

ART. IV.—CURIOSITIES OF PATRISTIC AND
MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE.

No. II.

IT is not for the sake of mere curiosity that these literary curiosities are set before the readers of the CHURCHMAN.

The former paper of this series aimed at showing how the doctrine of the Eucharist must have been changed between the fourth and the sixteenth centuries. Such a change is the only reasonable way of accounting for the fact that a distinct statement of Augustin in his own *ipsissima verba* was hastily marked with the brand of heresy by a Romish divine in 1608.

It was the figurative interpretation of our blessed Lord's words concerning eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, which was taught by the great Bishop of Hippo, and denounced by the Papist De Villiers.

In the present paper also we shall have to do with the question of the figurative or representative character of the sacramental elements.

We shall have to mark how in the eighth century the consecrated elements were asserted by some, and denied by others, to be *images*, or *figures*, or *representations*,¹ or types of the Body and Blood of Christ.

There is a very remarkable *curiosity* connected with the use of the word *antitypes* (and the like) as used by the earlier Fathers, and as affording a bone of contention between two Councils (both summoned as *Œcumenical*) in the latter half of the eighth century, which may well afford another most important lesson of instruction concerning the growth of Eucharistic doctrine in the advancing ages of the Church's history.

These councils belong to a period in ecclesiastical history which is not, perhaps, very often carefully studied; and it may probably be assumed that many of the readers of the CHURCHMAN are not familiar with it. It will be desirable, therefore, to give something of an outline of such portions of this history as are important for the purpose which we have in view.

But first it will be necessary to say a word for English readers concerning the meaning of the word *antitype*.

The sense it bears in our modern language is here altogether out of sight. It is true that before this date occasional examples of such a sense may be found. But such examples are quite exceptional. All readers of the Greek Testament

¹ On the distinction drawn by some between the terms *image*, *figure* *representation*.—See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 279, 280.

know that this word is used in the Epistle to the Hebrews to signify "the man-made *figures* of the true" most holy place in the heavens—not the truth or reality in heavenly things which correspond to the earthly representations. The antitype is nothing but the earthly representation or sign of that which is the heavenly and the true. The *ἀντί* here is not the *ἀντί* of correspondence or *συστοιχία* in heavenly things, but it is the *ἀντί* of substitution or proxyship. And the *ἀντίτυπον* is thus the earthly type which *stands* to represent the original or the reality in things above.

The period of history to which we are about to direct attention should be viewed in connection with the life of a very remarkable man, which terminated about the time of its commencement. John Mansour, commonly known as Joannes Damascenus, appears to have been born at Damascus towards the close of the previous century—the son of a Christian father who may probably be identified with the treasurer to the Caliph Abdulmelek. And John himself was at an early age called to the court, and became vizier to the then reigning Caliph. It was in the year 726 that the Byzantine Emperor, Leo the Isaurian, put forth an edict against image-worship, simply forbidding the adoration of images and paintings. This was followed in 730 by a second edict ordering the destruction of all such objects of worship. John of Damascus straightway stood forth as the champion of the images or icons, and sent forth two polemics against the action of the Emperor. But the most important of the works of Damascenus is his well-known book *De fide Orthodoxa*, which, as the first complete body of divinity which is known to us, has made its influence felt in the West as well as the East, and may probably have been before the Lombard when he prepared his famous "Sentences." In this work we have, for the present, only to notice one particular. Our attention must be confined to his dealing with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He strongly insists that the bread and wine are not a *type* of the Body and Blood of Christ. "God forbid," he says, "but (they are) the very deified Body of the Lord itself" (*μη γένοιτο ἀλλ' ἀντὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου τεθεωμένον*), "since the Lord Himself said, *This is My*, not a type of My Body, *but My Body*; and not a type of My Blood, but *My Blood*" (lib. iv., cap. xiii., Op. tom. i., p. 271, edit. Le Quien). And a little further on he declares that if any had called the bread and wine antitypes (*ἀντίτυπα*) of the Body and Blood of the Lord, as Basil the Saint spake, they spoke it not after the consecration, but so named the oblation itself only before it had been consecrated (p. 273). In this matter Damascenus was following the lead of Anastasius of Mount Sinai, who had

taught in the seventh century that what Christians receive in the Eucharist is not an antitype (*ἀντίτυπον*) of Christ's Body and Blood. This Anastasius may perhaps be looked upon as "the first inventor" (to use the words of Waterland, vol. v., p. 195) "of the spiritual *bread-body*, or first founder of that system," though Waterland questions its having so early a date.

What all this has to do with our history will appear very shortly.

It is not to be wondered at that in this century a strong and determined opposition should have set in against the superstition and idolatry of image-worship. It is sad indeed to think that, at this date, Christianity should have become so deeply corrupted. "Images," we are told, "were selected to be god-parents; part of the colouring with which they had been painted was scratched off and mixed with the sacramental wine: the consecrated bread was first laid upon images, that so the faithful might receive from the hands of these saints the Body of the Lord" (Kurtz, "Hist. of Ch. Church," edit. Edersheim, vol. i., p. 252). Yet the monks and the populace, filled with superstitious zeal, were united in their opposition to the edicts of the Emperor. And in their resistance they were supported by the aged Germanus, the Patriarch of Constantinople. Conflicts with the military, tumults, and bloodshed followed. Pope Gregory II. spoke of the Emperor "as if he had been a silly, naughty boy;" and Gregory III., in a synod held at Rome in 732, "pronounced an anathema against all opponents of image-worship" (Kurtz, p. 253).

In 741 Leo the Isaurian died, and was succeeded by his son Constantinus V., commonly called in derision Copronymus. By him an *Œcumenical Council* was summoned to support him in his endeavours to put down this superstition. This synod met at Constantinople A.D. 754. There were present 350 bishops, but Rome sent no legates. And no patriarch came from Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem, cities which were now under the domination of the Saracens. Moreover, the See of Constantinople was then vacant. The Council showed itself quite ready to do the Emperor's bidding. It manifested no lack of zeal in carrying out the purpose for which it had been assembled. It pronounced "the most sweeping condemnation against every kind of reverence paid to images" (Kurtz, p. 254). We need not dwell now on the barbarous cruelty with which its decrees were enforced, nor on the dreadful anathema which followed, issued by Pope Stephen III., A.D. 769, against all opponents of images.

But we are concerned with the language of this Council. It is important for our purpose to notice how it speaks of the elements of the Holy Communion. In its desire to condemn

the likeness of images, and the idolatry which they encouraged, it insists that Christ ordained that the oblation should be of the substance of bread which does not resemble the form of a man, and this in order that there might be no room for idolatry to be brought in by a side wind (*ἀρτον οὐσίαν προσέταξεν προσφέρεισθαι, μὴ σχηματίζουσιν ἀνθρώπου μορφῆν, ἵνα μὴ εἰδωλολατρεία παρεισαχθῆ*, Mansi., tom. xiii., c. 264). It states that no other form or type (than bread) was chosen by Christ as capable of representing His Incarnation (*ὡς οὐκ ἄλλου εἶδους ἐπιλεχθέντος παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν, ἣ τύπου, εἰκονίσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ σάρκωσιν δυναμένου, Ibid.*). And it calls this the Divinely-delivered image of His Flesh (*ἡ θεοπαράδοτος εἰκὼν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*); and, again, names it the true image of the Incarnate dispensation of Christ our God (*ἀψευδῆς εἰκὼν τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*).

So much for the *dicta* of this would-be Œcumenical Council. The Emperor died, and the wind changed. We pass over a period of thirty-three years. An Empress now sits on the throne. She is on the side of images. She is labouring to undo the work of the iconoclasts. Another Council is summoned. And this synod has been allowed to rank as œcumenical. The Pope is represented at this second Council of Nicæa, A.D. 787.

Here homage to images and prostration before pictures (distinguished from *λατρεία* due only to God) is allowed and approved.

But here again, for our present purpose, we are concerned with the language of this Council with respect to the elements of the Eucharist. At this synod were read the words of the synod of 754, and this reading was followed by the reading of its own words of reply and condemnation. Strong and vehement is the repudiation of what had been decreed by the previous Council—decrees which had been approved by some of the very Bishops¹ who now sat in judgment upon them. But what have they to say in reply to the contention that the Eucharistic elements are the only sanctioned representations of the Body of Christ?

It alleges that the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople, in turning away from the truth concerning the making of images, had been carried on in their error into another extreme madness of frenzy (*εἰς ἑτέραν ἐσχάτην ἀποπληξίας μανίαν*). They meet the assertion of the Eucharistic bread

¹ An account of the humiliating conduct of the Bishops who had previously belonged to the party of the Iconoclasts may be seen in Canon Robertson's "Church History," vol. iii., p. 134.

being an image of Christ's Body by distinct denial. They assert that not one of the holy Apostles (the trumpet voices of the Holy Ghost), and not one of our illustrious Fathers, ever spoke of our unbloody sacrifice which is made for the remembrance of the Passion of our God and of His whole dispensation as an image of His Body. For they had not received of the Lord so to speak, or so to profess their belief (οὕτως λέγειν ἢ ὁμολογεῖν). In support of their assertion they quote from our Lord's words in John vi., and from the words of institution, noting that our Lord did not say, "Take, eat the image of My Body" (οὐκ εἶπε Λάβετε, φάγετε τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ σώματός μου). Then, after further quoting from St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi., they conclude that "it is manifestly evident, as regards the unbloody sacrifice offered by the priest, that nowhere is it called an image or type, by the Lord, or by the Apostles, or by the Fathers, but the Body itself, and the Blood itself." And they add that indeed before the perfection of the consecration (πρὸ μὲν τῆς τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τελειώσεως) it had seemed fit to some of the holy Fathers piously to name them *antitypes*. They mention by name Eustathius (who on Prov. ix. 5 had said, διὰ τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ἀντίτυπα τῶν σωματικῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ κηρύττει μελῶν) and Basil (who ἐν τῇ ἐνχῆ τῆς θείας ἀναφορᾶς used these words θαρρόυντες προσεγγίζομεν τῷ ἁγίῳ θυσιαστήριῳ, καὶ προσθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου). They contend that in the case of Basil the context makes clear that his meaning is—that the elements are called antitypes before their consecration, but that afterwards they are called (and are, and are believed to be) simply the Body and Blood of Christ (μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα Κυρίου καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται), Mansi, tom. xiii., c. 265.

It is believed that Damascenus had died in the interval between the Council of Constantinople and this second Council of Nicæa. But it is obvious to remark how his assertion concerning the use of the term *antitypes* is reproduced by the Fathers of the latter Council.

We have assuredly here a strange curiosity of Christian literature. It is strange, indeed, that two Councils, separated by so short an interval of time, should have left on record such different views of the Eucharistic service: that the first should, apparently without doubt or question, have regarded the elements as a figure or type, or image of Christ's Body and Blood; and that the second should have repudiated such an idea, and pronounced the language which speaks of the consecrated bread and wine as antitypes to be a contradiction of the faith and language and the tradition of the whole Christian Church. It seems almost as if the Council summoned by Irene

would fain have anticipated the action of De Villiers, and set its mark of *dicet hæreticus* against the doctrine maintained by the Council summoned by Copronymus. But in so doing it would certainly, like De Villiers, have made heretics of more than it meant, and of more than it could have dared thus to brand for denunciation.

Was the assertion of Damascenus¹ true—was the contention of the Council defensible, that none of the earlier Fathers of the Church has named the consecrated elements the antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ? A marginal note by the Greek scholiast stands to correct the error of the Council (and therein, also, of Damascenus); allows that it was *not true*; declares that after consecration the holy gifts are *often* called *antitypes*.

In a treatise on inductive logic, the argument of the Council might well be stated as a remarkable instance of inductive fallacy. Two or three examples are cited in support of the Council's contention that the consecrated elements are not spoken of as an image, and the conclusion is drawn as incontrovertible (*οὐκοῦν σαφῶς ἀποδέδεικται*) that *nowhere*, by Apostles or Fathers, are they ever so designated; that any Fathers who used the term *antitypes* meant it only as applicable to the unconsecrated oblation.

The fallacy may easily be shown. It has been abundantly exposed. The mistake is now acknowledged by all. The misstatement is not defended by Romish controversialists.

But the reader may be glad to see a few examples of the use of the term *antitypes*, which was denied by the Council:

Τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφήνη τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες τούτων τῶν ΑΝΤΙΤΥΠΩΝ, τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν (Irenæus, "Fragm.," Op. ed. Migne, c. 1253; No. xxxvii.).

This is one of the Pfaffian fragments, which since the loss of the Turin MS. cannot be verified. But the remarkable agreement with the liturgy of the Apostolical Constitutions, as pointed out by Canon Heurtley ("Sermons on Recent Controversy," pp. 53, 54), leaves little doubt as to its being a genuine Patristic writing. The reader will observe that here the elements are spoken of as antitypes during their reception by the communicants.

Τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ λογικοῦ ἡμῶν θυσιαστηρίου ἐπιτελούμενα ἀγιάζει

¹ Waterland justly observes (vol. v., p. 198): "Had he said just the reverse, viz., that the Fathers had never so called them *before* consecration, but *always after*, he had come much nearer the truth."

τὴν τράπεζαν, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ σκεύη, *ΑΝΤΙΤΥΠΙΑ* γὰρ εἰς τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος (Origen, as quoted by Julius Cæsar Bulenger, "Diatribæ contra Casaubonum," iii., p. 166).

Here the reader should mark how the table and vessels are said to be sanctified by the antitypes of the Lord's Body, which could only be after they had themselves been consecrated.

These examples are selected from many others as abundantly sufficing to disprove the assertion of the Nicene Council (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 287-292). To estimate their importance as bearing on the doctrine of the Eucharist, they should be viewed in connection with another assertion of this Council, to the effect that if the sacrament is an image of the Body of Christ, it is not possible to be the Divine Body itself. [*Ἐν εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματος ἔστι, οὐκ ἐνδεχέται εἶναι αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον σῶμα* (Labbæus, tom. vii., c. 449.)] In this saying, the Council is only echoing the voices of many other witnesses (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 298, 299).

So then we have the Constantinopolitan Council regarding the Eucharistic bread as an image (figure or sign) of the Body of Christ, and therein following the examples of a multitude of earlier Fathers of the Church, Western as well as Eastern. And then a generation later we have the Nicene Council pronouncing such views to come of the delirium of madness, denying the truth that the Fathers had used such language aforesaid, and affirming that such expressions cannot be reconciled with what they maintain to be the only truth of the Eucharist, that it is the very Body and Blood of Christ.

Here then, at first sight, we seem to have the same conflict of doctrines as that which we observed between the views of Augustin on the one side, holding the figurative sense of our Lord's words of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, and those of De Villiers and the modern Romish controversialists on the other side, rejecting such figurative interpretations of the words which speak of the Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, and condemning as heretics all who deny the oral manducation of the very Body and Blood themselves.

But we should greatly err if we should hastily assume that the two cases are parallel because they appear so similar.

Of these two Councils we can scarcely perhaps identify the views of the first with those of Augustin. And the views of the second must be clearly seen to be very far removed from those of the Council of Trent.

(1) First, as regards its Constantinopolitan doctrine. Notwithstanding its use of the word *image* (which it uses to exclude all other images or icons), this synod uses language which, in its natural sense, would seem to teach a supernatural change wrought by consecration in the elements themselves,

extra usum—the Holy Ghost so coming upon them as to constitute a miracle corresponding (in some sense) with the mystery of our Blessed Lord's Incarnation, and making the true image to be also (in some sense) the Divine Body (*θεῖον σῶμα*).¹

It may perhaps appear doubtful to some whether St. Augustin's teaching does not sometimes seem to go beyond the meaning which our Reformers meant to be conveyed by the language which speaks of the elements as "effectual signs," and truly "exhibitive" of that which they signify.² But it is doubted whether in Augustin's language any example can be found to show that Eucharistic doctrine had ever in his teaching approached the point which it seems to have attained in the teaching of the Council of Constantinople in 754.

(2) But it is far more certain and far more demonstrable that the teaching of the Nicene Council was something quite distinct from the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation and the real Presence. And this distinction needs to be emphasized by those who would view aright the stages of progress by which in ages of ever-increasing corruption the doctrine of the Eucharist attained at length to its full growth of superstition and idolatry.

It has not, perhaps, been sufficiently recognised how widely the thought of the Eastern Church was influenced by the doctrine, or something like the doctrine, which has sometimes been designated by the name of the "Augmentation" doctrine. We have seen the Nicene Council following in the wake of the great doctor of the East, Joannes Damascenus. Nowhere, we believe, is to be found a clearer statement of the Augmentation doctrine than in his writings. The reader may be referred again to his treatise "De fide orthodoxa," lib. iv., cap. xiii. There he will see how the author, comparing the mystery of the Eucharist with the mystery of the Incarnation, insists that

¹ It may be questioned whether the doctrine of the Constantinopolitan Synod has not been somewhat minimized by Waterland (Works, vol. v., p. 201 *sqq.*). But his view of the meaning of its language is supported by the following quotation, which he makes from the Emperor Copronymus, as it has been preserved by Nicephorus, who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 800 to 815. Ἐκέλευσεν τοῖς ἀγίοις μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, παραδοῦναι δι' οὗ ἡράσθη πράγματος τύπον εἰς σῶμα αὐτῶν. Ἴνα διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἀναγωγῆς, κἀκεῖ ἐκ μετοχῆς καὶ θέσει γίνηται, λάβωμεν αὐτὸ, ὡς κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς, σῶμα αὐτῶν. (In *Notis ad Damascen.* tom. i., p. 354.) For the sense of *κυρίως* he refers to "Albertinus de Euch.," p. 461; and "Claude," Part II., p. 76.—As to the use of the term "Deification," see "Albertinus," p. 914; and Robertson's "History of the Christian Church," vol. iii., p. 236.

² Sayings, however, of Augustin and others, which, in their ambiguities may have a doubtful sound, may fairly claim a favourable interpretation to bring them into harmony with statements, more distinct and decisive, made elsewhere.—See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 317, 318.

the bread and wine are changed into the Divine Body and Blood (*μεταποιούνται εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα θεοῦ*). This he regards as the result of the supervention of the Holy Ghost effecting that which surpasses human conception (*Πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπιφουτᾷ, καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὰ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ ἔννοιαν*). He deprecates investigations as to the mode (*ὁ δὲ τρόπος ἀνεξερεύνητος*); but ventures on this much of explanation: that as bread which is eaten, and wine and water which are drunk, are changed (*μεταβάλλονται*) into the body and blood of him who eats and drinks, and becomes not another body different from the body which he had before; so the bread and wine, by the invocation and supervention of the Holy Ghost (*διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως καὶ ἐπιφουτῆσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος*), are supernaturally changed (*ὑπερφυῶς μεταποιούνται*) into the Body and Blood of Christ, not making two bodies, but one and the same Body (*καὶ οὐκ εἰσι δύο, ἀλλ' ἓν, καὶ τὸ αὐτό*).¹

The language of Damascenus here is very instructive. To the reader who studies it carefully two observations occur almost inevitably. *First*, the reader can hardly fail to observe how a remarkable similarity of language is paving the way for a farther advance of superstition, making easy the approaches to the full doctrine of the Council of Trent. And *secondly*, he cannot help noting how, notwithstanding this, the idea of Damascenus is entirely separate and distinct from that of the subsequent stages of doctrinal advance.

There is nothing here to be compared to the teaching of the same Body being at the same time in more places than one. Superstition has not yet come near to the point—the writer seems rather to regard as inaccessible and impossible to be contemplated the position—on which violence is to be done

¹ Much more to the same effect might be quoted from the Greek Fathers. Some form of this doctrine, or some approximation to it, appears to have very widely extended itself in the East. It would be out of place to argue the point here. But much evidence to this effect will be found in Claude's "Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist," Part I., book iii., ch. xiii., pp. 227-239. So far as the Eastern doctrine (which mainly insists on the virtue and efficacy of the Body and Blood of Christ, see Claude, Part I., pp. 223-228, and Waterland's Works, vol. v., p. 190 *sqq.*), took any definite form, it seems generally to have assumed something of this shape—the same similitudes and very much the same forms of expression frequently recurring, and the teaching of Damascenus ranking among them as oracular. (See Claude, Part I., Book III., ch. xiii., p. 221-340.) It may be that in some cases the view may have amounted to a conception of the hypostatical Union of Bread with the Divine Logos. But it is believed that very generally it may have fallen short of this. (See Claude, p. 238.) And, perhaps, it may be open to question whether those who used the language of *adoption*, *assumption*, *augmentation*, etc., would have been prepared to follow up their teachings to their logical conclusions.

to the simplest intuitions of common-sense by teaching faith to believe that, at the same moment, the same Body of Christ is in heaven at God's right hand, and on ten thousand separate altars on earth. With Damascenus, indeed, the bread is changed, and made into one and the same Body; not, however, by any Real Corporal Presence of Christ's Body in the form of the bread, but by the bread being added and incorporated (through the operation of the Spirit) into the one Body of Christ by way of augmentation or increase, as a mere human body incorporates into itself its natural food and sustenance. The idea conveyed is certainly not the idea conveyed by Romish doctrine. The two ideas may clothe themselves in language almost identical, yet they are separate one from another *toto calo*.

And this distinction explains what Rabanus Maurus in the next century is supposed to have written to Egilus when attempts were being made to put the wine of a *new* doctrine into the old bottles of this earlier language. He regards the Paschasian doctrine as a thing unheard of. He says (if Mabillon is right in thinking that he has recovered his letter in an anonymous MS. See "Romish Mass and English Church," p. 66), "Illud in hoc libro mihi prius fateor *inauditum* reperi sub nomine sancti Ambrosii, quod non sit hæc alia caro Christi, quam quæ nata est de Maria, et passa in Cruce, et resurrexit de sepulchro." (See Op. Rabani Mauri, Edit. Migne, tom. vi., c. 1513.)

But the Augmentation doctrine must not be supposed to be a peculiarity of Damascenus.¹ We believe that some sort of indefinite approaches to it were early made in the Eastern Church. And something more or less cognate to it seems afterwards to have prevailed very widely. Moreover, in the Western Church also, it largely made its influence to be felt.²

¹ After the time of Damascenus the same or similar views seem to have exercised considerable influence also in the West. Notwithstanding Dr. Pusey's argument to the contrary ("Real Presence from the Fathers," pp. 5-9) the language of Rupertus Tuitiensis can hardly be understood in any other sense than as supporting some similar form of doctrine. But Rupert was by no means alone among the Westerns in propounding this doctrine. See "Romish Mass and English Church," p. 62.

² Waterland says, "Before the end of the ninth century the *Eastern* innovations, introduced by Anastasius and Damascen, and established by the Nicene Council, spread wide and far, both among Greeks and Latins" (Works, vol. v., p. 204). "The old notion of a *sacrament*, as importing a *sign* and a *thing signified*, wore off apace; and now all the care was, how to make out that *very body and blood*, by some subtle evasions, or newly devised theories." (*Ibid.*)

These theories Waterland regards as reducible perhaps to *five*: 1. The elements literally becoming the same *personal* Body [Anastasius, Damascen and the Nicene Fathers]. 2. The elements containing the same body.

After reading the language of Damascenus it is obviously impossible to argue that the language of the second Nicene Council indicates the doctrine now held by the Church of Rome. The language of the Council is to be read in the light, not of subsequent developments of Eucharistic doctrine, but of what we gather of earlier and contemporary Christian thought on the subject.

It is probable, at least, that the language of the Council is intended to convey a meaning similar to that of Damascenus. The form of doctrine which he upheld may have admitted certain not inconsiderable varieties of phase, and may have found expression in slightly varying terms. The Constantinopolitan Council held that the *εἰκὼν* was the Lord's Body, *θέλει*, which has been translated sometimes by the Latin *adoptio* (Mansi, tom. xiii., c. 263), sometimes by *positio* (*ibid.*, c. 679). Perhaps the best English rendering would be "by appointment or institution." And though this language is ridiculed by the Nicene Council (Mansi, tom. xiii., c. 265), and though it conveys an idea which falls far short of *augmentation*, it may possibly have been intended to indicate a doctrine diverging indeed from that which was held by the Fathers of that Council, yet not so far removed from it as at first sight may have appeared.

Every form of this doctrine which thus speaks of the elements as the very Body and Blood of Christ, regarding them as made so to be, whether (1) by appointment or adoption, into union with the true Body of Christ, or (2) by way of augmentation and incorporation into His Body, attributing this change to the advent and supervention of the Holy Ghost, should be viewed in connection with the Eastern doctrine of the consecra-

[Paschasius?]. 3. The elements becoming *another* personal Body [Rupertus Tuitiensis? Odo Cameracensis?]. 4. The elements containing another personal Body [Ratramn?]. 5. The elements being or containing a *true* and *proper* Body of Christ, distinct and different from a *personal* Body [Remigius of Auxerre, Pseudo-Alcuin "De Divinis Officiis"]. See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 294, 295 and 297.

These all (except No. 2) seem to be slightly varying modifications of the same general view, according to which the language of the earlier Fathers is to be rejected, and the consecrated elements are to be regarded (not as *signs*, or *figures*, or *antitypes* of the Body and Blood, but) as the very Body and Blood of Christ, in virtue of their being, in some way, spiritually united to the person of the Logos, or to the Body of Christ.

It is scarcely needful to say that this view is quite distinct, and indeed very far removed, from that of the Real Presence of Romish or Lutheran doctrine.

When sayings of the Fathers are adduced, which *sound like* the Real Objective Presence, and seem to present difficulties which cannot be solved by the interpretative *dicta* of Augustin and others, it will be found, if we mistake not, that they can, for the most part, be easily understood, as expressing or implying some (perhaps very indefinite) form of, or some approximation to, this view.

tion, which attributes the change (not as the Western) to the words of institution, but to the invocation of the Holy Spirit. This is an interesting subject, but one which space will not permit us to dwell upon.

But this augmentation doctrine should also, and especially, be viewed in connection with the teaching of our own incorporation, by the operation of the one Spirit into the one mystical Body of Christ.¹ Does it not seem to rest on the mistaken assumption that as the medium of our spiritual participation of Christ, the sacrament must first itself be all that it can make us, by its reception, to be² that if, by being partakers of the one bread (1 Cor. x. 17), we are made to be partakers of the one Body, the bread itself must first be converted into that Body, and be made Divine by the indwelling of the Spirit, even as 'the receivers are Divinely united to the living Christ and made to drink into one Spirit?

This is a mistake, and a mistake which (like other forms of Eucharistic error) arises from a forgetfulness of the truth, that in the Eucharist we have to do primarily and immediately and directly with the atonement of the death of Christ, with His Body and Blood as given for us, and separate in death for our sins, and that our spiritual union with the glorified Christ is that which *follows upon* our communion and partaking of the sacrifice of the death of Christ.

And our history has shown us how, when this mistaken notion has taken hold of men's minds, it tends to repel and reject the language which, in earlier and purer times, regarded the consecrated elements as *antitypes*, and spoke of them as images, figures and signs of the Body and Blood of Christ. Thus it is that this first step in departure from the teaching of Scripture was preparing the way for the incoming of Paschasian and then of Tridentine doctrine.

And may we not see here also how needful it was that our Reformation should take us back to the earlier and purer

¹ The Fathers frequently set side by side, and in connection one with another, the two sayings (1) that the Sacrament is the Body of Christ; (2) that the Church is the Body of Christ. See examples in "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 317-329. But they recognised also the truth that by Baptism we are incorporated into the Body of Christ; and this (notwithstanding later superstitions of the East) without the water being made to be the Body and Blood of Christ. Leo's saying, "Ut corpus regeuerati fiat caro Crucifixi" (De Pass. Dom. Serm. xiv. In Heptas. Præsalum, p. 62) is but the expression of a truth universally recognised.

² See especially the language of Nicholas of Methone, "De Corpore et Sanguine D." in Migne's P. G., tom. cxxxv., c. 512, language which in part is borrowed from Chrysostom. See also "Eucharistic Worship," p. 317 *sqq.*

teaching, to the doctrine which did not hesitate to call the elements *figures* and *antitypes*?¹ And may we not see also how needful it is for us, if we would uphold the truth taught by our English Reformation, that we should earnestly contend for the doctrine which bids us to regard the elements as *effectual signs*, signs, indeed, truly effectual for the real communion of the Body and Blood of Christ to the exceeding comfort and health of our souls, but still *signs*—*signs* which, though rightly bearing the names of those things of which they are effectual conveyances, cannot possibly be themselves the signs and the things signified? True faith does no violence to sanctified reason and intelligent common-sense. And sanctified common-sense, rejecting many statements of the Nicene Council, willingly accepts from it this one *dictum*: 'Ἐν εἰκῶν τοῦ σώματος ἔστι, οὐκ ἐνδεχέται εἶναι αὐτο τὸ θεῖον σῶμα.
N. DIMOCK.

ART. V.—PALESTINE AND THE RESTORATION
OF THE JEWS.

WHEN I was permitted to address the readers of the CHURCHMAN in May last, on "Palestine as a Field of Missions," I had no idea of the intense interest that would be awakened in the hearts of many in the land and its people in so short a time. But it is a feature of these days that events move rapidly. And in nothing is this more clearly seen than in the things that are happening in connection with God's people Israel.

¹ It is interesting and instructive to compare the faith of the Syrian Christians of Malabar as represented by the Romanists at the Synod of Diamper, A.D. 1599. It appears to have been alleged against them: "They held that the true Body of our Lord is not in the holy sacrament of the altar but only a figure thereof, that the holy Eucharist is only the image of Christ, and is distinguished from Him as an image is distinguished from a true man; that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is not there nor anywhere else but in heaven, at the right hand of the Father; that under the element of bread is only the body of Christ without Blood, and under the element of wine the Blood without the Body, and that in this sacrament there is only the virtue of Christ but not His Body and Blood. Further, the priest seemed to call on the Holy Ghost to come down from heaven to consecrate the elements, 'whereas in truth it is the priest that does it, though not in his own words, but in the words of Christ.'" (Rae's "Syrian Church in India," p. 236.) Again, "The Syrians lacked 'the healthful use of pictures'; they maintained that images are filthy and abominable idols, and ought not to be adored." (*Ibid.*, p. 238.)