

ART. IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS ON
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE dividing line between the doctrine of the Lord's Supper held by the Protestant Churches, and that held by the Church of Rome and by her sympathisers, is to be found in two positive principles which are thrown by the course of controversy into crucial importance. The second of them especially touches the most modern development of Anglo-Catholic theology, and consequently cannot be attested by the same positive concurrence of authority as the other. On either side of these lines there may be found considerable variety in the estimate formed of the Sacraments and in the position, dignity, and importance comparatively assigned to them. But any man, however high may be his estimate of the Lord's Supper, who maintains these principles, belongs essentially to the Protestant school. Every one who maintains the converse propositions, however Evangelical his language may sometimes be, belongs essentially to the Anglo-Catholic school.

I. The first is that the grace, virtue and efficacy of the Sacrament, whatever it be, is not to be found in the elements, but in the heart of the faithful recipient. That this expresses the true mind of the greatest Divines of the Church of England can be proved by most abundant evidence. Enunciated in its most distinct form by the judicious Hooker (Ecel. Pol. b. v. c. 67), it has been emphatically repeated by another great authority on this subject, Dean Waterland. "What Mr. Hooker very judiciously says of the *real presence* of Christ in the Sacrament, appears to be equally applicable to the *presence* of the *Holy Spirit* in the same. It is not to be sought for in the *Sacrament*, but in the worthy receival of the *Sacrament*. As for the Sacraments they really exhibit; but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace, which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Waterland's "Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist," c. v. p. 94, Oxford, 1823.) Bishop Moberly, in his "Bampton Lecture," recognises the fact that "Hooker and Waterland limit authoritatively that presence to the heart of the receiver." ("Bampton Lectures for 1868," Lect. 6.)

II. The second principle is that the Body and Blood of Christ, of which we are made spiritually partakers in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, is not the glorified Body of Christ now existing in heaven with flesh and blood united in the one living

organism, but it is the Body as it was crucified, and the Blood as it was poured out from the flesh and separated from it. This vital distinction has been thrown more and more into prominence in the course of controversy. The Church of England in her Communion Office teaches her children to pray that—

“ We receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood : who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread and, when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, ‘ Take, eat, this is My Body which is given for you : Do this in remembrance of Me.’ Likewise after supper He took the Cup ; and, when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, ‘ Drink ye all of this ; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you.’ ”

Our great Divines repeat the same keynote, as may be seen from the following quotations :—

How are His Body and Blood to be considered ? Surely not as Christ is glorified, but as He was crucified ; for it is that Body that was given, and the Blood is that Blood which was shed.—Bishop Lake, “ Sermon on Matt. xxvi.”

If a host could be turned into Him now, glorified as He is, it would not serve ; Christ offered is it, hither we must look.—Bishop Andrewes’ “ Sermon on the Resurrection.”

Christ's Flesh, not indeed simply as it is Flesh, without any other respect (for so it is not given, neither would it profit us), but as it is crucified and given for the Redemption of the World.—Bishop Cosin, “ Hist. of Transubstantiation,” lvi.

If the consecrated elements be the Flesh and Blood of Christ, then are they the Sacrifice of Christ Crucified upon the Cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of Christ as in His Body, while it was whole, but as separated by the passion of His Cross.—Thorndike, “ Just Weights and Measures,” xiv. s. 7.

The Body we receive in this Holy Sacrament is His Crucified Body.”—Archbishop Wake's “ Principles of the Christian Religion,” p. 364, London, 1827.

In the learned work of Dean Goode on the Eucharist, he maintains with abundant proof the following proposition :—

The Fathers tell us that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is present as *dead*, and His Blood as *shed*, upon the Cross, and that we eat and drink them *as such* ; and they cannot be really and substantially present in this form, as they do not now exist in it.

In the work of Dr. Vogan on the Eucharist, this aspect of the question is yet more thoroughly worked out, and supplies the basis of his elaborate argument. To his volume the reader is referred for fuller information, and for the authorities by whom the distinction between the dead and living body of the Lord

Jesus Christ is supported alike by the Early Fathers and the Divines of the Church of England.

From these two principles the following rules are readily deduced:—

1. Any writer who refers the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to the heart, and lays stress on the faith and moral condition of the communicant.—

2. Any writer who speaks of God the Father as the giver of the grace of the Sacrament, and the Holy Spirit and his operations in the human soul as the agent.—

3. Any writer who describes the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper as being still bread and wine after consecration.—

4. Any writer who speaks slightly of material sacrifices, and emphatically of those which are moral and spiritual.—

5. Any writer who identifies the Body and Blood of Christ received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper with the crucified Body and shed Blood of the Lord.—

6. Any writer who gives prominence to the Lord's Supper as commemorative of the sacrifice and death of Christ once for all accomplished on the Cross—

Must be understood *not* to maintain the Real Presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper. The *converse* propositions would of course be equally certain.

Before applying these rules to the passages from the Early Fathers, asserted to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, some preliminary remarks must be made on the general attitude maintained by them towards the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The following quotation is taken from a Letter published in the *Guardian* newspaper of February 10, 1869:—

But there is a practical mode of judging between sound and unsound views on the Eucharist better than from the subtleties of logic. If the doctrine on which Eucharistic adoration is based be true, it is a truth of cardinal importance. This is not only acknowledged but urged by those who hold it to be true, and experience shows that wherever this or a similar doctrine is held, it becomes the centre of the system of Christian teaching. Observing this fact, let us compare it with the general tone of the New Testament. Is the doctrine prominent there? Are the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul full of it? Was it the great theme of the Apostolic teaching? On the contrary, it is hard to find so much as a clause or a sentence which may be thought to give it an implied sanction. Had St. Paul known such a doctrine, its omission from his Treatise to the Romans is surely unaccountable. But his language to the Corinthians is even more decisive. In chapter xi. of his first epistle, he enjoins reverence for the Lord's Supper. It would have been to the purpose of his argument to leave nothing unsaid as to the mystery of Christ's presence. Yet his

words in every respect accord with the solemnness of our English Liturgy.

The same principle is at least applicable to the writings of the Early Fathers as it is to the Apostolic epistles. Yet what are the facts? The Early Fathers quoted in the Article in the *Church Quarterly*, of October, 1879, are Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus. In the larger work of Dr. Pusey, whose statement that to his knowledge he had omitted nothing bearing on the subject should be kept in mind—within the same limits of time the same writers, and the same only, are quoted. Irenæus was born somewhere between A.D. 120-140, and his great work against heresies was written between A.D. 182 and 188. Tatian, who comes next in Dr. Pusey's catena, flourished about the middle of the second century, and was contemporary with Justin; but the exact date is uncertain. Clement of Alexandria, who follows, died A.D. 220. It is therefore admitted that till towards the close of the second century the only writers in whose works any clear references to the Lord's Supper are to be found are Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tatian. It is true that Dr. Hebert, in his history of uninspired teaching on the Lord's Supper, adds Clement of Rome, and the author of the letter to Diognetus. But the only ground for this afforded by the language of the former is the use of the word "offerings," and of the latter the use of the words "passover" and "mysteries." How slight and untrustworthy such indications of doctrine are, to say the least for them, and how little is their controversial value, is shown by the fact, that Dr. Pusey has passed them over altogether. It remains therefore that, on the admission of Anglo-Catholics themselves, there are only four writers to be found in the first one hundred and eighty years after Christ who make any reference whatever to the Lord's Supper. Polycarp, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, Hermas, Papias, and Athenagoras are all silent. It is scarcely possible that the significance of this fact should be overrated. This silence becomes more remarkable, the more closely the remains of these Fathers are studied. Topics are discussed and passages occur over and over again, in which the subject of the Lord's Supper would almost necessarily have been introduced, had the ordinance possessed to their mind the primary importance with which the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements necessarily invests it. Thus Barnabas has a chapter entitled "The Jewish Sacrifices are to be abolished;" Clement speaks of offerings presented by priests; the Pastor of Hermas enjoyed a popularity in the early ages, which has been compared to that of the Pilgrim's Progress among ourselves, and speaks largely of religious duties. The Epistle to Diognetus was written

to give an account of the Christian religion; Athenagoras heads chapter xvii. of his work with the words, "Why the Christians do not offer sacrifices." Yet in none of them is a single clear and indisputable reference to the Lord's Supper to be found. The argument has been stated with great force by Dr. H. Burgess, and he quotes in illustration the two passages from Clement of Rome, in which Dr. Hebert erroneously considers a reference to be made to the Lord's Supper. In order to avoid misapprehension it would be as well to state at once, and most positively, that if the passages quoted by Dr. Hebert from Clement and the Epistle to Diognetus do refer to the Lord's Supper, there is not a syllable in the reference that can be twisted by any possible ingenuity into an affirmation of the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of the "Real Presence."

Thus out of ten writers three only make any reference to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at all, much less affirm the Presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in or under the forms of the consecrated bread and wine. That doctrine gives an awful importance to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and forces it into prominence as the great vivifying principle of every theology of which it constitutes a part. Had it been held, we must have found it everywhere, just as we do find it everywhere in the writings of modern Anglo-Catholics; yet with the exception of the three writers whose works remain to be examined, and of Tatian, we find it nowhere. The whole subject is even strangely absent. It is impossible that these Fathers can have known anything of the doctrine, which Anglo-Catholics assert to have been the universal doctrine of the Church from the beginning. If Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus teach it, they are not only in this respect out of harmony with all the other writers of their day, but in absolute opposition to them. Men who do not refer to the Lord's Supper even when the natural course of their argument would have suggested the reference, cannot have belonged to the same school of belief with those who hold that the consecrating words of a human priest can attach the very Body and Blood of Christ to every atom of the bread and every drop of the wine used in the Sacrament.

But if it is demonstrable that this doctrine was not the general doctrine of the Fathers of the first two centuries, another question arises. Can it possibly have been the doctrine of Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus? The affirmative is incredible. To establish such a fact would need language the most precise and exact; assertions the most clear and indisputable in the writers under review. Is such language, are such assertions, to be found? They are not. There is not a sentence in either of these writers which is not in entire consistency with that doctrine of the

Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Ordinance, which has been shown to be the doctrine of the Church of England.

What is it then that Ignatius teaches on this subject? The first passage we have to deal with is from the Epistle to the Smyrnæans:—

They [the Docetæ, who denied that our Lord had a True Body] abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised up again. They, then, who speak against this gift of God, incur death in the midst of their disputes, but it were better for them to treat it with respect that they also might rise again. Cap. vii.

It is argued that "the Eucharist" is used for the elements in the Lord's Supper. Let the assumption be for a moment granted. Even so, the passage affirms no more than do our Lord's words of institution: "This is My Body." No more stress or higher meaning can be laid on the word "is" in the language of Ignatius, than in the language of our Lord himself. The affirmation therefore proves nothing whatever. But is it certain that the word "Eucharist" is used for the elements? It appears certain that it is not.

In the first place the apposition between the Eucharist and "prayer" is destroyed by the supposition. Prayer must be the ordinance of prayer and not any special part of it; neither the words separately, nor the bodily attitude separately, nor the intention of the heart separately, but prayer as including all these in one ordained act of communion with God. By parity of reasoning, "the Eucharist" must mean the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and not any part of it. The word is only used by Ignatius on two other occasions. It occurs in his Epistle to the Philadelphians: "Take ye heed, then, to have but one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup to (show forth) the unity of His blood" (cap. iv.). Here it seems indisputable that the ordinance is intended, not the elements, for the unity of the ordinance is based upon the unity of the flesh and of the cup. It also occurs in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans: "Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is administered either by the Bishop or by all to whom he has entrusted it." Here again the word is co-extensive with the act of the Bishop who administers, and that act reaches to the entire ordinance. If in two of these passages the word is certainly used of the ordinance, in all human probability it must be used of the ordinance in the third instance also. The word is not employed for the "action," as has been most inaccurately stated; but it is employed for the ordinance, of which the action is only a part. If the language

appears harsh, the object of the argument should be remembered. Ignatius is writing, not of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but of the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ altogether. "He, Christ, suffered truly, even as also He truly raised up Himself, not, as certain unbelievers maintain, that He only seemed to suffer" (cap. ii.). He proceeds to argue that after His resurrection Christ was still possessed of flesh (cap. iii.), and indignantly exclaims, "What does any one profit me if he commend me, but blasphemes my Lord, not expressing that He was (truly) possessed of a body" (cap. v.). He asserts that even angels, "if they believe not in the Blood of Christ, shall, in consequence, merit condemnation" (cap. vi.). Then, in the next chapter, he contrasts the error of the Docetæ, who, not believing in the reality of our Lord's body, and therefore not in the reality of His sufferings, neither kept the memorial of His death, nor approached God in prayer, through His mediation, with the duty of the true Christian to "give heed to the Gospel in which the passion (of Christ) has been revealed to us and the resurrection has been fully proved." The longer form of the Epistle, the value of which is still disputed among critics, renders the passage quoted thus: "They are ashamed of the Cross; they mock at the passion; they make a jest of the resurrection." None, who take the Epistle as a whole, will doubt that this is the true interpretation.

The next passage is as follows: "Breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote to prevent us from dying" (Ep. xx.).

It should be noticed that the word "Eucharist" does not occur in this sentence, but only the word "bread;" and that the phrase "medicine of immortality" is associated with the "bread"—indications sufficient of themselves to prove that Ignatius says nothing in these words of what is commonly known as the "Real Presence." His language implies a high conception of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but not a whit higher than is expressed by the Church of England herself, by Jewell, Hooker, and the other writers quoted in a previous Article. To affirm that "according to S. Ignatius the Eucharist (that is, the elements) is the bearer, not of magical powers, but of the Body and Blood of Christ," is to put into the language of Ignatius ideas of which he was wholly ignorant. In what sense the Father attaches the idea of immortality to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be illustrated by a parallel passage in his Epistle to the Philadelphians:—

The Gospel possesses something transcendent above the former dispensation, in the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ, His passion and resurrection. For the beloved prophets announced Him, but the Gospel is the perfection of immortality. (Philad. ix.)

In another passage the language is yet more striking: "I flee to the Gospel as to the flesh of Jesus" (Philad. v.).

As the Gospel is the perfection of immortality because it conveys the full revelation of Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life," so the bread is the medicine of immortality, because it represents that meritorious sacrifice and death which have purchased eternal life for all that believe.

The third passage on which reliance has been placed as an evidence of the doctrine of the Real Presence, has been already quoted in another relation. In order to avoid all disputes about translation, all the passages are given in this Paper from Messrs. Clark's "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

Take ye heed then to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to (show forth) the unity (literally, into the unity) of His blood; one altar, as there is one bishop, along with the presbytery and deacons my fellow servants; that so, whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to (the will) of God (Philad. iv.).

"Here again," asserts the Anglo-Catholic writer, "the Eucharist is spoken of objectively, and effects are attributed to it which could only be attributed to the Body and Blood of Christ. The partaking of the cup has for its effect the *ἔνωσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*." But Ignatius says no such thing. He says that the oneness of the flesh of Christ and of the cup proves the oneness of the "Eucharist." The Eucharist, therefore, is neither the flesh of Christ nor the cup; although the ordinance includes both as parts of one whole. The word is not used for the elements. He further affirms that the object of the ordinance is to make all believers one in the "Blood" of Christ. Thus, he concludes his epistle to the Smyrnæans as follows:—

I salute your most worthy bishop, and your very venerable presbytery, and your deacons, my fellow servants, and all of you individually as well as generally, in the name of Jesus Christ, and in His flesh and blood, in His passion and resurrection, both corporeal and spiritual, in union both with God and man (chap. xii.).

In this case, as in the former, light may be thrown on the meaning of Ignatius from the language of the longer Greek recension. If it be spurious, it suffices at all events to show how his words were understood in other and earlier times:—

I exhort you to have but one faith, and one (kind of) preaching, and one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, and His Blood which was shed for us is one; one loaf also is broken to all (the communicants), and the cup is distributed among them all. There is but one altar for the whole Church, and one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow servants; since

also there is but one true begotten Being, God, even the Father, and one only begotten Son of God, the Word and man; and one Comforter, the Spirit of truth; and also one preaching, and one faith, and one baptism; and one Church which the Holy Apostles established from one end of the earth to another by the Blood of Christ and of their own sweat and toil; it behoves of us also, therefore, as a "peculiar people and a holy nation" to perform all things with harmony in Christ (Philad. iv.).

Such are the three passages on which Anglo-Catholic writers rely, in proof that Ignatius held the doctrine of the Real Presence. There are two other passages which are admitted to afford *primâ facie* evidence on the other side. We give them together, as they serve to throw light on each other:—

My love has been crucified; and there is no fire in me desiring to be fed. But there is within me a water that thinketh and speaketh, saying to me inwardly, "Come to the Father. I take no delight in corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life, I desire the Bread of God, the Heavenly Bread, the Bread of Life which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was born in the last line of the seed of David and of Abraham; and I desire the drink of God, namely His Blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life." (Rom. vii.)

Wherefore, clothing yourselves with meekness, be ye renewed in faith, that is the flesh of the Lord, and in love, that is the Blood of Jesus Christ. (Trall : c. viii.)

Of both these passages it is equally true that if they refer to the Lord's Supper at all, they do not contain a syllable affirmative of the modern doctrine of the Real Presence. It has been shown that such language only implies the Reality of the Presence of Christ in the ordinance, and the blessings procured for us by His sacrifice, and implies nothing more. It is simply equivalent to the words of administration appointed by our Church: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee—the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ that was shed for thee—preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." But do they refer to the Lord's Supper at all? The question is best answered by parallel passages from the same writer, for the language of Ignatius, in common with that of other Early Fathers, is too loose and inexact to make a minute verbal criticism of much value. When it is seen that similar phrases are used where no reference whatever to the Sacrament could be intended, it becomes evident that the reference is not even to the ordinance, but it is only to the spiritual communion of the soul with God. Thus he tells the Ephesians, that "faith and love towards Christ Jesus are the beginning and the end of life" (c. xiv.). To the Magnesians he writes: "I pray for a union both of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, the constant source of our life, and of faith and love, to which nothing is to be preferred" (c. i.). Again: "That they

may prosper both in the flesh and spirit, in faith and love, in the Son and in the Father, and in the Spirit, in the beginning, and in the end" (c. xiii.). To the Smyrnæans he says: "That which is worth all is faith and love, to which nothing is to be preferred." If any doubt can remain that it is a spiritual communion with Christ of which Ignatius speaks, the doubt must vanish when we turn to the Syriac version of the three Epistles, which the late Dr. Cureton maintained to be the only authentic remains of Ignatius: "I seek the Bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, and I seek His Blood, drink, which is love incorruptible."

The next Father to be examined is Justin Martyr. There are eight passages in his writings considered to refer to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but the writer in the *Church Quarterly* has appealed to the following only:—

This food is amongst us called the Eucharist, whereof no one may partake but the man who believeth that which is taught him by us to be true, and who has been washed with the water which is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, hath both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and for which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, "This do ye in remembrance of me, this is my body," and that after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, "This is my blood," and gave it to them alone, which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras commanding the same thing to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn. (Apol. I. c. 66.)

The word "food" at the beginning of the sentence is τροφή, to the meaning of which attention has already been called. It may be added, that Irenæus used it in the precise sense which has been assigned to it; εἰς τροφήν ἡμετέραν (Fragments). The words "the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word" become in Anglo-Catholic translation, "the food that has been made Eucharist." The words are ἡ εὐχαριστηθεῖσα τροφή, and the reader can judge of the two translations for himself. It is also asserted to be the meaning of Justin that by the Eucharist, that is, in the writer's meaning, "by the consecrated elements, our flesh and blood are nourished by transmutation." What Justin really says is only, that "by the food our flesh and blood are nourished by transmutation," or, to use the modern word, by "assimilation," a plain proof to ordinary minds that the bread

and wine after consecration remain simple bread and wine, and nothing more, so far as they themselves are concerned. When he says "not as common bread and common drink do we receive them," Justin only affirms what we cordially accept, that the bread and the wine which have been consecrated, have become different from other common bread and wine, in that they have been set apart by the express commandment of Christ himself as efficient symbols of the body and blood of the Lord. When he says, that by virtue of prayer, carrying with it the promises contained in the Word, the consecrated elements become (spiritually and sacramentally) "the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh," he only affirms what has been already shown to be in the doctrine of the Church of England, and which is expressed in the words of administration, "The Body of Christ—the Blood of Christ." Yet out of these simple and apparently inoffensive words of Justin, Anglo-Catholic ingenuity has drawn four formal propositions, bristling with the highest sacerdotalism. In lieu of any elaborate refutation of their fallacy, it will suffice to quote the note appended to this passage, by the editors of Messrs. Clark's Ante-Nicene Library:—

This passage is claimed alike by the Calvinists, Lutherans, and Romanists; and, indeed, the language is so inexact, that each party may plausibly maintain that their own opinion is advocated by it. The expression "the prayer of His Word," or of the Word we have from Him, seems to signify the prayer pronounced over the elements, in imitation of our Lord's thanksgiving before breaking the bread.—"Justin Martyr," p. 64.

Irenæus must now claim attention. Six pages of elaborate argument in addition to very lengthy quotations are devoted to the exposition of the views of this Father. It has been already said that, in face of the general silence maintained by the great body of the Early Fathers on the subject of the Lord's Supper, nothing but the most precise statements on the other side can render it credible that any of them can possibly have held the modern doctrine of the Real Presence. If any such precise statements were to be found in the writings of Irenæus, all this elaborate argumentation would not be necessary. The strict limits of space imposed on this Article renders it impossible either to quote Irenæus at length, or to follow out in detail the fallacies of his mis-interpretation. It must suffice to warn any reader of the *Church Quarterly*, that he must not accept the sketch of the argument of Irenæus given in its pages without carefully testing it for himself by a reference to the original.

The seventeenth chapter of the work against heresies is headed "Proof that God did not appoint the Levitical dispensation for His own sake, or as requiring such service; for He does, in fact, need nothing from man." The chapter contains six

sections, and occupies nearly six octavo pages of letter-press in Messrs. Clark's edition. The general argument is directed to prove the abrogation of sacrifices under the New Covenant. The key to the whole is given in the following sentences :—

When He perceived them neglecting righteousness and abstaining from the love of God, and imagining that God was to be propitiated by sacrifices and other typical observances, Samuel did even thus speak unto them : “ God does not desire whole burnt offerings and sacrifices, but He will have His voice to be hearkened to. Behold a ready obedience is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.” David also says : “ Sacrifice and oblation Thou didst not desire, but mine ears hast Thou perfected; burnt offerings also for sin Thou hast not required.” He thus teaches them that God desires obedience, which renders them secure, rather than sacrifices and holocausts, which avail them nothing towards righteousness; and (by this declaration) he prophesies the New Covenant at the same time. (Irenæus c. Hær. b. iv. c. 2).

Having thus declared the services of the New Covenant to be spiritual, he enlarges upon this idea. It is not till the fifth section that he refers to the Lord's Supper :—

Giving directions to His disciples to offer to God the first fruits of His own created things—not as if He stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took that created thing bread, and gave thanks, and said, “ This is My Body.” And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His Blood, and taught the New Oblation of the New Covenant; which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offer to God throughout all the world, to Him who gives us the means of subsistence, the first fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament. (*Ibid.* iv.)

Let it be observed that the oblation is not the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, but of “ the first fruits of His own created things;” viz., the bread and the wine. This bread and wine are sacramentally and spiritually the Body and Blood of Christ. He proceeds in the next section to declare that they are this by representation :—

Just as a King, if he himself paints a likeness of his son, is right in calling this likeness his own, for both these reasons, because it is the likeness of his son, and because it is his own production; so also does the Father confess the name of Jesus Christ, which is throughout all the world glorified in the Church, to be His own, both because it is that of His Son, and because He who thus describes it gave Him for the salvation of man.

The one reason states the representative character of the consecrated elements; the other, the divine authority which invests them with this character. He points out also that the symbolic use of the bread and wine is in accordance with God's mode of

working. After quoting the words of Malachi, "And in every place incense is offered to my name as a pure sacrifice," he adds, "and John, in the Apocalypse, declares that the incense is the prayer of the saints."

Irenæus pursues the subject in chapter eighteen. Since God does not need anything from his creatures, it follows that our services are rendered acceptable, not by the value of the service itself, which would be the case on the Anglo-Catholic hypothesis, but by the moral disposition of the offerers. Accordingly he enlarges upon this:—

It behoves us to make an oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God our Father, in a pure mind, and in faith without hypocrisy, in well grounded hope, in fervent love, offering the first fruits of His own created things. And the Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to Him with giving of thanks (the things taken) from His own Creation.

Let it be observed that over and over again the oblation is described as consisting of "created things." Then, pleading against those who deny a resurrection, he proceeds:—

But our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion. For we offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship and union of the flesh and spirit. For us the bread which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly (by the material substance and the spiritual reality represented by it); so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity. (*Ibid.* s. 5).

There is nothing here which is not strictly consistent with the Church of England doctrine of a Real Spiritual Presence. The bread at consecration ceases to be common bread, and becomes bread separated to a sacred use; it is, as Irenæus states in s. 4, "The body of the Lord and the cup His blood." The use of the word Eucharist is ambiguous. In the first instance it appears to be used in its proper sense of the ordinance, and subsequently in its derivative sense of the elements. It is much more probable that this ambiguous use of the word arose from habitual inexactness, than from conscious use of a figurative sense. It has been often noted that the early germs of Sacramental error are to be found first in Irenæus.

In his fifth book, Irenæus recurs to the subject, and further vindicates "the salvation" of the body and its regeneration, that is, its resurrection. Otherwise, "neither did the Lord redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His body. For blood can only come from veins and flesh, and whatsoever makes up the substance of man, such as the Word of God was actually made." Here "Eucharist" is used in its

proper sense; the language is strictly scriptural, and the reference to the Sacrifice upon the Cross clear and specific.

“He had acknowledged the cup (which is a part of the creation) as His own blood, from which He draws our blood; and the bread (also a part of the creation) He has established as His own body, from which He gives increase to our bodies. When, therefore, the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receive the Word of God, and the Eucharist of the Blood and Body of Christ is made, from which things the substance of our flesh is increased and supported, how can they affirm that the flesh is incapable of receiving the gift of God which is life eternal, which flesh is nourished from the body and blood of our Lord, and is a member of Him?”

The reality of Christ's presence is everywhere affirmed, but nothing is said of the mode of it. The Church of England appears to have used the language of Irenæus in her Communion Office: “Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed by His most precious blood.” In these words it is evident that a spiritual feeding by faith is contemplated, and not a natural feeding by the mouth—a feeding which may take place in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, but is not exclusively attached to it. If, according to the Anglo-Catholic hypothesis, all who receive the consecrated bread and wine eat the body and blood of Christ, the petition is evidently unnecessary. It is remarkable that the doctrine of Irenæus, that the “Lord gave his soul for our souls, and his flesh for our flesh” (Bk. v., c. i., s. 1). is not consistently carried out by the Church of England, for it is the soul which is to be “washed in His precious blood.” The evident explanation is, that by the body and blood of Christ our Church means the whole redeeming efficacy of His sacrifice and death, applied indifferently to either the human body or the human soul, and equally effectual to the salvation of them both.

The same explanation is equally applicable to the one remaining passage on which reliance has been placed:—

Just as a cutting from the vine planted in the ground fructifies in its season, or as a corn of wheat falling into the earth and having decomposed, rises with manifold increase by the Spirit of God, who contains all things, and then through the wisdom of God serves for the use of man, and having received the Word of God becomes the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ; so also our bodies, being nourished by it (that is, by the produce of the vine and of the corn) and deposited in the earth, and, suffering decomposition there, shall rise at their appointed time also.

The illustration is simply that of 1 Cor. xv. 37, 38. We are tempted, however, to add another short passage, which Anglo-

Catholics are not accustomed to quote, from the surviving fragments of the lost writings of Irenæus:—

Though these oblations (those of the New Covenant) are not according to the law, the handwriting of which the Lord took away from the midst by cancelling it; but they are according to the spirit, for we must worship God "in spirit and in truth." And therefore the oblation of the Eucharist is not a carnal one, but a spiritual; and in this respect it is pure. For we make an oblation to God of the bread and cup of blessing, giving Him thanks in that He has commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our nourishment. And then, when we have perfected the oblations, we invoke the Holy Spirit that He may exhibit (*ἀποφίνη*) this sacrifice, both the bread the body of Christ, and the cup the blood of Christ, in order that the receiver of these anti-types, may obtain remission of sins and life eternal. Those persons, then, who perform these oblations in remembrance of the Lord, do not fall in with Jewish views (*ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δογμασι προσερχοῦνται*), but, performing the service after a spiritual manner, they shall be called the sons of wisdom.—"Ante-Nicene Library, Works of Irenæus," p. 176.

If doubt should still remain on the mind of any reader, let him take the trouble to test the language of these Fathers by the Canons suggested in the beginning of this Paper. The assertion that Ignatius has taught the Real Presence is contradicted by Canon 1, inasmuch as he places great stress on faith (Eph. ix., xx., Philad. v., Smyr. iv.): by Canon 2, inasmuch as he emphatically refers the enjoyment of the presence of Christ to the "Word of God" (Phil. iv.), and, in singular accordance with the language of the Homily of the Sacraments, describes the Holy Spirit as "a rope" by which the soul ascends up to God (Eph. ix.): by Canon 3, inasmuch as he speaks of the elements as "bread and wine" after consecration (Eph. xx.): by Canon 5, inasmuch as he declares the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins (Smyr. vii.), and by Canon 6, inasmuch as he connects it with "the passion of Christ." (*Ibid.*)

Similarly, the ascription of such views to Justin Martyr is forbidden by Canon 1, in that he lays emphatic stress on the faith of the communicant, stating that no one was allowed to partake but "the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and who is living as Christ has enjoined (*Apol. I., c. 66*): by Canon 2, inasmuch as the Father and the Holy Ghost are made prominent in the Sacrament, "Praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offer thanks for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands" (*Ibid. c. 66*): by Canon 3, inasmuch as he calls the

elements after consecration "bread and wine" (*Apol. I.*, 65: *Dial. with Trypho*, c. 41): by Canon 4, inasmuch as he teaches with Irenæus that the ancient sacrifices and temple were not needed by God, but were ordained for the good of men, and therefore depended for their value on the moral disposition of the offerers (*Dial. with Trypho*, c. 22).

Similarly, even Irenæus, the least satisfactory of these Early Fathers in his views of the Lord's Supper, is vindicated from the suspicion of teaching any Real Presence of the Body of Christ in the elements by Canon 1, inasmuch as he declares the value of the Christian sacrifice to consist altogether in the moral disposition of the offerer (Irenæus c. Hær. b. iv. c. 22, ss. 2, 3, c. 18, ss. 3, 4): by Canon 2, inasmuch as he asserts "the incapacity of flesh to receive the life granted by God" (*Ibid.* b. v. c. 3, s. 3), and teaches that the Lord "hath poured out the Spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God and man, imparting indeed God to man by means of the Spirit" (*Ibid.* b. v. c. 1, s. 1): by Canon 3, inasmuch as he describes the elements as bread and wine (cup) after consecration (*Ibid.* c. 2, s. 9): by Canon 4, inasmuch as, with emphatic reiteration and at great length, he denies all spiritual value to external and material sacrifices (*Ibid.* b. iv. cc. 17, 18): by Canons 5 and 6, inasmuch as in immediate connection with the Lord's Supper stress is laid on Christ having "redeemed us by His blood, and blood can only come from veins and flesh, and whatsoever makes up the substance of men, such as the Word of God was actually made" (*Ibid.* b. v. cc. 1 and 2); again, "as He suffered, so also is He alive and suffering" (*Fragments*, 52).

These facts prove that the Early Fathers, of the first two centuries at all events, did not hold or teach the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper. All the alleged proofs of it fail, and turn out on examination to be no better than a groundless mass of misapprehensions. It is not the object of this Article to continue the inquiry beyond the first two hundred years after Christ; and whether the same purity of doctrine continued for the first three hundred years, or, as Bishop Jewell affirmed, for the first five hundred, is a comparatively unimportant matter of opinion. For two hundred years at all events, a period covering the lifetime of all those who conversed with the Apostles, or with the immediate successors of the Apostles, the broad line separating the pure Protestant doctrine of the Lord's Supper from the later corruptions which culminated in the Trent Decrees was never passed. The doctrine during this period was distinctly Evangelical; and the fact proves beyond reasonable doubt that the interpretation which the Evangelical churches have placed on the words of Institution is the true interpreta-

tion. Here stands the gulf, broad and deep and clear, between the apostolic doctrine and the doctrine of later times. And it is to be observed, that the absence of all theological accuracy and technical language during the struggles of the first centuries serve to render the interpretation of our Lord's personal teaching, thus afforded to us, the more certain and trustworthy. When Christianity was fighting for its life there was no time for subtle refinements, and in the very simplicity of the theology of those ages we find the assurance, that the teaching of the Great Master and the impression made by it on the mind and heart of the Church has been faithfully handed down to successive generations. To conceive that our Lord could have intended to teach the modern doctrine of the Real Presence, and yet that the Christians of the first two centuries should have known nothing of it, would be to conceive the most impossible of moral impossibilities. Yet it is evident that if the great Fathers of the period held such a belief, they certainly did not teach it. Not only is not one single precise statement of the doctrine to be found, but the whole tenor of their language, and therefore the whole current of their thoughts, stand in irreconcilable opposition to it.

The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable, that the Anglo-Catholic catenas, which have been used as the commonplaces of sacerdotal belief, are not to be trusted. It does not become any one who is conscious of the weakness of the highest human judgment, and of the force with which strong moral tendencies pervert the strictest exercise of the understanding, to use hard epithets of any one. But neither must the truth be blinked, or facts allowed to be misrepresented in a false charity. The assertion, that the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements was the faith of all Christians from the beginning, is simply and absolutely untrue.

What then becomes of the asserted Catholicity of the doctrine of the Real Presence; what of its historical continuity; what of the loudly paraded doctrine of Vincentius, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*? The broken reed pierces the hand that leans upon it. The imposing superstructure fades into nothing with the shaking foundation on which it rested. To discuss the true character of the doctrine of the Real Presence and its perverting influence on the whole system of sacerdotal theology, lies outside the object of this Paper. It is enough to say that, while it is not to be confounded with transubstantiation, and may, perhaps, be distinguishable from consubstantiation, it contains the vitiating poison of them both. All that makes them dangerous to men's souls and dishonourable to God, survives in the Real Presence. Metaphysicians may argue about

the modes of the Lord's presence in the consecrated elements, but it is in the belief of the Presence itself that the danger lies, and in the materialising of the invisible into creatures visible and tangible. Those who are well acquainted with the articles of accusation charged against the martyrs of the Marian period, will be perfectly well aware that disbelief in Transubstantiation was generally the subject of one article, and disbelief in the Real Presence the subject of another. May I say that the Real Presence is the heart and life both of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation? It is a doctrine so vital, so fatally operative, that the Church of Rome thought herself justified in burning men for rejecting it, and that saints of all ages and ranks considered it to be dishonouring to their Master, and preferred to die rather than give their tacit consent to it. But whatever estimate may be formed of the doctrine, one thing is certain, it is neither primitive nor apostolic. It was not the doctrine of the Primitive ages; it was not the doctrine of the Apostles; it was not the doctrine of the Incarnate God, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

EDWARD GARBETT.

ART. V.—THE PRINCE CONSORT.

The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By THEODORE MARTIN. With Portraits. Volume V. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1880.

THE world is justly impatient of the panegyric of a biographer. If a man's deeds and thoughts do not of themselves sufficiently proclaim his worth, the fault is either his biographer's or his own. In the case of the Prince Consort, all that could be told of him went to make the narrative a "chronicle of actions bright and just;" and if at times Sir Theodore Martin unwittingly added superfluous words of praise, he may plead in excuse the difficulty of silence where the chronicler has had occasion to scrutinise a character under many and very varied aspects, so narrowly as it has been his duty to scrutinise that of the Prince, and "has at every step found fresh occasion to admire its purity, its unselfishness, its consistency, and its noble self-control." Sir Theodore's biography, of which the last volume is before us, will convey to the minds of those who read it "no feeble reflex of the profound impression which these qualities produced upon" his own mind during years of close and conscientious study. Much has necessarily become known to himself, of course, "which it would