran in 1139, "and order to be repressed by the secular powers those who, simulating a sort of religious scruple, condemn the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood."[2] The Beguards and Beguines were condemned by the Council of Vienne[3] (1311), and the Quietists[4] by Innocent XL (1687), for maintaining that devotion to the Blessed Sacrament withdrew their thoughts from God.

The question of the Minister of this Sacrament, in so far as it concerns doctrine, and not merely discipline, belongs rather to the study of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice, than to this consideration of it in its sacramental aspect. The sacramental power of the priesthood is necessary for the "confection" of the Eucharist at the consecration; but as it remains a permanent and complete sacrament from that moment, no further sacramental power is necessary for its administration to the faithful. In this respect the administration of the Eucharist resembles somewhat the administration of baptism. In each case the ordinary minister, by

[1] Denz. 878. [2] *Ibid.* 367. [3] *Ibid.* 478. [4] *Ibid.* 1252.

right of office, is the deacon or the priest. Whereas in the administration of the Eucharist any priest who says Mass has the right of dispensing the Sacrament except (normally) as Viaticum, in the case of baptism the parish priest or his delegate alone have the right. The deacon needs to be delegated in both sacraments equally. Equally, too, in cases of urgent necessity, both Sacraments may be administered by any one—with this difference, however: a lay person administering baptism would give it only to another, never to himself, whereas a lay person would communicate himself alone, except in very extreme cases.

Though the general discipline of the Church in the administration of the Eucharist has always followed these principles, it has varied greatly from age to age in matters of detail. In ancient times, and as late as the fourth century, it was customary for the faithful to carry the Blessed Sacrament to their homes, there to communicate themselves. Until the ninth century it was usual for the priest to place the Sacred Host in the right hand of the recipient, who kissed it and placed it in his own mouth. In this ceremony women were required to wear a cloth wrapped about the right hand.

The custom of receiving under one or both kinds is merely a matter of discipline, as long as the doctrine involved is safeguarded. This has been done once and for all by the Council of Trent in its declaration that the Church has authority to prescribe or change anything relating to the *dispensing* of the Sacraments, provided their substance remains untouched.[1] Before the present discipline of communion under one kind came into force, there had been much variety of practice in different

[1] Denz. 931.

times and places. Communion under both kinds was the more common practice in the early centuries, and then the deacon was called upon for many functions that are not necessary to-day. He took Holy Communion to those who were unable to assist at Mass, and gave the Chalice to the communicants at the Mass itself. In the thirteenth century the deacons administered only the Chalice, though at the bidding of the bishop or priest, in a case of necessity, they might dispense the Host also. Their ministrations became more and more restricted as the custom of communion under one kind became the rule. When the Chalice was still administered to the laity, they sometimes drank from it as the priest does still, but more frequently they used a tube—a custom which still survives in the Mass of the Sovereign Pontiff.

The devotions with which the piety of the faithful has surrounded the Blessed Sacrament have also varied much from age to age. Devotion, in the traditional Catholic meaning of the word, is the ready good will with which men throw themselves into the service of God. It leads to a joyous enthusiasm in that service, and pours itself out in a spontaneous and expansive expression of emotion, attended sometimes by tears, sometimes by a decorous gaiety. Various temperaments have various ways of expressing themselves in the devout discharge of their service of God. These various ways we call "devotions" in the Catholic Church. Some of them are characteristic of certain times, others of certain places or classes of people, others again are fairly general. The Church watches the devotions of the faithful with great vigilance, commending what is good, reprehending what is evil or imprudent. Generally speaking, any devotion is lawful

if it is based on sound doctrine, and not already restricted by the Church's discipline. There was a great outburst of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament as reserved on the Altar during the thirteenth century, and another at the time of the counter-reformation in the sixteenth. The former gave us the Feast of Corpus Christi and its procession; the latter "Benediction," and the devotion of the Forty Hours. Confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament have existed since the days of the Mediæval Guilds to organize public devotion to the Blessed Eucharist, and it is now a disciplinary law of the Church[1] that they should be erected in every parish and linked up with the Archconfraternity of the same name existing in Rome.

1 Codex Juris Canonici, 711, §2.

(2) The Eucharistic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas.

Among the Christian classics the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas hold a very high, if not the highest, place. Among these writings the most celebrated, both for excellence of matter and perfection of manner, are those parts which treat of the Holy Eucharist.

As has already been explained, the definition of the Church's doctrine is not the work of individual doctors, however enlightened, naturally or supernaturally, these may be. It is the exclusive work of the Church herself, the Mystical Body of which Christ is the Head and the Pope His visible representative. The official declarations of the Church are not made in the name of reason, or on the authority of any doctor, however revered, but under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit who dwells within her, and directs her in all her ways.

The chief proof in the eyes of a Catholic of the greatness of St. Thomas Aquinas is the unique approval which the Church has given to all his writings, and the use she has made of his thought and the manner of its expression in all her subsequent definitions and decrees. St. Thomas wrote when the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist was coming to the forefront of theological discussion and of ecclesiastical definition. Although that discussion and

definition went on for three centuries after his death, it added nothing, save official sanction, to the doctrine as he had already expounded it.

This does not at all mean to say that the official teaching of the Church on the Eucharist, as we have it to-day, was the invention of St. Thomas Aquinas. It was not the method of St. Thomas to invent, or even (in the strict sense of the word) to prove; but rather to reason from the dogmatic data of tradition and definition, thus showing the consistency of each part of the Church's teaching and practice with the whole, and the conformity of the whole to those tests of truth with which the human mind, at its best, is endowed. Apart from their subsequent approval by the Church, the only value to us of the writings of St. Thomas on the Holy Eucharist is that of a commentary by an exceptionally intelligent and holy man on the logical and historical coherence of the Catholic belief and practice of his day, which incidentally we recognize as identical with the Catholic belief and practice of our own.

The first principles from which St. Thomas argues are not (as is so common nowadays) any hypothetical suppositions of his own; neither are they (as in the case of the best pagan philosophers whom he so much admired) the first principles evident to human reason. He begins always with the divinely given and universally accepted dogmas of the Catholic Church, receiving these on faith himself and expecting his readers to do likewise. Then he proceeds to show how admirably these answer, and more than answer, to all the demands of human beings, especially to the demands of their minds; and how worthily they become a God who is infinitely good, and whose Intelligence is the highest of all His perfections.

Again and again in his writings on the Blessed Sacraments he makes it clear that this and no other is his method:

Docti sacris institutis,
Panem, vinum in salutis
Consecramus hostiam.

Dogma datur Christianis
Quod in carnem transit panis
Et vinum in Sanguinem.

Quod non capis, quod non vides
Animosa firmat fides,
Praeter rerum ordinem.[1]

So he sings in the office of Corpus Christi. And again in his hymn to the Blessed Sacrament:

Credo quidquid dixit Dei Filius;
Nil hoc veritatis verbo verius.[2]

The *Sumina Theologica,* in which St. Thomas treats most exhaustively of the Eucharistic doctrine, was written to instruct beginners in Catholic Truth, following the order that a good teacher should observe, and with such brevity and lucidity as the subject allowed.

The most natural way to explain any subject with lucidity is to state it in terms that a mind acquainted

[1] "Taught by the sacred rites laid down (for us) we consecrate bread and wine into the Victim of salvation. It is given as a dogma to Christians that the bread is changed into flesh, and the wine into blood. What you understand not nor see a lively faith confirms, outside the order of nature." From the Sequence of the Mass for Corpus Christi.

[2] "I believe whatsoever the Son of God has said; there is nothing more true than this Word of Truth." From the hymn *Adoro te devote.*

only with elementary notions will easily understand. We are frequently told that the chief characteristic of St. Thomas's work is that, against (he common custom of his time, he restated Catholic doctrine in terms of the Aristotelian philosophy. This woidd have been a very unnatural way of making it lucid to beginners unless they had already been thoroughly well trained in that philosophy; and in view of the opposition excited by the Aristotelianism of St. Thomas, even in his own Order, it would seem most improbable that the beginners for whom he wrote could have had any such training. The truth of the matter is that St. Thomas was really in earnest to make his exposition lucid, and that in the natural way, of reducing abstruse matters to elementary notions. It was precisely because the elements of Aristotle's thought are so evident and familiar to the simplest minds, and the logic by which he proceeds from those elements so easy and compelling to all, that St. Thomas shows such a predilection for his teaching.

It is in his treatise on the Blessed Sacrament that St. Thomas introduces into Catholic Theology the most characteristic of the Aristotelian doctrines—that of the Categories, Substance and the Accidents. This he does because there is no simpler way of bringing home to minds acquainted with the ordinary experiences of life the meaning and implications of the fundamental doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. He makes no attempt to prove these doctrines by principles drawn from Aristotle. On the contrary, he simply says that the Blessed Sacrament is an exception to the ordinary laws of nature observed (by Aristotle and all who think as lucidly as Aristotle) in other substances and their accidents. The difference here,

as always, implies a great deal in common; for all that, it is the difference and not the resemblance which is important. The Blessed Sacrament resembles other objects of our experience, inasmuch as our senses perceive certain accidents, by which we are made aware of a substance underlying them. But it differs from everything else in that the substance is not the one we naturally expect to be there; the proper substance of the accidents of bread which we see has been changed into the Body of Christ, and by a miracle outside the order of nature the accidents themselves remain without a substance to support them.

This is certainly not proving or explaining the mystery; it is merely stating it in the simplest possible terms. Unfortunately the terms "substance" and "accident" are not recognized as simple terms nowadays. They are supposed to be ponderous abstractions which only long labour of thought can enable the elect to grasp. It is indeed laborious for sophisticated minds to think simply; bad habits are always troublesome when we wish to be our natural selves. But a child has no difficulty, even nowadays, in grasping the distinction which Aristotle points out between "things" and the "appearances, and properties and conditions and circumstances of things"; it easily recognizes the difference, and the importance of the difference, between a tree on the one hand, and on the other the shape and size and age and colour of the tree. If encouraged to generalize the difference, the child is usually intelligent enough (though not always articulate enough) to say that the shape and size and the rest *belong* to the tree, whereas the tree does not belong to them. Nor has a child any difficulty in seeing that "to belong" means "to be

along"; the shape, size and so on exist *along with* the tree, while the tree exists, not along with them, but by itself. Add that from time immemorial things which exist by themselves have been called "substances," and things which exist along with them, "accidents"—and the child has already got a clear notion of the Aristotelian doctrine of Categories, or modes in which things may exist. It was merely to get this notion clear in the minds of his pupils that St. Thomas had recourse to that doctrine.

Having done that, it was as easy for him as it is for us in the instruction of children to-day to pass on to a simple exposition of the doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. The priest pronounces the words of consecration over a piece of bread; immediately, by the miraculous power of God invested in the priest, the substance of the bread, which was existing by itself, is changed into the substance of our Lord's Body. But the accidents of the bread do not go along with it, as would happen if the change were a natural one; neither do they belong to our Lord's Body, which has its own accidents, though these do not appear, as would be the case in a natural change: the accidents of the bread just remain, having nothing for the time being to belong to. It is a miracle of divine power which keeps them there in that extraordinary position. When in the course of nature they become so altered that we can no longer call them the appearances of bread, they are changed not only into new accidents, but into the substance (saliva for instance), to which those accidents naturally belong. But all the time that the appearances of bread are there we can look at them and say "This"—meaning "this *substance*"—"is not bread, it is the Body of our Lord." But "these appearances"—that is "these *accidents*"—

"are not the appearances of our Lord, they usually belong to bread, but here they have nothing to belong to; they exist miraculously."

This application of the Aristotelian doctrine to the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament, St. Thomas pursues with exhaustive thoroughness. One important point which he brings out with regard to the Real Presence is often missed by those whose exposition is not so painstaking, and is very characteristic of the penetrating mind of the Angelic Doctor. The Real Presence is not a local presence. The place occupied by the consecrated Host is an accident, not of our Lord's Body, but formerly of bread, and now of no substance. The *locus* of our Lord's Body is heaven, not the many places on earth where He is present really, truly and sacramentally, but not locally. "When we say that He is in this Sacrament, a certain relation of Him to this Sacrament is signified."[1] Therefore when we point to the tabernacle and say, " Our Blessed Lord is *there,"* we must be as careful of our meaning as if we were to put our finger to a friend's forehead and say, "Your soul is *there."* Our Lord is not present in the tabernacle as though the tabernacle were pinning Him down to a fixed point of space; He is there substantially *under accidents not His own.* The place occupied could formerly be predicated definitely and properly of the bread. It cannot now be predicated in the same way of our Lord's Body. The Body is in the same relation to the place as it is to the other accidents, such as colour, shape, and the rest. The point is a subtle one no doubt, and liable to be misconstrued by careless minds; but for those who delight in accurate thought it will be an encouragement to devote

[1] *Summa,* III.'γό, vi.

to St. Thomas the patient attention he so well deserves. It will further help to confirm the faith of such persons in the Holy Catholic Church when they find how carefully and skilfully she has dealt with this very point in an infallible utterance intended not merely for the subtle-minded, but for all her children, simple and sage. "It is not a contradiction," she says in the Council of Trent, " that our Saviour should for ever sit in heaven at the right hand of His Father according to the natural mode of His existence, and that nevertheless *His substance* should be present *sacramentally* with us in many other places, by a mode of existence *which, though we can scarcely express it in words, we can see* with minds illuminated by faith *to be possible to God.'*[1]

But St. Thomas has an even greater claim on the attention of thoughtful readers than the exquisite lucidity and accuracy in matters of detail that we have just illustrated. He more than fulfils the promise held out in the Prologue to the *Summa,* and already referred to above, of handling his subject in the order that a good teacher should observe. The greatest quality of a good teacher is to expound the first things first, and then everything else in its proper sequence, so that secondary things follow primary and are more than half explained before they come up for consideration. It is this synthesis that is the most valuable contribution of St. Thomas to Catholic theology, and nowhere is its value more apparent than in his treatise on the Holy Eucharist. To read any part of the *Summa Theologica* in isolation is to miss the one thing in that part which ought not on any account to be missed, namely, its relation to the whole scheme of the work. To read the treatise on the

[1] Denz. 874.

Eucharist by itself would be to miss seeing why Catholic piety makes this Sacrament the central point of all religious life, and why Catholic theology finds it a richer field for study than any other. It would also be an injustice to St. Thomas himself; for it is only when we see where the Eucharist stands in his synthesis that we can understand why he makes so much of the subject, not only as a theologian, but as an artist and a saint.

The treatise on the Blessed Sacrament occurs midway in the third part of St. Thomas's great work. In the first part he discourses of God, in Himself and in His Creation. In the second part he considers Man in his moral relations to God. In the third part be treats of Jesus Christ, God and Man, by whom fallen men are reunited to God. In order to understand what he has to say on this subject, it is necessary to have followed him, not only in his treatment of the nature of God and the nature of man, but more particularly in his discussion of the Old Law, which is God's preparation of man for the coming of Jesus Christ, and in his treatise on Grace, which is the reason of Christ's coming. With this preparation we are able to follow him as he unfolds the mysteries of Christ's Incarnation, Life and Death; and to understand why from that he immediately passes to the Sacraments. The Sacraments are the continuation of the Incarnation. Take the Sacraments away, and the Incarnation ceases to work its effects amongst us. Take the Blessed Sacrament away, and all the other Sacraments go with it; for it is the end for which, and the reason by which, they exist and are what they are. In a word, the Holy Eucharist is the keystone of the Christian religion; take it away, and the whole of God's work for man falls to pieces.

St. Thomas emphasises this point with all his tremendous force of argument when speaking of the Sacraments in general, and again when he begins to speak of this Most Blessed Sacrament in particular. This is the greatest of them all; first, because it contains Christ Himself substantially, whereas the others contain only His grace, instrumentally and by participation; again (and this is the important point he is constantly making), the other Sacraments are ordained to this one, as to their end; finally, when the other Sacraments are received they are usually completed by the reception of Holy Communion.[1]

The most illuminating passage on the importance of the Blessed Sacrament is that in which St. Thomas asks whether this Sacrament is necessary for Salvation.[2] He answers that it is not necessary to the individual Christian in the same way as Baptism; its necessity is of a higher kind. Baptism is necessary as a means to an end; the Holy Eucharist is the end to which Baptism is the means. In one respect, and that a most important one, St. Thomas identifies the Holy Eucharist with the Church. He distinguishes first of all, by a distinction which he has in constant use, between a sacrament as a sign, and the thing signified by the sacrament. "The thing signified by this sacrament is the unity of the Mystical Body, without which there can be no salvation; for the way of salvation is open to none without the Church, as neither was it in the Flood without the ark of Noe, which signifies the Church. But the thing signified by a sacrament can be had before the actual reception of the sacrament as a sign, by the very desire of receiving the sacrament." This reception by desire

[1] *Summa,* III. 65, iii. [2] *Ibid.* III. 73, iii.

is different in the case of Baptism and of the Holy Eucharist. "Baptism is the beginning of the spiritual life, and the gate to the other sacraments. The Eucharist is, as it were, the consummation of the spiritual life, and the end of the other Sacraments; for by the grace of the other Sacraments we are prepared for the reception or the consecration of the Eucharist. Therefore . . . the reception of the Eucharist is necessary for the consummation of the spiritual life, not, however, in the sense that it must actually be received; it is sufficient to receive it by desire, just as the end is possessed by wish and intention." He further points out that only adults can receive Baptism by desire; but all, even children, receive the Eucharist by the desire and intention of the Church.

These conclusions can be summed up briefly thus: the Holy Eucharist is not necessary as a means to an end, as Baptism is; but it is necessary as the end itself. Therefore it is the Eucharist which makes even Baptism necessary. If you exclude the end, the means become not only unnecessary, but useless. This argument can be extended to everything else that is necessary to salvation as a means to an end; take away the Eucharist, and everything that goes to make the Church the only means of salvation becomes not only unnecessary, but superfluous.

It is inevitable that questions about the absolute value of St. Thomas's work, in this treatise on the Eucharist as well as elsewhere, should suggest themselves to the modem reader. St. Thomas lived and wrote centuries ago, using a language, or at any rate an idiom and a vocabulary, that is not universal, and using the scientific notions of his time, which subsequent ages have in many cases modified and in some instances

reversed. It is conceivable that a classic may continue to be of permanent value for all time, and yet need to be read with a certain reserve, because of elements peculiar to the place and time and other circumstances of its origin. Must we make any reservations and qualifications when we are reading this Eucharistic treatise of St. Thomas? Or can we accept it without question as being, in the fullest sense of the word, catholic, even to its minutest details?

To those who are interested in the question of St. Thomas's language and idiom it is interesting to observe what happens when, as frequently occurs, a passage from the works of St. Thomas is incorporated in some official decree of the Church. The following is an example:

Summa. III. 79.1.	*Council of Florence-,* 1439.
Et ideo omnem effectum quem cibus et potus facit quantum ad vitam corporalem, quod scilicet sustentat, auget, reparat et delectat, hoc totum facit hoc sacramentum quantum ad vitam spiritualem.	. . . omnemque effectum, quem materialis cibus et potus quoad vitam agunt corporalem, sustentando, augendo, reparando et delectando, sacramentum hoc quoad vitam operatur spiritualem.

It will be noted that the scholastic idiom of St. Thomas's Latin gives way to the more classical idiom affected by the humanists of the early Renaissance. But that is the only change. The doctrine, the scientific accuracy of statement, the general literary form in which the thought is expressed, even the vocabulary are treated by the humanist theologians with a scrupulous courtesy. Such respect is not usually paid by Œcumenical Councils to anything of local or ephemeral interest; it is reserved for what is "catholic" in every sense of that word. The

elements which have survived in the transition here illustrated represent fairly accurately the elements of permanent value in the writings of St. Thomas. Except for the idiom of his Latin—which is a small matter—there is nothing in St. Thomas's treatise on the Holy Eucharist that can ever be out of date.

It may be objected that the doctrine of substance and accident as used by St. Thomas is little better than a provincialism. The Catholic Church (the objection proceeds) has never committed herself to it; and modem science will not allow us to accept it, any more than it allows us to accept the statement of St. Thomas, made elsewhere, that "light travels instantaneously," and is therefore not measurable by time.

There are certainly grounds for this objection, though they are not serious when examined. It is true that the Church never states her positive doctrine of the Eucharist in terms of "accidents"; she always speaks of "species" instead. But her use of the word "substance" is precisely the same as St. Thomas's, and shows that when she says "species" she means exactly what he means by "accidents." "Species" is an ambiguous word for St. Thomas, since it means one thing in the philosophy of Aristotle, and quite another in Eucharistic theology. If he had spoken without qualification of the "species" of bread and wine, he would have been understood in that sense of the word which we still intend when we speak of the human "species"; therefore he had to avoid the word whenever he wished to speak with scientific accuracy. The Church was under no such obligation. "Species" is the traditional word she has always used when speaking of the Blessed Sacrament. There has never been any danger of the word being

taken, when she uses it, in the sense of "specific nature," as there would have been in the schoolrooms for which St. Thomas wrote.

It is true that St. Thomas docs not speak of substance in a way calculated to please a modern chemist. He does not, for instance, make our modern distinction between elementary chemical substances, chemical mixtures and chemical compounds; and his arguments seem to be invalid for that reason. He explains that the Real Presence ceases when the Sacred Host becomes pulverised, or when any considerable quantity of other liquid is mixed with the contents of the chalice, and this because the accidents of bread and wine have undergone a substantial change. The dust of bread, he says, is not bread, but a new substance. Mix equal quantities of any two liquids, and, according to him, you have neither of them left, but a third substance in their place.

The Catholic chemist no doubt thinks that all such passages in the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist ought to be rewritten. But the Catholic scientist too often forgets that modern science has twisted a great many metaphysical words into a physical meaning. As a rule they are proud to have done so, having a contempt for metaphysics. But abstract thought is natural to the human mind, and substance is one of the words by which human nature under our civilisation has expressed one of its first metaphysical notions from time immemorial. When St. Thomas says that pulverised bread is a different substance from bread, he is not speaking at all of chemical substances. When the physical science of the day has linked itself up with the metaphysics to which it owes all its meaning and value as a science, there will still be intelligent Catholics (some

of them chemists perhaps), saying, with St. Thomas, that *because bread-dust is not bread* a pulverised host is no longer the Body of our Lord. And they will explain this, as St. Thomas does, in terms of Transubstantiation.

Theology is a science, and St. Thomas, writing on the Blessed Sacrament, is a scientist of the highest order. But in him the cold light of reason, so much praised in these days, does not extinguish his faith or quench his charity. It is an unusual thing to see together, as we do in the closing chapters of this treatise, a heart glowing with fervour and a mind shining with undiminished brightness. Judged as mere intellectualism, this part of his work yields nothing to the greatest philosophic or scientific masterpieces to which the learned of every age devote their attention and their praise. Judged as literature warm with emotion and quick with beauty, it can be compared only with the inspired writings of the Old and New Testament. It is small wonder that its author, having repeated it in a form suitable to the Church's use on the Feast of Corpus Christi, created the work of art that was to be the real link between the philosophy of Aristotle and the poetry of Dante. But it is neither for philosophy nor for poetry that St. Thomas is most to be praised; it is for his sweet, saintly wisdom. Like the Hierotheus of whom he writes, quoting from Dionysius, his learning is not merely knowledge of divine Truth, it is a passion. *Hierotheus doctus est non solum discens, sed patiens divina.*

This passion he himself expresses thus:

O memoriale mortis Domini,
Panis viviis' ydtam piaestans homini;
Prâèsta ineàè menti de Te vivere,
Et Tel Hli semper dulce· sapere.

VL

THE PERIOD OF THE SCHOOLMEN: THE SACRIFICE.

By the Rev. M. de la Taille, S.J.[1]

(i) The Problem of the Mass in Relation to Christ's Eternal Sacrifice.

Before entering upon the discussion of the scholastic problem of the Mass, it is mere common sense to ask ourselves what is, in the matter of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the authoritative teaching of the Church. There may be room, and there is room, in theology, for many theories, conflicting opinions, widely divergent speculations; but only within certain limits, the boundaries of which are marked either by the everyday teaching of the unanimous body of the Pastors, or, it may be, by the occasional pronouncements of the Episcopate in council assembled, or of its Head, exercising his personal prerogative. Should we happen to overstep these limits, we are no longer playing the theologian, but the heretic.

On the subject of the Mass the whole of the Catholic teaching, as a matter of fact, has been set forth by the Council of Trent in three chapters and five canons, which may be summed up as follows:

[1] No references have Veen given iu'the 'twa following papers to the works of the author mentioned ex alluded to^ They are all to be found in the lecturer'^ book) *Mysienùm 'Fidei,* lately published by G. Beauchesme & Co.«(Paris)*.

1. There is in the Church a Sacrifice instituted by Christ, the Sacrifice of His Body and Blood, under the appearances of bread and wine.
2. That Sacrifice is in some sense one with the Cross: the same Victim, the same Priest: only a different manner of offering: bloodstained on the Cross, bloodless on our altars.
3. It is a Sacrifice of atonement for our sins and the sins of those for whose sake it is offered, be they living or dead—but dead in Christ.
4. Its worth and efficacy is derived from the Sacrifice of the Cross, the benefit of which it applies to us.
5. Although offered up to God, and to God only, yet it may be celebrated out of devotion for the Saints, as a manner of honouring their memory, *in honorem el memoriam.*
6. The institution of that Sacrifice goes back to the Supper, when Christ, who was about to deliver Himself up for us on the Cross, wishing moreover to endow His Church with a Sacrifice commemorative of His own, in His capacity of High Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, first, offered up His Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and next, appointed His apostles (and likewise their successors for ever) to renew the same offering after Him.

Such is the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. These are the data on which not only modern theology, but practically also pre-Tridentine theology has had to base its account of the internal economy of that mysterious sacrifice.

We know that the object of theology is not only to ascertain what has to be believed, but also, and mainly,

to discuss the *how's* and *why's,* and meet the objections of the unbeliever.

Now, *how* is it possible that the Eucharistic rite should be a true Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord? *Why* is Christ, at the end of the Eucharistic process, to be looked upon as sacrificed by us? Is it not *absurd* to think of Christ, of the glorified Christ, as a victim? And yet, if there is no victim, how can there be a sacrifice? That is the first question to be answered. And, secondly, there comes this difficulty: given that the Mass is a Sacrifice, how can the fact be reconciled with the all-sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross, impressed on us with such force in the Epistle to the Hebrews?

The first question will take up most of our attention. From its solution, if adequate, the answer to the second question should follow of itself.

In the first place, then, the problem before us is the following: how is Christ, in our Eucharist, a victim? A victim, that is, something victimised, something subjected to a process of immolation ; something, in a word, that can be looked upon as being really and truly in a state of sacrifice? The solutions of the post-Tridentine theologians are manifold.

First solution. We make Him a true victim, by endowing Him with new conditions, either of a physical or moral order, such as to lower His status, or lessen His activities, as a human being. That is the realistic theory of Lugo, Franzelin, and others.

Second solution. We do not alter in any way His real condition, nor need we turn Him into a true victim, which He once was, but never shall be again. All we have to do is to vest the reality of His Flesh and Blood with a likeness of death. The mere symbol of immolation,

coupled with His real presence, yields, so to say, a real sacrifice in either of these two ways. First manner: in so far as it recalls the bloodstained immolation of Calvary. This is the view of Vasquez. Second manner: even apart from any antecedent immolation whatever, by the very fact of here and now showing Christ under an appearance of death. Thus Cardinal Billot, whose contention is that, a sacrifice being nothing but the outward sign of an inward self-dedication to God, it does not matter whether the intended victim is really affected by the ritual process or not, so long, that is, as there remains some visible sign of our own self-surrender: which sign, he claims, subsists just as well in the case of a merely symbolical as of a fully real immolation.

Half-way between realism and symbolism, we are confronted by conditional realism, which is the system of Lessius, Billuart and others. The words of consecration being, as a sacramental form, effective of what they mean, would have the power, it is claimed, to sever from one another the Body and the Blood, to which they point separately, in the mystical drama, were it not for the present condition of the glorified Christ, risen from the dead to die no more. Thus the Eucharistic rite implies a virtual slaying of Christ, which, under the circumstances, may be accounted as a true sacrifice.

Such are the main lines of thought followed by the theologians of the last three centuries. The disagreement is wide indeed, covering, as it does, all the distance between two such extremes as the destruction of Christ's actual life, to use the phrase of the Spaniard Ulloa, and the fiat denial of all sacrificial conditions within our

so-called Victim, to put bluntly the view of many a metaphysical genius. At one end stands pre-eminent, with his wonderful erudition and absolute lack of balance, a man who in his days was of high repute, Theophilus Raynaudus, a contemporary of Lugo, but probably independent of him, who claims to hud on our altars an immolation more real even and more thorough than on the Cross itself. That is to say, the sacramental conditions, depriving, as he thinks, Christ our Lord of His size and bodily dimensions, do by the very fact abolish in Him, normally speaking, not only the use of those external senses, which the Passion, by its very torment, was at least stimulating, but also, and consequently, the use of all internal senses, imagination, emotion and the like, grounded upon our physical apparatus, and, furthermore, all such exercise of the intellect and the will, as from its dependence on imagination and brain, may be called specifically human. A very dreadful conclusion, indeed, reached by dint of intrepid logic. At the other extreme, as I said, not the slightest element of any sacrificial state or condition whatever is considered inherent in Christ Himself; nothing but a semblance, due to the outward garment of death, to that Eucharistic shroud, thinly woven, of words and visible appearances, which, while hiding the presence of the Lord, exhibits to us His Passion. Another triumph of logic. Transubstantiation, they say, does not modify Christ in any way; it is a change not of Christ, either for better or for worse, but of the bread into Christ's Body, of the wine into Christ's Blood. The change effects what is subjected to it, and nothing else. Now of the two substances subjected to the change, bread and wine, nothing remains; no part of either is

found to survive in Christ. There is nothing, then, in Christ to be affected by the change. That being so, nothing has been done by us, nothing effected, within Christ Himself. Therefore no real immolation has taken place. And therefore, again, they go on to say, of a true and intrinsic state of a victim there can in the Eucharistic Christ be no thought whatever. We must be content with a mere show.

One side objects to the other the impropriety of injuring, debasing Christ, even granted our power to do so, such as the Jews once had, but were never praised for using. The other side naturally rejoins by expostulating against the whittling away of sacrifice, which, failing a true victim, cannot but come to naught. Both sides combine in assailing the solution of the *via media,* the conditional slaying. On the one hand, as conditional, that is, dependent upon a condition which is not fulfilled, it remains just as unreal as the mere figuring of death, and thus lies open to the objection of the realist. On the other hand, the assumption that the twofold consecration could, even in a given condition, entail death, fails to do justice to the analysis of Transubstantiation, on which our modem symbolists, in full accord with St. Thomas, are wont to lay great stress. This is how we stand: either Christ is "victimised," and that is too much, or Christ is not victimised ; and where then is the victim of that true sacrifice proclaimed by the Council of Trent, and before the Council of Trent by the explicit teaching of at least fourteen centuries? The plea that even killing in effigy manifests our devotion to God is irrelevant. We are not only to show our devotion to God, which may be done in a thousand ways, but to show it (the Council says) by the way of a true sacrifice : which

supposes a victim, and a true victim; but a true victim there cannot be, short of a sacrificial state thereof. We are driven into a corner, then, it would seem; and no possibility appears of an escape. And yet there must be a way out of the difficulty, and in all probability an easy one: for this reason, that to us the dilemma is so obvious, whereas none of the mediaeval theologians seem ever to have been embarrassed, or even confronted by it. Which may suggest that possibly we have gone the wrong way about the problem. It is not unthinkable that the question should have been given a wrong twist, so to say; that some of its elements should have been inadvertently disturbed, so as now to be incapable of fitting together; just as, if in the data of a mathematical problem you include a latent contradiction, the contradiction may blossom ultimately into two sets of conflicting solutions. Such seems to be our case:

1st solution: *I* must impair Christ.

2nd solution: I cannot by any means do so; and even could I, God forbid that I should!

Let us get back, then, to the original setting of the question, and there try to get at the root of the discrepancy between post-Tridentine and pre-Tridentine theologians. If we hit upon some different implications or presuppositions, then no doubt the difficulty will be more than half solved.

When the realists say, we have to victimise Christ, they take two things for granted: first, that the object of a sacrifice is to turn one into a victim; second, that Christ, at the present time, is not a victim apart from our sacrifice.

Now the symbolist disagrees with the realist as to the first point; but he agrees with him as to the second.

How about the pre-Tridentine theologian? Does he admit either of these two presuppositions? He admits neither; and there the difference comes in between him and the school or schools of modern times. This cannot be illustrated without summarily at least indicating the old schoolmen's views, first, on sacrifice in general; and second, on Christ's eternal condition.

For the exposition of mediaeval thought we may fairly apply (amongst others) not only to the Prince of theologians, St. Thomas, or to his master, Albert the Great, but also to their senior, a specialist on the question of sacrifice, William of Paris, and to their junior, Duns Scotus, a specialist on the question of the Mass. Their statements do not in the main appear to have been challenged during the period under consideration, that is, down to the Renaissance, by any orthodox writers. They complete one another, and for the sake of brevity, in the course of this study, shall be blended together.

A sacrifice is a sign, the visible token of our inward self-dedication to God, in the shape of a gift meant primarily, by its removal from profane use and transference into God's dominion, to testify to our own religious consecration, and secondarily (if so it be) to bespeak by its bloodstained condition the acknowledgment of our guilt, along with the intention of repairing it in some way and the desire of being pardoned. All that is implied in the latreutic and propitiatory sacrifice of fallen humanity. Fundamentally then the sacrifice is a gift; not any kind of a gift, nor for any purpose you may devise; but for a religious purpose, a ritual gift.

Now it is the object of a gift not only to be given or

presented, but also to be accepted or taken. That is what is aimed at by the giver; and in the case of a sacrifice, it is in this that his hopes of grace and relief have a sure foundation. If God does not accept the offering, if He rejects it, nothing is done, no benefit can accrue to the offerer. On the other hand, if accepted, the sacrifice has effect to the end for which it was presented. Thus arises between God and man a kind of contract, or covenant, even as between man and man from any similar transaction. As a matter of fact, does God accept, does He take unto Himself the gifts of our human lowliness? Goats and oxen were slain before His altar: did He taste them? The sweet odour of incense rose to the clouds; did He smell it? He protests through His prophets that He has no use for it all. And yet the Jews were persuaded, and divinely encouraged in their persuasion, that their sacrifices were in some way accepted. In some way, I say, because on the other hand St. Paul writes in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the whole thing was a failure; otherwise it would not have to be repeated every day. Only one sacrifice has been a success; that of our High Priest according to the likeness of Melchisedech. What then? God did not accept the victims of the Hebrews? Yes, in some way, as has been said, that is, in figure; even as the thing itself was a shadow of the Victim to come. And that figurative acceptance was made sensible and visible in most cases by the action of the miraculous fire, which, preserved from the day of Aaron's consecration, alone was entitled to devour God's share in the banquet. But the acceptance in the case of Christ was real; and not only enclosed in the secret of God's bosom, but also, as behoves a covenant,

declared outwardly and actually carried out in Christ's resurrection from the dead, ascension to heaven and glorification throughout eternity. Truly and verily the Victim slain and dead was devoured by God's uncreated fire of heavenly glory. Truly was it transferred from its earthly and corruptible state into God's own incorruption and immortality. Truly was the price of our sin taken into God's powerful hand, there to be retained for ever. Truly was the Lamb carried into the bosom of Him to whom it had been made over. Nothing more real, nothing more true, nothing more actual and nothing more perennial than the divine acceptance of Christ s sacrifice; what St. Thomas calls the eternal consummation of the Sacrifice once performed. And here is the conclusion which strikes the earlier schoolmen, as it had struck the Fathers, led by St. Paul's teaching to the Hebrews: Christ is a victim· even now, *hostia illa perpetua est,* St. Thomas says. In heaven He is a victim, no less than He was on the Cross, only more so, forasmuch as the offering then tendered having now reached its destination, there is a seal, as it were, on its character of a gift passed from mankind to the Deity. That is of primary importance. If Christ is a victim, confirmed and stamped, so to say, in that capacity by His very glory, then He has not got to be turned into a victim by us. He has not to be slain or immolated, marred or impaired in any way. You cannot make Him to be what he already is without us; and then the very foundation for the realist's contention falls to the ground. But the symbolist is also hit by the discovery. He thought that in our Sacrifice we were to do without anything really endowed with the actual character of a victim. Now you cannot have

Christ without having in Him what He is: the victim of our salvation.

Panem, vinum in salutis
Consecramus hostiam.
"The bread and wine we consecrate,
Into the victim of salvation."

What St. Thomas says in those lines, and more distinctly still in the *Summa,* and in the *Commentary on the Sentences,* the popular apologists at the outbreak of the Reformation were not slow to retort to Luther, who, while holding the Real Presence, rejected the Sacrifice. "Is Christ's Body and Blood truly present under the sacramental appearances?" George Witzel would ask Luther: "If thou art a Catholic, thou must say yes. Now then, is Christ's Body and Blood there a sacrifice also, and a victim? That is the crux of the question. But I will solve it for thee. If Christ's Body and Blood is no victim at all, then our faith is vain and we are yet in our sins. But if His Body and Blood is a victim even as yesterday so to-day, yea and for ever, how then darest thou deny Him to be a victim in the Sacrament?" This is one instance amongst many. One point then is secured so far as the outcome of transubstantiation; not indeed the making of a victim, but the presence of a victim. Christ was a victim in the making once, on the Cross. He is a victim ready-made now for ever, wherever He is. If present in the Sacrament, there He is such as He is: a victim, a host. The Real Presence of Christ, in whatever shape or form, carries with it the sacrificial status inherent in the Lamb that was slain and liveth.

But is that an adequate solution of the problem of the Mass? By no means. As all the scholastics were quick

to perceive, a sacrifice is not the mere presence of a victim, but the offering thereof. Now where is the offering? So far I see the putting before us of the divine Victim. I do not see the sending up thereof to God. I would say more. A question arises whether the possibility of a fresh sacrifice is not precluded by the very permanence of Christ's sacrificial status. If He be already a sacrifice, how can He be sacrificed any more? All is done, nothing remains to be done. Away then with the sacrifice of the Mass' We may have the Divine Victim brought down from on High; we may come into contact with that eternal Victim; and a memorial too of past immolation and oblation there may be. But a sacrifice of ours we have not, we cannot have, as long as He, the ransom of our lives, remains what He is for ever, a Victim. And certainly this has been one of the objections of the reformers against the Sacrifice of the Mass. I shall not ask how the scholastics met it, but how the old school had forestalled it.

In the opinion of the thirteenth-century theologians, the immolation of Calvary is all-sufficient, and, as a real immolation, exclusive of any repetition. But immolation is only one element of sacrifice, and indeed not the one that has to be performed by the priest, or sacrificer. The priestly element is oblation. The oblation has been performed by Christ, St. Thomas marks, in such wise, that it might be renewed by us. The immolation then, or mactation, has been done once, and need not be repeated, and cannot be repeated. But the offering can, and should be, of daily recurrence, according to Christ's command: *this do in remembrance of Me*. Now the sacrifice being not the mactation or immolation, but the offering up of what is either slain

or to be slain, it follows that our daily celebration is also a daily sacrifice. That is the common teaching of the old commentators on the famous question of the fourth book of the Lombard: *Si Christus quotidie immoletur, vel semel tantum immolatus sit.*

It remains further to be seen how and why the Eucharistic rite is an offering of Christ's immolation.

(2) The Mass as an Offering of the Passion.

I consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ, and am supposed thereby to offer up to God the Victim of the Passion. How is that? Simply and solely because by thus doing I am doing the same thing which was done by Christ before me. *This do in remembrance of Me.* What are we to do? The same that He did: *this,* what He had just been doing. If then Christ offered up His death while consecrating the bread and wine, surely, on the strength of Christ's own word, I too, while consecrating the bread and wine, am offering His death. But did Christ, as a matter of fact, at the Last Supper, offer up to God His passion and death for the redemption of mankind? That is exactly what our doctors tell us. Christ in the Supper offered Himself up to death. "This is My Body," He says, "which is delivered up for you," delivered unto death (as even our modern rationalist commentators point out). "This is My Blood, which is shed for you, in atonement for your sins." "My Blood which flows for you": is not that death? Death put indeed before us in a symbol, by means of that sacramental parting of the Blood from the Body; but death at the same time already pledged to God for all its worth, as well as all its awful reality, by the expressive language of that sacred symbol. The price of our sins shall be paid down on Calvary; but here the liability is incurred by our Redeemer, and subscribed in His very Blood. The Flesh of the Lamb is here consigned into God's hands, forasmuch as it is assigned

as our ransom. Christ is bound for His Passion, from which it is henceforth impossible for Him to step back without taking from God what He has given to God, and thus violating that principle of justice according to which every one is bound to render unto God the things that are God's. Wherefore, St. Anselm remarks, it was Christ's duty to die, not to fulfil any particular command of His Father, which to the majority of our doctors is unthinkable, but only to keep the law of justice, even unto death.

Such is the ritual process by which Christ made an offering, an outward and visible offering of His passion. It has not been analysed to the full by the Schoolmen: possibly because it was too plain to all from Scripture, from the Fathers, and from their popular hymns. But we find in their writings all the elements of this statement, that Christ offered His passion, while representing it, in the Eucharist. So that in turn they might also say that the Eucharist, the sacrament, the mystery of the Body and Blood was "consecrated," or was "offered" on the Cross itself; that is, finally brought there to its completion as a sacrifice; a statement which we find not only in Albert the Great, but even before the opening of the scholastic period in Bede, and at the close of the Middle Ages in the writings of another great Englishman, Thomas Walden. Such was the link between the Eucharist and the Cross, that the Eucharist was "fulfilled" on the Cross, because the Cross had been pledged in the Eucharist.

One point has escaped the notice of the Scholastics, although it was set forth so plainly in the works of one of their favourite authors, Hesychius; that is to say, the similarity between Christ's method of offering and

the traditional Hebrew rite of oblation. Oblation, as distinct from immolation, amongst the Hebrews, took the form mostly of a sprinkling of the blood on the altar: the blood representing life, and the altar being looked upon as the seat of the Divinity, and therefore as a fit substitute of the Godhead, in regard to the visible reception and invisible sanctification of the gifts. Accordingly Christ offered His life by sprinkling the Blood on the altar. The altar of Christ is His own Body, the true seat of the Divinity, sanctified and sanctifying. On that true altar Christ poured His Blood, while sacramentally shedding it, in view of the Cross, where the shedding was to be no more sacramental, but real. Thus was the Body bathed in blood twice; not only on the Cross, at the hands of the executioners, but in the first instance, sacerdotally as well as mystically, by Christ Himself, the High Priest according to the order of Melchisedech. If the mediaeval theologians did not explicitly note this parallelism of the Hebrew rite and the Eucharistic proceedings of the Supper night, yet this much is clear to them—that Christ's Body is God's Altar, the one Altar of the one Sacrifice; the only Altar to which our High Priest ever ministered, on which ever lay the price of the world, and from which the Blood of the Victim may be obtained by us. This view, for which might be quoted scores of authorities ranging from the ninth to the thirteenth century, may serve as a useful *confirmatur* for the conclusion at which we had already arrived from the mere consideration of the symbolic immolation. Christ in the Supper offered His death. And we offer it, because we do the same that He did. "Do this"—what?—"the same that I have done. I have offered My death; you shall offer

My death." Thus we do the same that He did, but yet with a difference, and indeed with a twofold difference, respecting time and authority.

In the first place, our celebration is connected with His passion and death as things of the past, whereas His was pointing towards the Cross as a thing of the future. He was offering Himself up to what was in store for Him; we offer the relic, but the living relic of His Blood once spilled. His was an oblation of the immolation to come: *se obtulit immolandum,* as not only the Fathers, or old Liturgies, but also the early mediaeval writers, like Alcuin, for instance, were wont to express it. Ours is the oblation of the Victim once immolated, *rei immolatae oblatio,* or *oblatio occisi ad cultum Dei,* to use Albert's phrases. There we have just the difference of the commemoration and the anticipation. What He anticipated, we commemorate; even as He said, "Do ye this in memory of Me"; or St. Paul, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come." In both cases the sacrifice rests upon the same immolation, upon the Cross; but in two different ways, that is, from two opposite sides: here, *oblatio hostiae immolatae',* there, *oblatio hostiae immolandae.* So that His sacrifice, as many of the Fathers at Trent pointed out, although celebrated ritually by Him in the upper room, was not finished till He died at the hands of His enemies; whereas our sacrifice, having no more to expect its completion from the slaying of the Victim and the shedding of its Blood, ends with the very Eucharistic celebration, which, as has been said, lays before God the Victim that it yields: the Victim of the passion immortalized in glory, not an *idolothytum,* but an eternal *theothytum.* Here we touch the reason

why one sacrifice was blood-stained, and the other is bloodless, and yet both are the same.

Second difference. In the upper room, He was alone to offer: nor could it be otherwise: we must be redeemed before we join with Him in the act of His priesthood. So that even Mary, the Virgin Mother, could not effectively share in the first offering of the Sacrifice by which she herself, as well as the rest of mankind, although in a different manner, had to be redeemed—indeed more redeemed than ourselves, that is with a fuller effect of that purifying grace of redemption, which in her forestalled all taint of sin. *Torcular calcavi solus,* the Lord could verily say, although in a different sense perhaps from the prophet. But now, it is the other way about. We, if I may say so, tread the wine-press, which He once trod. We are offering anew, under Him indeed, and by His commission; but truly we are offering, and truly it is a fresh offering. On His part, on the contrary, there is nothing but the oblation gone by, ever operative through ours. None of the scholastics before the sixteenth century ever ascribed to Christ more than this one oblation of old, permanently hovering, so to say, over our altars, so as to incorporate in itself the subordinate and ministerial exercise of our delegated priesthood. The words are ours, the sacred words which are once more, by the narrative of the Supper, placed on the lips of the Lord. They are ours as to the uttering, but His as to the virtue and efficacy which they borrow from His one utterance (and present co-operation). The power to offer is His; but the act of offering is ours. He offers indeed, but through us only, that is, through our agency, not by any formal presentation of His own. He offers, in so far as we offer by His

mandate, as parlakers of that priestly dignity and activity of His, which once shone forth amid the surroundings of the passion, and now has come to rest on the seat of glory at the right hand of the Father. The toiling of the priesthood is now all our own; ours is the plea for acceptance on behalf of the Church, that fulness of Christ's Body, which being entirely sacerdotal as Body of the High Priest, yet must needs use the appointed and ordained organs of its sacrificing activity, and through them only forward to God the gift of the community, the Victim, which it is its privilege to share with Christ in offering.

That doctrine, taught implicitly at least by St. Thomas, as Suarez himself, an opponent, frankly admits, has been more fully, more explicitly, and we may say, more brilliantly, expounded by Scotus in his famous twentieth *Quodlibetum.* But who better than Thomas Walden ever expressed our present relation to Christ's original act, in the phrase, namely, by which he describes the part of the priest in the consecration? "Ponuntur verba illa superexcellentis divinae auctoritatis, alta mentis devotione promulganda: promulgatur et (perhaps for *et* should be read *enim)* semper effectrix Christi sententia: *Hoc est corpus meum."* What we do is a promulgation of Christ's effective sentence, of His authoritative statement, to the bread which we hallow and to the chalice which we bless. Wherefore also we declare, in the very act of consecration, that Christ in the Last Supper actually handled the chalice which we bless, and blessed the chalice which we handle: "accipiens et *hunc* praeclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas . . . dixit: *Hic est calix sanguinis mei."* Christ spoke then of the Eucharist of

all times, of any individual bread or chalice that might ever be reached by the force of His words, conveyed on our lips, or rather, of the one bread and the one chalice, ever the same through all ages from the night in the supper-room to the last day of the world. Which view in the early Middle Ages received current expression from the pen of Agobardus, Florus, Paschasius, and others down to Innocent III.

After the English Carmelite, Thomas Walden, we may still give ear to an Irish Franciscan, Anthony Hickey (Hyquaeus), of much later date, who aptly connects our ministration not only with Christ's personal activity and initiative, but also, and none the less essentially, with the general intention and collective devotion of the universal Church; so that even severed from the unity of the Church, a priest still does offer (if he offers at all) in the name and on the part of the Church, of the true Church, of the whole Church: "Haereticus sacerdos etiam *in -persona Ecclesiae* . . . offert sacrificium"; a statement which through Gabriel Biel, and in part through Scotus and William of Paris, goes back to Algerus of Liège, the best exponent in the early Middle Ages of the doctrine of St. Augustine on the Eucharist.

To sum up, the generally accepted view of the Eucharistic sacrifice amongst pre-Tridentine theologians, so far as we may gather it from a conscientious study of their works, appears to have been the very same that was propounded at the outbreak of the Reformation against Luther by such unsophisticated champions of the Faith as Latomus, Thomas Herenthalinus, Tapper in Flanders, Herbornus, Gropper and the canons of Cologne in the Rhineland, Klinke in Saxony, Fabri in

Bavaria, Jerome Negri da Fossano in Northern Italy, and many others, who all fall in line with the definition given by Blessed Peter Canisius in that famous catechism that saved the faith of Lower Germany. "What are we to believe of the sacrifice of the altar?" the catechism asks. The answer is: "The sacrifice of the Mass rightly understood is both a representation, at once holy and living,' and an offering, bloodless yet actual"—of what?—"of the passion of the Lord and of the blood-stained sacrifice which was offered for us on the Cross." You see the two elements combined in the definition: first, a representation (symbolical, of course) of the passion and death of the Lord: second, an oblation, real though bloodless, of the same passion and death. The Mass, whilst picturing, also tenders unto God the sacrifice of the Cross. That is offered which is represented. You represent Christ's death; you offer Christ's death. Such was the catechism taught to our forefathers, not only in Germany, but also, as might be shown, in other countries as well.

As long as this doctrine was left in peaceful possession of the theological field, there could hardly be any difficulty in reconciling the recurrence of our daily sacrifice with the all-sufficiency of the one sacrifice of redemption. It is true that St. Paul says that Christ offered only one sacrifice, and offered it only once; and that this unique oblation once for all perfected them that are sanctified. It is true, therefore, that the fulness and adequacy of the price once paid excludes all addition of any further instalment, if I may so speak; and, as the price was paid in the Blood of Christ, it follows that to the one immolation of our one Victim there can be no question of appending any subsequent immolation of either the

same or another victim. Which comes to this: that henceforth no other sacrifice can be acceptable to God. Hence the objection of the Reformer: the Mass must be done away with; there is no such thing in the Church as a sacrifice of atonement for the living or the dead: since the one sacrifice of atonement for all men and for all sins was that of the Cross.

I would not say that certain forms of the realistic or even the symbolistic theory are not hit by that argument: in so far, namely, as either they imply in Christ some change of state for the worse, or at least hold out some sort of sacrifice subsisting apart from the Cross. Wherefore we find that some confusion or lack of thoroughness may be noted at times in certain post-Tridentine solutions of the above objection, as was remarked by Cardinal Cienfuegos. The confusion in fact goes back even to the days of Trent, and showed itself in one of the conciliar debates, not regarding indeed directly the Mass, but the Last Supper. The question arose, whether the Last Supper should be defined to have been a sacrifice or not. Great was the difference of opinion amongst the Fathers. A number of them opposed the definition, on the ground that it would create a very serious difficulty in our discussions with the heretics. The heretics would certainly object the oneness of Christ's sacrifice, as emphasized in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Now should we not have two sacrifices of Christ, if in the Last Supper, that is, prior to the Cross, there appeared already one? Worse still: as the sacrifice in the Supper must needs be, if anything, a sacrifice of atonement ("This is My Blood that is being shed for you and the many unto the forgiveness of sins"), would it not follow that mankind was

redeemed even before the sacrifice on the Cross? What an awkward conclusion ! And how could one possibly escape it? Thereupon the answer came from a certain number of Bishops, amongst whom 1 maybe permitted to point out the Bishop of Paris, Eustace du Bellay, who spoke as follows: "Christ did offer Himself up in the Last Supper. . . . Yet there are not two offerings, but one only together with that of the Cross. For in the offering of the Supper He had already begun His passion; and the offering in the Supper was continuous with that of the Cross ; and being the same with that of the Cross, it was propitiatory too." Many followed suit, as for instance the Bishop of Leiria, in Portugal: "In the Supper and on the Cross there is only one victim and one oblation. The unity of the Supper and of the Cross is indivisible." Similarly the Bishop of Palermo: " In the Supper, Christ began His offering, and finished it on the Cross." And the same you hear from the lips of the Bishops of Fiesole, Calvi, Teano, Campagna, in Italy, of Viviers, in France, and a number of others of various nationalities. Some time before, the Archbishop of Cologne had thus advocated a change in the original draft of the decree (which change the Council sanctioned) : "Christ," he said, "under the species of bread and wine offered His Body and Blood for a sacrifice which was to be completed and carried out on the Cross by the hands of others. . . . Christ offered Himself up to His Father by His own hands; but the wicked to whom He was delivered up made no end of beating, crushing, scourging and crucifying Him, till they had achieved the Sacrifice which was offered up in bread and wine. . .. And with this doctrine," he goes on to say, "both Fathers and Scripture agree, who from the sacrifice of the

Supper never dissociate the sacrifice of the Cross, but include the latter in the former, in such manner as is possible, namely, in a bloodless manner; yet even so it was nothing else but the self-same sacrifice, that was being offered already . . . pending its final completion. This doctrine," he concludes, "being most true and Catholic, it seems well that we should alter a few words in the draft, lest they should be interpreted otherwise." Which recommendation of his, as I have said, won the sanction of the Council. Thus the Protestant difficulty was cut at the root, as regards, at least, the Last Supper.

But the same solution must, with due proportion, apply to the Mass. Yes, the Mass would be derogatory to the dignity, and I would say the monopoly of the Cross, if any other immolation but that of Calvary were to be offered on our altars. But the selfsame sacrifice of redemption is offered here and there. There by the Redeemer, here by the redeemed, whom He not only loosed from their sins, but also made priests unto God His Father, to join with Him in the offering of the Blood of the Covenant, as behoves the members of the High Priest. The dignity of the Cross is perfectly safe. Nothing is added to the price once paid, nor to the payment of it once made. Only we, as fellows of Christ, subscribe to the document of that divine transaction, not to enhance its value, but to appropriate its merit, that is, its worth and efficacy. Where is the belittling of the Divine Sacrifice? Rather there is an exaltation of our human frailty, which, indeed, we may well admire, and give thanks to the mercy of God, through whose grace we Christians are an elect race, a royal priesthood.

Such is the doctrine of the Mass which to my mind commends itself as more true to antiquity, not only

scholastic, but also patristic; more true also to Scripture, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews; more true to the nature of things and to the Semitic view of sacrifice; and moreover as reconciling together the various points that have proved irreconcilable in the other conflicting theories.

Before concluding, I may perhaps be permitted to tell a little story. Seventeen years ago, while staying at Accrington, I was asked by the Rector of the church, Fr. Martin, to give a course of sermons on the Mass. I replied that I would willingly preach on the Sacrament of the Eucharist, on Holy Communion. No, on the Sacrifice, he said, on the Mass. I felt rather afraid to speak on the subject, no theory having ever approved itself to me, save one, for which I knew of no authority amongst the theologians of modern times. I went to the library of the house in search of some respectable patron. The first book that attracted my notice was the Catechism of Blessed Peter Canisius, which I had never opened before. I opened it, and found there the definition to which I have referred above. All my fears were gone. I preached the desired course of sermons, which in later years developed into a course of university lectures, and finally into a volume, to which I beg to refer my hearers.

In the meantime it is a great pleasure for me to be able to bring back to England's shores what I thus owe to the encouragement of an English priest and the goodwill of an English congregation.

VII.

THE LATIN LITURGY.

By the Rt. Rev. Abbot F. M. Cabrol, O.S.B., O.B.E.

(i) The Roman Missal.

I think it is scarcely necessary for me to excuse or explain myself with regard to the subjects I have chosen for my two conferences on Liturgy. Since the Eucharist forms the general subject of discussion in our Summer School this year, it is only natural that I should speak of the Mass and the Missal.

I might here make a comparison between the work I am undertaking to carry out in your presence, on the Roman Missal, and the labours of a geologist seeking to explain the gradual formation of the earth-crust. Let me suppose you to be walking along the banks of a river and, as we are at Cambridge, let us say the banks of the Ouse or the Cam; you admire the calm stream flowing along between wooded banks and flowery meadows, you follow its many windings and you are greeted by new charms at almost every turn. You admire and rejoice in the beauty that surrounds you with the feeling of a poet or an artist, or at least of one who can appreciate the loveliness of nature. But suppose you take a geologist as your guide along the river banks, the attitude of your mind will be altogether changed. The geologist will point out to you that this river, the Ouse or the Cam as you will, has changed its

course many times, and has not always flowed peacefully along as you see it now. He will go on to explain to you the geological reasons that have led to the formation of the actual bed in which it has flowed for many centuries past. He will show you the traces the river has left of its former courses, in the wearing away of rocks, in the different shape of certain stones, and in the débris it has left behind. The landscape that you looked on hitherto with the eye of an artist or of a lover of nature, will now show itself to you in quite a new aspect. You will see in it the traces of ages long gone by, of the centuries before the Norman invasion, or even before that of the Saxons, at a period when the basin of the Wash was a disputed boundary between land and sea, that made the Fen country of that time a kind of English Netherland, half submerged like the plains of lower Holland. The islets that arose amidst this morass were the homes of seafaring tribes whose utensils and whose arms of flint are to be found mingled with the bones of mammoths and strange creatures of the sea.[1] It is even said that during the Glacier period, what are now England and Northern Germany formed then one continuous stretch of land.[2]

The labours of the archaeologist in unravelling the history of the Missal may be compared, I think, without pressing analogy too far, to those of the geologist striving to make the earth disclose its secrets.

Take a man of ordinary intelligence and education, put the Missal into his hands, such as it exists in the latest edition of 1921. If he has penetration and a

[1] The remains of a whale were found at Waterbeach, about 10 miles from Cambridge.

[2] Ramsay, *Physical Geology and Geography of Great Britain.*

certain amount of the critical faculty he will see that the Missal forms a species of liturgical anthology, wherein are found proses such as the *Dies Irae* or the *Stabat Mater,* side by side with the distichs of Theodulphus of Orleans, the *Gloria Laus,* or again the *Exsultet* of Holy Saturday, together with the Introit *Salve Sancta Parens.* Again, he will notice on the one hand the Collects of the Sundays after Pentecost, so remarkable for their precision of thought and rhythmical style—so essentially Roman in conception; on the other hand, the *Kyrie eleison* or the *Agios O Theos,* striking evidence of Byzantine influence at Rome in the 6th century. He will find, in short, the débris left behind by almost every age of the Christian Church.

Realising this, our friend will no doubt seek the help of archaeologist and liturgist. We can picture him saying: "This book interests and puzzles me. Can you give me any idea as to its origin?" The situation of our imaginary investigator of the Missal is, I think I may say, though there are undoubtedly exceptions, that of most of my audience. In any case, it is to those who wish to learn something about the origin and history of the Missal that I address the following remarks. To them I say: *Habent sua fata libelli:* "Books have their fate." The destiny of this particular book is one of the strangest. I shall now do my best to set it before you.

I.

In the first place it may be truthfully said that there is hardly any other book so widely known and used as the Missal. I am not sure that I should be right in making an exception even for the Bible itself. From the time

at least, of the Council of Aix-la Chapelle and the famous capitularies of Charlemagne in 789, and of Louis le Débonnaire in 817, every priest was obliged to possess a Missal1; and with the Missals properly so called we must count the books provided for the laity, which, under one form or another, were but adaptations from the Missal. Thus millions, and perhaps hundreds of millions of copies, were spread throughout the world, wherever the Catholic Church had extended her sway. Is there any other book that, from this point of view, can compare with the Missal? It is true that the value of a book cannot be estimated only from the number of editions through which it may pass. Still, the fact that the Missal has been read and used and meditated on in every country of the known world and during twelve centuries of its existence, is not a fact to be lightly set on one side.

But the history of the Missal and of its spread throughout the world will, as a fact, teach us that, after the Bible, or one might even say, equally with the Bible, since the Missal contains so much of Holy Scripture, no other book has been considered worthy of such honour and respect. *If there were time to* do so, I could speak to you of ancient manuscripts of both Sacramentary and Missal, which are among the most precious treasures possessed by certain libraries of Europe—manuscripts written in letters of gold or silver, or adorned with beautiful illuminations. When printing replaced writing by hand, the best examples of the new method were usually either Bibles or Missals.

* *Monum. Germ. Leges,* T. 1, p. 65; Baluze, *Capitularia·,* T. i, col. 237 and 569; *cf.* S. Berger, *Hist, de la Vulgate,* p. 186. Paris. 1893·

All this will serve to give us some idea of the interest attaching to the history of the Missal, its origin, and its evolution. In order to trace this history, even summarily, we have a fairly long road to travel—from the 5th or 6th century right up to the century in which we live. This long journey must be divided into several stages, and it is a journey that must be made, as it were, backwards, that is, from the 20th century back to the 5th.

The Missal, as we have it now, except for a few additions and modifications, is practically the Missal reformed and edited by St. Pius V. in the year 1570. Here we have the first stage of our journey. From the 16th to the 20th century the Missal comes under the immediate supervision and control of the Sovereign Pontiff. No one else may lay hands upon it. In this way its preservation from corruption is guaranteed.

It was the Fathers of the Council of Trent, who, seeing the continual menace of change and innovation to which the Liturgy of the Church was exposed, decided that a complete revision, not only of the Missal, but also of all the liturgical books, was imperative, in order to safeguard the unity of the Roman Rite. We should be grateful that the authority of the Church has thus intervened for, even as late as the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century, we have evidence in France of the liturgical chaos that results from too great liberty in such matters. Certain French bishops took upon themselves to draw up special rites for their own dioceses, turning the liturgical books upside down, and often substituting their own fantasies for the age-long traditions of the Church. The differences between the Missal of St. Pius V. and the recent edition of 1921 are very few in number. This is fortunate, for at the

present day, when the "liturgical sense" seems to have been almost entirely lost, there is great danger of a break with the past by introducing features not in keeping with sound liturgical principles. If a real reform of the Missal should ever be attempted, let us hope that it will not be carried out until after long study and reflection, and also earnest discussion with liturgical experts. Unfortunately, this has not always been the case in so-called reforms of the Liturgy.

The second stage of our journey is from the 16th to the 13th century. St. Pius V.'s Missal was not the earliest printed Missal. The earliest, and typical edition, as it may be called, dates from the year 1474. This edition has been reprinted by the Henry Bradshaw Society, to whom we offer our sincere congratulation for having undertaken the task.[1]

The differences between this Missal and that of St. Pius V. are unimportant. It is unnecessary to treat of them in detail here, they have recently been discussed by Mgr. Batiffol.[2] Again, the differences are very few between the edition of 1474 and the Manuscript-Missals. The manuscripts of the 14th and 13th centuries belong to a widespread type—the Missal of the Roman Curia: *Ordo Missalis secundum consuetudinem Romanae Curiae.* This was adopted and spread abroad by the order of Friars Minor. Numerous copies are to be found in the old libraries and the greater number have been catalogued.[3]

[1] *Missale Romanum Mediolani,* 1474. London, 1899 and 1907.

[2] *Leçons sur la Messe,* Paris, 1919, pp. 3, *sqq.*

[3] In spite of the labours of Ebner, Ehrensberger and others, there is great need of a work like that already carried out with regard to the printed Missals by W. H. Jac. Weale, *Bibliographia Liturgica : Catalogus Missalium Ritus Latini,* Londini, 1886.

These manuscripts are not, however, the most interesting in the history of Liturgy, we may therefore pass on at once to the next stage.

This stage, the third on the journey, is from the 13th to the 10th centuries. The Manuscript-Missals of this period are far rarer than in the preceding ; and although many already possess the chief characteristics of those of the Roman Curia type, there are, at the same time, owing to the wider liberties then existing in such matters, considerable differences. Hence they deserve to be studied in greater detail, and I am happy to be able to say that in these days there are young students who are devoting themselves to the task, the result of whose labours will be of the greatest use for the history of liturgy during that period. Their pioneers and models in these studies have been Ebner, and especially Delisle, of whom we shall speak later on.

The greater number of these manuscripts are what are known as "Plenary Missals," that is, books containing all parts of the Mass without exception. We shall see that in the fourth and last stage the Missal did not possess this character.

The last stage in the journey we have taken through the ages is from the 10th to the 6th century. Here we enter a special territory, of greater interest to the liturgist than any other, even though the path is strewn with many obstacles and the way seems far from clear. We may compare it, perhaps, to the ascent of a high mountain; as the mountaineer approaches the summit, the difficulties and fatigue become greater than ever, so that real courage is necessary if the end of the journey is to be attained. The Mass-books of this period are considerably different in character from those of the

nth to 13th centuries. They arc not, in fact, Missals at all, as we understand that term now. They belong to the type known by the name of "Sacramentary," from the Latin name *Sacrainciilariutn,* which is an abbreviation of the full title *Liber Sacramentorum.*[1] All the manuscripts of this period, which, as a matter of fact, are relatively few in number, are of the greatest value. They have practically all been carefully examined and catalogued by the two *savants* of whom I have already spoken.[2]

All those who wish to devote themselves to liturgical studies must begin by a careful examination of these Sacramentaries. The distinction between the Sacramentary and the Missal consists in this, that instead of including all the different parts of the Mass, the former contains only those elements that are recited by the Celebrant. The Sacramentaries contain neither the Introit, nor the Kyrie, Gradual, Offertory or Communion, nor, generally speaking, the Epistles and Gospels. The Sacramentary was, in fact, essentially the priest's book, and in it are to be found only the Collect, Secret, Preface, Canon, and Postcommunion. The choral parts of the Mass were contained in a special book, the Antiphoner or Gradual *(Liber Antiphonarius, Liber Gractualis),* while the Lessons, Epistles and

1 The above distribution of the different types of the Missal among the various periods must not be taken too strictly; manuscripts belonging to the Sacramentary type are found in the 10th century and, on the other hand, in the earlier centuries are to be found manuscripts like that of Bobbio, which already possess many of the characteristics of the later Missal.

2 Delisle: *Mémoire sur d'anciens Sacramentaires,* Paris, 1886; Ebner: *Quellen u. Forschungen. zur Gesch. u. Kunstgeschichtc des Missale Romanum,* Freiburg im Breisg., 1896. To these writers may be added Hugo Ehrensberger, *Libri Liturgici Bibliothecae Vaticanae,* Freib. im Breisg., 1897.

Gospels were to be found in the Lectionary. Sometimes the Epistles and Gospels were in separate volumes, known respectively as the *Epistolarium* and the *Evangcliarium.* As for the Rubrics and Ceremonial directions, these also existed apart in the *Ordo.* These various liturgical books have each their own history, of which we know little at present. From this it is clear that the tendency at that period was in the direction of the division of labour. At a Mass which is either Pontifical or Solemn Mass—High Mass as we should say nowadays—the different ministers are provided with their own special books. The Bishop or Priest has his Sacramentary, the Deacon and Sub-deacon have their Epistolary and Evangeliary, the Cantors have their Antiphonary. The Sacramentary alone must claim our attention here.

Between the years 784 and 791 an event took place that was to influence the whole history of the Missal. The Emperor Charlemagne, who had united under his sceptre the whole of France, together with a part of Germany and Italy, and who had restored the ancient Roman Empire in its Christian form, wrote to Pope Hadrian I, asking that Pontiff to send him the Sacramentary of the Roman Church, which his predecessor, St. Gregory the Great, had revised towards the end of the 6th century. This event was of capital importance for the history of the Missal, for it meant the spread of the Roman Rite throughout the greatest empire of that period, and its substitution in the place of the various local rites, Gallican, Ambrosian, Mozarabic, and Celtic, that had existed hitherto in the Emperor's dominions. This move on the part of Charlemagne need not astonish us, for his zeal for discipline and tradition, order and

unity in ecclesiastical matters, is well known. He had always shown, too, the greatest respect and reverence for the city of Rome, centre of the Christian world, and for the Pope its spiritual head. It may be added, however, that this tendency towards uniformity had already made its appearance before the time of Charlemagne, notably under the rule of Pippin. Charlemagne's work was moreover rendered easier by the fact that the various local rites to which I have referred had begun to lose much of their importance, and their liturgical books were in a state of confusion.

The Pope naturally welcomed this request on the part of the Emperor, and sent him the Roman Sacramentary that was attributed to St. Gregory the Great. Whether this Sacramentary had originally been drawn up by the Saint or not, it is nevertheless certain that during the period from after his death to the pontificate of Hadrian (604-772) certain additions had been made to the text.

It would seem that Charlemagne's plan for establishing liturgical uniformity in his empire was complete. He had received a book that embodied the norm of the Roman Rite; he was all-powerful in his dominions—even in ecclesiastical matters, with regard to which he had already published decrees with the support, or at least the tacit approval of the Church, as his capitularies show. But in history, it is usually the unexpected that happens. Charlemagne did not find the Roman Mass-book altogether to his liking; it seemed to him too simple and even incomplete. He therefore called upon one of the most learned and most pious men of that age, the celebrated Alcuin, to take in hand the work of enriching the Roman Sacramentary and

making it more acceptable to Gallic devotion. Alcuin seems to have accepted this commission with alacrity, and he carried it out with the care and intelligence that he showed in all his labours. He divided his work into two parts. Part I. contained the Sacramentary of Pope Hadrian, Part II. formed a kind of supplement which Alcuin drew up himself, and which consisted of various Masses, blessings and prayers that were wanting in Pope Hadrian's book. At the same time, Alcuin took care to point out to the reader the distinction between these two parts of his book by means of a prefatory note, placed between the Sacramentary and the Supplement. This note runs as follows:

"The foregoing Sacramentary up to this point is known to have been put forth by the blessed Pope Gregory, except those items which the reader will find marked at the beginning with a dagger, the Nativity and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, etc... But since there are other materials which Holy Church necessarily uses and which the aforesaid Father (Gregory), seeing that they had been already put forth by others, left aside, we have thought it worth while to gather them, like spring flowers of the meadows, and collect them together, and place them in this book apart, but corrected, amended and headed with their titles, so that the reader may find in this work all things which we have thought necessary for our times, although we had found a great many also embodied in other Sacramentaries. But for the purpose of separation we have placed this little preface in the middle, so that it may form the close of one book (Gregory's) and the beginning of the other (his own) ; to the intent that one book being before the preface, and the other

after it, everyone ma}7 know what was put forth by blessed Gregory and what by other Fathers ... let the reader be assured that we have inserted nothing but what has been written with great accuracy and care by men of excellent learning and the highest repute."1

It was this composite Sacramentary that was imposed by Charlemagne on the churches of his Empire. Curious to relate, it was this Sacramentary that, years after, found its way back to Rome and succeeded in ousting the original Roman Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great. Had I not reason to say at the beginning of this lecture: *Habent sua fata libellil* The Gregorian Sacramentary thus adapted by Alcuin and finally established in Rome itself has become the Roman Missal as we know it to-day, the book whose history I have described to you in its principal phases from the 9th century up *to* the reforms of St. Pius V, and from thence to the latest edition of 1921. It will then be of interest to us to examine more closely the work carried out by Alcuin, since the Church has herself set her seal upon it in accepting the book as her own official Mass-book. With regard to the Sacramentary of Hadrian itself, all that we can say here is that Alcuin's text is as pure as possible.2

As for the Supplement which he added to the Sacramentary, Alcuin was too much a man of tradition to attempt himself to compose prayers that were intended for the use of the Church in general, although he was

1 *Cf.* Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica Historica,* pp. 50-52, Oxford, 1918.

* It would be impossible in this place to treat in detail the many questions and problems connected with Hadrian's Sacramentary

quite capable of doing so from the literary point of view. He drew instead upon the treasures of the Liturgy that existed or had formerly existed in western countries. He borrowed much from the Sacramentary attributed to Pope Gelasius (492-496), which was widely known in Gaul at that time, and also from those books of the Gallican Liturgy that had not yet entirely fallen into desuetude.[1]

II.

Here then, we have the various elements of which our Roman Missal is made up. The principal part of the book is the work of that great Pope St. Gregory, one of the greatest and holiest in the long line of popes which extends from St. Peter to Pius XI, and among whom so many great and holy men are to be found. In spite of the many labours of his pontificate—a pontificate that stands out among all others in the annals of the Church—St. Gregory yet found time to occupy himself with liturgical matters. And in this department too, as in all others, we find evidence of his genius for organisation and simplification. He cut off all that was no longer necessary or useful, as, for example, the regulations concerning the Catechumens or the Penitents in Lent. He simplified ceremonies and shortened prayers, and brought greater unity and logical sequence into the liturgy of the Mass. Another great pope, Gelasius I, one of Gregory's predecessors, took a large part also in

[1] I am obliged to sum up very briefly a history that is, in reality, very complicated and even obscure, and which has only quite recently been brought out into the light by the labours of liturgical scholars. The work done by Edmund Bishop in thia connection can never be too highly praised, and his conclusions are beginning to be accepted by all liturgists and have been confirmed, for the most part, by later discoveries.

the building up of our Missal. The Gelasian Sacranientary, of which unfortunately we do not possess the original text, is a liturgical *chef d'oeuvre.* It is of the very highest importance for all desirous of entering upon the serious study of the Liturgy. No other document gives so clear an idea of the Roman Rite from the 6th to the gth century. The Gelasian Sacramentary, too, was the basis of St. Gregoiy'sreform. This latter inventednothing himself ; his work, as we have already seen, was one of modification, adaptation and simplification.

But our Missal contains elements even more ancient than those derived from the Gelasian Sacramentary. Another book of still earlier date has left its mark upon it. This is the Leonine Sacramentary, so called because it was believed to be the work of St. Leo I. Its author ship is however still a matter of dispute. But the author, whoever he may have been, was certainly a liturgist of the most extraordinary genius. Sometimes his prayers possess all the precision, dignity and sobriety of the true Roman spirit. Sometimes, on the contrary, they become veritable lyrics, highly mystical in character. The author, again, rises without effort to the sublimest form of prayer and then suddenly descends from the heights in order to rail against his enemies with a bitterness and acrimony that, to say the least, seem hardly in place in the prayers of the Mass.

Finally, we have the elements belonging to the Gallican Liturgy introduced by Alcuin into the Missal. We may be grateful to Alcuin for having preserved for us what would otherwise probably have entirely perished. The difficulty is to sort out these various elements of the Missal, so as to point out clearly what is Roman and what is Gallican. It is much to be desired that the

critics and the philologists should take up the work and provide us with a critical edition of the Missal in which these differences could be set forth clearly. We may recall, in this connection, the name of Edmund Bishop, who in his *Genius of the Roman Rite* was the first to point out the distinction between the Roman and the Gallican spirit in liturgical matters, and the evidence of this in our Missal to-day.

In conclusion, I think I may say that there are few books which, even from the philological and literary point of view alone, can equal the Roman Missal in interest. There are few that are of such importance for the history of the Liturgy. And as I am addressing an audience, the greater number of which belong to the Catholic Church, I may add that, after Holy Scripture, there is no other book so worthy of our veneration.

(2) The Holy Eucharist in the Liturgy.

Any one desirous of employing the inductive method might easily point out that in the dogma of the Holy Eucharist is contained practically the whole theology of the Incarnation and the Redemption. Or again, he might show how the whole of Catholic piety and devotion converges on this dogma and also springs forth from it. Is not this, in fact, what Mgr. Gerbet has striven to do in his *Dogme générateur de la -piété catholiqueD*

The same process might be employed with equal success from the liturgical point of view, and it would be seen that the whole of Christian worship takes its inspiration from the Eucharist, and that the whole Liturgy of the Church is, so to speak, concentrated in it. By keeping to a strictly liturgical method and relying only upon the evidence of the facts of history, we can show that the Holy Eucharist has always, from the very beginning, held the central place in the Christian Liturgy. This statement may cause surprise to some. It has been said that devotion to the Holy Eucharist has developed only since the 13th century. It was then that the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament was instituted, and we may remark the growing popularity, from that time onwards, of processions, expositions, and the service of Benediction. This is, however, a short-sighted view of history. External devotion to the Holy Eucharist has manifested itself outwardly in different

l *Considerations sur le Dogme générateur de la piété catholique,* Paris, 1852.

ways, no doubt—it has its own history. But this devotion itself has always existed; the members of the early Church showed no less faith, no less fervour, than the faithful of our own day. In reality the Holy Eucharist has always been the keystone of Catholic piety, and were it to lose its position, the whole edifice of Christianity would fall in ruins. It will be seen, in fact, that from the very earliest days of the Church the Eucharistic synaxis was already the centre of Christian worship. The Apostles and their first disciples still continued to go to the Temple at the hours of prayer, for the separation between the Old and New Covenants had not yet actually taken place. As Our Lord Himself says, the object of the New Covenant was not to destroy, but to perfect and complete the Old. The break between these two was to take place, only when it had become clear that the general mass of the Jewish people had definitely rejected Christianity, and Providence itself was to show, by the destruction of the Temple in the year 70, that nothing was to remain of the Temple, of its ceremonies, of its cult. Its sacrifices were to cease, its worship to come to an end. But even before that fatal day, the true Christian worship was not celebrated in the Temple. It took place, as the Acts of the Apostles tell us, in the houses of the Faithful, who met together there for the "Breaking of Bread" (Acts ii. 42, 46).

The meeting thus described in the Acts was nothing else than the Mass, the primitive Mass; the elements of which it was composed, are not, it must be admitted, very well known. But, as the old saying has it, *Nomina, Numina.* Great attention must be paid to the different terms employed at that time to describe the Holy

Eucharist. In the passage from the Acts which we quoted «above it is said of the disciples at Jerusalem, that "they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers (ii. 42) . . . and continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they took their meat with gladness and simplicity of heart" (46).

The words *Fractio Fanis,* used of the Eucharist in the primitive Church, are characteristic. We may remark the care taken by the Synoptics and by St. Paul to mention this breaking of bread whenever there is question of the Holy Eucharist, or even simply in the case of the multiplication of loaves.[1]

This "Breaking of Bread," understood in the full sense, means that the bread, after having been blessed, was broken in order to be distributed. Thus the words *Fractio Panis,* in many of the passages in which it occurs, means the consecration of the bread together with prayers of thanksgiving, and its distribution for the communion of the Faithful—in other words, the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The word "Eucharist," which is derived from the Greek word meaning to give thanks, is no less characteristic in its application to the Mass, which is the thanksgiving prayer *par excellence.*[2] The actu«al text of the primitive prayer of thanksgiving is unknown, but we may gather that it contained all the essential elements of the Holy Sacrifice.

[1] Matt. xiv. 19; xv. 36; Mark vi. 41; viii. 6, 19; Luke ix. 16; Matt. xxyi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; I Cor. xi. 24; x. 16; Luke xxiv. 30, 31. This question is treated in greater detail in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéol. chrét. eide Liturgie* under the word *Fraction.*

[2] See the texts quoted in the preceding note, and also the article *Eucharistie* in the same *Dictionnaire.*

It appears that the first disciples, when they met together to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, were accustomed to read portions of the Old Testament, letters received from any of the Apostles, and later on, the Gospels. Psalms and hymns were also chanted, and spiritual advice and exhortations were given by those who presided over the assembly. There was no necessary connection, however, between this service and the Holy Sacrifice, and it sometimes took place apart from the latter and formed in itself a complete *Synaxis.* It seems, nevertheless, to have been generally followed by the Holy Sacrifice, and in time it came to be regarded as an integral part of it. It is easy to see that even in the Mass as it is now there are two distinct rites existing side by side. First there is a preparatory service such as we have just described, and which came to be known as the "Mass of the Catechumens." This service ends at the Offertory, which forms the beginning of the Mass proper, called the "Mass of the Faithful." The first part of the Mass is not—at least in its earliest form—sacrificial. It is a service of instruction and prayer. Its object is to praise God in prayer and psalmody, and to instruct the Faithful in His law and to preach to them His Word. Catechumens, penitents and even heathens could assist at this service. In its general outline it corresponded to the Synagogue service of the Jews, in which lessons from Holy Scripture were read, psalms were chanted, prayers recited, and a sermon or homily was delivered. Since the earliest Christians were converts from Judaism, it has been conjectured with great probability that the Mass of the Catechumens was, in great part, derived from the Jewish service. As we have seen, this service of prayer

and instruction soon became an integral part of the Mass, and in all the churches of both East and West we find it composed of the same elements, whatever differences there may be in detail. Apart from rare occasions when the preliminary sendee was celebrated alone, forming the "aliturgical synaxis," as it is called, the Christian assembly *par excellence* consisted of the two synaxes together, now welded into one.[1] It was to celebrate this holy rite that the Faithful met together on Sundays and feasts, and what were called the "Station-days." Hence we see that even from the earliest times the Mass possessed what we may call a universal character, and formed practically the one and only Christian ceremony.

According to Acts ii. 46, already quoted, the Eucharistic Synaxis was celebrated every day in Jerusalem—*καθ' ημέραν, quotidie.* This shows that frequent and even daily communion is not so modern a practice as has been supposed. But when the Church began to spread abroad beyond the confines of Jerusalem, and when converts to the new Faith began to increase in numbers, it was no longer possible for the Faithful to meet together every day. The Sunday was therefore naturally marked out as a day for public worship, and from very early times—the 2nd century certainly, and perhaps even earlier—Wednesday and Friday were also

[1] With regard to the aliturgical synaxes, see the word *Aliturgiques (Jours),* and also the article *Fêtes* in the *D.A.C.L.* The Vigil-service, held on certain important occasions, and which continued during the greater part of the night, usually ended with the celebration of Mass in the early hours of the morning. The Mass of the Presanctified, while not a real Mass, since there is no consecration, and consequently no sacrifice, is not, strictly speaking, aliturgical, since it originally included the Communion of the Faithful and still does that of the Priest.

chosen for this purpose. The celebration of Mass on these two days gave to them a special festal character. Already the very idea of a feast-day implied of necessity the offering of the Holy Sacrifice.[1] In later times, the Liturgy—at least that of Rome—kept up this practice of the primitive Church. In the 6th and 7th centuries the "Stational Mass" was still a living custom. The faithful went in procession to one of the churches that had been chosen for the station, either St. Peter's St. Paul outside the walls, St. John Lateran, St. Mary Major, or St. Lawrence outside the walls, and there the Pope celebrated the Solemn or Stational Mass. A relic of this custom is still to be seen in the Missal, in the Masses of Advent and Lent, and certain other circumstances, for each of which a station at some one of the Roman Churches is assigned.

The universal character of the Holy Eucharist to which we have already referred, appears more strikingly still if we study it in its relation to the other sacraments. We might almost say that these latter are all, in a sense, already contained in it. Theologians tell us that the Holy Eucharist is *the* sacrament *par excellence*—the Blessed Sacrament, as it is called by all Catholics, it is the first of all the sacraments, because while the others give us grace, the Holy Eucharist gives us the Author of grace Himself. From the liturgical point of view, this supreme dignity is also evident.

Let us take the Sacrament of Baptism first. Baptism is of course a distinct sacrament: it can be administered apart from any other rite or ceremony. We have an early example of this in the case of the eunuch of Candace,

[1] See the article *Fêtes* in the *D.A.C.L.*

Queen of Ethiopia, who was baptised by the Deacon Philip in a stream, while on a journey and without solemnity (Acts viii. 27-39).

Nevertheless, we find that Baptism was at a very early date attached to the Holy Sacrifice. It was during the vigils of Easter and Pentecost that this sacrament was usually administered. Now if we study these two vigil-services closely, we shall sec that they form one logical whole, in which the administration of Baptism and the offering of the Holy Sacrifice are so closely united as to seem to be one single rite. The prophecies (twelve on Easter, six on Whitsun Eve), the collects, and the tracts sung at intervals, are all chosen with reference to the Catechumens who are about to receive the sacrament of Baptism. The blessing of the font is its immediate preparation, and the Litany, which is in reality the beginning of the Mass, is sung while the Catechumens are actually being baptised. The Mass itself, both of Holy Saturday and of the Vigil of Pentecost, is before all else the Mass of the newly baptised. This is clearly shown in the w'ords of the Canon: *Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae, quam tibi offerimus pro his quoque quos regenerare dignatus es ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto,* etc. The whole of Low week, and, in a lesser degree, the Octave of Pentecost, is consecrated to the neophytes. And in Lent the greater number of the Masses of that season are specially concerned with those who are preparing for the reception of Baptism. It will be enough to refer here to the most striking examples, for instance, the Masses of the Third Sunday in Lent, the Monday and Friday in the third week, the Fourth Sunday, and Wednesday and Friday in the fourth week.

In connection with the Catechumens and the Sacrament of Baptism, we may mention the public penitents and the Sacrament of Penance. Like the Catechumens, the Penitents were only present at the first part of the Mass—up to the Offertory—and they were dismissed with them before the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful. The Lenten Masses have their teaching for the Penitents as well as for the Catechumens. The Mass of Ash Wednesday was originally entirely concerned with the penitents. The Masses, again, of Monday and Friday of the first week of Lent, of Thursday in the second week, Monday and Saturday of the third week, and Thursday and Friday in the fourth week, are also examples of this. The penitents were re-admitted to the Mass of the Faithful on Maundy Thursday. As in Baptism so in Penance, all is done in connection with the Holy Eucharist.

The Sacrament of Holy Orders, like Baptism and indeed all the other sacraments, is in itself quite distinct from the Holy Eucharist. It can be and has actually been administered apart from the latter, and apparently accompanied by no other rite than that of the laying on of hands. The Canons of Hippolytus give us an example of this, and the Apostolic Constitutions also. But in accordance with a very ancient custom which has now become the general law, ordinations always take place during Mass.[1]

After all, are not bishops, priests and all other grades of the sacred ministry destined before all else for the service of the altar? In early times, ordinations usually

[1] The Tonsure, which is only the preparation for receiving Orders, and the Minor Orders alone may be conferred apart from Mass, according to the actual discipline of the Church.

took place during the Solemn Mass of each Ember Saturday, especially that of December. In fact it seems dear that the rites of ordination were considered as finding their full significance only in and through the Holy Sacrifice.

It would be impossible to attempt here to discuss the Sacrament of Matrimony in relation to the Mass, nor certain sacramental rites as they may be called, such as the monastic profession ceremony, the consecration of virgins, the blessing of abbots and abbesses, the anointing of kings, the dedication of churches, the blessing of candles, of ashes and of palms, and finally the ritual for the dead—all of which are closely united with the Holy Sacrifice.[1]

But besides the sacraments and kindred ceremonies, there is another and most important element of Christian worship, of which we must speak in connection with the Mass, the Divine Office. The Divine Office, as it is constituted nowadays, and has been constituted for some centuries past, finds too its centre and its *raison d'être* in the Mass. And this is not astonishing, for what after all is the Holy Eucharist, as its very name indicates, but the great thanksgiving prayer of the Church? The Mass is the holiest, the most sublime, and the most complete form of prayer. The Divine Office, and, in fact, prayer in all its forms, has no perfection, no efficacy except in Christ and through Christ. In the

[1] At first sight, the sacrament of Extreme Unction and the rites of Exorcism would seem to be exceptions. But it must be remembered that the ritual for the sick is in reality closely connected with the Holy Eucharist. As to the Exorcisms, the most important of these form a part of the ritual of Baptism, which, as we have already seen, was administered in early times during Mass.

Divine Office the Collect of the day concludes practically always, *per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.* But if Jesus Christ is the great High Priest who offers our prayers to His Father, it is especially at the Holy Sacrifice that He exercises this office, for there He offers not only our prayers, but Himself also, as the Victim of the Covenant Sacrifice of the New Law, in Whose Blood our sins are washed away. It is the act of sacrifice that gives its efficacy to prayer. At the end of the Canon of the Mass occurs a doxology which, from its place in the Holy Sacrifice and from the solemnity of the ritual that accompanies it, deserves to rank as the queen of all our doxologies. It sums up too, in a few lines, all that we have tried so far to express. The priest, taking the Sacred Host in his hands, traces the sign of the Cross with it five times over the chalice and between the chalice and himself, saying: *Per ipsum et cum ipso et in ipso est tibi Deo Patri Omnipotenti in unitate Spiritus Sancti omnis honor et gloria per omnia saecula saeculorum, Amen.* While pronouncing the words *Omnis honor et gloria,* the priest elevates both Host and Chalice together. This, now called the Little Elevation, was up to the nth century the principal elevation in the Mass, and was then probably carried out with greater solemnity. Before St. Gregory the Great's time it formed the real conclusion of the canon.[1]

Besides this, we find in the Mass examples of all the different forms of liturgical prayer. The chief forms are the "Litany," in which the people reply to the invocations made by the cantors by means of short acclamations; the "Collect," which is a prayer said

[1] See the article *Elévation* in the *D.A .C.L.*

by the priest in the name of all present, and to which they assent by their "Amen"; the "Eucharistic prayer" which is usually known as the "Preface," and which is a solemn prayer of thanksgiving. It is in the Mass that these different forms of prayer find their most natural place, since, in fact, it is to the Mass that they owe their origin. We find too in the Mass other elements that occur in the Divine Office, psalms, responsories, antiphons, lessons from the Old and New Testaments, and acclamations such as *Amen, Alleluia, Kyrie eleison,* etc. Hence in all cathedrals, monasteries and collegiate churches where the Divine Office is solemnly celebrated, the Chapter or Conventual Mass—the "Solemn Mass" of the chapter or community—forms the centre and, as it were, the final object of the canonical hours of both night and day.[1]

Even for those who, while belonging neither to cathedral or collegiate chapter nor to any monastic body, are yet bound to the obligation of the Divine Office, the Mass forms the rallying point of their devotion, if one may employ such a term. The connection between Mass and Office appears even in extra choral recitation of the latter, for there is in principle strict accordance between the Mass and the Office of the day. The same Collect is recited at both, and the portion of the Gospel read at Matins is taken from that of the Mass. Besides, the idea of a feast is inconceivable without the Mass—the two ideas are interdependent. There is no feast without its Mass, and it is in the

[1] It will perhaps be objected to tliis that in the old monasteries Mass was not celebrated regularly every day; but this was due, partly to the fact that the Divine Office had not yet fully established its position as the official prayer of the Church, partly to the scarcity of priests in monastic communities.

prayers of this Mass that we must seek for the true meaning and significance of the feast.

These few considerations from the liturgical point of view, which I have been obliged to set forth only very briefly, seem to open out vistas to both reflection and devotion, and to show us how all the mysteries of our faith are summed up in the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. They show us too that no one worthy of the name of Christian can remain indifferent to this great centre of attraction.

In the Canon of the Mass, before the Consecration, we find these words: *Ecclesia, tua sancta catholica, quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum . . . hanc oblationem cunctae familiae tuae..* . and again, before the Communion . . . *eamque {ecclesiam) secundum voluntatem tuam pacificare et coadunare digneris.* These words are, under another form, the expression of a thought which we find in what is perhaps the most ancient form of eucharistie prayer that has come down to us from antiquity: "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together, became one, so let thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom, for thine is the glory and the power, through Jesus Christ for ever, Amen. . . . Gather together thy Church from the four winds, sanctify her for thy kingdom which thou didst prepare for her; for thine is the power and the glory for ever."[1] Traces of this prayer are found in the early liturgies, and St. Augustine, as usual the faithful interpreter of tradition, teaches that just as the

[1] *Didache,* IX. 4; X. 5 (transi. Schafi, *The Oldest Church Manual,* pp. 192,196, Edinburgh, 1885); *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 17, etc.

grains of wheat are joined together to make one loaf, so are we joined together to make one whole with Christ. Just as the many grapes are pressed into wine, so the Faithful are united in communion in Christ.[1]

One of the lecturers of this Summer School whom you will have the pleasure of hearing has recently brought out a magnificent work on the Holy Eucharist under the title *Mysterium Fidei*—words that occur in parenthesis in the Canon of the Mass, but which sum up so wonderfully its whole character. This writer might equally well have entitled his book, *Mysterium Caritatis,* words entirely applicable to this great Sacrament, perfect symbol and perfect realisation alike upon earth of the love of Christ for mankind, perfect symbol and realisation on earth of the love of men for one another in Christ. *Mysterium Caritatis*—such is the lesson we should draw from the study of the Holy Eucharist.

1 Sermons 272, 229, 227; *in Joann.* XXVI.

VIII.

RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

By the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Canon Freeland, V.G.

(i) The Early Christian Period.

A wonderful familiarity in relation to the Blessed Sacrament, and that on the part of the laity, is observable during the first six centuries of the history of the Church, a period which, according to a great many, is regarded as being that of primitive or early Christianity. The Holy Eucharist is kept in the houses of priests, in the homes of the faithful. It is sent from the Church to the absent after the celebration of the Divine Mysteries, and is taken by the communicant to relatives, friends and neighbours. Under the name of *Fermentum* it is awaited, at least in Rome, on its journey from the Papal Mass, by a bishop or priest who is offering the solemn sacrifice in some other quarter of the city. It is given by a consecrating bishop to the newly consecrated, and for forty days afterwards is used by the latter at his Mass. Hermits in the wilderness, and, towards the close of the period, communities of monks, keep it with them, and by them, and religious women not only have it in their settlements and under their custody, but administer it to themselves. It goes on a journey, not merely solemnly when sent by bishop to bishop, but almost secretly, suspended to the necks of laymen at

sea. It blesses the eyes of the living, and it is placed between the lips of the dead.

It is not to our purpose either to praise or to blame any one of these customs. We simply record them; and we record them not as something exceptional, as something which, happening with the rarity associated with events narrated in a legend, offers no testimony of a general spirit or attitude, but, on the contrary, the incidents mentioned arc usual and ordinary, and lead us to suppose that the Christian of those days would have been surprised had any follower of Christ acted in a different manner.

The kind of Reservation which this familiarity with the Holy Eucharist alluded to presupposes, and the doctrinal view which lies at the basis of this most reverential "making free," need not just at the present detain us. We are concerned with the question of Reservation of the adorable Sacrament of the Altar in the church itself, called at all times the House of God and, in modern times very often, though not generally, the Home of the Blessed Sacrament.

There seems now no disposition anywhere to deny that the Holy Eucharist was reserved in Christian places of public worship from the beginning. The very name of its dwelling place, the *Pastophorium,* was taken over from the house or home which had served in the capacity of a church before the religion of Christ had buildings specially dedicated to ecclesiastical use. Either there, or in the wall itself of the sacred building behind the Altar, the Blessed Sacrament was reserved, unapproached and, except by the ministers of the Church not lower in order than an acolyte, unapproachable. In loneliness, and surrounded by a solemn silence, the abiding presence

of Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word, dwelt on among men, the only accompaniments demonstrative at all of worship of a more manifest nature being the lamp which burnt before, and the simple curtain drawn carefully across, the *Area.* In the *Pastophorium,* or *Diaconicum,* or *Sacrarium,* the Old Testament, and a little later on the Four Gospels, were kept with the Reserved Eucharist, and the same may be said of another *Armorium* or *Area* for the Blessed Sacrament behind the Altar in what we may call the East wall, but which was, likely enough, the West.[1]

It is impossible for us to judge adequately of the intensity and of the solemnity of the worship which the early Church and its members associated with this action of placing their Lord in concealment unless we endeavour, and to some extent succeed in the endeavour, to obtain an early Christian mind, with regard to the Abiding Presences first of God, and then of Jesus Christ, the *Verbum Incarnatum,* God manifest in the Flesh.

Very frequent mention is made in a host of writers of the influence which both the Greek and the barbarian mind have exercised upon the mentality of the Christian. This may be true; but, whether true or not, we are not concerned with the question excepting inasmuch as it prompts us to express our surprise that so few have endeavoured to point out a mind which has, and that

[1] *Apostolical Constitutions,* Bk. 8, c. 13: "When all have received Communion the deacons are to take away what remains and bear it to the Pastophoria." The same Constitutions order two of these Pastophoria "looking towards the East," to be built in the church. There are many things which would render *Orientation* as the rule at least doubtful before the fourth century.

quite properly and in the very nature of things, influenced the Christian way of regarding religious ideas to so enormous an extent as to make us reflect that mind almost at every turn we take. This is the Jewish.

The truth of this assertion will, of course, be at once conceded when it is remembered that the Old Testament was taken over by Christianity as a sacred object. Taken over, that is, not as an antique, not as a curious specimen of what men held years ago, but as a Divine Witness to Christ and the Faith He taught, inalienable by us, inseparable from us to that extent that Christianity ceases to be a *fulfilment* without it, and it ceases to be a Divine Witness without Christianity. Even more than this, Jewish thought, either directly or indirectly formed by Rabbinic interpretation of the ancient Scriptures, and even the names by which many religious beliefs were expressed in Israel two thousand years ago, exercised such an influence on Christian ideas and Christian phraseology that the only short way of describing the difference between the two *minds,* a difference which was quite fundamental, is by saying that Jesus Christ our Lord made all the difference.

Now, the fact of the abiding presence of Jehovah in the midst of His people is abundantly clear from certain passages of the Old Law; at least the Rabbinical interpretation of that Book shows absolutely no doubt as to what these passages mean. God did dwell in a house made with hands. He takes up His residence with His wandering people in the desert. The name of his place of residence was called the Abode, *Mishkan.* He solemnly made His entry into the Temple which Solomon erected, and dwelt between the wings of the

Cherubim under circumstances similar in the main to those under which He had dwelt in the wilderness. If He was not in the second Temple, nor in the third, the negation implied an assertion at the same time; for although the Abiding Presence, the Sheckinah, had departed at the destruction of the "First House/' and had never made a solemn entrance either into the second or the third, yet it was believed that in both of these latter houses there *was* an Abiding Presence, the distinction being only a mental one. The Sheckinah, God dwelling with man, was in each Synagogue, in the place which, answering in position to where the Ark of the Covenant was originally kept in the Temple, formed a receptacle for the Torah or Law. He dwelt over ten just men; over three; over one when studying the Scriptures; and under the name of the Holy Ghost He dwelt with any one who had a true prophecy to make.[1]

Nor were these ideas conceived of as having a connection only with religion as it was at that time practised by the Jewish people. They were to be referred also to the World to come, the reign, that is, of the Messiah, whose days, according to the Talmud, the prophets made it their sole business to foretell and to describe. Indeed, one of the rewards of the righteous in the world to come was that of enjoying the *Food of the Sheckinah.*

The early Christian both fostered these ideas and felt that the application of them all to Jesus the Christ was

1 These views concerning the Sheckinah will be found scattered up and down the Babylonian Talmud. They are all gathered together, with so much besides that is valuable to a Christian studying the Talmud, in Hershon's (Hebrew) *Pentateuch according to the Talmud.*

inevitable and overpowcringly compelling. Indeed, our Blessed Lord speaks of His abiding Presence in terms very similar to those used by the Rabbis in relation to the abiding Presences of Jehovah. The proof of this assertion is contained in the gospels, and particularly in the Gospel according to St. John. No Gospel, so much as this one, ascribes to and predicates of Our Lord all and everything which the Talmudists ascribe to and predicate of Jehovah, and *Eternal existence, Life, Light, Holy Spirit, Food of the righteous, Abiding Presences among men* form only a part of that all. We are, however, only concerned with the Presences of Christ, and here is one asserted by our Lord in almost the very words which the Jews employed in relation to Jehovah. "Where two or three of you are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of you."[1] Here is another: "If any man love Me, I will come to him, and the Father will come to him, and We will make our abode with him." Just reflect on the Talmudic assertion that Jehovah, the Sheckinah that is, dwells with one man meditating on the Law. Just compare the expression of Christ, "I and the Father are one," with the expressions of the Talmudists that the Word, the Sheckinah, the Holy Ghost and Jehovah are one and the same. And then there is the Food of the Sheckinah. Is it possible not to be reminded at once of the remarkable sixth Chapter of this Evangelist? The *Food* was the *Vetbum Incarnatum,* "the Word made Flesh."

That there was to be an abiding presence of Christ, both the words of our Lord Himself had led them to believe and their own expectations with regard to the Messiah to hold. And while they felt most undoubtedly

1 Matt, xviii. 20.

that the Presence of their Master with each one who followed closely in His footsteps was "about their path and about their bed," they also felt, none the less undoubtedly, that the special presence connected with Him, so to speak, as the Incarnate Word under the Eucharistic forms, found a place in the church itself. Naturally, to their mind, that place was where the *written* Word of God was kept or in its vicinity. It was a part of their nature to believe that the Sheckinah, if not attached to the Torah, the written Word, resided where that written Word of God was solemnly deposited; and, when the Gospels had been granted both the dignity as well as the status of the *Verbum Verbi,* the Word of the Word, they assumed that relationship to the Sheckinah or the Abiding Presence of our Lord which had already, through the ages, existed between the Torah and the Sheckinah both in the Synagogue and the Temple.[1]

The Blessed Sacrament was, then, regarded as the Abiding Presence of the New Law. It was different from the other Presences of Christ in the same way as the Jews, from whom these first Christians had come forth, considered that the Sheckinah in the Temple and the Synagogue differed from those other Presences of Jehovah which were none the less actual, though much less definable. Christ in the church dwelt in great

[1] "It may be safely assumed that the Ark constituted from the first an integral part of the Synagogue edifice. The Synagogue was considered a Sanctuary next to the Temple, and the Ark as corresponding to the third division of the Temple, the Holy of Holies" *(Jewish Encyc., art.* "Ark of the Law"). "The perpetual lamp is usually hung in front of it (the Ark)." "Whenever the Ark is opened the congregation rises in reverence for the Torah' it holds, and when it is empty. ... a burning candle is placed in it" *(ibid.).*

majesty and awe in die *Pastophorium,* the *Diaconicum,* the *Sacrarium* as Jehovah in great awe and majesty had dwelt between the wings of the Cherubim in the first Temple, and as, in spile of Rabbinical teaching, He was regarded as dwelling behind the curtains in the last. Much more truly, because more completely, did Our Lord dwell. For whereas in the Synagogue all that could be asserted was that in some unaccountable manner God was present indissolubly associated with the Torah, in the Christian Church, in the Blessed Sacrament, the Word *made Flesh* was dwelling among us.[1]

Simple though this form of reservation seems to us to be, there can be no doubt that it had assumed this form because it was conceived as being in accordance with the wishes of our Lord. Whoever had heard of an abiding presence which was not *secluded* in the sacred building, and which did not dwell dissociated from the frequented parts of the *Domus Dei* in solemn awe and majesty, alone? Was anything wanting in the deep reverence which the people of Israel felt towards the

1 In order to make the foregoing argument quite clear it should be observed that:

(a) I have not stopped to *prove* that the Blessed Sacrament was reserved in the Early ages, because I regard it as acknowledged, both by friend and foe of the doctrine of the Real Presence. Indeed, the evidence from archaeology, from allusion, and from written testimony is overwhelming.

(b) Nor have I tried to *prove* that the early Christians believed that the Blessed Sacrament is our Blessed Lord objectively, really, and indeed. The Fathers, both Greek and Latin, as well as the early Church historians, make it abundantly clear, so as to admit of no doubt, that such was the belief of ancient Christianity.

(c) *My* argument is really an answer to the following question: How do you account for the fact that the early Christians reserved the Blessed Sacrament in silence, in seclusion?

Presence of the Lord of Hosts abiding in the Holy of Holies? Nevertheless, only once a year, and by one person only, and that the most sacred person in the land, did any one draw aside the curtain and enter. God had expressed a wish that it should be so and, more than this, He had given a command that such should be the circumstances surrounding His dwelling among men. Could anything, then, be said to be wanting in deep reverence, wanting in adoration, wanting in belief towards the Blessed Sacrament, and the abiding presence of the Word made Flesh because, both from Scripture and because of their own natural ideas on such matters, they concluded that the Divine *Way* was, when dwelling among men, to do so in solemn loneliness and seclusion? What irreverence was there in placing Him in the same *theca* or *armarium* or *area* with the codices of the Gospel, the Word of God, when in His pre-earthly existence, anterior to His becoming man, He had dwelt in the first Temple, and in the last as well, and in every Synagogue since the time of Esdras, in the closest proximity with the same word of God, though not, of course, the Gospels?

But they never prayed to it, it will be said; they did not "visit" it. It is difficult indeed to see how such an assertion can be proved, although it will be acknowledged at once that it is not at all easy, in case there were any need to do so, and this there is not, to prove that the assertion is groundless. Visiting the Blessed Sacrament is a private devotion, and our Lord in His abiding presence is a direct object of private prayer. But who can say, excepting the individual engaged in prayer, who the objective of his pious and private aspirations may be? Of course, posterity will be able to

prove conclusively who and what are the objects of our own private devotion at the present time; and, if it amounts to the proportions of a discussion, will be able to point to an abundance of prayer manuals and to pious literature written expressly for the purpose of guiding the devout soul in communing either with the Blessed Sacrament, or with other sacred objects both divine and saintly. But such testimony docs not exist either with regard to the early or to the middle ages.

But even were we to admit, and we are very far from admitting it, that the Christian of those remote times neither prayed to nor formally visited the Blessed Sacrament, what are we to conclude? What does it prove? Simply this, that their ideas of worship on some occasions were different from our own. We have almost lost the solemn attitude of silence and the profound awe manifested by the absence of words, in both public and private devotion, which were such remarkable features in the worship of other days, early Christian or mediaeval. We find it most difficult to understand so rudimentary a piece of information with regard to adoration as that contained in the well-known lines of Faber, "Only to *sit and think* of God, Oh! what a joy it is!" I do not know that I attach any blame to ourselves for this. We have our own most excellent ways. But, on the other hand, it is surely not only wrong, but senseless, to suspect the Faith or to question the adoration in the matter of the Blessed Sacrament of those who, probably, though very far from certainly, treated the Abiding Presence of Christ in the church with the worship of silence. "There was silence in Heaven for half an hour," St. John tells us; a sentence which strikes, with its beauty, the meditative person so

much, that he has to close his eyes and enjoy the sight of angels and saints motionless, spell-bound and lip-bound, because their heart's love is so full that they cannot, and their sense of the Majesty of God is so great that they may not utter so much as a single, simple syllable !

Before passing on to the practices of the Middle Ages with regard to Reservation, we ought not to allow those points to pass unnoticed which private reservation on the part of the laity certainly sets forth and makes manifest. The Laity evidently felt that Christ was their Life, their Light, and their Protection in the most Holy Eucharist. The very passage in St. Cyril of Alexandria in which he asserts, for the benefit of the monks of the desert, that the power of consecration is a lasting and abiding power over the consecrated elements, is an indirect proof that the monks desired and practised daily Communion.[1] Both these, as well as the laity properly so called, took much more to heart than we do at the present time, the words of our Lord, "Without Me ye cannot do anything"; and they realised, again much more than later ages, that the *Me* could only refer to His Eucharistic Presence. Life here, and Immortality hereafter, are the predominating notes in the famous expressions of St. Irenaeus on reception of the Blessed Sacrament,[2] and the idea moved so mightily in

[1] "I am informed that they say the Mystical Blessing has not the power of consecration («is αγιασμόν *άπρακτεΐν)* if any of it remain over for another day. They who make such an assertion are out of their minds; for Christ does not change, nor does His Holy Body depart, but the power of the Blessing and the life-giving grace is permanent in the same" (S. Cyril. Alex. *Contra Anthropom).*

[2] Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses,* Bk. 4, par. 251 and Bk. 5, par. 294 (Migne).

the mind of Ongen and of St. Augustine that they appear to maintain that even little children are not exempted from a strict obligation of receiving It.[1] The "making free" with the Eucharist, in its Reservation other than that in the church, was not of their choosing. They were impelled to it by what they believed of Christ and by what they believed of His real and objective Presence in this wonderful Mystery. Was He not the Light of the world, was He not the Living and consuming Fire? How frequently they moved Him, *the* Light, to their eyes, the most precious and the dearest of earthly things they possessed connected with this which we call light around us! How often St. Chrysostom talks of the Blessed Sacrament as the Fire, and the consuming fire; and how St. Ephrem the Syrian emphasises it as the burning coal, and points out that the fire taken from the Altar, mentioned by the Prophet Isaias, was a type of it.[2] It was their Lord, their God—"Our God is a consuming fire." They could not live without Him who in this Sacrament, like fire in nature, changes the self of the recipient into Himself; and they felt they must be most intimate with Him who, like the "burning Light" He is, refines all He touches, and purifies all He envelopes and permeates. It was their Rock of defence and a very refuge in the day of trouble; a defence which

[1] In connection with this matter, however, see *Cone. Trident,* Sess. 5, Can. 4; where an admonition is given against believing that some of the Fathers, though holding these views, held that the obligation was *de necessitate salutis.*

[2] S. Ephrem (ed. Lamy), Tom. 1, p. 419. Also St. John Damas., *De fide Orthodoxa,* Bk. 4, C. 13 (Migne): "Approaching with ardent desire let us receive the burning coal." The Syrians call the Blessed Sacrament the Burning Coal to this day. See note to St. Ephrem, *op. cit.,* p. 419.

protected itself, like the God it was, only when it cared, but which was a sure and continual protection to all those that trusted in it. A coal, dull and dead, St. Cyprian tells us, was what the Eucharistic Lord left in His place in a private *area* when threatened by impious hands. He cared then to defend Himself. In an angry sea, St. Ambrose tells us, his own brother once struggled with the waves, trusting only in the Lord Whom, in sacramental form, he was bearing with him as his sure defender, and uninjured, with that Lord he reached the shore. To this narration the early Christian would add the words, *More Suo.* The *Dominus Deus Noster* of the Blessed Sacrament *never* failed those who trusted in Him.

From what I have already said it must surely be gathered that I am not inclined to hold the commonly received view that Reservation in the Church was a practice simply and solely for the more convenient administration of Holy Communion to the sick. Neither the authorities nor the sick themselves turned their thoughts to the *Pastophorium* as the proper place from which cases of infirmity which needed our Lord were to be met. Such demands, as also the demand of the absent, were either satisfied Sunday by Sunday by means of deacon or acolyte direct from the celebration of the Mass, or by a priest who reserved the Blessed Sacrament in his house, or by the friendly services of some Christian friend, who bore it away in his *Area* taken with him when he approached the Altar for his own Communion, and replenished by the celebrant. No: not for the sick primarily, but for Sheckinistic purposes did Reservation in the sacred building take place; and, if any uses whatsoever were made of the

August Majesty of the *Verbum Incarnatum* in His home on earth, those uses were in the main liturgical. The Reserved Eucharist was brought to the Altar for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy.[1]

[1] On sending the Reserved Eucharist to the absent see Justin Ap. i, 67. Also Alart. Rom., S. Tharsicius Acolythus.

The following story from Eusebius presents us with a "sick call" in the 3rd century, one of the things to be noticed being that the Holy Eucharist is kept at the Priest's house: "Sarapion became so ill as to be speechless and senseless for three days, but getting a little better on the fourth day he called for his grandson and said to him, 'I do ask you to hasten and call me one of the priests.' The lad ran for the priest, but he was ill, and it was night time. He was not able to come, but he gave a small portion of the Eucharist to the boy, telling him to moisten it with water and put it into the mouth of the old man." Eusebius, H. E., Ek. VI. C. 45.

(2) The Mediaeval Period.

This custom of taking the Blessed Sacrament from the *Pastophorium* for liturgical purposes, and of suspending the *Turris* or small receptacle made of ivory, and later of metal, containing it, from the the roof of the Baldichino or *Ciborium,* was doubtless the action which suggested the selection of another place, as well as the *Armorium* in the curtained wall, as an abode for the Reserved Eucharist. Certain it is that *over the High Altar,* in very many churches, and that for centuries, was the place where God's Glory dwelt; although in some districts the ancient custom held its own, while in very many, perhaps in the majority, the two uses went on, side by sjde, in the same church.

The idea fostered and made manifest by the mediaeval Christian with regard to the Reserved Eucharist, at least in so far as its place of Abode was over the Altar, was Sheckinistic. Nevertheless, although, as we shall see, it was in accordance with the writings of St. John, as was the view of antiquity in the matter, this, the idea of the middle ages, was suggested also by the unsettled state of the times themselves down from the seventh to the fifteenth centuries. Our Lord God, to use the very favourite name of Mediaeval Christianity for our Lord, dwelt in a Tent *(tabernaculum),* in the midst of peoples who, in their mode of life, were very like pilgrims and wanderers; who in peace passed their days mostly in the open, and in war time, which seemed to be always, were familiar with the sight of the tents

of the warriors, eminent among which was that of the Leader and King. The small *pyxis* or *turris?*[1] which holds the Most Adorable Sacrament is now (in the middle ages) called, The Tent. Like a tent it is draped. Sometimes, when the curtains which reach from column to column of the baldichino arc withdrawn, the hangings of the Tabernaculum are so looped as to form a wide opening, making its similarity with the Pavilion, or dwelling place of the king when on a journey, or when engaged in battle, very striking. From the dais or canopy of the *Tabernaculum,* which itself is suspended from the roof of the *Ciborium* or Baldichino, hangs the *Turris,* the Tower, another word for Royal Residence; a very simple sight, but a sight to the mediaeval eye most pleasing and consoling, being, as it was, a part fulfilment of the prophecy, "Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty, and the land which is very far off."

The word *Tabernaculum* as applied to the name of the Residence of the Abiding Presence is distinctly mediaeval. Not that the word itself is what some writers call by the name of Ecclesiastical Latin, for *tabernaculum,* with the express and definite signification of *tent,* is as old as Plautus, and, therefore, quite respectable from a classic point of view. But we find only the shadow of a trace

1 These "Eucharistic Towers" are very ancient. Rohault is of opinion that, in the shape and size in which two or three of the *mediaeval Turres* have survived (one of these is in the present writer's possession) they date from the fourth century. I am of opinion that in size and shape (they are comparatively very small) they are the same as the *private area* used by monks and laity in the earliest times, and that this was called a Tower after, and was a small copy of, the *Armarium* in which in the church the Blessed Sacrament was reserved. In the Babylonian Talmud *(Oheloth,* c. 4) the word *Migdal* (Tower) is used to express an *Armorium,* and in two sketches of it given there it is very like the Christian Eucharistic Tower.

in early Christianity of its application to, and connection with, the Reserved Eucharist. The use of the word as it is upon our lips to-day has a most distinctly mediaeval origin, not, indeed because in those days the word itself was so much favoured as *pyxis* or *turris,* but because the thing itself which formed the Residence of the King of Kings on earth *was* a tent, and, as a tent, impressed both the eye and the imagination.

As I have said, a somewhat new idea, though a very true one, for truth is many-sided, had arisen with regard to the Abiding Presence of Christ in the sacred building. Certainly, and in every way, the ancient view that the *Verbum Incarnatum* was the August Resident of the Holy of Holies was kept in mind. No less certainly the words of the Apocalypse, "Behold the Tabernacle of God with men, and He shall dwell with them," were treasured words, and of so great influence that the shape of the Dwelling of the great Resident had become, almost universally in the West, that of the *Tabernaculum.* But their mind reverted far more to the *Mishkan* in which the Lord of Hosts dwelt among the people of Israel in the wilderness than, as was the case with the early ages, to the Presence behind the veil in the Temple. To them the Blessed Sacrament Reserved, "coming down," and residing over the Altar, was the "Lord God, in the midst of Camp." The strife without and the *militia vitae,* of which Job speaks, within, forming, as it were, a part of the very times, led them naturally to desire and to believe that, while the Church was the "city of peace" it was also the "City of the Great King," Who dwelt there in *Tentorio,* the Arbiter and the Disposer of all things, and who, if He were but to issue forth, might lead an army to victory in war

and with His mighty blessing might give abundance to the land in peace. The Blessed Sacrament was taken out to battle; processions of the Blessed Sacrament are read of even before the institution of the Feast of *Corpus Christi.*[1]

By no means, however, was the new idea exhausted or completely fulfilled in what we have so far endeavoured to describe it as being. The Presence abiding with man in the Reserved Eucharist became to them that of the great Pilgrim, the Divine Wanderer. Their intense realisation of the fact that the existence of man here below is that of a *Peregrinatio,* a journey in a far country away from our Father's house, and the feeling of an extreme need of getting all the Divine Comfort they could command, made them see in the Blessed Sacrament, dwelling in Tents, the Supreme Companion of those whose misfortune it was to have to be wayfarers themselves in the "tents of Kedar." The Reserved Eucharist was the Viaticum, the Wayfaring Friend, of *all* in this vale of tears, even as the Eucharistic Food, the same divine and Blessed Companion, was the Viaticum to the individual through the valley of the shadow of death.

Nevertheless, though the great truth behind the practice of reservation, while presenting some of the features of the early ages, offers another side of itself to Christians a thousand years later, old customs and ancient names in connection with reservation still held on. The niche in the wall of the church with its Divine Occupant continues to exist almost as tenaciously and quite as long as the hanging tabernacle, and the little

[1] In such Processions, however, the Blessed Sacrament was not exposed. See Raible, *Der Tabernakel einst und jetzt,* p. 158.

vessel containing the Blessed Sacrament is called, more generally than it is called anything else, by the venerable name of *Turris,* Tower. Considering that the ancient *Turris* was made of ivory, and keeping in mind the profound belief held with regard to the divine Person who resided in the *Turris eburnea,* it seems almost certain that mediaeval thoughts on the Blessed Sacrament are responsible for giving to the first Home of the Word Incarnate, our Blessed Lady, the title of Tower of Ivory, with which we sometimes still salute Her. Even when the Reserved Eucharist was placed in the mural recess the sacred vessel which contained it was the *Turris* still, although in such circumstances it was very often mentioned as *Sepulchrum* or Sepulchre, because, as we are told by an old authority, the Tomb in which at the Crucifixion the Body of Christ was deposited had the form of a tower.[1] Many of these wall Tabernacles, as they are called, still exist, some of them bearing upon themselves the sad marks of time and of sacrilege, while others, although now unused after so many centuries, are as beautiful to-day as they were when first adorned with all the reverence which devotion could command and all the loveliness which art could offer. I am of opinion that in most conventual establishments for religious women and in the private chapels of at least great ecclesiastics, the mode of Reservation

[1] It seems to me certain that the so-called Easter Sepulchre is simply a survival of, though not necessarily the same thing as, the Wall Tabernacle; and that the liturgical processions to it on Maundy Thursday and from it on Good Friday were, in the late Middle Ages, and are to-day, the only occasions on which is carried out the very ancient custom of taking to and from the *Pastophorium* the Reserved Eucharist at the end of one mass and at the commencement of the next. See also Gregory of Tours, *Mir.,* Bk. i, c. 86.

was that of the *Monumentum* or Sepulchre. St. Clare almost certainly unlocked not a hanging tabernacle, but this little niche in the wall; and certainly bore a *Turris,* and not a Monstrance, with which, in the name of her Eucharistic and Present Lord, she put the Saracen marauder to flight. And here, in England, at the same time or a very little later, Prior Crawenden left one of his marks as a devout Catholic on his little private chapel at Ely, in the shape of what seems almost certainly a small tabernacle in the North wall. Thence, the doors opened with great faith and veneration, the old Prior received his viaticum when dying, and there, the doors wrenched rudely away, aftertimes committed one of its many crimes against the Eucharistic Lord, leaving the little place in all the desolation of Magdalene when she said, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." Its former ornamentation is still somewhat apparent; its desolation is still very much in evidence.

It is very difficult indeed to give a reason for the hanging Tabernacle, the shape of which was that of a dove and which was very common, though not nearly so common as the *Turris* in the Tent, during the later middle ages. Many of them still exist, though now there is only one in use, and that one of modem make, over the High Altar of Amiens Cathedral.[1] Had it been a product of ancient Christianity instead of times

[1] The form of the Dove hanging over the High Altar at Amiens is different from that of mediaaval times. This modern one has outstretched wings and seems to be in the act of settling. Those of former times are standing, with closed wings. Permission was given to the Bishop of Amiens in the year 1878 to re-introduce this form of Reservation, for which he was able to show five centuries of custom, and which had been uninterrupted until the French Revolution. See Raible, *Der Tabernakel,* p. 148.

remote, yet bordering more nearly upon our own, there would be less ground for bewilderment; since the Jewish idea of the Sheckinah confused, and that often on purpose, the Abiding Presence and the Holy Spirit very generally, a confusion which popular early Christian thought, quite unorthodoxedly, might easily be conceived of as also doing. Nevertheless, and in spite of very learned and weighty opinion to the contrary, I cannot help feeling a certain amount of sureness that thoughts on the Holy Spirit in the mediaeval mind were indeed responsible for this beautiful, if quaint, form of a dwelling place for the Reserved Eucharist. An age which has given us the feast of the Adorable Trinity, and left behind for us that exquisite sequence, *Vent Sancte Spiritus,* would, without any doubt, hasten to represent vividly to our mind, what has always been believed from the beginning, how that, as the Word became Incarnate and dwelt among us by the power of the Holy Spirit, so, by the power of the same Holy Spirit, that Word Incarnate exists on earth; and corporally, though sacramentally, really dwells and abides here.

To some extent the exterior or manifest worship towards the Abiding presence seems to be at least a little different during the two periods under consideration. How much different it is indeed most difficult to say. Processions of the Blessed Sacrament, one of which we read of in the eighth century, and many of which, to judge from the existence still of many very large Towers, must have been not infrequent before the fourteenth century, had this difference from those of the early ages that, while any movement from the *Armoriutn* to the Altar done processional-wise was strictly liturgical,

these mediaeval processions, *(.abide the church,* cannot be so described. But beyond this it is not easy to detect variation of an ‹›ll *i*stamti ll:; nature in the general attitude of worship during the two periods. True, the Anchoress in that very line book of the middle ages, the *Ancrcn Rule,* is bidden in her cell to turn to the place where Christ is "over the High Altar/' and to salute Him in words which even now are well known; but the exterior attitude, to say nothing of the interior devotion, does not seem to be different in kind from that of Nonna the mother of St. Gregory Nazianzen in the fourth century, or from that of Macrina the sister of St. Gregory Nyssa of the same date, the former of w'hom blessed her eyes in communicating with the Light of the World, the latter of whom, according to her brother's charming account, appears to go into rapture at receiving her second viaticum on the same day. Lyndwood, in the *Provinciale,* gives us what must have been the custom of proceeding with the Blessed Sacrament to the sick in the fifteenth century, and mentions the prayer he himself said, but the idea of external worship is not changed from that of the times of Chrysostom, who said that a case had been brought to his knowledge in which the angels of Heaven had been observed, as soldiers attendant on an emperor, accompanying our Lord in the Reserved Eucharist, when on His way to the infirm and dying. Certainly, it may be said that bending the knee in adoration to the Reserved Sacrament is a practice due to mediaeval times; but that exterior adoration is to be observed, at least when receiving it, is taught by St. Cyril of Jerusalem when instructing catechumens how to make their First Communion, and St. Angustine witnesses to the custom

in the fourth and fifth centuries. Even Reservation outside the Church, which as we have already said was very common in ancient times, seems to be quite usual at the commencement of the Middle Ages, although long before the end of them as a practice it had ceased to be. There is a case in the Venerable Bede's History of such reservation connected with Caedmon the Anglo-Saxon poet; another may be found in Gerald of Wales of the twelfth century.[1]

The "other side" which the Truth concerning the Reserved Eucharist manifests in the Middle Ages seems to me to be that Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament is the Most Powerful, Great and Attached *Friend* of the human race. The relationship *to the individual,* so remarkable a feature in the sentiment displayed in the early ages, appears to me a thousand years later to be very much obscured. In a sense, it is surprising that this should have been the case. At no time was personal love of our Lord greater than in the Middle Ages. Of course, we can find expressions manifesting a deep-set attachment to Christ in the remote days of antiquity, but they are not so common cis to form, as they do in mediaeval times, a complete and extensive literature. From prayers, from hymns, issuing as well out of the mouths of the devout in a parish Church as of that of the mystic in his cell, we should say that the attitude of the Christian five and six hundred years ago consisted, more

[1] The case in St. Bede (Bk. iv. c. 24) shows us quite clearly that the Blessed Sacrament was being reserved in a house where no priest was residing, and that Holy Communion, at least in sick cases, might be given by lay people. Indeed, it *looks* as if Caedmon administered viaticum to himself. The case in Giraldus Cambrensis *(Top. Irlandiae,* Dist. 2, c. 19) is from Ireland. The point in the story of importance here is that a priest on a journey has the Blessed Sacrament concealed on his person.

than in anything else, in a continual display of an almost childlike, warmhearted affection and attachment to our Blessed Lord, a sentiment which is quite as apparent in the Eucharistic expressions of the times as, for example, in those prompted by considerations on the Passion. Yet there are few signs in the attitude of the day towards the Reserved Eucharist in particular, and of the Blessed Sacrament in general, of that intimacy which is not satisfied without being very closely indeed knit together in inter-communion, and even in association.[1] I have used the words "making free" when mentioning the idea which I have in mind and when asserting that the results of the idea were particularly observable in the conduct of the early Christians towards the august subject under consideration. Then, in ancient times, that was noticeable with regard to the Blessed Sacrament which is so aptly described in four lines by Faber when talking of the love which a soul may feel for Christ:

> Oh wonderful that Thou should'st let
> So vile a heart as mine
> Love Thee with such a love as this,
> And make so free with Thine.

Now in the middle ages where is it? Not, where is the *love* for this most blessed Gift, for, as we have said, that is even greater than in former days; but where is the craving for "being together"? Not that I am

[1] I am not, of course, denying the existence of very many most tender expressions towards the Blessed Sacrament coming from the mouth of *(e.g.)* the mediaeval saints and mystics. I am thinking of the absence of the feeling, so much in evidence in early times, that personal, most intimate, union with the Blessed Sacrament is an absolute necessity of Christian life.

inclined to lay much stress upon the generally received account of the rarity of receiving Holy Communion in those days, a view of the times which to any one who remembers the passages connected with the subject in Thommassin will be regarded as very much exaggerated. It is *desire* which seems to us to be absent—that desire, "to be with Christ, which is far better," in this Sacrament, and which is so striking a feature with the Christian of antiquity.

I am of opinion that the reason for this difference is contained in what I conceive to have been the different aspects of the great truth connected with reservation of the Eucharist Lord. To the early Christian that Great Being who dwelt behind the drawn curtains and before whom the small lamp was ever burning was the Life itself, the Light itself, the Fountain of Being, the Medicine and the Immortality of all things mortal. Why exactly He *dwelt,* they would not have been able to say. He wished it. He said so. But what they thought the Blessed Sacrament was, and what it brought to them may be summed up in the expressions we have just used. With the mediaevalists it was much more than this, and much less than this. Jesus in the Most Holy Eucharist is still as much God as He was in the estimation of former days, but the things said of Him in the Nicene Creed, though profoundly believed, are not grasped, are hardly considered, as they were grasped and ever in the mind of times remote. These later people are more simple. They are without any of that extraordinary intellectuality with which, among other things, the Christianity of the first centuries lived, and moved, and had its being. To them Christ in the Holy Eucharist was indeed the Lord God,

but He was not nearly so much the God, "who dwelleth in light inaccessible," as He was the "Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief." Intensely human themselves, they regarded this Gift as most divine, indeed, but as intensely human also. They could hardly understand, as their early Christian brother did so well, how the Light divine could permeate and go right through them by reception, how, by Communion they were the recipients of a new life, the Life, which turned them almost into the inhabitants of Heaven while still here, and made them immortal. Their thoughts about our Blessed Lord in this matter were not as being about something which drew humanity up to Heaven, but, on the contrary, of something which, being Heaven on earth, was not only Divine in itself, but divine in its immense condescension and love. The Second Person of the Blessed Trinity loved man so that He condescended out of the love He bore him to continue that residence really and truly, though sacramentally, which He first of all had taken up when Gabriel sang the first *Ave Maria. Of* that, hanging over the High Altar in the Tabernacle, they felt, "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our misfortunes." In "this valley of tears" the Divine Wayfarer had made His abode among men, wayfarers themselves. Considering Who He was, and regarding the wonderfully sympathetic personality He had of old time shown Himself to be—His comprehensive tenderness, the rich flow of consolation and of peace which His mere presence imparted—they were abundantly content with that great comfort which *closeness* always brings. When the consideration of His overwhelming magnificence had left their minds, some kind of estimate of which can be formed from their superb

processions and their artistic decorations in relation to the Reserved Eucharist, I am of opinion that almost all of their extremely warm attachment to the Blessed Sacrament may be shown in the following imaginary words: "The Divine Friend of us all is close, is near, is by. He lives in the Tent. His Home is in the Church, in our very midst. We have found that which Job sought in vain when he said, 'Oh that I knew where I might find Him, that I might come even to His seat'; and the mere knowledge that He is where He is, is sweet." Sweet, of course; for, when the burden of life is heavy, when care is multiplied and strife is rampant, and sorrow is sometimes dull and sometimes keen, the closeness of the mighty Friend is all-comforting, and the nearness of one who has borne the same and who cares, lightens the load. The Divine and Blessed Lover of mankind was really, truly, and indeed, very *near to all*—that, perhaps, might sum up the sentiment which was peculiarly that of the Middle Ages towards the Reserved Sacrament in the Church.

It is these two attitudes, these two dispositions, the one peculiar to the early Church, as I think, and the other to Christianity of more recent times which blend together in, and form devotion to, the Reserved Eucharist in modern timeo. Not that these two phases of one and the same great truth stand exactly where they did. The mediaeval idea of closeness and of nearness with regard to the Blessed Sacrament has for a long time past become more and more *intensified,* and while the early Christian idea of intimacy which could stay at nothing short of reception is more and more on the increase, it has attained nothing like the proportions which it certainly assumed in ancient times. We are only

gutting back to early Christianity by the practice of Prcquent Communion, lint we are letting the domina ting concept of the Middle Ages, Christ Himself corporally near in the Reserved Sacrament, carry us on from strength to strength, and the closeness which is now desired, and which alone will satisfy, has, unlike that of the middle ages, a touch of *intimacy* about it which demands that at least our presence should be where His real Presence is. Visiting the Reserved Eucharist, our Blessed Lord, has become to-day a natural and almost necessary part of devotion to this most adorable Mystery.

It may not I hope, be considered fanciful if I allow myself to assert that the modern Tabernacle, in the names which are applied to itself and to things most closely associated with it, seems to gather up into small compass both past customs of reservation and the great ideas which have been and still are connected with it. The Home of the Abiding Presence is now universally called a Tabernacle, a Tent, and the strict order for its complete covering, if carried out, has the effect of making its appearance tent-like. The hanging Tabernacle has passed away. It was passing away even before the Council of Trent. It has now for at least three centuries been decreed that the Tabernacle be securely attached to an Altar, a decree which has very largely found its interpretation in a form of Wall-Tabernacle reminiscent by its position, though not from its location, of very early times. The veils inside remind us of days when veils screened off the *Armorium*\ and those which envelope the *Ciborium* bring back to memory both the curtains which went from column to column of the .ancient *Kiborion,* as well as the small hangings which

clothed the *Area* or *Turris* when it was not exposed to view. We need say nothing of the ever-burning light.

These are, all of them, things which the Church not only treasures as relics of past devotion, but also as objects still of the greatest use. Surely not the least of these uses is that of their reminiscent power which is incentive to the present to rival and to outstrip the past. There is not so much need of exciting us of to-day to realise that our Great and Sovereign Wayfarer in this our Pilgrimage from earth to Heaven dwells at our doors. There never was such a silent and continual flow to visit the Reserved Eucharist as now. There is not so much need either, to incite an age that is weary and troubled, to take to its inmost heart the Lord Who was Himself the Man of Sorrows and who alone can say, "Peace, be still." But in the following, surely, lies a need indeed. The times are very intellectual; they are very philosophic; and man in his intellect and with his philosophy is despairing of the Future, is getting hopeless of his chance of Immortality. The need of to-day, in its relationship with the Blessed Sacrament, is surely that mankind should be brought to realise, as the followers of Christ realised seventeen hundred years ago, that it is possible to be in the most intimate communion with One of Whom it is said, ''And in Thy Light we shall see Light." Not for nothing did He say that His very *being* is Life, Truth and Immortality—"I am the Way, the Truth, the Life; I am the resurrection." But it would have been for nothing, so far as we are concerned, who, indeed are concerned most, if there were no way left by Him of getting that *Being* of perennial life and that *Being* of perfect knowledge into our very selves. The cry of

the thoughtful now is for Wisdom and Truth. In the Reserved Eucharist Wisdom and Truth are at our doors, *feeling the* most ardent wish that they, or rather He, may be permitted to come right into us and stay.

X.

CATHOLIC DEVOTION TO THE HOLY EUCHARIST: THE FRUITS OF HOLY COMMUNION.

By the Rev. J. B. Jaggar, S.J., B.A.

Quotidie peccas, quotidie sumas.
Daily dost thou sin, daily receive.

Our Divine Saviour assumed our human nature that He might reconcile all nature to its Lord. Now among all peoples there is no more perfect sign of reconciliation between those who were estranged than that they should be united at one common table. In the Holy Eucharist, which is the fulness and the extension of the Incarnation, we have as a consummation of the Sacrifice of Calvary, represented in the Sacrifice of the Mass by a bloodless rite, the life-giving banquet in which Christ Himself becomes the food of men. "My flesh is meat indeed and My blood is drink indeed" (John vi. 56).

> "God Who has given Himself to us as Father, Who has adopted us as children, Who has made us the heirs of His possessions, exalted us with His name, honoured us with His glory and His kingdom, wills also that we ask of Him our daily bread. . . . He bids us ask what is forbidden our thought, seeing that a heavenly Father exhorts heavenly children to demand a heavenly bread. He Himself has said:

'I am the living bread which came down from heaven.' He Himself is the bread which sown in the Virgin, leavened in the flesh, prepared in suffering, baked in the oven of the sepulchre, seasoned in the Churches, laid upon the altars, serves up daily to the faithful a heavenly food" (St. Peter Chrysologus, Homil. *by).*

During the last fifteen years there has been *a great increase of devotion to this Sacred Banquet,* owing to the exhortations and acts of Pope Pius X. of blessed memory, and especially to the decree on Daily Communion. This devotion has manifested itself in the vast numbers of those who daily, or, at any rate, very frequently, receive our Lord in Holy Communion and assist at Holy Mass. The *raison d'être* of this devotion is a clearer understanding and appreciation of the fruits so wondrous and resplendent of the Eucharist as a Sacrament and Sacrifice. Let us investigate the nature of these fruits of the Eucharist as a Sacrament.

In the first place we *must reject the opinion of Luther and others that the Holy Eucharist was instituted primarily, directly and of its own nature to remit grievous sin.* Such an opinion runs counter to the very constitution of the Sacrament, which is bestowed by w'ay of food. Food can be assimilated only by one who lives ; hence the spiritual food of the Eucharist can be taken only by one who is spiritually alive, *i.e.,* free from grievous sin, in a state of grace. You do not give food to a corpse. In other words, the Holy Eucharist is a sacrament of the living of its own nature. Luther's opinion is in opposition with the practice of the Early Church, which gave Holy Communion to those guilty of great crimes only after long penance. It contravenes the teaching of the

Fathers, who complain that some sinners, without penance, were admitted to the Holy Table—"penance not done, confession not made, no hand of bishop or clergy laid on them, the Eucharist is given to them" (St. Cyprian, Epistle 9, *n.* 2). It is against the teaching of St. Paul: "But let a man prove himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh without distinguishing the body, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself" (1 Cor. xi. 28, 29; Westminster Version). Such a probation would not seem requisite if Holy Communion directly, *per se,* remitted mortal sin. Nor does it suffice to say, that only because of defect of faith St. Paul reprehends the Corinthians. He upbraids them also fc-r excluding the poor from their tables, and for their drunkenness. This opinion also is condemned explicitly by the Council of Trent: "If any one shall say that the special fruit of the Holy Eucharist is the remission of sin, or that other effects do not follow from it, let him be anathema" (Sess. xiii. Can. 5).

Should any one, however, approach this Sacrament who is in a state of mortal sin without the knowledge of such a state or affection to it, but with supernatural attrition, "if he approaches reverently and devoutly, he will obtain by this sacrament the grace of charity which will perfect contrition and remission of sin" *(Summa Theologica* 3. 79. 3). This opinion of St. Thomas and Suarez is not held by all theologians. The remission in this case is said to be *per accidens.*

The special and primary fruit of Holy Communion is Union with Christ and the Members of His Mystical Body by Charity. It is immediately ordained to increase charity or love for its own sake, that love which is the

very life of the soul. Our Lord tells us this Himself: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me" (John vi. 57, 58). To live by another, to remain in another, and to have another abiding in oneself expresses the most intimate friendship and closest union between those who love. St. Paul proclaims the brotherly love promoted by Holy Communion when he writes: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread" (1 Cor. xi. 7). Whence St. Chrysostom: "For what is the bread? The Body of Christ. And what do they become who partake of it? The Body of Christ, not many bodies but one body. For as the bread consisting of many grains is made one, so that the grains nowhere appear—they exist indeed, but their difference is not seen by reason of their conjunction—so are we conjoined both with each other and with Christ; there not being one body for thee and another for thy neighbour to be nourished by, but the very same for all" (Hom. xxiv. in i Cor.). Wherefore concord and agreement are requisite for the reception of this sacrament: "Therefore if thou offerest thy gift at the altar and there thou remember that thy brother has anything against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and first go to be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift" (Matt. v. 23, 24). In the words of St. Augustine: "O Sacrament of affection (pietatis)! O sign of unity! O bond of charity! He who desires to live hath where he may live, whence he may live. Let him draw near; let him believe; let him be incorporated, that he may be quickened" *(In Joann,* tr. 26, 13).

In the Holy Eucharist *not by other elements such as water, oil, the laying on of hands, does Christ sanctify us and unite us to Himself, but He Himself really and substantially under the sacramental signs comes to us,* unites Himself to us, and is, as it were, commingled with us. Wherefore by St. Cyril of Jerusalem we are said to be "of one body, of one blood" with Christ *(Catech.* 22. 3). "It is called Communion and is so truly," says St. John Damascene, "because by it we communicate with Christ"; we share by it His Flesh and Godhead and communicate and are made one with one another. The purpose therefore of Holy Communion is to incorporate men more completely into the Body of Christ.

Moreover, if Christ has instituted this Sacrament under the form of food, that in the effects of bodily nourishment we might see shadowed forth in some way the effects of spiritual nourishment in the soul, who can doubt that as it is proper to food to be united intimately to a person, to be changed into his substance and to become one with him, so it follows that this heavenly food which we receive is most intimately united to us, and by love effects, that even we coalesce as it were with Him into one? St. Cyril of Alexandria compares this union with that which exists between two pieces of melting wax *(In Joann.* Lib. IV, c. 17), and St. Chrysostom says that "we are clothed with the royal robe of Christ, nay, with the King Himself." "We are one body and members of His flesh and bones . . . that we may be this not only by love but even in reality, since we are commingled with that flesh; tor that is effected by the food which He has given, to show how great is the love with which He is on fire towards us—

therefore Tie lias kneaded Himself up with us and fashioned us into one complete body, that we may be one as a body joined to the head" (l lorn. *In Joan.* 46. 2).

But though the Body of Christ is received through the mouth, *vet il does not become part of us, but we become part ofIIim*. l le is not resolved into the structure of our minds, but we pass, on the contrary, in some mysterious way into His Divine organization. "I am the nourishment of great souls," says St. Augustine, "grow and)'ou shall eat me. But you shall not change me into yourself as you do your bodily food; it is you who will be changed into me" *(Confessions,* VII. 10). As Christ converts the bread and wine into His real Body and Blood, so the Holy Communion is a living act whereby He possesses Himself of our souls and bodies, pervades our soul through and through in all its powers, and making it His own, moulds and shapens it to His Divine wishes and instincts, so that we can say with St. Paul, "I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me." Though Christ is not changed into us, as happens with material food, yet we are changed and transformed into Him, not by a union which makes us one nature with Him or one person with Him, for that were impossible; but being united with Him, we feel the quickening power of His life-giving Flesh. Though the life-giving action of Holy Communion is fleeting and passes away with the disappearance of the Sacred Species, the espousals with this Divine Lover abide. "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me and I in him." The actual Communion is transient, but its reality, "the thing or virtue" of the Sacrament, incorporation with Christ, espousals with Him, are permanent. We are united also with

the Father: "that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ" (1 John i. 3). With the Father we possess, though in a different manner, the Godhead of Christ, His Sacred Body and His Soul, which is the bond uniting Man with God and God with Man. "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one" (John xvii. 23).

"If the flesh of the first man made poisonous and mortal communicates death to the soul, shall not the *Flesh of Christ, which is healthful and life-giving, bestow upon it life and safety?* Therefore as the soul contracts all its ills by flesh, it ought by flesh to receive all its benefit. If it is to be freed from the evil which came to it by the flesh of the first man, it must have society and union with the Flesh of Christ, the Second Man. And as by the single flesh of the first man all souls are infected and destroyed, so are all souls washed, cleansed and quickened by the Flesh of Christ. As the Flesh of the first man is the storehouse of all vices, sins and crimes, so all virtues, all spiritual treasures and all blessings are stored up in the Flesh of Christ. As the former flesh separates the soul from God and unites it with Satan, so the Flesh of Christ separates it from Satan and unites it to God. For as Satan lurks in the flesh of the first man, so the Godhead abides in the flesh of the Second Man. Therefore when the soul is united and associated with the Flesh of Christ, it is associated and united with the Godhead. And as Satan takes possession of souls by the flesh of Adam, so by His own Flesh are they taken possession of by Christ" (Raimundus de Sabunde, *Titulus* 290).

As we all partake, then, of one and the same Food,

sit down at the same Tabic, feeding on the one Body of Christ, so we become of necessity one with one another, enjoying in common the possession of Christ. "For we being many arc one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread" (r Cor. x. 17). By Baptism we are unified, yet St. Paul attributes the perfect union of the faithful to Holy Communion, which makes us one thing as Christ is one with the Father, grapes of the same cluster, and grains of one ear. The Divine Word in the Holy Eucharist takes upon Himself the flesh of us all, makes it His own, and so unites us to one another as the members of one body.

Actual Charity is communicated by this Sacrament. "This Sacrament confers grace," says St. Thomas of Aquin, "spiritually with the virtue of charity; whence Damascene compares this Sacrament to the coal which Isaias saw; for the coal is not simple wood but united to the fire; so also the bread of Communion is not simple bread but united to the Divinity. But as Gregory says, 'the love of God is not idle; for it works great things, if it is there'; and therefore by this Sacrament, as far as it depends on its own virtue, not only *the habit of grace and virtue is bestowed, but also stirred up into act,* according to 2 Cor. 5, 'the charity of Christ presseth us.' Hence it is that from the virtue of this Sacrament the soul is spiritually refreshed, in that the soul is delighted spiritually and somehow inebriated by the sweetness of the divine goodness, according to Canticles 5: 'Eat, O friends, and drink and be inebriated, my dearly beloved' " *(Summa Theol.* 3. 79. i ad 2). To attain this actual charity, spiritual sweetness and joy we must approach the Sacrament *with attention and devotion.*

The fruits of Holy Communion are still further explained in the Councils of Florence and Trent. In the Council of Florence (1438-1445) in the decree for the Armenians, we are told that "the effect of this Sacrament, wrought in the soul of the worthy recipient, is the union of man with Christ. And because by grace man is incorporated with Christ and His members, it follows that grace is increased by this Sacrament in those who receive it worthily, and that every effect which material food and drink produce for the life of the body, by sustaining, increasing, repairing, and by giving delight, this Sacrament accomplishes for our spiritual life." Additional light is thrown on this by the Council of Trent: "But our Saviour wished this Sacrament to be received as the spiritual food of our souls, by which they may be nourished and strengthened, living with the life of Him Who said, 'Whoso eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me' (John vi. 58); and as an antidote by which we may be delivered from daily faults, and preserved from mortal sins. Besides, He wished it to be a pledge of our future glory and perpetual happiness, and further, a symbol of that one Body of which He Himself is the Head (1 Cor. xi. 3; Ephes, v. 23), to whom He wishes that we as members should be bound by the closest connection of faith, hope and charity, that 'we should all say the same thing, nor should there be schisms among us' (1 Cor. i. 10)" (Sess. xiii. c. 2).

These daily faults of which the Council speaks are venial sins which are forgiven by this Sacrament, if no affection to them is retained in the soul. To keep our bodies in health and repair the daily wear and tear of tissue, nerves, etc., we need food. "Spiritually," says St. Thomas, "day by day something is lost to us through

the heat of concupiscence, by venial sins, which diminish the fervour of charity, and therefore it pertains to this Sacrament to remit venial sins. Whence St. Ambrose! says in Bk. 5 on the Sacraments, that 'this daily bread is taken in remedy of our daily infirmity.' But the effect *(res)* of this Sacrament is Charity not only habitual but actual, which is stirred up in this Sacrament, by which venial sins are loosed" *(Summa Theol.* 3. 79. 4).

Charity being the primary' fruit of this Sacrament it is *evident that it preserves the recipient from sin in the future, especially mortal sin,* which is the spiritual death of the soul. "Whence," says St. Thomas, "in that manner a man is preserved from future sin, in which the body is preserved from future death. Which is done in a twofold manner: (1) Inasmuch as the nature of man is strengthened internally against what internally corrupts, and so he is preserved from death by food and medicine; (2) by this that he is fortified against external attacks and so he is preserved by arms with which the body is fortified. In both ways this sacrament preserves from sin ; for in the first place it unites him by grace to Christ, strengthens the spiritual life of man as a spiritual food and a spiritual medicine; . . in the second, inasmuch as it is a certain sign of the Passion of Christ, by which the devils are conquered, it repels all onslaughts of the devils" *(Summa* 3, 79, 6).

Though the Eucharist as a Sacrament is not directly instituted to satisfy for sin, but to nourish spiritually by uniting us with Christ, *it remits temporal punishment due to sin,* not directly but indirectly by way of consequence *(ex consequenti).* For the Sacrament directly nourishes the soul by exciting charity in it. Now an act of charity or love satisfies for sin and remits part

or the whole of the temporal punishment according to the degree of the fervour and devotion of this charity *(cf. Summa* 3. 79. 5).

Holy Communion is the Bread of the Strong, the Wheat of the Elect, for it strengthens the soul against temptations, weakens concupiscence, inasmuch as it tempers the lust of the flesh, checks the unruliness of the imagination and subdues the passions of the sensitive appetite, while it confers copious graces to avoid sin and to practise all virtues. "Receive beforehand the Lord Jesus in the hostel of thy mind. Where His Body is, there is Christ. When the adversary shall see thy hostel occupied by the brightness of the heavenly presence, knowing that the place is shut against his temptations by Christ, he will flee and withdraw, and without any offence thou shall pass through the midnight darkness" (St. Ambrose, Sermon in Ps. 118, *n.* 48).

"As the flesh is fed on the Body and Blood of Christ, so too the soul becomes fat on God" (Tertullian, *De Carn. Resurr.).* "Let us withdraw from this table like lions," writes St. Chrysostom, "terrible to the devils, reflecting that Christ is our Head, and how great is the love He hath shown us. Parents often hand over their children to others to be nourished, I on the contrary nourish them with My Flesh, and I serve up Myself at table to you. I wish you all to be ennobled, and I bring you good hope for the future. - - - I wished to be your brother, on account of you I had fellowship with flesh and blood, again I deliver to you flesh itself and blood, by which I am made your Kinsman. This Blood within you shows forth a royal and beautiful image, it begets incredible beauty, allows not the nobility of the soul to wane, while it frequently waters it and gives

it nourishment. For the blood made from the food we take is not made straightway, but something very different, but this Blood at once waters the soul and gives it great power. This Blood is the salvation of our souls: by this the soul is cleansed, adorned, enkindled, this makes our soul more full of splendour than is fire . . . from this table a fountain bubbles forth emitting spiritual rivers. Beside this fountain not fruitless willows raise their heads, but trees which reach to heaven, which bring forth fruits in due season, which never wither. If one rages with his passions, let him draw near this fountain and temper his heat" (Homil. 46 in John, *nn.* 3, 4).

It is *the wine which generates Virgins, for it diminishes the fire of Concupiscence* by increasing the fervour of divine love and filling the soul with spiritual delights and heavenly consolations, so that the pleasures of earth pall. It is the Bread of Angels, who are Virgins. It is the Bread containing all sweetness. Surely he whose soul is nurtured by the Lord of purity, whose body is hallowed by the virgin-flesh of the Lamb of God, must needs be a lover of chastity and like to His Heavenly Lover Who feeds among the lilies. Often it is the one and only remedy against sins of the flesh.

Lastly, the Holy Eucharist is a pledge of future glory or confers a title to a glorious resurrection. Christ proclaimed this when He said: "He that eateth My flesh, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 55). This is taught by St. Ignatius of Antioch: "Breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we die not, but live for ever in Jesus Christ" (*Ephes.* 20, 2), and by St. Irenaeus: "For as the bread, which is from the earth,

on receiving the invocation of God, is now no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and an heavenly, so our bodies receiving the Eucharist are no longer corruptible and have the hope of resurrection" (*Against Heresies,* 4, 18, 5).

This eternal glory and resurrection of the body is not to be attributed to this Sacrament merely because, like the other sacraments, it confers grace, the seed of glory—a gift which is common to them all—but because it confers a right to a glorious resurrection. This is a special effect of this Sacrament due to the union with Christ on the part of those who worthily communicate.

Although as long as we are in a state of grace our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost and we are members of Christ, bone of His Bone, flesh of His Flesh, since by His Incarnation He has made our nature His own and shared in our flesh and blood, still this mysterious union of our flesh with the flesh of Christ receives its fuller perfection and quasi-sacramental consecration by the conjunction of His glorified Body and Blood with our bodies in Holy Communion. By such a union the nuptials of the Lamb are celebrated with His Bride the Church, yet journeying in each of her members and preparing them for the consummation of those nuptials in the Beatific Vision. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were gone, and the sea is no more. And I, John, saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride for her husband" (*Apoc.* xxi. 1, 2). From this special sacramental union there arises a special affinity and kinship of our flesh with that of Christ, so that He considers our flesh under a special title His own. Wherefore He

likens our flesh to His own glorified Flesh, not by giving us here and now the gift of incorruptibility, not by taking away from us concupiscence, but as far as our present state permits and the defect of our co-operation raises no obstacle, by providing us with most powerful help internal and external against the temptations and onslaughts of the flesh and the devil. Sometimes He holds in check and fettered concupiscence, or the *fomes peccati,* in the bodies of His Saints.

Surely if by His Word and touch He raised the dead to life, how much more will He raise up our vile bodies by reason of His life-giving flesh which has been housed within these same bodies. Wherefore the Holy Eucharist gives a new title to a glorious resurrection. This title is so efficacious, that if men were not to rise again by a general law, those would have the right to rise who in worthy dispositions have been fed on the Body and Blood of Christ in Holy Communion:

Se nascens dedit socium,
Convescens in edulium,
Se moriens in pretium,
Se regnans dat in praemium.

At birth our Brother He became;
At meat Himself as food He gives:
To ransom us He died in shame;
As our reward in bliss He lives.

X.

APPENDIX A: THE KISH SYMBOL.

By the Rev. H. Morrisey, M.A.

"A mystery ought to be most faithfully hidden and concealed, especially by us who bear the name of faith."
—Lactantius.

"We live in the midst of symbolic representation," wrote Le comte Goblet d'Alviella, "from the ceremonies which celebrate our birth unto the funeral emblems that decorate our grave." We even write and speak in symbols. The simplest and commonest objects of life are idealized, transfigured and given a new value, the mind remaining conscious the while of a distinction between the image and the being or object represented. The profanation of the famous "Golden Stool" could call forth a holy war. It typified the soul of the Ashanti nation. The Cenotaph is held to be "one of the greatest symbols of an Empire's unity in sorrow for its dead."

Symbolism seems to be propagated by Art and to be disseminated from the *foyers* of classical culture, whilst in the religious sentiment of all peoples emblems or ideograms have always found a fertile soil. It would be hard to imagine how any religion could exist without well-established symbols and mysteries, especially if it had a polyglot community of any importance. It was.

however, in times of persecution that they chiefly flourished, when a necessary silence or restraint was put upon (he initiated. The (',liions of symbolism, once introduced, tended to become stereotyped, and the religious artist then found himself confined to cryptic or allegorical representations which yer must lead the minds of believers to sec therein a higher reality. "The keynote of early Christian art," says Air. O. M. Dalton, "is to be found in its indirect and symbolic nature. - - - It avoids the direct representation o historic events, caring little for exactitude of detail or wealth of incident. Instead of this, it works upon minds specially prepared to comprehend its teaching by symbols, types and allegorical scenes. ' The literature that has come down to us fom the Church of the second and third centuries reveals the great part played by symbolism in the religious thought of those days.

Accordingly, upon catacomb walls and ceilings, on funeral slabs, sarcophagi and signets now preserved in museums, we find delineations of simple, everyday objects, which, by the "universal language of the eye," conveyed to the trained Christians of early times meanings of deep religious import. In the selection of such symbols, however, even greater care and dis crimination was shown than appears later in St. Clement of Alexandria's list of fitting emblems for rings. On the one hand, they must not be too pagan, and yet, at the same time, there was danger in their being too obviously Christian. "It is certain that the Fathers of the Church held the mysteries in abhorrence and that whatever borrowing took place from these on the Christian side was unconscious and in a sense involuntary" (Dr. James Orr, *Neglected Factors in the Study oj*

the Early Progress 0] Christianity, 1899).[1] This point seems to have been lost sight of by later writers who, eager to demonstrate their theories about the fusion and transmigration of symbols, strived to derive many Christian rites, ceremonies and even the emblem of the Cross itself, from sources utterly pagan.

The palm-branch, dolphin, stag, peacock, the lamb beside the milk-pail, the good shepherd, Orpheus the mystic singer, etc., were amongst the representations most commonly seen in the excavated crypts of Rome. The trident and the anchor also figure largely, and the ship with full rigging, all perhaps concealing from the uninitiated, as did the intricate ceiling patterns, the cherished symbols of the Cross. But commonest and most prominent amongst these emblems was the *Fish.* It is displayed on funeral slabs, alone or in conjunction with the palm-branch, the anchor or the dove; on painted tufa walls, in the act of swimming or being taken by the hook ; as part of the viands, along with bread, in the earliest banquet scenes, and as apparently alive in water, curiously bearing a basket of loaves. Its use, however, as a Eucharistic symbol (always conjoined with bread) in the catacomb paintings was much earlier than its function as an isolated anagram or ideograph.

Deriving its origin probably from the allegorical

1 In his repent work, ***Orpheus the Fisher,*** the Austrian archaeologist, Dr. Eisler, retracts his former view that "primitive Christianity was to a great extent 'a syncretistic religion,' and that we ought to seek lor a 'pagan, or more exactly, an oriental prototype for the Eucharist.' He is now iirmly convinced that 'the Eucharistic rite arose out of a purely Jewish ritual,' and though still maintaining ' Pagan ***parallels*** to the later development of it into a mystic theophagy,' he believes 'no longer that pagan ***influences*** were at work in the ***initial*** stage of Christian origin' " (Pref., p. v.).

explanations resorted to by Alexandrine theologians, the Fish was the most ancient symbol of our Lord. The anagram ΙΧΘΥΣ found frequently in the monuments and the. patristic writings was an acrostic composed from five other Creek words yielding the phrase: "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour." As an ideograph, or image, its predecessor is thought to have been the dolphin, "the friend and rescuer of men," though from early pictures of the dolphin on the trident in the Ardeatine Cemetery, it would seem to have typified our Lord rather as the Crucified. Dolphins symmetrically attached to the trident (as in a reproduction given in the *Month* for May, 1921) probably represent Christians ready to follow their great Master to the end.

The Fish was rarely, if ever, found in the frescoes of Pompeian style in the first century, but in the following century it holds a prominent place in the mural decorations of the chapels. By the fourth century, when Christian art need no longer seek refuge in allegory, it was becoming less and less frequent. After Constantine's time it was used more from custom and ornament than from necessity. Marucchi thinks that the symbolic image was inspired by the miraculous multiplication of the loaves, and from the banquet our Lord gave His disciples beside the lake, of which theme one fresco has been identified. Its origin might partly also be accounted for, as St. Clement of Alexandria and St. Prosper suggest, by the consideration of the marvellous virtues of the fish of Tobias—a subject which found an early place among the frescoes in the Catacomb of SS. Nereus and Achilleus.

Commenting upon the actual Greek *word* for "fish," Dr. Lightfoot holds that probably the earliest extant

reference to it is in the late second century inscription of Abercius, "with perhaps the exception of *Oracula Sibyllina,* VIII. 217 *seqq.,* which contains the acrostic." These marvellous lines, beginning each with a letter which helps to spell out in order the full words "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour, Cross" are cited by Eusebius and St. Augustine, who both hold that the word *ichthys* originated here. It seems more probable from the inscription referred to, which is strangely reminiscent of the Sibylline phraseology, that the anterior use of the Fish as an image suggested the acrostic to the unknown Christian of the third century who is credited with having touched up this mid-second century work of an Egyptian Jew.

As a pictorial representation, about the beginning of the third century the fish when placed alone, or supporting an anchor, a ship or a dove, typifies Christ, as may be seen from gems in the British Museum or from the curious epitaph in the cemetery of St. Priscilla:

Alexander in (here a fish is portrayed).

In Prof. Marucchi's *Christian Epigraphy* (1912) two inscriptions are given, one showing under the Greek words for "Fish of the Living," a fish on each side of an anchor (probably for symmetry), and the other portraying a fish after a Greek prayer equivalent to "May we live in God." The ideographic sign then came to denote one baptized in Christ, as is clear from passages in St. Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian *(De Bapt.* I.): "We are born in water, little fishes according to our Fish Jesus Christ"[1] *(cf.* "a great fish and pure" in the

[1] Padre S. Scaglio thinks Tertullian had the catacomb pictures before his eyes when he wrote this. *{Manuale di Archeologia Cristiana,* p. 287.)

inscription mentioned later). In this signification the Fish is represented as united to the anchor or looking towards the dove, the latter hearing a palm-branch.

It is, however, in the Catacomb frescoes themselves that the Fish, *in conjunction with bread,* realizes its highest symbolism. In their numerous attempts to symbolize the Holy Eucharist according to the disciplinary laws then binding them, the earliest Christian artists took as their theme the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, rather than the no less important miracle introducing the element of wine—that performed in Cana of Galilee. Symbolic pictures based on this latter miracle are only two in number, one of the third century, the other of the fourth, but the subject became a favourite one with sculptors of sarcophagi in the latter century.

The mystic meaning of some of the many paintings of repasts has indeed been questioned, and lively discussions have taken place amongst experts as to which are strictly sacramental as opposed to the *agape* and "celestial feasts." The difficulty arises from one type of banquet being closely linked up with or symbolizing another. When fish and wine or other viands are served, the baskets of loaves lacking, servants present and inscriptions visible, Wilpcrt classes such frescoes as realistic scenes—"funeral feasts"—even though the guests are seven in number. Dr. Clark D. Lamberton ably defends Mgr. Wilpert against Prof, von Sybel, who taxes the great authority on Catacomb paintings with "clerical predispositions," and claims that all the pictures of feasting in Catacomb art are intended to portray the banquets of the blessed in Paradise. He even seeks to connect them with similar feasting-scenes in the art

of ancient Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia (*Themes from St. John's Gospel in Early Roman Catacomb Art,* p. 96).

In the Eucharistic frescoes, where fishes and loaves lie before or on the table, no attempt is made at historic details; the number of guests is invariably *seven,* as is also the number of baskets, though in two scenes as many as eight and twelve are portrayed, all heaped with loaves of bread and arranged together in the foreground or grouped symmetrically on either side of the table. From the fact that these remarkable details are so pronounced and invariable in the banquet scenes of the different catacombs, Dr. Lamberton states that it is "impossible to escape the inference that they form a cycle of distinct significance. Their deep meaning can be appreciated only by him who is familiar with the Eucharistic passages in the Gospel" (p. 4). The baskets of bread constitute the characteristic element of a series comprising about thirty frescoes inspired by the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, and the theme is frequently reproduced on fourth century sarcophagi side by side with the scenes depicting the raising of Lazarus, Moses striking the rock, and the wine miracle at Cana.

Commenting on the paintings of the Sacraments in the catacomb of St. Callixtus, Marucchi affirms that they have undoubtedly been inspired by an ecclesiastical teacher, insomuch as they display a logical sequence from the symbolic rock to the celebration of the Eucharistic rite. In nearly all the Eucharistic paintings the mystic representation of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist are brought into close relationship. Being usually the central scene in a group of three, the strictly Eucharistic fresco receives greater particularisation in its symbolism from the nature of the flanking

scenes, but apart from its sequence and the character of its surrounding pictures the actual position of the Sacramental beast should be noted, especially if it be immediately over the altar or part of the decorative work in the apse.

One of the first paintings giving us in almost Pompeian style the Eucharistic significance of the Fish is that in the crypt of St. Lucina, in the oldest portion of the Catacomb of St. Callixtus (beginning of 2nd century). It is represented, in a somewhat more distinct form than in the original, in the present work. A fish, apparently alive, is there reproduced on either side of a defaced wall space separating two *loculi,* once covered, Wilpert thinks, with a painting of a banquet-scene with loaves and fishes. It is clearly no mere study of still-life, as Renan claimed, nor can it have any historic associations. It is a picture chiefly intended to convey a great dogmatic truth, though, quite incidentally, it recalls the early method or carrying the Eucharist. Both fishes, each corresponding to the other closely in detail, carry on their backs (so it would seem), a number of loaves in a basket, through the wicker-work of which may be seen a phial containing what appears to be red wine. The fact that such a representation of the Eucharistic species, in so close a conjunction with the Fish,should appear in an honoured position, surrounded by symbols of such deep significance as the good Shepherd, Moses striking the rock, *elc.,* evidently points to a mystery such as Origen could only allude to :—" Whoso is imbued in the mysteries knows both the Body and Blood of the Word of God. Let us not dwell therefore upon these things which are patent to those who know, but cannot be understood by the ignorant." The Fish is here identified with the

consecrated elements of the Eucharist[1] in a unique emblematic picture—*panis verus et aquae vivae piscis.* (Paulinus).[2]

In the so-called "Greek Chapel" of the Catacomb of St. Priscilla, probably the earliest of the frescoes typifying the Holy Eucharist was discovered by Mgr. Wilpert in 1893. When the chalk incrustation was removed from the *apse* of this subterranean chapel, there appeared the painting now known as the Fractio Panis, "the Breaking of Bread," and considered to be the earliest representation of the Holy Mass. Seven persons, as usual, are depicted seated round a curved table. Two plates lie on this, one containing five loaves, the other two fishes. One of the guests is a woman, veiled. To the left of the table as we view the picture is the "President," seated apparently on a special chairand holding both hands over the table in the act of "breaking bread." Before him is a two-handled cup, and to right and left of the table are the customary baskets recalling the miraculous multiplication and *localising* the symbolism. The mind of the beholder is taken back at once to the great Promise of Life-giving Food—"and the Bread that *I* will give is My Flesh for the Life of the world." Quite unusual realism marks the treatment of this theme; the figures are natural in their somewhat conversational postures, too animated, in fact, for some critics to acquiesce in the view of Wilpert, held also by Marucchi

1 "C'est l'arcane lui-même" (Dom Gueranger, *Sainte Cécile,* p. 290).

2 Mgr. Wilpert will no doubt be surprised to see over his photograph of this fresco reproduced by Dr. Eisler (Pl. liii.): "Still-life paintings of the second century from the catacomb of S. Lucina, showing the Friday-Fish, the basket with the newly-baked Sabbath 'Thanksgiving' bread, and the glass 'Cup of blessing* filled with red wine" (all in capitals, tool).

and many others, that wo have here a representation of the actual Eucharistic rite. The agu/ic'·, dissociated from the Eucharist in the second century, is admitted to be conjoined with it in this fresco. Lamberton readily grants it to be ''a faithful portrayal of what was enacted in the very chapel whose apsidal arch the painting adorned." But to Wilpert, the action of the bishop or priest is *the* realistic feature of a composition in which symbolism and realism meet. Dr. Eisler sees no symbolic meaning in the banquet scenes; they are ''contemporary meal-ceremonies of the earliest Christian church" (p. 219), and hence in the *Fractio Panis,* ''the meal is celebrated *on the lawn.* A pillow is laid *on the grass* in an open hemicycle " *(his italics).*

Until the third century the two frescoes described are the only ones which contain any allusion to the Eucharistic wine.

In the Catacomb of S. Peter and Marcellinus (early III. Century), a painting which occupied the inner space of an arcosolium affords us the first known rcproduct ion of the miracle at Cana of Galilee. Seven persons are seated at a sigma couch before which stands a tripod. An attendant with long hair in ringlets, offers a large dish to the nearest guest on the left as we look at the picture. In the foreground the seven baskets of loaves have here given place to six water-jars which Our Lord is touching with a rod. On the side of the converging arch Moses is figured striking the rock, whilst counter-balancing this across is another Baptism scene. From the middle of the vaulting an Orant, with arms out-spread, looks down upon what was the altar table, typifying, according to Wilpert, the effects of Holy Communion. *(Maiereien,* Plate 57; *Pitlure,* p. 278).

In the course of the third century the Catacomb artists seem to have omitted tlie Fish from their paintings and devoted themselves to depicting scenes suggested by the multiplication of the loaves. The Fish was becoming a detached symbol of Christ owing to the now established acrostic Icirnivs. Consequently another Eucharistic symbol replaced it in the frescoes—wine. Prof. C. R. Morey adduces as the reason for the introduction of the marriage-feast of Cana as the new distinctive type of the Eucharist, "the breaking-up of the Eucharistic symbolism through the isolation of the Fish as a Christ-symbol." That both types of miracles were painted to convey the same Eucharistic truth is clear from the fact that in the above-mentioned Catacomb these two scenes occupy "opposite end spaces in the vault of an arcosolium" (Lamberton, p. 92). It may be that one of these paintings is the "Celestial Banquet," of which Marucchi says this wine miracle is a pledge.

Amongst the few ante-Nicene wiiters Tertullian refers to the Cana miracle in this symbolic context: "So He has now consecrated[1] His own Blood in wine, who figured blood in wine." Later St. Cyril could ask: "He once at Cana in Galilee turned water into wine, which is akin to blood, and is He undeserving of belief when He turned wine into blood?" But probably St. Ephrem succeeds in bringing out more forcibly than others the Eucharistic sense of the combined miracles: "Though the seven loaves which He broke failed, as also the five which He multiplied, one bread which He broke was more than enough for the world. . . .

[1] "Consecrated," or perhaps "hidden" *cf.* p. 36.

He filled the water vessels with the best of wine1; it was drunk, and, though abounding, was exhausted. Small indeed was (he quantify in the (balicc afterwards drunk of, vet has it the greatest potency and is unlimited" (Translation from *of Catholics,* Vol. II, p. 249).

brom the «above attempt to explain the Fish-symbol it will be seen that, though the elements or species of the Holy Eucharist were ever the same liturgically, according to the Divine Institution, the pictorial representations of the viands in Catacomb Banquets changed with the canons of symbolism. Whereas the wine element appeared along with bread *and fishes* in the two most ancient Eucharistic frescoes, yet was lost sight of in early Christian art for over a century, the Fish, which occupied so ancient and honoured a position on the walls of the Roman crypts, never lapsed into obscurity. Connoting more than the dolphin, by reason of the acrostic, it came, even alone, to be the Christians' most sacred emblem of the Saviour, True God and True Man.

Before passing to inscriptions, we are compelled to describe here briefly a fresco which, though not portraying a banquet scene, symbolizes the Holy Eucharist at a more solemn moment even than the *Fractio Panis.* In one of the chapels of the Sacraments in the catacomb of Callixtus a remarkable painting symbolizes the actual rite of Consecration. Two persons are represented beside a three legged table *{mensa Domini),* on which are placed a loaf of bread and a fish. The priest, in tunic and pallium, extends his hands over the *oblata,*

l *Cf.* the Abercian inscription "having *goodly* wine and giving the mixed-cup with bread " (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers,* Part II. Vol. I. p. 481).

whilst the other, an Orant (probably typifying the Church) stands reverently by with arms upraised during this solemn symbolic act. By identifying the "priest" with Christ, Wilpert seems to draw this fresco into close parallelism with that of the twin fishes and the loaves in the baskets. The Eucharistic meaning of the painting is proved from the actual place it occupies in the chapel, between two other scenes emblematic of Baptism and the Eucharist, and quite close to the painting of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac.

Whatever doubts remain in the mind as to the significance of these cryptic pictures of the "Mystery of Faith" may perhaps be dispelled if they are viewed in the light of Patristic texts and of genuinely attested monuments, not Roman in origin, but discovered in comparatively recent years as far afield as Asia Minor and Gaul.

There was found near Autun in 1839 a Greek metrical inscription, given to the world by Dom Pitra (later Cardinal), which Cardinal Wiseman hailed as the most precious inscription yet brought to light. "It is the only one," he wrote, "that alludes to the Eucharistic rite." A veritable logomachy raged for years concerning its date and interpretation. Over thirty years later the Rev. Wharton B. Marriott wrote decrying its Catholic sense, yet giving no less than nine different translations of it by European experts in his Appendix. We content ourselves with quoting part of the translation as it appears in a praiseworthy little S.P.C.K. publication, *Christian Inscriptions,* by H. P. V. Nunn, M.A. (1920). The date of the inscription is not given here, but Dr. Pusey, followed recently by Dr. Darwell Stone, assigns it to the period between the coming of SS. Pothinus and

Irenaeus, and the desolation of the Church in a.d. 202:

> "Divine offspring of the heavenly *Fish,* preserve a reverent mind when thou drinkest of the immortal fountain that springs up amongst mortals. . . . Take the honey sweet food ot the Sa\iour of saints and eat it hungrily,[1] holding the *Fish* in thy hands. Feed me with the *Fish,* I pray Thee, my Lord and Saviour; may my mother sleep in peace, I beseech thee, Light of the dead. Aschandius, my father, beloved of my heart, with my sweet mother and my brethren, be mindful of thy Pectorius, abiding in the peace of the *Fish."*

The initial letters of the words introducing each of the first five lines make up the acrostic which gives the sacred anagram ΙΧΘΥΣ—a w'ord which not only begins the first line, but appears again in the brief text no less than three times.

The phrase "holding the Fish in thy hands" refers clearly to the ancient custom of receiving the Holy Eucharist: "Make thy left hand," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "a throne for thy right as for a king, and hollowing thy palm, receive the Body of Christ, saying over it, Amen." It is strange how Eisler (p. 220 and 210) can refer these words to the man "taking hold of the lush and of another loaf placed under it" in the tripod scene of the Sacrament Chapel, and stranger still when (p. 219) explaining Pistis he writes, "a female personification reminding us immediately of the *woman* blessing the bread in the S. Callisto picture."

"The reality of His Presence," says Wiseman, "could not be more clearly intimated in an inscription composed

[1] Many authors still translate "eat, *drink,*" following Secchi, Wiseman, Pitra, J. Franz, Lenormant, Pusey, etc.

whilst the *Disciplina Arcani* was in full vigour and forbade distinct allusion to what was contained and received in the Blessed Sacrament."

The inscription may be said to compare favourably in sentiment with the unique third-century gravestone of Syntrophion, found at Modena in 1862, where two fishes are roughly portrayed swimming towards each other, and separated by a curved line of small, crossed loaves.

But even clearer testimony was forthcoming when between 1884 and 1885 Sir William Ramsay, prompted to the quest by De Rossi, unearthed fragments of an inscription in Phrygia which "breathes so unmistakably the atmosphere of early Christian symbolism." It proved to be the epitaph of the bishop of Hieropolis, written in his lifetime at the age of seventy-two, after a long journey to Nisibis and Rome (before a.d. 190). Mr. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A., dates the inscription as early as 170 A.D., or thereabouts.

"Its mystical language corresponds with the terms used by Tertullian and by Clement of Alexandria and with the symbolic paintings in the catacombs of the second century. . . . When compared with that from Autun, it bears valuable evidence to the unity of the Christian faith, both in the East and West, in the divinity of Christ and in the doctrine of the Eucharist."[1]

This "Queen of Christian inscriptions," as De Rossi styled it, is deserving of quotation in full, but space confines us to the lines immediately bearing upon our subject:

> "Faith led me everywhere, and she gave me food in every place, a *Fish* from the fountain, a mighty Fish and pure, which a holy maiden took in her hands, and

[1] Nunn, *Christian Inscriptions,* S.P.C.K.

this she gives to her friends to eat for ever, having goodly wine, and giving it mixed with water, together with bread. . . . Let him who understands this, and everyone who agrees therewith, pray for Abercius. . . ."

We are thus taken back to a liturgy followed in Asia Minor about the time of the death of the last Apostle, and amongst many other rites and dogmas vindicated we notice a corroboration of St. Justin Martyr's reference to the κραμα or "mingling of wine and water" in the Mass.[1]

A couple of brief extracts may be pardoned, showing the relationship that existed between the two Greek-speaking Churches where these striking monuments were found. "Asia Minor and Gaul," says the learned Lightfoot, "were closely related, both politically and ecclesiastically, as mother and daughter. Irenaeus had been educated in the one and had migrated to the other. His testimony, therefore, represents both regions."

Paul Allard claims that "the admirable letter written in a.d. 177 by the Churches of Lyons and Vienne to those of Asia and Phrygia testifies to the intimate relations which existed between these so widely separated Churches." (*Ten Lectures on the Martyrs,* p. 17).

The Abercian stele, then, and the Pectorian slab are kindred monuments, chiselled in the same closing decade of the second century by Christians who, like their common Father, the great scholar of St. Polycarp, professed under the same symbols and practised in the same spirit, a belief in the Holy Eucharist identical with that manifested by their contemporary fellow-Christians in the painted subterranean chapels of Rome.

[1] *Apol. I.* ch. 65-7.

The key to the symbolism of the sacred frescoes was never lost. It could not be, if, indeed, the hidden jewel was so precious to those "imbued in the mysteries." But to the world of doubting savants a greater *('lavis* than that of the saintly Melito was held out to unlock the secrets of the famous sixth chapter of St. John, when sculptured stones cried out from afar what the more restricted sister Art at Rome strove to reveal.

XI.

APPENDIX B: THE SACRIFICE IN HOLY WRIT.

By the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., M.A.

The general impression appears to prevail, perhaps even among Catholics, that Holy Scripture presents a stronger case for the Real Presence than for the Eucharist as a Sacrifice. It is at least a question whether this view of the matter be correct; it may be noted that already in the second century it was confidently held that the Holy Eucharist fulfilled Malachy's prophecy of a new sacrifice (*cf.* pp. 22-27). Even so, the New Testament must also be taken into account, as strongly confirming what we find in the Old.

In our Bibles, Malachy comes last of the minor prophets, though it is a question whether he was the last in point of time. His date is about the middle of the fifth century b.c.; his style, vigorous invective and lively dialogue. God complains that He is dishonoured by the careless neglect of His priests, and by the blemished victims which are thought good enough *for* Him; let them send up these latter *to the* Persian governor, and see what *he* says! It were better to stop the whole business. The best translation of what follows appear

to be this: "I have no pleasure in you, saith Jehovah of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof My name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place shall incense be burnt and sacrifice be made to My name, even a pure offering. For My name shall be great among the Gentiles, saith Jehovah of hosts."

Omitting all discussion of minor details, three notes upon the above translation appear to be necessary. In the first place, it has been put into future time, which is required by the grammar in the first sentence ("will I accept"), and by the sense in what follows, although there of itself the grammar is neutral as to time. That the sense requires future time throughout is not likely to be very seriously disputed. Secondly, the word rendered, "shall incense be burnt," occasions some difficulty. The Revised Version takes it as a substantive, meaning "incense": "incense is offered unto My name, and a pure offering." The use of incense would still be implied as a feature in the Sacrifice of the New Covenant, though in actual history it does not appear to have been introduced at once. The Latin Vulgate renders, "there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation." This is possible, but not quite so easy to reconcile with the Hebrew, which seems to refer directly, not so much to sacrifice itself, as to the burning and smoke either of sacrifice or, as taken above (c/. Exod. xxx. 7-8, in the Hebrew), of incense. To come now to the third note upon the translation, the word used for "offering" is in both places *minhah',* this is obviously a peculiarly suitable word for the Holy Eucharist, if taken in its specialized sense of "grain-

offering/' but inasmuch as it is used just before in its most general sense, it might be unwise to insist too strongly upon the narrower meaning.

We have, then, a rejet lion of the levitical sacrifices, to be followed by another sacrifice, perhaps accompanied by incense, to be offered everywhere among the Gentiles, a pure oblation. Can there be any doubt as to what is meant? This prophecy appears to me overwhelming in its directness and clearness; and after much study of alternative views I cannot see that it has any explanation that is even plausible except the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Almighty God would in any case preserve His Church from error in so grave a matter, but in fact and history one of the most powerful safeguards to the truth has always been the prophecy of Malachy. And to the non levitical sacrifice corresponds, as is shown in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. vii), the non-levitical priesthood of Melchisedech (Gen. xiv. 18), the type of the priesthood of Christ, Himself not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah. It is in the person of Christ that the Catholic priest renews the offering of the Victim who died once and for all upon Calvary; it is by reason of his unity with Christ in divine and everlasting priesthood that he also is a priest for ever, after the manner of Melchisedech (Psalm 109).

In my original lecture I have confessed that "I should hesitate to say that in the gospels alone we have an absolutely clear proof that the Holy Eucharist was intended by Christ to be a sacrifice" (p. 8). But the words of institution are set forth with more direct reference to sacrifice by St. Paul. Perhaps I may mention that since the lecture I have dealt with St. Paul's doctrine of the Eucharist more systematically in *Verbum*

Domini for April, 1923, a little monthly issued in Latin by the Biblical Institute, giving practical help in matters biblical to all priests; and to the treatment there I would by preference refer them. In 1 Cor. xi. 24 the most correct text of the words of consecration appears to be, "this is My body, which is for you" (τὸ *σώμα το unrep vμώv),* a formula which seems to indicate that Christ's Eucharistic Body was even then in a sacrificed or sacrificial state, more so indeed than the use of any present participle, which in Greek and Aramaic and Hebrew may indicate the future (Greek, Acts xxi. 2-3; Aramaic, Daniel ii. 13; Hebrew, Malachy i. 11). Of the consecration of the Cup I have already said enough (pp. 4-8); but reference must here be made to the words, "This do ye in remembrance of Me. . . . For as often as you eat this bread and drink of the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until He come" (1 Cor. xi. 24-26). The apostles are to do what Christ has done, and therefore to present His Body and Blood in a sacrificial state; nor does it appear how else they can proclaim His death, since the mere eating does not do so.

A still clearer proof of the Sacrifice is to be found in I Cor. x. 21: "You cannot partake of *the table of the Lord* and of the table of devils." In the preceding verses there is question of taking part in idolatrous sacrifices, and nobody denies that "the table of devils" refers to such. Hence "the table of the Lord," in sharp contrast to it, also refers to sacrifices, a conclusion all the more certain when we realize that the expression is taken from Malachy i. 7 and 12, between which verses stands the great Eucharistic prophecy, in the eleventh verse. Paul heads the age-long appeal to Malachy.

A word may be said in regard of the ICpistlc to the Hebrews. To myself it appears to be the chief advantage of the doctrine *revived by Père* de la faille that it does fuller justice to such expressions as Christ's "one oblation" (Heb. x. 14), used in this epistle, inasmuch as he would say th.it it is always Christ's one sacrificial death which is being represented and offered. But what I would here urge is that in the light of Heb. xiii. 10-1G it is at least rash to say that there is no recognition of the Eucharistic sacrifice in this epistle. "We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle"; *why no* power, if tins altar be nothing more than prayer? True, ours is "a sacrifice of praise"; but in the Old Testament, here quoted, a sacrifice of praise is sacrifice with praise, not praise without sacrifice (Psalm 49; *if.* Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon,* Oxford, 190b, pp. 392-3). And it appears to be generally admitted, largely on account of *l* Cor. x. 16, that the mention of "communion" or "fellowship" in the sixteenth verse must be explained as at least including the thought of the Holy Eucharist.

That St. Paul believed in the Real Presence need not here be urged at length; he quotes the words of consecration and draws the obvious conclusion, "whoever eateth the bread or *drinketh of the* cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord - - - he that eateth and drinketh without distinguishing the body," that is, from ordinary food, a fault whereof some Corinthians were practically guilty, "eateth and drinketh judgment to himself" (1 Cor. xi. 27-29).

St. Paul, writing less than thirty years after the

Crucifixion, admitted but one common faith in himself and the other apostles; he himself, at all events, did not believe that he was inventing Christian dogmas for himself as he went along. To show this fully would take us far outside the scope of the present work; but two important passages may be quoted. In the Eucharistic epistle itself, speaking of Christ's resurrection, he exclaims, "Whether therefore I or they, so we preach, and so you have believed" (1 Cor. xv. 11). And he even tells the Galatians that he explained his gospel privately to "those in repute, for fear I might be running or had run in vain" (Gal. ii. 2). From Gal. ii. 9 it appears safe to infer that by "those in repute" are to be understood "James and Cephas and John."