THE EARLY EUCHARIST

THE EARLY EUCHARIST

BY

FELIX L. CIRLOT

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.2
1939

Made and Printed in Great Britain by T. and A. CONSTABLE LTD.
at the University Press, Edinburgh

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I HAVE explained briefly at the beginning of Chapter VI the circumstances that led to the treatment of the material in the order followed in this book. No doubt it will be said to expose one to the danger of reading back into the New Testament evidence conclusions reached on later evidence. But while there is this danger, it is not necessary to fall into this error, and I have striven to the best of my ability to avoid it, by being constantly aware of the pitfalls of the method I have employed. Whether by being constantly on my guard against these perils I have successfully avoided them is a matter on which I must submit to the judgments (and arguments) of others.

I am, however, firmly persuaded of the general legitimacy of the method I have used. And I am further persuaded that the contrary method is at least equally liable to be abused. Often I seem to find writers putting on a particular piece of evidence the minimum interpretation it will bear, when a slightly later piece of evidence suggests very strongly that it should actually receive an interpretation very much nearer the equally possible maximum. I hold that it is not "reading back" to interpret earlier evidence in the light of later, provided only that certain rather obvious conditions are fulfilled. The earlier evidence must not have a forced, unnatural, or improbable interpretation put upon it, of course. But where a decisive conclusion cannot be reached from the earlier evidence alone, it is legitimate, and indeed obligatory, to prefer the one of several possible interpretations which best agrees with the more definite and certain results arrived at from the later evidence. It is on the basis of this canon that the conclusions given in this book were reached. And as this was the order in which the actual studies were conducted, it has been preserved in the published form. If it is a defect, as I cannot believe, those who will disagree with my conclusions have a right to know it, and to make of it whatever is fair.

This book was originally a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Theology written at the General Theological Seminary in New York City between July 1933 and March 1935. It has been revised considerably since then in the interest of publication, and also in the interest of removing as far as possible certain limitations imposed upon me in writing the thesis by those under whom it was written. I am all too conscious, however, that many of these limitations remain, as well as many others for which I alone am responsible. In the original draft the evidence was dealt with with a detail and, I hope, thoroughness, which was not possible in the final form in which a rather narrow word-limit was set—at least to the main body of the thesis. This shows especially in Chapters IV and V, in which I have been able to do little more than summarize rather fully the conclusions reached by a very extensive study of the two subjects there considered. It shows also in the great extent of the Appendices. For I was allowed to include as many of these as I desired, without any word-limit. Originally there were even more Appendices than will be found in this book. But in the interest of publication I have omitted all except the most essential, and in my judgment valuable. I may be excused for stating, then, that the arguments at some points are very much like an iceberg—only a small part showing (in print). In my first draft, which of course I have preserved, there is a wealth of evidence and argumentation based on it which might be convincing in some cases where the comparatively brief summary I was allowed to include is not, or is less so.

Of all the people to whom I am in various ways indebted in connection with this thesis, the Professor under whose direction it was completed, Dr. Burton Scott Easton, is the one to whom I owe by far the greatest debt. His untiring energy (even when I knew he was really very tired) and his unstinted self-giving in innumerable and long conferences on the various sections of the thesis are not only deserving of unspeakable gratitude on my part, but in addition they enable me to submit my results to a wider public with a confidence I could not possibly have, had not every particle been subjected to his

ever acute and brilliant scrutiny. I feel that not many serious errors are likely to have passed him unnoticed. I must not give the impression that he agrees with all I have written by any means. But in the parts with which he agrees I feel a confidence very profound. And even where he dissents, I am thankful to believe that not many important adverse arguments are likely to have escaped my notice where I have had him as a friendly but earnest and vigorous critic and opponent. I am convinced that it is not simply the usual adulation of the student for his Professor which makes me think that I could not possibly have had a more valuable guide among living scholars.

In far lesser but still considerable degree I am indebted for valuable conferences and advice on specific points to the late Dr. Frank S. B. Gavin, to his professorial colleague, Dr. M. B. Stewart, the Reverend Harold Neil Renfrew, and to Dr. Edward Rochie Hardy, all of the General Theological Seminary. To a smaller extent I also owe thanks to Professor Charles N. Shepard, Dr. Donald F. Forrester, and the Reverend Charles R. Feilding. To the Dean of the General Seminary, Dr. H. E. W. Fosbrooke, and to Dr. William H. Dunphy, a Professor of the Philadelphia Divinity School, I owe thanks for financial assistance at different stages on the road to publication. Dean Fosbrooke also saved me from one bad if immaterial blunder which had escaped the colossal learning of Dr. Easton. And Dr. Dunphy favoured me with many hours of informal consultation on points of scholarship in the thesis while it was being written. To Professors Ginsberg, Finkelstein, and Barron of the Jewish Theological Seminary, also in New York City, I am very deeply indebted for invaluable aid in connection with the first chapter. My literary debts will be made evident, as far as such a thing is possible, by the references and bibliography. Finally, I owe thanks to the Reverend William J. Alberts, to Mr. Sverre Fasting, and to Miss Mildred Everiss for the irksome burdens they have borne in typing for me the original and revised versions of the manuscript. I have also had material assistance in manuscript correction from the Reverend William B.

Gentleman, and in other miscellaneous matters from the Reverend Thomas D. Byrne. I fear I must have forgotten many others who have assisted me in various ways, but the long interval in between the completion of the thesis and its final publication, filled as it has been with other and very different activities, has tended to erase much of the detailed history of its production from my memory. To any such whose names have been omitted I extend both thanks and also a sincere apology for this neglect. Last of all, I owe special gratitude to the S.P.C.K. and to Dr. Lowther Clarke in particular for making publication possible. A young author has great difficulty in getting his first book published, and cannot but be deeply grateful for such help, which he can hardly hope is deserved.

And now I commend this effort to the consideration and criticism of both theologians and historians, hoping that whatever is erroneous may be rendered innocuous and speedily overthrown, and that if anything within it is true and valuable it may prevail and minister to the progress of historical truth and to the vindication of sound theology. God grant this may be fulfilled in His infinite mercy.

FELIX L. CIRLOT.

CHAPTER I

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND

To the present writer the reasons appear decisive against accepting the Synoptic chronology which would identify the Last Supper with the Passover Meal. Assuming here the establishment of this conclusion, it will be evident at once that we must look elsewhere for the Jewish antecedents of the Eucharist—if indeed it had any antecedents. Since the Eucharist was by its whole history a corporate meal or rite, we need not look among individual or private meals for any likely antecedents. But specialists in Talmudic and Jewish studies tell us of certain corporate meals held both by families and also by special groups having some bond of union.

Let us investigate these meals of *Haburoth* (as the groups were called in Hebrew) to see if they can throw any light upon the origin of the Christian Eucharist or of the Agape.

Of course, it is obviously a far cry from a modern Jewish practice to one that was in vogue at the time Jesus was on earth. Any attempt to determine whether a modern practice goes back that far, and if so in what form, runs up against the double difficulty that our earliest sources are of questionable value for so early a date, and also that they contain little on our subject, not all even of this little being easy of interpretation. Still, we must not despair. For liturgical practices are notoriously conservative; and this is pre-eminently true, at least in a general way, of the Jewish religion, due to the nature of its history since the Bar Kochbah revolt. This greatly diminishes the *a priori* probability that there must have been great changes during all these centuries. I believe that the actual study of our evidence, scanty though it is, and often lacking in clearness, will confirm in a quite remarkable way the possibility that even in those remote days the *Haburah*

Gentleman, and in other miscellaneous matters from the Reverend Thomas D. Byrne. I fear I must have forgotten many others who have assisted me in various ways, but the long interval in between the completion of the thesis and its final publication, filled as it has been with other and very different activities, has tended to erase much of the detailed history of its production from my memory. To any such whose names have been omitted I extend both thanks and also a sincere apology for this neglect. Last of all, I owe special gratitude to the S.P.C.K. and to Dr. Lowther Clarke in particular for making publication possible. A young author has great difficulty in getting his first book published, and cannot but be deeply grateful for such help, which he can hardly hope is deserved.

And now I commend this effort to the consideration and criticism of both theologians and historians, hoping that whatever is erroneous may be rendered innocuous and speedily overthrown, and that if anything within it is true and valuable it may prevail and minister to the progress of historical truth and to the vindication of sound theology. God grant this may be fulfilled in His infinite mercy.

FELIX L. CIRLOT.

CHAPTER I

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND

To the present writer the reasons appear decisive against accepting the Synoptic chronology which would identify the Last Supper with the Passover Meal. Assuming here the establishment of this conclusion, it will be evident at once that we must look elsewhere for the Jewish antecedents of the Eucharist—if indeed it had any antecedents. Since the Eucharist was by its whole history a corporate meal or rite, we need not look among individual or private meals for any likely antecedents. But specialists in Talmudic and Jewish studies tell us of certain corporate meals held both by families and also by special groups having some bond of union.

Let us investigate these meals of *Haburoth* (as the groups were called in Hebrew) to see if they can throw any light upon the origin of the Christian Eucharist or of the Agape.

Of course, it is obviously a far cry from a modern Jewish practice to one that was in vogue at the time Jesus was on earth. Any attempt to determine whether a modern practice goes back that far, and if so in what form, runs up against the double difficulty that our earliest sources are of questionable value for so early a date, and also that they contain little on our subject, not all even of this little being easy of interpretation. Still, we must not despair. For liturgical practices are notoriously conservative; and this is pre-eminently true, at least in a general way, of the Jewish religion, due to the nature of its history since the Bar Kochbah revolt. This greatly diminishes the *a priori* probability that there must have been great changes during all these centuries. I believe that the actual study of our evidence, scanty though it is, and often lacking in clearness, will confirm in a quite remarkable way the possibility that even in those remote days the *Haburah*

meal, and the *Kiddush* with which it often closed, was in many ways very similar to what it is today. With so much by way of preamble, let us proceed at once to our investigation.

I shall take as my starting-point the text of *Kiddush*, and the description of the meal of which it is a part, as found in the modern Jewish Prayer Book. I shall use the *Standard Prayer Book* (authorized English translation by the Rev. S. Singer, New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1920) and supplement it with information gained from other sources, especially Dr. Lietzmann's splendid and extremely valuable discussion on pp. 202-210 of his *Messe und Herrenmahl.*

Prescription for the blessing of the wine, and express prohibition to eat anything at all before one has blessed it.

Whispering: And it was evening and it was morning,

Aloud: the sixth day. And the heaven and the earth were finished and all their host. And on the seventh day God had finished all His work which He had made: and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and He hallowed it, because He rested thereon from all His work which God had created and made.

The following is said over the cup of wine, which is then sipped and passed to the others:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who createst the fruit of the vine.

Then immediately afterwards, over the same cup, before it is sipped and passed, is said the Kiddush or Sanctification of the Day, which I give in its Passover form, the words in brackets being added when it is also a Sabbath:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from all peoples, and exalted us above all tongues, and sanctified us by thy commandments. And thou hast given us in love, O Lord our God, (Sabbaths for rest,) appointed times for gladness, festivals and seasons for joy; (this Sabbath and) this day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Season of our Freedom; (in love) an holy convocation as a memorial of the departure from Egypt; for thou hast chosen us, and sanctified us above all peoples, and thy holy (Sabbath and) appointed times thou hast caused us to inherit (in love and favor) in joy and gladness. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who sanctifiest (the Sabbath,) Israel, and the festive seasons.

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast kept us in life, and hast preserved us, and enabled us to reach this season.

Certain not very extensive appropriate changes are made in this

text for other seasons such as Pentecost, Tabernacles, etc. For comparison I give the Kiddush in its usual Sabbath form when there is no occurrence of another feast:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast taken pleasure in us, and in love and favor hast given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance, a memorial of the creation—that day being also the first of the holy convocations, in remembrance of the departure from Egypt. For thou hast chosen us and sanctified us above all nations, and in love and favor hast given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hallowest the Sabbath.

After the Kiddush he blesses a double portion of bread (two loaves) and breaks them (? or one of them) on the under side, afterwards, of course, partaking himself and distributing to the others:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth.

Then follows the meal. Before partaking of it the hands must be washed, at which time is said:

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who sanctified us by thy commandments, and hast given us command concerning the washing of the hands.

After the meal is finished, Psalm cxxvi. is said ("When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion"); and when this is concluded, the Grace-after-Meals over a final chalice of wine, blessed by one for all, with the following formula. The introduction is used only if a traditionally required number of males (3) over thirteen years of age is present. If not, the Grace-after-Meals begins at the place marked with an asterisk in the text:

Leader: Let us say grace.

Others: Blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and for ever.

Leader: With the sanction of those present (*they give it silently*) we will bless Him of whose bounty we have partaken.

Others: Blessed be He of whose bounty we have partaken, and through whose goodness we live.

Any who have not partaken: Blessed be His name, yea continually to be blessed for ever and ever.

Leader: Blessed be He of whose bounty we have partaken and through whose goodness we live.

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who feedest the whole world with thy goodness, with grace, with loving-kindness and tender mercy; who givest food to all flesh, for thy loving-kindness endureth for ever. Through thy great goodness food hath never failed us; O may it not fail us for ever and ever for thy great name's sake, since thou nourishest and sustainest all

beings and doest good to all, and providest food for all thy creatures whom thou hast created. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who givest food unto all.

We thank thee, O Lord our God, because thou didst give as an heritage unto our Fathers a desirable, good, and ample land, and because thou didst bring us forth, O Lord our God, from the land of Egypt, and didst deliver us from the house of bondage; as well as for thy covenant which thou hast sealed in our flesh, thy law which thou hast taught us, thy statutes which thou hast made known unto us, the life, grace, and loving-kindness which thou hast vouchsafed unto us, and for the food wherewith thou dost constantly feed and sustain us on every day, in every season, at every hour. (*On Chanukah and Purim thanks for the miracles of the occasion are inserted here, and then he continues:*) For all this, O Lord our God, we thank and bless thee; blessed be thy name by the mouth of all living continually and for ever, even as it is written, "And thou shalt eat and be satisfied, and thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which He hath given thee." Blessed art thou, O Lord, for the land and for the food.

Have mercy, O Lord our God, upon Israel thy people, upon Jerusalem thy city, upon Zion the abiding place of thy glory, upon the kingdom of the house of David thine anointed, and upon the great and holy house that was called by thy name. O our God, our Father, feed us, nourish us, sustain, support, and relieve us, and speedily, O Lord our God, grant us relief from all our troubles. We beseech thee, O Lord our God, let us not be in need either of the gifts of flesh or of their loans, but only of thy helping hand, which is full, open, holy, and ample, so that we may not be ashamed nor confounded for ever and ever. (*Then come variable portions for the Sabbath or new moons or the different feasts, but ending in all cases with a petition for the consolation and rebuilding of Jerusalem.*)

There is a fourth blessing which I shall not quote as it is admittedly quite late. The three quoted are said by the authorities to be of high antiquity. Then the meal closes with the singing of a song or hymn.

We note as the main points that concern our inquiry that the meal begins with the beginning of the Sabbath or shortly afterwards, and that there is first the double blessing—a "wine-blessing" and a "day-blessing" or *Kiddush*, in that order—over a chalice of wine, followed immediately by the "bread-blessing" over a loaf of bread (a "double loaf" for the Sabbath). Then follows the main part of the meal. After

the meal is finished, there is the "food-blessing" or "grace-after-meals" over a final common "Cup of Blessing." Then they close with a hymn.

Let us observe carefully certain interesting points. First of all, the "grace-before-meals" is simply the short "bread-blessing," said on tasting the first morsel of bread.

Secondly, the "food-blessing" or "grace-after-meals" is not to be confused with a "wine-blessing" or a *Kiddush*. It is the much longer and more elaborate blessing quoted just above.

Thirdly, we must distinguish carefully the *Kiddush* Cup and the "Cup of Blessing." The former is the one (now at the beginning of the meal) over which the Sanctification of the Day is pronounced (preceded by a wine-blessing). The latter is the cup after the meal has "ended" over which the grace-after-meals (but no wine-blessing) is pronounced. Both are blessed by one speaking for all, and both are drunk only on festive or special or joyous occasions.[1] On the Passover the first of the four cups is the *Kiddush* Cup, and the third is the Cup of Blessing.

Fourthly, the *Kiddush* is now pronounced also on Friday evening, at the end of public worship in the synagogue. This seems to be in violation of the long-standing and firmly fixed Rabbinic rule that it could only be pronounced in connection with (or at the place of) a meal.[2] However, this seems to be satisfactorily explicable by the checkered history of the rite. We seem to have four stages. The first was in the Tannaitic period, when the meal and its *Kiddush* were both at home. The second stage was when, late in the Tannaitic period or at the beginning of that of the Amoraim, the whole action, meal and *Kiddush*, was transferred to the synagogue. The third was when, not much later, the meal was abolished, only the *Kiddush* surviving. Its apparent violation of the Rabbinic rule that the *Kiddush* could only be held in connection with a meal was explained away by means of the fact that travellers slept and ate in a room adjoining the synagogue. The fourth and last stage is the present, in which the house meal with the

[1] The Cup of Blessing, however, is drunk on all the same occasions as the *Kiddush* Cup, and on some others as well. [2] *Bab. Pes.*, 101*a*.

Kiddush is restored; but without giving up the *Kiddush*, apart from any meal, in the synagogue.[1]

At this last stage the *Kiddush* Cup came before the meal, which began after the Sabbath had actually arrived, and was blessed by one leader for the whole group. I believe, following Elbogen and several other scholars, that this order, which is the one we still find today, represents a threefold change from the practice a century and more earlier, and throughout the first century A.D. Elbogen holds that in this preceding form the meal began some time before the onset of the Sabbath, so as to be nearly or quite finished by the moment the Sabbath actually began. Then, when the Sabbath arrived, the *Kiddush* was said over a common cup, over which a wine-blessing was also said. The schools of Shammai and Hillel differed as to the order in which the wine-blessing and the day-blessing (*Kiddush*) should be said.

Later, as outlined just above, the meal was shifted to an hour after the return from synagogue, and hence after the Sabbath had already begun. The *Kiddush* was also then shifted[2] from the end of the meal to the beginning, in order to be as near to the onset of the Sabbath as possible.

This double shift also required a third. The Mishnah rule had made each one bless his own articles of food and drink in the preliminary course before the formal meal. But after they reclined at the table and the formal meal began, the opposite was the rule—that is, one leader said the blessing for them all.[3] However, according to the same Mishnah rule, an exception was made of wine, which each continued to bless for himself, even during the formal meal. Only the wine after the meal[3] (i.e., on Elbogen's view, the Cup of Blessing, and the *Kiddush* Cup when there was a *Kiddush*) was blessed by one

[1] As a matter of fact, according to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, *Kiddush* really occurs twice in the synagogue. It occurs in a purely verbal form as the middle section of the *Amidah* prayer (Eighteen Benedictions). It also has been customary since Talmudic times for the reader to "sanctify" over the cup near the end of the service. It appears, however, that the reader does not drink himself, but usually lets some children take a few drops from the cup.

[2] *Tal. Bab. Pes.*, f. 102*a* (cf. *Pes.*, 99*b*); *Tos. Ber.*, v. 2, v. 3-4.

[3] *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 6; cf. also *Tos. Ber.*, v. 6 and iv. 12; probably, by implication, also *Tal. Bab. Pes.*, f. 119*b*.

leader for them all. When the *Kiddush*, by the above-described change in the practice, came to be at the beginning of the meal, the Mishnah rule was *ipso facto* impossible—at least on days when there was a *Kiddush*. For the *Kiddush* Cup had to be blessed by one leader for them all. Hence a change was necessary, and is duly found in the Talmudic parallels. Thus we have, as said above, a threefold change from the order as it had been since the end of the Tannaitic period.

I repeat that my own findings agree with those of Elbogen. The matter cannot be treated as settled, however, for Dr. L. Ginsberg of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York has vigorously contested Elbogen's contentions, both in a review and also in a long interview granted to the present writer. While I cannot feel that his interpretation of the evidence is as likely as that of Elbogen, it certainly seemed to be at least an entirely possible one. Hence, while I shall for the purposes of the present investigation accept Elbogen's findings, it will be with the reservation just expressed as to their certainty.

This change, and especially the change in the position of the *Kiddush* Cup from the end of the meal to the beginning, is of considerable importance for our purposes—the investigation of Eucharist origins. Several modern writers (such as Oesterley, Box, and others) who have attempted to derive the Eucharist from the *Kiddush* have supposed the order in our Lord's time was cup–bread. This supposed order has then been used to determine the doubt raised by the apparent division in the early Christian evidence in favour of the like order (cup–bread) supposed to be attested by the "shorter text" of Luke, the *Didache*, and 1 Cor. x.

I believe this conclusion to be entirely invalidated [1] by the shift in the position of the *Kiddush* Cup. Strangely enough, Oesterley and Box seem to accept Elbogen's findings, without, however, perceiving their bearing on this very crucial point. Clearly, if his conclusions are correct, exactly the opposite order would be supported by the conjectured origination of

[1] Even, that is, on the preliminary assumption that the Eucharist derives from the *Kiddush*, which I cannot accept, for reasons to be given below.

the Eucharist out of the *Kiddush*. In that case the bread would come (as we shall see below) at the beginning of the "formal" meal, and the *Kiddush* Cup right at the very end, even after the Cup of Blessing.

It will appear at once, however, that if Dr. Ginsberg's position be correct, then the opposite order (cup–bread), attested in the later Jewish evidence, would be also the one in vogue in our Lord's time, and hence would indeed support the supposed order of the *Didache*, etc. This might seem at first sight to be of sufficient importance for our present purposes to necessitate a detailed study here and now of the issue between Elbogen and Dr. Ginsberg. Fortunately this is not the case. As we shall see in the next paragraph, there are the most convincing reasons (with which all the Jewish experts I have been able to consult agree unanimously) why the Last Supper cannot have contained a *Kiddush*. Hence the matter ceases to be of such great and direct importance for our purposes as would otherwise be the case.

While I know no explicit statement to that effect, I get a very strong impression that the *Kiddush* never would be transferred to any other occasion. It was not like the Vigil of a Feast in the developed Christian calendar, which prepared the way for the feast. It was rather like the First Vespers of the Feast or the Proper Preface or "Hail, Festal Day" (for want of better illustrations). In other words, it belonged to the feast itself, and hailed the feast as already just begun. It did not prepare for its approach. The *Kiddush* itself always occurred after the feast began, even if it be admitted that in early Tannaitic times the meal at the end of which it came anticipated the arrival of the feast or Sabbath by an hour or more. The *Kiddush*, it must be remembered, was not the meal but only the day-blessing over a special common cup at the end (Dr. Ginsberg would say the beginning) of the meal. The very fact that the first of the four cups at Passover was the *Kiddush* Cup shows how extremely improbable is Dr. Oesterley's suggestion of a shift of Passover *Kiddush* that year twenty-four hours ahead. The Passover Meal would in no way exclude, but rather inevitably include, the *Kiddush*. When a feast fell

on a Sabbath this was handled by verbal changes within the *Kiddush* formula, as illustrated above. It would not lead to one or the other being "translated" as are Christian feasts sometimes when two fall together. Something more like our "commemoration" took place. All this makes the idea that the Last Supper contained a *Kiddush* unlikely in the extreme. For, despite many doubtful points, its date on Thursday night (our reckoning) is one point that seems beyond doubt.

Let us now go on to see what evidence there is that in the time of the Tannaim and early Amoraim the Jewish meal and the connected *Kiddush* were already substantially as we found them in the modern Jewish Prayer Book above.

First of all, the texts of the bread-blessing and the wine-blessing are already fixed in the Mishnah [1] just as they are in use today.

Secondly, the details [2] given as to the invitation to say the grace-after-meals, varying somewhat for different numbers present, and also the reference to the blessings for the land and for Jerusalem,[3] give us a strong suggestion that the grace-after-meals (the food-blessing) may also very likely have been substantially as it is today.[4] This does not hold, of course, for the fourth benediction, which all agree is much later. Nor can it be true, naturally, for the period before 70 A.D., of the petition in the benediction for the consolation and rebuilding of Jerusalem. But for the rest, and with the qualification "substantially," the likelihood is very great.

Thirdly, experts tell us that all the extant texts of the actual *Kiddush* prayer (the prayer for the Sanctification of the Day) agree very closely, thus indicating that they go back to a very early and reliable tradition.

[1] *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 1. [2] *Mish. Ber.*, vii. 4-5.

[3] *Tos. Ber.*, vii. 1. The second benediction is for the land, and the third (now, since 70 A.D., turned into a petition for mercy rather than a benediction) for Jerusalem, just as in the modern Jewish Prayer Book (see the grace-after-meals quoted above).

[4] In *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 8, the reference to " the three benedictions " may refer to the grace-after-meals, and if so, it shows that already there were three separate benedictions of which the grace-after-meals was composed. This also agrees with our other evidence. Also in *Mish. Ber.*, iii. 4, " the grace-after-meals " is explicitly referred to by that description. I think *Tos. Ber.*, vii. 1, strongly confirms the above as to the three benedictions.

Now the very existence of these formulas goes far toward showing that the traditional practice has been preserved in a remarkable way. But we have other evidence of an even more direct sort, which we shall now notice.

The meal begins some time before the end of the sixth day (or the eve of the approaching feast). First of all, we have evidence of an informal preliminary course[1] taken while sitting around on chairs or benches. As the guests gather, wine, water for the hands (one hand), and relishes are passed around to those who have come. According to the rule that no one can partake of aught without a blessing, these must, of course, be blessed. But during this course each one blesses for himself the articles of food brought to him. The formal meal has not yet begun.

When sufficient guests have arrived, they recline at the table (which is often upstairs) and the formal meal begins. The hands are probably washed again, though this may belong to later times only. Most likely it was already practised. But both of these handwashings at the beginning of the meal are still optional.

First, after the handwashing, comes the blessing and breaking of a loaf of bread (on the Sabbath two loaves) by one leader for the group. Our sources do not explicitly say that this begins the formal meal. But that conclusion is probable because: (*a*) such is the present position; (*b*) hence we can understand that the bread-blessing came to be called[2] the

[1] *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 6; *Tos. Ber.*, iv. 8; *Jer. Ber.*, f. 10*d*; *Bab. Ber.*, f. 43*a*.

[2] This is probably already the case in Tannaitic times. For in *Mish. Ber.*, iii. 4, we have an explicit distinction between the grace-before-meals and the grace-after-meals. This shows that *some* grace already bore that appellation. And to what is it as likely to refer as to the bread-blessing, which we know bore it later?

I believe further confirmation of this is derived from *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 5, according to which if one has already said a blessing over the bread it need not be said over the relishes, but if already said over the latter it must still be said over the bread. This is, I would suggest, because the bread-blessing was the grace-before-meals, and hence could never be dispensed with. Taking this passage with *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 7, which seems at first to contradict it, I would suggest this reconstruction. Bread was never blessed in the preliminary course, even if served in small quantities with some other article of food, because (since no article was ever blessed more than once at the same meal) the bread-blessing had to be reserved to open the formal meal, being the grace-before-meals. If, therefore, relishes appeared during

grace-before-meals; and (*c*) apparently the phrase descriptive of the act can be used as a synonym for taking a meal.[1] In any case, its existence at some point within the meal is proved by the existence of the bread-blessing, and by *Bab. Ber.*, f. 39*b*, in which Rabbi Abba is quoted as to why a double portion is taken for the Sabbath. This clearly implies a single portion would be used on ordinary occasions. Rabbi Abba dates around the end of the third century. Rabbi Aschi (427 A.D.) is quoted in the same passage: "We have seen how Rabbi Habana took two but broke only one." This confirms the preceding. As Lietzmann rightly says, the almost total absence of explicit references in our sources is, in the case of something so commonplace, of no significance—certainly of no negative significance.

Then the rest of the meal is served. If relishes are served, they need not be blessed again. The blessing on them when served before the meal began, and also on the bread at the beginning of the meal, alike make this unnecessary. If wine is served during the meal, it would not need to be blessed at all if it had already been served and blessed by each one for himself before the meal. If not, it would be blessed [2] on its first appearance and use, but by each one for himself, and not again thereafter unless there was a *Kiddush*. Hence, as we shall see just below, the Cup of Blessing (when used) would have no wine-blessing over it, unless there had been no wine served earlier in the meal. Likewise, if more bread were brought it would not require another blessing.

After the meal would be said the food-blessing, also called the grace-after-meals. It was *the* blessing *par excellence*. It was always said by one leader for all present. There was an introductory dialogue if enough adult males were present. In

the preliminary course, before the bread could be blessed, they would need to be blessed. But if they first appeared after the bread had been blessed, they could then be treated as an accompaniment of the bread and hence would not need to be blessed. Similarly we find that if wine were served with rice, only the latter need be blessed (*Tos. Ber.*, iv. 13). Presumably the wine is considered as "sauce" for the rice. All this would confirm our conclusion as to the place of the bread at the beginning of the formal meal, but after the preliminary course.

[1] Possibly *Tos. Ber.*, vii. 24, may have some bearing here also.

[2] The usual wine-blessing, and this alone, would be used.

a simple, ordinary, informal meal it might be, and usually would be, said simply as a conclusion to the meal, as we say such a grace, and not in connection with any particular article of food or drink. Then would follow the (obligatory) hand-washing after meals, and the meal would be over.

On special, joyous, or festival occasions, however, and hence probably at every *Haburah* meal, this grace-after-meals would be said over a special common cup, blessed by one leader for the whole group.[1] Only this blessing would be said over it[2] (unless no wine had previously been served). Hence it was called the Cup of Blessing, i.e. the Cup of *the* Blessing[3] *par excellence*. Judging both positively and negatively from our evidence, it does not seem that any substitute for wine would ever have been used for this chalice,[4] least of all water. It would, of course, be used on all occasions when there would be a *Kiddush*, but not only on those occasions. It would be used on a wider circle of special occasions as well. When it was used, the schools disputed whether the handwashing should follow or precede the mixing (and blessing?) of the chalice. Prior to this Cup of the Blessing the meal would not differ, except perhaps in the quality and quantity of the food served, from a formal meal on the most ordinary day.

Finally, on the eves of Sabbaths or great feasts (a narrower circle of occasions than that mentioned just above) there would be brought a second cup, the Cup of the *Kiddush*. The schools of Shammai and Hillel differed as to the order of the two blessings over the *Kiddush* Cup. Both agreed there should be a wine-blessing and a day-blessing (the latter alone being, in the strict sense, "the *Kiddush*"; for the *Kiddush was precisely* "the Sanctification of the Day"). But Hillel held the day-blessing should follow the wine-blessing; Shammai said it should precede it. Obviously, however, this very dispute attests inescapably its existence and its main features. Clearly it was (as it still is) a common chalice of wine, blessed

[1] *Tos. Ber.*, v. 3-4; also *Tos. Ber.*, iii. 8; also *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 6, taken with *Tos. Ber.*, v. 6.
[2] *Mish. Ber.*, vi. 5.
[3] Cf. *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας* (1 Cor. x. 16).
[4] See, for a discussion, Appendix VII.

by one leader for the group with a double blessing, i.e. a wine-blessing and a day-blessing (in disputed order).

The account just given assumes that Elbogen's view discussed above is correct as to a supposed shift in the position of the *Kiddush* during the second Christian century. On Dr. Ginsberg's view, our account of the meal itself remains unaffected. But the *Kiddush* Cup with its double blessing is held to have preceded the meal as the normal practice, just as it does now. In that case there has been no change. Dr. Ginsberg treats the evidence for the position of the *Kiddush* after the meal, which Elbogen has produced from Tannaitic times, as being either exceptional cases, or rulings given for such cases. Fortunately, as pointed out above, in view of the extreme unlikelihood that the Last Supper contained a *Kiddush*, the point ceases to have any direct bearing on the origins of the Eucharist. Hence we need not pursue it further here.

From the above, then, we gain a picture of three chief types of Jewish meals. I summarize here very briefly the outstanding features that concern our study in Eucharistic origins:

A. A preliminary informal "course," taken seated, in which each one blesses for himself the articles of food or drink brought to him. This is found in the second and third types of meal, but not in the first.

B. The formal meal is taken reclining. It is opened with the blessing and breaking of bread by one leader for all present. This is found in all three types.

C. At the conclusion comes the "grace-after-meals," called the "food-blessing," said also by one leader for all present. On simple occasions (the first type of meal) it is said without any "Cup of Blessing." But on special occasions of joy, etc., it is said over a common cup, called the "Cup of Blessing" (or "of *the* blessing"). This is true of the second and third types. No prior cup is blessed by one for the group.

D. Finally, after all this, comes the *Kiddush* Cup, blessed with a double (wine- and day-) blessing. It too is a common cup and is blessed by one leader for the whole group. This is found only in the third type of meal.

It is probable enough that our Lord conformed to these

customs to justify us in assuring that He did, if such an assumption will help us to achieve an attractive historical reconstruction. Especially will this be licit if we discover any positive evidence to show that the early Christian Eucharist or Agape was modelled upon, or agreed closely with, the Jewish pattern arrived at above.

A point which needs to be set down here as one of the assured results on which we can build in our studies of the early Christian liturgy, is the Jewish manner and conception of blessings. All one has to do is to read a great number of specimens of these blessings to be led without hesitation to the generalization that a Jewish blessing does not ask God to bless the food, but blesses God for the food (or the day, or the light, etc.). God must be blessed either by name or (where that was frowned upon) by some surrogate for the name such as Lord. And the particular thing for which He was thanked would be added in a relative clause. Sufficient examples of this can be seen in the bread, wine, and other blessings quoted above. Dr. Gavin, speaking of the conception at the back of the practice of blessing foods, etc., says:[1] "it (the blessing) was deemed to release the food for human consumption, for without pronouncing a blessing no one ought to eat anything, for to do so would be theft from God, or sacrilege. Blessings in ancient days were conceived to release power, by invocation of the Divine Name, just as curses were effectual and potent releases of Divine power."

Before leaving this part of our study I must add a brief statement on the *Haburoth* in first-century Judaism and their common meal. I rely here chiefly on Dr. Oesterley (*The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 167 *et passim*).

A *Haburah* (or *Chaburah*), plural *Haburoth* (or *Chaburoth*), was a society of comrades or friends. It took its name from the word *Haber* (or *Chaber*), meaning a comrade, companion, or friend. Oesterley tells us "the word *Haburah* . . . means 'fellowship,'[2] almost 'love'.[3] The root meaning of this word

[1] *Theology Reprints*, ix. 6.

[2] Cf. Acts ii. 42.

[3] Cf. the name for the early Christian common meal that included the Eucharist (Agape), and also the extraordinary usage of the word ἀγάπη in John, especially Chapters xiii.-xvii., and in the first Epistle.

is a 'bond'; then it comes to mean fellowship among men; and *Haber* means a friend." These *Haburoth* had as their *raison d'être* acts of piety and love,[1] as indeed is implied by the name *Haburah*.

After the exile, but exactly when cannot be decided—at any rate well within pre-Christian times—these *Haburoth* were in existence, and had the custom of meeting, especially on Friday afternoons, at the house of one of the members, for a social meal. Dr. Oesterley quotes Geiger: "At these meals, each member of the *Haburah* brought some food some time before the Sabbath (so as not to profane it) to the particular house in which the meal was about to be held." [2]

The meal began rather early in the afternoon, and was drawn out by conversation and discussion until dusk.[3] Then came the *Kiddush* ceremony, at the end of the meal. Besides their social character, there was also a distinctly religious atmosphere about these gatherings. Religious topics were of paramount interest to the Jews; hence the subjects of conversation on these occasions were predominantly of a religious character.[4]

The interpretation (of Jesus and His disciples and the common meals they must often have taken together, including the Last Supper) in terms of these customs and conceptions is both easy and obvious.[5] Especially important is it to notice that this *rapprochement* in no way depends upon the identification of the Last Supper with a *Kiddush* meal. For we have no proof, nor is it likely, that these *Haburoth* would rigidly limit themselves to holding a social meal on those occasions when a *Kiddush* would be in order. Certainly, at any rate, Jesus and His disciples could hardly have done so. And on other occasions the meal would probably have followed the type of the more formal and solemn meal described above, save that there would have been no *Kiddush*. Presumably every *Haburah*

[1] Cf. the religious, charitative, and fellowship-love characteristics of the primitive church.

[2] *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* . . ., p. 124 (1857). Dr. Oesterley quotes this in a footnote on p. 169 of *The Jewish Background*.

[3] Cf. possibly John xiii. 30; but this is doubtfully relevant.

[4] Cf. the conversations in Luke xxii. 26-38 and John xiii.-xvii.

[5] Cf. the comparisons given *passim* in the footnotes to the account of the *Haburah* and its meal, given immediately above.

meal would have been deemed a joyous occasion; and hence, unless lack of wine made this impossible, there would have been a Cup of Blessing at the conclusion of every such meal. Especially would this inference seem to follow for the *Haburah* composed of the "sons of the bridechamber" while the bridegroom was still with them. Possibly the fact that this meal with His *Haburah* (including at least "the twelve") was a publicly known phenomenon may help to account for the accusation "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber." And least of all can we suppose the Last Supper to have been lacking in all the solemnity Jesus could impart to it. Hence we should expect *a priori* that it would conform to the type of meal described above as the more solemn and formal type of *Haburah* banquet. This expectation, as we shall see later, our evidence in the Gospels and St. Paul does not disappoint, but strongly confirms.

CHAPTER II

THE AGAPE

WE come now to one of the deepest of historical enigmas, the Agape. The difficulties of this subject have given us an innumerable company of theories of all sorts and kinds. Thus it has been possible for Batiffol [1] to deny that there ever was a general assembly of the church as a whole for a common meal (except for the Eucharist); and for Dr. Karl Völker [2] to put forward a similar theory, at least for the first century and more of Christian history. Conversely, there have been those like Spitta and Jülicher who have held that the Agape was the original phenomenon and the Eucharist grew out of it, rather early but not early enough to be justly termed co-original. Or perhaps their view would be better expressed by saying that the two were co-original because not originally distinct but identical. Then there is the view of Ladeuze and Ermoni that the Agape and Eucharist are both fully primitive and Apostolic and equally (or almost equally) original; but that they were not only quite distinct entities all along, but normally quite separate from each other, though occasionally joined as in 1 Cor. xi. Finally, there is the view once generally accepted, and still held by many, though lately challenged from all these quarters just enumerated, to which the present writer must give his preference. It is that the Eucharist and Agape [3] (to

[1] *Études d'histoire*, first series, many editions: concluding essay, "L'Agape."

[2] *Mysterium und Agape* (1927).

[3] I shall say here once for all, and not repeat myself hereafter, that I use these words only for convenience's sake, and am not forgetting the many questions begged by their use. I shall hope to clear up what the early usage was later. Until that is done, I use Eucharist to mean the special bread and cup to which a supernatural significance is supposed by some to have been attached; and Agape to mean a merely common, satisfying meal or part of a meal, but held by the *Haburah* and so in some sense a religious act.

use later and partly inaccurate terms) were originally distinct, but not separate. By this I mean that the Bread and Cup of the Eucharist were always distinguished in the mind of the reverent and instructed laity (and *a fortiori* the "clergy") from ordinary food; but were united to such food in a social-charitative common meal of the whole *Haburah* of Christ. Views differ as to just where they came in relation to it. Some would say the bread–cup (*or* cup–bread) came before the meal, using the *Didache* as their chief evidence. Others would say both came (in whichever order) at the end of the meal. Still others would suggest that the bread came at the beginning of or during the meal, and the cup at the end.[1] And other combinations are possible, though I do not happen to have met them in my reading.

It will facilitate our study as to its written form, and avoid much repetition, if I set down at the beginning the conclusions at which I have arrived for the earliest period. Taking our departure from the Jewish background as we reconstructed it in the first chapter, we begin with a post-Resurrection *Haburah* meal of the disciples of Jesus.

Before the formal meal opened, there would be normally, or at least often, the same informal preliminary course as at an ordinary Jewish *Haburah* meal. It would be taken before reclining, and whatever was served was blessed by each one for himself. At the beginning of the formal (reclining) part of the meal the bread would be blessed and broken by one for them all. Then would come the main body of the formal meal. Such a meal, especially in the spirit of the early post-Resurrection days, would always be festive or joyous, as indeed we saw that quite possibly all the meals of any *Haburah* would be. Hence it would always include (unless by any chance lack of wine made this impossible) the Cup of Blessing at the very end of the meal, blessed by one for the whole group. The bread and cup which opened and closed the formal part of the meal would have been what were later called "the

[1] The present writer would give his opinion in favour of this last view, but with the qualification that at the very beginning, before even the bread, came (normally) the preliminary informal course, eaten before reclining, which we found attested in contemporary Jewish practice.

Eucharist," when the term came, as by the time of St. Ignatius and almost certainly of the *Didache*, to be applied to the food and not merely to the service. It was these that Jesus had in some sense called His body and His blood at the Last Supper He had eaten with His disciples before His Passion; and this fact had not, needless to say, been forgotten. The preliminary course, and also any food that was served at the formal meal *between* the opening bread-breaking and the concluding chalice (exclusive in both cases, of course), would have been considered as "common food." Of course this is not to imply that a strongly religious tone would be lacking even in these "common" parts of the fellowship meal. We have, however, no reason to doubt, and every reason to believe, that from the very first *the* Bread and *the* Cup of Blessing would, in view of the Last Supper on which the whole meal was patterned, be carefully distinguished in the minds of at least the thoughtful from any other bread or cup, as well as from any of the other foods that might be brought during the meal.

Thus it is that I conceive the primitive *Haburah* meal of the early Christians to have been, supplementing the almost total poverty of the Acts evidence with the comparative richness of the evidence of contemporary Jewish practice studied above, and the accounts of the Last Supper. This is not, of course, to set any rigid pattern to which, even in details, every such meal must be supposed to conform. It is only to picture the norm as our evidence gives us good reason to suppose it to have been.

At the beginning, of course, there would be no new or technical title for the meal in question. It was a meal that had already been held many times before the Last Supper by Jesus in company with His disciples. Hence it already would have great preciousness in the eyes of the original disciples. In addition, it had the new, added, and infinitely greater significance which Jesus had given it at the Last Supper, and which the early church for some reason seems to have understood was to inhere in it permanently. But it had at first no new name or technical title. Hence descriptive titles would at first be used for it. It would be called simply "the breaking

of bread" (or "the bread");[1] and by another descriptive title, the "Supper of the Lord." Needless to say, the use of the first title need not in any way have signified that the Cup of Blessing was not of co-equal importance with the bread that was broken. Still less does it prove that it had originally no parallel significance, or was totally lacking. Other evidence may conceivably lead us to either of these latter conclusions; the substantival title or its verbal correlative gives us no basis whatever for either. They are simply primitive makeshifts for such later developed titles or phrases as the "Eucharist" or the "Agape," and "to make (hold, or celebrate) the Eucharist (or Agape)."

Let us look at once at what little direct evidence we have for the pre-Pauline Jerusalem church. That will be the accounts of the Last Supper in the Synoptic Gospels and St. Paul, and two very brief and general passages in Acts.

As to the former, it is my intention to undertake a critical historical and "doctrinal" evaluation of them last of all, at the very end of our whole study. I prefer this because they seem to me to be the part of our evidence on which it is least easy to arrive at secure conclusions. Hence I prefer to reach as many secure conclusions in all the branches of the surrounding evidence as I can, in order, if possible, to throw more light on the Last Supper, or at least increase the security with which we can draw our conclusions. Hence what follows will inevitably have some measure of tentativeness, in addition to being only a summary in which reasons are not given.

If we may prefer the combined testimony of Mark, Matthew, Paul, and the doubtful "longer text" of Luke to the perhaps equally doubtful "shorter text" (as we shall see reasons for doing in our final chapter), then the Last Supper appears to have conformed with remarkable exactness to the picture of

[1] Because this was the one constant and invariable element (generally speaking) in all meals. Not all had a Cup of Blessing, nor a preliminary course, nor a *Kiddush*, nor any other fixed element. But every meal included bread which had to be blessed and broken. And this was done at the beginning of the meal (of the formal meal when a preliminary course was served). Furthermore, the bread-blessing was, as we saw above, the grace-before-meals. Hence the term " to break bread " becomes a simple and easy metaphor for " to eat, take, or serve a meal."

the Jewish *Haburah* meal, which we obtained from our studies in the Jewish material.

It is not made clear in Mark-Matt.-Paul whether the bread came at the beginning of the meal or during it. But Mark-Matt. make it clear that the bread-breaking took place while they were "reclining," [1] and Paul has nothing to the contrary. So the general Jewish custom is therefore probably decisive in favour of the beginning.

Even the preceding chalice in Luke is no decisive objection. For it admits of being interpreted as the wine of the preliminary course. And it is possible we have a double confirmation of this. First, Luke xxii. 15-17 are remarks most likely to have been made just at the very beginning of the meal, i.e. as the preliminary course began. And it is perhaps significant that before these words we get, not the word "to recline" but the more general word *ἀνέπεσεν*, which could, I suppose, as easily mean "He sat down" as "He reclined." Also, the surprising words over the first chalice are better understood if, as probably would have been the case in the preliminary course, Jesus had filled and blessed only His own chalice for Himself, and passed the wine (not the chalice) to fill and bless likewise for themselves (cf. *Tos. Ber.*, v. 6). It would seem probable, then, that Luke xxii. 15-17 not only does not prove that the bread did not begin the formal meal, but in addition attests the preliminary course.

Matt.-Mark-Paul-Luke (longer text) all agree in putting the cup after the bread. And St. Paul expressly says "after supper" and calls it the "Cup of Blessing" in 1 Cor. x. 16.

The meal in between the bread and the cup is self-evident. Hence we get, especially considering the brevity of the accounts, a very remarkable amount of confirmation of the view that the Last Supper was (in external respects) simply an ordinary "formal" *Haburah* meal shared by Jesus with His disciples.

But beside their disputed value as historical evidence for the actual Last Supper, these accounts indirectly attest the practice of the early church—i.e. as far back as they really historically reach. For the church either based her practice on the facts,

[1] Mark xiv. 18; Matt. xxvi. 20.

if the accounts are historical; or else her practice gave rise to the accounts. But even if these are not historical, they must in all probability reach back behind St. Paul's conversion. For he is not likely to have remained unsuspicious if he received them much later than that. Hence we may, as said, use them also as evidence for picturing "the breaking of bread" or the "Lord's Supper" in the pre-Pauline Palestinian church. Fuller reasons for these conclusions will be given in the final chapter.

The first of the passages in Acts is ii. 42. "The fellowship" of the Apostles presumably is the nearest equivalent Greek expression for "the *Haburah* of which the Apostles were the heads."

The phrase which chiefly concerns our present inquiry is "the breaking of the bread." That it should be mentioned in so brief a summary passage shows that it was something of pre-eminent religious importance to the life of these early Christians. More than that I do not see that we can learn from the passage.

The second passage is Acts ii. 46-47. Of this I think precisely the same things must be said. Presumably "breaking bread at home" refers to precisely the same religiously important *Haburah* meal or cult rite as did "the breaking of the bread" in Acts ii. 42. And the same wide range of interpretative possibilities consequently present themselves. Some have urged that the grammatical construction of the passage requires, or at least favours, the view that "breaking bread at home" must refer to the same action as the immediately following "they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart." This does not seem to be at all necessary.

The one bit of added information we seem to get from these two passages is the indication that "the breaking of the bread," whatever it was, was a strictly private action of the *Haburah* in which they separated themselves from non-Christians with whom on other occasions they worshipped in the temple. And even this is not beyond dispute, though it seems the natural inference from the two passages taken together with the stress on "the Apostles' Fellowship (*Haburah*)" and the apparently intentional opposition in ii. 46 between "in the temple" and "at home."

We need hardly say, one would suppose, that no negative conclusions can be drawn from things not mentioned. It is nothing short of preposterous to argue that "the breaking of the bread" was disconnected from the Last Supper, was no memorial of Christ's Passion, had no second part (the chalice) and no sacramental or mystical content *because* "no trace is found of these things" in Acts ii. 42 and 46. If one wanted to show the argument from silence at its weakest, or even to caricature it deliberately, one could hardly frame a better specimen for the purpose.

Let us now go on to consider Acts xx. 7-12. The important thing to remember here is that this is not a "precious description of the way the Eucharist was celebrated in those far-off early days" but an account of a "wonderful miracle" St. Paul "wrought" concerning the lad Eutychus. This happens to have occurred at "the breaking of bread," and so enough has to be said about that to complete the narrative. But it is not in the least the writer's purpose or primary interest here. We find the same designation in use for the action, occurring twice, once with the article and once without it. We find the same silences, and should undoubtedly attach the same significance to them as in the two passages just considered, i.e. none at all. Surely we should not attach *less* importance, since the account is less abbreviated; though many strangely do.

We get no hint of any preliminary course before the bread was broken, and this may be significant in view of what we shall have to say later apropos of 1 Cor. xi. But nothing can be made out of it from this text alone. Obviously the occasion is exceptional in more ways than one.

We have in the passages so far considered (it is important to insist here, in view of the theories of some scholars) no basis at all for the view that there was a considerable gulf between "the breaking of the bread" as practised in the Pauline communities and in the primitive Palestinian church. That may or may not be true, but it must be settled, if at all, on other evidence. That which we have thus far studied throws no light at all upon the subject.

Let us next consider the passage in Acts xxvii. 33-36. Very

little need be said here; for this text, according to what is surely the correct reading, gives us no ground to consider it a Eucharist. To take bread and to give thanks is a thing that could be said of every non-Christian Jew every time he began a meal. Besides, we have every reason to believe that even at this early date the Eucharist would not be celebrated before non-Christians, nor would the Agape.

We shall now consider the first passage outside the Synoptics that throws any real light on the way the primitive Eucharist and Agape were conducted. The evidence we have studied thus far would not of itself so much as tell us whether there was any Agape. When we come to 1 Cor. xi. 17 ff. the case is different. Here it is clear beyond any doubt that we are in the presence of a common meal united to the Eucharist. And it is clear that the Eucharist does not precede the meal. If the account given of the institution may be taken as evidence of the norm, the Cup came after the supper, and the Bread either at the beginning of or during the meal. It seems that the food for the meal is brought by the more well-to-do members of the church rather than bought (with the alms given by members) by ministers of the church. It also seems clearly implied that the meal ought, if properly conducted, either to be or to include a "Lord's Supper." And in view of the use made of the narrative of the Last Supper, we may safely infer that a Lord's Supper would be one that faithfully fulfilled the institution of Christ at that Last Supper. But it is not entirely clear [1] whether this would mean that the term "Lord's Supper" applied to the whole meal; or to the Eucharistic Bread and Cup only; or possibly, though less likely, to the common part of the meal.

The greater part of the information we should like to get from the passage is, however, denied us because of the doubts

[1] My own view, dependent partly on the other evidence, is that it applied to the whole meal as St. Paul had taught it to the Corinthians, without prejudice to the fact that St. Paul most insistently demands, even under pain of physical destruction, that the body and blood of Christ be discriminated or distinguished carefully from the common food which composed the rest of the meal. I doubt, however, if it is late enough to have a special *term* for the supernatural, sacramental elements of the meal considered in abstraction from the rest of the meal of which they formed a part.

that cluster around it. And these centre chiefly in the question whether the common meal itself is condemned by St. Paul, or whether it is only abuses connected with it that are condemned. There is much to be said for the first alternative.

To begin with, it appears that St. Paul feels he is expected to praise the Corinthians; presumably for some innovation they have introduced independently of his instruction (1 Cor. xi. 17 and 23). Did this concern the wholly new introduction of a common meal along with the Eucharist, or did it concern only those points which St. Paul treats of as gravely wrong? Let us ask ourselves what objections St. Paul raises against the practice of the Corinthians.

First of all, that they do something which makes it impossible to celebrate a true Lord's Supper, and makes it into a mere matter of each one's own supper. This appears to be for several reasons. For one thing, there is the selfish attitude displayed.[1] For another, there is the unworthy reception of the body and blood of the Lord through drunkenness, etc. And for a third, there is the secularizing of what ought to be a solemn memorial of Christ and His Passion. What remedies does St. Paul recommend?

First, let a man prove himself. This presumably means, let a man inquire carefully into his spiritual state as to whether he has faith and repentance for his sins, with a sincere purpose of amendment. But in view of the following verse, it apparently includes more. It appears to include also the proper devotional attitude which enters upon the whole in a right and sober spirit of brotherly unselfish love, deeming "the breaking of the bread" a solemn memorial, and distinguishing the Bread as the body and the Wine[2] as the blood from common foods.

But that is not all. "Wait for one another; and if anyone is hungry let him eat at home." The first injunction alone might mean no more than "begin all at once so as to avoid

[1] This, however, seems to be the point least stressed by St. Paul.

[2] Possibly the use of the disjunctive "or" here may be due to the possibility that a man might be sober and pious at the time the opening bread was eaten and yet become drunken by the time the final cup was passed around.

using up everything before the late arrivals come." But there is the added "What, have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" and again, twelve verses later, "if any man is hungry, let him eat at home." This latter sounds much more as if St. Paul were abolishing the eating of common food at the church meeting, not merely correcting the abuses of it. It is, I think, not impossible to understand the language about eating at home to mean: "If you are so hungry that you cannot wait for the others, eat enough at home to stay your appetite until the meal begins at the church." But this is surely not the most natural meaning of the unqualified language St. Paul actually uses.

Further, since it is inconceivable that the Corinthians should have hoped to be praised for the very abuses listed, it would seem to follow that not these, but the common meal in connection with which they occurred, were the innovation for which they hoped to be praised. This makes it all the easier to interpret the injunction "let him eat at home" as intended to abolish entirely the innovation. Perhaps it was not objectionable in itself, but at least it led to these very grave abuses.

On the other hand, "wait for one another when ye come together to eat" does not sound as if it really meant "eat nothing when ye come together except the Bread that is Christ's body and the Wine that is His blood." Surely more eating is here referred to than that. And besides, I doubt if any injunction to wait upon each other for that part of the whole would have been necessary, since we have every reason to suppose that the Eucharistic Bread would be broken for all by one, and hence it would be impossible not to begin at the same time.

I believe it is possible, with the help of our knowledge of the Jewish meals from which the Christian Eucharist in all probability sprang, to find a solution which will do justice to both elements in this apparently conflicting evidence. On the one hand, it has appeared that not only the abuses, but the meal itself from which they arise, is being abolished. On the other, it appears that St. Paul expects more than an isolated Eucharist to be left after his advice to "eat at home"

is followed. I believe both of these elements can be satisfied if we accept the following reconstruction.

St. Paul had introduced the Eucharist into Corinth, and presumably into the other Gentile churches which he founded, united indeed to an ordinary *Haburah* repast, but divorced from the preliminary course customary in contemporary Judaism at any sort of a banquet. Presumably this course would have been carried over into the normal practice of the primitive Palestinian church. But since it was purely a matter of Jewish custom, St. Paul could easily have taken the view that it was of no religious importance. Then, seeing that it might open the way to serious abuses amid the conditions in the Gentile churches, he had, I suggest, introduced the Eucharist-Agape into the churches of his founding without this element. Possibly St. Paul might have seen evidence of those abuses in the Jewish churches, but where he was in no position to assert himself and remedy the evil. Or possibly he had not found those abuses in Palestine because the food for the Eucharist-Agape was bought from the community treasury; but could easily foresee what would happen under Greek conditions where similar "banquets" were already widespread and where the opposite custom prevailed of each one bringing his own contribution of food (not money) toward the meal. At any rate, whether for these or other reasons, he had instituted it so that all should "wait for one another." The meal should begin with the solemnly blessed and broken Eucharistic Bread, the body of Christ, which would at once set the tone for the whole meal. The common repast followed, intended primarily for social and edificatory ends rather than as a fully satisfying charitative meal, but playing nevertheless the latter rôle to a great extent in the lives of the very poor. The meal closed with the solemnly blessed "Cup of Blessing," the Eucharistic Cup, the blood of Christ.

Such, I would suppose, was the Eucharistic practice at Corinth at the time when there came down from Jerusalem those who taught many to say "I am of Peter"; i.e., I presume, "I follow the ways of the Apostolic Church up in Jerusalem." These people would have told the Corinthians at once: "Why,

look here! You people don't do this thing right. This is not the way we do it in Jerusalem." And they would at once have told the Corinthians about the preliminary course and urged its adoption. Contemporary Greek customs of a parallel sort, and the world, the flesh, and the devil, would have done the rest. Thus we get the situation with which St. Paul is confronted and which he meets as we saw above. It seems to me that such a reconstruction satisfies every element in our evidence. St. Paul disapproves the innovation and wants the *status quo* restored. The other more difficult and more complex problems presented he will deal with when he comes.

The only other evidence in the New Testament is the passage in Jude 12, where, according to much the best attested text,[1] we have: "These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts (ἀγάπαις=Agapes) when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves, etc." Here then we have clearly to do with either the Eucharist alone, called by the name of Agape; or with an ordinary meal of the community; or with a combination of the Eucharist with such a meal, the whole bearing the title Agape. The words used in the next clause "when they feast with you" seem to suggest rather strongly that we should not choose the first alternative; though it would not, I suppose, be impossible to refer to the reception of the Eucharist as "feasting" in a sort of spiritualized, metaphorical sense. More information than this I cannot see that the passage gives us.

In 2 Pet. ii. 13 the parallel passage should most probably read ἀπάταις instead of ἀγάπαις. But even if ἀγάπαις is the correct reading it would probably add nothing to what little we could gather from the passage in Jude.

From St. Ignatius we get a little more, I believe, though even here it is only through solving many enigmas. Let us first notice *Smyr.*, 7 : 1 and 8 : 1-2. In the former the verb ἀγαπᾶν seems to be used with a double meaning;[2] viz. "to love" and "to join in the love-feast (Agape)," the withdrawal

[1] The reading of A C *al. pauci* is probably confirmation to the text in 2 Peter ii. 13.

[2] There is a somewhat related phenomenon in the Johannine literature.

from which by the Docetists is in St. Ignatius' eyes a major infraction of that greatest of Christian virtues. This is only comprehensible if the Agape is or included the Eucharist. Again, in the latter passage, while the deduction is not inescapable, it seems very likely that the terms are used almost if not quite interchangeably. If so, the same conclusion as in the first passage would follow.

In the light of these passages two others are relevant. Twice, in *Trall.*, 8, and in *Rom.*, 7 : 2-3, St. Ignatius equates in some sense the blood of Christ with love or love incorruptible. In one of these two passages the body of Christ is equated with faith, and in the second with the bread of God. The latter seems to imply, and other evidence in St. Ignatius makes it reasonably clear, that we have Eucharistic references here. Have we at the same time a play on the word Agape, giving it a double reference: to the Agape (which the heretics shun but for which St. Ignatius earnestly longs); and to the virtue of love, of which St. Ignatius sees a major violation in their abstention from the Eucharist? If so, it strongly suggests either that the Eucharist was the Agape, or else was closely associated with it. Perhaps we get a slight confirmation in the other equation in the same passage—faith which is the flesh of Christ. Here again he probably sees a major violation of the virtue of faith in their denial of the true Incarnation of Christ.

It might seem at first that this does not take us very far. I think, however, it does enable us to eliminate one of the three possibilities left us by the passage in Jude, the first to use the term Agape. For at least the idea of a common meal of ordinary food, entirely dissociated from the Eucharist, seems fairly definitely excluded by the evidence of St. Ignatius. We are left to choose between the two remaining alternatives, and I believe we can make the choice with comparative safety in the light of the following considerations. Later on we find an ordinary common meal, as we shall see, called in Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian the "Agape" and in St. Cyprian and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus the "Lord's Supper." Now this is much easier to account for if the Eucharist were

originally attached [1] in some manner to an ordinary common meal, the *whole* being called the "Agape" or the "Lord's Supper," than if originally the latter terms applied to the Eucharist alone separated from any ordinary food. For it is much easier to see how on the former alternative both names passed over to the ordinary common meal at or after a conjectured separation of the earlier united elements than it would be to explain how they both became detached from the Eucharist to which they originally belonged exclusively, and became attached to the ordinary common meal to which they originally belonged in no way whatsoever.

If this reasoning be sound, we are at last in a position to conclude definitely *both the existence of an ordinary community meal in the primitive church and its union with the Eucharist.* We can also conclude with probability, though not with the same amount of certainty as for the titles "Agape" and "Lord's Supper," that the earlier, semi-technical, "the breaking of bread," refers likewise to the composite whole.

Let us now pass to the passage in Pliny. It might be very valuable to us but for the host of unanswerable preliminary questions it raises. In view of our inability to answer these questions, the interpretation must remain in the utmost doubt. Even with them settled we could not get much certain information. The passage is so difficult and perplexing we had best not try to base any conclusions on any particular interpretation of it. The term "*cibum promiscuum tamen et innoxium*" does, however, seem to this writer to be an effort to reassure the pagan officials concerning slanders connected with the Eucharistic food. Thus I incline to interpret the later meeting as a night meeting for the Eucharist-Agape, before the edict. But even this is clearly very far from certain.

Before passing to the study of the later evidence, we must study briefly the evidence of the *Didache.* I shall give in Appendix I reasons for a slight conjectural emendation in the text of the *Didache* and show how greatly it facilitates a superior reconstruction. Here, however, I shall for methodological

[1] The reader will remember the passage in Jude was unfavourable to, without entirely excluding, the alternative here rejected.

reasons take the evidence as it stands. So taken, we get a Eucharist-Agape in which the Eucharist as a whole precedes the common meal; and the latter concludes with a grace-after-meals, to which, however, no cup is any longer attached. Moreover, the cup which presumably once was blessed with this final grace is now found at the beginning as the Eucharistic Cup, before even the Eucharistic Bread. It is blessed with an exceedingly short thanksgiving of one brief paragraph. This is just about the length of the usual wine-blessing in Judaism. The thanksgiving over the bread is composed of two short benedictions, and is more than twice as long as the thanksgiving over the wine. And both have been "transposed into a higher and more spiritual key."

The same is true of the concluding grace after the meal. It is composed, as was the contemporary Jewish grace-after-meals, of three separate but brief benedictions. Moreover, although in the process of transposition the second benediction (the blessing for the land) has naturally lost its original character (since the Christians were no longer concerned about the literal promised land), yet the third benediction has visibly retained it. The third, it will be remembered, was the benediction for Jerusalem, and contained, at least after 70 A.D., a petition for the restoration of Jerusalem, and probably earlier a petition for the gathering together of the Jews of the *Diaspora*. The first of these is carried over and applied to the church, the second to the ingathering of the elect foretold in the Gospels at the *Parousia*. Moreover, it seems as if the blessing over the bread has tended to grow and expand in the direction of parallelism with the concluding grace. It has become two benedictions instead of the original one. The second and concluding one is rather closely similar to the concluding benediction in the grace-after-meals. In other words, it was on its way to be patterned after the originally much longer grace-after-meals, but it had not completed its development, judged on the basis of our present text, when something arrested its growth.

Many scholars have doubted the Eucharistic character of these prayers. But there is no sufficient reason for this, as

our studies in the development of the early liturgy will show conclusively. The internal evidence that they are Eucharistic is practically decisive. Before the whole passage we get, "But concerning the Eucharist, give thanks thus." Then we get the Cup and the Bread, with directions for blessing each. Then immediately "But let none eat or drink of your Eucharist except (the baptized)." And at the end of the whole passage "But let the prophets hold Eucharist as much as[1] they will." This rubric is clearly occasioned by the fact that forms have just been given to which those who are not prophets must conform. Hence these are Eucharistic forms. There is also the reference in the prayers themselves to the gift of "spiritual food and drink and eternal life" which is almost certainly a reference to the Eucharist, and recalls the Johannine and Ignatian doctrine that the Eucharist is the "medicine of immortality."

On the whole, any doubt seems unreasonable. And in view of *Did.*, 10 : 1 ("But after you are satisfied[2] with food, give thanks thus"), any doubt that it was connected with a common meal seems equally unreasonable. In fact, the very use of the grace-after-meals would (as our text stands) show this conclusively also. For a post-Communion thanksgiving is, at such a date, quite unattested and improbable. Hence we have in the *Didache* a complete Eucharist, with the Cup preceding the Bread, and with the common meal following the Eucharist. The whole is closed by a grace-after-meals.

The date for the *Didache* is probably 130-150 A.D. and may be even later. At so late a date, such comparatively undeveloped prayers cannot but occasion great surprise. We shall see in our liturgical chapter that already before the time of Justin Martyr the normal liturgical development has reached a stage like that shown in the *A.T.* of Hippolytus, with perhaps an even considerably longer Anaphora. The *Didache* is practically contemporary with this, and yet in it we have moved hardly an inch (save in the transposition into the higher spiritual key) from what was probably the very most original

[1] ὅσα θέλουσιν (*Did.*, 10 : 7).
[2] ἐμπλησθῆναι.

forms used in Judaism. The bread-blessing is a little longer; the grace-after-meals and the wine-blessing presumably just the same. It is a very strange phenomenon indeed. Possibly sources may help to account for it. Perhaps also a rather crude effort by a ±140 A.D. author to reconstruct the very primitive Apostolic age may be a part of the explanation. Very likely the church it represents may have been a backwater church, or even sectarian and abnormal in many ways. We cannot pursue the subject further here. But I cannot allow myself to close without expressing doubt that so brief a consecration prayer for the wine as that given in *Did.*, 9 : 2 was ever anywhere in normal use, especially as late as ±140 A.D.

I believe, however, that without amending the present text of the *Didache*, we can safely deduce from it an important prior stage which will be of great value for our investigation. That stage is one in which the Eucharistic Cup was at the end, after the common meal, and had as its consecration prayer the grace-after-meals (*Did.*, 10 : 2-5 at least). This we have seen every reason to believe was the most primitive form of the Christian "breaking of bread," as well as of the pre-Christian formal *Haburah* banquet. And the very puzzle of the *Didache* itself is best explained [1] by assuming such a prior stage. The *Didache* form will then have arisen by the Cup having been moved (for what reason we cannot say at this stage) up before the Bread. But its consecration prayer was the grace-after-meals, of immemorial standing and universal acquaintance. Hence it could not be moved forward with the Cup. So the only available alternative, the usual Jewish wine-blessing, was chosen to meet the difficulty (transposed of course into the higher spiritual key). Hence probably arose the *Didache* form as we have it. Paradoxical as it may sound, I believe that this prior stage of which I speak may be considered even more historical than the form in the *Didache* itself, if by historical we understand once actually practised somewhere. Hence I shall not hesitate to use it in our reconstruction at the conclusion of this chapter. And to avoid cumbersomeness in references to it, I shall simply call it "pre-*Didache*."

[1] Unless one accepts the textual emendation proposed in Appendix I.

It will have been noted that neither the *Didache* nor our "pre-*Didache*" provides any evidence of the preliminary course. By their dates it has died out even in Jewish-Christian circles.

It will not be necessary, nor will the space at my disposal allow me, to consider the slight references in all the writers at and after the middle of the second century. Minucius Felix, of doubtful date, but who may possibly belong to the last third of the second century, describes the Christian feasts (*convivia*) as being "chaste and temperate; we neither indulge ourselves in *epulis* nor protract our *convivium* with strong drink; but we blend cheerfulness with gravity." This seems like a common meal of ordinary food, no longer united to the Eucharist.

Justin and St. Irenaeus, our bulkiest second-century writers, are completely silent about the Agape, though both deal extensively with the Eucharist. The nature of this silence, especially in Justin where he would be expected to deal with points occasioning trouble with the State authorities, makes it very probable that the Agape was no longer in existence, at least in his and perhaps some other localities. Certainly it was no longer in connection with the Eucharist, if it existed at all. And our later evidence will agree, like Minucius Felix, with this latter point, with the barely possible exception of Clement of Alexandria. Also it will suggest quite strongly that the Agape, though everywhere by that time separate from the Eucharist, had not been everywhere abolished, even for a time.[1]

Let us now go on to consider the Agape as we find it about the year 200 A.D. Fortunately we have four witnesses whose testimony comes somewhat near this date, and three of them, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, very near to it. The fourth is St. Cyprian. We shall take Hippolytus' *A.T.* first, as it is our best and fullest account.

In Chapter 26 we get what is generally—and no doubt rightly—considered a description of the Agape as this staunch

[1] For the evidence discussed after that of Pliny I am indebted to A. J. MacLean's splendid article "Agape" in *E.R.E.*

traditionalist would have it take place, and hence presumably as he has known it all his life, apart from any innovations he may be silently discarding. It is not anywhere called the Agape, however, nor does it seem to take place in the church building, but rather in a private house. Nor does it seem that the community as a whole is invited, but only selected members; though this inference is not so certain, especially in view of the presumably small numbers of Hippolytus' sect. But in the great church, before the schism, it is almost if not quite self-evident that not all the members could be invited to a banquet in any one private home. The name used is the "Lord's Supper," presumably from some historical relation, real or supposed, with the Last Supper, as suggested above.

The meal begins with a solemn blessing, breaking, and distribution of a loaf of bread by the bishop or in his absence some cleric, presbyter, or deacon. But no layman can bless this bread, even in the absence of all the clergy. The one who blesses the bread, called the *Eulogia* and treated as of some special but vague and undefined significance, is required in every case to "taste and eat it with the other believers." This bread is given only to the baptized. To the catechumens "bread of exorcism," a substitute, is given; and they are not allowed to sit at the Lord's Supper. Presumably they stand.[1]

After this is done, all, whether baptized or catechumens, must "offer" (i.e. give thanks over) a cup, each one for himself. And so they shall go on to the main body of the meal, for which certain disciplinary rules are given. The only one of these we need notice is the complete dominance of the meal by the bishop or other presiding cleric.

Nothing is said about the conclusion of the meal. This may be due to a purely careless omission, and in that case the meal might end with a Cup of Blessing and a grace-after meals. If so, such a cup would not be considered Eucharist,

[1] A question—could the word translated " sit " mean to recline ? If so, perhaps then the catechumens only sat when the full members reclined. But I doubt whether the same rigid distinction would be drawn in non-Jewish circles between sitting and reclining; there the only distinction preserved with much rigidity is likely to have been between formal and informal meals.

i.e. the blood of the Lord. It might be considered something special, on an equal footing with the *Eulogia*; or it might be treated as purely ordinary wine, just a good way to bring the banquet to an end. However, I cannot but think that if this be the correct text of *A.T.* there was no such semi-liturgical cup, analogous to the *Eulogia* at the beginning; but only a grace after the meal such as would be said at any meal, even a purely private one (see 28 : 9), and hence would not need to be prescribed. My reasons are twofold: (1) A careless omission of so major a point is very unlikely in a meticulous writer like Hippolytus; and (2) the practice of the *Apoforetum* seems to suggest that after the public blessing and distribution of the *Eulogia* by the bishop, and of wine by each one for himself, the liturgical part of the meal was over, and the body of the meal could be taken home and eaten as one pleased. In other words, I consider 26 : 8 as parallel with and alternative to 26 : 6-7, being different ways to proceed after 26 : 1-5. Then 26 : 9-10 gives an added direction about the first form 26 : 6-7; and 26 : 11-12 gives directions in case the bishop is absent. Of course 26 : 13 is a general direction, but it too applies chiefly to the form in 26 : 6-7.

In the brief Chapter 27 I find the point to be that the Lord's Supper could also be given especially for the widows, and in either form mentioned in Chapter 26. And the rules of Chapter 26 would apply, with the one natural addition that in the case of a meal to widows alone they must be dismissed before evening. It seems to me that both the meal for widows and also the *Apoforetum* form of the more general "Lord's Supper" show how far the charitative element has come to overshadow the social-religious element in these meals. This was, I suppose, inevitable as the church grew and zeal waned and the love of the brethren for each other grew colder. But the Agape could never have become a meal for only a part of the community as long as the Eucharist was united to it.

It has been suggested that 26 : 2-3 show that the Agape has been only recently separated from the Eucharist and that consequently there is a tendency to confuse the *Eulogia* with the body of Christ, which until recently was consecrated and

received at that same point in the service, and for which the *Eulogia* was substituted at the time the Eucharist was separated from the Agape. I suppose the reasons would be two: lest the Agape lose its liturgical character entirely; and because the beginning of a formal meal without the breaking of bread by a "president" was unthinkable either in Judaism or primitive Christianity. With the probability of most of this I would concur. But if Justin's evidence is good for Rome and shows the Agape to be no longer united to the Eucharist, I doubt if the separation can have been as recent as this view would require. Hence I am inclined to take 26 : 2-3 not as warning against too high but against too low an estimate of the *Eulogia*, and as insisting that it be treated as in some special sense holy and more important than the other ordinary food, though he hastens to concede that it is not the Eucharist, the body of the Lord. This interpretation seems to give the proper force to "for," which the other apparently does not give.

Let us now go on to consider the evidence of Tertullian. We shall find, I think, that he will confirm in the main the picture we have just drawn from Hippolytus. The chief passage occurs in *Apology*, 39, especially the last third of the chapter. Tertullian tells us: "Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it Agape, i.e. affection (or love)." The cost in the name of piety is gain, for it benefits the needy. "As an act of religious service it permits no vileness or immodesty." There is prayer to God before reclining. Eating and drinking are in strict moderation. It appears to occur at night or late evening. "Their conversation is as with the Lord present as one of the auditors." After manual ablution, and the bringing in of lights, hymns are sung by individuals. The feast closes with prayer.

This is the chief passage in Tertullian. There is, however, one lesser passage worth noticing in *De Jejunio*, xvii. It was written after Tertullian became a Montanist and condemns the Catholics very bitterly. Yet, all allowance made, this passage in all probability really does attest gross abuses even if Tertullian's charges are exaggerated. The other point added by this passage is a reference to the double portion given to the

elders (or possibly only to the president). This will have parallels in the later evidence.

Thus we get in Tertullian the name Agape; its charitative as well as edificatory purpose; assertions of moderation in food, drink, and conversation, bitterly denied later as a Montanist; its occurrence at night, hence its separation from the Eucharist, which for Tertullian occurs in the early morning; its beginning and ending with prayer; the washing of hands and the bringing in of lights; the singing of hymns; the presidency of the clergy; and their (or his) double portion.

As he is also from Northern Africa, though a generation or two later, we shall next notice the evidence of St. Cyprian before going on to Clement of Alexandria, who represents a different locality, in which, moreover, there is reason to expect *a priori* a possible difference of practice on this, as on so many other points. Our total yield from the four relevant Cyprianic passages [1] on the Agape (in some cases with more than a little doubt) seems to be as follows: (*a*) Its existence and the title "Lord's Supper"; (*b*) its separation from the Eucharist; (*c*) it was not for the whole community, but provided (directly or indirectly) from the offerings of those who attend; (*d*) the offering at some point of the mingled cup; (*e*) that the meal should be temperate and resound with psalms.

This seems, broadly, to confirm what we learned from Tertullian, but adds nothing to his testimony except the doubtful evidence as to how the food was provided, the indication that the whole community did not attend, and the important offering of the mingled cup.

We now go on to Clement of Alexandria. There seem to be two passages only that seriously concern our inquiry, and one of these (*Stromateis*, iii. 2) tells us only of great abuses among certain heretics in connection with their so-called Agapes—abuses on account of which Clement indignantly refuses the name Agape to their suppers. The other is in *The Instructor*, ii. 1. I confess myself able to draw with confidence comparatively little information about the Agape

[1] These are: *Ad Donatum*, 16 (*Ep.* 1); *On the lapsed*, 6; *On Work and Alms*, 15; *Epistle* 62 (some number it 63).

from this passage. I prefer therefore to quote from Völker[1] the picture he gathers of the Agape as Clement would wish it to be.

"The Christians come together to a simple meal, which begins and ends with prayer. Psalms are sung to instrumental accompaniment. Passages of Holy Scripture are read. There is connected with these an edificatory discussion. The partakers then continue together for a while in well-behaved conversation, with the moderate use of wine." Völker also thinks it clear that in Clement the individual well-to-do Christian is the patron of the Agape, and that the social side—the social feeling or disposition shown by the Agape—is given prominence. But the charitative and edificatory sides are quite unmistakably in evidence as well.

We cannot leave Clement without mentioning the contention of Dr. Bigg[2] and Dr. A. V. G. Allen[3] that "the Eucharist was not distinguished in time, ritual, or motive from the primitive Supper of the Lord." The argument of the matter would be long and tedious and would involve much detail. But my own opinion is that we are safe in concluding that Clement's testimony gives us no good reason to believe that the Eucharist was still united to the Agape in Alexandria in his day. In fact, the almost unmitigated contempt with which he speaks of the suppers called Agapes seems to me utterly unlike the extreme reverence with which he always speaks of the Eucharist. And it seems to me quite unaccountable if the latter was still even a part of these suppers, let alone if it were "not distinguished in time, ritual, or motive from the primitive Supper of the Lord"—unless the latter does not mean Clement's Agape.

We thus get little information from Clement about the Agape, but the little we get agrees well enough with our information from Hippolytus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian.

Let us now go on to notice the evidence of the other and later Church Orders. I think they are the only ones of the

[1] *Mysterium und Agape*, p. 160.
[2] *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 102-103.
[3] *Christian Institutions*, p. 522.

later sources it will be worth our while to inspect. We shall begin with the *Ethiopic Church Order*, which at this point differs enough from Hippolytus to be treated as substantially an independent authority, at least for its additions. In saying this I am following the conclusions of Dr. B. S. Easton, that 26 : 14-32 is not an original part of *A.T.*

Taking the *Eth. C.O.* as we find it, we must, I suppose, treat 26 : 1-13 as copied out of reverence for the source, to which there might or might not be any local practice corresponding. If so, it would probably be the Agape in private homes. Then 26 : 14-32 would be added because it was the local practice for the public Agape. If no local practice corresponded to 26 : 1-13, then 26 : 18-32 might be either public or private. In any case there is no need to repeat here the directions taken from Hippolytus. As to the part peculiar to *Eth. C.O.*, taking the meal in the order in which it is intended to happen rather than in that in which it is described, we get this:

Apparently the meal opens with the bringing in of a lamp already lighted outside by the deacon and its blessing by the bishop, with a prayer preceded by the traditional Eucharistic dialogue minus the *Sursum Corda*. But it is possible that this is not intended to be chronologically first, and it may have come during the meal as darkness began to draw near. In any case, "as they are eating their supper" and "before they partake of their own bread," the faithful shall every one take a little of the *Eulogia* from the hand of the bishop. And the catechumens shall also take the bread, "a mystic portion" (Connolly's rendering); presumably, in view of the source, the "bread of exorcism." The bishop shall dominate the conversation, and all shall be silent when he speaks. In case the bishop is absent, a presbyter, or even if necessary a deacon, may take his place in these matters with the possible but doubtful exception of blessing the lamp. After the supper they shall rise, the children and the virgins shall pray, and they shall (all?) sing psalms. Then the deacon shall bring the mingled cup of the *Prosphora* to the bishop, who shall offer it with the proper thanksgiving in some relation to the recitation of one or more

Hallelujah Psalms, which relation the confused state of the text does not enable us to determine definitely. Then, if the conjectural textual emendation of cup [1] into bread be correct, he offers with the proper thanksgiving a second loaf of bread and distributes the fragments to the faithful.[2] If the repetition of 26 : 2 has confused the sense, this might be the *Eulogia*, in which case the *Eulogia* would presumably drop out at the point given above. Otherwise it will not be the *Eulogia*, but some other loaf.

We shall next turn to the *Canons of Hippolytus*, which alone of the remaining Church Orders gives complete directions for an Agape. As commonly interpreted, these suggest two or possibly three forms of the Agape; a meal or supper (it is not clear whether these two are distinguished or whether we have here the "or" of apposition) for the poor and a commemoration for the departed. But the directions do not give an alternative form for these. It would seem, therefore, that whether there are two or three forms, the procedure was the same in all cases except one. The commemoration of the departed either could not take place on a Sunday, or, if it did so, could not be preceded by the reception of "the mysteries," which presumably means the Eucharist, and in both kinds. The former alternative is the more likely.

The ending of the meal is quite unmistakably described before the beginning. And this, I think, is quite certainly because he is following the *A.T.* of Hippolytus in some such

[1] Suggested because the text reads " he shall give thanks over the cup, and shall give of the fragments to all the faithful." Barring an accident, not likely to be ordered in the rubric, the cup would not have fragments.

[2] This is explicitly placed, in our present text, " when the (final) psalm is completed." However, what immediately follows at once raises a serious difficulty about this. We get : " And as they are eating their supper, the believers shall take a little bread from the hand of the bishop before they partake of their own bread, for it is *Eulogia* and not *Eucharistia*, as the body of the Lord." And then we have in addition a repetition of 26 : 10-12.

Now it is clear that these repetitions at once raise a problem about what appeared to be the *closing* blessing, breaking and distributing of the bread. For these injunctions are clearly an afterthought, occasioned perhaps by the realization that no directions at all have been given for the opening or the regular course of this particular type of meal, and intended to refer to the opening rather than the closing bread-breaking, and to the earlier part of the meal. Hence it is quite a problem whether this passage ought to be taken as representing an Agape in which the *Eulogia* came at the end.

textual form as we find in *Eth. C.O.*[1] Then he, having based his account on the "second form," goes back, just as did the redactor we found in *Eth. C.O.*, to supply the omitted directions about the beginning and procedure of the meal from the "first form." An important problem, however, and one that seems to me by no means clear, is whether the variations from *Eth. C.O.* are intentional adaptations to local practice, or unintentional changes due to misunderstanding of his source, or quite possibly a combination of both causes. He is more than a mere translator, and this seems to favour the first alternative. But he adheres quite slavishly to his source, adding very little new. Moreover, his variations admit in most cases of being easily explained as misunderstandings of his source. So I am by no means sure the second alternative is wrong.

If this suggestion be well founded, then we have no way of telling what the practice in his own locality was. I cannot but think this very likely, for it is hardly credible that by simple coincidence the practices he knows should have varied from those of *Eth. C.O.* in just such a way as to look so much like misunderstanding of the text underlying the latter. Yet presuming that the alterations have been made intentionally,[2] and in order to conform to local practice, in that case we get this picture of the meal.

The meal is preceded by the celebration and reception of the Eucharist (the Oblation, the Mysteries). Then, just before they sit down together, "bread of exorcism" is given to the faithful, but sent away to the catechumens who are not allowed to attend. The bishop should pray over this bread, sign it with the sign of the cross, break it, and distribute it. In his absence a presbyter if available, or else a deacon, may do the same. If only a layman is available, he may only break the bread but do nothing besides, and each one apparently

[1] Though there is also the possibility that he knew and used a form of it which included all the material in the Ethiopic text, but in which the verses 2-13 had been either transposed or else repeated in their entirety after 26 : 32, instead of the shortened form in which *Eth. C.O.* repeats them (verses 2 and 10-12).

[2] The direction about the commemoration for the departed being preceded by the Eucharist, but not on a Sunday, seems the most likely to be an intentional addition or change.

says his own private thanksgiving. The meal is to proceed with moderation of food and drink, orderly behaviour, proper conversation, and full respect for the presiding cleric. The bishop shall pray for the host and the guests; but the precise point at which this is to be done is not made clear. It seems to be put just after the lamplighting, but this may well be a mere coincidence, and it may be done at the first prayer over the bread. As darkness draws on, the deacon lights the lamp and brings it to the bishop to bless it, which he does with a prayer preceded by the Eucharistic dialogue minus the *Sursum Corda*. Then they repeat psalms before they go away. And they should be dismissed early so that they may go home separately before it is completely dark.

The rest of the Church Orders need not delay us, as they contain nothing of value for our investigation.

We are now ready to draw our conclusions and to propose our reconstruction. We shall begin by giving what we conceive to be the norm, not as we find it in any one document, but as it is attested by the general drift of the evidence as a whole, and controlled at doubtful points by the probabilities due to Jewish antecedents. We get the following picture.

The meal begins with the *Eulogia* for the faithful and "bread of exorcism" for the catechumens, blessed, broken, and distributed by the bishop or some other presiding cleric in his absence.[1] When darkness draws near, there is the hand-washing [2] and the ceremonial lighting of the lamp.[2] After supper there are psalms and hymns and possibly other spiritual exercises.[3] Then the meal concludes with the solemnly blessed and commonly shared "mingled cup of the *Prosphora*." [4]

[1] *A.T.* and its versions, *Eth. C.O.* and *C.H.*: confirmed by the "opening prayer" in Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, which for a meal must be the grace-before-meals, the bread-blessing. The "pre-*Didache*" evidence also confirms it, and 1 Cor. xi. as reconstructed above, for the stage before the separation of the Eucharist. Finally, the Jewish background agrees weightily.

[2] *Eth. C.O.*, its source, *C.H.*, and Tertullian; confirmed by the Jewish background.

[3] Tertullian, *Eth. C.O.*, its source, *C.H.*, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian.

[4] Cyprian, *Eth. C.O.*, its source; implied (probably) in the "closing prayer" of Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, which for a meal must be the closing grace-after-meals, probably said over a concluding festal chalice; confirmed by the Jewish antecedents. It is also confirmed, for

Let us also recall that we found no evidence that the Eucharist was anywhere separated from the Agape prior to St. Ignatius (inclusive); nor, on the other hand, any evidence that they were still united (unless the *Canons of Hippolytus* be deemed an exception) as late as St. Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. Apparently, then, the Eucharist was everywhere separated from the Agape during the second century.

We shall conclude our study by reconstructing in summary the whole development as far as we can trace or conjecture it from our studies.

The Last Supper, as we find it described in the dominant tradition in our records, is best taken as having been of the formal type of *Haburah* meal as we reconstructed it from our Jewish background studies. This is much more probable than the view that it was the Passover or the *Kiddush*. And while our records are not very complete, what we have for the Last Supper agrees perfectly with what we know of the formal *Haburah* meal on a day when there was no *Kiddush*. Our Lord was believed to have given a new and great significance to this already customary meal and to have indicated, either by explicit command or in some other effective way, that He wished it, when continued,[1] to retain this new meaning and value.

So was the customary *Haburah* meal continued in the earliest Jerusalem church, modelled as closely as possible on the Last Supper, and believed to have permanently the new significance Jesus had given that Supper.

When taken out into the Gentile world it was continued on the same pattern, save that the preliminary course frequently, in fact usually, was not retained; presumably as being purely Jewish and unessential and productive of abuses. In time this

the stage before the separation of the Eucharist, by 1 Cor. xi. and the "pre-*Didache*" evidence; also by the Synoptics in so far as they attest contemporary practice.

Eth. C.O. at least represents Egyptian practice, deeply coloured by Jewish influence, that may safely be attributed to the third century, and hence is an important independent witness where it differs from *A.T.*

[1] Which is assumed as self-evident. Obviously, since it was already an established practice of His *Haburah*, it would be continued without needing any special command on His part. Only an explicit command that it should cease, or the dissolution of His *Haburah* due to His death, would be at all likely to bring it to an end.

was abandoned even in Jewish circles. In 1 Cor. xi. and the "pre-*Didache*" we see the rite at this stage of development. The body of Christ is at the beginning, the common meal follows, and the blood of Christ is at the end.

At the first, the "consecration" of the bread would have been the very brief and simple bread-blessing, the grace-before-meals. The "consecration" of the cup would have been much longer, being the so-called grace-after-meals. There is no good reason why it should not have been in length and general form or structure substantially as we find it in the *Didache*. There, however, the content shows it already transposed into the higher spiritual key. And though this may well be very early, it can hardly be strictly coeval with the very origin of the Eucharist. Soon a double development would set in. The great difference in the length of the two still separate "consecration prayers" would seem improper, and there was apparently a tendency to expand the shorter prayer over the bread until it became in length and structure parallel to the prayer over the cup.[1] At

[1] The latter, then (not the wine-blessing, of course, but the grace-after-meals), is the starting-point for the development of our Eucharistic Anaphora. Confirmatory of this are three chief points :

(*a*) The growth in length is much less extreme, and hence more easily explicable, than if it began with the bread-blessing or the wine-blessing.

(*b*) It was introduced (see *Mish. Ber.*, vii. 4 (3)) with an invitatory formula which varied somewhat for the number of people present, but always began " Let us bless (or Bless ye) Him (or our God, or the Lord our God) of whose bounty, etc." The others replied " Blessed be He (etc. with the same variations)." The similarity of this to the beginning of our Eucharistic dialogue after the *Sursum Corda* is obvious ; especially when we remember that to bless and give thanks were practically interchangeable. Our Lord's warning against " vain repetition " may account for the different form of the Christian reply to the invitation.

(*c*) The prayers in the *Didache* show us (even as it now stands) the bread-blessing " growing " in the direction of the grace-after-meals. And if the slight conjectural emendation which is proposed in Appendix I be accepted, the growth is practically complete and the similarity very striking. Further, the grace-after-meals in the *Didache* agrees substantially with the same as we have every reason to suppose it to have been in the contemporary Jewish practice. It has three paragraphs, each a separate blessing. And the last of these, with its petition for the ingathering of the church from the corners of the world, is closely analogous to an invariable element in the third blessing in the Jewish grace-after-meals. We have only to suppose (as is antecedently probable) that the present Jewish grace-after-meals, though *substantially* the same as in those days in its first three benedictions, has changed and grown considerably in its wording and added (as is admitted) the present fourth blessing, to see how striking is the similarity and how probable, consequently, the dependence.

the same time, the two prayers would be progressively spiritualized and transposed into the higher (Eucharistic) key.

As long as the Eucharist was united to the Agape, and the whole conformed to this pattern, the merging of the two widely separated consecration prayers into one was obviously out of the question. But later the Agape was abolished, either due to abuses or to Roman legal obstacles. When this happened, the religiously essential parts, i.e. the Bread and the Cup (already now distinguished within the whole by a transcendental significance and a special title, "Eucharist"), could not possibly be surrendered. Hence, surviving, they would at once come into immediate juxtaposition by the simple process of removing that which had up to that time separated them. Once this had happened, it would speedily invite a double innovation of the greatest importance.

First, now that they were immediately juxtaposited, the double "consecration prayer" would seem to have lost largely its *raison d'être*, and would soon merge into the single "Eucharistic prayer" said over both elements as we already have it, apparently well developed, in Justin. Even in the stage lying one step removed back of the *Didache*, to which I have referred just above, the difficulty of keeping the double consecration prayer from becoming the mere repetition over the chalice of what had but a little earlier been said over the bread is already apparent. This difficulty would be greatly increased as the content of the thanksgiving tended to become stereotyped into something close to the sort of an Anaphora we deduce from *A.T.* supplemented by Justin's evidence. Hence, as soon as they ceased to be separated, the fusion of the two into one would be easy and quick, and indeed inevitable.

The second innovation would be due to the fact that once the Eucharist was separated from the Agape it would be much too short to constitute a satisfactory complete service. Hence it would very quickly, possibly even from the very first time of its separation from the Agape, be united to the already existing Christian service modelled on the Jewish service of the synagogue. The later-called *Missa Catechumenorum* thus

came into existence, or rather acquired its later character. Presumably the catechumens were already accustomed to attend this service. They would now be required to leave before the newly added Eucharist began. On the other hand, it would now be possible to admit them to the Agape where that had survived separated from the Eucharist. Presumably it was at this stage that the hour of the Eucharist was changed from night to morning.

As to the fate of the more common part of the Agape, it would no doubt in many cases be given up entirely, at least temporarily, due to the passing strictness of the enforcement of Roman legal prohibitions. In such cases, where this was the cause of the separation, of course no problem would arise as to the form in which the Agape should survive. But if in any cases the separation took place due to abuses connected with the Agape, and if despite these abuses and separation the Agape was not given up even temporarily, then the problem would arise: "In what form shall the Agape continue now that it is no longer united to the Eucharist?" In any case it would arise if and when the Agape, abandoned for either of these reasons, was resumed. It would also arise from a third cause. Presumably in many places the Eucharist continued to be united to the Agape after its first separation in other localities. Thus two very different usages would soon be confronting each other, whether or not the Agape had yet been reintroduced in those places where it had been abandoned. And experience would speedily demonstrate the superiority of the newer usage. Other churches then—of course not all at once—would be "converted" to the newer practice, but would not see in their change as to the Eucharist any reason for abandoning the Agape completely. Here also the question as to the form in which the Agape should continue after the separation would arise. Perhaps it is in this third case that the Agape as a separate entity first took its normal form as we found it in our reconstruction above.

It will be obvious at once that if one takes the Agape-Eucharist as we have described it before the separation, and simply subtracts the Eucharistic Bread at the beginning and

the Eucharistic Cup at the end, the remainder is a very anomalous entity indeed for a religious meal. And I think we could not conjecture any more suitable way to deal with the problem than the one our reconstructed norm seems to indicate was taken. This was the perfectly simple and obvious expedient of substituting a special non-Eucharistic (but in some special sense holy) common loaf in place of the Eucharistic Bread at the beginning; and similarly for the Cup at the end. The rest could remain entirely undisturbed. And what more likely than to name the new bread *Eulogia*, on the analogy of *Eucharistia*, and to conceive it as not only blessed bread, but perhaps also as conveying some undefined blessing—though far less of course than the body of Christ? The same cycle of ideas would operate with the final cup, though the name "cup of the *Prosphora*," if technical and widely used, is not so easy to explain. Perhaps it was simply like this—that as the cup it replaced had originally been called the Cup of (the) Blessing because *the* Blessing *par excellence* had been said over it; and later was called Eucharist because it had been "Eucharistized"; and the new bread was called *Eulogia* because a εὐλογία had been said over it, so this new substitute cup was called "the cup of the oblation (*Prosphora*)" because it had been or was to be "offered."

Then, when it was shortly seen to be possible now to admit the catechumens to the Agape, they were given "bread of exorcism" instead of the *Eulogia*, but at the same point in the meal. If, as our evidence does not enable us to say, the catechumens were allowed to receive the "cup of the *Prosphora*," then the denial of the *Eulogia* to them was probably more because they were deemed to need "bread of exorcism" (i.e. probably bread having the same effect as an exorcism [1]) than because either the *Eulogia* or the "cup of the *Prosphora*" was deemed too sacred for the unbaptized to touch. If on the contrary they were not allowed to share in the final cup either, then the second reason given, or possibly both combined, may be right.

[1] As Lietzmann says, "bread of which *eine Bannwirkung gegen die Dämonen* was expected."

Thus we get an easy and as far as I can see completely satisfactory account of how the separated Eucharist and Agape each reached the form in which our evidence shows them to us in *c.* 200 A.D.[1]

[1] It would be possible to show, if space allowed, that the variations in our evidence from the norm as we have pictured it and used it in our reconstruction above are easily, and in fact best, explained as the result of the local variations from it, whether unintentional or motivated. Hence, they constitute no argument against our conclusions in favour of such a norm.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY LITURGY

THE present subject has been touched on somewhat incidentally toward the end of Chapter II. We shall now go back, however, and study the matter more in detail, not only for its own sake but also for its confirmation of what we have already studied, and likewise for its very important bearing on the questions of Eucharistic doctrine yet to come.

Our study will take the form chiefly of an effort to reconstruct, as nearly as possible, the liturgy as it was in the time of Justin, our earliest witness of any moment for our present topic (save the anomalous *Didache*). But the *A.T.* of Hippolytus will be of equal or greater importance for our task. And I shall not hesitate to use any other evidence, earlier or later, which will help us. We shall also attempt, where possible, to reconstruct, even if only conjecturally, the history of the development before and after Justin, to some extent. All this has its relevance for our study.

A. In Justin it seemed clear that the Eucharist was separated from the Agape and united to the Prayer Service of the early Christians, later to be called the *Missa Catechumenorum*. This was originally modelled, presumably, upon the service of the Jewish synagogue, and consisted (broadly) of Scripture reading, preaching or instruction, and prayer; with the singing of psalms or hymns. Hence we are not surprised to find that the Eucharist in Justin includes the following elements in the order named:

(1) Scripture reading; (2) preaching in the broad sense; (3) all rise for common prayers; (4) the Kiss of Peace;[1] (5) bringing of the elements for the Eucharist; (6) the Eucharistic Prayer; (7) Amen, by the people; and (8) the Communion.

[1] But possibly the Kiss of Peace was at first used only in Baptismal and Ordination Eucharists, and thence spread to all Eucharists.

B. Before the Eucharist and the Prayer Service were conjoined, catechumens and possibly other non-Christians were allowed at the latter, but not at the former. This will have led to the unbaptized (at least catechumens) being allowed to attend the first part of the Eucharist after the conjunction. All these things will have led to the viewing of only the later part of the Eucharist (from which the unbaptized were excluded) as strictly essential. Hence Baptismal Eucharists, where there was every desire to shorten due to the length of the combined sacraments, would regularly omit the non-essential "Mass of the Catechumens" (with which, moreover, the catechumens were already familiar). We find this not only in Justin (1 *Apol.*, 65) but also in the *A.T.* of Hippolytus. The same reasons would promote the shortening of an Ordination Eucharist, and it would naturally be done in the same way. This also is attested in the *A.T.* of Hippolytus.

From this, however, it will follow that we have no right to draw the conclusion that in Hippolytus' time (or rather the time to which his ultra-traditionalistic work harks back) the Eucharist was not yet united to the Prayer Service, and hence that he gives us a tradition earlier than that of Justin. For we lack his account of the ordinary Sunday Eucharist; and it would be as misleading to base broad conclusions on his Baptismal or Ordination Eucharist as it would on Justin's Baptismal Eucharist in Chapter 65 of the *Apology*.

C. The later liturgies include long thanksgivings for God's dealings under the Old Covenant, as well as under the New. This seems to presuppose at a comparatively early stage of the development, perhaps while there was still a "double" "consecration prayer," a comparatively brief prayer, but with *nuclei* of both O.T. and N.T. material employed. Of the former, at least a reference to Creation and the Fall may be assumed as normal; of the latter, at least a reference to (the Incarnation and?) the Redeeming Passion, which the Eucharist commemorated. The spinning out of these two *nuclei* would explain all the later developmental phenomena, including the *Sanctus*, Words of Institution, *Anamnesis*-Oblation, and Invocation.

Now it seems to have been in the process of the very varied measure of the spinning out of the former *nucleus* that divergent O.T. matters were brought in, including the *Sanctus* in connection with the seraphim in Isaiah. At first the selection from each Testament would have varied greatly both in length and in the identity of its particulars. But soon certain ones would be seen to be generally more appropriate than others, and would thus acquire such a measure of popularity as practically to pre-empt a regular place in nearly all—and ultimately in quite all—such Eucharistic prayers. Such would have been the case with Isaiah's seraphim and the consequent *Sanctus*. Now this would be quite impossible where the O.T. was not drawn upon in the material for thanksgiving. Hence we can easily understand the (necessary) omission of the *Sanctus* in the Anaphora of the *A.T.* as we have it.

On the other hand, Justin gives us fairly clear indications that in the Eucharistic prayers to which he is accustomed O.T. materials were brought in some seventy years before *A.T.* Hence a *Sanctus*, either as a variable or even as an habitual element, is not only perfectly possible by Justin's time but rather more likely than its absence.

If this difference from Hippolytus extended to ordinary occasions, it might be explained several ways. I am inclined to think, however, that the difference is only due to the same desire for brevity on a special occasion which, as we already saw, led to the omission of the Mass of the Catechumens. This I would suggest [1] led him to shorten the Anaphora here in his Baptismal and Ordination Eucharists; while on more ordinary occasions he himself would have used a much longer Eucharistic prayer. This would seem to be implied, perhaps, by the rubric immediately following the versicle, "It is meet and right," which reads, "and then he shall immediately proceed thus" (*et sic iam prosequatur*). This *iam* can easily be understood to imply that on more ordinary occasions the celebrant would use a longer Eucharistic prayer including thanksgivings for O.T. matters, and the *Sanctus*, and a transition to the part *A.T.* actually gives, which was presumably

[1] I owe this suggestion originally to Dr. B. S. Easton.

looked on as the most important and appropriate part of all. But on this special occasion, when brevity was an urgent *desideratum*, only the last and most appropriate and important part would be used; to which, after the introductory versicles, the celebrant is instructed to "proceed immediately."

Of course, due allowance must be made in all this for the primitive liturgical freedom of even the ordinary officiant, for the lack of any one authoritative form, and especially for the liberty of those under immediate inspiration "here and now" to "give thanks as much as they will." But apart from these qualifications, the development in its general lines would have been as I have just indicated.

D. I spoke just above of the primitive liturgical freedom of the officiant in the Eucharistic prayers. It is worth while to summarize our evidence here. There does not seem to have been much freedom in the pre-Christian Jewish forms. But as the very nature of the Eucharist made a revision of these, at least by a drastic readaptation, practically imperative, there cannot have been the same amount of fixity among the early Christians as among their Jewish contemporaries. And of course the "freedom of the Spirit" was an even weightier cause. Just how much variation there was is the question.

If 1 Cor. xiv. is referring to the Eucharist, then it would seem to have been very great. In that case St. Paul even contemplates the possibility of a man making the Eucharistic prayer in an "unknown tongue," though he does not approve of it, at least unless someone is present who can "interpret." But there is doubt as to whether this passage is Eucharistic, also as to whether 1 *Clement*, 59-61, is specifically so.

In the *Didache*, however, we get both forms for "uninspired" celebrants, and also the direction: "But let the Prophets give thanks as much as (or "for as many things as") they wish (*ὅσα θέλουσιν*)." In view especially of the fact that even as late as *A.T.* the forms given are only patterns which are to be followed in a general way but not in their very words; and in view of the further fact that the trend seems to have been from more to less liturgical freedom as we move down through the second and third centuries; it

seems best to interpret the forms in the *Didache* as subject to at least as much variation (even for uninspired celebrants) as Hippolytus contemplates for the forms he gives. In that case, of course, the ὅσα θέλουσιν conceded to the Prophets must be conferring a still greater freedom, in fact almost *carte blanche.*

Now the evidence of Justin fits in perfectly with all this. He tells us in 1 *Apol.*, 65, that the "president" sends up thanksgiving ἐπὶ πολύ—"for a good while," or "to a considerable extent" would be, I suppose, good translations. And we get about the same idea from his remark in 1 *Apol.*, 67, that the president sends up prayers and thanksgivings ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ—"to the best of his power," I suppose. And of course it must be remembered that this evidence, for the middle of the second century, already represents considerable progress toward fixity (witness Justin's ability to describe in a general way what the Eucharistic prayer will contain). Thus the primitive condition will have been one of still greater liturgical freedom.

E. Does Justin give any indications that his liturgy contained, even in the germ, the Great Intercession of the later liturgies? There are two possible places in which we might try to see this. The first is in the "common prayers" (κοινὰς εὐχάς) which Justin in 1 *Apol.*, 65, tells us were offered immediately after the newly baptized person was led to the brethren. Their common character is probably to be emphasized, as when Justin repeats in 1 *Apol.*, 67, his description of the regular Sunday Eucharist, he at this precise point again repeats the word κοινῇ—"we all rise *in common* and send (up) prayers (εὐχάς)." While Chapter 67 gives us no information on the nature of these prayers, Chapter 65 says "common prayers heartily both for ourselves, and the enlightened one, and all others everywhere, that it may be vouchsafed us who have learned the truth to be found in deeds good citizens and guardians of the ordinances so that we may be saved with the everlasting salvation. We salute one another with a kiss when we have ceased from the prayers. Then is brought to the President a loaf and a cup of water and tempered wine, etc." Thus these prayers are clearly intercessions, which is certainly one of the things, though not the only thing, εὐχή could mean.

However, they come before both the Kiss of Peace and the Offertory. And this creates somewhat of a difficulty. For none of the extant liturgies have the Great Intercession in this place. The bulk of the Greek liturgies have it after the consecration, the others within the Anaphora but before the consecration as now understood. The Roman Canon includes the Great Intercession also, although it is divided, part coming before the *Qui Pridie* (the consecration according to the present and very venerable view) and part afterwards. Thus only the Gallican liturgies (using Gallican in the broad sense) have the Great Intercession before the Canon even begins. But even these have it after the Offertory and the Kiss of Peace. Thus in none of our witnesses does the Great Intercession come in the position occupied by these "common prayers" in Justin, before the Offertory and the Kiss of Peace. On the other hand, their position there, and after the *Missa Fidelium* has begun, is the regular place for the "prayers of the faithful." Hence these intercessions are probably to be identified with the "prayers of the faithful" of the later liturgies, rather than the Great Intercession; the more so since Justin's description fits so well the content of the later "prayers of the faithful."

The second point in Justin where it seems possible to try to see the Great Intercession at least in the germ is in the mention of prayers (εὐχάς) and thanksgiving in Chapter 67 as composing the Eucharistic (consecration) prayer. While no doubt εὐχή is a broad enough term to include thanksgivings if used alone, yet it can hardly help meaning something different, or at least additional, when put alongside of "thanksgivings" in this manner. When the same conjunction recurs at the same point in Chapter 65, the inference becomes practically a certainty. This is still further strengthened by the fact that the same Greek word is used in both accounts to describe the different (and intercessory) prayers we have just finished considering immediately before the Kiss of Peace and the Offertory. And the fact that these were intercessions might seem to favour the idea that what Justin is attesting here is a long consecration prayer composed—like most of the early extant consecration prayers—of thanksgiving and intercessions.

In that case we would have the Great Intercession beyond any reasonable doubt, at least briefly and in the germ.

There are, however, several matters that throw grave doubt on this conclusion. First of all, we have just seen that the Greek word εὐχή is a broad generic term. It could easily mean intercessions, as I said above. But it could also easily mean other kinds of prayer. Now in Chapter 67 Justin says nothing to throw any further light on the nature of these εὐχαί. But in Chapter 65, in describing precisely the same point in the service, he says that the "celebrant" "sends up *praise* and *glory* . . . and makes thanksgiving for a good while for His vouchsafing these things; and when he has completed the *prayers* and the thanksgiving, all the people present approve by saying Amen, etc." Here then a careful exegesis would favour very strongly the view that it was the "praise" and "glory" which are by Justin distinugished from the thanksgiving and summed up under the word εὐχαί; especially since he mentions the "prayers" before, not after, the thanksgivings. Of course, when we consider the fluidity of early practice in general, and especially the early liturgical freedom, it would be absurd to interpret this conclusion so strictly as to mean that intercessions never could or would be allowed to slip into the Eucharistic prayer. But it does seem that Justin's words give no support to the idea that intercessions were normally included in it. They rather favour the contrary conclusion.

Secondly, I think we shall see below [1] that the similarity between the Mass as Justin described it and the Mass as Hippolytus gives it in his *A.T.*, where the actual text of a pattern Eucharistic prayer is given, is so great that, taken with considerations as to place and date to be given below, it very strongly encourages the view that Justin has in mind the same identical Mass (*in genere* of course) that Hippolytus undertakes to preserve and recommend. Now *A.T.* contains no Great Intercession in the Anaphora. There is only the barest germ there, and it seems to be limited to a very brief summary prayer for the benefits of Communion. This prayer is, to be sure, in just the proper place to provide the germ and starting-

[1] Pp. 74-77 inclusive.

point for the development of the Great Intercession at the regular place it occupies in the bulk of the Oriental liturgies. But as it stands it can hardly be closely compared to a Great Intercession at all, due to its extreme brevity and very restricted content. On the other hand, "praise, glory, and thanksgiving," the three words Justin actually gives us, would seem to cover its content very satisfactorily. Here, then, is a second reason to doubt if the εὐχαί mentioned by Justin are intercessions (in these two cases only, of course).

Thirdly, if there were intercessions (other than the simple prayer for the fruits of the Communion) in the Canon, it becomes difficult to account for the very divergent positions the intercessions occupy in the later fixed liturgies, or why in fact they were ever changed from whatever was their original position within the Canon. If, however, on the other hand, the intercessions described in Justin as coming before the Kiss of Peace and the Offertory were the only ones habitually offered in the Mass in these early days, then it becomes easy to frame a fairly clear and simple theory which will account for all the later phenomena.

It would seem, then, that our most probable conclusion is that the intercessions described in Justin as following the sermon and preceding the Kiss and Offertory are the only intercessions the Mass in his day normally contained. We concluded above (p. 55 this chapter) that they were probably to be identified with the "prayers of the faithful." But it will have had, in its "prayers of the faithful," the parent of all the later Great Intercessions, however great the variety of their several positions in the Mass in relation to the Anaphora.[1]

F. We now pass on to the subject of the primitive consecration prayer, in order to complete our picture of the liturgy in Justin's time.

[1] I wish to close this section on the Great Intercession by noting that, even if the interpretation put by Fortescue and others upon the letter of Innocent to Decentius is correct, it does not exclude the intercessions having been, *in Justin's time*, at the position we have concluded he gives them; nor does it require a second intercession after the *nucleolus* of the Anaphora in Justin's time. The position found in Justin, coupled with one or the other of the possible later changes, would adequately explain Innocent's language, provided it took place some little time before his day.

First as to the Words of Institution and the Western theory. These are in all extant liturgies except the *Didache* and the so-called Nestorian rite. The late Dr. Frank Gavin says that "As to the latter, we possess in *Aphraates* (after the middle of the fourth century) an indubitable Eucharistic narrative of the Institution, so there is (here) no exception to this rule." Just how the conclusion follows I am unable to grasp. Dr. Gavin also discusses the *Didache* and reaches conclusions which remove this document from the number of exceptions. Here again I find it difficult to concur; but I have dealt with the *Didache* elsewhere. For the present I think we must count both of these as probable exceptions. Some have attempted to handle the "difficulty" in the Nestorian rite by holding that the Words of Institution were omitted in this rite because they were known by heart and recited from memory. And this phenomenon is related to the *disciplina arcani*. This explanation I also find of doubtful cogency.

More important still is the way the Words of Institution are brought in in the earlier of our extant liturgies where they do occur. They seem to be brought in, not as playing the crucial rôle in consecrating the bread and wine; but either as the authority for the rite or service as a whole, or for the Great Oblation in particular; or else for the realistic meaning given to the Eucharist; or else simply as one item (albeit an especially vital one) in a chronologically arranged sequence of things for which God is thanked. We notice this with special clearness in Serapion's Anaphora. Nor does there seem any clear evidence that the consecration was ascribed to the Words of Institution until we get to the latter part of the fourth century, where it seems to be found in St. Ambrose and is almost certainly found in the *De Sacramentis*, which is probably of this date.[1]

[1] Dr. Gummey in his well-known and justly esteemed book *The Consecration of the Eucharist* makes the much more extreme contention that even in Ambrose and the *De Sacramentis* this theory is not really found; but that in reality it does not occur until the ninth century, and then only faintly and in the germ. Its ultimate triumph in the West he puts still later, and connects it with the systematizings of the Scholastic movement and with the growth of the medieval doctrine of the Eucharist influenced by the Eucharistic controversies of Paschasius Radbertus and later of Beren-

Furthermore, although here the evidence is more difficult and in some measure conjectural, it seems not to have triumphed even in the West, apart from Rome and the immediate sphere of her special influence, until much later. The Gallican liturgies (in the broad sense) contain variable *Post Pridie* prayers which tend to include either an *Anamnesis*-Oblation, or an *Epiclesis*, or both of these. And sometimes the *Epiclesis* is quite clearly and unmistakably Eastern. The bearing of this is obvious.

Finally, and perhaps still more important, the view seems to have triumphed, even at Rome itself, only rather late and after the *Epiclesis* had reached such a stage of development as to make it need later reformation to bring it into consistency with the triumphing theory of consecration. In view of the dispute and supposed doubt as to whether the Roman rite

garius ; and by the ceremonial developments he so interestingly traces. He makes his case rather strong and quite attractive. But he leaves doubts of a serious character in the mind of the present writer, and chiefly for these reasons :

1. He gets rid of the language earlier than the ninth century, which seems to favour the Western view, by interpreting it all of a different theory ; namely, that the words of Christ, spoken " once for all " at the Last Supper, are continuously and abidingly efficacious like the " creative word " of God or the word of God pronouncing all things good. It is not their repetition by the celebrant at each Eucharist but their original " creative " use by Christ which is being referred to by these writers.

Now there can be no doubt that this theory is used by Eastern controversialists (at the time especially of the Council of Florence) to reconcile their own view with concessions or quasi-concessions to the West. Also it is assuredly found earlier and even in some Western writers. In quite a few of the cases it is at least a part of (if not the whole of) the meaning of these writers. But in others (as, e.g., especially in *De Sacramentis*) it is very difficult to conclude that it is their meaning, still less their whole meaning.

2. Furthermore, Dr. Gummey seems to think that if one of these writers can be shown to assign to the Holy Spirit a great or predominant part in the making of the sacrament, that shows he must have held the Eastern view ; and hence language of his seeming to support the Western view must not really be so interpreted but rather as above. This, however, seems to the present writer a quite unsafe inference. I doubt if even Roman theologians of the present time would deny *entirely* to the Holy Spirit *any part* at all in the Eucharistic consecration. But whether this be so or not, it would surely be perfectly easy for a writer of these earlier centuries to think that the Holy Spirit was the agent who changed the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, or at least had a part in so doing, yet that He did so (whether explicitly prayed to do so or not) upon the occasion of and by reason of the recitation of the Words of Institution by the priest speaking as Christ's delegate or representative and (as it were) *in persona Christi*.

ever contained such an *Epiclesis*, and if so where (*Te igitur, Hanc igitur, Quam oblationem, Supra quae, Supplices te rogamus* are all at least possibilities), it may seem quite bold of me to say this. I shall pause, therefore, to give my reasons, which seem to me to remove the matter pretty well from the realm of doubt.

(1) I do not see how the conclusion can be avoided that Hippolytus' *A.T.* attests Roman usage. Now the *A.T.* contains a perfectly clear *Epiclesis*. It is not as definitely phrased as those in the next earliest liturgies. But, as I shall show later, it is probable that if we could catch those *Epicleses* at the same date we should find some of them about equally indefinite. I think it very unlikely that the *Epiclesis* in *A.T.* is looked upon as the consecration. Neither can I draw the same conclusion as some, from the indefiniteness of its language, as to the author's Eucharistic doctrine. But at least there it is, a clear-cut *Epiclesis*, and already definite enough to cause embarrassment as soon as the Western theory of consecration was well established and came into conflict with a different and incompatible theory in the East.

(2) Pope Gelasius I (492-496) seems to refer to it twice as being in the Roman liturgy even at his date. The first reference is not unescapably clear. But the second seems to me beyond any cavil. He says (Epist. fragm. 7 Thiel, *Ep. Rom. Pont.*, 1 : 486): "How shall the Heavenly Spirit *being invoked* come to the consecration of the divine mystery, if the priest who *prays him to be present* is condemned as being full of evil deeds?" It should be noted that it is not only an *Epiclesis*, but a Spirit-*Epiclesis* which he here attests. And with the support of Hippolytus' *A.T.* there can be little hesitation in admitting that the Roman liturgy contained, at least between these two dates (217-496), a Spirit-*Epiclesis*. We shall not, I think, be justified in interpreting these words of Gelasius to mean that he differed from the usual Roman view of the essentially consecratory effect of the Words of Institution, which would seem to be well established at least a century and more before his time. But at least he found a Spirit-*Epiclesis* in his rite. He probably simply interpreted the *Epiclesis* to mean that the Holy Spirit was the agent through whom the consecratory

Words of Institution were made effective, and that He was expressly invoked (to be present and do so) by the *Epiclesis*.

(3) Finally, I find it very hard not to see a rather obvious historical reconstruction which makes the point still clearer.[1]

It would seem, then, that the case against the view that the Institution Narrative has always been deemed the essential element in the consecration of the Eucharist (even in the West alone, or even at Rome itself alone) is extremely strong. And any attempt to extend the claim to the whole primitive church would seem to be quite out of the question. Can more be said for the same claim when put forward in behalf of the *Epiclesis*?

G. Yes, I think, considerably more! But not, for all that, by any means enough. Let us then begin at once our study of this important problem. I shall first of all state in full the view at which I have arrived, before I begin to argue the evidence; so it may be in the reader's mind as we inspect the evidence.

The early Christians had this rite which, from a very early time, they believed to be derived from and based upon an explicit (or at least implicit) command given them by their Lord the night before His death. And the command was "Do this in remembrance of me." [2] Now what was "this"? The Lord had taken bread and wine, blessed them, and given them to His disciples. He had used over the bread and wine as He gave it to them certain tremendously mysterious words which for some reason (to be investigated later) they took literally. And He had commanded them (at least they very early so thought) to do as He had done. And so, we find at once, they did as He had done and as they thought He willed them to do. They took bread and wine, blessed them, and received them "in remembrance of Him."

How did they bless them? Presumably the same way He had done. A Jewish blessing at table in this age was (as we saw above in Chapter I) simply a thanksgiving, a *blessing God*

[1] For this reconstruction see Appendix II.

[2] Or " for my memorial," or " Offer this for my memorial." But the word " Offer," if so they interpreted ποιεῖτε, equally involved the obligation to continue the same act, though in that case τοῦτο would hark back to the preceding τοῦτο and would refer grammatically to the thing offered rather than the action.

for the food, rather than a petition to God to bless the food. Hence the blessings He had used, and therefore presumably the ones the early Christians used, were those commonly used among contemporary Jews. If His blessing had been at all extraordinary we should probably find some trace of the fact.

But the simple act thus reproduced was believed to have a tremendous meaning. God in some wonderful way was believed to intervene and make of the bread and wine what the Lord on that last night had declared them to be. Only by Divine power could this take place. And the Lord's reported words at the Last Supper were at once the authority for repeating the act and also the authority for the tremendous interpretation put upon it when duly repeated. But although this would have been a commonplace to the early Christians—perhaps just because it was a commonplace—it was not for a moment thought necessary either to cite in the "service" itself the authority for what was being done or for its significance, or to petition God to intervene and do what He was undoubtingly believed to do. To obey the Lord, to do as He had done and commanded, to bless this bread and this wine and receive them, was all that was necessary.

And in fact it is hard to see how at the earliest stage either of these additional elements could well have come in. The Words of Institution, as we now call them, could not have occupied the place in the Anaphora they did later, for the simple reason that there was "no such place" yet, nor even any such Anaphora. How there came to be "such a place" we shall see in a moment. But at that time there was none. If used at all, it would have had to be in some place analogous to our use of Acts viii. in the Confirmation Office. But of such a use there is not, as far as I know, a particle of evidence anywhere for any date whatsoever.

As to a prayer for God to intervene and do what He was already believed to do, it is unlikely, both because of lack of a likely point in the blessings for it to have occurred, and still more because of the very circle of ideas involved in the Jewish conception of blessing. God was blessed for the food. It was not necessary to ask God to bless the food.

Yet both these elements, which we have just seen could hardly have been expressed in the earliest thanksgivings at the Eucharist, were clearly and unmistakably present and believed in to the mind of all; and in this sense unmistakably implicit in what was done. Nothing is more natural, then, than that they should begin upon occasion (but not at this second stage always, or even normally) to find explicit mention, though in varying order and language, as soon as the thanksgivings customarily employed had developed sufficiently to provide a fitting opportunity for them to enter explicitly. Let us next, then, trace this development.

At first the Jewish conception of blessing by thanksgiving would have been fully familiar to all from their Jewish training. But as Christianity passed out into the Gentile world, and the church became more and more predominantly Gentilic, this familiarity would fade and finally be completely lost. Of course the mere conservative tenacity of tradition would have led to the retention of substantially the inherited forms for quite a while after the Jewish conception of blessing was no longer familiar. Especially would this be the case in largely or predominantly Jewish corners of the church. This probably accounts for the survival of such forms as we find in the *Didache*, long after it is likely they had disappeared from the main stream of church usage; i.e. if we date *Barnabas* after 117 A.D. and *Didache* at least a little later still. But sooner or later they would have been certain to disappear entirely—and did so.

Meantime, however, there would already have been a very early tendency among Christians, due to the freedom of the Spirit, to much greater variation and prolixity in their thanksgivings than among the ordinary Jews.[1] Under this influence the original forms inherited from Judaism would tend very strongly to be completely transformed and spiritualized and

[1] Among these, there seems to have been, at our period, very little variation. Moreover, the prolixity seems to have been confined (for the blessings that concern our purpose) to the grace-after-meals, which was of considerable length; and, in lesser degree, to the *Kiddush* proper. The latter, we have decided above, does not directly concern our study. But the former is, as pointed out elsewhere, the real starting-point for the development of the Christian Anaphora, rather than the very brief bread- or wine-blessings. (See the very important discussion there, p. 45.)

"transposed into a higher key," becoming a thanksgiving for the New Covenant and all its benefits and outstanding truths or events. In this second stage, then, the N.T. portion of the developed εὐχαριστία, dealing with God's saving acts for the church (the new Chosen People) under the New Covenant, would have arisen. Quite naturally, this would suggest in turn the parallel idea of His dealings with the church under the preceding Covenant; for to the early church its continuity with the Chosen People and the Fathers was axiomatic. And thus the O.T. section of the developed εὐχαριστία would also have arisen. In all this, however, there would obviously still have been no necessity to cite the authority for the rite or its significance; or to declare explicitly that what they were doing was in obedience to and a fulfilment of that authority; or finally to ask God to intervene and give the needed Divine co-operation with what they were obediently doing.

Now at this stage what, let us stop and ask, would a Christian carefully questioned about the "consecration prayer" at the Eucharist have told us? He would *ex hypothesi* be no longer in touch with the Jewish conceptions of blessing food for use. And the later conceptions, whether of the East or the West, would be not yet possible for him. No doubt in a sense it would be our Lord's institution, and in that sense His words, spoken once but with an abiding effect, which was responsible for the bread and wine becoming the body and blood of Christ. No doubt also it was by Divine intervention, due to that institution as its ultimate cause, that the change was effected and the sacrifice accepted (two elements and not just one, be it noted, in which the Divine intervention was needful and confidently believed to take place, without being explicitly asked for by the one presiding). But neither of the later theories would, for all that, have been possible to him.

What then would he have answered, how would he have conceived it? It is not probable, of course, he would have had the matter at all well thought out. But if forced to answer, he would almost inevitably have said something like this: "In obedience to our Lord's command we invoke God with praise and thanksgiving over the bread and wine, as He did; and

God for His part intervenes in return to make our sacrifice what our Lord said it was, and to accept it favourably at our hands for His Son's sake and because of His institution." If pressed further to the logical consequences of this statement he would probably admit that in a sense, therefore, the change was caused by the said invocation.

That he would have always called it an "invocation" is by no means certain, or even probable. But as no better name was available (nor I think any other—unless εὐχαριστία—so good) it is natural and probable that he would often have done so. And our earliest evidence indicates that such was the case. But it might also be called simply λόγον θεοῦ, as twice by St. Irenaeus ; [1] or εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ, as by Justin (*from Him* in the sense that it was by His command and in accordance with His example, at least supposedly); or some other such general designation of which no trace happens to be preserved.

I cannot be certain whether this prayer was called ἐπίκλησις because (or chiefly because) the Divine Name (or Names) was in it "called over" the elements (as Armitage Robinson, Connolly, and Cassel maintain), or only for the more general reason that in it "the name of the Lord" was "called upon." But that will not matter greatly.[2] In either case there need be no slightest suggestion that it was an *Epiclesis* in the perfectly definite but later Eastern sense.

Let us resume now our account of the development where

[1] The latter elsewhere calls it ἐπίκλησιν θεοῦ and also τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως, and twice in the same context speaks of the Gnostic heretic, the Valentinian Marcus, as consecrating the Eucharist by an ἐπίκλησις which he spun out to extraordinary length.

[2] An important controversy on this and related points between Dr. Robinson and Dom Connolly on the one side and Dr. J. W. Tyrer and Dr. F. E. Brightman on the other (too long for us even to summarize) is judicially estimated by Odo Cassel in the *Jahrbuch für Liturgie* u.s.w., iv. 170-174. I shall summarize his article very briefly. He thinks Tyrer has made out his point that ἐπίκλησις is not a *mere* naming of names, but includes at least implicitly, and may contain explicitly, a prayer, a calling upon, an appeal, an invitation to be present (or active ?). But he is wrong in denying the element Connolly contends for, the naming of the names. And he agrees with Tyrer against Connolly that the Trinity-*Epiclesis* in Origen is not the concluding Doxology but the whole Canon of the Mass. But he would extend this also to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ambrose, and later writers where Tyrer took a different view. Tyrer is wrong in saying ἐπῳδή (=*incantamentum*) and not ἐπίκλησις (=*invocatio*) would be used of a " naming-of-names-coupled-with-supernatural-power-laden-formula,"

we left it four paragraphs above. We had just said that at that stage of the development the elements we had referred to, destined later to develop into the Institution Narrative, the *Anamnesis*-Oblation, and the *Epiclesis* of the later liturgies, as fixed and essential elements, would still not have been necessary. They would not have been necessary, but they would, at that stage, have become possible. For the thanksgiving for the saving acts of God under the New Covenant would naturally and even inevitably have included the Passion and in connection with this the institution of the Eucharist, as subjects for thanksgiving among other subjects. Moreover, these would take quite naturally their regular chronological order in the sequence. The added functions of the Institution Narrative as authority for the rite, and for the interpretation of its significance, might or might not have been in mind as reasons when it first came into the εὐχαριστία. But sooner or later these added values were sure to be noted. Thus, it seems in Hippolytus, our earliest extant Canon, at least the former is in evidence already; and in Serapion, our next earliest, the latter. Meanwhile the privilege of sharing in the Eucharist itself would be an added subject of thanksgiving. This too seems attested in Hippolytus, but not, as far as I am aware, later.

As to the entrance of the *Anamnesis* and Oblation into the

and he gives references to show this. But Connolly still, even in his reply, gives too little recognition to the " calling upon," " appeal," " invitation to be present " idea, which is implied and often expressed. Yet Connolly is right on the basic idea of the word as being a " naming of the Divine Names " over a person or thing, wherein lies already, according to the ancient belief about names, a calling upon, an appealing to, the Divinity; but this will often find actual expression, yet it need not.

If I may add a few words of my own, I would hazard the opinion that both sides, and even also the judge to a lesser degree, are trying to put under too few headings a great variety of shades of meaning. The term seems to me so broad that we find attestation for almost any plausible use we might seek to give it. Certainly at least this much can be safely said: if we find from the Eucharistic texts as we examine them that it makes the best sense to take it as a " calling down upon "; or a " calling a Name (or Names) over "; or " calling upon Someone " (or " some Name ") in connection with something or someone; or even in the broadest of all senses of simply a " prayer addressed to Someone "; we need have no reason to hesitate to give it any of these senses based on lexicographical scruples as far as the evidence adduced by any of these learned scholars enables us to see. Also it might be a whole formula, or an address within a formula, or a prayer within a formula. Thus our liberty is almost complete.

εὐχαριστία it is also very easy to see the logic by which this came about, and by which it secured its very regular present position in the sequence. It (or they) would follow inevitably upon and in the closest connection with the Institution Narrative, for the very simple reason that the *Anamnesis* was by its essential nature a declaration that, in obedience to the command just recalled (in the Institution Narrative), we here and now do this (*or* offer this) in remembrance of His Passion, as just commanded. And since we obediently offer our Oblation as commanded, we can at once and confidently ask God on His part to accept the said Oblation. The logic here is so clear that surely no further argument or explanation is necessary. Yet it would be easy to imagine a stage in which the first step of this logic had found explicit expression, while the second was still implicit, simply taken for granted without the need of asking. And this is just what we seem to find in Hippolytus. There is an *Anamnesis*; but an Oblation only in the sense of offering the Oblation, not of asking God to accept it.[1]

Finally, we come to the entrance of the (later called)

[1] While, however, the *Anamnesis*-Oblation would normally enter in this way, it seems logically reasonable to suppose that, since it was always implicit, it might easily have sometimes made an independent entrance without the Institution Narrative. I would suggest that something of this type has been the antecedent of Serapion's Anaphora. For though he has the Words of Institution they are divided and appear to have only the function of proving that our Oblation is, by Christ's own appointment, the "likeness" of His body and blood. In fact, here the major elements we are considering are so interwoven as to suggest a stage before clarity of thought, and consequent logical sequence in expression, had been fully attained. And this is just what we would expect, from Serapion's comparatively early date, if the account is correct which I am giving of how the *nucleolus* of the later Anaphoras arose and attained its great fixity.

I would leave in closing the query as to whether what is usually considered the first *Epiclesis* in Serapion, and also the only one in Hippolytus, are not, rather, vague prayers for the acceptance of the Oblation, considered, however, in the less precise conception of "ratifying" it. In any case, neither is given the title ἐπίκλησις except by later writers.

An alternative explanation of the interweaving of the Words of Institution and the *Anamnesis*-Oblation in Serapion would be that, due to their being so closely connected in thought-content and logical interrelatedness, such an interweaving would be a natural phenomenon to expect occasionally, merely by the laws of chance, in view of the liturgical freedom and consequent welter of variability we find in the early church, of which phenomenon it is not surprising one specimen has survived. What I mean here will be clearer if we consider the way the later order of *Anamnesis*-Oblation-*Epiclesis* is often lacking (or upset) in the Gallican liturgies.

Epiclesis into the εὐχαριστία. Our problems are more complicated here. For one thing, we had in the other cases just considered not differences of content, but only of order (and of course the detailed phrasing). If there was to be an Institution Narrative, an *Anamnesis*, an Oblation at all, it could vary very little in content. And also the logic of the question settled the problem of order rather easily. In both of these respects the *Epiclesis* raises more difficult problems.

I have pointed out above that the germ idea of the later *Epiclesis* would be for God on His part to intervene and make the Eucharist what His Son willed it to be, after we on our part had obediently done as His Son commanded. This, I said above, He would already be steadfastly believed to do, even before it became the custom to ask Him in the liturgy so to do. But the conception could remain very vague and indefinite as long as there was no need to express it. As soon, however, as it seemed desirable to make an express petition to Him to do so, it became necessary to begin clarifying the conception. For the question naturally was, "Just what then do we wish to ask?" And to that the answers must at first have varied widely: first, as to just what it was God did when He so intervened; and secondly, as to how definitely and completely all this needed to be expressed in the petition.[1] Thus a differ-

[1] E.g.: Some would answer "God sends down His Word upon the elements," and hence could arise a Logos-*Epiclesis*. More, as far as we can judge, would say, "No, He sends the Holy Spirit," and hence could arise a Spirit-*Epiclesis*. I say "could," for by no means all who thought that definitely need express themselves with equal definiteness. Still others would say, "The Three Persons of the Godhead must be invoked," and hence would arise the type of Trinity-*Epiclesis* found in *Testamentum Domini* (not Origen's or St. Cyril's or St. Ambrose's, which seem likely to be something different). Yet others would say, "All that is necessary is to petition God."

Then the further question would arise: "Yes, but what shall we petition Him to do, or to send down the Son or the Holy Spirit to do?" Some would answer vaguely: "To bless (*or* ratify, *or* consecrate, *or* make perfect, *or* complete, *or* make acceptable) our sacrifice." Some might go on to express the purpose: "for our spiritual benefit" (specifying more or less); or "that it may be a legitimate Eucharist"; or "that we may receive it worthily or (and) fruitfully"; or "that it may be acceptable in Thy sight"; or "that it may become the body and blood," etc. Some might leave the purpose unexpressed.

Others would answer more definitely: "to transform the elements into the body and blood of Christ"; and these also might or might not go on to express the fruits expected, and with an equal measure of variation.

ence of wording in two such prayers may indicate a real difference in belief on the part of those who composed them. But it may also occur, and be very wide, without any such difference of belief being back of it at all.

Thus we can see how at this stage any one of the *Epicleses* we know, whether Eastern, Roman, or Gallican, might have arisen and might have been all the prayer for Divine intervention the liturgy in question (if with the current freedom it can be called *a* liturgy) at that time contained. But once such appeals for intervention had begun to be made, their appropriateness would have become speedily evident, and they would have thus tended to become "the fashion," then common, then universal. This would have been furthered by the tendency to prolixity and explicitness which is manifested if we compare Hippolytus—or even Serapion—with the classical liturgies. The same tendencies would have led to the longer, more explicit, and more definite forms being preferred. And in order to allow time for all this to have occurred we must suppose it was going on throughout at least most of the second and third centuries. It may even have extended backwards into the late first and forward in a measure into the fourth century. But by the latter century the part of the result I have so far described seems to have been pretty well completed.

Meanwhile, there had been a continual tendency (on which see *D*, pp. 53-54) away from the primitive liturgical freedom. Everywhere there was a trend toward fixity. First, presumably, this affected only the main outlines of the liturgy, then the structure in detail, then the contents of the separate parts. Decisive in this regard was the trend toward written liturgies, for this called for even verbal fixity, at least in a sense. But here there was one vital difference between East and West. The East, for whatever reasons, tended toward complete fixity for all the main parts of the Anaphora, so that variant or alternative Oblations, *Anamneses*, *Epicleses*, etc., were not allowed. This strict invariability made a choice among many variants necessary. And naturally and inevitably the fullest, most definite, and most explicit type was sure to prevail. Even if a "less ideal" written form had already been adopted it

would be amended to correct its defects and bring it into conformity with other near-by specimens which on the particular point showed greater perfection. For the written forms were not at first counted sacrosanct. And (*vice versa*) any special perfections it might have would tend to be taken over into neighbouring liturgies. The process seems to have reached its term by the late fourth century. The simple logic of the internal development, asking and answering the questions involved, coupled with the tendency to prolixity and theological definiteness, would seem to have been the chief contributing cause. Thus we have answered, I believe, our first problem, how the *Epiclesis* arose as to its final "perfect" form.[1]

What as to the place within the Canon which it assumed? We must, in order to answer this question, recall what was said above about the way the Institution Narrative and the *Anamnesis*-Oblation entered the Anaphora. Now it speedily was seen to be fitting, and became customary, to complete the chronological list of subjects for thanksgiving by adding the Resurrection and Ascension to the Passion as great truths or facts of which a thankful memorial was made at the *Anamnesis*. But would they stop here? Would the sending of the Holy Ghost and all that had meant to the church be omitted from the subjects for which thanks were given? Obviously not! And the chronological sequence of these great events would inevitably necessitate the mention of the Holy Spirit exactly at this point. Indeed, it is altogether probable that these major subjects for thanksgiving would have been regularly included in the εὐχαριστία long before the authority for the service, or the petition for Divine intervention, were included. In fact, in this sense, these might all be looked upon as "interpolations"

[1] In the Gallican liturgies, on the contrary, alternative forms were allowed, and seem even to have increased in number after the liturgy assumed written form. Now the latter practice would create no necessity for choosing with any sort of finality between the innumerable types of variants (described in the preceding footnote as the primitive condition of the *Epiclesis*). Hence they would survive; and this seems to be just what we find in the Gallican *Post-Sanctus* and *Post-Mysterium* prayers. Nearly every conceivable type is there represented. Only it would seem likely that the victory of the Western theory of consecration has operated to thin out the more definite and Eastern-sounding forms, but without getting rid of them entirely.

in a chronologically arranged sequence already in existence. And the petition that the Holy Spirit be sent to sanctify the Eucharist would quite naturally be put at the point where the Holy Spirit was already mentioned. I may add that this growth must have been pretty well completed by the early fourth century, if not before, both to account for St. Cyril's remarks, and also because it even seems to have determined the place [1] of Serapion's Logos-*Epiclesis*.

What, finally, as to the significance, the necessity, the "consecratory effect," of these "interpolations" into the earlier, simpler consecration prayer of thanksgiving? It is too obvious to need saying, that before the Charter Narrative or the prayer for Divine intervention was introduced, neither one could have been considered the essential formula of consecration. Yet even at that time it would be believed, as I showed above

[1] As an explanation of the " Egyptian position " I suggest this. If the *nucleolus* of the Anaphora originated as I have been contending, then in that case, although the point where the Holy Spirit was mentioned already was the most natural place to insert the prayer for Divine intervention, when it took the form of a Spirit-*Epiclesis*, it would by no means be so fitting a place when the prayer took one of the other possible forms.

A natural alternative answer would be possible, especially if in any place the Institution Narrative had already come to be looked upon as the " moment of consecration." That would be to place the prayer for Divine intervention just before the Charter Narrative, which either effected what God had just been asked to do, or at least gave the authority for the asking. I think this is the most likely explanation of the Egyptian position for the *Epiclesis*.

However, another possible alternative explanation of that position is that it came in before the Institution Narrative and the related *Anamnesis*-Oblation had found their way into the Anaphora. In this latter case, it would simply have been at the end of that prayer (except for the Doxology) ; and it may be worth while pointing out that the same would be true of the *Epiclesis* in the usual Eastern place (as it certainly is in Hippolytus) if the theory be accepted which I developed above (in this chapter), that at the beginning and even as late as Justin and *A.T.* there were no extended intercessions in the Canon but only where Justin was seen to put them. The end of a prayer would be a very fitting place to insert an explicit petition to God to intervene and do what it was already believed He did as a result of the same prayer before the petition came to be inserted—i.e. when once it was felt desirable to insert such a petition at all. Hence this same consideration may have been an added reason why the " regular " Eastern *Epiclesis* assumed the position it had first taken before the intercessions were within the Anaphora. At the same time, while this alternative explanation is to me rather attractive, I cannot overlook the fact that the *Epiclesis*, when it occurs in this position, is always of the indefinite type (except in the Bodleian Papyrus, which is easily accounted for) and this tells strongly in favour of the first proposed explanation.

(pp. 62 and 64-65), that it was only in virtue of our Lord's Words of Institution, and of God's intervention in accordance with, and in fulfilment of, those words, that the simple thanksgiving over the bread and wine had the tremendous effect it was believed by all to have.

Now these facts have a double importance. On the one hand, they might easily suggest that the one or the other of these elements was the essential element, once they had found their way into the prayer and had been there long enough for men to have lost sight of their origin.

On the other hand, they should lead us to be very cautious in drawing inferences. For it will now be evident that one who believed in such an act of Divine intervention at every Eucharist long before it was asked for at all in the prayer, might, if questioned, or if he thought at all of his own impulse about the matter, have conceived that this intervention consisted more precisely in the operation of the Holy Ghost,[1] to whose activity the early Christians were inclined to attribute all or nearly all blessings and benefits they received within the limits of the church. Hence for a writer to say that the Holy Ghost "sanctifies the Eucharist," or other language to a like effect, does not even prove that there was in the liturgy as he knew it a definite petition to the Holy Ghost to do so, even in the vaguest and most general terms. Still less does it prove that it was essential, let alone the essential element, and consequently the "moment of consecration." On the other hand, vagueness or indefiniteness of expression in such an *Epiclesis* in no way proves vagueness or indefiniteness in the belief back of such expression. It might be due to that cause, but it might equally well be due to any one of several other causes.

It would seem almost certain that for some time after the Institution Narrative, the *Anamnesis*-Oblation, and the prayer for Divine intervention had all found their way into the Anaphora, as explained above, the question was still little if at all raised, "Just how is the consecration—the change in the elements—effected?" In so far as it was asked or thought

[1] Of course he might equally well—or almost equally well—have conceived it in one of the other ways suggested above in the footnote to p. 68.

about, the answer would still for a while have lain along the lines conjecturally set forth above. But this could hardly have lasted, especially since the original Jewish conception was by that time nearly or quite lost. The very length of the current Anaphoras, and the questions that sometimes would arise from accidental interruptions, would have tended to make a more precise answer seem desirable. But probably the speculative spirit is chiefly responsible, coupled with the obvious fact (once it is thought of) that since the old Jewish conception of blessing had been lost, the church really had no theologically comprehensible theory of consecration, but had simply been drifting along without one (see again Chapter III, p. 64). Thus the question was bound to arise sooner or later: "Just how—and why—is the change in the elements effected?" And when it did, two answers, differing totally on the surface, and unreconciled, though not, I think, irreconcilable, were possible and, *de facto*, given by different sections of the church.

The West gave one answer, and as this answer penetrated and finally prevailed, it apparently arrested the development in the other part of the liturgy against which the decision had gone. On the other hand, the East gave the opposite answer, and under this final and decisive stimulus developed the relevant part of its liturgy to a definiteness and explicit fullness it seems never to have attained on a wide scale in the West. I would suggest "schematically" that: during the second century the Spirit-*Epiclesis* (along with other types) was coming in and spreading widely, but was not yet accounted essential, let alone *the* essential; during the third century it was winning its way to be considered essential (i.e. *an* essential element); and during the fourth century was triumphing (in the East) first as the most essential element, and finally as the definite "moment of consecration." Meanwhile, as to terminology, *the Epiclesis sans phrase* was the whole Anaphora, not simply this one section within it. But *the Epiclesis* was an *Epiclesis* of the Holy Trinity, and hence included an *Epiclesis* of the Father, and an *Epiclesis* of the Son, and an *Epiclesis* of the Holy Ghost. Hence the portion dealing mainly with the Father (viz. the long *εὐχαριστία*, especially the O.T. part)

would be an (*or* the) "*Epiclesis* of the Father" (or of "God" when so used as to imply a distinction from the other two Persons); the portion dealing with Christ (viz. the N.T. section of the *εὐχαριστία*, and especially the Institution Narrative) an "*Epiclesis* of the Son"; and the portion dealing with the Holy Spirit (whatever it said, which was or at least included always, later, the petition that He be sent down) an "*Epiclesis* of the Holy Ghost." But *the* *ἐπίκλησις* (singular) of the (whole) Trinity was, inevitably, the whole prayer. And when used with that qualification, or without any qualification, or with "God" meaning not the Father but the entire Trinity, it must always be so interpreted in early writers. Yet the separate parts, as just said, might after a while also be considered and called *Epicleses* of a limited nature within THE *Epiclesis* unqualified and *par excellence*.[1] And, once the Eastern view of consecration had progressed far enough, the section or element newly believed to be most essential could easily preempt to itself first the significance and function and finally the title of *the Epiclesis*. Thus an important transformation of terminology, which has caused historians much confusion, was completed.[2]

I shall close this section on the early liturgical development by comparing carefully the account in Justin with the Anaphora and other data in Hippolytus' *A.T.* Both probably represent Roman usage, the former writing about the middle of the second century, the latter not long after 217 A.D. But as Hippolytus is strictly traditionalist, ultra-conservative, and inveighs against innovation on principle, it is *a priori* very likely that on any subject that had arisen before his day, and on which accordingly there existed a traditional usage, he will be found in accord with it. This was of course most emphatically the case with the Eucharist, whether as to doctrine or to liturgy. Hence we should naturally expect his book to represent usage perhaps fifty years at least before he wrote it. But it seems, after comparing him with Justin, that the usage is earlier still. For the similarities are so striking, as will be

[1] This I would suggest is the stage we have in Cyril of Jerusalem.
[2] On the evidence in support of this view of the *Epiclesis* see Appendix III.

seen, that it seems impossible to explain them on any other basis than that the Roman liturgy had already assumed substantially the Hippolytan form well before Justin wrote. Furthermore, since Justin claims to represent general Christian usage, and not merely Roman, and since he was very intelligent, widely-travelled, and well-informed, it seems to follow as at least very probable that the same holds good for the church at large, or at least the chief centres which Justin had visited. And this is very strongly confirmed by the great popularity of Hippolytus' work, and especially of his liturgy, as shown by the tremendous influence it was able to exert. For had it been innovatory or differed widely from the customary liturgy in any part of the church, it is hardly credible it should have done so.

1. Justin contains two accounts, one of the Baptismal Eucharist and one of the regular weekly (Sunday) Eucharist. Hippolytus likewise contains two, but neither of these is the regular Sunday Eucharist. One is the Baptismal Eucharist, the other is for the Ordination of a Bishop (or possibly for any Ordination). Now, in Justin it is only in the regular Sunday Eucharist that we get the *Missa Catechumenorum*, as it was later called (=Scripture Lessons and Preaching). Hence, since we do not have the regular Sunday Eucharist described in Hippolytus, it is not in the least surprising that we do not get the *Missa Catechumenorum* attested in him. His silence proves nothing at all against its existence in his day.

2. Justin's regular Eucharist has these parts: (*a*) Scripture Lessons; (*b*) Preaching; (*c*) Common Prayers; (*d*) Offertory; (*e*) Eucharistic Prayer (=the Consecration, probably already often called the *Epiclesis*); (*f*) Amen; and (*g*) the Communion. Probably the Kiss of Peace has been inadvertently omitted between (*c*) and (*d*); but it is also very possible that this was at that early date used only on great occasions, as at an Ordination or a Baptism. It is attested for both in Hippolytus, and for the Baptismal Eucharist in Justin, and always at exactly the same point in the service.

3. In Justin's Baptismal Eucharist the sequence is the same as just above, except that the Kiss of Peace comes in between

(*c*) and (*d*), and (*a*) and (*b*) are lacking entirely. Now in Hippolytus we get in both his Ordination Eucharist and his Baptismal Eucharist the same sequence from the Kiss through the Communion, and all is explicitly attested except the Amen in the Baptismal Eucharist. There is of course no reason to suppose that this silence implies its omission.

4. As to (*c*) in Justin's account, it is explicitly attested in the Baptismal Eucharist of *A.T.* in such a way [1] as to make it very probable it is to be identified with the later "prayers of the faithful." And the usual content of these is the same as Justin describes. As to Hippolytus' Ordination Eucharist, it seems to have contained a substitute for (*c*), especially suited to the occasion, namely the Ordination Prayer of the Bishop, rather than any strict equivalent for (*c*). It can hardly be considered the strict equivalent for (*c*) because it does not contain, except by the barest implication, any prayers for all sorts and conditions of men, which Justin's (*c*) contained; and still more because it is really not so much a part of the Eucharistic liturgy as of the Ordination proper.

5. As to the Anaphora, see the discussion above (pp. 51-53 and 54-57, i.e. *C* and *E* above). I shall not repeat it here, but only summarize. In that discussion we saw that Justin implies at least *some* thanksgivings in the Anaphora for O.T. matters. What he says is (*Trypho*, 41 ". . . Jesus Christ our Lord delivered (the Eucharist) to be offered so that we might at the same time both give thanks to God for His creation of the world, with all that is in it for man's sake, and for His having freed us from the evil in which we had come to be, and for having overthrown with a perfect overthrow principalities and authorities through Him who became subject to suffering according to His purpose." The first part of this certainly implies at least the germ of the long section of thanksgiving for O.T. dealings which we find in *Ap. Con.* and later liturgies. I discussed above (*loc. cit.*) several possible explanations of the lack of this in *A.T.* If the second of these, based on the abbreviation of a

[1] What *A.T.* says (22 : 5-6) is : " And immediately (after the Baptism) they shall join in prayer with all the people, but they shall not pray with the faithful until all these things are completed. And at the close of their prayer they shall give the Kiss of Peace."

usually much longer prayer probably hinted at in "*et sic iam prosequatur,*" is correct, the difference vanishes. Even if not, it is easy to offer plausible explanations. For the rest, it is quite remarkable how closely the description we have given from Justin fits the Anaphora given in Hippolytus. All the elements Justin stresses, viz. redemption from the evil in which we had come to be, and the overthrow of principalities and authorities, and that all this happened according to the Divine purpose, find expression in the Anaphora of *A.T.* Also in 1 *Apol.*, 65, we find that thanks were included for His "vouchsafing these things." Here the antecedent of "these things" is either completely vague or else (and I think much more likely) it is the Eucharist itself, just mentioned. Now in *A.T.* we find at the end of the *Anamnesis*-Oblation section of the Anaphora, "we offer to thee the bread and the cup, yielding thee thanks because thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and to minister to thee." Once again we saw reason above (*loc. cit.*) to interpret Justin, 1 *Apol.*, 67 ("the president sends up prayers similarly and thanksgivings"), in the light of 1 *Apol.*, 65 ("sends up praise and glory to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit and makes thanksgiving"), taking the prayers referred to as being not intercessions but the "praise and glory." And how well this along with "thanksgivings" describes the general character of the Anaphora of Hippolytus will be obvious to anyone who examines it closely, as I pointed out above. So on the whole the similarity in the Anaphora is much too striking to be accidental.

Allowing then for the explicit recognition in *A.T.* that the forms it gives are *patterns* to be more or less closely copied rather than verbally reproduced from reading or memorizing, and for the further fact that the regular Sunday Eucharist is not given, it seems we must conclude that the Eucharistic rite as described by Justin is much too closely similar to that in *A.T.* to admit of any other reasonable explanation except such a one as described above (p. 75, this chapter).

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRAMENT

I SHALL begin by showing the views of those writers—St. Ignatius, Justin, St. Irenaeus, *A.T.*, the Gnostics and certain inscriptions—who share a very definite view of the Eucharist on its sacramental side.[1] Then I shall consider indications that they are simply giving expression to the universally held belief of the church, and do not in any way represent a mere "school" within the church. Finally, I shall consider certain objections which might seem at first sight to tell against such a conclusion.

The language of St. Ignatius is so difficult, that it is in some passages possible to assign diametrically opposite meanings to him. It is therefore the more necessary to avail ourselves of any passages whose meaning, as far as it concerns our purpose, is beyond reasonable doubt, to help us fix the meaning of the doubtful ones. Fortunately there are two whose meaning seems indubitably clear. The first is *Smyr.*, 7 : 1; the second *Eph.*, 20 : 2*c*.[2]

Taken together, these passages enable us to fix quite easily and securely the Eucharistic belief of St. Ignatius. In the first passage it is certain that "the flesh of our Saviour" is meant in the strictly literal sense. For it was just on that point that the Docetists stumbled. Any wholly or partly metaphorical meaning would have brought them flocking back joyfully to the church. But any compromise on the full reality of Christ's flesh would have been unthinkable to St. Ignatius.

[1] For early belief on its sacrificial aspect see the next chapter (V).

[2] "They (the Docetists) abstain from Eucharist and prayer because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His goodness raised. They therefore who deny the gift of God are perishing in their disputes; but it were better for them ἀγαπᾶν, in order that they also may rise" (*Smyr.*, 7 : 1). ". . . breaking one bread which is the medicine of immortality, an antidote not to die but live forever in Jesus Christ" (*Eph.*, 20 : 2*c*).

It might seem, however, that while "flesh" must be in the strictest sense literal, yet "is" (*εἶναι*) could still mean "represents" or "symbolizes" (in our modern sense). For the Docetists did not admit that Christ really had any true permanent abiding flesh of His own for the Eucharist *either to be or to represent*; and hence they also denied He had really suffered and risen, so the Eucharist could not be a memorial of His Passion and Resurrection. But in the second passage it seems certain that at least tremendous realistic *effects*, viz. attaining to the resurrection and immortality, are attached to the Eucharist. Hence we are left with this result: the first passage excludes all intermediate positions between the purely figurative and the strictly and fully realistic; and the second passage forces us to choose the latter alternative.

This our main argument is supported by several others. Thus the second passage itself implies the identity of the "one bread" which the Christians "break" with "the flesh of Christ." For it asserts effects of the "one bread" which the (evidently very familiar) Fourth Gospel asserts only of the flesh of Christ or of Christ Himself, who is the bread of God [1] —the bread of life. And that this is no mere coincidence is shown by the fact that elsewhere [2] St. Ignatius twice uses the "middle term" of this "equation"—the bread of God—the first time in such a context as to imply that the lack of it would be a very grave matter, the second time with an explicit identification of it with "the flesh of Christ."

Conversely, if we recognize, as we surely ought, a double meaning in the word "love"—*ἀγαπᾶν*—when St. Ignatius uses it in these Eucharistic connections, and admit a reference to the Agape, then surely we get the first passage clearly implying the same tremendous and absolutely realistic effect—resurrection to life eternal—which the second passage explicitly teaches. St. Ignatius means that by returning to the Agape, from which their disputings have led them to withdraw, they will again be able to receive the "one bread," the "bread of God," which is really "the flesh of Christ," and thus attain to

[1] John vi. 33-34.
[2] *Eph.*, 5 : 2 ; *Rom.*, 7 : 3.

the final resurrection. This also enables us to see the point in the highly poetic phrase [1] "for drink I desire His blood which is love incorruptible." When we remember his play elsewhere on the word ἀγάπη, and the inseparable connection in his day between the Agape and the Eucharist, which is the food of immortality, we cannot, I think, have much doubt as to his meaning. The desire for "Christ's blood which is love incorruptible" for drink is immediately preceded by a disclaimer of desire for "food of corruption" and a wish for "God's bread which is the flesh of Christ."

Thus the full and uncompromising realism of St. Ignatius' belief is beyond question. The first of our passages also makes it clear that the "Eucharistic flesh" is not an impanationistic "bread-flesh" as some distinguished authorities [2] would have us believe. In fact, the whole issue with the Docetists seems to assure us beyond mistake that it is the incarnate flesh and blood of Jesus which is in question. But *Smyr.*, 7 : 1 definitely adds "the flesh . . . which suffered . . . which the Father raised. . . ." The numerical identity of our Lord's body in the Passion and in the Eucharist could not be more clearly expressed. The evidence of St. Ignatius, besides its own value, has the added value of being about as early, as authoritative, and as competent an interpretation of the Eucharistic teaching of the Fourth Gospel as could well be desired. There seems no doubt that he is thoroughly saturated with Johannine teaching and thought. We may have in *Smyr.*, 7 : 1, in the identification of the Eucharistic flesh of Christ not only with the flesh that *suffered*, but with that which was *raised*, a key to St. Ignatius' interpretation of John vi. 62-63. But one thing at least is certain—he did not allow these verses to divest the rest of the great Eucharistic discourse in John vi. of its obvious realistic meaning. I think we shall see in Chapter VI that an independent study of the Fourth Gospel leads us to a perfect agreement with St. Ignatius' interpretation of it.

Let us next take Justin Martyr.[3] I wish first to attempt to

[1] *Rom.*, 7 : 2.
[2] E.g. Dr. Loofs and Dr. Lucius Waterman.
[3] 1 *Apol.*, 66.

settle three subsidiary questions of interpretation which might otherwise distract us from our main problem:

1. The phrase "the food 'Eucharistized' by the word of prayer which is from Him (Jesus)" refers to the consecration of the Eucharist, and means that it is effected by "the thanksgiving" said over the elements, i.e. by the whole Anaphora. Enough has been said, I hope, to prove this point in Chapter III and its related appendices; so I shall not dwell on it further here.

2. The parenthetical phrase—food by which our blood and flesh are by a change [1] nourished—is not intended to express any such difficult and profound doctrine as that our natural bodies are gradually transformed into the spiritual body of the resurrection by continually feeding upon the risen and glorified flesh and blood of Christ. Justin is writing to the pagan emperor, who could not be presumed to know enough about Christian doctrine to understand so deep a point even if it had been adequately expounded. But in reality we would have only a very brief and cryptic reference. How could Justin possibly expect the emperor to understand it? All he hopes to secure by his *Apology* is tolerance; certainly not to convert His Majesty to Christianity.

Surely all he is trying to do by that parenthetical phrase is to assure the emperor that, although the Christians believe the Eucharist to be supernatural spiritual food, yet visibly and on the earthly plane it is merely ordinary harmless food—"*cibum promiscuum et innoxium*" as the Christians had been anxious to assure Pliny a half-century earlier. If that be his meaning, the passage becomes vitally relevant to his purpose. For the Christians had to combat the grave charge of Thyestean banquets—a charge almost certainly connected with their realistic belief about the Eucharist. Nor can it be denied that Justin has done splendidly, if such were his purpose. For without letting himself appear over-anxious, or even (directly) apologetic on this point at all, he has, by a perfectly simple, straightforward, and transparently honest account of what the Christians actually do, enabled the emperor to see without

[1] Greek: κατὰ μεταβολήν.

difficulty how the charge of Thyestean banquets arose, and at the same time how utterly innocent the Christians really are.

3. The phrase "as by the word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour became incarnate, and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, etc.," is not for the purpose of drawing a parallel between an in*carn*ation of Jesus at His conception and birth and an im*pana*tion in the Eucharist. Again, as in the case just considered, it is hard to see how Justin could have expected the emperor to understand this point, especially when so briefly and poorly expressed; or even why he should have at all desired him to understand it. Besides, even the word "body" is not a word naturally to be understood in the sense here supposed. But the words Justin uses, "blood" and "flesh," are extremely unfavourable, especially the latter. For while "body" does sometimes refer to other than human or animal bodies, blood and flesh (I believe) never do. And here Justin has the word "body" easily available and shows he knows our Lord used it. Yet he himself repeatedly uses "flesh." This is incomprehensible if he held an impanationistic view. Finally, Justin does not say that the bread and wine are believed to be "flesh and blood" of the Logos, or even simply of Jesus *sans phrase*, but "of that *incarnate* Jesus." This seems of all possible phrases the one he would have been least likely to use had he held "impanationism."

With the ground cleared of these preliminary problems our task is really quite simple. For Justin's clear, simple, unqualified, literalistic realism is made perfectly evident by the passage. In it—if we remember his purpose, and to whom he is writing—he not so much claims or even teaches as *concedes* that the Christians do indeed believe the bread and wine over which they give thanks *really to be* the flesh and blood of Jesus. Since that belief was the cause of so much embarrassment and misunderstanding, he would surely have done anything he could to dull the point of the misunderstanding.

Consequently, if he could have conscientiously said "pictures" or "represents" instead of the stark "is" which was the basis of the whole difficulty, he would inevitably have done so. Or at least he would have explained that "although

we use the word 'is,' we mean 'represents,' so the whole difficulty rests on a simple misunderstanding." Again, if his belief had been that grace, virtue, or benefit was received (however realistically), but not the very body and blood of Christ, his task would have been at least as simple. And surely he would either have expressed himself differently; or at least have added some simple explanation of the traditional language he felt obliged to use. But he does nothing at all of this sort. He simply confesses up fully and frankly as an honest Christian was obliged to do. And he trusts the emperor will see that while he cannot abate one iota of the stark realism of Christian belief, yet that belief itself does not substantiate the charge of Thyestean banquets—at least not in any sense with which the emperor would be concerned.

It seems indeed possible that Justin has tried to drop the emperor a couple of apologetical hints. But if so, they both seem directed to the end of making the Christian belief appear less preposterous in the emperor's eyes, and hence presuppose and confirm its realism. The first is that the phrase about bread and wine being changed by metabolism into *our* flesh and blood *may* be intended to hint that it is not incredible that God should be able to do in a special "miraculous" way in the Eucharist what He is doing every day by the regular laws of nature—changing bread and wine into flesh and blood. The second is that the reference to so great an effect as the Incarnation being produced merely by the word of God *may* be a hint that it is not preposterous to believe that a simple thanksgiving prayer such as the Christians, *at Christ's* [1] *express command*, use in the Eucharist should be powerful to change the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ.

On the whole, then, Justin's simple, direct, unreflective, but strict, unqualified, literalistic realism seems to be as certain as that of St. Ignatius. I do not mean to imply by the strength of my language that he would not have held it was the spiritual, glorified, heavenly flesh and blood of Christ which he believed to be present in the Eucharist. No doubt, judging from the general Christian tradition in which he seems so unqualifiedly to

[1] Who was Himself God.

stand, he would unhesitatingly have so held. His own character as a philosopher confirms this probability, if confirmation were needed. Also he gives us no hint as to his views of the benefits of the Eucharist. Presumably here again we may without hesitation attribute to him the teaching of the tradition in which he stands. Only he does not happen to have expressed himself on these subjects, so we cannot prove it by direct evidence.

Let us now go on to St. Irenaeus. The evidence seems overwhelming that he is strictly realist; that the true body and blood of Christ, and not some other *res sacramenti*, is believed to be present. Let us begin with *Adv. Haer.*, I. xiii. 2, in which he tells us of the heretic Marcus pretending to consecrate mixed chalices and spinning out "the word of the *Epiclesis*" to such length that (presumably by the action of some chemicals he has stealthily introduced into the cup) a visible change into blood takes place. Of course Christians did not expect the change to be *visible*—that is the amazing part of Marcus' fraudulent practice. And it would seem quite clear that at least Marcus, and possibly also at that early date St. Irenaeus himself, have not reflected that since "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more" the truth later expressed in the doctrine of concomitance must follow. But it does not seem doubtful that the belief in the presence in the Eucharistic elements of the true blood of Christ on the part of the orthodox and Gnostics alike is a necessary presupposition for such an episode as this.

This inference is decisively confirmed by the passage at the end of IV. xviii. 4 in which St. Irenaeus says: "And how will they be assured that this Eucharistized bread is the body of their Lord and that the cup (contains) His blood if they do not admit, etc.?" Here it is clear that they *do* say it and that St. Irenaeus thinks they *should* say it.

Further on in the same passage he goes on to use two arguments, both of which seem to exclude any non-realistic interpretation. The first is: How could Christ make mere bread and wine His body and blood if He is not the creative Logos? Clearly this cannot mean *represent*; it must have to do with a strictly literal realism. St. Irenaeus' second argu-

ment is: "How can they assert that the flesh is destined to corruption and does not share in life, which (flesh) is nourished from the body of the Lord and from His blood, etc.?" This argument, put briefly here, is repeated much more fully and even more clearly in v. ii. 2-3. It seems beyond reasonable dispute that here we have indeed the argument that the flesh and blood of Christ are in such a direct and real way the actual nourishment of our own mortal flesh and blood [1] that these receive resurrection as a result of feeding on that medicine of immortality. Here again the argument requires a strictly realistic meaning to be assigned to the eating of the body and blood of Christ.

At the end of the passage quoted above to confirm the deductions made from the passage about Marcus, and which also contained the twofold argument we have just been examining, St. Irenaeus goes on to say: "But our view is consonant with the Eucharist and the Eucharist confirms our view. We offer to Him His own," thus fittingly announcing fellowship and union of flesh and spirit. For as bread from the earth when it receives the invocation of God is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, both an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible but have the hope of the resurrection to eternity, etc."

Scholars have differed here as to what the two elements are, the "two things, both an earthly and a heavenly." Here I can only state the results at which I arrived after a detailed study: that the earthly thing is most indubitably the bread and wine which are of the same creation as our everyday bodies; and that the heavenly thing is the body and blood of Christ. And if this be the correct interpretation, then St. Irenaeus has told us here that after the *Epiclesis* the bread *is* common bread *plus* the body of Christ. He knows nothing of any "virtualism," nor of a doctrine which makes the Holy Spirit the *content* of the Eucharist.

The passages we have so far studied are the clearest and

[1] And not simply of the soul, or of the body only *in*directly through the soul.

most decisive. But there are others, which at least look strongly in the same direction and confirm the conclusion drawn from the above passages.

The attempt to put an "impanationist" interpretation on St. Irenaeus rests mainly on so reading passages which might *admit* of but certainly do not require such a meaning; and on a serious misinterpretation of the passage about the "two elements, an earthly and a heavenly." This Dr. Waterman derives from an interpretation of the phrase descriptive of the consecration, "receiving the Word of God" (i.e. the personal Logos), which I believe our studies below on the *Epiclesis* in Appendix III have completely overthrown. Thus his interpretation collapses of its own intrinsic weakness. But there are in addition strong direct proofs to the contrary. I shall notice several of these.

The episode of the heretic Marcus shows clearly it was physical (red) blood, not a metaphorical "wine-blood" in the presence of which all believed. The same is clearly the premise of the argument in *Adv. Haer.*, v. ii. 2-3, in which the heresy of those who deny the flesh is saved is held to lead to the conclusion that Christ did not redeem us by His blood, and that the cup is not the communion of His blood. "For blood is not, except from veins and flesh," which the heretics deny Christ really had. Clearly here the body and blood of the Eucharist are the same as that of the redemption. And a little below in the same general argument it is implied that by feeding on the Eucharistic body and blood we are made "members of His body, out of His flesh and out of His *bones*." It surely does not seem possible to interpret this as referring to any other than His *incarnate* body. And there are many subsidiary arguments adducible, if space allowed.

As to the *beneficium sacramenti* in St. Irenaeus, he holds the direct nourishing of our flesh and body by the body and blood of Christ, resulting finally in their being no longer corruptible but rising to eternal life. But we must not take this to mean that he doubted or was ignorant of a direct benefit for the soul from the worthy reception of the Eucharist. He is not writing a treatise on systematic theology but a polemical treatise in

which he only argues the things his opponents denied. Now they did not differ with him as to the Eucharist, but as to the resurrection of the flesh. Hence his silence on other points than the ones he mentions is due purely and solely to the fact that he has no controversial use to make of them against these particular adversaries. We must also make allowance for the way the exigencies of controversy may have led him to a one-sided emphasis on the points he does use.

Let us next notice very briefly two early inscriptions. That of Avercius, commonly dated not later than 192 A.D., seems good evidence for a 140-190 date. The relevant portion reads: "everywhere faith . . . set before me fish from the fountain, mighty and stainless, whom a pure virgin grasped . . . to eat, having good wine, giving the mixed cup with bread." Here the simple but clear realism of the second-century belief is evident. The fish (=Christ) is given in the Eucharist as food to the faithful.

The inscription of Pectorius of Autun is usually dated near 200 A.D. The two most important lines run:

> "Receive the honey-sweet food of the Saviour of the holy,
> Eat, drink, having the fish in thy hands."

In the first of these lines we probably have an appositive genitive, i.e. the Saviour is the honey-sweet food. At any rate it is perfectly clear in the last line that "the fish," i.e. Christ, is believed to be eaten and drunk. Here again the strong realism of the early church is clear.

It is necessary to notice also the Eucharistic doctrine of early heretics. First of all, since the Docetic opponents of St. Ignatius rejected the church's Eucharistic doctrine, they saw nothing to do but give up the practice of the Eucharist itself. The doctrine and the rite were so inseparably connected that to attempt to dissociate them, even for strongly controversial motives, was to them unthinkable. They thus in the very act of denying the Eucharist to be Christ's historical but glorified body bear independent and powerful witness to the existence and unchallenged supremacy of the doctrine within the church that it was.

Next we come to the controversy of St. Irenaeus with the Gnostics. And the evidence as to *their* views on the subject is threefold. First of all, he can use *his* view as a *premise* in arguing other matters with them. This shows that they did not materially differ on the Eucharist. Secondly, he asks: "How can they be sure that this 'Eucharistized' bread is the body of their Lord and the cup His blood if they do not admit, etc.?" Here it is unmistakably implied that they admit no doubts though it would have been a distinct controversial advantage to have rejected it entirely. Thirdly, the case of Marcus pretending to change mixed chalices *visibly* into blood shows clearly that they held an actual presence of the true incarnate blood of Jesus.

Nor are we limited to these very strong indirect proofs. The Eucharistic prayers and formulae of administration in the *Acts of (Judas) Thomas* (Chapters 49-50, 133, 158) also show by many allusions and phrases [1] that the elements are believed to be the real incarnate flesh and blood of Christ; that the same realistic effects are attributed to the Eucharist; and that the Eucharist is deemed a sacrifice and a commemoration (presumably of the Passion). The *Acts* probably date 225-250 A.D. and raise many critical problems, one of these being the possibility of a Catholic redaction. But for what they are worth, they confirm our other evidence.

Apparently, then, the Gnostics (unless we include the Docetists) are at one with the doctrine we found in the church in St. Ignatius, Justin, St. Irenaeus, and the two inscriptions. And even the Docetists bear indirect testimony to the existence and universal unchallenged prevalence of that doctrine.

Let us conclude our survey of early witnesses with the *A.T.* of Hippolytus. Due to its early date, its unique character, its great authority in the following centuries, and the rigid traditionalism of its author, it is a very important and valuable source. Its date (±220 A.D.) makes it over a century earlier than any of the related Church Orders. And its conservative character makes it, generally speaking, good evidence for a

[1] See the Supplement and Addendum to Appendix III for the text of these prayers and for some discussion of the many problems they raise.

period at least as far back as 175-200 A.D. if not earlier. What is its Eucharistic doctrine?

In 4 : 2 we get the rubric that the bishop "shall say as the thanksgiving" the prayer given immediately following. Now, as we saw above in Chapter III, "the thanksgiving" is "the consecration." Hence our problem really resolves itself into the simple question: "What effect does this thanksgiving have on the bread and wine?" And fortunately Hippolytus has given us his own explicit answer to that question in another passage. He tells us in 23 : 1 that "by thanksgiving he (the bishop) shall make the bread into an (or the) image of the body of Christ" and the mixed chalice into "the likeness of the blood which is shed for all who believe on Him."

It is obvious at once that any purely symbolical or figurative view is excluded. For arbitrary, empty symbolism is dependent in no way upon a thanksgiving prayer, but upon the simple arbitrary decision of the human will to let x equal so-and-so. Hippolytus clearly believes a change takes place in virtue of the thanksgiving prayer. Because of this change he orders the words "the heavenly bread in Christ Jesus" to be used as the consecrated bread is delivered to the communicants. Elsewhere he distinguishes *this* bread, called "Eucharist" which *is* the body of the Lord, from the *Eulogia* of the Agape which *is not*, though it is something special.[1] The words in italics are implied rather than expressed in the text, but it seems to me the implication is quite unmistakable. This, of course, states Hipploytus' belief in perfect harmony with the unwavering tradition before his time as we have found it above. And finally, the function of the Words of Institution in the Anaphora is not *merely* historical, but *historical with a purpose*, i.e. to show *why* we stand ministering to God, offering to Him *the* bread and *the* cup; and *what* the bread and the cup are [2] which we offer. In addition to this, it seems clear to me that

[1] If one prefers the alternative reading, or rather translation of this text (26 : 2-3), as Dr. Easton seems to do, one gets still the same result for our present purpose, as in that case the Eucharist (the service and not the food) is called the service of the body of the Lord.

[2] See both these points developed more fully below in Chapter V where the sacrificial doctrine of *A.T.* is being discussed.

in 36 : 3 we have at least an indirect—if not primary and direct—reference to the Eucharist, and once again in the same terms.[1] And in fact, this is only what we should expect to find in view of the known ultra-conservative and tenacious traditionalism of the author.

There are a few other passages which are doubtfully Hippolytean (e.g. Canon 32 and disputed passages or fragments of other works) but which if authentic would confirm our conclusion already reached for Hippolytus. That is, that his belief is the same strong and clear realism we have found in all our other witnesses.

I wish now to point out certain indications which seem to increase our certainty that the belief we have found in the writers we have so far studied represents the generally accepted doctrine of the church and is in no sense merely their own personal opinions, or even the authoritative position of a "school" within the church, to which they belong.

1. Their very number, their unanimity, their standing in the church, and the total absence of any *dissenting*[2] opinion (save such as confirm our contention, e.g. the Docetists and the first systematizers) all point very strongly in this direction.

2. They all assume it as undisputed, even by their opponents. And their opponents seem to confirm this. The Docetists will give up the Eucharist entirely rather than contest (not, of course, St. Ignatius' but) the church's doctrine about it. And St. Ignatius for his part will let them leave the church rather than abate her realism one iota. Justin was widely travelled and a learned writer. But he cannot, even under the most tempting conditions, modify the realistic belief which "*we* have been *taught*." St. Irenaeus can confidently use his realism as a premise, which his opponents would surely have wished to reject if they could have quoted any even slight authority from reputable tradition within the church for doing so. His unhesitating use shows he knows they could not and did not even try.

[1] See both these points developed more fully below in Chapter V where the sacrificial doctrine of *A.T.* is being discussed.

[2] As distinguished from *less unambiguous expression* of the *same opinion*!

3. Hippolytus is a very conservative and traditionalistic theologian; and he professes explicitly to be clinging steadfastly to the sacrosanct Apostolic tradition. Nor does his claim, at least on Eucharistic matters, seem ever to have been challenged. This confirms us in understanding him in harmony with the other and earlier writers, and also gives us strong reason to consider his Eucharistic doctrine as simply reproducing the authoritative tradition of the church.

4. The Gnostic position accorded very ill with the fully realistic Eucharistic doctrine; consequently it is unthinkable that they should have invented the latter for themselves. Hence they must have taken it with them when they left the church. For the same reason they would never have taken out with them the doctrine of the strictly realistic "school" if there had been any other "school," even a minority, which had any sort of reputable standing in the church. Hence we should conclude that at least as early as the Gnostics began "going out from us," the church already had a perfectly homogeneous Eucharistic tradition of strict realism. Finally, they would in all probability have availed themselves of any less embarrassing doctrine that was *remembered* to have been in good standing in the church, even if it no longer was. Hence our inference must be true *as much further back* as the memory of men could reach. Parity of reasoning applied to the Docetists seems to lead to similar and strongly confirmatory results.

5. The charge of Thyestean banquets seems certainly to rest upon a misunderstanding of the church's realistic doctrine and hence to attest its existence as far back at least as such charges go, which is quite early. I cannot but think it was at least as early as the letter of Pliny; otherwise why did they bother to assure him that the food they ate was "*promiscuum tamen et innoxium*"? And as troublesome as that charge became, they never met it by abating their Eucharistic belief, or even their straightforward expression of it, one iota.

6. The same realism is found in St. John, St. Paul (see Chapter VI), and apparently in the times and places in which at least the first two Gospels and the longer text of Luke originated, as well as the traditions behind all of these, including

St. Paul. And again there is no adducible dissent. The shorter text of Luke would be a very doubtful exception to allege.

7. Finally, it seems that only one theory is ever given as to where, why, and how the Eucharist, and this steadfast belief about it, originated. That is, the Last Supper and the authority of Christ Himself. We are not concerned at this point with the accuracy of this belief. But, in view of the supreme and unquestionable authority of Christ's words, its bearing on the probability of any division in the church's tradition is obvious. From the earliest time we can trace, the church believed Christ had uttered those words and meant them realistically. There seems then to be very little likelihood (purely *a priori*) of any division in the church's tradition as to Eucharistic realism. I do not, of course, mean to exclude such "doubts" as John vi. 52, 60 attest, or the Docetists. But men always leave the church when they come to doubt her realistic teaching on the Eucharist.

All these reasons seem to leave very little doubt that in the second century, and even considerably further back, the church's Eucharistic teaching was, and from "time immemorial" had been, a strict and literal realism. By literal I do not mean that the conception was a carnal or materialistic one; rather it was the spiritual glorified body and blood of Christ which were believed to be present. But I mean by "literal" to exclude all forms of realism such as would later have been called "virtualism"; i.e. all which would make the gift in the Eucharist to *be* grace or power or forgiveness or even the Holy Spirit or the Divine nature of the Logos Himself, but to *exclude* the actual presence of the true flesh and blood of the exalted Christ. Our evidence seems decisive against all of these.

I have purposely avoided raising so far the question whether the early belief was that the body and blood of Christ were actually present *in the elements* or only that they were actually *received* by means of the elements. My reason was that much of our evidence was definite enough to *limit* us to *one of these two views* which are alike strictly realistic; but not decisive as to the choice between them. With so much settled, however, we shall now inquire whether we have sufficient indications

in our evidence to enable us to determine this further question, if not with certainty at least with probability. I think we shall find we have.

1. Let us emphasize at the very beginning that it is not suggested that the early church had definitely and consciously faced this precise issue and decided it in favour of one alternative, formally condemning the other. What we are inquiring, then, is the direction in which the belief of the early church tended without a conscious raising of the issue. Now the view later called "receptionism"—that there was no presence in the elements—seems to me to be indubitably a "refinement" of the alternative view and to presuppose no small reflection. Hence, if it existed at all in the early church we should expect to find it succeeding to and later than the "less refined" and more spontaneous view. In other words, development is likely to have been from the more unqualified realism to the more refined, but not *vice versa*.

2. In accordance with this *a priori* expectation, we find widespread and repeated use of language which most naturally means a presence in the elements, and no single hint of any word or phrase which even disfavours, let alone excludes such a view. We are told repeatedly that the elements *are* or *become* the body and blood of Christ; but never that they are or become the instruments for receiving it, or that they convey it, confer it, or any other such language. Now even today we can see the force of this phenomenon. But I doubt if we fully appreciate it. For we live in an age when long and persistent usage has accustomed us to the really quite unnatural mode of expression of saying that "the bread is the body of Christ" when what is really meant is that it is *not so at all*, but only conveys that body; or even only the grace and virtue of the body, and not the body itself. But even today, inured as we are to this mode of speech, receptionists and virtualists tend strongly to shrink from it and avoid it by using some other term or expression where possible. And when they first began to oppose the belief in an "objective presence" they did so to a much greater extent still, and only used this kind of language *at all* under the controversial pressure of the fact

that the earliest Fathers and the Holy Scripture itself used it. Of course they wished to claim accord with these, so they had at least to acquiesce in such language and use it, at least sometimes, in their own unnatural sense. I am not imputing insincerity to these men. But how unnatural it would be to choose originally, when the slate was clean, such modes of expression to express a receptionist doctrine, I think we, with our long "conditioning" to this very phenomenon, find it hard to realize. The language in itself is by all odds the natural way to speak if, *and only if*, one believed in a presence *in the elements*.

3. Finally, certain special indications are available in particular writers or episodes:

(*a*) The clearest of these is the episode of Marcus, who professed to make the blood appear visibly right there in the chalice itself. And the belief that is a presupposition for this fraudulent pretence was, as we saw above, that of the church in general and of the Gnostics by inheritance from her. St. Irenaeus tells us of it, but is describing a practice—not a single event—that went on about a generation earlier.

(*b*) The inscription of Pectorius of Autun speaks of holding "the fish" *in your hands*. Unless one explains this away as pure rhetoric it is as decisive as the preceding case.

(*c*) In St. Paul as well as in the Gnostic *Acts of* (*Judas*) *Thomas* and St. Cyprian we get almost certain indications of a presence in the elements. St. Paul thinks unworthy reception has caused sickness and death. St. Cyprian tells of the Host turning to a cinder in the hands of an unworthy recipient. The *Acts of* (*Judas*) *Thomas* tell of the elements withering the hands of an impenitent murderer. We must not allow our repulsion by at least the last two of these stories to blind us to their implications for contemporary belief.

(*d*) The doubtfully Hippolytean 32nd Canon in *A.T.* is at least early third-century. And its implications for our purpose seem very strong. Both its superstititious reason given for fasting Communion; its careful preservation of the reserved Eucharist from any "unbeliever, mouse, other animal, alien spirit, falling, being spilled, or being lost"; its implication

that by so doing the "body of Christ" would be despised and His "blood" guiltily scorned; all these points show a belief that the elements themselves are, by consecration, changed and made intrinsically sacrosanct.

(*e*) I cannot escape the conviction that the quite unnecessary phrase in John vi. 23 (where they had eaten the bread *after that the Lord had given thanks*) should be explained in the light of the primitive belief about consecration of the Eucharistic elements by a thanksgiving. Then we probably have the implication that the thanksgiving *was what multiplied the loaves*, just as it was what effected an even greater change, soon to be discussed (vi. 26-63), in the Eucharistic elements. In other words, vi. 23 really means only "had eaten the bread which the Lord had multiplied." And the idea that this was done by the thanksgiving is carried over from his ideas of the consecratory effects of the Eucharistic thanksgiving.

It is true that most of this evidence is for the latest part of our period. But the writers throughout these two centuries all speak of the Eucharist in exactly the same way. And we have no grounds to suppose the earlier ones meant anything different by their language from what the later ones almost certainly meant by the same language, as shown by the evidence just quoted. Nor must we be misled by the fact that so much of this evidence seems superstitious. That is about the only kind of direct evidence we could well expect to get in a period where the question is not being explicitly raised, and where, by consequence, any indications we find must almost inevitably be of an incidental character. Such superstitions presuppose a substantial body of non-superstitious but "high" sacramental belief, and it seems to centre around a change in the elements themselves so that they *really* BECOME the body and blood of Christ.

We must close by considering several objections which might be raised to our ascribing such a belief to the universal consciousness of the church of the first two centuries.

1. The absence of Eucharistic adoration, even if a valid objection at all, would tell only against a presence in the elements, not against the belief that the body and blood of

Christ are at least actually received in the Eucharist. But I cannot believe the objection is valid at all. The extreme slowness of the church in drawing all the practical inferences logically inherent in her beliefs (as well as *vice versa*) is too well known to need enlargement here. Suffice it to say the objection would prove far too much. For, on any showing, belief in a presence in the elements was established many centuries before the corollary of Eucharistic adoration became generally practised. Eastern practice even today shows how unsafe such arguments are. Besides, it must be considered how close the superstitious attitude toward the elements, of which we saw evidence just above, comes in itself to being a rudimentary form of an equivalent phenomenon.

2. The *Didache* (dating perhaps 130-150 A.D. or even later) cannot be rightly used as evidence against our general conclusion. For it would be only an argument from silence, and such is not valid against actual evidence. Especially have we no right to base one on the silences or indefiniteness of expression in a liturgy. They notoriously lag far behind other contemporary evidence in this regard. Thus the earliest Gnostic Eucharistic prayers in the *Acts of John* are, if anything, even more indefinite than the *Didache*; yet other evidence shows the contemporary Gnostics shared to the full the realism of the church, and later Gnostic formulas finally acquire definiteness. The Anaphora in *A.T.* (if one leaves out the Institution Narrative, which *Didache* lacks) is no more definite than *Didache*. Yet other evidence in *A.T.* itself shows that we must draw no negative conclusions from this fact, to say nothing of abundant contemporary *and earlier* evidence outside *A.T.* In fact, even the later liturgies fall far behind contemporary patristic and other evidence in explicitness and definiteness, especially some of the Gallican *Post-Pridie* forms. And particularly would it be difficult for a "celebrant" to find occasion to express with any precision his doctrinal beliefs about the Eucharist at a date when the Anaphora was a simple thanksgiving, however long, which did not yet contain the later *nucleolus* of Institution Narrative, *Anamnesis*-Oblation, and *Epiclesis*. For even in later liturgies it is chiefly in these

parts that the more definite expressions occur; or else outside the Anaphora entirely. In short, the *lex orandi* is a guide to the *lex credendi* (especially in early times) only positively but not negatively. And in the *Didache* the argument, if good at all, would prove far too much—viz., that the Eucharist had no connection with the Last Supper; was no memorial of the Passion; and that the author had no knowledge of even the terminology employed universally elsewhere from before St. Paul down through the ages. Yet we could prove the same thing from *A.T.* if we omitted the Institution Narrative and the *Anamnesis*-Oblation. Finally, it must not be forgotten that *Didache* does call the Eucharist "spiritual food and drink" and "holy" so that it must not be given to the dogs. And it mentions blessings which, while not expressly ascribed to the reception of the Eucharist, are probably at least in part implied to be gained from it and which agree closely with the *fruits* (as distinguished from the Eucharistic *gift* of which they are the fruits) ascribed to the Eucharist in general tradition. These are knowledge of the holy vine of David, life, knowledge, having God's holy name to "tabernacle in our hearts," faith, immortality, and eternal light. I think the author knows and accepts the ideas of John vi. without doubt.

3. There is considerable dispute about the Eucharistic views of Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian. In so far as the latter's realism is doubted on grounds of his use of words like figure, symbol, represents, etc., we shall consider it under the next objection. For the rest, he in some places uses the same directly realistic language as the earlier Fathers we have studied. And to put an entirely non-Eucharistic interpretation on John vi. need not be any indication of irrealism. But even if Tertullian's personal belief is "purely symbolical," or a mitigated realism of some sort, he has felt obliged to make concessions to the tradition of the church by at least using its *language*, only to explain it away. And by so doing he has borne striking witness to what that tradition was.

As to Clement and Origen, it is hard to decide whether they really intend the irrealistic elements in their teaching to retract or explain away the traditional realism they elsewhere, like

Tertullian, also express; or whether they are superimposing a "higher" (novel) view upon the traditional one, as something additional rather than alternative. Fortunately it does not matter, for at least Origen admits the realistic view is the traditional one and his own "higher" view an innovation. And thus he confirms rather than undermines our conclusions as to the regular tradition of the second century.

We must further remember that Clement and Origen belong to the Alexandrian School with its extreme allegorizing tendency. Hence such phenomena in them—which are not limited to the Eucharist—are of much less importance than if they came in writers like St. Cyprian, Hippolytus, or St. Irenaeus.

Also Tertullian as well as the two Alexandrians stand, following the Valentinian Gnostic Theodotus, at the very beginning of what we may call theorizing or systematizing about the Eucharist, as distinguished from the simple, naïve, direct, and even sometimes crude assertion of the bare, bald realism which we find in the earlier writers and reproduced also in some passages of these first theorizers. And we all know how a man's *theory* of anything, especially when theorizing first begins, nearly always, and almost inevitably, falls short of doing justice to the very thing it is created to explain. Sometimes it completely explains away, or even contradicts, what it set out to explain. This, of course, is quite unintentional; and to treat it as if it were more fundamental to the thinker's mind than the thing he is trying to explain is entirely unjustified.

4. The last objection we need consider is the one based on the use of words like symbol, figure, likeness, antitype, similitude, representation, etc., and the related verbs in Tertullian, *A.T.*, and quite a few later writers. On this several things need to be said.

(*a*) I should estimate the present state of the controversy over the intrinsic force of such words to be about this: that if Harnack and those who have followed him mean that such words never can express bare symbolism, they are wrong; and likewise if they mean that these words *of their own force* DEMAND that the thing signified should be in some way *really identical* with the symbol. On the other hand, his opponents are wrong

if they deny that they *easily can* and indeed *often do so*. And that is all that is needed to show the unsoundness of the objection. For, granted so much, this language becomes *ambiguous* language which consequently must not be used to evacuate unambiguous language of its natural—and certainly traditional—meaning. And besides the strong and abundant language expressing "identity" or "becoming" or realistic effects, there are other less frequent elements in our evidence which completely defy any purely symbolical interpretation. But once grant these "symbolical" words are capable of realistic force and the objection loses all its *prima facie* cogency. For we have no reason to set any *particular limits* to the realistic force they can bear.

(*b*) A very relevant consideration is the following:

The word "sacrament" as we know it, with its carefully defined meaning of an outward and visible sign *plus* an inward spiritual grace, both inseparably united into one "sacrament" which, when referred to by name, covers both parts, was not yet born. Neither was any cognate verb. But both were already sorely needed. And the language which creates our problem was probably the first efforts of the church's leaders to "feel around" after some suitable way of expressing the thought that was already theirs, and is quite likely of no more significance than that. Certainly it dies out as a more satisfactory terminology is developed.

(*c*) And after all, there is *some* difference between the sacramental body and the natural body, as St. Thomas would phrase it. Of course, at this early stage the matter would not be at all carefully thought out; but it would none the less be obvious at even a superficial glance that there was *some* difference, *some* kind of distinction. And so there would be an instinctive hesitation at times on the part of the thoughtful and a tendency to shrink a little[1] from calling the Eucharist without any

[1] How little difference is sufficient to impel a writer of those times to shrink from asserting baldly an identity, and to prefer instead one of these words we are studying, is evident from the way St. Paul can speak of Christ having come in the *likeness* of sinful flesh. In all probability it was to St. Paul's mind perfectly identical in every way with our flesh, except that it was not guilty of sin.

reserve at all simply "the body of Christ" or "the blood of Christ." This, taken with the lack of such an adequate term as sacrament, and the absence of any polemical motive for asserting the unqualified language in the teeth of really dissenting opponents, probably had a good deal to do with the use of the sort of language we are discussing.

(*d*) It is, finally, very probable that the things we considered about the beginning of theorizing and speculation on the Eucharistic presence at the end of the preceding objection are at least equally pertinent here. But enough, I hope, was said there; and there is no need to repeat it.

We seem justified in concluding, then, that the use of "symbolical" language is no proof of irrealism on the part even of those who use it, let alone on the part of the earlier tradition, which apparently did not use it at all.

I am not aware of any other serious objection to the conclusions we reached in the major portion of this chapter; and, as the objections seem, when examined, to break down, those conclusions may now claim our acceptance.

CHAPTER V

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES

THAT in the first two centuries the Eucharist was considered a sacrifice, and indeed the supreme Christian sacrifice, is obvious from a variety of considerations. This is already clear in St. Paul, but as a special section is devoted to him, I shall not dwell on him at any length here. We may summarize the other evidence very briefly.

1. It is called *θυσία*, *δῶρα*, *προσφορά*; and the verb related to the last is applied. Justin Martyr uses two of these.[1] St. Irenaeus calls it "the oblation of the new covenant" and speaks of it being "offered." [2] In *A.T.* such language is common and "the oblation" is used absolutely. But we are not limited to later writers. In *Didache*, 14 : 1, it is called a *θυσία*. Even as early as 1 Clement it is, surely, called *προσφορά*[3] as well as *δῶρα*,[4] and the verb *προσφέρω* is applied in the last context. St. Paul implies it by his argument in 1 Cor. x. 14-22.

2. Accordingly, it is interpreted as the fulfilment of Mal. i. 11 as early as *Didache*, 14 : 3, and possibly even in 1 Cor. x. 21. Justin has it,[5] and St. Irenaeus; [6] and it is a commonplace to later writers.

3. As early as St. Ignatius [7] and even Heb. xiii. the word altar is at least very closely connected with it, if not actually applied.

4. The minister of the Eucharist is called a priest or high-priest as early as Tertullian, Origen, and *A.T.* Indeed, the latter shows it must have been long in use before its actual appearance in extant documents. In *Didache* the apostolic prophets who celebrate the Eucharist with special privileges

[1] *Tryph.*, 41, 116, 117.
[2] *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xvii. 4-5.
[3] 1 *Clem.*, 36 : 1 and (?) 40 : 2.
[4] 1 *Clem.*, 44 : 4.
[5] *Tryph.*, 41, 116, 117.
[6] *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xviii. 5.
[7] *Eph.*, 5 : 2 ; *Trall.*, 7 : 2 (?) ; *Phil.*, 4.

are called high-priests. And in Justin, *Didache*, St. Ignatius, and 1 *Clement* the bishop (or bishops) to whom the term priest is first applied when it comes into use later are already the normal ministers of the Eucharist. St. Clement of Rome already seems to tremble on the verge of calling them priests, without quite doing it.[1]

5. In line with all this, the word ποιεῖτε in the Words of Institution is understood in the sacrificial sense (=to offer). This is inescapable in Justin, and happens thrice.[2] It is also much the most probable view to take of *A.T.*, St. Irenaeus, and even St. Paul (see the section on him, and Appendix IV on the three writers here named). And these are the only writers whose views are ascertainable. In a non-Eucharistic application the verb ποιεῖν also gets the sacrificial meaning in 1 *Clem.*, 40 : 4, and Justin, *Tryph.*, 117.

That the Eucharist is, then, *the* great Christian sacrifice from the time of the earliest available evidence that is relevant would seem clear. It remains to determine the sense in which this was conceived to be the case.

Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, St. Irenaeus, Athenagoras, *Diognetus*, Justin, Aristides, and *Barnabas* are at one in repudiating vigorously and scornfully all carnal or material sacrifices whether of pagans or Jews. Alongside of this, and in some of the very same writers, Christian belief, life, and worship in its broadest sense are regarded as spiritual sacrifices, and the sacrificial terminology is applied to them. These facts are not disputed, so it will not be necessary to pause for quotations and references. In some of these writers [3] it even seems to be said that prayers, praise, thanksgivings, etc., are

[1] He compares them to the O.T. priesthood, and with the Eucharist especially in mind. He urges the rebels not to exceed "each one his appointed limits." He recalls the Korah episode as a warning. He calls Jesus the high-priest of our offerings, which must at least include the Eucharist. He makes the Christian Ministry the "successor" of Christ as Christ is of God. He has them "offer the gifts." He even speaks surprisingly of them as "offering the gifts of the episcopate" as if the connection of those gifts with the episcopate was very rigid. Surely the word priest must have come very near rolling off his tongue in reference to them.

[2] *Tryph.*, 41 and 70 (twice).

[3] E.g. Justin, 1 *Apol.*, 13, and *Tryph.*, 117; also Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xvii. 4.

the *only* sacrifices truly perfect and acceptable to God; and hence, we would suppose, the only ones Christians offered. It might be supposed at first sight that this limited the sense in which the Eucharist was called a sacrifice (as we saw above) to its prayers, praise, thanksgiving, etc., and excluded any sacrificial significance being attached to the elements (whether as consecrated or as mere bread and wine). But this inference is certainly untenable.

1. The "δῶρα of the Episcopate" in 1 *Clem.*, 44 : 4, must be at least the Eucharistic elements, and possibly alms and other material offerings as well (cf. the many offerings in *A.T.*).

2. Justin definitely speaks of the Eucharistic elements as being offered.[1]

3. It is made clear beyond any possible doubt in St. Irenaeus, whose whole argument [2] would be shattered by its negation. He even affirms in set words that oblations as such (*genus oblationum*) are not abolished in Christianity. He certainly has in mind at least the Eucharistic elements, and probably also such lesser objective oblations as we find in *A.T.*

4. In the latter document (*A.T.*) the presence of objective material oblations, of many kinds but with the Eucharistic oblation holding a complete hegemony among them, is so clear that I believe no one questions it. And its early date and conservative traditionalistic character make it a powerful confirmation of our conclusions on other writers of (say) 150-200 A.D.

Besides, while it is not a *necessary* interpretation of the Malachi prophecy, it is surely most natural to suppose that, once it came to be applied to the Eucharist at all, the "incense" would be interpreted [3] of the prayers of the saints, and the "pure offering" of the Eucharistic elements. And we do indeed find that *Did.*, 14 : 3, and St. Irenaeus,[4] carefully omitting the "incense," interpret the καί as meaning "and," not "even," and expressly apply the "pure offering" to the Eucharist.

[1] *Tryph.*, 41 and 70 (twice).
[2] *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xvii.-xviii. See my summary of his argument below, p. 119.
[3] As in John., *Apoc.*, and Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xvii. 6.
[4] *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xviii.

Even *Barnabas* and Athenagoras, who seem among the most uncompromising, are not without passages which at least *may* very well be Eucharistic.[1]

It seems, then, that some of the same writers who repudiate carnal sacrifices among pagans and Jews admit objective, material sacrifices among Christians, of which the Eucharistic elements are the chief by far, if not the only one. If an unresolved contradiction seems to reside here, it should probably be attributed partly to one-sidedness in particular passages due to the accidents of controversy, partly to the fact that in the Eucharist the effect of the prayers and thanksgivings so transforms and differentiates the objective oblations as to give grounds for a basic distinction from the objective sacrifices in other religions. It is noteworthy that at least once in Justin the apparent assertion of the exclusively sacrificial character of prayers, thanksgivings, etc., becomes almost immediately tied up inseparably with the Eucharistic memorial of the sacrifice of Christ's Death and Passion. This last point leads to the observation that surely the very objective sacrifice of our Lord's Passion and Death was in no way excluded by these merely one-sided statements.

If, then, such statements in *some* writers do not prove a rejection of objective sacrifices, especially that of the Eucharistic elements, in Christianity, as proved by what they elsewhere say, we cease to have any reason to construe them as such a repudiation even in those writers who do not happen elsewhere to supply the corrective to their own unbalanced remarks. We are in a position, then, to conclude that the Christian sacrifice *par excellence* was the Eucharist; and that it was such not only in virtue of the prayers and thanksgivings that it included but also because of the accompanying objective oblation of the

[1] The latter says: "Yet it is right to offer a bloodless sacrifice and to present our reasonable service" (Supp. 13). And *Barnabas* (*Ep. of Bar.*, 2 : 6) says: "These things therefore He annulled, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . might have its oblation not made with hands." The passages could refer to Christian belief, life and worship alone; and Dr. Stone seems so to take them. But even so, the Eucharist would probably be in the foreground of their thought as the supreme act of Christian worship. And an exclusively Eucharistic reference in both cases is neither impossible nor, I think, improbable.

elements. It remains only to inquire whether these were conceived to be offered as *mere* bread and wine or as *consecrated* bread and wine, i.e. as "Eucharist." Put in another way, were they offered only before consecration?

I think our studies in the early liturgy will, almost by themselves, enable us to answer this question. We saw there that the Eucharist was a sacrifice, and so included an oblation, long before any explicit "Oblation prayer" found its way into the liturgy. It is further very probable that the original thanksgiving over the elements not so much *accompanied* an (as yet) unexpressed act of oblation as *actually was itself* that act. At least as late as *A.T.*, 26, in the reference to the catechumens "offering each his own cup" at the Agape, we get a clear attestation of the conception and usage that to give thanks over the cup *is* to offer it. Moreover, this seems likely to have come straight through from the Jewish background, and hence to have been the primitive view. This is, it may be added, closely similar to the case of the *Epiclesis*. There too we saw that the primitive thanksgiving prayer *was* the "consecration," and was believed to effect the tremendous Eucharistic change long before it contained any explicit petition either for consecration or for a change in the elements. Thus the primitive Eucharistic prayer was already in and of itself, at one and the same time, *implicitly* both a consecration of the elements and an oblation of them, long before it was *explicitly* either; certainly at least as a regular thing.

Now if we are right in supposing that the oblation consisted not in some essential *physical action* with the elements, but in the thanksgiving to God for them and over them, it will follow that in the primitive liturgy there was no "minor oblation" at all, not even implicitly, but only one oblation, the "major oblation" of the "consecrated" elements. For one and the same prayer "consecrated" and "offered" them. The evidence all looks in this direction. In *A.T.* the only "offering" mentioned in reference to the unconsecrated elements is the "offering" of them by the deacon to the bishop. They are offered *to God* for the first and only time by the bishop by means of the consecratory thanksgiving prayer. The fact that

by that date certain elements originally only implicit have become explicit does not alter our main conclusion; it certainly *cannot* for earlier times, as can be seen at once by supposing the *procedure* described in *A.T.* to be carried out with *earlier forms of prayer*, e.g. those of the *Didache*. Besides, the actual prayer-forms for the "minor oblation" are admittedly much later than even the *explicit* prayer-forms for the "major oblation."

Thus we seem forced to conclude that the only oblation of the elements, to God, in the primitive liturgy was the offering of the consecrated elements. For it was precisely the "consecration prayer" that primitively "offered" them. Thus they are not offered as unconsecrated but as consecrated.

That this conclusion is correct seems to receive very strong confirmation from the fact (which I believe to be indubitable) that they were *offered for a memorial* of the Lord's Passion, or, more generally, of the Lord Himself. It is not merely that they were "offered" *and, in addition, were* a memorial, etc. But they were *offered* FOR *a memorial*, i.e. the offering and the memorial are inseparable. Hence they can only be offered as *Eucharist*; i.e. as consecrated, as being the body and blood of Christ (or the "antitypes" thereof, if one prefers). For it is only *as such* that they *in any way whatever* constitute or make a "memorial," either of our Lord Himself, or of His Passion, Resurrection, or Incarnation. Nowhere in the entire ante-Nicene church (or even much later, I believe) is there any faintest hint that the *unconsecrated* elements in any way whatsoever are or represent the body and blood of Christ.

Let us then collect the evidence to show that in the church of the first two centuries the Eucharist was believed to be "offered for a memorial" and not merely that it was a sacrifice and a memorial (two separate or at least distinct things).

1. Justin distinctly says[1] that the meal-offering (of the O.T.) was "a type of the bread of the Eucharist which, *for a memorial of the Passion* . . . our Lord delivered *to be offered*, etc." Again,[2] "Now it is clear that in this prophecy also reference is made to the bread which our Christ delivered to

[1] *Tryph.*, 41. [2] *Tryph.*, 70.

us *to offer for a memorial*[1] of His having become *incarnate* for the sake of those who believe on Him, for whose sake also He became subject to *suffering*; and to the cup, which He delivered to us *to offer* in the Eucharist (lit. 'Eucharistizing') *for a memorial*[1] of His blood."

2. Likewise in *A.T.*, 4 : 11, the idea of the memorial and of the offering are inseparably connected. After the ending of the Institution Narrative in *A.T.*, 4 : 10, with "as often as ye perform this, perform my memorial," it proceeds at once: "Having in memory, therefore, His death and resurrection, we *offer* to thee the bread and the cup, etc." I have used the commonly received translation. But if, as seems to me much the most probable view, we translate "do" or "perform" as "offer" and take the memorial as objective, as I argue in Appendix IV should be done, we get the even clearer sequence, "as often as ye offer this, ye offer (or 'offer') my memorial. Therefore, making the memorial . . . we offer to thee the bread and the cup, etc." Thus we have in Justin the clearest conceivable *doctrinal* expression given to the point, and in *A.T.* the clearest *liturgical* expression.

3. As a more general point, which applies at least to St. Paul, Justin, St. Irenaeus, and *A.T.*, and probably to the whole tradition of the first two centuries, we must remember that the sacrificial meaning put upon ποιεῖτε makes the Institution Narrative itself conclude: "*Offer* this for my memorial." The determinative force of this for the belief of the early church would be just about decisive, even if we lacked the direct evidence of Justin and Hippolytus.

4. Finally, we can solve much more easily the superficial contradiction noted above between the repudiation of carnal or objective sacrifices and the recognition of the Eucharistic elements as being offered if we admit that they were "offered" *as a memorial of the sacrifice* of Calvary and not as being, in their own nature, independent and purely material sacrifices, which as mere bread and wine they would surely be.

[1] In these two cases it is hard to believe he means anything different than he would have meant had he said explicitly "offered as *antitypes* of Christ's flesh and blood."

In view of all this evidence, then, it would be quite unjustifiable to attempt to contend for an essentially different meaning in those writers who recognize both the memorial and the sacrificial aspects of the Eucharist, but do not happen to have made express mention of the essential linkage between these two. Thus our premise that in early belief the Eucharist was "*offered as a memorial*" seems securely proved.

We get still further confirmation of our view that the Eucharistic elements were offered *as consecrated*, not as mere bread and wine, from the prevalent sacrificial interpretation of ποιεῖτε in the Institution Narrative. Just above we used this to show that the elements were "offered" *as a memorial.* We shall now use it to prove an added point. Let us note that as soon as we take ποιεῖτε to mean "offer" instead of "do" we automatically change the meaning of τοῦτο from "this action" to "this object." Now this at once makes it refer to the object just declared to "be" Christ's body or blood. We get the sequence: "This is my body. Offer this, etc."

Indeed, we have already seen above, in Chapter III, that one of the functions of the Institution Narrative in the early Anaphora, before it came to be considered consecratory, was to give the authority for what the church was doing, *and to define its nature and significance.* This is especially clear in Serapion, a little more than a century after Hippolytus, where the words "This is My body . . . My blood" are used *formally and explicitly* to *prove* that what is being offered is the body and blood of Christ. But it is probable even in *A.T.*, especially if we admit the translation "offer" instead of "do" or "perform."

Thus the high *a priori* probability based on the prevalent interpretation of the Institution Narrative—"*This* is My body . . . My blood. Offer *this*, etc."—seems to be confirmed by the two earliest extant liturgies that contain it.

We have already noted above, as our fourth reason for holding that the Eucharistic elements were *offered as a memorial* and not as independent material sacrifices, the fact that this would make more comprehensible the sweeping rejection of all carnal and objective sacrifices by the early Fathers in their

controversies with the Jews and pagans. I wish to emphasize this again in our present broader connection—that of showing that the Eucharistic elements were "offered" as consecrated, and not as mere unconsecrated bread and wine. In fact, if the latter had been the conception of these early Fathers it seems very difficult to doubt that they would have given an entirely different answer from the one they actually gave in reply to the attack on the ground that they had no sacrifices. They could then have replied that, although they did not have animal sacrifices, they did indeed have sacrifices of bread and wine. And their opponents would have been able to retort but poorly, for some of their sacrifices were of the same nature. Since, however, the Fathers would have had to give the (from their opponents' viewpoint) vulnerable answer that their sacrifice was a memorial of Christ's Passion, we can understand that they replied as they did, i.e. by repudiating and condemning all carnal or objective sacrifices on principle, because God had no need of them, etc.

If our view helps to explain their repudiation of carnal and objective sacrifices, it also helps us to reconcile their correlative insistence that prayers, thanksgivings, etc., are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices in God's sight with their clear recognition of an objective sacrifice of the Eucharistic elements. For it was the Anaphora, composed of these prayers and thanksgivings, which made the Eucharistic elements into something essentially different from and superior to mere carnal or material objective sacrifices. The consecratory force of the thanksgiving prayer over the bread and wine supplies the resolution of the apparent contradiction.

There was also the added point that the Eucharistic memorial of the Passion provided the means of applying and the occasion of pleading the sacrifice of Calvary. For, given a broad acceptation, to praise, glorify, and thank God for that His chief, and all His other benefits, was and is as true a pleading of the sacrifice of Calvary as the later dominant practice of basing petitions on that sacrifice. The practice dominant in earlier times, with a more jubilant and less introspective confidence, simply takes for granted that God, for the merits

of His Son's Passion, has given or will give us all these benefits, and proceeds to thank Him and glorify Him for the same.

Yet another point that our view will help to explain is the complete predominance of the Eucharist among all the objective sacrifices of the early Christians. Such a view as I am supposing, *coupled with* the fact of its Dominical institution, is a much more adequate and satisfying explanation than the possible alternative that though it was merely a material sacrifice of simple unconsecrated bread and wine, yet it had Dominical institution and the others had not, and hence it was immeasurably superior to them. In fact, if the latter is the correct answer to our present question, it raises a serious problem in regard to the repudiation of material sacrifices among the Jews. For they are repudiated as well by those who do *not* hold that the Jews misunderstood God's will and meaning in offering these sacrifices commanded in the O.T. as by those who do so hold, with the help of an extreme allegorizing interpretation. On the view of the former, the Jewish sacrifices could all have claimed Divine institution. St. Irenaeus even argues [1] that our Lord "witnessed to the prophets that they preached the truth" in their negative attitude toward objective sacrifices. It surely seems incredible that in the face of this view he should have held that our Lord Himself had instituted a purely material sacrifice of the sort St. Irenaeus thought He had condemned.

Besides these more general reasons, which apply to the whole tradition, there are several special indications in particular writers that they thought of the Eucharistic elements as offered not as unconsecrated but as consecrated, i.e. as Eucharist, consisting (in St. Irenaeus' words) of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly.

1. St. Irenaeus in IV. xviii. 4 says: "The church alone offers this pure oblation [2] to the Creator, offering to Him, *with giving of thanks*, of His (own) creation." No doubt a looser interpretation is possible; but the view that the "giving of thanks" is of the essence of the oblation, due to its consecratory effect, seems the most likely.

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xvii. 4. [2] I.e. of course the Eucharistic Oblation.

This will receive confirmation from a passage [1] which also makes its own contribution to our present point. He asks there how can the Gnostics, on their premises, "be assured that this bread over which thanks have been given is the body of their Lord and the cup . . . His blood?" Then he asks how they can assert the corruptibility of the flesh that has been nourished from the Lord's body and blood. Then he at once draws the conclusion: "Either they must change their views or renounce the said oblations." Here the inability to admit the high sacramental doctrine of the church is treated as one of several reasons requiring the renouncing of the Eucharistic Oblation. This would not follow if they were "offered" as mere bread and wine.[2]

Again he says: "Moreover, giving to His disciples counsel to offer first-fruits to God . . . He took bread . . . and gave thanks saying, 'This is My body.' And the cup similarly . . . He declared to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Covenant." Here it seems that what our Lord declared them to be is intimately related to their being the new Oblation of the New Covenant. And this is all easily understood if we admit that it is *Eucharist* which is offered, and not just bread and wine later to become Eucharist.

2. Hippolytus seems clearly to think of the Eucharist as in some sense a propitiatory sacrifice. Now such it could hardly have been as an offering of *mere* bread and wine. But as a memorial of the propitiatory sacrificial Passion of Christ the conclusion is not only easy but inevitable. But are we not too bold in saying that the Eucharist was already looked upon as a *propitiatory* sacrifice? I think not, for we have two pieces of

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xviii. 4 (end)-5.

[2] Even if it be suggested that "renounce the said oblations" is simply a synonym for "give up the Eucharist," still is it at all likely this mode of synonymous reference would ever have been adopted if it had been thought that it was only in a minor aspect and in a stage *before* the thanksgiving had made them the body and blood of Christ that they were really oblations? But the Greek, which is here fortunately preserved, seems to make the argument even surer. For it has literally "to *offer* the aforesaid (things)" τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα, i.e. they must cease to offer them. Now a reference to the full text shows that unless we go a long way back indeed, only "the body and blood of Christ" or "*the bread over which thanks have been given*" are available as "the aforementioned (things)."

evidence to that effect. (*a*) The phrase in the Ordination prayer for the bishop, "to propitiate thy countenance without ceasing," can hardly be denied to have at least a primary Eucharistic reference, especially when so closely coupled with the immediately following clause, "and to offer thee the gifts of thy holy church." (*b*) There is the passage in 36 : 1-3, in which we read: "Therefore in the old (Covenant) the law commanded the shewbread to be offered continually for a type of the body and blood of Christ, and commanded the sacrifice of the dumb lamb, which was a type of the perfect lamb; for Christ is the Shepherd, as He is also the bread that came down from heaven."

We should take this passage along with the one in Justin in which he tells us that "the meal-offering . . . was a type of the bread of the Eucharist which . . . Jesus Christ . . . delivered to be offered . . . for a memorial of (His) Passion." These two passages are too similar to be dissociated. But while in the latter there might conceivably be some slight doubt as to whether the Eucharistic bread was in mind as consecrated or unconsecrated, in the passage from *A.T.* no doubt at all is possible. If there is a Eucharistic reference at all, it is to the Eucharist as the body of Christ, not as mere bread and wine. And I do not see how we can reasonably doubt that there is at least a secondary, if not actually a primary Eucharistic reference in *A.T.*, 36 : 1-3. This seems to me inescapable for two reasons. First of all, as I have said, the passage is too similar to that of Justin not to mean fundamentally the same thing. The difference in the O.T. type used is purely incidental, and a minor matter, which does not affect the fundamental solidarity.[1] Then, secondly, it is only through the medium of the Eucharistic Bread and Cup as being

[1] In fact, in *Tryph.*, 70, Justin has found another O.T. bread which he promptly makes a "type" of the Eucharist. It seems perfectly clear to me that it is due to the Eucharist that any bread mentioned in the O.T. is likely to be seized upon as a type or prophecy. And in *A.T.*, 36 : 3, it is vital to notice that while the lamb is the type of Christ yet the shewbread is the type not "of Christ" but of the *body and blood* of Christ. Surely the Eucharistic reference cannot be avoided. It may be well to add that in all probability John vi. was to Hippolytus Eucharistic, so that the quotation thence does not help to avoid or even weaken the conclusion; it rather strengthens it.

truly the antitypes of the body and blood of Christ that the typology seems at all comprehensible. The fact that he stresses that the shewbread was to be "offered continually" for the type increases the likelihood of a Eucharistic reference, because it is then the type of the Christian antitype which we know was also offered continually.[1]

As I attempt to reconstruct the writer's thought, he looks upon the shewbread as the type, as distinguished from the antitype, which is the Eucharist. This in turn is *in some way* to be distinguished from the body and blood of Christ in heaven, as He appears continually before God on our behalf. The antitype does not differ from the heavenly reality in any such way implying a *real non-identity* as the type does. Yet for all that, there is *some* kind of distinction to be granted. And I do not suppose Hippolytus had thought the matter out much further.

Such a view of the Eucharist implies of course that it is propitiatory. It is the shewbread of the Passion. Just as the *consecrated elements* of the Eucharist are antitypes of the *victim* of Calvary, so the *sacrificial act* of the Eucharist is an antitype or likeness of the *sacrificial act*—the Death—of Calvary. And so it is (commemoratively) a propitiatory sacrifice.

3. In view of this, and remembering what we said above about the possibility of pleading the sacrifice of Calvary by giving thanks for it, we cannot, I think, miss the same meaning in Justin. He says [2] that Christ gave us the Eucharistic bread to be offered as a memorial of His Passion "so that we might at the same time give thanks to God for . . . (creation) . . . and *for His having freed us* from the evil in which we had come to be, etc." It is not the bread as mere bread but as a "memorial of the Passion," as a "memorial of Christ's being made flesh and of His blood," which is offered as the basis and occasion of such a "thanksgiving-plea."

4. The same inference is probable from the evidence of Tertullian, who, in addition to language which shows he shares the general view that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, speaks of it being "offered" for emperors, for the dead, etc. This is much

[1] Cf. ". . . to propitiate thy countenance *without ceasing*."
[2] *Tryph.*, 41.

more easily understood of applying or "pleading" the sacrifice of Calvary through its memorial than of offering mere bread and wine on their behalf as a material sacrifice.

5. St. Paul also, as we shall see more fully in Chapter VI, contains clear indications of the higher view of the Eucharistic sacrifice. To him also it is a dramatic, realistic, objective memorial of the Passion, and the Christian sacrifice. And by feeding on their sacrifice which is the "one bread," the Eucharistic elements, Christians are brought into a strictly realistic, even metaphysical, communion with Christ. But surely it is as the body of Christ, not as mere bread, that their sacrifice produces this effect. Thus it is as the body of Christ and not as mere bread that it is the Christian sacrifice.

Thus there are at least five writers or sources which contain separate individual indications of the higher view of the Eucharistic sacrifice. When added to the general evidence of relevant points in the tradition as a whole, they seem very cogent indeed.

But before we can leave our subject we must hear certain objections. The first of these will, incidentally, cause us to elucidate more precisely just what we conceive this "higher doctrine" of the Eucharistic sacrifice to have been. For therein will lie the answer to the most plausible objection that can be raised.

The objection is, if the early fathers held the view you attribute to them, why does not at least one of them give expression to it at least once? They are perfectly capable of clear and definite language when they wish to use it.

But what is it I suppose them to have held? Not that doctrine which we find in the medieval and later theologians; at least not in its developed and elaborated form. But rather its premises only, and in an undeveloped and quite unreflecting form. They held, as I read the evidence, that *in the strictest of all senses* the Eucharist was not a sacrifice at all, but only the *memorial* of a sacrifice. Thus it was not a substantive and independent sacrifice, in its higher aspect, at all. *In this sense,* both the prayers and thanksgivings, and even the material oblations, in themselves, as unconsecrated, were more truly

sacrifices than the Eucharistic memorial of the Passion of Christ. Nor would anyone be so bold, that being the case, as to speak of "offering Christ" in the Eucharist, or even of "offering the body and blood of Christ"? They would shrink from this, not because they did not believe that τοῦτο, which they "offered" in obedience to Christ's command, was, as He said, His body and blood; but because it would sound too much like an independent and fresh sacrifice of Christ. And to them, as to us, it was a simple commonplace that "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more"; and that He "made there by His one oblation of Himself once offered a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, etc."

Besides, it is writ large upon every page of the history of dogma that the Christians were in many matters very slow to see the implications and to draw the logical conclusions which lie, beyond any doubt, just below the surface of their conscious and explicit belief and thought. And even for a medieval theologian the expression to "offer Christ" or "His body and blood" is not without its explanations and its qualifications. There can be little wonder, then, that the early Christians shrank from saying what, with the help of multitudinous qualifications and the use of carefully guarded technical terms, later theology found it possible—*and vital*—to say.

But all this does not abolish certain other equally indubitable facts. They do—as we have established at length above—hold that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. They do hold that it is such *as a memorial of the Passion* and not *merely* as a sacrifice of prayer and praise or of unconsecrated (i.e. *mere*) bread and wine. And they do hold that it is a memorial of the Passion not merely as a mental, subjective, *recalling* of the Passion, but as an *objective*, vivid, dramatic *memorial* or *representation* of the Passion made by offering the Eucharistic elements which are the sacrificed body and blood of Christ, or at least the realistically understood antitypes. Because the *elements* are such, the action "makes the likeness" of His sacrificial Death, as Serapion so well says, giving expression therein not merely to his own belief and that of his age, but to that of the entire general tradition as far back as our evidence enables us to

trace it. It is even "offered for" particular persons or purposes and deemed in some sense propitiatory. Thus, if it is certain that no one before St. Cyprian gives definite expression to the later developed theology, it is hardly less certain that that theology is fully and clearly *implicit* in what the earlier writers *do* believe, and that the *premises* of the development are not only implicit but actually explicit in their belief.

Furthermore, the proposition must not be allowed to go unchallenged that these early writers speak only of offering bread and wine or prayers and thanksgivings but never of the higher kind of sacrifice. For it is never just "bread" and "wine" that are said to be offered, but "*the* bread" and "*the* cup," or "*this* bread" or "the bread *of the Eucharist.*" And we know (see Chapter IV) that they just precisely did not believe "*this* food," "*the* bread," "*this* cup," "the bread *of the Eucharist*," etc., to be *mere* bread, but infinitely more—the true body and blood of Christ. Passages are not wanting in which the sacramental rather than sacrificial aspect is in view, and in which by consequence it is certain the *consecrated* elements are meant, yet they are called "bread" and "wine" or "the cup" or "food," [1] when we might expect "the body of Christ" or "the blood of Christ." I mention this only to show that they shrank somewhat at this early date from *modes of expression* clearly justified by their belief.

A second objection is that since in the earliest known liturgies the Oblation precedes the *Epiclesis* which was the consecration, therefore the elements were offered as (still) unconsecrated bread and wine.

This objection falls, of course, with the results arrived at in Chapter III that not the *Epiclesis* but the whole Anaphora was in those early times deemed the consecration. Especially will it be clear that this objection could not be raised for the period before either an Oblation or an *Epiclesis* was included in the Anaphora. But that being granted, and the irregular, varying, and largely incidental character of their early penetration being considered, their *order* when they did first gain entrance could

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. x. 15-17, xi. 27-29; Justin 1 *Apol.*, 65-66; *A.T.*, 23 : 7 and probably 23 : 5.

not have been of any significance either. That order, in fact, as we saw in Chapter III, was determined not at all by theological, but by logical or chronological considerations.

Now, such being the case, it will follow that even after they did become rigidly fixed parts of the Anaphora, and the Institution Narrative or the *Epiclesis* came, in the West and East respectively, to be considered the definite "moment of consecration," still their position before or after the Oblation was not thought to have any bearing at all—let alone any essential bearing—on the nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice. For were not East and West already at one on the doctrine of the sacrifice? And did the emergence of different "moments of consecration" in both, one before and one after the Oblation, affect this in the slightest degree?

As a matter of fact, the time element was quite unimportant, because quite unattended to in the early centuries. When later it was attended to, the West had already developed a theory of consecration which left it free from any difficulty in the matter. As to the East, she solved the problem by a philosophical, super-temporal explanation. But primitively it was not so much a matter of a well-thought-out, super-temporal explanation of the problem, as that there simply was no problem. And even after it came into existence it seems not to have been adverted to for quite a while.

Thus, in Serapion I should hold the *Epiclesis* is probably still not the consecration. But that is by no means a necessary premise in order to show the fallacy of the objection we are considering. Serapion quotes the words of Christ to prove that the elements being offered *are* the likeness or similitude of His body and blood. Then afterwards comes what from its wording sounds like a petition for the consecration. In other words, whether the *Epiclesis* is the consecration or not, the elements are offered *as being* what it is next prayed they may become. This shows decisively of how little importance the time sequence is in the early liturgies. Nor can this truth be avoided by saying that the first *Epiclesis* was the consecration. For in that case it is later prayed that the elements may become what they have already been made by consecration.

Finally, it will not do to suggest that this "later super-temporal [1] view" is due to the necessities of fitting recalcitrant liturgies or their fixed framework into a sacrificial doctrine later than and essentially different from that they were originally designed to express. It is due rather, as said above, to the fact that the position of the *Epiclesis* after the Oblation is due originally in no way whatsoever to doctrinal reasons but to reasons utterly unrelated to any such considerations. The Oblation came just after the Words of Institution because it was explained by, and offered in obedience to, those words. And the *Epiclesis* came after the *Anamnesis*, which was inseparably associated with the Oblation, because, mention having been made in the *Anamnesis* of the Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, mention of the Holy Spirit was naturally due next on purely chronological grounds, and had already, *as a subject for thanksgiving*, won a place in the Anaphora. When a Spirit-*Epiclesis* was introduced, then, it naturally took this position within the whole Anaphora; and its location with respect to the Oblation was—as far as any sacrificial significance goes—purely fortuitous.

It is only the emergence of a definite theory of a particular moment of consecration which could ever suggest any such doctrinal inference as that proposed by the objection with which we are dealing. And if it had not done so in the East, *where it was in the process of prevailing*, by the time of Serapion, it is surely completely untenable to suggest that it had done so a full century and a quarter earlier in *A.T.* and in the West, where it was not prevailing and never was to prevail. It seems then that on all counts the second objection must be disallowed.

The third objection, and the only remaining one I think we shall need to consider, is that at least St. Irenaeus definitely, repeatedly, and emphatically stresses that what the Christians offer is firstfruits of God's creation, and that of course means bread and wine *as* bread and wine. Moreover, when it occurs to him that what he has been saying against material sacrifices amongst non-Christians requires some defence in view of the

[1] I doubt if it is yet really quite that, even in Serapion. It is, I believe, even in him, a problem unattended to rather than rationalized.

fact that Christians too have material sacrifices, he gives not the answer a "higher" sacrificial doctrine would have enabled him to give, but a very different one—that Christians offered them not as slaves but as freemen. This objection really has two quite distinct parts. We shall take them separately.

As to the first, I have no doubt that such stress in a modern writer would, unless under special conditions, constitute conclusive proof that he had in mind the antithesis hotly debated since the Reformation: "Is it the body and blood of Christ which are offered *or* is it mere bread and wine?" But to read any such antithesis into the mind of St. Irenaeus is utterly unhistorical. He has as his primary controversy a debate about the resurrection of the flesh: and back of this the still more fundamental controversy about the whole material creation, whether it is good or evil, and whether it could come and does come from the good God, the God of the New Testament and Father of Jesus.

Now he thinks he finds in the Eucharist a crushing set of arguments against the heresy of Gnosticism. First of all, how could they be sure Jesus has the *power* to make mere bread and wine become His body and blood, if He is not the *Creative* Logos. Secondly, if Jesus were the Son of another God than of Him who created the material world, then not only the *power* over it, but also the *right* to it, would be lacking in Him. To take from another's creation and make it one's own is immoral. It is unjust and covetous. Thirdly, the Eucharist provides a perfect illustration of the union of the material universe with the heavenly, thus giving an added proof that it is good and from the good God, and not from some evil demi-urge. This also carries with it the principle needed to justify belief in the resurrection of the flesh.

Hence it is *as being firstfruits* of the creation, but *not* as being *mere* firstfruits, that St. Irenaeus needs to use them in his argument. But he nowhere stresses or says or even so much as hints or implies in the faintest possible way that they are *mere* firstfruits. And in fact it would weaken his argument, if anything, if they were. It would totally destroy *one* of his three arguments, the third one noted just above.

As to the second part, St. Irenaeus cannot give an answer that would do only for the Eucharist. For we know from the practically contemporary Hippolytus that the Christians had other objective sacrifices besides the Eucharistic elements. Hence, though St. Irenaeus is speaking of the Eucharist, he was obliged to give an answer that could cover these other sacrifices as well.

It does not appear, then, that any valid objection can be raised against our conclusions developed above about the sacrificial beliefs of the first two centuries. These conclusions are further confirmed by the way they help us to explain certain points in Church History not otherwise so easily explained.

1. If the view I have explained and defended be rejected, then there is a complete chasm in the development of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice that remains to be bridged. For the evidence seems overwhelming that in the fourth century such a view, *only in a much more developed form*, was accepted universally, unchallenged by anyone, and already of immemorial standing in the church. Our third-century evidence is vague and ambiguous except in St. Cyprian, so that we seem to be left with two alternatives. Either we can interpret the ambiguous third-century evidence in line with St. Cyprian; and the second-century evidence as I have been urging; and thus get a steady, rectilinear, uphill development to the state of doctrine we find in the fourth century, without any radical breaches or chasms to be explained and bridged. Or we can put upon the second-century evidence the interpretation I have rejected, and interpret the ambiguous third-century evidence in line with this. Then we must treat St. Cyprian as the point for an almost totally new departure, which nevertheless, despite the tenacious conservatism of the ecclesiastical tradition, has completely triumphed over the doctrine of the first two hundred years and more of Christianity, on a universal scale, and without any signs of protest or controversy, in about one hundred years (or even, I think considerably less). Such a view as this latter seems to me unlikely in the extreme.

2. It explains why the sacerdotal terminology was so long in being applied to the ministers of the Eucharist, and why

when it finally was applied, the conception was one of a "ministerial priesthood" [1] rather than of absolute priesthood in the pagan or Jewish sense.

On the other hand, the view I am rejecting would put the triumph of the Cyprianic-Cyrilian-Serapionic doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice much later than the triumph of the application of sacerdotal terminology to the ministry of the Eucharist. But in reality, as suggested just above, it seems likely to have been the effect rather than the cause of such a doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and of a fairly advanced stage of it at that.

Our final conclusion must be, I think, that the doctrine [2] of the Eucharistic sacrifice I have ascribed to the church of the first two centuries is strongly attested by direct and indirect evidence bearing on the immediate point, and confirmed by historical considerations of a more general nature.

[1] To use Dr. Moberly's convenient and excellent phrase.
[2] For the statement of it see above, pp. 114-116.

CHAPTER VI

ST. JOHN, HEBREWS, AND ST. PAUL

IT was the common opinion of the author of this thesis and of the professor under whom it was undertaken that the subject of the Eucharist in the New Testament had been so thoroughly canvassed from such diverse points of view that there was very little chance either of doing anything "original" such as was required for a Doctor's dissertation, or of reaching any truly decisive results at all from within the N.T. evidence itself. But I hoped that by exploring as thoroughly as I could the five surrounding fields considered in the preceding chapters and their appendices, I might be able to throw some new light into the N.T. itself, or at least determine with greater certainty which of the already proposed viewpoints was to be preferred. It is now time to proceed to the complicated questions raised by the N.T. evidence, to see whether with the light gained from our studies in the surrounding territory we can make any progress with St. John, Hebrews, and St. Paul. I believe we shall find our results so far achieved will help not a little. But it may be well to call attention to the fact that some very important results for the first century have already been reached above in Chapters II and III, even though the N.T. evidence there played only a comparatively minor part in giving those results. Thus we already seem richly rewarded for our excursions into the adjoining region. Let us now inquire, however, what added light they throw into the N.T. evidence itself, as distinguished from the N.T. period already often invaded above. And let us begin with St. John's writings.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

We shall not waste time considering the theories which are based on a more or less high historical estimate of the dis-

course as really proceeding from Jesus. It would not, it must be conceded, be so easy to deny the possibility of some sort of historical or semi-historical *nucleolus*; especially if allowance be made for confusion of occasions, and perhaps conflation of ideas or nucleolar conceptions originally spoken on more than one occasion.

The Discourse is Eucharistic, at least in part. Just what part is much more disputable; and I feel that for our purposes it is comparatively unimportant. However, I shall simply state my own conclusions with little argument. I believe there is a very real element of truth in both the extreme views, one of which holds that only a very small part of the sixth chapter is Eucharistic (e.g. 53-56—Batiffol) while the other makes the whole chapter so.

The former seems to me right in the sense that the Eucharist is not being directly or explicitly referred to until we come to 51*b* or possibly even 53. Thus in verses 35-47 all the references to *beholding, hearing, learning, believing, coming, and being drawn* seem clearly to indicate some modes of appropriating the Bread of Life wider than the Eucharistic. And verses 27 and 29, "*work for* the food, etc." and "This is the work of God, that ye *believe*, etc." confirm this strongly.

Yet I cannot think that even in verses 22-51 the Eucharist is "entirely absent," for the reasons given in the footnote.[1] And the section 51-59 (or at least 53-56) is indubitably Eucharistic. Moreover, those critics who, in order to preserve the unity of the Discourse, have attempted to extend the plausible "purely spiritual" meaning of the first part throughout the chapter have at least been influenced by a sound principle. The chapter should be interpreted as a unit if it can.

I would suggest that the unity of the Discourse, and of the whole chapter, is best preserved by recognizing that while St. John is in truth referring primarily in the first part to faith in

[1] Thus the manna is a more natural type for the literal bread of the Eucharist than for Christ's person spoken of under the metaphor of bread. Again, while we usually get the present tense, we get the future in verses 27 and 51, and in both cases it is Christ and not the Father who *will give* it. Once again, we get in verse 27 the ambiguous "food" instead of simply "bread," and the words "hunger" *and* "*thirst*" in verse 35, although there has been up to that time no question of any drink.

Jesus' Messiahship and Divine Sonship (and possibly in verse 51 to faith in His redeeming Passion), yet even here he is saying all this for one ultimate purpose—to lead up to the primarily Eucharistic portion in what he deemed apologetically the most effective way. It is not simply a matter of going on from one truth to deal with a second (the Passion) and finally with a third (the Eucharist). Rather St. John thinks it greatly lessens the difficulty of the Eucharist and strengthens it apologetically to set it on a background of the broader truth of the Passion; and that in turn upon the still broader truth of Jesus' pre-existent and Divine Person and His mission. The Eucharist is only one way—albeit a vital and the literal way—of "feeding on Christ's flesh," i.e. appropriating the benefits of His Passion. And to appropriate the benefits of His Passion is only one way—again a most vital way—of "feeding on Him." Faith, "beholding," and presumably love and obedience are other ways.

Those modern critics are surely right who refuse to see—or at any rate to suppose St. John saw—any incompatibility between the sacramental and the "mystical" modes of feeding upon Jesus. And the reason is very simple—his own concrete, most indubitable experience. St. John had long been practising both before he ever began to puzzle out any sort of a theology to explain or systematize his experiences. To deny either aspect of his (and the contemporary church's) experience would never have entered his head. And if by any chance his head had seen any difficulty, his heart and will would promptly have asserted their supremacy, sheltered under the authority, as he firmly believed, of Him who alone on this earth "had the words of eternal life."

If this understanding of the problem be approximately right, it will throw some further light on the general problem. St. John's whole Gospel is professedly an apologetic work. Hence its purpose is to provide positive evidence in support of Christianity; and, where this cannot be done, at least to answer objections. In a work that takes the form of a quasi-biography his opportunities are rather limited. But he will make of them the best he can without transgressing these

limits. For he considers the method that imposes these limits to be, after all, the strongest argument he has. "Can this be? Come and see!" is the argument on which chiefly his own faith stood or was believed to stand. "We have seen and know!" And he issues the same invitation to others, to the intent that they too may "see" and come to "believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," so that "believing (they) might have life in His name."

This will explain many of the peculiarities of St. John's Gospel. In particular, it explains the absence of the Eucharist (at least its formal absence) from the Last Supper, and its insertion at the point chosen. For the Eucharist is not, even to St. John, one of his positive arguments for Christianity. Rather it is one of the major difficulties he has to meet. As such it would have been very difficult to deal with it in the hallowed context of the Farewell Supper, and to give it there, where only the most faithful disciples were present (save, of course, Judas), the highly controversial treatment it required. The limits of the form he has employed forbade this. And no harm could come from the shift. No one was ignorant of the belief universally held in the church that Jesus had instituted the Eucharist, and no one disputed or doubted it.[1] Nor would anyone dream of supposing that he wished to suppress, deny, or avoid what he did not tell. "Many other things did Jesus that are not written in this book," he warns us.

He has made his selection on the basis of their apologetical value; not to supplement the Synoptics, still less to retell what they have already told, simply because it once really happened. The ethical aspect of the Eucharist and the "charitative" side of the Agape St. John does consider of some apologetical value. Hence we do get the stress on the ambiguous ἀγάπη in Chapters xiii.-xvii., probably with the just suggested double meaning, and in addition aimed at those

[1] If one did, St. John's giving of the Eucharistic discourse in Chapter vi. would as clearly give his view on the subject as he could possibly do any other way. There our Lord is represented as having the Eucharist in His mind early in the ministry and announcing His intention of instituting it. He even declares it "necessary to salvation."

who violate love by deserting the Agape. Also, as we saw just above, he does consider the broader and more general idea of different ways of abiding in Christ, as a background for the special kind of Eucharistic abiding, apologetically helpful. Hence we get in Chapter xv. the allegory of the Vine. Finally, the relation of the Eucharist to forgiveness of sin[1] was apologetically valuable and hence is hinted at in the foot-washing.[2]

But the doctrine of the presence of the body and blood of Jesus in the Eucharist was a major stumbling-block. We know from St. Ignatius, and scarcely less clearly from St. John himself (vi. 52 and 60-61), that not only non-Christians but even many who had once been Christians had "stumbled," even to the extent of leaving the church, because of this doctrine. And as I read him, even St. John himself does not find it easy—certainly not one of his "strong points" for his apologetic. He will not give it up or compromise it, to be sure. Rather he "contends earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." Jesus had taught it, and Jesus had the words of eternal life. To whom could he go if "he too went away?"

But while he remains intransigeant as to the doctrine, he realizes that it is difficult and wishes to do all he can to make it easier. Hence he puts it at a point where both his time and audience leave him free to depict a bitter controversy. He introduces it by two undoubted miracles. The first is to show that even in His earthly life Jesus could feed men with miraculous food simply by "giving thanks" over ordinary loaves. The second is to show that He could come to His disciples in miraculous ways—that He was not bound by the same ordinary physical limitations that we are.

Having thus introduced the subject, and with some further

[1] However he may have conceived it! Possibly the antithesis is with Baptism, which cleanses "the whole man." Not impossibly it may be hinted that the Passion "washes us," and the Eucharist, its effective and applicatory memorial, "washes (daily, or frequently) our feet."

[2] We must remember that his judgment of the apologetic value of anything would be determined largely by past experience as to whether it had appealed strongly to his hearers or conversely had raised difficulties and objections.

help by alluding to the manna to make the idea seem less strange, he puts the difficult doctrine on such a theological background as he has found helpful to increase its reasonableness.[1]

And finally he points to the Ascension and concomitant Glorification whereby Christ became "life-giving Spirit" as providing an answer (perhaps a double answer) to the difficulty. He means that the One who even in His earthly life could walk on the sea, and after His Resurrection could appear and disappear at will, pass through closed doors, and ascend into heaven, all the time retaining His body with the nail-holes in it—such an One could do even this. He could, both because by all these things He proved Himself to be a supernatural Divine Being to whom all things are possible; and also [2] because His body was—especially after the Resurrection and Ascension—very different from our earthly bodies, for which this would be indeed impossible. The things about which Jesus had been talking in the discourse which gave offence—namely His body and blood—were not flesh and blood as we know them in this life, or in death. They were His flesh and blood as they shall be after He is risen, ascended, and glorified. They shall have become a *spiritual* body at the time He will give them. And only as such could they profit unto eternal life. Flesh and blood—even *His* flesh and blood—as ordinarily understood, would indeed profit nothing. But it was not this of which He had been speaking. The things about which He had been speaking—His glorified flesh and blood—were spiritual, and hence could give life.

It will be seen that I have indicated my own interpretation of the passage; and in doing so some of my reasons, chiefly the purely exegetical ones, will have become apparent. But I have not yet given in any complete form the reasons for holding that the Discourse ought to be interpreted realistically. It remains now to do this.

The chief argument of all seems to me to be the following:

[1] That is, he provides as it were a philosophy of the Eucharist.

[2] If he had only one of these two answers in his mind, it was probably this second, as it connects very well with verse 63 while the former hardly connects at all.

St. John here and often elsewhere in the Gospel and First Epistle is combating the Docetists. Now these rejected the church's teaching that "the Eucharist is the flesh of Christ." Hence, if he is combating not merely their secession from the church, but also their reason for leaving, he must be defending the doctrine they reject. And most surely he is combating both. The anti-Docetic character of the Gospel is abundantly clear, not only from tradition but also from internal evidence; and is so generally recognized as not to require discussion here.

Now if St. John in Chapter vi. were combating or explaining away the realistic Eucharistic doctrine, he had only to make himself clear to bring the Docetics flocking back into the church. In all probability, it may be added, he could have set the church back on the right path as well, from which on the anti-realistic interpretation it was grievously straying. Surely his authority was great enough to do this; or at the very least to create a symbolical school on Eucharistic doctrine.

It must be added that this argument from the history of the Docetic controversy not only excludes pure symbolism, but also any of the less definite forms of realism such as would make the sacrament merely to bestow grace, or mediate the benefits of the Passion, or of the Christian religion in general, or of mystical union with a purely spiritual Christ but without conveying the real body and blood of Christ. It is just precisely the actual body and blood of Christ which raise the difficulty. If the Eucharist had not been claimed definitely to be these, it would have given the Docetics no greater difficulty than Baptism. It was because it was so claimed that their premises made it impossible for them to accept it.[1]

[1] It seems to me that this argument leaves just one loophole. The Docetists would, as we have seen, have been able to accept any "purely spiritual" interpretation and also any less definitely realistic view. But would they not have been as much obliged to reject a purely metaphorical view (This *represents* my real flesh) as a strictly and definitely realistic view? I cannot but think so. Hence we cannot by this argument exclude this one particular non-realistic view. I believe other evidence will exclude this one also, especially the argument in the paragraph beginning at the middle of p. 129 (which see). But the Docetics at this one point do not seem to me to enlighten us—at least not decisively.

The second argument for a realistic interpretation of the passage is the strong, repeated, and uncompromising use of realistic language, especially in verses 51-58.[1]

With the Synoptics giving us the realism of contemporary belief shortly before St. John wrote, and the Ignatian Epistles shortly afterward, to suppose that St. John is not realistic is to put him out of the church's tradition entirely, when in reality he is vigorously defending it. Moreover, if he were trying to combat it, can he have possibly failed to see that, the tradition being what it was, what he says was sure to be interpreted as a firm adhesion to it and a vigorous defence of it? And if he foresaw this, why did he not set about his purpose very differently?

Even if the phrases "to eat (Christ's) flesh" and "to drink (His) blood" could be taken figuratively, as meaning only "to eat that bread which represents His body, etc.," still at least the spiritual effect seems indubitably real. To have eternal life (54), to abide in Christ and have Christ abide in you (56), and by consequence to be raised up at the last day—these are realistic effects and not mere figures. This seems decisively to exclude the possibility of a Eucharistic but purely figurative interpretation of the passage.

The two opening miracles very largely lose their *raison d'être* if the doctrine be not realistic. They play no part in defending a purely symbolical Eucharist.

These reasons appear more than sufficient to establish that for St. John the Eucharist is to be interpreted realistically, not figuratively. Not only is this so, but we can define more closely still. His realism excludes anything that might be called (in later terminology) "virtualism," even in its "highest" possible forms. There is in St. John's belief indubitably what would later have been called a *res sacramenti*. And that *res sacramenti* is not any undefined virtue or grace of the Eucharist; or the Holy Spirit; or even the Logos Himself in His spiritual Divine nature, but apart from His real, glorified, human body

[1] His repeated use of the very materialistic word τρώγω to express the eating is especially striking. It has rather the connotation of "chew," and so opposes strongly any merely metaphorical eating.

and blood. The latter, and nothing else, are the *res sacramenti* in which St. John believes. His theology is that by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ we feed on Christ Himself.

The "fruits of communion" show that the Eucharistic food is to St. John, as to St. Ignatius, the "medicine of immortality." We may list the fruits as follows:

1. Abiding in Christ and being indwelt by Him (verse 56, and the Vine allegory).
2. Escaping death and attaining the resurrection and immortality (verses 27, 50, 51, 54, 57-58).
3. Conferring, even in this life, a new and supernatural life (verses 33, 53, 54, 57-58).
4. (Probably) the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin (the foot-washing, xiii. 7-10).

St. John, if our interpretation of vi. 62-63 is approximately correct, holds a spiritual rather than a carnal or materialistic conception of the body or flesh and blood of Christ present in the Eucharist. It is necessary to raise the question what St. John could have meant by "flesh and blood" in the glorified Christ. Did He any longer have flesh and blood? An attempt will be made to answer this in Appendix V to which the reader is referred.

HEBREWS XIII. 10-16

To begin with, it seems violent indeed to take "those that serve the tabernacle" in xiii. 10 as being the Christian worshippers, as some do. This necessitates, for one thing, that οἱ λατρεύοντες should be the subject (or the same people as the subject) of ἔχομεν. Also it is a most surprising expression if the Christian worshippers are really meant. Furthermore, it makes the passage a protest against the realistic Eucharistic doctrine. But this is very unlikely. There is, for one thing, the author's general approval of sacramentalism as revealed in vi. 2. Then, besides, it is most improbable we should find any great leader of the church protesting against a doctrine we have already seen (in Chapter IV and the first part of this chapter)

to have been generally received and of primitive origin. Still less likely is it that his work would have been canonized had he done so. Finally, even if he disapproved the realistic belief, he could not have combated it by urging his readers to imitate the faith of those who had held it, nor by stressing the immutability of Christian teaching of which it was a part. Nor is it likely he could have referred to it as diverse and strange (ξένοις) teaching. Thus only if our conclusions above are utterly false can this interpretation be considered to have the slightest probability.

Secondly, the two γὰρ's in verses 9 and 11 must be given their natural force if it is reasonably possible. The "diverse and strange teachings," then, must be or include the strengthening of the heart by meats instead of (or as well as) by grace; because the fact that Christians should have their hearts established by grace, not by meats, is the *reason* they should avoid being carried away by these divers and strange doctrines. Also the O.T. rule quoted in xiii. 11 must be the *reason* why those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat of the Christian altar.

Thirdly, the word "eat" must be taken literally, not figuratively, as meaning "to partake of the spiritual benefits of the sacrifice." For the whole purpose of offering the sin-offerings was in order that the *benefits* might be gained. It was only the strictly physical, literal eating which was forbidden. The argument here is pure nonsense if appropriation of the spiritual benefits is all that is meant.

Fourthly, it is unlikely the "diverse and strange teachings" concern ordinary foods, whether we think of the O.T. laws as to clean and unclean foods, or of dualistic objections to certain foods and drinks in Gentilic circles. For in neither of these cases, I believe, was it ever thought that eating certain foods strengthened the heart, but rather that eating other and improper foods "defiled the heart," so to speak. It is not permissible to interpret the writer negatively when he has spoken positively, unless it is impossible to avoid doing so.

Fifthly, we conclude, from the immediately preceding result, that it is a question here of sacrificial "meats" which were

supposed to bestow some positive benefits; and which, moreover, the Christians might be tempted to use by the plausible argument that their own religion had no true sacrificial meal and hence needed to be supplemented in this respect by partaking of either Gentilic or Jewish sacrificial meals. This inference seems to be strongly confirmed by the general trend of the argument, by the use of "altar" in xiii. 10, and by the reason adduced in xiii. 11.

Sixthly, it will make no difference, as far as the Eucharistic teaching of the passage goes, whether the sacrifices in which the Christians were being tempted to share were Gentilic or Jewish. If the latter, the argument is perfectly simple and direct. If the former, it is less direct, but *a fortiori*. In this case, the author means that if even the authentically Divine sacrificial meats of the O.T. had profited their users nothing, how much less will the pseudo-sacrificial meats among the Gentiles profit any!

Seventhly, xiii. 8 gives the reason why the Christian Faith does not change (because Christ, its giver, does not); and why consequently the present generation should imitate (hold fast to) the faith of those from whom they had received the tradition. Then xiii. 9*a* draws, from the general truth enforced by xiii. 7-8, the general inference that new and strange doctrines contrary to what had been received ought to be avoided. Then he narrows down the general principle of xiii. 7-9*a* and applies it to the particular danger he has in mind, at the same time backing up the general argument with a more specific one (xiii. 9*b* and *c*). Then he goes on to give a more fundamental answer to the specific point to which he passed on in xiii. 9*b*. He denies the very premise on which the argument that tempted the Christians was based. It is not true that the Christian religion lacks its sacrificial "meats" and therefore needs to be supplemented in that respect. We have, on the contrary, a sacrifice on which we feed; and if this sacrificial food is indeed of a different sort from that eaten in other religions, it is not because it is inferior to theirs, but rather because it is superior. In fact, we have a sacrifice of which we alone may eat—namely our Sin-offering (which is Christ).

Therein we surpass even the Jewish religion (which to the author is unquestionably the highest and truest religion outside of Christianity—yea the only one that was in any sense true). Because even the Jews were not allowed to feast on their sin-offerings, though of course they did on their other sacrifices. Thus we Christians have an absolutely new and unique and supremely perfect sacrificial meal which puts us far ahead of those to whom you are tempted to join yourselves. Their sacrificial meals would profit nothing anyway, even if we had none better of our own. But in fact we have, and it is one in which we eat not ordinary meats but the spiritual, glorified body and blood of Christ, who suffered for us as our Sin-offering. In eating of this we receive bountiful Divine grace by which the heart can really be strengthened.

This exegesis seems to me altogether preferable on all accounts to any other I have found. Whether the altar is Christ or the Eucharist I cannot be sure. But in any case the Eucharist is directly and explicitly in mind and under discussion. If Christ is the altar it is meant that we eat in the Eucharist of Him who was our Sin-offering, thus enjoying a privilege that was denied even to the Chosen People until Christ came. The doctrine is the same as that we shall find some thirty years earlier in 1 Cor. x. and have already found later in Justin Martyr. In these three writers we have evidence that shows that from almost if not quite the first, the Eucharist was considered a sacrifice, not merely as the offering of mere bread and wine, but—much more—as the "offering" of that which was a memorial of the Passion and by eating which the Christians shared in the benefits of the Passion, viz. the Eucharistic "antitypes" of the body and blood of Christ. And we saw in Chapter IV and just above that these were not figuratively but most realistically conceived. It is not merely that the Eucharist was (in some lesser sense) a sacrifice and also the body and blood of Christ. Its being a sacrifice is in these three very early writers inextricably associated with its being the body and blood of Christ. This conclusion, if sound, is of very great importance; for it differs widely from what is usually said on the subject.

In view of this exegesis of xiii. 9-12, it becomes very tempting to see a primary, though not an exclusive, reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice in xiii. 15-16. All praise, all confession of God's name, all well-doing and "communicating," are true spiritual sacrifices in the thought of the early Christians; but these all reach their climax and have their centre and heart in the Eucharistic memorial of the Sacrifice of Calvary. Through this Sacrifice Christians believed themselves to have all the benefits for which they ought at all times, but especially and pre-eminently in the Eucharistic *Epiclesis*, to thank and praise God. Therefore it was through Him (xiii. 15) that all these "sacrifices" were offered up to God. The idea of the Heavenly intercession, which is so prominent in the Epistle as a whole, and is also found in St. Paul and St. John, seems to be clearly present here again. On the whole, then, it seems likely there is a Eucharistic reference in xiii. 15. If so, it is the first extant text in which the term "sacrifice" is applied directly to the Eucharist; though, as we shall see later in the present chapter, it is clearly impliedly applied by St. Paul. Also the word "altar" precedes that word's occurrence in St. Ignatius by perhaps thirty years; for in any case it is used in direct connection with the Eucharist even if it is Christ Himself and not the place or table where the Eucharist is offered. This passage, then, gives strong added support to the conclusions we reached in Chapters IV-V about primitive Eucharistic doctrine, without adding anything essentially new or different.

ST. PAUL

Let us begin with 1 Cor. x. 1-5. Surely here at once we find a most significant result. For it seems clear beyond any doubt that those against whom St. Paul directs his argument look upon the Eucharist as an infallibly certain and sure "medicine of immortality." And St. Paul answers, as we see both from this passage and from xi. 27-33, not by denying but by distinguishing. He disputes the inference only for those who receive unworthily, or who otherwise jeopardize their salvation by other forms of sinful misconduct. But this by

clear implication grants [1] the doctrine in the case of those who receive worthily and live aright. Furthermore, even in the cases in which he denies the expectation, he does not expect the Eucharist to have no effect at all, but a definitely and tremendously harmful effect. It even produces visible, tangible, physical ill results, such as sickness and death. Nor does the fact that he describes these as chastenings, with a view to the ultimate salvation of the offenders, require that they should be only occasioned by the wrong use of the elements and not caused by it. Other considerations to be noted immediately will negative this alternative. Thus we find the elements to be charged with some tremendous supernatural power, working salvation and immortality to those approaching and using it properly, but death and destruction to wrongful users. Why is it thus?

The answer must be, "Because it is the spiritual, glorified, body and blood of Christ." There are several things that lead to this conclusion.

1. The terms "spiritual food and drink," applied in x. 3-4 to the sacramental types in the wilderness, must be held to have been carried over to the types from the Christian antitypes, and thus to be primarily and directly applicable to the Eucharist. What do they mean? They must be taken, at least as applied to the Eucharist, to refer not only to its supernatural origin but to its metaphysical character, its kind or mode of being. Thus, elsewhere St. Paul distinguishes between a natural body and a spiritual body; and he there uses the same word as here. Besides, we know that he held the exalted Christ had, since His Resurrection and Glorification, a spiritual body,[2] but no longer a natural (psychical) body. Since, as we shall see below, he believed Christ's body and blood to indwell the Eucharistic bread and wine, it must be to this spiritual

[1] I am of course aware that in logic, when one distinguishes, one does not always grant what one does not deny. It is equally possible to "transmit." But not only is St. Paul not the subtle dialectitian to warrant us in suspecting such a procedure here; the nature of his argument and the terrifying results of unworthy reception both point irresistibly in the opposite direction.

[2] For a consideration of the glorified Eucharistic Body in both St. Paul and St. John see Appendix V.

body he refers. The bread and wine are "spiritual food and drink" because they are infused with the spiritual body and blood of Christ.

2. In x. 4 St. Paul even says, "and the rock was Christ." This too must be held to be in all probability a carried-over expression, occasioned by the Christian belief that the Eucharistic elements are the body and blood of Christ. Of course St. Paul cannot say "the rock was Christ's body or blood," because he well realizes that Christ at that time had not yet taken upon Him any body. It is for this reason that he used this expression, which the earliest tradition does not seem to have applied to the Eucharist, at least not easily and regularly. They did not say that the Eucharist elements were Christ, or that Christ was received; but that they were His body and blood, or that His body and blood were received. I believe this distinction to be important.

3. In x. 16-17 we get the phrases "communion with (*or* of) the body (and blood) of Christ." It is surely wrong method to attempt to determine the meaning of "communion" here from its use in x. 18, 20 in regard to the Jewish "altar" or to the demons. Rather the primary thought in St. Paul's mind is his conception of the Eucharistic communion. And while the phrase might in itself bear a variety of meanings, verse 17 seems to show that here it bears the most strictly realistic meaning. The argument is that by partaking of the one bread, which is the one (real, spiritual, glorified) body of Christ, we (the communicants) are united into the one (mystical) body of Christ. Thus not only the "sacrament" but also the "communion" is understood in the most realistic manner conceivable.

4. In the Institution Narrative (xi. 23-25) the language of identity is used, though the sharp edge of its force is blunted a little by the transmuted form of the cup logion. Of course in itself the expressions could bear a purely figurative meaning. But we have already seen enough (and we shall see yet more) to exclude the possibility of this having been the meaning of the words for St. Paul, or, *in his opinion*, for Jesus.

5. In xi. 27, if the verse stood alone, it would be possible to evade a realistic meaning. But in xi. 29, intimately connected

with verse 27, we get the crucial phrase, "not discerning the (Lord's) body." The Greek is *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*. Some MSS. add "of the Lord," which is an unauthentic gloss, but certainly a correct one; for verse 27 excludes the interpretation "the mystical body." The word *διακρίνων* may be translated, as I have done, by "discern"; in which case the complaint is that the careless receiver fails to "look beneath the surface" and perceive something that escapes superficial observation. And we are at once told what that is, viz. the (Lord's) body. An alternative translation might be (at least, has been) "discriminate" (*or* distinguish). In that case, the meaning is "failing to distinguish between that which in reality is the (Lord's) body and that which it appears to be, merely bread"; or possibly "failing to distinguish *that* bread which is *also* the (Lord's) body from other (mere) bread."

In the light of this result the most natural interpretation to put on xi. 27 is that by unworthy reception a direct outrage is committed against the Lord's body and blood, which are really present but are treated in an insulting, or at least neglectful, manner.

It seems, then, clear beyond reasonable cavil that the tremendous supernatural power, working salvation and immortality or judgment and physical destruction, with which we saw the Eucharistic elements to be charged, is nothing else but the effects of the spiritual, glorified body and blood of Christ, which are present in the "one bread" and "the Cup of Blessing."

Yet although the Eucharistic belief of St. Paul is clearly and unmistakably realistically sacramental, it is not justly open to the charge of magic, though it does not entirely escape some crudity. The *ex opere operato* efficacy for good or ill is entirely dependent upon the Divine will and operation; hence the fact that it is in some sense dependent upon an outward formula and external action does not make it magical. Further, the concrete effect upon the individual is conditioned strictly by his own subjective moral and spiritual condition and attitude; hence it is fully ethical. Finally, even the Divine chastening connected with unworthy reception is viewed as teleological,

as medicinal [1] rather than vindictive; and therefore as rational and even, ultimately, merciful; not as purely mechanical and magical.

Let us now pass on from the sacramental to the sacrificial side of the Pauline Eucharist.

In 1 Cor. x. 14-22 the argument seems to be: "All sacrificial meals bring the partaker into communion with the 'deity' concerned; therefore to participate in feasting on things sacrificed to idols brings the partaker into communion with the demons which are the reality behind the idols." The antecedent is proved by two cases in point: first, the Christian sacrifice; secondly, the Jewish sacrifices. It is thus presupposed that the Eucharist is, and is known by all to be, the Christian sacrificial meal; and that both it and the Jewish sacrificial meals really bring the partaker into communion with Christ or "the altar" (=Yahweh) respectively. Thus the Eucharist is the Christian sacrifice.

The same implication is probably involved in the close connection in x. 21 between the "table of the Lord" and the (certainly sacrificial) "table of demons." It is even possible we have here a reminiscence of Mal. i. 7, 12, and thus the first extant application of Mal. i. 11 to the Eucharist.

In what sense the Eucharist is a sacrifice we may be able to discover from 1 Cor. xi. 25-26. We see from those two verses that it is a memorial of the sacrificial Death of Christ on the Cross, a proclaiming of that Death till He come. Verse 26 in particular will reward our special attention.

First of all, it shows that, although he does not pause to quote it, because it has no immediate relevance to the argument he is going to draw from the Institution Narrative, the logion "I shall not drink henceforth, etc." (Mark xiv. 25 and parallels) is in all probability known to St. Paul, and that that verse has gone with 1 Cor. xi. 25 to give St. Paul his interpretation of the meaning of the action as he summarizes it in 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Secondly, St. Paul does not say, "Ye ought to proclaim, etc."; and the context shows that he does not mean that, although its

[1] Though not infallibly sure to succeed.

character as a memorial, as "a proclaiming," is dependent upon what Christians say or do or think, yet the Corinthians are unfailing in their carefulness that it should never fall short of this character. What he says is, "As often as—*every time that*—you eat this bread, etc., ye *do* (in fact) proclaim the Lord's death till He come." The rite is in and of itself a solemn memorial, an automatic proclaiming, of the Lord's Death. And the reason is not far to seek. It is because the bread is (or represents) the Lord's body broken in death for men, and the cup (or its contents) is (or represents) the sacrificial blood shed on the Cross to consummate the New Covenant. This makes the rite, the action, *in itself* a memorial of the Lord's sacrificial Passion, i.e. a sacrificial memorial; and hence the "communion" is a sacrificial meal. It has this character, even if those who participate forget about it and treat it as common food and as an ordinary and profane action. It is just this which makes unworthy reception and participation doubly serious. And in recognizing that this is St. Paul's conception, it is not necessary to go further and suppose any connection with the δρώμενον of the (technically called) "Mystery" of various pagan religions.

Thus the Eucharist is for St. Paul a sacrifice in a double sense. It is a realistically conceived, objective, vivid, dramatic memorial or proclaiming of the Lord's sacrificial Passion—a sacrificial memorial. It is also a sacrificial meal or banquet. And in this latter sense, as we saw above, the Christians are believed really to feed upon their sacrifice, which is nothing else than the (once) broken body and outpoured blood of Christ now not only represented by but (in its glorified state) present in the broken bread and the Cup of Blessing which the Christians blessed. It is not as being mere bread and wine, but as being (or representing) the body and blood of Christ, that they are the sacrificial banquet[1] of the Christians; just as it is not as being mere bread and wine that they constitute,

[1] For it is as the sacrificial banquet of Christians that they bring the partaker into communion with Christ's body and blood, into the unity of Christ's mystical body. And this they do, as we saw above, not as mere bread and wine, but as the "one bread" which is the spiritual, glorified, heavenly body of Christ.

with the connected actions, an automatic memorial of the Death of Christ till He come.

In the light of these conclusions let us turn to the twice-repeated command (in 1 Cor. xi. 24-25): τοῦτο ποιεῖτε (ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε) εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.[1] In this sentence, both the words ποιεῖτε and ἀνάμνησιν admit of a sacrificial meaning. Neither of them in itself requires, or even favours, such a meaning. And at least ποιεῖτε the great majority of times does not actually bear it. Yet I repeat both do admit of it quite easily, where the context is sacrificial. And here, as we have just been seeing, it is strongly so. The reasons we have just been giving show, in fact, that ἀνάμνησις here does not mean a mere recalling to mind, but a putting in mind, an objective memorial, a proclaiming. And since the rite is a sacrifice, it is likely that God is at least included among those "reminded."

As to ποιεῖτε, not only is the context strongly sacrificial (if we have rightly understood it above), but there are other reasons for favouring here a sacrificial interpretation of the word, such as: "*Offer* this for My memorial."

1. In both cases it makes a smoother reading. We get τοῦτο ἐστὶν . . . τοῦτο ποιεῖτε where the τοῦτο both times means the same thing; which indeed we should expect where no hint of a change of antecedent is given. In the second case especially is it smoother. There πίνητε (which cannot mean simply "as often as ye drink *at all*") has no object near at hand to be understood unless it is the τοῦτο. Thus, if we refuse to translate "offer" we must understand τοῦτο to be the object of πίνητε; yet not the nearest but the most remote τοῦτο; which in addition refers to something very different from the nearer τοῦτο. This of course is not unthinkable, where the meaning would be fairly easy to grasp; yet it is surely grammatically an inferior rendering.

[1] I wish to emphasize that our conclusions already reached in no way whatsoever depend upon the point I am now about to discuss. Rather it depends in part upon them; and it would not at all affect the conclusion just reached if my conclusions on ποιεῖτε and ἀνάμνησιν were entirely disallowed. If accepted, however, they confirm it still more strongly, besides having some importance of their own.

2. The double repetition, and over two elements not closely juxtaposited in the meal, but at its beginning and end, suits the rendering "offer" better than "do" in my opinion.

3. We have seen in our studies on second-century sacrificial doctrine [1] that—certainly in Justin, and in all probability in St. Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the only three writers whose views are ascertainable—ποιεῖτε means "offer" rather than "do." This suggests that such was the traditionally accepted rendering in the church. If so, it may well go back at least as far as St. Paul.

4. This last supposition, while probably not required, will help to explain why the Eucharist so soon came to be considered and even called a sacrifice, when it was in reality only, in the strict sense, a memorial of a sacrifice. It will also help to explain why early writers speak of it as "offering" the gifts, or the bread and the cup, when a careful examination shows that no one of them can (as far as I am aware) be shown to think that it was as mere bread and wine that they were offered. Neither can their use of "offer" be explained by the reply, "Yes, but they thought of the body and blood of Christ as being offered." For that idea, though undoubtedly a logical deduction from what they did say and think, is not to my knowledge actually said by anyone for at least two hundred years and more. What they "offered" was "this," which by being "offered" made a "memorial of the Passion." And "this" was not mere bread and wine (mere material sacrifices) but also the body and blood of Christ. Yet the thought of the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of the Cross made it centuries before anyone was to be so bold as to draw the logical deduction and say that therefore the body and blood of Christ were "offered," even in the looser and secondary sense of the term.

It seems, then, that for St. Paul the Eucharist is a sacrifice in which the Eucharistic elements are first spoken of as being "offered" and afterwards are eaten as the Christian sacrificial banquet. The latter is a strictly real feeding upon the (glorified) Christ who is the Christian sacrifice. The former was not

[1] See Appendix IV.

understood, of course, to involve any real repetition of Christ's Suffering or Death. Yet it was thought of (and soon spoken of) as in a secondary sense a sacrifice; and the elements, believed not to be mere bread and wine, were (probably by St. Paul and certainly not much later) spoken of as being "offered." This offering, as I reconstruct the history, consisted at first in the thanksgiving over the elements, which at one and the same time "consecrated" and "offered" them. We would thus have, coming straight through from the Jewish background, the conception of "giving thanks" over the cup as "offering" the cup, which we find in Christianity at least as late as ±220 A.D. in the 26th chapter of the *A.T.* of Hippolytus.

There is one other thing I wish here to point out. What is the implication of the words "as often as" in the second command to repeat? Their natural force is "every single time that," "every time without exception." Also, it seems clear that St. Paul takes it to mean, "Let there be no Eucharist which is not a solemn memorial of Me (i.e. of My Passion)." In fact, his very reason for quoting just the part of the traditional account of the Last Supper which he does quote, and no other, is that the twice-repeated command to "do" or "offer" this "for My memorial" is chiefly what he wants for his argument. That, I take it, is, that since the Eucharist is in itself a solemn memorial of the Lord's Death, it demands a certain type of moral and spiritual conduct and attitude which is being grossly violated by the Corinthians. While, however, this seems to be the particular use that St. Paul makes of the words ὁσάκις ἐὰν, it is not likely to be their original force. They are more likely to be applied to some cup already familiar in existing practice which it might be possible and tempting to drink, at least sometimes, not as the Lord's memorial but in the older and "secular" manner. Hence in all probability these words are pre-Pauline. We shall therefore consider their precise original force when we study the Eucharist before St. Paul.

There is one other result of major importance for our next investigation which it will be well to record here. St. Paul, in

what he says in 1 Cor. x.-xi. is not innovating, but is simply following, substantially at least, the tradition as he has received it. A variety of considerations assure us of this:

1. He presupposes the agreement of the Corinthians with the portions of his teaching we have used, by employing them as premises for the points on which they disagree and which he wishes to prove. Now this might seem at first sight to prove no more than that it was what he had taught them. But he is in fact writing to a church in which there are at least two anti-Pauline parties, or at any rate non-Pauline. And one of these two, the Petrine, probably represents the "middle-of-the-road" Jerusalem Christianity of which St. Peter was looked upon as the leader and type. Hence St. Paul must be fully confident that his Eucharistic teaching is in harmony with the common-Christian belief.

2. That he is justified in this confidence seems to follow from the fact that, despite all his subsequent troubles with the Corinthian church, he does not have to say a word, in our II. Corinthians, in defence of his Eucharistic teaching. And this in all probability means it was not attacked by any of his opponents at Corinth in any party.

3. On a broader basis, the same argument is even more cogent. Neither in his Epistles, nor in Acts, nor anywhere else in early sources do we find the slightest trace of any attack upon St. Paul on the ground of his sacramentalism. Now he certainly gave the same teaching in his other churches which he gave at Corinth. Moreover, in nearly all of them, as well as in the non-Pauline Jewish churches, especially Jerusalem, he had bitter, acute, and watchful opponents, both within Christianity and without, only too eager to seize upon any grounds to destroy or attack him. We can only conclude, then, that on this point he was no drastic innovator, but the faithful transmitter of the generally received tradition, and the generally accepted belief about it.

4. The tradition of the church after St. Paul is entirely at one with him in the doctrine we have derived from him above. Now, on points specifically Pauline he does not seem to have exerted any such utterly dominating influence. This, then,

suggests that the later tradition proceeded not from St. Paul alone but from the whole early church. Even the utterly un-Pauline *Didache*, as far as its brief forms give us any light, holds the same general view. And there is no reason to suppose its silences on certain points imply dissent. Nor is there anywhere in the first two centuries any slightest trace of a divergent tradition.[1] In all probability the accounts in Mark, "Matthew," and both texts of Luke, which are all in a measure independent witnesses, presuppose the same Eucharistic doctrine, as they certainly do (except the shorter text of Luke) the same historical tradition. And these can hardly be indebted so deeply to Pauline influence.

All this, then, shows that St. Paul's Eucharistic doctrine is not in any sense specifically his own, but that he shared it with the general tradition and belief of the pre-Pauline church. And so we strongly confirm his own most solemn asseveration: "For I received from (ultimately) the Lord that which I also delivered unto you."

[1] I say tradition, because there is some possible divergence in Clement of Alexandria and Origen. But it is not even alleged to rest on any traditional basis.

CHAPTER VII

THE ORIGINS OF THE EUCHARIST

If there is any one point at which the likelihood of independent information being possessed by an evangelist, normally dependent on written sources, is at a maximum, it is precisely here. For not only were the Passion Narratives, of which our section formed a part, extremely popular and presumably very widely known, but the liturgical use of this section in one form or another must have been very early and quite universal. Long before any Gospels were written, every single community must have had not only its Passion Narrative, but in particular its account of the Last Supper. Hence no person can possibly be imagined in the early church who was at all exclusively dependent on some written source for his knowledge of what happened at the Last Supper. But this being the case, we have to give especially respectful consideration to the variants found in "Matthew" and in the longer text of Luke,[1] on the weight of which see the note below.

Once again, where, as in the present case, we can be practically sure that more was actually said than any one of our sources gives us,[2] we need to be very careful in assuming that

[1] If not authentic, the longer text is more likely to represent a local tradition which has been used to correct the supposedly imperfect shorter text, than to be a correction based entirely on Paul, or even on Paul and Mark combined. If so, it will be entitled to considerable weight on its own account. In any case, it will have the same sort of confirmatory value as, say, "Matthew." It must be very early, for it has infected every single Greek MS., save the bilingual D. In addition, it has the whole Egyptian version in its support, both Bohairic and Sahidic; and the dependent Ethiopic Version. It has considerable support in the Old Latin, and gained the allegiance of the Vulgate. It has the support of the lesser Armenian Version. It has corrupted the text of 1 Cor. xi. 24 in some good authorities. And it was presumably Justin's text of Luke. A date in the first quarter of the second century, if not even earlier, must then be assigned to it. And this makes it only a little later than the First Gospel. Consequently its weight as an independent authority will not be negligible.

[2] Unless it be the longer text of Luke, on the probable authenticity of which see Appendix IX.

the writer has given us all he knew or trusted. It is, no doubt, sound to argue that no writer would leave out any part he considered really vital. But we must beware of supposing that what is vital to us would necessarily be equally vital to him (or them). Justin's quotation, since he certainly knew our three Synoptic Gospels, is a good object-lesson on all these points. He quotes first the command to repeat, and adds only "This is My body" and "This is My blood" without any additions to either. Yet surely he not only knew but trusted all our evangelical accounts, and 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 as well. We conclude, then, that while, of course, substantial accuracy would be a matter of vital importance and conscientious obligation to our evangelists and St. Paul, neither precise verbal accuracy nor completeness would have been a matter of any moment to them. There is, of course, the obvious exception that if stress is going to be laid on any special words, or on an argument based on them, accuracy would be compulsory.

Let us first consider our chronological notices. Mark and "Matthew" this time directly dependent on him, give us *ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν*. But this really need not mean more than that it was a part of the meal. If we recall that in Luke [1] the prediction of the betrayal is placed after rather than before the institution, we shall see at once that the Markan order is not decisive on this point. Hence we could understand that the bread was blessed, etc., at or very near the beginning of the meal. This would agree sufficiently with the regular position we found for it in our studies on contemporary Jewish customs.

Luke's first cup might seem to constitute an objection. When we remember, however, the distinction we found in our Jewish evidence between a preliminary course and the formal meal begun by the bread-breaking, it is easy to interpret the first Lukan cup, if it is historical, as the cup drunk during this preliminary course. This might help explain the rather puzzling language: "Take this and divide it among yourselves." For "this" could as easily refer in history (not

[1] Moreover, Luke's form seems more likely to be historical than any of our alternative accounts.

necessarily in Luke's mind) to the container as to the chalice; and we remember the cup in the preliminary course was not a common cup. The verb διαμερίσατε would suit this better than drinking from a common chalice. If Luke's statement that the opening cup was received after they reclined be based on accurate information, we should probably still identify it with the cup of the preliminary course, but simply assume that our Lord and His disciples did not always punctiliously observe the perhaps rather refined distinction whereby that course was taken before reclining. It is well to recall at this point, however, that the Talmudic accounts of the festive banquet put a common cup at the beginning of the reclining meal, and the *Tosephta* gives the same cup, though there it is not made clear whether it is common or individual. Following several eminent authorities, I have taken in Chapter I the view that the Talmudic account contradicts the evidence of Mishnah, vi. 6, and consequently represents a change from an earlier practice in vogue in the first century. Dr. Ginsberg, however, thinks the two accounts are reconcilable, and his view is at least possible. On this view we may have here the cup referred to in *Tos. Ber.*, iv. 8, and the two Talmuds as dispensed after they have just reclined, and a common cup at that. In this case the bread would come immediately after it, very near the beginning.

Suffice it to say that there is no difficulty in explaining this Lukan cup in terms of attested contemporary practice, either way we reconstruct the latter. But in no case will it be the Cup of Blessing (nor of course a *Kiddush* Cup). And whichever way we take it, it does not militate against the position of the bread at, or at least very near, the beginning.

As to the Covenant-blood Cup, all our notices place it after the bread, and St. Paul expressly says "after supper" and calls it "the Cup of Blessing." He uses this expression in such a way as to make it seem clear that it was a commonly accepted title. Now we know the Cup of Blessing in Jewish practice came after the meal. Hence we have in this title strong confirmation of St. Paul's chronological notice. And since there is nothing in our other accounts to create any

difficulty, we may confidently conclude that the cup our Lord called His blood was the regular concluding Cup of Blessing of the customary festive meal.

Such a conclusion has the added advantage that it gives us the best available explanation of the words ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε in 1 Cor. xi. 25. It might have been possible for you (plural—the *Haburah*) to go on drinking the Cup of Blessing in its old semi-secular sense, at least sometimes. These words insist that *every time* the *Haburah* celebrates the *solemn common* meal, it should single out this cup [1] as a memorial of Jesus.

There are only two serious objections that could be raised against this conclusion. The first is the total denial of the historicity of any Covenant-blood Cup, anywhere. This will be considered below at the proper point. The second is based on the alleged fact of primitive Eucharists with the Cup before the Bread. As to this I will say just three things here: (1) The evidence for this alleged fact is very weak, as will be shown in detail in Appendix VI; (2) even if it be a fact, it would not be decisive against the Eucharist having originated from the Last Supper as Mark xiv. 22-25 pictures it; and (3) even if it were decisive against that, it still need not be decisive against a Covenant-blood Cup in the Markan position. It would only *prove* that the Eucharistic Cup *originated* otherwise; possibly from the first, rather than from the second, cup at the Last Supper, or else independently.

There is no reason to doubt that the first eschatological logion in Luke (xxii. 15-16) is in its right place, whether we interpret it of a fulfilled or an unfulfilled wish. It is, in fact, just where we would expect it if it is historical at all, as I see no reason to doubt.

As to the second eschatological logion, the problem is more difficult. In favour of its Lukan position it can be argued that Mark had to shift it to the final chalice, since he mentions no other, and it obviously belongs with some chalice. Also, its parallelism with Luke xxii. 15-16 could be adduced. However, the argument from the parallelism is at best a two-edged sword. It probably tells in the other direction, as explaining why

[1] And of course *on such occasions* also the opening bread-breaking.

Luke or "L" brought the saying forward from its true (i.e. Markan) position. Moreover, in its Lukan position it would exclude our Lord having partaken of any subsequent wine at the meal. We have to remember also, on the purely evidential side, that "Matthew" has some independent weight as a witness. And in the same connection we should recall that St. Paul seems to know this logion, and probably in a position after the Covenant-blood Cup logion. Thus it is practically three against one. Another reason is that Luke's own larger context shows signs of xxii. 18 having been shifted, either by Luke or by the author of his source, from between 20 and 21 to its present position. For the transition from 18 to 21 is surely better than from 19*a* to 21, or even from 20 to 21. This exegetical reason I shall develop below. Thus, on the whole, the evidence favours the Markan position.

As to the command to repeat, if it is historical at all, there are good reasons to prefer its double form as in St. Paul. These will appear when we study below the question of the historicity of that command. It is important to realize, however, that the view that Christ consciously intended to institute a memorial of His Passion is by no means inseparably connected with the view that the "command to repeat" is historical. No doubt the former view would, if accepted, increase the probability of these words having been actually used. But it would in no way depend on them so being. There are other ways Jesus could have made this intention sufficiently clear to the disciples. It might have required no more than assigning a new, striking, and tremendous significance to an already existing practice, such as the regular solemn *Haburah* meal, the repetition of which could be taken for granted.

Let us now pass on to the question of the meaning of the actions and logia, and how much of them is probably historical.

First as to the saying in Luke xxii. 15-16. I am not giving the reasons of most scholars for rejecting the Paschal date of the Last Supper, because they are too well known to need repetition. Granted their soundness, however, we have here an unfulfilled wish, and in connection with that a perfectly

definite forecast that Jesus would be executed before the next evening's meal. But the end of their habitual table-fellowship, although final as far as this world was concerned, was not to be an unqualified disaster but a necessary means to victory [1] and to a subsequent triumphant reunion with His disciples at the Messianic Banquet in His Kingdom, however He may have conceived that Banquet.

But why had Jesus so intensely desired to share this final Passover with them? Was it merely sentiment, however noble a thing sentiment can be in its proper place? Was it merely "I had so intensely hoped to live to share one more Passover with you before I am taken from you"? Or was it more still? We cannot tell from this saying itself which alternative to prefer.

The logion over the bread agrees in all our accounts as far as the words "This is My body." I believe much the best interpretation is that which refers these words to the Lord's imminent Passion either as an acted parable or as an instituted memorial.

The idea of our Lord instituting a precious table-fellowship which should survive even His Death in the immediate future; or of His symbolically giving Himself, His life, teachings, example, all He had meant in their lives *to* them—not *for* them—as a parting gift: these are beautiful and noble thoughts, but seem capable of being expressed better in language than in symbols. Why, then, single out such amazing figurative expressions as to call something which was being given to them to eat, "My body," and to drink, "My blood," and especially "of the Covenant"? Such expressions would arouse only the most intense abhorrence among simple Jews, however figuratively they might have been understood.

But if Jesus is interpreting to them, as by an acted parable, the significance of His imminent Death, which He conceives to be a divinely willed and planned sacrifice bringing in the New Covenant foretold in the Scriptures, then the *language* and the

[1] Once the cosmos-shattering fact of the death of the Messiah loomed on the horizon as certain, Jesus could hardly have failed to see in it some such tremendous significance, even if one deems the evidence of His use of Isaiah liii. doubtful, as the present writer cannot.

bread-and-wine symbolism, at least, are comprehensible. And I think we shall see below (pp. 160-161) they are both even better accounted for, along with the *eating-and-drinking* symbolism also, if He was not only interpreting to them the significance of that Death but instituting a memorial of it.

So much, then, for the meaning of the words "This is My body." They refer to His real body about to be broken in death. Now as to the variant additions to these words! If the view just taken be correct, some addition to the words is in my judgment far more likely than the use of the bare words alone. For as such they are barely if at all comprehensible. It is quite hard to guess what the disciples would have made of the bare words "This is My body," or even with the addition *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, if no such word as broken, given, etc., was added, and no command to repeat. We must remember they did not go on at once to hear, almost in the same breath, the words we read in our texts over the Cup. These were probably spoken a half-hour if not an hour later. Nor could they interpret His words in the light of well-known practice and belief as we can, or even of any understanding of the impending Passion. Hence some such addition as "broken" or "given" is highly probable.

It is a very difficult problem, however, to know which of the several possible additions to prefer. It is very tempting to conjecture that the inferiorly attested reading in St. Paul, *κλώμενον*, is authentic and historical. It fits the symbolism better than any other word. Yet in view of the state of the external textual evidence, it would probably be over-bold to accept this reading as authentic for St. Paul. If we must choose between attested words, perhaps *διδόμενον* is preferable. If the longer text of Luke is authentic, it would be able to claim strong attestation. Even if not, it would still have a fair claim as representing an independent tradition.

As to the meaning, any plausible addition would be less definite than the well-attested words in connection with the cup; so it will be best to consider the question when we go on to the interpretation of the Covenant-blood Cup logia. The same will be best with the "command to repeat."

Let us then go on at once to the Covenant-blood Cup logia. Against the Covenant-blood logion several objections are raised. It is objected that body and blood are not properly the constituent parts of human nature, but flesh and blood. Hence, since "This is My body" is historical, the Covenant-blood Cup is not. I cannot see any weight in this objection. Jesus was probably not much concerned about the perfection of logical symmetry either in language or symbolism. Moreover, He may have had in mind in the bread logion that He must be sacrificed before His blood could be shed. Thus the "breaking" of His body must precede the shedding of His Covenant-blood. Or, finally, if He was instituting a memorial, the bread may have been a symbolical feeding on their sacrifice, the wine an inward sprinkling for the forgiveness of sins with the blood of the New Covenant whose prime characteristics were to be its spiritual inwardness and its forgiveness of sins.

The second objection is that most of the variations in our accounts centre around this logion, raising a doubt as to its historicity. But I doubt if the one important variation really proves anything more than that the logion was a scandal-giving one of which the Pauline-Lukan form sought to dull the sharp edge by its transformed version. The other variations certainly prove nothing.

The last objection is to the symbolism of *drinking* Covenant-blood rather than *sprinkling* it. This objection, however, lies equally against any view which treats the "double parable" as interpretative of Jesus' Death. And the only even semi-plausible alternative, the idea of Wellhausen, that the drinking of the cup was a symbolical institution of a blood-brotherhood, seems extremely improbable, inasmuch as it interprets the saying and its action by primitive conceptions probably long forgotten, instead of by the obvious Exod. xxiv. 4-8 and Jer. xxxi. 31 ff. along with Isa. liii. 11-end. Thus we seem obliged either to reject entirely the historicity of the saying, or to come to terms with it as applicable to Jesus' impending Death.

The former alternative seems impossible. Matthew, Mark, Paul, and the longer text of Luke all attest it. The Fourth Evangelist, who was probably actually present at the Last

Supper, implicitly does the same. But over and above all this direct testimony, the saying is unthinkable as invented by the church. Speaking generally, the more repellent a saying would be in its superficial sense, the less possible it is to detach it from our Lord's authority. And here we are very near the summit. That anyone should have gratuitously represented our Lord as causing people to drink His blood, even symbolically, is about as improbable as anything we can well imagine. And the *allusions* to Exod. xxiv., Jer. xxxi., and Isa. liii. are all introduced in just such a way as they would be by one who was at the very crisis of the supreme mission of all history, and who had formed His conceptions of that mission and come to terms with its startling paradoxes with the help of those three crucial passages. Our logion surely defies the ingenuity of accidental mishap, or even of the cleverest inventor. Parallelism with the bread logion is no sufficient explanation, even granting that logion would already have been a great difficulty. To increase that difficulty gratuitously for the sake of mere parallelism is contrary to all probability; to say nothing of the fact that it goes beyond the bread logion in the reference to the Covenant. Surely the historicity of this saying cannot be reasonably contested.

How then may we come to terms with it? Most probably simply by recognizing that Jesus was no stickler for a precisionistic symbolism. It was not customary to sprinkle the Cup of Blessing upon people, but to drink it. And this probably is all that determined that part of the symbolism. Jesus had chosen the Cup of Blessing to represent His blood of the New Covenant. What more likely, then, than that He should be content to let simply the drinking of the Cup of Blessing symbolize the reception of the blessings that should flow to men from the shedding of His Covenant-founding blood. Especially if He were instituting a memorial to be repeated often is it unlikely that He should command to waste large quantities of wine by sprinkling it—a meaningless gesture.

It seems, then, we must set aside the objections to this saying as insufficient to overthrow the great weight of the argument in favour of its historicity. What then is its meaning?

A new and greater Covenant foretold in Jer. xxxi. 31 ff. is to be founded by the sacrificial blood of a better Victim than those whose blood had sealed the old Covenant as told in Exod. xxiv. 4-8. That Victim is to be none other than the Messiah the Servant of Yahweh, who, it had been expressly foretold in the Scriptures, should give His soul an offering for the sins of many, unto their justification. That is all there is to it. Perfectly simple—and perfectly tremendous!

As to additions to the words "This is My blood" I think it is not possible to doubt that at least the words "of the Covenant" are authentic. They seem to be attested clearly if indirectly in the Paul-Luke tradition, besides having unambiguous attestation in Mark-"Matthew." And their absence in the shorter text of Luke can have no significance, as the whole logion is there absent. The word "new" before Covenant stands at least an equal chance of being historical, as having been apparently contained in the very early form which underlay the metamorphosed Pauline form. The word would increase the facility of comprehension at the Last Supper, and this tells in favour of its historicity. Fortunately the point does not matter seriously for exegesis; for whether He used the *word* or not, Jesus can not have had anything else in mind than a *new* Covenant, as foretold in Jer. xxxi. 31 ff. The old Covenant had already been founded long ago.

There seems no good reason to doubt the words "which is shed for many." They depend chiefly on Mark, but get some confirmation from "Matthew" and Luke (longer text). St. Paul's omission is of little or no weight. He is writing very concisely and quotes only the words he needs for his immediate argument. Fortunately, again, it would matter little for exegesis if the words were not historical. In any case, Covenant-blood *means* blood *shed* in a sacrifice on which the Covenant is based.

As to the added words in Matthew "for the remission of sins," while it is very possible they may have come down by a sound historical tradition, yet the odds seem somewhat against this. However, they seem certainly a correct even if unduly restrictive gloss, as we shall see below.

In any case, the evidence that Jesus attached a sacrificial,

redemptive, sin-remitting significance to His Death, and so expressed Himself at the Last Supper, seems beyond any reasonable doubt. Whether He did it at the bread or at the cup or both, and in just what words, the various traditions that have come down to us do not enable us to determine with as much confidence. But that He did so somewhere, and in some words, they all agree, except the shorter text of Luke. And that account, while it may be textually authentic, is certainly not to be trusted as the most historical.

Do our Lord's words teach or imply an *exclusively* atoning Death? Or rather a Covenant-founding Death, of which forgiveness of sins would be indeed *an* effect, *one* of the blessings coupled with membership in the New Covenant, but by no means the only one? Surely the latter is the true answer.

Let us pass on to the so-called "command to repeat." It is present in 1 Cor. xi., where it occurs twice, with the bread and with the cup. In the longer Lukan text it occurs only once, with the bread. The Pauline form over the cup, which gets no support from the longer Lukan text, contains certain added words which I believe to be important. But the "command" is omitted not only in the shorter text of Luke (which is probably without significance) but in Mark and also in "Matthew" who though dependent could easily have added it from his local tradition had the latter contained it. Thus a serious question is raised as to whether it can be historical. The likelihood of even one of the evangelists omitting these crucial words had he known of them and believed them to be historical is commonly felt to be less than that of their aetiological insertion to explain the current practice of the church. It would be simply assumed that Jesus must have commanded the Last Supper to be repeated, since it was repeated from the first.

Still, I see reasons to hesitate about this conclusion. Let us first examine the exegesis of the logion without regard to its genuineness. It seems at first sight to be the crucial words in the whole narrative; the words that turn what would otherwise have been a mere acted parable into an institution in the church destined to be continued throughout the remaining

generation of the world's existence. But on a closer and more strictly historical inspection I am more than doubtful whether that is quite the nuance the words really express. The meaning just given is certainly a perfectly possible one from the form given over the bread. But it is not the only one. And the form given over the cup, with its added words, seems to me strongly to disfavour, if not to exclude, the above exegesis. The stress is on the significance to be given to the act when repeated. The repetition is not commanded, but taken for granted as inevitable. It is even implied that the repetition might perfectly well, at least on some occasions, be done with a purely secular significance; or at least with some other significance than the one stipulated in the logion. This is surely the natural force of ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε.

Now we can understand all this quite well if we remember that, according to our reconstruction in Chapters I and II, the Last Supper was probably simply the last of many suppers already shared in common by Jesus' *Haburah*; most if not all of them with Jesus Himself present and presiding. Now Jesus surely did not intend His *Haburah* to be dispersed and dissolved by His Death. But if the *Haburah* should unquestionably continue, so by all means should the common meal. What these words represent Jesus as doing, then, is not instituting an entirely new rite, but assigning to the customary *Haburah* meal—or rather to its salient parts—a new significance. Hitherto it had been His joy to share it with them in person. But now He would, He felt sure, never do so again until they were reunited with Him in the Kingdom. He was to be separated from them henceforth. And this meal, which they had so often shared in common with Him, should henceforth, as often as they joined in it, be His memorial.

But if such be the force of these words, they really become nothing more than a doublet of the first part of the bread and cup logia respectively. They are a more explicit, but much less vivid and edifying way of saying precisely the same thing. At least this would be the case from the standpoint of the later church, once the Eucharist was a thoroughly established practice and no one disputed the current theory of its origin.

To say "This is My body" and to say "This is My memorial" are but two ways of saying the same thing. But the first also says much more, and something that, once the realistic doctrine was well established in the church, was even more precious in their eyes than the other element in their Eucharistic faith, to which both sayings alike give expression. Hence the second saying apparently receded rapidly into the background in the esteem of the early church. They even forgot what its precise force had been. St. Paul almost certainly misuses it in his argument in 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff. For it surely does not really mean "as often as ye celebrate the Eucharist, do it in the reverential spirit suited to a solemn memorial of My death," but probably "as often as ye drink the Cup of Blessing after I am gone, drink it as My memorial."

It would seem, then, that it is a serious mistake to read into this passage, in the minds of our first and second evangelists, the importance it has for us in view of recent controversies about the origins of the Eucharist. They knew, or at least without the slightest shadow of doubt thought they knew, that Jesus had instituted the Eucharist and that He had meant that the actions and words He had used at the Last Supper should be repeated. Neither one of them ever dreamed for a moment that anyone could conceivably think Jesus had simply been explaining something parabolically which could better have been explained in words, and had no intention that His actions should ever be repeated. And probably no one in all the church would have raised a doubt about this by the year 65 A.D. Hence both the evangelists introduce their accounts as aetiological cult narratives—in a sense implying, of course, no prejudice to their historicity. But this must not be taken to mean that they were trying to prove anything. They were simply recording a vital but quite undisputed event which happened at that point in their narrative.[1] Hence there can be no sound reason for contending that if they knew these words they would have been sure to bring them forward. They were of no more importance to them, in all probability, than

[1] They amount to little more than saying: "at this point Jesus instituted the Eucharist and then they sang a hymn and went out."

the first eschatological logion in Luke xxii. 15-16, or the first cup with its peculiar logion which all but Luke omit; or the second eschatological logion which Paul omits though he shows he knows it; or the second command to repeat which the longer Lukan text omits after giving the first. I doubt very much if we should ever have heard of these words at all, save for the lucky accident that they happened to lend themselves handily to the particular misuse of them which we find in 1 Cor. xi.[1]

Especially does it seem to me incredible that St. Paul's account should have differed from St. Peter's in this respect; or that Mark, the companion of them both, can have never heard of the words. But if he had heard of them, is it at all credible that he has deliberately cast them aside because he knew them to be not historical? Why, then, had he not told St. Paul of the mistake? Granted the companion of St. Paul must have known these words, it seems much more likely that his omission of them is due to a desire for brevity and a sense of their unimportance for his purposes, than to any conviction that they were spurious.[2]

Thus it seems quite unsafe to lay any stress on Mark's omission of these logia; still less of "Matthew's" following him. And if this be so, there are several reasons telling strongly in favour of the authenticity of the commands.

1. The first and most weighty is that they give far and away the easiest and simplest answer to what is otherwise a difficult and complicated problem. Why was the Last Supper repeated if Jesus had not, in this or in some other way, made His intention clear that so it should be? And why was just the particularly repellent symbolism of eating flesh and *drinking blood*—summit of abominations to any Jew—singled out to be alone treated as of vital and permanent importance? And why,

[1] In fact, by the time of Mark and later, they might even have been more or less of a liability. For men who said: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" might have tried to use them as a means of escape from the realism of the church's belief.

[2] It may even be that his interpretation of Mark xiv. 25 has operated still further to make this command seem like a dispensable doublet, as Dr. Klostermann and Dr. N. P. Williams have thought; though the latter's contention that such was the true meaning of Mark xiv. 25 seems fantastic.

when the realistic meaning was coming in, and the stumbling-block was being immeasurably augmented, did not someone discover or rediscover that Jesus had never commanded or meant any such thing, that He had only acted a simple if tremendously significant parable? Certainly Mark and "Matthew" had not discovered this. Rather, as said above, they give the accounts as aetiological cult narratives, and thus imply clearly that He did then institute the Eucharist.

Why should not the Apostles of all people have known the truth? And if they knew that Jesus had only acted a parable, why did they not stop this tremendous mistake that was happening under their eyes? Why also did not St. Paul find out the error of his account in his contacts with them, which were considerable before 1 Cor. xi. was written? If, on the other hand, they too were unanimously deceived, how can this be accounted for?

It will not do to answer that although none of them thought the explicit "command to repeat" was historical, and Mark got his tradition lacking it from them, yet they soon were, one and all, deceived by accidental[1] current church practice into forgetting entirely what the true character of the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper had been, and in substituting a common misunderstanding for the true one. If they thought so at—say—the year 40, and on the basis of a tradition which they knew did not contain the "command" in question, then what reason have we to say they were mistaken? There are other ways in which Jesus could have made such an intention clear.

It seems, then, that we come to this result. While it probably is not *impossible* that the Lord's Supper might have been continued due to an accident or a misunderstanding, we have no evidential reasons whatsoever to think that such was the case, and it seems improbable in the extreme.

If, however, Jesus really intended not merely to act a parable but to institute a Lord's Supper[2] among His "little flock,"

[1] And how account for this practice?

[2] Dr. Easton has pointed out to me that St. Paul's use of this title is such as to indicate it was a common traditional one. This presumably implies its institution by Him. For in what other sense was it *the Lord's Supper*?

then while it at once relieves our present investigation of any great importance, yet at the same time it greatly increases the chances of these logia being historical. For if He had indicated such an intention at all, in what way is He so likely to have done it as in these simple words attached at just the point in which our Pauline account places them?

2. It seems remarkable how these words, if historical, fill out, illuminate, and integrate the description of the Last Supper. The action with the bread, accompanied with the words "This is My body," could hardly have helped leaving the disciples in hopeless confusion as to what Jesus meant or was doing. To add "which is given for many" helps some, but still leaves it far from clear. And we must recall again that the parallel action with the cup was not to come until the end of the meal, and they presumably had no idea it was coming at all. But to add "Do this for My memorial" at once makes everything clear, even to the most simple and worried minds. And we must remember that Jesus was presumably speaking to be understood, and with as little difficulty as possible. The same considerations apply also to the action and logion with the chalice.

3. If this be so of the language used, it is no less so of the symbolism. There are really two separate symbolisms: the bread and wine=body and blood symbolism, and the eating and drinking symbolism. It will be best to notice them separately.

But first of all, if Jesus were only interpreting the significance of His Death, why use symbolism at all rather than words? The latter could say all that was to be said a great deal more clearly and explicitly than any symbol. On the hypothesis of a memorial, however, there is the perfectly simple and decisive reason that Jesus would not be there on future occasions to speak the words. Thus for a memorial the use of symbolism was imperative.

As to the bread and wine symbolism, both, and especially the wine, are more or less unsuitable to symbolize the Passion. This makes a difficulty for the "acted parable" theory, since on it symbolism was easily dispensable, unless satisfactory

symbolism could be found. But for a memorial there is no such difficulty, since no better was available, and some symbolism had to be used.

As to the eating and drinking symbolism, there is again a difficulty. Why make men *eat* flesh and *drink* BLOOD (above all things) even if only symbolically? On the "acted parable" view there seems no reason save the fact that that was what was normally done with the bread and wine. But this does not explain why Jesus chose for His symbols something that had subsequently to be eaten and drunk, thus producing so repulsive a symbolism. It would seem more natural to dispense with the symbolism entirely. For a memorial, however, since it was to be subsequently repeated, the difficulty is much less. For not only was some symbolism indispensable, but, according to contemporary conceptions, the precise way to share in the benefits of a sacrifice was to feast upon it.

The language and symbols employed at the Last Supper, then, seem much more easily understandable if Jesus were instituting a memorial than if He were merely expounding the significance of His Death.

4. The words ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε also seem to tell strongly in favour of the historicity of the logion as a whole, if our exegesis of them above is correct. For it seems much more likely to have originated, containing those words as it does, at a time *before* the *Eucharistic* Cup was a familiar *quantum*, and hence not to be an aetiological creation. Once it was such, it is natural to understand "as often as ye drink the Eucharistic Cup." But our exegesis above, if correct, shows it originally meant "as often as ye drink the Cup of Blessing." Now, while it is, of course, not impossible some early Christian might have been able to think himself back into the precise historical situation successfully enough to fashion an aetiological command in words expressing precisely this nuance, yet it is certainly a very improbable supposition. The hypothesis of historicity is much simpler and more probable.

5. The occurrence of the "command to repeat" *in doubled form*, when reflected upon, seems also to tell in favour of its historicity. Any later writer or speaker would probably tend

to be satisfied with one command, as was the longer text of Luke. But in the actual historical supper the reason why it should be doubled is clear as soon as we remember that the bread and cup came a half-hour (or more) apart. The first command was *necessary* to make the action and the saying with the bread more comprehensible, as no one but Jesus knew the second one was ever coming. The second was almost as necessary. For the preceding one was spoken quite a while before, and it was very easy to repeat it. Moreover, it contains the perhaps important added words "as often as ye drink it."

Incidentally these words probably are as significant for their absence in the first command as for the nuance they convey in the second. We considered the latter just above. But why would anyone creating an aetiological command ever have thought of doubling it and yet of including these words one time and not the other? Out of the historical situation, however, the distinction is easily explained. If Jesus had used these words with the bread logion, it would have made it impossible for the early disciples to hold any common meal, however informal, without it coming under this command, perhaps several times within the same meal. For bread was broken at least once every meal. With the cup, however, it was different. For it is not *any* cup or *any* wine that is in question, but only the comparatively rare Cup of Blessing, which was always a common cup, never came more than once in a meal, and only in the more solemn or festive type of meal at that. It was feasible to add the words "every time you drink it" in regard to such a *quantum*. But what later inventor of the logion could ever have thought of such a distinction?

6. The second "command to repeat" connects with Mark xiv. 25 better than either Mark xiv. 24 or Luke xxii. 17, especially if the connecting particle γάρ is original. Moreover, it not only connects better, but it gives Mark xiv. 25 an *independent function* instead of making it a mere doublet of Luke xxii. 15-16. For such it would otherwise be, with the Passover meal only twenty-four hours away. On the view I suggest, Mark xiv. 25 tells why they should "do this for His memorial"—why He would need a memorial. The reason

was, He would henceforth be separated from them, before they would ever have a chance to share their meal in common another day. Then it is no mere doublet of Luke xxii. 15-16. The latter tells why He institutes *that night* what He had originally hoped to institute on the morrow at the Passover itself.

7. Finally, there is the great weight of St. Paul's direct testimony on the subject. His account is the earliest of our written accounts. But that is only the beginning of the story. He says it is what he received, and that ought to mean at or not long after his conversion. This takes us back at least to 37 A.D., probably to 33-34, possibly even to 30 A.D. Moreover, some three years later he went up to Jerusalem. There and on other occasions, such as his contacts with Mark and Barnabas, he had splendid and very early chances to check any matters on which their tradition differed from the one he had received, and he presumably did so at least on important matters. His tradition then, as he gives it to us in 1 Cor. xi., presumably ran the gauntlet of these tests successfully. Moreover, in 1 Cor. xi. he is making the precise words in question the very crux of his argument. Hence he is himself bound to be sure of their accuracy; and his opponents, who knew the Jerusalem tradition independently, would be sure to have exploited the fact if he had made spurious words the very mainspring of his argument against them. Such untrammelled scholars as Harnack have had to confess that St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi. 23 are "too strong for" them.

8. It may be worth mentioning the "new commandment" which the Fourth Gospel places at the Last Supper. At first this seems quite irrelevant. But further thought leads, I believe, to a different conclusion. If, as I believe, the author claims—and rightly—to have been present at the Last Supper, he should know what was done there. Now none of our other sources gives any commandment at the Last Supper to "love one another," or any other commandment, new or old, except the aetiological "Eucharistic" Narrative. Nor could "love one another" be called a new commandment, for Jesus Himself had already accepted that as being the heart of the last six commandments of the decalogue, and St. John must have been

aware of this. When we add to this the double meaning he gives, or at least hints, for the word "love" in his writings, with the Agape (i.e. Eucharist) in his mind apparently, it is hard to doubt that he has in mind in his "new commandment" the institution of the Eucharist.

We conclude, then, that there are strong reasons for accepting as historical the twice-repeated command to "do this" for the memorial of Jesus, not the least of these reasons being the fact that there are still stronger reasons for believing that Jesus instituted a memorial in some words, if not in these. On the other hand, the only serious objection, after examination above, must be judged to be much less cogent than many—including, I must confess, the present writer until quite recently—have thought was the case.

Let us now summarize briefly our picture of the Last Supper according to our proposed reconstruction. It will be convenient at some points to paraphrase and expand considerably rather than quote exactly, in order to bring out what we conceive to have been thought, implied, or intended as well as what was actually said.

As they sat down Jesus said to them: "I had most intensely desired and hoped that I might live to share the Passover with you this year before I suffer. But I see now my hopes are to be in vain. I am absolutely convinced I shall never eat another Passover in this world. Before tomorrow night I shall be taken from you. Therefore I must do tonight what could most fittingly have been done tomorrow night at the Passover."

Then He passed them the wine-container and the water, that each might mix for himself the individual cup of the preliminary course which was customary among Jews of that day. As He did so He probably said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves." Whether He implied He was in no spirits to drink wine that night we cannot tell; but it would have been evident to them, who could see whether He had first taken of it or not. Perhaps it would have set the tone for what was to follow.

Then He took the loaf of bread, blessed it and broke it in His own characteristic and inimitable manner, and as He gave

it to them used the startling and utterly unforgettable words: "Take, (?) eat (??)! This is My body which I am about to give in sacrifice for the sake of many. Henceforth let this action, which we have done so often together, be My memorial, and especially of My Passion."

Then as the supper progressed, no doubt at considerable length, there were other foods and certainly much conversation. In this Jesus presumably took the predominating part. The main topic would be the great things that were about to happen, and any things Jesus had formerly said to them He was especially anxious to be sure they did not forget. There would probably also have been certain things, especially parting instructions, He had saved up to tell them at the very last. For Jesus with His deep knowledge of men would know that things said *that* night would be written indelibly into their memories, if not in the elaborated form of the actual conversation, at least as to the substance of all the main things He wanted to say. Perhaps there was some of the more commonplace woven into their conversation. Luke xxii. 21-38 and (less reliably) John xiii.-xvii. are our best guides to this conversation, apart from general probabilities, which in a case like this are probably fairly safe guides also.

When they had finished the meal, Jesus took the customary final cup, the Cup of Blessing, into His hands, spoke over it the much longer grace-after-meals, *the* blessing *par excellence* of the Jewish meal, and passed it around among them. As He did so He said: "Drink ye all of this (?); this is My blood which is about to be shed in sacrifice to inaugurate the New Covenant which (the prophets have foretold) will bring blessings unspeakable, including the forgiveness of sins, to many. Henceforth, whenever ye drink together this Cup of Blessing which ye have so often shared with Me in the past, let it be My memorial, and especially of My Passion. For I tell you without a shadow of doubt I will never be present to share it in person with you again. For behold My betrayer is at hand and has already begun his treason, as indeed must have been the case. For the Scriptures have foretold it all, My betrayal and My sufferings and death, as part of the irrevocably deter-

mined plan and counsel of God. However, be of good cheer. It is not really the end, but only the path God, My Father, has marked out to victory. And in the Kingdom not long hence we shall be reunited to share together the Messianic Banquet. It will be the fulfilment alike of the Passover we cannot share this year and of all other rightful meals, especially the one we have shared so often, and which I have just bade you observe, now that I am leaving you, as My memorial."

And when He had so said, they sang a psalm and went out, and henceforth did as He had that night commanded them. To forget what He had said or to misunderstand it was impossible.

Epilogue

So originated the Eucharist. I have examined in Appendices VI and VII the evidence for Eucharists in one kind, for Eucharists in bread and water, and for Eucharists in which the Cup preceded the Bread. It will be found there that in all these cases the evidence is very weak. In none of the three cases is there any slightest likelihood on the evidence of such having ever been the prevalent practice in the primitive church; and in the last two cases at least—quite probably in the first as well—there is no real evidence of it as being primitive at all, even as an exception.

But even if any one of these—or even all three—could be shown, or conjecturally admitted, to have been practised exceptionally in the primitive church, that would be no valid objection to the Eucharist having originated as described just above. Our Lord had not given a *codex juris canonici* with a detailed section bearing on the Eucharist. So many unusual questions could arise under extraordinary circumstances, and it might not be clear to everyone who was called upon to make the decision just what the answer should be. Thus irregularities could easily arise on the theory of origin I have given.

For example, suppose wine was lacking. Some, being faced with a new contingency, might decide to go ahead without it, and so we would have a Eucharist in one kind. The same would result (if anyone missed the implication of ὁσάκις ἐὰν

πίνητε) from the holding of an informal meal, in which no Cup of Blessing would be used. Should such a meal be His memorial? No, if our exegesis of "as often as, etc.," is correct. But there is no reason why someone in the very early church might not have given the opposite answer.

Again, some who lacked wine might conceivably give a different solution to the problem and proceed with a chalice of water. This seems much less likely, at least until the identity of the Eucharistic Cup with the Cup of Blessing was lost sight of. For the latter was a festal cup, and to use water would, I should think, be almost as unlikely as to serve water for dessert in a modern meal. Better omit the Cup entirely. Yet it is not impossible, and if it did ever happen it would give us bread-and-water Eucharists, but would likewise tell nothing against our conclusions.

The Eucharist with the Cup preceding the Bread seems most difficult of all to explain until the ancestry of the Eucharistic Cup in the Cup of Blessing was forgotten. For the latter was by its very nature and essence at the conclusion of the meal. Yet we may have it attested in the *Didache* (120-150 A.D.). But again, exceptional cases of this, even if earlier, would in no way militate against our conclusions.

As to the contention that the very early Eucharist was no memorial of the Passion, and that the Cup, if there was one, was not essential, or else was an eschatological cup rather than a Covenant-blood Cup, suffice it to say there is no evidence at all of this except the silence of two very brief summary passages in Acts. And to frame such an argument from silence is utterly beyond comprehension. Paradoxically, some who do so refuse to draw a similar conclusion from the silence of the longer passage in Acts xx. Nor can any conclusion be drawn from the joyous tone of the very primitive Eucharist. People who attributed to Christ's Death the stupendous soteriological consequences those early Christians did, had every reason to commemorate it with joy. Besides, there was the vital difference that to the disciples Jesus was not dead but alive again and victorious. Hence His Death was but a

step toward victory and would not in any way exclude a joyous tone.

There seems, then, no good reason to doubt that the primitive Eucharist was a fairly exact replica of the Last Supper as we have pictured it not only at Corinth and in 53 A.D. but everywhere else, and during all the period between its institution and that date. We can allow for such exceptions as discussed just above if we wish, though I know of no direct evidence for any of them at this early date. But we have no reason, I repeat, to doubt that the overwhelmingly predominant practice was as I have contended.

There remains the one staggering problem, than which I suppose there is no more difficult from the purely historical standpoint in the whole range of N.T. study—how to account for the origin of the strictly realistic sacramentalism which we have seen above that St. Paul inherited from the common pre-Pauline tradition. It would seem impossible to account for this as derived from Gentile sources, even back behind St. Paul. For one obvious reason, there is no close parallel from which it can be derived. But even if there were, it is unthinkable in the actual state of the evidence that it could have effected an entrance into the Christian tradition from such a source.

For St. Paul received his tradition about the Eucharist—and this must mean not only the account of the Last Supper, but, at least in its broad substance, the interpretation he puts upon it—not just a little while before writing 1 Corinthians, but at, or surely not long after, his conversion, for which a good "middle-of-the-road" date is ±33 A.D. He may even have become acquainted with it before his conversion, in the inquisitorial proceedings inevitably connected with the persecution he was conducting. But if he received it at his conversion this would certainly have been one of the things he would check when he went to Jerusalem "after three years," i.e. ±36 A.D. If he first heard at some still later date of the Institution Narrative (as is hardly possible), or of the high sacramental interpretation of it which he handed on to the Corinthians, I do not believe we can for a moment imagine one of his nature and disposition and of his intense conviction

of the absolute authority of the teaching of the Lord resting at all until he had run the matter down thoroughly and assured himself to the very best of his ability what the true tradition was both as to facts and as to doctrine. And the same holds if, after receiving it at his conversion, he had later found one or more divergent traditions or interpretations current elsewhere in the church, especially in the great and authoritative mother church in Jerusalem.

Besides, the Apostles were all alive and avid for the careful preservation of the tradition committed to their keeping; and at least St. Peter and St. James, "the Lord's brother" were at Jerusalem available for consultation and were actually seen by St. Paul upon his first post-conversion visit there. Moreover, we may be especially sure that they would not have looked tolerantly upon anything constituting so unmistakable an apologetic liability as the high sacramental Eucharistic doctrine of St. Paul, or allowed it to effect a lodgment in the tradition from any external Gentilic source whatever. Finally, the opponents of St. Paul and of the Gentile mission as it was actually conducted would have been only too eager and speedy to pounce upon anything so justly open to the charge of paganism as would be that Eucharistic doctrine, if it came from any outside source whatsoever and had not been an accepted element in pre-Pauline Jewish Christianity. Thus, although we lack direct testimony—except St. Paul's own—we seem driven by the most cogent considerations to the really startling view that the high sacramentalism of St. Paul's Eucharistic doctrine, including his belief that the body and blood of Christ are really present and received in the Eucharist, was already the common faith of Palestinian Jewish Christianity well before the Gentiles began to flock into the church, and was really received by St. Paul from that source. How can we possibly account for its presence there?

Certainly the historical data, if viewed from the relatively narrow sphere in which we have so far been working, seem to clamour insistently for the answer that such an advanced belief, in such a *milieu*, and at such an early date, admits of only one explanation. That is, that it must proceed from the one

and only source sufficiently authoritative to secure the early, universal, and unchallenged acceptance of so extremely scandal-giving a belief, viz. the Lord Jesus the Messiah Himself.

But historical considerations of a broader sort, which it is not possible to investigate here, seem to raise very serious doubts as to whether it is historically tenable to conceive the human knowledge and Personal Self-Consciousness of the historical Jesus in such a manner as to leave room for the fully, literally, realistic view in His human mind, at least along the lines usually assumed. If not, then is there a different line along which room can be found for it there, without challenging the reality of those apparent limits in His human mind which modern historical criticism believes itself to find? If this cannot be done, then what explanation of the very early and unchallenged prevalence of this clear and strong realism, short of His Personal authority, can be made in the least plausible?

On these questions I hope further study may throw more light. But at present I am unable to come to any very confident conclusions. I am attempting in my own mind a highly speculative solution to this very difficult and complicated problem. But I am not yet ready to submit it even tentatively for general perusal and criticism. I shall deeply appreciate it if any who think themselves to have a plausible answer would communicate it to me. I shall, of course, be glad to treat any correspondence as confidential if so requested. Possibly together we might be able to advance further in the quest for Truth.

APPENDIX I

A SUGGESTED STRENGTHENING OF THE THEORY SET FORTH IN THE TEXT

I HAVE contented myself in the main text with the formulation of the theory I propose on the basis of the evidence as it at present stands in the several opinions of our best editors of the particular sources. I have done this for two reasons. Firstly, I did not wish the theory I have presented to depend in any serious measure on doubtful texts, or on conjectural emendations. Secondly, I wanted the conclusions at which we have arrived to add their own weight to the arguments about to be deduced in support of a different view of certain pieces of the evidence.

I believe, however, that we should accept views different from those now prevalent on at least three important points in our sources. If we do so, we shall find that the evidence for our main reconstruction is very considerably strengthened. This point I shall develop in the sequel, after we have seen what are the novel conclusions proposed, and the reasons assignable in support of them.

The suggested changes in our evidence are these:

1. The author of the *Didache* has been misled by the reference to the Holy Vine of David (*Did.*, 9 : 2) into the supposition that the first brief paragraph (9 : 2) should be a wine-blessing. He has therefore himself added to his source (which contained neither) the two brief (and mistaken) rubrics: "first concerning the cup," and "and concerning the broken bread." Omitting these, we would have a source which would read just as *Didache* 9-10 otherwise do now. Chapter 9 : 2-4 is the bread-blessing, then comes the meal, and Chapter 10 is the blessing of the Eucharistic Cup.

The result is very enlightening. At once we get a Eucharist-

Agape in which there is no opening cup but only the opening Eucharistic Bread. This is just what the rest of our evidence would lead us to expect. Also the Eucharistic Cup comes just where we would expect it; i.e. after the meal had been completed, in the place where the grace-after-meals would be expected inevitably to come. Let us remember in this connection that the grace-after-meals—*the* blessing at the Jewish meal—was the regular blessing used over the Cup of Blessing.

Not only does the position thus gained for the Bread and Cup, with their respective prayers, recommend our proposed view. Even more strongly does the resulting structure of the prayers recommend it. We now have two "consecration prayers" that are, at least in structure, closely parallel to each other. Each prayer is composed of three short paragraphs. In both cases the first two paragraphs end with "to thee be glory forever," and the last paragraph with "for thine is the power and the glory [1] forever." In both cases the concluding paragraph contains the petition for the gathering together of the church from the four ends of the world into the Kingdom.

This last may be with considerable reason looked upon as the "transposed" and "spiritualized" Christian equivalent for the usual third paragraph in the customary Jewish grace-after-meals. That paragraph prays now for Divine mercy upon "Israel," "Jerusalem thy city," "Zion, the abiding place of thy glory," "the kingdom of the house of David thine anointed," "the great and holy house that was called by thy name." It prays for relief from "all our troubles." It closes always with a petition for the consolation and rebuilding of Jerusalem. Of course the latter must be later than 70 A.D. But it is not at all unlikely that before that time its place was taken by a petition for the ingathering of the *Diaspora*, or of the "lost tribes." In any case, the portion quoted first above is in all probability earlier than 70 A.D.; and in this connection we should remember how the Christians looked upon themselves as the new and true Israel, and the Kingdom to come as the new and true Jerusalem. Finally, we should especially

[1] The order of "glory" and "power" is transposed, but this can hardly be significant.

remember how the Jewish grace-after-meals had at that date precisely three "paragraphs."

What I would suggest is that from a very early time Christian thought and piety felt some incongruity in ascribing precisely equivalent effects to two thanksgivings so very disparate in length as the (very brief) opening bread-blessing and the (long) closing grace-after-meals with which the Eucharistic chalice was blessed. But the tendency among the early Christians was all in the direction of even greater prolixity in their thanksgivings than among the Jews. This led speedily to a powerful tendency to expand the briefer of the two essential Eucharistic blessings until it soon became parallel to the longer one. The latter, I would suppose, underwent less drastic development; though its length was made to vary somewhat, and of course it too was spiritualized and "transposed into a higher key." In the *Didache* we would have both these tendencies completed, and the results of the evolution before us.

Another reason for accepting the view I propose is that it relieves us of three really serious difficulties. The first is: "How did the Eucharistic Cup ever become separated from its traditional blessing—the grace-after-meals—while the latter still survived, and while the Eucharist was still united to the Agape?" On our theory we can answer simply that it never did—that all that happened was a mistake by an obtuse and unthoughtful editor whose prescriptions do not reflect contemporary practice.[1]

The second difficulty of which the same answer will relieve us is: "How did the Eucharistic Cup ever come to be shifted to the beginning of the meal?" There seems no likely explanation of this while the Eucharist is still united to the Agape.

The third difficulty (and perhaps the greatest of all) is: "How, even if we could account for the Cup being transferred, could we ever account for it receiving so short a blessing?" Especially how can this be historical as late as ±140 A.D., which is probably the date of the *Didache*? We have seen in Chapter III strong reason to believe that the usual Anaphora

[1] Though they may possibly have influenced some later practice in certain places.

by Justin's time was already longer than the one in Hippolytus' *A.T.* Nor should we forget that the *Didache* pretends to set a norm, and is not a mere isolated occasional accident. I consider this difficulty very grave. But if an obtuse editor simply drew a false inference from the reference to the Holy Vine of David, and erroneously rubricized his source accordingly, without stopping to think how anomalous a Eucharist would thus be occasioned, the matter ceases to be troublesome.

The extremely primitive character of these prayers, coupled with the relatively late date of the book as a final product (probably 140 A.D.), makes it very likely that we have to do with a source reproduced by a later editor. Also, the use of either the *Epistle of Barnabas* or else of the "Two-ways" document in some other or separate form makes this sure for the earlier part of the book.

If the text be taken as it stands, both the wine-blessing and even the bread-blessing are sufficiently short to raise a difficulty. This we noted above. But there is the further difficulty: "Why in that case is there such a discrepancy between the length of the two blessings?" The bread-blessing is more than twice as long as the wine-blessing, and for no apparent reason.

Again, if the text be taken as it stands, there is more Eucharistic language in the prayer not associated with the consecration of the elements than in those which are. Surely this is a difficulty!

Still again, the order in the text as it stands is cup-bread. Not only is this difficult to account for, if the Eucharist originated as described in the main text. In addition, the customary order is at least twice attested in these very chapters themselves. In 9 : 5 we get, "Let none *eat or drink* of your Eucharist, etc."; and in 10 : 3, "but us hast thou blessed with spiritual *food and drink*, etc."

Finally, there is a point I consider very weighty. In 10 : 6 we get, "If any man be holy, let him come! If any man be not, let him repent. *Maran atha.* Amen." It is very hard for one acquainted with the early liturgies to avoid the impression that we have here the "Holy things to the holy" so familiar in them. But if so, then the Communion is almost

inevitably about to be received rather than long past. For those words are—it is hardly too much to say—inseparably connected with the Communion everywhere else they occur. Nor is it improbable that, in view of these facts, we have here a rather specialized usage of *Maran atha*, with an especial though not exclusive reference to the Lord's coming to be present in the Eucharist. If either of these is so, Chapter 10 must be a real Eucharistic consecration. Besides, is not a post-Communion thanksgiving at such an early date very surprising, and quite unattested elsewhere, even in the Gnostic evidence, until much later?

Even the closing injunction in 10 : 7 ("But suffer the prophets to hold Eucharist as much as they will") is most naturally understood to imply that the forms provided are Eucharistic, including the one most recently given. But of course an untechnical meaning of *εὐχαριστεῖν* is here possible. The connection between this closing verse, however (10 : 7), and the opening verse (9 : 1) is unfavourable to this possibility, for 9 : 1 can hardly be untechnical. It seems 9 : 1 says, "Here are forms for the Eucharist"; and 10 : 7 adds, "But these are not binding on those having the gift of inspired prophecy."

All these reasons seem to give us a very strong case for the view of the Eucharist I have suggested the *Didache* attests after being critically examined and evaluated. We get a common meal preceded by the Eucharistic Bread (blessed with 9 : 2-4) and followed by the Eucharistic Cup (blessed with 10 : 2-5). How much better this makes the *Didache* fit in with the rest of our evidence will be obvious at a glance.

2. The correct text of the *A.T.* of Hippolytus is substantially that found in the *Eth. C.O.* (viz. 26 : 1-32) rather than the more usually accepted one based on the Latin, Sahidic, and Arabic versions (viz. 26 : 1-13 only). This brings the Roman evidence for the year ±200 A.D. into very much closer agreement with our hypothetical norm, and at the same time greatly decreases the variations from that norm for which we otherwise would need to be able to account. The reasons for this important conclusion I will give at once.

The "shorter text" of *A.T.* (which assumes only verses 1-13

of Chapter 26 to be original) leaves several difficult problems. In *A.T.* 26 : 1-13 we have a very careful description of how the Agape should begin, but no mention of the lamplighting, or spiritual exercises, and no single word as to how it should end. In the Ethiopic text, on the other hand, we seem to have two different Agapae. The first (verses 1-13) usually is taken to be the private Agape. Then, after an unrelated digression (verses 14-17), the second is taken to be the public Agape (verses 18-32). Here again the first Agape lacks the same elements as above; while the second contains all those things which verses 1-13 lack, but lacks anything even remotely resembling the usual beginning. To be sure, in the Ethiopic text as it now stands, this lack is partly remedied by the repetition of 26 : 2, 10-12. But this only emphasizes the difficulty. For it clearly describes the beginning of this Agape, yet describes it after the middle and end have first been fully described. Why this anomalous procedure?

I believe the answer is not far to seek. The original text of Hippolytus was sufficiently confusing to be quite incomprehensible to one not acquainted with the local practices he is describing. Hence it has been misunderstood by all the translators and redactors whose work has come down to us, though not all have remedied the confusion in the same way. Now, when we find what at first sight seems to be two distinct Agapae very closely connected in one of the chief authorities for our text, each lacking just what the other supplies, and the total providing only one complete "normal" Agape, it surely does not lie far to suspect that what we really have is the beginning, middle, and end of only one Agape. In short, we have here, I suggest, nothing else than a complete and fairly detailed account of the one and only type of Agape commonly practised in the Roman church at the time. There seem to me four weighty arguments confirming this conjecture: (*a*) The text admits of a fully satisfactory interpretation on this supposition; (*b*) it also enables us to understand easily the confusion and variations we find in the later versions and redactions; (*c*) it presents us with an Agape conforming almost perfectly to the norm we have reconstructed inde-

pendently of this conjecture; and (*d*) it may fairly claim to have stronger external textual evidence in its favour than the view that only 26 : 1-13 are original. I must enlarge upon these four points in turn.

(*a*) I am taking the view that, speaking generally, the Ethiopic version is the key to the true original text in this particular passage. I do not intend this to apply, however, to the repetition of 26 : 2 and 10-12 after 26 : 32. That repetition I hold to be almost certainly unoriginal. Also 26 : 32 will probably be unoriginal if the conjectural emendation of "cup" into "bread" must be accepted. (But this I doubt—see below.) Finally, it is possible (but I think improbable) that 26 : 14-17 are unoriginal.

Taking our text, then, as this would leave it, we shall see that it all admits of a fully satisfactory interpretation as constituting a continuous description of one single, complete Agape. Verses 1-5 describe the beginning of the meal. Verses 6-7 and 9-10 describe the conduct expected during the meal. Verse 8 digresses to describe what shall be done (instead of verses 6-7 and 9-10) if the meal is to be taken home and eaten rather than eaten at the home of the host. Verses 11-12 tell what shall be done in case the regular officiant is not present to preside. Verse 13 is a general direction. Verses 14-17 regulate the practice alluded to but not described in 26 : 9 of sending some of the food to absent or needy Christians. Then verses 18-27 give directions as to the lamplighting which is to take place as darkness begins to set in. Chapter 27 harks back to this and orders that if it be a meal for widows the meal shall not be allowed to last so long, but they shall be dismissed in time to get home before dark.[1] Finally, verses 28-32 (or 31?) describe the spiritual exercises and the offering of the "mingled cup of the *Prosphora*" with which the Agape normally concluded.

[1] We should recall at this point that the Jewish meal, from which the Eucharist originated apparently, also began some time before dark, and that the arrival of the feast or Sabbath, if one was approaching, was greeted with the *Kiddush* Cup at or near the end of the meal as the day actually arrived (Shammai ?) or as soon after as the meal could be conveniently concluded (Hillel ?).

I would incline to think that in 26 : 32 "cup" is, after all, the correct reading. I admit this cannot be retained if the reference to "fragments" is original. But to change "cup" into "bread" here creates serious difficulties. If the change is compulsory, then 26 : 32 must be held unoriginal, along with the repetition of 26 : 2 and 10-12. But I believe a simpler solution to the difficulty is to suppose that in this tertiary version some originally vaguer expression has in the process of multiple translation become transformed into the more definite "shall give the fragments to all believers." Such expressions suggest themselves as "and shall give *of it* to all the believers," or "and shall divide it among (or pass it to) all the believers." [1] The phenomenon of Luke xxii. 17 ("take this and divide it among yourselves") is enlightening in this regard.

(*b*) The variant textual phenomena all seem more easily explicable on the assumption that this text (26 : 1-32) is original than on the assumption that only 26 : 1-13 is. The relevance of verses 14-17 is not at all obvious to one living elsewhere and later, and not knowing the local practice which it regulates. To such a one it would seem an entirely new topic, as indeed it does to practically all modern scholars. But then verses 18-32 would also become isolated and incapable of being rightly understood.

Hence it is easy to understand how some later scribes, translators, or editors who knew only one form of the Agape should prefer and retain what appeared to them to be the one of two forms corresponding the more closely to the practice with which they were acquainted. Thus would they omit verses 14-32, and so would arise the form of text we find in our extant Sahidic and Arabic versions [2] and possibly (but doubtfully) in the Latin.

Others would handle the enigma differently. They would

[1] This may receive some slight confirmation from the fact that otherwise no " distribution " of the chalice is ordered.

[2] Especially when we remember that (apart from the doubtful Latin) the only sources we have which lack 26 : 14-32 are the *later* Sahidic, and the probably dependent Arabic. And this may be an omission of what had by their date (or the date of the extant Sahidic) ceased to be practised, or else at least been considerably transformed.

retain "both forms" of the Agape which *A.T.* seemed to them to provide. But they would supply the total lack of the usual beginning for the "second form" by repeating, in whole or in part, verses 1-13. It seems that the Ethiopic [1] or its source has supplied only verses 2 and 10-12 (but possibly also verse 32). It seems quite likely, however, that the *Canons of Hippolytus* is dependent on a form in which verses 2-13 came after verses 18-32 (whether also before, in the *Eth. C.O.* position, one cannot tell). If not, then in any case the editor has gone back and formed his Agape by beginning in the middle of a text like our present *Eth. C.O.* and completing it from the first part (verses 1-13) in just the place our *Eth. C.O.* repeats verses 2 and 10-12.

As to the Latin, it does not seem possible to speak with certainty. At first sight it seems to be a sure witness for a text running 26 : 1-13, 27, etc., and definitely omitting verses 14-32. There is a lacuna, but it seems to come before rather than after verses 1-13 and thus not to account for the absence of verses 14-32. On a more careful study, however, the certainty of this is greatly shaken. We know for certain that *Eth. C.O.* repeats at least a part of 26 : 1-13 after 26 : 32. Moreover, we just saw that it is quite probable *C.H.* used a form which either repeated verses 1-13 after 26 : 32 or else contained it only in that position. Once we have adequately

[1] The Ethiopic translator lived in a backwater section of the church, where old customs had been changed less radically and more recently, so he undertook to deal with the problem in a less radical way. The unprecedented beginning of the Agape was the main difficulty—in truth, it made no provision for the beginning. This he attempts to remedy. He will not break into his text, which (i.e. 26 : 18-32) seems to him to be a continuous whole. But he attempts to supply the defect by retrospective rubrics, placed at the end of the section and before the next following one. What he says amounts to this : " But let this form of the Agape, for which in its first part no directions are given above, be conducted just as the preceding form." He does not need 26 : 6-9, because he understands this as a public form not given by an individual. The catechumens' " bread of exorcism " is covered by the repetition of 26 : 11*d*. He may simply take 26 : 3-4*b* (the initial cup) for granted, or he may think the " mingled cup of the *Prosphora* " takes the place of this. I do not mean to suggest that after these amendments he has made the directions conform precisely to the Agape as he knew it. But he has done his best with a rather difficult text to make it much less " unorthodox " than it was ; and especially to secure that the opening bread-breaking by the officiant, which was, I suppose, the most universally identical single point in the Agape ritual—should not be omitted.

envisaged the possibility of such texts existing, we must see at once that our Latin version may have rested on one of them. But if so, then verses 14-32 and possibly a first occurrence of verses 1-13 may have preceded the point at which our present Latin text resumes after the lacuna, and so may have been contained in the Latin version in its integrity. This makes the evidence of the Latin version much more doubtful. In either case, however, it can be easily explained on the assumption that the original contained verses 14-32, which is the only point with which we are concerned just here.

On the other hand, if only 26 : 1-13 is original, it is really quite difficult to explain *Eth. C.O.* and *C.H.* For why, then, does the former repeat 26 : 2 and 10-12 after instead of before his own addition to the original (which in that case 26 : 14-32 would be)? Or if it came in somewhere between Hippolytus and the hand that repeated 26 : 2 and 10-12, why was it left entirely devoid of any directions as to how it should begin? More difficult still, why did *C.H.* begin his account in the middle of the meal and then go on to finish it and afterwards go back and tell about the beginning? Perhaps these difficulties are not insuperable, but they are surely very real.

(*c*) It will not be necessary to spend much space showing how much more closely the Agape conforms to our reconstructed norm if 26 : 1-32 gives us the original text of *A.T.* Our norm (see p. 43, Chapter II, of the main text) gave us the following picture:

The meal begins with the *Eulogia* for the faithful and the "bread of exorcism" for the catechumens; blessed, broken, and distributed by the bishop or some other cleric in his absence. When darkness draws near there is the handwashing and the ceremonial lighting of the lamp. After supper there are psalms, hymns, and possibly other spiritual exercises. Then the meal concludes with the solemnly blessed and commonly shared "mingled cup of the *Prosphora*."

The correspondence between this norm and the Agape given in *A.T.* (assuming the text I propose) is truly remarkable. In fact, it is closer than any other single account we possess, unless one reads into Tertullian things he does not mention

(but probably means, as we know from other sources). It almost seems as if we had made such a view of the text of *A.T.* the very basis of our norm. Yet, on the contrary, it will be remembered we carefully avoided doing so, and provisionally took as our working basis the "shorter text" of *A.T.* Surely, then, this very close agreement with our norm (only the hand-washing is lacking in *A.T.*), and particularly with the contemporary and locally adjacent Tertullian, is a strong argument in favour of the Hippolytean authorship of 26 : 1-32 and its Roman provenance at a ±220 date.

In fact, it simply comes down to this. If 26 : 1-32 is original, we get *one* Agape *closely agreeing* with our norm; if only 26 : 1-13 is original, we get *two* Agapae *disagreeing widely* with it—at least in so far as each lacks large portions of the whole. Yet, combined, these two total just precisely our norm. This is too remarkable to be a coincidence.

(*d*) As to the external textual evidence, at first sight it seems to be one-sidedly averse to our proposal. It seems to be two primary versions (the Latin and the Sahidic) and one secondary version (the Arabic) in agreement against one solitary tertiary version, the Ethiopic. But again a closer study gives a very different result.

We saw above that it is by no means safe to count the Latin as having originally lacked 26 : 14-32. It may well have contained originally all the material in the Ethiopic text, only in the order that seems likely to underlie *C.H.* In that case 26 : 14-32 would fall within the lacuna. Then, secondly, a recent editor of *A.T.* (Dr. B. S. Easton) holds that an earlier Arabic version than our extant one must underlie the Ethiopian version, and that that in turn is derived from an earlier Sahidic than the extant Sahidic. Thus we are justified in claiming earlier Sahidic and Arabic versions to offset (or more than offset) the extant but later Sahidic and Arabic. Finally, there is the weighty fact that the fourth-century *Test. Dom.* seems to have known and used a text of *A.T.* which contained at least some of 26 : 14-32; and the (probably) fifth-century *C.H.* certainly knew and used a text containing all that our extant Ethiopic contains, though possibly in a

different order or else with 26 : 1-13 repeated in its entirety after 26 : 32.

It seems, then, that in reality there is more than enough external evidence to swing the scales against the "shorter text" even if we counted the Latin as unreservedly in its favour—a thing it would, as we saw above, be quite unsafe to do.

Thus, our four reasons given above in favour of the originality of the "longer text" of *A.T.* (26 : 1-32) seem to be made good. It remains only to glance briefly at the objections:

(1) It is suggested that there is nothing in 26 : 14-32 which "could have troubled the Sahidic and Arabic translators; the insertion of such widespread usages is easier to understand than their omission."

This objection loses its force if our interpretation of the text is correct. For in that case it would be very easy to lose entirely the key to its proper understanding. Now, once this was lost, there would be something to trouble the editors. For the supposed "second form" of the Agape would be quite anomalous, having no beginning corresponding to any practice these editors had ever seen. Hence, as we saw above, some would supply the lack by repeating the whole or a part of verses 1-13 after verse 32, while others solved the difficulty by simply omitting the incomprehensible and anomalous "second form." Verses 14-17 are responsible for the whole thing.

(2) It is also objected that the repetition of earlier matter after 26 : 14-32 shows a bad textual tradition.

This is true, but it does not show how much of the text is bad. The explanation given to the first objection would seem to answer this one too. I would suggest that only the repetition of 26 : 2 and 10-12, or at the most 26 : 32 plus that repetition, is unoriginal.

(3) It is objected that 26 : 14-32 is "badly placed between the private Agapes (26 : 1-13) and the equally private meal for widows."

But our interpretation of the text answers this objection. It does not, on our view, show us a "second form" of Agape (i.e. a public one), but the completion of the "first" and only

"form," the private one. See more fully our "first reason" given above in implicit answer to this objection.

We seem, then, in a position to conclude that the probabilities strongly favour the originality of the whole of 26 : 1-32 and an interpretation such as has been given it several pages above under (*a*), the first of our "four reasons."

3. It will not be possible, due to the length to which this Appendix has already run, to give in full the detailed analysis necessary to establish the next point. That point is, that the *C.H.* probably do not really attest divergent local practices, for the most part, but rather misunderstandings of parts of the sources used. The most likely exception to this rule is probably the direction to receive "the mysteries" before "they sit down together" at a memorial on behalf of the departed (except on Sunday). Probably the clearest illustration of it is the notice [1] that the "thanksgiving which is at the beginning of the *missa* is incumbent on the poor." This very puzzling and enigmatic direction can, I believe, be understood from 26 : 18-27 of *A.T.* (on the textual view I propose). It probably means that the versicle "Let us give thanks, etc.," in the Eucharistic dialogue is required to be used (before the thanksgiving over the lamp) also at the Agape for the poor. I do not, however, wish to be understood as denying that some of the variations may be adaptations to local custom.

The result of these three conclusions (as to the *Didache* and its source, the true text of *A.T.*, and the nature of the chief variants in *C.H.*) is to strengthen very considerably the case for our proposed solution of the problem as to the relation between the Eucharist and the Agape. In detail we would have these gains:

1. We would have in the *Didache* a clear case of the norm as we reconstruct it before the separation of the Eucharist from the Agape.

2. At the same time, the chief dissentient witness (the *Didache*) would vanish, or rather be converted into the favourable witness just referred to above.

3. We would have in the *A.T.* our best, fullest, and most

[1] 166.

explicit witness to our proposed norm after the separation of the Eucharist from the Agape.

4. We would be wholly rid of two partially dissentient witnesses (i.e. the *A.T.* and *Eth. C.O.*) by converting them into one very favourable witness.

5. We would diminish still further the circle of dissentient witnesses by our view of *C.H.* Neither that document nor the present *Didache* would be real witnesses to actual practice.

All these results would greatly strengthen a theory which would seem already strong enough, independently of them, to stand upright on other evidence.

APPENDIX II

A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ROMAN EPICLESIS

(*Vide* Chapter III, page 61)

WE know from *De Sacramentis* that by the year *c.* 400 A.D. the *nucleolus* of the Roman Canon had reached very much its present form, except for verbal differences, at least from the *Quam oblationem* through the *Supra quae.* The only material difference was that the language about the heavenly altar and the holy angels was at that time in the *Supra quae* and it is now in the *Supplices te rogamus.* Now, remembering, as we saw in Chapter III, that Gelasius I (492-496) tells us implicitly —almost explicitly—that there was a Spirit-*Epiclesis* in the liturgy even in his day, *c.* 100 years after *De Sacramentis*, and that the latter document shows it was not the *Quam oblationem* or the *Supra quae*, we seem obliged to choose among the *Te igitur*, the *Hanc igitur oblationem*, and the *Supplices te rogamus.* The reasons for preferring the last of these are overwhelming.[1] For one thing, both the former are probably alternative forms of a Great Intercession, whether they originally followed the *Supplices te rogamus* or whether they were

[1] Dr. Gummey will have it that the change I am going to suggest as having taken place in the *Supplices te rogamus* is quite unnecessary since the prayer precisely as it stands is already a Spirit-*Epiclesis*, and a perfectly definite one at that; only couched in highly ornate and figurative language. According to his view, Christ is the Heavenly Altar and the Angel the Holy Spirit, and the petition in the *Supplices* simply means that the bread and the wine may be identified with the body and blood of Christ by the intervention of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, he will have it that this interpretation was familiar to and accepted by the writers of the early Middle Ages in considerable numbers; and he quotes examples. This view, too, is attractive and has much in its favour. But I cannot but believe that the use given these words in the Oblation prayer of *De Sacramentis* is a much easier, more natural, and therefore more probably original one than the meaning he proposes for them in the *Supplices*, and that their presence there is most likely to be explained as set forth in this Appendix. But the fact that his interpretation is a possible one may well have facilitated the change I have conjecturally accepted. At the same time, the fact that it is

originally after the Offertory, as in the Gallican type of liturgy. This is already clear as to the *Te igitur*, as soon as we realize that the *Memento* (*vivorum*) and *Communicantes* make with it one prayer. As to the *Hanc igitur oblationem*, when it was put into its present place in the fixed Canon it of course lost its "intercessory continuation" as being too obviously a doublet of the *Memento* (*vivorum*) and *Communicantes*. But Baumstark has discovered a form in which there was a regular full intercession, closely equivalent in substance to the *Te igitur* plus *Memento* (*vivorum*) plus *Communicantes* with still other intercessions included. Drews would have this a "Deacon's Inclination prayer" in the Roman Mass, similar to the same in the Eastern liturgies. Either this theory or the one I have suggested would remove the *Hanc igitur* from among the possibilities as the original Spirit-*Epiclesis*. Thus the case would almost inevitably go to the *Supplices te rogamus* by default, with the elimination of all other contenders, even if we had no positive reasons favouring such a conclusion.

But as a matter of fact such positive reasons are by no means lacking. They are chiefly two. First of all, it is the regular place for such an *Epiclesis* in the main stream of Eastern tradition and in the Gallican liturgies where there is one at all. And with the *Quam oblationem*, which occupies the only alternative of the "characteristically Egyptian place" for the *Epiclesis* excluded by the testimony of *De Sacramentis* itself, once again the honour goes by default. But, secondly, the very tell-tale shift of the language about the heavenly altar and the hands of the angels (changed into the singular) from the *Supra quae* in *De Sacramentis* to the *Supplices te rogamus* in the Gelasian Sacramentary seems to me extraordinarily significant. It is far and away most easily explained by the view that when the *Supplices te rogamus* was—deliberately and for dogmatic reasons—denuded of its character as a definite

by no means the only possible interpretation in its present context will probably be the reason the words could so well serve the purpose of him who, on the theory I suggest, deliberately made this change. If some writers do, as Dr. Gummey rightly says, give his interpretation to these difficult words, still others give a different meaning. And some frankly confess that they do not know what to make of them. One says they are too deep and wonderful for human comprehension.

Spirit-*Epiclesis*, it caused a gap which the reviser wished to bridge with the minimum of disturbance possible. Now the *Supplices* before the revision would have run somewhat like this: "We humbly beseech thee, O almighty God, to send thy Holy Spirit upon [1] (the offerings of thy Church) that He may make them the body and blood of thy Son Christ our Lord, to the end that as many of us as worthily partake of the same may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace through the same Christ our Lord, Amen" (or possibly proceeding with the *Per quem haec omnia* or else an intercession of the *Te igitur* type or its *Hanc igitur* variant as suggested above).

This could be brought into harmony with the Western theory of consecration most easily and with the least disturbance by: (*a*) omitting the bare words of the embarrassing Spirit-*Epiclesis*; (*b*) bridging the gap with the already familiar and beautiful words about the heavenly altar and the hands of the holy angel; and (*c*) shifting the mention of the body and blood of Christ from the first half, where they were no longer apposite, into the second half, where they could be made to fit quite well. The hole left in the Oblation prayer as found in *De Sacramentis* by the subtraction of this highly poetic language could easily be filled by a more commonplace clause meaning exactly the same thing. On the other hand, the poetic language taken over into the *Supplices* was especially suited to its purpose precisely because, being poetic and highly ornate and beautiful, it could suggest a greater variety of thoughts and thus leave the really unsatisfactory nature of any thought in that context (except the one then being intentionally removed) far less obvious than it would have been with words of a definite and obvious meaning. The notorious difficulty these words (in their new context) have given commentators, coupled with the unsatisfactory nature of any attempt we ourselves can make to assign to them any one meaning, and viewed by comparison with their perfectly clear, satisfactory, and obvious significance in their earlier context in *De Sacramentis*—all these combine

[1] Or "this bread and this chalice," following the Oblation prayer in *De Sacramentis*.

to favour the explanation of the puzzle just suggested, and also to show us that the reviser did about as admirable a job as could have been done without a much wider and more drastic revision of the Roman rite as he found it.

Now if this line of reasoning be sound, it will not only complete the proof that the Roman rite once contained a definite Spirit-*Epiclesis*, but it will further make it probable that it had attained a greater definiteness than it had in *A.T.*, and that it definitely named the changing of the Oblations into the body and blood of Christ as the specific thing which the Holy Ghost was called upon to do. I deduced this above from the fact that these words now occur in the second half of the one-time *Epiclesis* prayer, where they do not usually occur in other liturgies, and that they were most probably transferred there from the first half of the *Epiclesis* prayer at the time the revision was made.[1]

An added reason for supposing the Roman *Epiclesis* had developed, at the time it was revised, beyond the limits of the *Epiclesis* in *A.T.* is the very general one that all the liturgies tended in this direction. More is said about this in Chapter III, in particular relation to the *Epiclesis*. But the same tendency is seen at work in other parts of the liturgy. Take, e.g., Hippolytus' *Anamnesis* and Oblation prayer, where we can check it, because the *De Sacramentis* gives us its corresponding prayer, though it does not give us its *Epiclesis*. Compare the two:

A.T.: "Having in memory, therefore, His death and resurrection, we offer to thee the bread and the cup, yielding thee thanks, because thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and minister unto thee."

[1] The idea that the *Epiclesis* was one on the communicants only and not on the Oblations seems to me very unlikely for two reasons. First, even the *A.T.* has the *Epiclesis* on the Oblations, though the expected operation is not—I maintain—fully defined or explicitly specified. Secondly, if, despite this, the trend in the Roman liturgy had been in the opposite direction so as to result in a gradual attenuation of the *A.T. Epiclesis* until it was finally only one on the communicants and not on the elements at all, then what was the need of the important revision discussed above? Such an *Epiclesis*, since it could have been put forward by the Roman side of the consecration controversy as the original and true form and function of the *Epiclesis*, would have been a strength rather than a weakness for the Roman side. Surely it never need have been, and probably never would have been, revised.

Here the very minimum possible to constitute the usual joint *Anamnesis*-Oblation prayer is given. Then there is an added thanksgiving on this basis, quite in line with the primitive trend in which all three (the Institution, Oblation in obedient memory, and "Invocation") would seem to be parts of a chronologically arranged sequence of blessings for which God is thanked in a Eucharistic prayer which, as a whole, is conceived to be consecratory. Compare this with the decidedly more developed *De Sacramentis.*

De Sacramentis: "Therefore, mindful of His most glorious passion and resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven, we offer to thee this immaculate sacrifice (or 'host'), this reasonable sacrifice (or 'host' still—same word both times), this holy bread and cup of life eternal; and we beg and beseech thee that thou wouldest receive up this oblation onto thy altar above by the hands of thy holy angels, just as thou didst vouchsafe to accept (or 'receive up') the gifts of thy just Abel and the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and that which the high priest Melchizedek offered to thee."

Here the *Anamnesis* is enlarged somewhat, the Oblation still more decidedly, and there is no thanksgiving as in *A.T.* Rather its place is taken by an explicit prayer for the acceptance of the Oblation just offered, couched, of course, in the highly symbolical and poetic language we have already considered.

On a similar analogy, the *Epiclesis* as in use at the time of *De Sacramentis* is likely to have developed far beyond that in Hippolytus' *A.T.*

I should wish to issue a *caveat,* however, against the view that we need (or may attempt to) develop an explanation of the Roman liturgy in which the *De Sacramentis* stands in a straight line (at whatever respective distances) between *A.T.* and the Roman Canon as we find it in the *Gelasianum.* Duchesne has warned us of one of the great differences between the Gallican type of liturgy and the Roman. The Roman tended toward fixity from an earlier mean between its own later fixity and the later increased variability of the extant Gallican liturgies; while the latter seem to have moved in the opposite direction. From this it will follow that in early times, even after we get

written forms as something more rigid than mere patterns of "the kind of thing to say," we still have several or even many variants before we finally and gradually attain fixity. Naturally, fixity would be earliest attained in the more central and vital parts of the Canon and latest in the least central. But it is doubtful in the highest degree if even the Institution Narrative would have attained fixity at the time Hippolytus wrote the *A.T.* And the prayers before and after this are greatly variable in the Gallican liturgies, namely the *Vere Sanctus* and the *Post-Pridie* [1] prayers. Not only are there alternatives, but these vary in detail, in specificity, and even sometimes in lacking entirely an important element. Thus, e.g., Gallican *Post-Pridie* prayers usually "ought" to include three comparatively essential elements, viz. *Anamnesis*, Oblation, and *Epiclesis*, in the order named. Now very often they do, but also not infrequently the order will be reversed, or there will be a combination of two into one, or one or two may even be lost entirely. An example of a somewhat similar phenomenon can also be seen outside the Gallican family in Serapion where the *Qui Pridie* and *Anamnesis*-Oblation are interwoven in a very remarkable manner instead of being separated and successive as usual.

Now, as I just finished explaining, even where the Gallican *Post-Pridie* prayer contains all three major elements, *Anamnesis*, Oblation, and *Epiclesis*, these will vary very much in length, explicitness, etc. Sometimes they will be as vague and even more irregular than the corresponding part of the liturgy in *A.T.* Then again they will be as clear, precise, and regular as (say) the *Anamnesis* plus Oblation prayer in *De Sacramentis* or in the present Roman liturgy. Also the *Epiclesis* will sometimes equal an Oriental *Epiclesis* in clearness and content. Now at the earlier stage, when there was similar variation also in the Roman liturgy (even if a lesser measure of it), the same

[1] I have called these prayers "*Post-Pridie*" without scruple in this section. In reality they are not so called in the Gallican liturgies in the narrower sense, but rather "*Post-Secreta*" or "*Post-Mysterium*." The word "*Post-Pridie*" used for the same prayers in the Mozarabic liturgy is, however, the most convenient title, as revealing even to the uninitiated the exact place in which they come.

situation must be supposed to have existed. And *a fortiori* this will have been the case when there were not only variant written prayers, but when the written prayers themselves were only intended to be types or patterns. This latter was, of course the case in the time represented by *A.T.*

We are, then, on perfectly safe ground in supposing that, even when Hippolytus wrote, not all *Anamnesis*, Oblation, or "Invocation" prayers would be as simple and undeveloped as those he wrote. And we are especially safe in holding this if, as seems possible (and I think likely), he was intending to indicate a desirable minimum. We are at liberty, then, assimilating these prayers in *A.T.* to the less definite type found in the Gallican liturgies, to suppose that there were much more definite ones also even in his time (again on the Gallican analogy). Then the straight line of development will run from these no longer extant, but easily conjectured, forms as being the more usual, through the forms in *De Sacramentis* and the conjecturally reconstructed *Epiclesis* above (p. 187) up to the final form the Roman Canon assumed. This does not, of course, clear up that tremendously complicated problem, but it seems to take us at least several steps in that direction.

APPENDIX III

EVIDENCE ON THE EPICLESIS

LET us look at the texts supposed to favour the thesis that the *Epiclesis* was primitively and generally the accepted method of consecration in the church. I shall follow the course marked out in Dr. J. W. Tyrer's *The Eucharistic Epiclesis* in studying the evidence. For his book contains for our purposes the most convenient statement of the case for that thesis with which I am acquainted.

I shall take the third-century evidence first, then the fourth-century, and finally the second. I pursue this course because I believe the third-century evidence tells a very different story if read on its own merits from the story Dr. Tyrer draws from it by reading back into it the ideas he finds (with at least more justification) in writers of the second half of the fourth century, and in St. Cyril just before the middle of that century. Then if we find that from the conclusions so reached we can easily come to terms with, understand, and explain the fourth-century evidence, we shall be at liberty, and indeed obliged, to interpret the second-century evidence in the light of that of the third century and not of the fourth, as Dr. Tyrer in effect has done.

It will conduce both to clarity and brevity if we set down and number six distinguishable stages through which, as I conceive it, the development of belief on the subject has passed. This is the more necessary because one of the chief flaws in the arguments of Dr. Tyrer and other supporters of his thesis is that they habitually assume from passages one of the more advanced stages, when one less advanced suffices to explain what the passage contains. I for my part wish to say in advance that I fully realize I have no right to assume blandly that all a passage need mean is all it did mean. The contrary is often quite admissible and even probable. But in this case (to anticipate the results of my discussion) it will be

a double argument, viz. that *none* of the evidence *requires* Dr. Tyrer's interpretation, coupled with the fact that much of it opposes his view and favours a different one, more in harmony with our point of departure in the Jewish conception of blessing by thanksgiving. Our six stages, which will be used constantly in this Appendix, are as follows:

1. Divine intervention believed by many to be effected by the agency of the Holy Ghost, but no prayer to that effect yet included in the Anaphora (=the whole Thanksgiving prayer, Greeting+*Sursum Corda*—Doxology+Amen).

2. Such a prayer (of any imaginable degree of clarity or vagueness) included but not yet deemed essential.

3. The same included, and deemed essential; yet not *the only* or *the supreme* essential, but only *an* essential.

4. The same included, and deemed *the most essential* element and hence the *climax*, the *supreme moment* of the Anaphora; yet not singled out from the whole as being the entire consecration.

5. The same included, and at last singled out from the rest of the Anaphora as being the whole consecration, *the moment of consecration*; but not having yet pre-empted to itself the *title* of *the Epiclesis sans phrase.*

6. The same included, deemed the moment of consecration, and finally pre-empting to itself the title of *the Epiclesis sans phrase.*

Needless to say, I do not intend to imply either that these stages are sharply distinguished from one another, or that any particular writer would have been prepared with a ready answer as to the precise stage at which he himself stood. They are, nevertheless, valuable milestones in our investigation.

And now, with so much by way of introduction and preliminaries, let us go on to examine our witnesses. Let us begin with Origen, whose testimony I believe to be the most important.

Third Century

1. Origen speaks, as we saw above, of "the loaves on which has been invoked ἐπικέκληται the name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Ghost." Here at least two things are unmistakable. First, if the Anaphora Origen knew contained an

"intervention prayer" like that of *A.T.*, at least the reference cannot be to that. For the Holy Spirit is said to be invoked in connection with, and therefore presumably in the same sense as, the Father and the Son, and hence ἐπίκλησις cannot mean an invocation in the later and more definite sense (i.e. a *calling down upon*). Secondly, if it is going to refer at all to a *part* of the prayer, then it must be taken as attesting a Trinity-*Epiclesis* more or less like that in *Test. Dom.*, and not a Logos-*Epiclesis* as in Serapion or a Spirit-*Epiclesis* as in *A.T.* And even so it would still not mean a *calling down upon*. Consequently, we are forced to the conclusion, with which even Dr. Tyrer himself, I believe, would agree, that ἐπίκλησις here certainly means not a *calling down upon* but either a *calling the Triune Name over*, or else (as I prefer) a *calling upon the Triune Name* in the matter of the elements. A second conclusion, less certain but very probable, is that it refers to the whole prayer. The alternative, as said above, is a Trinity-*Epiclesis* of the type found in *Test. Dom.* But Dr. Tyrer has given a cogent reason why it is not likely he has reference to such an *Epiclesis*. And, in addition, the type itself seems quite unknown except in the Syriac evidence. Moreover, Dr. Tyrer shows splendidly how, in the broader sense we are forced to assign ἐπίκλησις in this passage, the whole Anaphora in *A.T.* could naturally and fittingly be described as an ἐπίκλησις of the Name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. Hence the testimony of Origen seems strongly favourable to the view I have proposed above, on pp. 73 and 74.

2. The *A.T.* of Hippolytus contains what from the later standpoint would be called an "indefinite *Epiclesis*" of the Holy Spirit, and Hippolytus himself in his *Philosophumena* (written about 230 A.D.) copies St. Irenaeus' words about the heretic Marcus, without stopping to explain the words τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως. Dr. Tyrer argues that this shows he assumes his readers will understand it perfectly, and therefore shows how familiar already in his day was the idea of consecration by an *Epiclesis*. Undoubtedly! But what it does not show (even taken with the Anaphora in *A.T.*) is how they would understand it. It was made clear near the end of

Chapter III that it can as easily mean the whole Anaphora as that portion concerned with prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost. And there is nothing in *A.T.* to show that the term ἐπίκλησις was at that date applied to the portion of the Anaphora in question.

Now if we distinguish the six possible stages of the development listed above, then the evidence of Hippolytus, while too late for stage 1, is equally well satisfied by any of the later stages. In fact, the "indefiniteness" of his *Epiclesis* (which I shall henceforth call "intervention prayer") rather favours the view that we are not yet as far along as 4, 5, or 6 but are only at 2 or at the most 3. And this is decisively confirmed by Hippolytus' conservatism, taken in connection (1) with the use we shall see below that Justin and St. Irenaeus (and the *Didache*?) make of εὐχαριστέω as a transitive verb meaning to "consecrate by thanksgiving"; and (2) with the high probability based on the Jewish antecedents that this was the primitive usage and belief about consecration; and finally (3) with the fact that he himself has the same identical usage in Chapter 23 of *A.T.* where he says, ". . . and *by thanksgiving* (italics mine) he (the bishop) shall make the bread into an (? the) image of the body of Christ and the cup of wine mixed with water according to the likeness of the blood, which is shed for all who believe in him." I do not recall that this usage is found later than in this passage; but here it is practically conclusive on the point we are studying. If, in addition to this, we find that even for some time after Hippolytus (and therefore *a fortiori* before him in St. Irenaeus whom he quotes) the whole Anaphora, and not merely this portion of it, was called "the *Epiclesis*," and that the consecration was in those days ascribed to "the *Epiclesis*" (whatever that meant), we shall then have completely decisive reason for interpreting Hippolytus the way our studies on him alone have already very strongly inclined us to do.

3. Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, in a letter written to St. Cyprian in 256 A.D., tells of a certain heretical prophetess twenty-two years earlier who frequently dared "*ut et invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se panem et eucharistiam facere simularet.*" He also tells us that she was careful to follow

church customs, so that she might seem to depart in nothing from the ecclesiastical rule. Dr. Tyrer sees here added proof that at these dates both orthodox and heretics consecrated by means of an invocation. This is sound, but it raises the same question as before as to what both meant by "invocation." And it seems to me that we have here a clear case of a prophetess who felt at liberty to "give thanks as much as she wished" (*Didache*) or "to the best of her ability" (Justin), which Firmilian admits was not at all bad. But surely such liberty referred to the whole prayer, not just some crucial section of it. And it seems far more likely that Firmilian is frankly recognizing on the whole her gifts in that line, rather than singling out one small section of her prayer for such praise. We must judge, then, that his testimony is definitely (though not so inescapably as in the case of Origen) favourable to the view I am suggesting.

4. St. Cyprian says, arguing against the validity of heretical and schismatical Eucharists: "nor can the oblation there be hallowed where the Holy Spirit is not." Dr. Tyrer does not quote this passage in this connection, but later he seems to think it attests a Spirit-*Epiclesis*. But what St. Cyprian says here does not require anything more advanced than the first stage of the six we have distinguished. Of course it easily admits of being said at any of the more advanced stages; and on other grounds I should think that either stage 2 or 3 had been reached in Africa by this time. But his words give us no reason at all to suppose that the fourth stage has been reached; or even, with any assurance, the third. The second would adequately suffice. Also there is no reason at all here to suppose that if asked to what he would apply the word ἐπίκλησις (or (*invocatio*, which he does not use) he would have said a particular part of the prayer rather than the whole Anaphora.[1]

[1] Elsewhere St. Cyprian says: "The priest, before the prayer (*orationem*, but the meaning of this absolute use seems to be *the* prayer), by way of preface (*praefatione praemissa*) prepares the mind of the brethren saying, 'Lift up your hearts,' etc." Does not this tend to give at least some confirmation to the view just expressed. In view of the evidence of St. Irenaeus, Origen, Hippolytus, Firmilian, and the later writers yet to be noted, I think we can easily imagine him substituting "*invocationem*" for "*orationem*" in this context.

5. Finally, we come to the *Didascalia*, where Dr. Tyrer has his most promising ante-Nicene witness. Speaking of the Eucharist he says: "*panem mundum praeponens qui per ignem factus est et per invocationem sanctificatur*" (Hauler, *Didasc. Apost. Frag.*, p. 85). Here clearly "the invocation" is the essential "form" of consecration. But Dr. Tyrer forgets as usual to ask what it means. Except on Dr. Brightman's premise that *ignem* is a pictorial reference to the Holy Spirit, which I do not think probable, I see no reason at all to doubt that it means the whole Anaphora, as in the rest of the third-century evidence we have seen. The fact that the Syriac evidence tends to support a Trinity-*Epiclesis* of the *Test. Dom.* type rather diminishes any likelihood of it referring to a Spirit-*Epiclesis*.

But perhaps Dr. Tyrer's view can gain some added support from two other *Didascalia* passages he quotes. One is: "*gratiarum actio per Spiritum Sanctum sanctificatur*" (*ibid.*, p. 80). The other is: "*quid est maius: panis aut Spiritus Sanctus qui sanctificat panem?*" (*ibid.*, p. 81). But the same remarks seem to me to apply here as in the passage from St. Cyprian immediately preceding, and for the same reason. Nor can I see that the passage first quoted, with its reference to consecration by "the invocation" (or "an," for Latin has, of course, no definite article), makes this interpretation any less likely. The writer simply holds that the whole Anaphora consecrates, and that the Holy Spirit is the Agent. But as to the part played by the Holy Spirit, the Anaphora he knew, and his belief about it, might equally well be at any one of the six stages I have distinguished.

This is all the third-century evidence I know of, except that Origen thrice applies to the Eucharistic consecration the words of 1 Tim. iv. 5: "it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." But this seems to me so indefinite and doubtful of interpretation that I think it best to postpone consideration of it until we study the second-century evidence, where, in Justin and St. Irenaeus, we shall find somewhat similar phrases. As to the evidence we have examined, while none of it excludes Dr. Tyrer's view (unless Origen, whose Anaphora, as we saw,

might include what Dr. Tyrer means by *Epiclesis*; but he applies the term to something else, which is the consecration), none of it in any way favours it. And in three of the cases the passages seem in varying degrees to support the view I am presenting. Origen is very strongly favourable; Hippolytus strongly; Firmilian more favourable (at least) than to Dr. Tyrer's view. The others seem to me at the worst neutral. Hence we have a negative argument—the complete absence of a single passage before Nicea which can be fairly said to give any positive support to Dr. Tyrer's view; some positive evidence—that just noted, from Origen, Firmilian, and Hippolytus; and the *a priori* probabilities as set forth in our conjectural account of the development given at length above in Chapter III. Unless the fourth-century evidence [1] raises some serious difficulty, we shall have every right to consider the matter settled by arguments of such combined strength.

Fourth Century

Let us then, as the next step in our argument, look at Dr. Tyrer's fourth-century witnesses. The only allegedly favourable one earlier than 370 A.D. is St. Cyril of Jerusalem. And since he is Dr. Tyrer's star witness anyway, we had best begin with him. Serapion also is earlier than 370, but, as is well known, he is not on Dr. Tyrer's side; but his liturgy contains a Logos-Intervention prayer at the usual point of the later Eastern *Epiclesis*, and a very indefinite God-Intervention prayer at the "regular Egyptian" point for the *Epiclesis*. And neither is called, either explicitly or implicitly, *the invocation* or even *an* invocation. Let us then go on to St. Cyril.

First of all, we find in St. Cyril non-Eucharistic passages in which the word ἐπίκλησις and related verbal forms are used in broader senses than *calling down upon*, which is the sense it bears in its later technical Eucharistic usage. However, we also find in him, for the first time as far as I am aware in Christian literature, the phrase "the *Epiclesis* of the Holy

[1] For the evidence *earlier* than the third century will surely raise none, but rather will be all in line with our theory. This we shall see below.

Spirit," and in immediate connection with the Eucharist. The text says: "For just as the bread of the Eucharist after the *Epiclesis* of the Holy Ghost is no longer mere bread but Christ's body, etc." (*Cat. Myst.*, iii. : 3). And lest there be any doubt what he means by "the *Epiclesis* of the Holy Ghost," we have another highly relevant passage of his where the term ἐπίκλησις is lacking but where he tells us very definitely: "We beseech (παρακαλοῦμεν) . . . God to send down (ἐξαποστεῖλαι) the Holy Spirit upon the (gifts) lying before (τὰ προκείμενα) (us—*or* him) in order that He may make the bread the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ. For in very deed whatever the Holy Spirit has touched (*or* laid hold of—*or* ἐφάψαιτο) this has been sanctified and changed" (*op. cit.*, v. : 7).

This seems clear enough, at first sight. Yet upon closer examination we find reason to be less confident. As we saw above (Chapter III), it would be quite possible for a writer to speak of a section of the Anaphora as an (*or* the) invocation of that particular Person to whom the section chiefly or entirely applied; while to the same writer the Anaphora *as a whole* was still "the *Epiclesis*" *sans phrase*, or the *Epiclesis* of the Holy Trinity. And while the former does not, to my knowledge, occur unambiguously in St. Cyril, the latter actually does. Thus in *Cat. Myst.*, i. : 7, he says: "For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the holy *Epiclesis* of the adorable Trinity, were mere bread and wine, but after (*or* when) the *Epiclesis* has taken place (ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γενομένης) the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ, just so, etc." It may not be quite fair to quote this as a reference to the *Epiclesis sans phrase*, though it certainly at least comes very near it. But at any rate, St. Cyril here, at least as unambiguously as in the former passage, ascribes the consecration to the *Epiclesis* (which he especially characterizes as "holy") of the adorable Trinity and *probably*, in the same breath to the *Epiclesis sans phrase*, i.e. absolutely. And I do not think it is reasonable to doubt that in this passage he has reference to the whole Anaphora. Dr. Tyrer would avoid this inference, and hold that he refers here also to the *Epiclesis* of the Holy Ghost, and that he calls it this time the *Epiclesis*

of the adorable Trinity because in it (see it quoted just above) all three Persons are prominently mentioned. I see several reasons against this view. For one thing, it is not at all a natural explanation, even before we go on to consider other evidence. Also it would be a mode of expression without unmistakable attestation elsewhere. For Dr. Tyrer admits it is not that of Origen, though he does try to put the same meaning on St. Ambrose. Finally, if the third-century usage will explain the usage in St. Cyril and St. Ambrose, that explanation is surely to be preferred, for usages like entities ought not to be multiplied unnecessarily. Besides this, Dr. Tyrer's view makes St. Cyril much further ahead of his time, much more a projecting salient into the development, than the view I favour.

If these objections, then, be deemed convincing, how are we to estimate St. Cyril's position? I think we do full justice to all his evidence if we say that he is surely not yet at stage 6 distinguished above (p. 193 in this Appendix) and probably not yet fully at stage 5, but at the point of transition between stages 4 and 5. It is not at all clear to me that the term ἐπίκλησις in its appearance in St. Cyril quoted first above is technical at all. It may easily be untechnical and an early instance of the meaning "the calling down of the Holy Spirit upon the elements." If it is technical at all, it will not have the meaning "calling down upon," but the meaning suggested above of one of the three *Epicleses* necessary to make up "the holy *Epiclesis* of the adorable Trinity." Hence St. Cyril is probably, after all, not so advanced as he seems at first sight. Let us now go on to consider Dr. Tyrer's other witnesses.

1. The *Apostolic Constitutions* is of doubtful date, but somewhere, probably, in the last quarter of this century. Hence we may discuss it first. It has a perfectly definite Eastern *Epiclesis* of the usual type. Moreover, at first sight it must be admitted that these "regular *Epicleses*" sound so clear and definite that one would suppose they must be intended as the precise instrument of consecration. However, once the possibility of a development whose history is like that proposed above has been adequately envisaged, this conclusion is seen

to be very hazardous. Such an *Epiclesis* as we find in *Ap. Con.* could easily exist along with the belief that the whole Anaphora, as always before, effected the change, but that it was better (or perhaps even necessary) to pray explicitly and as definitely as possible for what the Anaphora was believed to effect anyway. There is nothing to show either that the section in question was in *Ap. Con.* called the *Epiclesis* or that it was considered *the* essential moment and instrument of consecration.

2. PETER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, in succession to St. Athanasius, writing about 373 A.D. speaks of certain outrages committed "on the very altar where (ἔνθα) we invoke (ἐπικαλούμεθα) the descent (κάθοδον) of the Holy Spirit." Since he says "we invoke" and not simply "where the Holy Spirit comes down" or "effects so-and-so," he must be more advanced than our stage 1.[1] But any of the later five stages will adequately explain what he says. I am not intending to suggest that it is at all likely he was only at stage 2. Other evidence makes that very improbable. But I am simply trying to show how little the evidence, carefully interpreted, really tells us for certain, compared with what Dr. Tyrer seems to think.

3. The passage in ST. BASIL is in my judgment really important for our purposes. In *De Spiritu Sancto*, XXVII. 66, he asks, arguing for the authority of unwritten tradition: "Which of the saints (N.T. writers, I suppose) has left to us in writing the words of the invocation (τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα) at the consecration (ἀναδείξει) of the bread of the Eucharist and of the Cup of Blessing? For we are not content (ἀρκούμεθα) with saying what the Apostle (i.e. St. Paul) or the Gospel has mentioned, but we also prefix (προλέγομεν) and suffix (ἐπιλέγομεν) other things as having great strength for

[1] Even here, if we take ἐπικαλούμεθα as meaning "call down," could it not be said by one whose Anaphora contained no explicit petition, but who believed that to be the effect of the Anaphora? To illustrate, could not one who had reference to the Anaphora in *A.T.* speak of it as calling down the Logos, *if* he believed, for the sake of argument, that what the Holy Spirit did when He came was to cause the real presence of Christ's body and blood? Let me repeat, I am only pointing out these extreme possibilities, not because I consider them likely, but because I want to show how dangerous it is to draw hasty inferences from language that admits of a less pregnant meaning, as Dr. Tyrer seems to me to do continually.

the sacrament (*τὸ μυστήριον*), having received (these) from the unwritten tradition (*διδασκαλίας*)." The editors of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* in a footnote to this passage, labouring under the same failure to realize the early usage of *Epiclesis* as Dr. Tyrer, point out that the word here used for consecration (*ἀναδείξει*) is the same as the word used to express the change in the *Epiclesis* of the liturgy of St. Basil, and think that he is here quoting from or at least echoing the said *Epiclesis*, to which consequently he is undoubtedly referring in what he says. But leaving out any question as to whether the liturgy of St. Basil, or even its Anaphora, really comes from him, I do not see that in any case that conclusion would follow. All the phenomena would really require would be that *ἀναδείκνυμι* was St. Basil's word for "consecrate," that he believed the whole Anaphora was the consecration, and that it included a direct and explicit petition asking for the descent of the Holy Spirit to consecrate the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. And that this is the most likely interpretation of what he says seems to me to follow from two facts. First, he seems to express himself in such a way as to imply that the words preserved in written tradition, i.e. the Institution Narrative, are a part of the *Epiclesis*. And secondly, he seems even more clearly to include things *pre*fixed to these words, as well as things appended, as a part of the *Epiclesis* which has not come down by written tradition, but which are nevertheless of great strength (*ἰσχὺν*) *πρὸς τὸ μυστήριον*. Hence for St. Basil it would seem the whole Anaphora is still the *Epiclesis*. And it is clear that the *Epiclesis*, whatever it is, is the consecration. I do not mean to imply that he need have considered all parts of the *Epiclesis* equally weighty. He might well have thought the petition for the descent of the Holy Ghost the most important single part of them all. But further than that he would not seem to have gone. To him the *Epiclesis*, which is the consecration, is the whole Anaphora.

4. ST. OPTATUS, a bishop of Northern Africa, writing about 380 A.D., but speaking of outrages perpetrated during the reign of Julian the Apostate (*c.* 362 A.D.), refers to the Donatists as desecrating "the altars of God . . . *quo Deus omnipotens*

INVOCATUS *sit, quo* POSTULATUS *descenderit Spiritus Sanctus*" (*De Schism. Donat.*, vi. 1). Here there is certainly nothing to prove a very advanced stage of the development. *Postulatus* almost certainly shows that the first stage has been passed. But any of the five later stages will suffice. And it is worth noticing that it is *Deus omnipotens* (not the Holy Spirit) who is said to be "invoked." As we have God used here in such a way as to be a synonym not for the Father, but for the whole Godhead, the Trinity, it seems fairest to say that what Optatus attests here is a Trinitarian *Epiclesis* which included a prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit. The date of Optatus, and the fact that he is a Western, combine to make it unlikely that he considered this particular part of the *Epiclesis* the essential "form" of consecration.

5. ST. AMBROSE OF MILAN, writing in 381 A.D., tells us that the Holy Ghost, "*cum Patre et Filio a sacerdotibus in baptismate nominatur et in oblationibus invocatur*" (*De Spir. Sanc.*, III, xvi.: 112). But this tells us at the most that there was such a prayer within the Canon as St. Ambrose knew it. It does not even tell us whether it was definite or utterly indefinite. Still less does it imply that it was essential, let alone that it was by itself the consecration.[1] As a matter of fact, St. Ambrose seems elsewhere pretty clearly to indicate that he was already in possession of what we now call "the Western view" of consecration.

6. Dr. Tyrer quotes ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, writing, he says, "not later than 390, probably a little earlier," as saying of the celebrant: "when he also calls on (καλῇ) the Holy Ghost and completes (ἐπιτελῇ) the most dread sacrifice" (*De Sacerdot.*, VI. iv. 519). Elsewhere (*ibid.*, III. iv. 179): "The priest stands bringing down not fire but the Holy Ghost, and he makes lengthy supplication . . . that grace falling on the sacrifice should through it set on fire the souls of all, etc." And again

[1] It will be noted that the passage just quoted very probably attests not a Spirit-*Epiclesis* but a Trinity-*Epiclesis*. The crucial word "*invocatur*" seems to be applied to the Father and the Son in the same way in which it is applied to the Holy Spirit. There is an escape from this conclusion by holding that "*cum Patre et Filio*" refer only to Baptism. But this does not seem the most natural interpretation.

(in *Coemst. Appel.*, 3): "When the priest stands before the table, stretching forth his hands to heaven, calling on the Holy Ghost to come and take hold of the elements." And yet again: "The grace of the Spirit being present and hovering over all prepares that (τὴν) mystic (μυστικὴν) sacrifice" (*De S. Pentecoste*, i. 4). And yet once more: "This bread through the visitation of the Spirit becomes heavenly bread" (*Hom.*, xiv. 2 *in Johan.*).

All this certainly seems to indicate that here at least we have a clear-cut, unmistakable case of the "Eastern view." And so it may be. Yet we must reckon with the fact that elsewhere the saint seems to make the Words of Institution the essential instrument effecting the change. He says (*De prod. Jud.*, 16; cf. xi. 6): "Christ now also is present. He who adorned that table is He who now also adorns this. For it is not man who makes the gifts that are set forth to become the body and blood of Christ; but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The priest stands, fulfilling a figure, speaking these words; but the power and grace are of God. 'This is My body' he says. This word re-orders (μεταῤῥυθμίζει) the gifts that are set forth."

So possibly after all we shall be nearer to St. Chrysostom's total mind on the subject if we suppose him to have thought that the whole Anaphora [1] consecrated; but did so in virtue of certain essential integral parts of which the *Epiclesis* [2] or "intervention prayer" was one and perhaps the chiefest; but not the only one, the Words of Institution playing also an essential part. Incidentally we would then see in Chrysostom still more clearly how the two views, Eastern and Western, originated and later diverged. He suggests two agents of consecration (doubtless in different senses, or at least in slightly different relations to the effect), and accordingly two "sacramental forms," one appropriate to each agent. Either conception, developed to the exclusion or neglect of the other, would lead directly to the Eastern or Western view separately.

7. Dr. Tyrer's last witness is THEOPHILUS, BISHOP OF

[1] And it may still have been called the *Epiclesis*.

[2] I here use it in the later sense, but I know of no evidence that St. Chrysostom so used it.

ALEXANDRIA. And he has to transgress the limits of the century, at least slightly, to get him in. Dr. Tyrer dates the passage 401 A.D. Replying to Origen, who had contended that the Holy Ghost does not sanctify inanimate things, he says that in saying this Origen did not "consider[1] that . . . the bread of the Lord . . . and the sacred chalice which are placed on the table of the church . . . are hallowed by the invocation and coming of the Holy Ghost." But while well advanced, this still need not take us beyond St. Chrysostom. It may mean more, but it need not. It would be satisfied by stage 4. The consecration could still for him be the whole Anaphora, called the *Epiclesis* of the Holy Trinity, and be composed of three subordinate *Epicleses*, of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; of the last of which he makes controversial use in the passage quoted above.

Incidentally, such a usage as is suggested here, and much more strongly in St. Ambrose and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, would enable us easily to understand how the originally subordinate invocation of the Holy Ghost, once it secured this appellation, could easily, because of its content, come to be considered *the Epiclesis par excellence*, and thus pre-empt the title exclusively to itself after a while.

It is noteworthy that on the system of interpretation we have been following, not a single Western of the first four centuries can be quoted as even remotely favouring the Eastern view.

This would tend to confirm the likelihood of what I have been arguing, that even in the East it was a late growth and of rather slow development and was a long time attaining its final goal. In fact, both the Eastern and Western views seem to have branched off immediately and directly (not mediately and indirectly) from the primitive view for which I have been producing the evidence. They branched off, to be sure, after the Anaphora had come to include both parts (the Institution Narrative and the Intervention prayer) later destined to have exclusive consecratory force ascribed to them in West and East

[1] Does not it rather suggest that the Anaphora as Origen knew it may not have contained any "Intervention prayer"? Or that, if it contained one at all, it was either quite general or a God-"Intervention prayer," or one for the Logos?

respectively. But the Western view developed before any such value was ascribed to the Intervention prayer in the West; so that there was no case of it supplanting the Eastern view, but of it developing parallel to and independently of it. And precisely the same thing, *mutatis mutandis*, can be said also of the development in the East. We have not, however, even yet seen any clear and decisive evidence that the *Epiclesis* view had completely developed, let alone completely prevailed, even in the East, by the year 400 A.D.

Let me say very explicitly once again that I am far from making the unwarranted assumption that every one of the writers I have classed as neutral invariably means the least his language can fairly be taken as meaning. Such an assumption is not only doubtful, it is very improbable. Yet for all that, it cannot, I should think, be a pure coincidence: (*a*) that none of the evidence definitely and unmistakably attests the final stage of the development; (*b*) that the two witnesses who are chronologically the latest come the nearest to doing so; (*c*) that all the fourth-century evidence fits in with, by at least admitting of, such a view of the development as I have adopted; and (*d*) that several of the earliest of our witnesses not only admit of it, but contain definite indications favourable to it, along with indications of the transition in progress to the later view. Surely in view of all this we have the right to at least the modest conclusion that the fourth-century evidence is not incompatible with such a view as I have proposed, but rather tacitly confirms it.

Second Century and Earlier

We must now close by considering the second-century evidence. There are only six pieces of this worth noting. And of these St. Irenaeus is the most important as being much less indefinite than the others. We take him first:

1. His texts are these:

(*a*) "Bread (the produce) of the earth, receiving τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ is no longer common bread but (the) Eucharist" (no article in the Greek) *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xviii. 5).

(*b*) The elements "receiving the word of God (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) become Eucharist" (*Adv. Haer.*, v. ii. 3). And a little earlier in the same passage: "the mixed cup καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος receive τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ and become Eucharist."

(*c*) Referring to the heretic Marcus he says: "Pretending to consecrate (εὐχαριστεῖν) cups of mixed wine, and spinning out to great length (ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτείνων) τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως, he makes them appear purple and red so that it might seem that *Charis* τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα, was dropping her blood into that chalice through his ἐπίκλησις" (*Adv. Haer.*, I. xiii. 2).

While of course it would not be impossible to interpret ἐπίκλησις here as referring to the prayer for the sending down of the Holy Ghost, especially in view of the existence of such a prayer in the so nearly contemporary Anaphora of *A.T.*, yet all the evidence we have seen above encourages us to give to it the other meaning, i.e. the whole Anaphora, the whole Eucharistic prayer. And there are several internal reasons why this would seem preferable also; though no one of these, or perhaps even all taken together, would be decisive, apart from the third-century evidence. These internal reasons are:

(*a*) What we get in the first passage is "*the Epiclesis of God*," not "of the Holy Ghost." We have no evidence that the section we now call the *Epiclesis* was ever thus described, as far as I know.

(*b*) "The word of God," recurring twice in the second passage, is an even less likely appellation for the section we call the *Epiclesis*.

(*c*) In the passage about Marcus, surely it is much more likely that what Marcus "spun out to great length" was the whole Eucharistic prayer and not just one section of it. Presumably he did this in order to give time for certain chemicals he stealthily introduced into the cup to produce the change described. There was already a good deal of liturgical freedom (see the section on this subject in Chapter III). But Marcus' Eucharistic prayer was so long as to excite special notice.

(*d*) This last point is confirmed by the fact that the word used for "consecrate" in the same passage was *εὐχαριστεῖν*, which seems to carry the implication that to St. Irenaeus' mind it was still the long thanksgiving prayer that "Eucharistized" the elements, and not some special section of it. Note especially that this cannot mean simply "give thanks." For Marcus not merely pretended to do that, he really did it. What he, to St. Irenaeus' mind—and I do not doubt rightly—only pretended to do was to change the contents of the "mixed chalice" into the blood of Christ, which the Christians held the chalice at the Eucharist really became. But this was of course known only by the "eye of faith." Marcus wanted (fraudulently of course) to prove his power in this regard by making it visible to the eye of the body. Hence not only is the verb clearly transitive, having a direct object, but the context, as just explained, requires that it be the verb signifying the change, the consecration. Consequently, the thanksgiving was the *Epiclesis*. In IV. xviii. 3 St. Irenaeus also says: "How will they be assured that the bread over which thanks have been given is the body of their Lord, etc.?" Here again the language points strongly in the same direction.

(*e*) "The word of the *Epiclesis*" is almost certainly equivalent to either "the word of God" as twice in the second passage, or "the *Epiclesis* of God" as in the first, and consequently means "the word [1] which is the *Epiclesis*." In other words, it is an appositive genitive. And nothing is said in any way to indicate that a part of the Eucharistic prayer consecrated, or that a part is being referred to as "the word of God," or "the *Epiclesis* of God," or "the word of the *Epiclesis*."

Hence it seems far preferable to take St. Irenaeus as I have done.

2. Next we shall take Justin. In him we have only the one phrase *τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν* which bears on our present subject. First as to the word *εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν*. It clearly is used here in the same sense we have seen in St. Irenaeus and *A.T.* It means, to be sure, what we mean by consecrate, i.e. to effect the change in

[1] Not of course a single word, but a prayer or formula.

the elements. But consecrate is not a good translation for it. It is best to transliterate it as "Eucharistize" rather than translate it. Thus we preserve its basic meaning as giving thanks, and at the same time show its transitive force. Its true force is "made Eucharist (i.e. the body and blood of Christ) by having a thanksgiving said over it." It is, in other words, "a thanksgiving with consecratory effect." The "consecratory effect" believed in was to "make it Eucharist," i.e. the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus.[1]

But the passage says further that this "Eucharistizing" is effected δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ. What does this mean?

(*a*) If εὐχῆς λόγου be translated "word of prayer" and referred to the Words of Institution, then τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ receives its most natural meaning. Besides, these very words are quoted immediately afterward. But they seem to be quoted as proof of Justin's doctrine, not as the formula of consecration. And our study of the Western theory of consecration above was so decisively negative that it could only be upset by a necessary, not by a merely possible or even attractive, interpretation of these words. Hence this meaning must be rejected.

(*b*) If we translate "by (the) prayer of (i.e. from) the Logos who is from Him (God)" we have, I think, an improbable translation; and besides will be compelled after all to take "the prayer" as meaning either what we just rejected in (*a*); or what I shall in the end list as the view I take; or else that the Logos while on earth left us an *Epiclesis* in the later Eastern sense (see discussed under (*e*)); or, finally, that the prayer of the Logos in Heaven is what really consecrates while the celebrant "gives thanks" here on earth. But Justin seems elsewhere to hold that it is the celebrant who "Eucharistizes" the elements into the body and blood of Christ. Besides, if we take this view, we simply deprive these words of any bearing on our subject.

(*c*) A proposed interpretation is "through invocation (εὐχή=ἐπίκλησις) of (i.e. addressed to) the Logos who is

[1] In Chapter 67, immediately after the *Amen*, is said ". . . and the distribution and participation ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων is then made etc.," where the force is obviously " of the consecrated things," whatever precise translation is adopted.

from the Father." This gives us a Logos-*Epiclesis*. But this gives us the same unlikelihood of translation as in (*b*). And in addition, the case for a primitive Logos-*Epiclesis* is very weak, certainly much weaker than that for a Spirit-*Epiclesis*.

(*d*) Dr. Lucius Waterman apparently would translate as in (*c*) but take "Logos" as meaning not Christ but the Holy Spirit, a usage fairly well attested for the first four centuries, he would say. But I think that what we have is not the Third Person of the Trinity called the Logos but the Second Person called Holy Spirit (*or* the Holy Spirit). This has the added difficulty that we must take τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ as a reference to the Procession of the Spirit from Christ. This need not be a fatal objection, however, as it can be taken to mean "the temporal Procession," and that can come as early as we like. Still, it does not seem a likely meaning here. Finally, if this meaning be taken, it runs into the difficulty to be noted next under (*e*).

(*e*) It can be translated "word of prayer" as in (*a*), but understood to refer not to the Charter Narrative but to an *Epiclesis* in the later sense as I suggested above under (*b*). This, however, would require the belief on the part of the second-century Christians that Christ Himself had given us the *Epiclesis*, and we have no evidence that they thought this, nor is it *a priori* likely that they did. Then there is the added difficulty that it requires us to reverse the interpretation it has seemed best to put on all the third-century evidence, and consequently on the fourth. Finally, it would require us to reverse the conclusions we reached just above on εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν. Now these reversals are not impossible—the evidence was not so decisive as to justify saying that. But they are improbable, and would therefore only be justified if the proposed interpretation were the only possible one, or at least clearly and unmistakably the best one; the mere fact that it is a possible interpretation cannot justify it.

We pass then to the meaning I think we clearly must accept. Translate "word of prayer which is from Christ" and understand it of the whole thanksgiving over the bread and wine, the whole Eucharistic prayer. It is "from Him" in the sense

that He did thus, and commanded us to do likewise. In this way εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν gets most easily the meaning we saw reason to prefer just above and also in St. Irenaeus and *A.T.* Also, on this view λόγου has precisely the same meaning as in St. Irenaeus, a formula of prayer (not necessarily *fixed*). And εὐχῆς λόγου is a perfect equivalent for τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως. But this in turn makes ἐπίκλησις a broad term, equivalent to εὐχή. How well all this fits in with the rest of the evidence, and confirms the view I have taken of it, will be obvious to anyone who has followed the argument carefully. According to Justin, then, the bread and wine are "made Eucharist" (consecrated) by the word of prayer, the word of the *Epiclesis*, the *Epiclesis* of God, i.e. the whole thanksgiving prayer, regardless of how much or how little in the way of a Charter Narrative, or an Intervention prayer, or a Great Intercession it had by that time come to contain.

This phrase "the *Epiclesis* of God" is, of course, as the reader will recognize, St. Irenaeus', not Justin's. But if "God" when thus used can and most naturally does mean not merely the Father, but the Blessed Trinity, then St. Irenaeus' meaning is the precise equivalent of Origen's noted above, when he says: "on which (loaves) has been invoked the name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Ghost." Also later we saw St. Cyril and probably St. Ambrose speaking of an invocation of the Trinity, and St. Optatus speaking of God being invoked. Now when Justin almost goes out of his way, as it were, to tell us (1 *Apol.*, 65 : 3) that the celebrant "sends up praise and glory to the Father of all *through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, and makes thanksgiving at length, etc.," we cannot fail to see that this praise and glory and thanksgiving (all very closely related ideas) addressed to the Father through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost *is* the invocation of the Trinity, or simply "of God" attested in these passages.

Now since Justin is describing what is the usual practice, the rule and not the exception, we see still more clearly that a Trinity-*Epiclesis* was already the essential consecration prayer by *c.* 150 A.D. All that is lacking in Justin is the word ἐπίκλησις. But the perfect equivalence of what he says with what is said

by St. Irenaeus, who does use the word, leaves, it seems to me, no room for any reasonable doubt. What I showed above at the end of Chapter III as to the very close similarity of what Justin describes with the liturgy in Hippolytus' *A.T.* greatly increases the probability of the interpretation whereby Dr. Tyrer finds Origen's Trinity-*Epiclesis* in the whole Anaphora of *A.T.* It will also make it very probable, it seems to me, that already by Justin's time both the Charter Narrative and the Intervention prayer were a usual part of the Anaphora. But the conjectural reconstruction of the development given above (Chapter III) will show that this does not necessarily follow from the fact that it was already a Trinity-*Epiclesis*.

3. Thirdly, we shall take the *Didache*. How completely this fits in with the view I have taken will be obvious without proof here. How embarrassing it is for the Eastern or Western views of consecration I need not pause to expound. There is, of course, no Charter Narrative or Intervention prayer and only a trace of an Intercession. But on the view I have expounded, all of this creates no difficulty. There is still an *Epiclesis* (in the sense I contend for) and it makes the elements Eucharist. At the primitive stage which this liturgy represents, even before the separate prayers over the bread and wine have melted together into one Anaphora, it is just about what we would expect if the theory I have outlined above is correct. His use of the verb εὐχαριστέω in 9 : 1 (concerning the Eucharist, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε) is to be noted.

4. The only hint within the Ignatian letters is the name given both to the service and the food. But this is very probably a valuable and fairly safe clue. For it is highly improbable that the service would thus take its whole title from anything other than its most essential feature; and still less probable that the very food should receive its name from a subsidiary element of the prayers. Taken in conjunction with the rest of the evidence we have reviewed, and its closeness to the Jewish origin in date, these inferences become much more weighty.

5. The phrasing of John vi. 23 (the place where they ate bread after the Lord had given thanks) is, when duly reflected

upon, so remarkable that it can hardly be explained by any other reason than that St. John holds the change in the Eucharistic elements, in which he believes, to be effected by a thanksgiving said over them. Reasoning then from this presupposition, he thinks the multiplication of the loaves to be effected likewise by Christ's thanksgiving over them. This accords with all the evidence we have been reviewing and is really weighty, especially when read in the light of the Jewish origin of the Eucharist and contemporary Jewish conceptions of blessing by means of a thanksgiving, to which St. John is very close.

6. The Gnostic evidence is studied in a supplement to this Appendix.

We have come to the end of a long study. But I think we are well repaid. Not only have we seen very strong reason to reject the claim that the *Epiclesis* (in the later Greek Orthodox sense) was primitively and universally the essential consecration of the Eucharist; but, what is much more worth while, I think we have been able to establish with considerable probability both what it actually was, how it developed, and how the later theories, whether Eastern or Western, grew out of it. The light this helps to throw on the Eucharist in the New Testament—and still more in N.T. times—will only be adequately appreciated when we come to apply our results to the first- and second-century Eucharistic doctrine. Its strongly confirmatory bearing on our reconstruction of the external liturgical history of the Eucharist in the first two centuries will already be evident.

Supplement to Appendix III

The Gnostic Evidence

Let us look briefly at the Gnostic evidence. Considering what the Gnostics did to the Baptismal formula, which we can (I believe) fairly safely reconstruct, it would be precarious in the extreme to conclude that any Eucharistic prayers we can find among them must be closely similar to those used in the

church. Yet they might conceivably have followed the church more closely on this sacrament than on Baptism. So their evidence cannot be totally neglected before it is examined. Hence the following summary:

We must remember that the *Acts of John* are generally admitted to be earlier than the *Acts of Thomas*. The former are usually dated about 150 A.D. or a little later, though a few think a half-century later still would be more likely. The latter are usually dated in the third century, and most would say in the second quarter. In addition there is for the *Acts of Thomas* the problem as to whether the Syriac is the original and our Greek text a later translation from it, as Syriac specialists agree in asserting; or whether, as M. R. James thinks, there was a still earlier Greek original which became practically extinct so that our present Greek texts are retranslated from the Syriac, yet the latter itself is not original and might easily, Hennecke thinks, have been revised in a Catholic direction. Thus we are left with many question-marks I cannot pretend to remove. Yet certain conclusions are possible despite all of this doubt.

First of all, the prayers in *A. John* are decidedly more primitive than those in *A. Thomas* if we judge them either by indefiniteness of theological expression and failure to say much explicitly which must have been believed already, or by the lack of anything even resembling the germ of the later Eastern *Epiclesis*, which occurs in two of the three prayers in *A. Thomas* but in neither of the *A. John* prayers. Further, the one *A. Thomas* prayer which lacks this *Epiclesis* is still much more elaborated than the two *A. John* prayers, which also lack it.

Secondly, these prayers are all much more elaborated than those in the *Didache*. Yet they bear, none the less, a much closer resemblance to these than to the next earliest extant Eucharistic prayers we possess, namely the Anaphora in Hippolytus' *A.T.* or Serapion or *Ap. Con.*

Thirdly, if one attempts to trace a conjectural line of development from the *Didache*, through prayers such as these, to any of the later liturgies, it is much less impossible to trace it to liturgies on the fringe of the main stream of tradition such as

Addai and Mari, or the *Test. Dom.*, than to those mentioned above. These two last are certainly among the earliest.

Fourthly, while there are distinctively Gnostic touches in these prayers, it does not appear that this Gnosticism is a full explanation of all the peculiarities they show. I am inclined to think that the chief reason for these is the fact that they represent a tradition nearer to the primitive. They are not themselves earlier than the type of liturgy found in Hippolytus which I believe was probably already in existence and widespread before Justin wrote; but their tradition had developed less rapidly and attained far less fixity, due to the general confusion among the Gnostics.

But there is one great matter in which these prayers diverge not only from the main stream of later liturgical tradition, but also from the *Didache*. This is in the studious omission (as it would seem) of any address to the Father. References to the Father are not completely excluded, but they are only of the slightest sort, save in the Syriac form of *Epiclesis* in the second prayer from the *A. Thomas*. Probably we have here a Gnostic *differentia*, due perhaps to a fear that the Father might be taken as referring to the O.T. God.

As to an *Epiclesis*, there is nothing approaching one in either of the prayers from *A. John*. Also the third prayer in *A. Thomas* (158th chapter) lacks it entirely. This would seem to show that even the author of that book did not consider it an essential to a "valid Eucharist." However, in the other two prayers (Chapters 49-50 and Chapter 133) there is a sort of an *Epiclesis* in both forms (Greek and Syriac) of both prayers. Dr. Oesterley tells us that in the Greek both times it is a Spirit-*Epiclesis*, while in the Syriac both times it is a Trinity-*Epiclesis*. I cannot see that this is an adequate statement as to the prayer in Chapters 49-50. For, first of all, both forms contain the petition "Come and communicate with us" addressed to Jesus even if it is not developed. And then, secondly, I doubt if "Come, power of the Father and wisdom of the Son, for ye are one in all" is really, amid the long address to the Spirit, a Trinity-*Epiclesis*. It seems to me it can at least as well be simply two more of the long list of appellations

by which the Holy Ghost is addressed. So it is essentially the same in both forms, and is an *Epiclesis* of both Jesus and the Holy Spirit in both.

For the second prayer (Chapter 133) Dr. Oesterley's statement comes nearer being adequate. Both forms begin with an apostrophe to "Bread of life" in which I cannot be sure whether it is our Lord or the (as yet) unconsecrated bread that is addressed. And no petition to "come and communicate with us" is here found. Then in the Greek there is "we invoke upon thee the name of the mother . . . we invoke upon thee the name of (thy?) Jesus." Surely this is as much a Christ-*Epiclesis* as a Spirit-*Epiclesis*. But it is not an *Epiclesis* of either in the later sense of a petition of the Father to send either down, or to either to come down. In the Syriac we get, after the same opening apostrophe, "we name over thee the name of the Father . . . of the Son . . . of the Spirit." This is a clear Trinity-*Epiclesis*, but not in the later sense of *Epiclesis* at all. The latter is not found at all in this evidence, except in the very vague "come and communicate with us" form seen in *A. Thomas*, Chapters 49-50, which does not seem to be upon the elements at all. But the second prayer in *A. Thomas* does close, after "And he said," with "Let the powers of blessing come, etc." (see the prayers quoted in the Addendum to this Appendix) where there is a petition that they may come upon the bread, but only in the most general form of an Intervention prayer that could well be imagined. It is just about the way I had conjectured above that this element would first have found its way into the Anaphora.

In concluding this treatment of the Gnostic evidence I would stress again how difficult the problem is and how uncertain as a consequence our results are. The Gnostic evidence could by reasonable explanations be fitted into almost any of the theories I have seen proposed and perhaps many others. But at least it agrees very well with the view I have adopted and even gives it considerable positive support, I think. Certainly it does not create any difficulties for that view as far as I can see.

I would close by suggesting that what we have in this Gnostic evidence is essentially the very primitive Eucharistic

consecratory practice, with the liturgical freedom of the president and consequent variability in the highest degree, but divorced from its Jewish roots, coloured by Gnostic *differentiae* somewhat, and perhaps accentuated by the doctrinal turmoil and confusion within Gnosticism. It has reached, as said above, a slightly more developed stage than in *Didache*. It looks as if we shall have to add the Eucharistic Anaphora to the Canon of Scripture, Creed, and Episcopate, to the fixing of which (according to our Church histories) the Gnostic controversy so strongly impelled. Justin's stress that in the consecration prayer (not his term, of course) we give thanks, etc., to the Father through the Son and Holy Ghost, and Origen's argument[1] against praying to Christ directly, or indeed in any other way except to the Father through Christ, can hardly be entirely disconnected with the flagrant violation of this practice seen in all the Gnostic prayers below. Also controversies with Gnostics who on Docetic or other dualistic grounds rejected the Real Presence, or the use of wine in the chalice, probably exerted a powerful impulse to support both these controverted points by inserting the Institution Narrative in the Anaphora, and perhaps by explicit prayer to make the elements the body and blood of Christ. I do not imply that these interpolatory practices were originated by the Gnostic controversy. I think they originated as described at length above. But the Gnostic controversy, and their utility in it, probably led to their more speedy and universal triumph, in orthodox circles, when they might otherwise have spread more slowly and only finally after a longer time have prevailed universally.

Addendum to Appendix III

The Text of the Gnostic Prayers

In the *Acts of John*, usually dated 150-180 A.D., there are two distinct but not widely dissimilar Consecration Prayers, as follows:

"And having said thus, John prayed and took bread and bare it unto the sepulchre to break it, and said: 'We glorify

[1] *De Oratione*, xv, referred to by Tyrer,

thy name which converteth us from error and ruthless deceit; we glorify thee who hast shown before our eyes that which we have seen; we bear witness to thy loving-kindness which appeareth in divers ways; we praise thy merciful name, O Lord, (we thank thee) who hast convicted them that are convicted of thee; we give thanks to thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, that we are persuaded of thy grace which is unchanging; we give thanks to thee who hadst need of our nature that should be saved; we give thanks to thee that hast given us this sure faith, for thou art God alone both now and forever. We thy servants give thee thanks, O Holy One, who are assembled with (good) intent and are gathered out of the world (*or* risen from death).'" (Chapter 85, M.R. James' translation in *The Apocryphal N.T.*[1])

The second is in Chapter 109, as follows:

"And he asked for bread and gave thanks thus: 'What praise or what offering or what thanksgiving shall we breaking this bread name save only thee, Lord Jesus? We glorify thy name that was said by the Father; we glorify thy name that was said through the Son (*or* we glorify the name of Father that was said by thee . . . the name of Son that was said by thee); we glorify thine entering of the Door. We glorify the way, we glorify of thee the seed, the word, the grace, the faith, the salt, the unspeakable (*alii* chosen) pearl, the treasure, the plough, the net, the greatness, the diadem, him that for us was called Son of Man, that gave unto us truth, rest, knowledge, power, the commandment, the confidence, hope, love, liberty, refuge in thee. For thou Lord art alone the root of immortality and the fount of incorruption, and the seat of the ages; called by all these names for us now, that calling on thee by them we may make known thy greatness, which is at present invisible unto us but visible only unto the pure, being portrayed in thy manhood only.'"

The *Acts of* (*Judas*) *Thomas* contain three such prayers, and as these differ considerably in the Greek and Syriac I give both forms, for the difference shows signs of being significant.

[1] Published by The Clarendon Press, with whose permission these extracts are printed.

I use James's translation for the Greek, and the translation given in Woolley, *Lit. Prim. Ch.*, pp. 141 ff., for the Syriac. The first prayer occurs in Chapters 49-50. The Greek runs thus:

"'Jesus that has accounted us worthy to partake of the Eucharist of thine holy body and blood, lo we are bold to draw near unto thine Eucharist and to call upon thine holy name. Come thou and communicate unto us.' (50.) And he began to say: 'Come, O perfect compassion; come, O communion of the male; come, she that knoweth the mysteries of him that is chosen; come, she that hath part in all the combats of the noble champion (athlete); come, the silence that revealeth the great things of the whole greatness; come, she that manifesteth the hidden things and maketh the unspeakable things plain, the holy dove that beareth the twin young; come, the hidden mother; come, she that is manifest in her deeds, and give the joy and rest unto them that are joined unto her; come and communicate with us in this Eucharist which we celebrate in thy name, and in the love feast wherein we are gathered together at thy calling.'"

The Syriac reads as follows:

"'Jesus who has deemed us worthy to draw nigh unto thy holy body and to partake of thy life-giving blood; and because of our reliance upon thee we are bold and draw nigh, and invoke thy holy name which has been proclaimed by the prophets as thy Godhead willed; and thou art preached by thy Apostles through the whole world according to thy grace and art revealed by thy mercy to the just; we beg of thee that thou wouldest come and communicate with us for help and for life, and for the conversion of thy servants unto thee, that they may go under thy pleasant yoke, and under thy victorious power, and that it may be unto them for the health of their souls, and for the life of their bodies in thy living world.'

50. "And he began to say: 'Come, gift of the exalted; come, perfect mercy; come, Holy Spirit; come, revealer of the mysteries of the Chosen among the prophets; come, proclaimer by the apostles of the combats of our victorious athlete; come, treasure of majesty; come, beloved of the mercy of the

most high; come (thou) silent (one), revealer of the mysteries of the exalted; come, utterer of hidden things and shewer of the works of God; come, giver of life in secret, and giver of manifest things in thy deeds; come, giver of joy and rest to all who cleave unto thee; come, power of the Father, and wisdom of the Son, for ye are one in all; come and communicate with us in this Eucharist which we celebrate, and in this offering which we offer, and in this commemoration which we make.'"

The second prayer is in Chapter 133, and the Greek has:

"'Bread of life, the which who eat abide incorruptible; Bread that filleth the hungry soul with the blessing thereof; thou art he that vouchsafest to receive a gift, that thou mayest become unto us remission of sins, and that they who eat thee may become immortal; we invoke upon thee the name of the mother, of the unspeakable mystery of the hidden powers and authorities (? we name the name of the unspeakable mystery that is hidden from all, etc.); we invoke upon thee the name of (thy?) Jesus.' And he said: 'Let the powers of blessing come, and be established in this bread, that all the souls which partake of it may be washed from their sins.'"

The Syriac reads:

"'Living bread, the eaters of which die not; Bread that fillest hungry souls with thy blessing; thou that art worthy to receive the gift and to be for remission of sins; that those who eat thee may not die! We name the name of the Father over thee; we name the name of the Son over thee; we name the name of the Spirit over thee, the exalted name that is hidden from all.' And he said: 'In thy name, Jesus, may the power of the blessing and the thanksgiving come and abide upon this bread, that all the souls which eat of it may be renewed, and their sins forgiven them.'"

The third prayer is in Chapter 158, and the Greek has:

"Thine holy body which was crucified for us do we eat; and thy blood that was shed for us unto salvation do we drink; let therefore thy body be unto us salvation, and thy blood for remission of sins. And for the gall which thou didst drink for our sake, let the gall of the devil be removed from us; and for

the vinegar which thou hast drunk for us, let our weakness be made strong; and for the spitting which thou didst receive for us, let us receive the dew of thy goodness; and by the reed wherewith they smote thee for us, let us receive the perfect house; and whereas thou receivedst a crown of thorns for our sake, let us that have loved thee put on a crown that fadeth not away; and for the linen cloth wherein thou wast wrapped, let us also be girt about with thy power that is not vanquished; and for the new tomb and the burial, let us receive renewing of soul and body; and for that thou didst rise up and revive, let us revive and live and stand before thee in righteous judgment."

In this case the Syriac differs only verbally from the Greek, except that it has no petition based on the reed. Hence it will not be necessary to reproduce it here.

APPENDIX IV

ON THE SACRIFICIAL MEANING OF ποιεῖτε

IN this Appendix I shall give the evidence to show that certainly Justin and probably St. Irenaeus and the *A.T.* of Hippolytus use the verb ποιεῖν in the sacrificial sense.

1. Justin three times uses the verb ποιεῖν with the Eucharistic elements as the direct object, in contexts where neither the translation "do" nor "make" is satisfactory. "Offer" seems to be the only translation that at all fits the context. Thus in *Tryph.*, 41, Justin says: "The meal offering . . . was a type of bread of the Eucharist . . . which Jesus Christ our Lord delivered to be offered (ποιεῖν), etc."

Again, in *Tryph.*, 70, reference is made to "the bread which our Christ delivered to us to offer (ποιεῖν) . . . and to the chalice which he delivered [1] (to us) making Eucharist to offer (ποιεῖν) for a memorial of His blood." And *Tryph.*, 117, although the object is not "the bread and wine of the Eucharist," seems to attest the sacrificial meaning of ποιεῖν, and in connection with the Eucharist.

In view of this use of ποιεῖν and the fact that Justin shows in 1 *Apol.*, 66, that he realizes this word was used by Jesus in commanding the Eucharist to be observed, it is hard to resist the conclusion that he would understand the word to mean "offer," even in the Institution Narrative. In fact, since he not only says that Christians "offer" (ποιεῖν) the Eucharistic elements, but that Jesus "*delivered*" them "to be offered," and the Christians "received" (the prayers and thanksgivings of the Eucharist) "to offer" along with the Eucharistic food "as a memorial," it does not seem to the present writer that it can be avoided even by straining.

[1] The next four words in English are translated from the one Greek word εὐχαριστοῦντας.

2. Twice St. Irenaeus in the very act of calling the Eucharist a sacrifice attributes its institution to our Lord Himself. In IV. xviii. 1 he says: "Therefore the church's *oblation* which *the Lord taught* to be offered (*offerri*) throughout the world, etc." Now we saw just above that Justin Martyr apparently interpreted the ποιεῖτε of the words "Words of Institution" as meaning not "do" but "offer." Hence it is simple and obvious here to hold that St. Irenaeus has interpreted the word the same as did Justin. It seems clear that if we can find a saying of our Lord in which on one interpretation He can be said to have taught what St. Irenaeus says He taught, then we ought to suppose he had that saying in mind, and put that interpretation on it.

But we have another passage which is even more favourable to the same conclusion. In IV. xvii. 5 he says: "Moreover, *giving counsel* to His disciples to *offer* (*offerre*) firstfruits to God . . . He took bread which is of creation and gave thanks saying, 'This is My body.' And the cup, similarly, which is of the same creation as ourselves, he declared to be his blood, *and taught the new oblation* of the New Covenant, etc." Here even less than in the former passage can there be any doubt that he has in mind τοῦτο ποιεῖτε interpreted as a command to offer. He says the Lord gave counsel to *offer*; he uses the precise words "This is My body"; he avoids the precise words over the chalice, because of the variant versions, giving instead what he is confident they all really amount to; and then immediately after the chalice he adds "and *taught* the new *oblation* of the New Covenant," just in the very place where the Pauline account puts the command τοῦτο ποιεῖτε κ.τ.λ. Once we know that ποιεῖτε *admits* of a sacrificial interpretation, and still more since it actually received it at least sometimes in the early church, we cannot doubt, it seems to me, that St. Irenaeus here puts the same meaning, i.e. the sacrificial meaning, on the word. St. Irenaeus believes our Lord Himself instituted the Eucharist *as a sacrifice*, and bases that belief on the Words of Institution themselves. The probability seems very great that he must be simply following the traditional interpretation of these words.

3. Dr. Lietzmann finds a break in the liturgy of *A.T.* between the first part of the thanksgiving ending with the Institution Narrative and the second part beginning with the *Anamnesis*-Oblation. Now it seems to me he has at this point missed a simple and easy solution to the problem that troubles him. If he had only remembered the interpretation Justin repeatedly puts on ποιεῖτε in the Words of Institution[1] he would have seen at once the solution of his difficulty. The word ποιεῖτε at the conclusion of the Words of Institution in *A.T.* meant, as it meant in other writers, "offer" rather than "do." Once this is seen, the logical breach is repaired, or rather discovered to have been an illusion; and the logical sequence is perfect. We get it said of bread and wine: "This is My body. . . . This is My blood. . . . As often as ye offer *this* (i.e. the elements), offer it for My memorial. *Therefore* we *offer* to thee *the bread* and *the cup* (which, in virtue of being what they were just defined to be, make a memorial of Christ) *making the memorial* of His Death and Resurrection and giving thee thanks because thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and to minister to thee."

The last words probably add still further indication that the word ποιεῖτε was understood in the sacrificial sense and the memorial in the objective rather than the purely subjective sense. For otherwise what is meant by saying that God has *counted us* (I suppose, the church) *worthy* to stand before Him and to minister unto Him (which Lietzmann with high probability retranslates into Greek as ἱερατεύειν σοι)? These words secure a much more adequate meaning if God has showed that He counted them worthy by commanding them to do what they have done. But if ποιεῖτε is taken as meaning "do," and the memorial as (purely) subjective, then it is hard to give such a meaning to the statement that God has "counted them worthy" to stand before Him and minister (in sacrifice) unto Him.

A critic, of course, might say that that is perfectly simple,

[1] See above in this Appendix. It is also very probably the meaning given the word by St. Irenaeus (see immediately above) and by St. Paul (see Chapter VI). Moreover, St. Clement of Rome uses it thus, though not in an immediately Eucharistic context.

that the sacrificial idea was a later importation into the simple sacramental meal. Whether that is true we are trying to find evidence to decide. But for Hippolytus and the early third-century Christians there can be little doubt that whatever the service was to them, that was what they believed the Lord had meant it to be when He instituted it. Hence, since it was to them a sacrifice, we have every reason *a priori* to think they would put that (sacrificial) interpretation on any words in the Institution Narrative that admitted of receiving it. And the words "do this in remembrance of Me" easily admitted, especially where it was chiefly His sacrificial Death that was to be commemorated, of the interpretation "offer this for My memorial." That is not to say that either the word ποιεῖν or the word ἀνάμνησις would by itself most naturally bear that meaning; but only that they could easily receive it, especially in a context where the thing to be done was to commemorate the sacrifice of Someone by means of His broken body and outpoured blood (broken and outpoured, of course, in His sacrificial Death).

We have seen in Chapter VI that the same is very probably true of St. Paul. Thus we find that in every writer whose view is determinable, down to Hippolytus inclusive, the verb ποιεῖτε receives the sacrificial meaning. This consequently, in all probability, represents the general tradition of the church from very early times.

APPENDIX V

ON THE POSSESSION OF FLESH AND BLOOD BY THE GLORIFIED CHRIST

I THINK we must begin by freeing our minds of a sort of quasi-dualism which tends to make us think of "having flesh and blood" as an alternative and contrast to "becoming life-giving spirit." Whether St. John was, as I think, a Galilean fisherman, or, as many hold, a Sadducee, in any case, as a follower of Jesus, who had sided with the Pharisees on the point of the resurrection, he would have believed in a real bodily resurrection. Now there does not seem to me to be any valid reason to make the distinction here which many moderns make, and to which the words so easily lend themselves, but by no means require—the distinction between retaining a body and retaining flesh after the glorification.

To be sure, St. Paul at one point says: "Flesh and blood can not inherit the Kingdom of God." Also St. John says: "The flesh profiteth nothing," though here the eschatological connection is more than doubtful. But it would be a great mistake to suppose from these passages that either of these, even the former, meant that in Heaven we would have no flesh in any sense at all. Flesh to St. Paul is more of an ethico-religious conception than a physical or a metaphysical one. He even speaks implicitly of those still alive as being no longer in the flesh (Rom. viii. 8-9). And while we have here a specialized usage which is not the same as that of 1 Cor. xv., yet it ought to warn us sharply against treating the word flesh in St. Paul as if it were univocal, or even confined to two distinct and well-defined meanings. St. Paul, as I read him, is distinguishing between different kinds, modes, and conditions of flesh ("there is one flesh of men, etc."), which have in turn different "glories." When he says flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, he means flesh and blood as we

now know them, before the change that takes place at the resurrection. Perhaps he also means—certainly he elsewhere says—that this change is a gift of God through Christ and not one the flesh has any power to achieve for itself. He no more means that after the resurrection we shall have (and that Christ had) no more flesh at all, than he means that we shall then have (and that Christ had) no more blood at all. And surely the *latter* MUST be attributed even to the risen Christ,[1] for St. Paul speaks of the Eucharist as being a "communion of His blood." The reason he used the term "body" instead of "flesh" is because that was the term Christ had used; not because Jesus no longer had any flesh but only a body. In fact, what needs explanation is not why St. Paul used "body" instead of "flesh," but why St. John used "flesh" instead of "body."[2]

That this conclusion is the correct one seems to me to be strongly confirmed by two important considerations:

1. Surely if "body," when applied to the risen and glorified Christ, had meant something intentionally set over against and distinguished from "flesh," which He was supposed no longer to have at all, the Docetists could have made a powerful plea on this basis. They could have accused those who began using and stressing the word "flesh" against them of a major and substantial innovation on the church's Faith. Also, instead of rejecting the Eucharist, they could have clung to it, at least in one kind, and contended for the traditional as against the novel interpretation. But it is, I suppose, just about historically certain that they did nothing of the kind. Surely St. John and St. Ignatius would have been obliged to grapple with such a contention, if it had ever been made. And yet we get neither there nor anywhere else in history any trace of it. The inference, then, seems safe that the word "flesh" was recognized

[1] That is, unless we make the whole matter completely irrelevant to our present inquiry by holding that in the undeveloped state of theological reflection neither St. Paul nor St. John realized that the only body and blood of Christ which there could be any question of receiving in the Eucharist was His glorified body and blood, since He no longer had any other to receive.

[2] I do not intend to suggest that there is any difficulty in explaining this. The anti-Docetic point of the Gospel is quite a sufficient explanation.

by all, including those who liked it least, to be no substantial innovation when substituted for the word "body."

2. Neither St. Paul's nor St. John's conception of the resurrection body was wholly or even chiefly theoretical and *a priori*. The latter believed he had actually seen Jesus risen with a body which on the one hand could pass through material bodies such as closed doors, appear and disappear at will, and ascend into Heaven in his sight; and on the other hand could be seen, touched, felt—which could eat with the disciples—which could speak and hear—and which still contained the wounds of the Passion. And to say that such a body was in no real sense any longer a body of flesh seems violent indeed. Also St. Paul, in all probability, believed himself to be in possession of a reliable tradition to the same effect; and to have beheld the risen Christ in person on the Damascus road. Now it seems that both of these men would inevitably form his conception of the resurrection body Christians would have mainly from their belief as to the kind of a body that Christ the Firstfruits had had after His Resurrection. And at least St. Paul seems clearly to have done so.

How unsafe it is to suppose that having a spiritual body would, to contemporary Jewish thought, exclude having flesh in some sense is shown by the belief attested in the Book of Jubilees that even angels were capable of circumcision. A more striking warning against importing modern dualistic conceptions into this radically non-dualistic thought-world could hardly be conceived.

It seems, then, our interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 50 has a strong claim to be considered correct.

APPENDIX VI

ON CUP–BREAD EUCHARISTS

THERE are supposed to be three pieces of evidence which attest the existence of Eucharists in which the cup preceded the bread. These are: (1) Luke xxii. 15-19*a* (the "shorter text"); (2) 1 Cor. x. 16, 21; and (3) the *Didache*. Let us examine these one by one.

As to Luke's first cup, it is possibly not even historical. The words "Take this and divide it among yourselves" may possibly have belonged originally to the bread.[1] The conjoined eschatological logion probably belongs after the Covenant-blood Cup, where it is placed in Mark-Matt., and probably implied in St. Paul (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 26—"until He come"). Certainly it provides a much better transition to Luke xxii. 21 than does Luke xxii. 19*a* or even xxii. 20. In that case Luke xxii. 21 explains why Jesus will never live to share another meal with His disciples. And the first cup may be introduced by Luke or L simply to provide a setting for the eschatological logion when that, for the sake of parallelism with xxii. 15-16, was brought forward from its right place. This may receive some confirmation from the fact that xxii. 17 ill suits any cup; and that the connecting particle, γάρ, in xxii. 18, does not really

[1] It is, indeed, quite tempting to conjecture that these troublesome words, in the tradition Luke uses here (though not necessarily to his own understanding when he found it), referred originally to the bread rather than to a preliminary cup. In that case, they would be its equivalent to Mark's "Take" and Matthew's "Take, eat." It will be noted that Luke lacks any such preliminary injunction entirely. Surely it applies more appropriately to bread than to wine. Also there are, as we shall see elsewhere, independent reasons for supposing the logion joined to it to belong at a later point after the Covenant-Cup. St. Paul's omission of any such injunction preliminary to the bread logion as we find in Mark, Matthew, and on this hypothesis in Luke's tradition, cannot fairly be used as evidence against its historicity. For surely he is quoting only that bare minimum portion from the whole traditional narrative which he needs for his immediate argument. He may perfectly well have known the tradition in the very form here suggested, and may even be the source from which Luke derived the words; though no doubt L is a more likely source here.

explain what precedes it, as grammatically it should. Luke's preservation of this particle, despite the fact that it does not fit in its context, would seem a good indication of its historicity. Mark and Matthew have changed it, the former to *ἀμήν*, the latter to *δέ*, because it does not fit in their present contexts either.

But even granted Luke's first cup is probably historical, it is not on any showing a Covenant-blood Cup. Not only is this excluded by the chronological data of St. Paul studied in the main text, but it is not even hinted in Luke's own account. The "shorter text" can more plausibly be made to support a Eucharist in one kind than a Eucharist in two kinds with the cup before the bread. Finally, the "shorter text" is by no means certainly the authentic text; nor is 19*a* quite certainly authentic, even if 19*b*-20 are not. But if we take the "longer text" as authentic, the difficulty collapses; and if 19*a* is to be deleted, the reversed sequence is destroyed. From Luke, then, the most we can get is a case based on a very improbable interpretation of a seriously doubtful text. This is not enough to overthrow such strong evidence as we found for our conclusion.

As to St. Paul's supposed evidence in 1 Cor. x. 16, 21, suffice it to say that people do not always mention things or events in the order in which they believe them to come. So, then, the fact that he mentions the cup and bread in a certain order when he is making no pretence of speaking chronologically, cannot raise any doubt about the chronological order he definitely asserts for the Last Supper, and implies for the Eucharist, in 1 Cor. xi. 23-25. For surely St. Paul cannot be taken to mean that, although Christ did it one way, and commanded His example to be repeated, it is actually repeated a different way. Besides, in 1 Cor. xi. 26-29, we get the usual order five times over, and all refer definitely to the Eucharistic Bread and Cup. Finally, two reasons can be assigned, if any were needed, why in 1 Cor. x. the order is reversed. They are:

(1) St. Paul puts the cup first because of the importance it had for the parellelism he is about to establish with the pagan sacrifices. The analogy between eating a morsel of bread and consuming sacrificial meats was a very remote one, but that between Christians drinking the cup of communion and pagans

drinking the wine of their libations was very close (cf. Goguel, p. 144, referring to Heinrici with approval).

(2) The comment on the bread in 1 Cor. x. 17 would have seriously interrupted the sequence of the thought had it preceded the reference to the cup. The order adopted is stylistically superior. There are instances in the writers of the second century of a reversal of the order in passages giving no indication of any chronological concern; while the same writers in chronological passages make the familiar order indubitably clear; and besides there can be no real doubt as to the practice between 150-200 A.D.

As to the *Didache*, it is very doubtful to the present writer whether we have anything more here than an unthinking disarrangement of the usual order, due to his misunderstanding of the words he has made into a prayer over the cup. This possibility—I should consider it more—is discussed at length in Appendix I. In any case, the *Didache* is a very dubious and anomalous document, especially at the date at present most authoritatively assigned to it. It is at most an exceptional case, and too late a case to be of weight for our purposes. Besides, its author twice seems to attest the regular order. In 9 : 5 we get, "let none eat or drink of your Eucharist"; and in 10 : 3, "but us hast thou blessed with spiritual food and drink, etc." Nor can I think so brief a consecration prayer for the Eucharistic Cup at a date later than 120 A.D. is at all credible.

In closing our consideration of this subject, I would observe that if 1 Cor. x. and *Didache* 9 : 1-3 do by any chance give us the most primitive order in the Eucharist, that would not tell against the historicity in its Markan position of a Covenant-blood Cup at the Last Supper, but only against the primitive Bread-breaking or Eucharist being derived from the Last Supper, and continuously practised thereafter strictly according to pattern. Only if the latter be assumed could cup–bread Eucharists possibly militate against the Mark-Matt.-Paul account of the Last Supper. And the assumption is less assured than the historicity of their triply attested account, so that it cannot be used to overthrow the latter.

APPENDIX VII

ON WINELESS KIDDUSHES, EUCHARISTS, ETC.

IN view of its bearing on bread-and-water Eucharists, or Eucharists in one kind, it is desirable to collect the evidence which my studies have produced on the subject of alternatives for wine in the *Kiddush*. It seems to be generally agreed among Jewish experts that it was, in the period of the *Tannaim*, an accepted principle that the *Kiddush* could only be said in connection with a meal, and over a chalice of wine. Nor do they think that wine was difficult to get, or expensive. Hence even the poor would have been able to have at least some wine. And a *Haburah* would be very exceptional indeed if it could not afford at least one large cup of wine for every meeting.

Confirmation of this conclusion seems to be supplied by the following facts. At a later date, and outside of Palestine over around Babylon, scarcity of wine created what seems to have been a new problem, viz. what to do about the *Kiddush* when wine could not be had. Elbogen thinks this was one of the main reasons why, first in Babylon, the *Kiddush* was transferred from the home to the synagogue. Wine could be secured, even though it was scarce and consequently rather expensive, by the community group which attended the synagogue, when it might be impossible for many to get it for a *Kiddush* in the home. Ultimately other solutions were also allowed. For example, in northern countries or others where wine was scarce, or too expensive for all to secure, certain substitutes were recognized. Thus any sort of strong drink available in the land in question, or syrup, or fruit juices, or indeed any beverage *except water*, was allowed, and was deemed "wine of the country." There was also, we are told, a divergent tendency to hold that, where true wine was not available, it was preferable to say the *Kiddush* over the bread rather than over any

substitute for wine. This, it will be remembered, was later, after the *Kiddush* Cup had (on Elbogen's view) been moved forward immediately before the bread. Meanwhile, Elbogen tells us, the old custom survived in Palestine to say the *Kiddush* over wine.[1]

Now all of this comes to us, not only from later sources, and relating professedly to later times (*c.* 200-300 A.D.), but with the air and tone of rulings on a new and unusual problem arising in foreign lands. This was apparently a new problem arising at this time, to which there was no traditional solution, and to which many varied (and in some cases surprising) solutions had to be found. Now all this would strongly suggest that it had not arisen, unless very rarely, even among those in humble circumstances, back in Palestine. There is, furthermore, no trace of any of these solutions in Palestine in the first Christian century. Besides it is not likely that syrup or fruit juices would have been any more plentiful or cheaper in Palestine than wine. And if the *Kiddush* was still at the end of the meal in the first century, it could hardly be said over the bread, which came at the beginning. Above all, it is unlikely that water would ever be tolerated for the *Kiddush*, especially in circles at all devout. Hence there seems every reason to suppose that, in Palestine in the first century, the *Kiddush* would be always and invariably with wine. No doubt anomalous exceptions might possibly occur. But they can be of no significance for our purposes due to their extreme rarity.

If this was true of the *Kiddush* Cup, still more would it be true of the Cup of Blessing. This was, by its very nature, festive, and partakes somewhat of the generic character of a dessert among us. A meal was, as we saw above, perfectly possible without it. For the grace-after-meals could be said, as indeed it was on simple and ordinary occasions, without any connection with any article of food or drink except the already completed meal. In fact, there is no evidence at all to my knowledge, even later and in other countries, that this was ever

[1] Presumably he means *only* over wine, for even in the other cases just dealt with, the substitutes were only approved where true wine could not be had conveniently.

said over any substitutes for wine. And its very nature, as being the grace-after-meals, was such as to exclude its ever being carried forward and said over the bread which was at the beginning. In particular, to say it over water would be just about as gross a violation of the amenities of the table as to serve water as a dessert among us on occasions when no regular dessert is to be served.

If, however, as the present writer contends, the Eucharist originated not from the *Kiddush* but from the more formal and solemn type of *Haburah* banquet, then there is opened a possibility that in those (presumably very rare) cases where the *Haburah* could not afford even one cup of wine, the grace-after-meals might have to be said, as at the less formal and solemn type of private meals, simply as a conclusion to the whole meal, and without any connection with any chalice at all. Whether this would ever occur, in a country where wine was plentiful and cheap, as long as the *Haburah* was able to afford the other foods necessary to have a meal at all, must remain very doubtful. Especially would this be unlikely among the Christians, who attached a transcendently important value to the Eucharistic elements as distinguished from the more common part of the meal. Probably some part of the latter would first be sacrificed to financial necessity.

Also it must remain doubtful what interpretation would be put on such a meal in case by any chance one did occur. Would it be considered a simple meal devoid of all Eucharistic character? Or would the opening bread be blessed in the usual manner, and hence be deemed still Eucharistic? If so, we would have a "Eucharist in one kind." No doubt the former conclusion would be theologically more sound. But in the supremely rudimentary state of theological reflection in which we would find ourselves in ± 31 A.D. we cannot be at all sure that all would so have viewed it. No doubt very soon the form of the blessing (thanksgiving) over the Eucharistic Bread began to diverge with ever-increasing sharpness from an ordinary bread-blessing. And then a distinction is much more likely to have been clear, at least to all the thoughtful. But at the very beginning such can hardly have been a settled and

certain inference, even for all of the latter, let alone for the poorly instructed or the unthinking. This would seem to give some *a priori* probability to the existence of an occasional "Eucharist in one kind" in the very primitive church. But it would also deprive that existence of any theological or apologetical significance.

APPENDIX VIII

ON SOME SUPPOSEDLY RELEVANT PASSAGES

The Supper at Emmaus

THE passage from Luke xxiv. 30-31 and 35 is widely assumed to be Eucharistic. I cannot see any grounds for this. If it is assumed to be historical—or failing this, that the narrator believed it to be historical—it can hardly be either a Eucharist or an Agape. For the officiant is represented as being a stranger (albeit a mysterious and very wise one), and it is hard to suppose such an one would be allowed to preside or be represented as presiding at the Eucharist. That he took bread, blessed it, brake it, and gave it to them, is no more than someone did at the beginning of every meal, Jewish or Christian; and hence is no evidence that the passage is Eucharistic. And in verse 35 we make the interpretation mystical at the cost of the whole context. Surely all it means is that finally, as they sat down and began eating, they recognized who the mysterious stranger was —perhaps by some characteristic trait He had in the way He began a meal.

It seems to me that only if we had first of all, on other evidence, decided in favour of certain ideas as to the origin and nature of the primitive Eucharist, could we be justified in reading those ideas into this narrative. Surely we do not derive them from the text. The idea that this passage is Eucharistic, and shows that the early Christians had the idea that Jesus was invisibly present as their Host at every Eucharist, clashes with the fact that in this narrative He is present not invisibly but visibly; not known but unrecognized; that He vanishes as soon as recognized; and that the early Christian belief alleged has to my knowledge no slightest particle of attestation before say 200 A.D. or even much later. But the very different belief, that He was present as their spiritual food, is abundantly attested. Matt. xviii. 15-20 is not the same idea as "This is My body . . . My blood" by any manner of means. And while it would, I have no doubt, hold good for the Eucharist as well as every other kind of religious meeting

of the early Christians, it cannot by that very criterion be either the source or the meaning of the belief that the blessed and broken bread and the blessed chalice were His body and blood. And we have, I repeat, no evidence that Matt. xviii. 20 was ever given any special Eucharistic application, or that it was taken as making Christ "the Host" at any meeting whatsoever.

The Miraculous Feedings

Much the same needs to be said, as I see the matter, of the stories of the miraculous feedings of the multitude. The evidence on which it is sometimes held that they were really in any way connected with the origins of the Eucharist or Agape is simply the "took, blessed, brake, and distributed," or equivalent words, without which the narrative could not be told. It is the same fallacy as in the preceding passage. The crowd is not all disciples; there is fish, but no Cup of Blessing; the gathering of the fragments is purely to emphasize the magnitude of the miracle; and the whole is told in every case except the Fourth Gospel as a great miracle, not as in any way connected with the Eucharist. Only the Fourth Evangelist, the latest of them all, connects it with the Eucharist at all. And he seems to have no idea—certainly he gives no hint—that it is in any way the source of the Eucharist.

Rather he seems to use it, along with the walking on the sea, as a starting-point for his polemic against those who say, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" And his starting hint seems to be that Jesus did admittedly, as an ascertainable fact, proved by these two instances, give miraculous food to men, and come to His disciples in a wonderful miraculous manner. He uses the lesser, but really great miracles to make the wonder of the Eucharist less difficult. And why, if the purpose of these narratives is Eucharistic, need they ever have become miracles? It would have been just as easy to let Jesus bless, break, and distribute 10 loaves to 20 men as 5 loaves to 5000, if all the writer was interested in was the so-called Eucharistic colouring. But if the miracle be admitted to be the primary point, then, for the reasons given above, I see no proof that

these other minor touches have any Eucharistic significance at all. I admit I do not know just what to make of the feeding narratives. But the Eucharistic suggestion does not seem to me to help in solving the problem at all.

The second-century evidence in the catacombs and inscriptions does not give any real support to the view that the feedings had originally any Eucharistic import, and that is all I am contesting. That they soon came to be looked on as in some sense types of the miraculous food of the Eucharist I entirely agree, though I see no evidence to show that this occurred earlier than the Fourth Gospel. Once it had occurred, for the reasons explained above, in that very important and authoritative book, and helped on by the discovery that the initials of "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour" gave the Greek word for fish,[1] the rest was easy. All the archaeological evidence of which I am aware seems adequately explicable in terms of these two phenomena; put, of course, on the background of current Christian belief and practice as regards the Eucharist and the Agape, and the contemporary way of viewing inspired writings. Hence we seem justified in concluding that the only connections of the miraculous feedings with the Eucharist or Agape are *ex post facto*.

John xxi

The only other passage that requires our attention is John xxi. 9-14. Here it is suggested that we clearly have an Agape,

[1] We have adequate evidence of the great interest in acrostics among those contemporary with the earliest Christians. And

Ἰησοῦς
Χριστός
Θεοῦ
Υἱός
Σωτήρ

could hardly fail to be discovered early by minds interested in that type of thing.

Now, once this great discovery was made, it was just about inevitable to see in the Feedings (already described in tradition, and believed to be historical) a type of the Eucharist. In the latter the bread was believed to be the body of Christ. But Christ was the heavenly Fish. Hence, what more inevitable than to connect a miracle in which Jesus had fed men with bread and fish with the Eucharist in which the bread *was* "The Fish" from heaven. But this throws no light on any point except the realism of second-century Eucharistic doctrine.

or at least the "overtones," so to speak, of an Agape. We have a meal provided by the risen Lord for His disciples and shared with them by Him. It is, furthermore, a meal of bread and fish, just as in the miraculous feedings. And it is already prepared for them when they come to land. The Agape colouring is very evident.

Yet I cannot but give the same judgment here as in the two preceding cases. First of all, there are certain difficulties in the incident itself. The breaking of the bread, and the blessing of it and of the fish, is not even mentioned, which is strange if the writer has any liturgical interest in what he is narrating. Also, and perhaps more serious, it is a morning meal, a breakfast. And we have every reason to think that, down to the time of the separation of the Eucharist from the Agape, both together took place at night. Further, this cannot be a Eucharist. And as to the Agape, it continued to be at night, even after the separation. There is also the probable implication that this is in some way a miracle. And we have no reason to suppose that the Agape, if ever held independently of the Eucharist (before the intentional separation when the Eucharist also became independent), was deemed in any way miraculous. Finally, there is the slightness of the positive basis for the *rapprochement*. Fish (and of course bread) must have been served at many Jewish meals, as well as many Christian meals which were not Agapes. Nor, on the other hand, do we have any evidence that fish was a special favourite at the Agape.

But my main objection to this suggestion is that it assumes a more or less definite theory of the origin and nature of the Agape which seems to me quite unevidenced, and also quite needless. I am not aware of any evidence in its support except such as is contained in the two passages just examined. And that we concluded to be an illusion. If we had evidence which gave some positive support to this theory, we would then have some justification for reading these passages in the light of it. Or again, if we were in desperate straits to account for the existence of the Agape or the Eucharist, and no reasonable alternative suggested itself, such procedure would perhaps be legitimate. But neither of these conditions is in accordance

with fact. Consequently I cannot but view the Eucharistic or Agapistic interpretations as read into these texts rather than as derived from them.

If the Agape was ever held entirely apart from the Eucharist, before the latter too became independent in the second century —and of this there is, I believe, no evidence—it is perfectly easy to account for it, along the lines laid down in the main text of our study. It might have been that wine sometimes simply could not be had, and that without it what could be held was not deemed Eucharistic at all; hence "mere Agapes." Or again, it might be that for some unrecoverable reason the *Haburah* meal was sometimes repeated in a simple informal manner lacking the special Eucharistic bread and cup, and that this again was not deemed Eucharistic at all; hence again "mere Agapes."

There is therefore no difficulty in accounting for them *if* they did exist; but I very seriously doubt this and see no trace of any evidence of it.[1]

At any rate I see no evidence whatsoever of an Agape so independent of the Eucharist as to require a special theory of its origin; or of two different Agapes, one originating, as described in our study, as a part of the Lord's Supper, and another from "the feedings" quite independently of that Supper. If all that is meant is that a writer looking back from the nineties sees in an incident he believes to be historical either a type or an instance of a "mere" Agape, then I have no objection, apart from those difficulties mentioned above as occuring within the narrative itself, and the uncertainty as to whether "mere" Agapes took place at that date. I must repeat, I do not see how any of these three passages can add anything to our knowledge. We could only justify the *rapprochement* on the basis of knowledge already possessed. And I fear we do not possess it.

[1] The two alternatives mentioned above are only possibilities. We have no proof that the second was a fact; nor any reason to think so; unless it be that sometimes no proper minister for the Eucharist was available; or unless the needs of the poor required a meal. But we have even there no proof it would be an Agape; and, if it was, none that it would not include a Eucharist. On the probability of the first alternative see Appendix VII.

APPENDIX IX

ON THE TEXT OF LUKE

As a tutioristic measure I have built my reconstruction in the main text on the assumption that the so-called "shorter text" of Luke is original. By original, I mean of course for the text of the Third Gospel, not that it is the most nearly historical of our accounts. I have done so because that assumption is the one least favourable to the conclusions at which I have arrived, and I have wanted it to be clear that those conclusions will stand even if the "shorter text" be authentic.

This is, however, very far from certain. I intend accordingly to investigate the question in this Appendix in an effort to arrive at a conclusion as to the probabilities in the case. More would not seem to be possible in the present state of our knowledge. The experts are much more evenly divided in their judgments on this question than is sometimes supposed. And this is of especial weight where, as in the present case, their opinions do not tend to coincide with their views on the primitive Eucharist or their theological presuppositions.

Thus the English tradition, under the influence no doubt of Westcott and Hort, inclines to favour the "shorter text" (xxii. 15-19*a*) without—as a rule—attempting to use it to go behind the Mark-Matt.-Paul tradition historically. Many, perhaps the most and best, of the German scholars do the same, though here there is more room for suspicion of dogmatic presuppositions having an influence on their decisions.

On the other hand, quite a respectable circle of Germans hold to the authenticity of the "longer text," not all of these by any means being theological conservatives. To these must be added the bulk of the French authorities, M. Loisy being a notable exception. Not only Roman Catholic scholars, whose decisions might be suspected of being foreclosed, hold

this view, but also scholars like M. Goguel or M. Reville, whose untrammelled judgment is beyond question—at least from the "liberal" side—and whose theological and historical views might be expected to incline them in the other direction.

Finally, there are a few scholars in Germany and England who favour some other solution to the problem. Of these I shall consider only the "very short text" (xxii. 15-18) supported by H. N. Bate in England and Wellhausen, Blass, Lietzmann (at one time), and K. Schmidt in Germany. Other alternative solutions seem to me too improbable to merit very detailed treatment. However, I shall discuss briefly the possibility of every available text being the original.

Leaving out the Diatessaron and Marcion, on the complicated problems of whose evidence I am unable to form any confident conclusions, we have five (or six?) forms of text which it will be necessary to notice. I shall take first those least likely to be original, shall enumerate their support, show the objections against them, and try to see what form or forms of the text they presuppose, since they themselves are not original.

1. The Peshitto (Syr. vg.) omits verses 17-18 of the Textus Receptus, while one Coptic MS. omits 16-18.

Not only is this late and weak attestation, but it cannot explain any of the other forms of the text. It simply presents no problems, exegetical, theological, or liturgical, to account for the great variety we find in our other texts. It seems to presuppose only the "longer text," though to explain it from the Sin. Syr. or Cur. Syr. plus the "longer text" is not strictly impossible. Nor is a knowledge of the "shorter text" excluded. But it is not revealed here.

2. The Sin. Syr. alone gives a text as follows: xxii. 15, 16, 19, 20*a*, 17, 20*b*, 18 with tiny variations.

No doubt this MS. of the Syr. vt. alone is weightier external attestation than the whole Syr. vg. Yet it is completely overwhelmed by the weight of all the major versions (Lat. vt., Sah., Boh., even the Syr. vt.—cf. Syr. Cur.), the Greek MSS. without a single exception, and all the other evidence. Besides, this text, like the preceding, cannot explain the "longer text," the "shorter text," the Syr. Cur., or the *b e* text. On the other hand, to explain this text is perfectly easy without assuming

its originality. It seems to presuppose, as its most likely explanation, the Syr. vt. as revealed in the Syr. Cur. plus a knowledge of the other Gospels and 1 Corinthians.

3. The Cur. Syr. gives a text containing xxii. 15-16, 19, 17-18. It is supported in the transposition of verses 17-18 and the omission of 20 by the weighty Old Latin MSS. *b* and *e*. But these also omit 19*b*. Whether to count these as one or two forms of the text it is hard to decide; which is the reason for the suggestion above that possibly we should enumerate six forms of the text instead of five.

It is worth noting here that this shows certain points in common among all our Syriac authorities. They all lack verses 17-18 in the place these hold in both the "shorter" and the "longer" texts. The Old Syriac transposes to a position after the bread; the Syriac vulgate omits them entirely. Also all our Syriac evidence gives 19 complete, never only 19*a*. This may be a more important point than the first.

Here the reading is not quite so impossible to be original. The attestation is considerably better, and it does present a problem, which might account for tampering with the text—viz. the lack of the most important Eucharistic words over the chalice. Still, the reading is very unlikely to be original, despite Zahn's adhesion. It cannot explain the "longer text"; for who would gratuitously create the grave problem of the two chalices after starting with such a text? If the Eucharistic words must be supplied, this could be done either as Sin. Syr. has done (by adding them or by amalgamating them with verses 17-18) or as the Peshitto (by substituting them for 17-18). In no case does any good reason appear for moving verses 17-18 forward after 15-16 when the Eucharistic words were added. For I cannot believe parallelism with 15-16 would have been a sufficient motive to lead anyone to create the difficulty of the double chalice.[1] In short, we can easily explain how verses 17-18 came to be moved from the position the overwhelming bulk of the external evidence gives them. But we cannot explain, at least not at all plausibly, how they were ever moved to that position if they were not there originally.

[1] Unless perchance a thoughtless scribe did not advert to the difficulty he was creating. But this, though not impossible, is surely unlikely.

Finally, it is very possible that Syr. Cur. and *b e* are independent efforts to remedy the difficulty of the "shorter text," and hence do not really attest one single form of the text. The discrepancy as to verse 19*b* seems to favour this view. This would weaken still further what little external attestation there is.

This text seems to presuppose the "shorter" rather than the "longer" text. It is very unlikely the Eucharistic words in verse 20 would have been displaced to make room for verses 17-18 after 19*b* or 19*a*. Not even Syr. Cur. alone seems to have added 19*b* from the "longer text." For he lacks the *διδόμενον* of the "longer text." Apparently he added the *τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν* from St. Paul directly.

It appears, then, that while the Old Syriac contained 19*b* (perhaps from the first), it was translated from a text (Latin or ?? Greek) which did not contain it but only 19*a*. It thus attests not the "longer text," but either the "shorter text" or else the *b e* text. If the former, it made independently the same transposition as *b e*, and of course for the same reason, probably at the very time the version was made. In either case, the "shorter text" (which the *b e* text presupposes) is attested for a date probably prior to the making of the Old Syriac version.

4. The issue, then, would seem to lie between the so-called "shorter" and "longer" texts. Let us consider first the "shorter text." It has in its support only one important Greek MS., D; and as that MS. is bilingual (Greek and Latin), with the Greek probably often influenced by the Latin, it is doubtful how far it can be counted as a real exception to the unanimity of the Greek evidence in favour of the "longer text." However, it has the apparent support of the Western text, which is an early text and a weighty one. Especially is it very weighty where it reverses its usual tendency to interpolate, and instead omits what all the other authorities give. These "Western non-interpolations" are treated by Westcott and Hort as exceptionally strong textual evidence. Not only does it have certain MSS. which scholars usually classify as the *Itala* group of the Old Latin version (viz. D=*d, a ff*^{2} *i* 1). In addition it may fairly claim, as we saw just above, the support of the "African" *e*, the European *b*, and the Old Syriac. It is not impossible

that Tatian also knew it, though he is usually considered a supporter of the "longer text." On Marcion's reading I do not feel competent to speak.

Stronger by far than the argument from its external attestation (which is at best indecisive) is the argument that it is far easier to account for the "longer text" on the assumption of the originality of the "shorter text" than *vice versa.* This is not to say that the first is free from difficulty, nor that the second is impossible. No doubt both are possible, and both present difficulties. But the contention that it is far easier to derive the "longer" from the "shorter" seems beyond refutation. We must, however, consider this in detail.

The explanation most often given as to how the "longer text" gave rise to the "shorter" one is that the two cups troubled some very early scribe, who solved the problem by simply omitting the second cup. To this attempt the answer is given that no scribe would have omitted the familiar Eucharistic Cup and its logia, but rather the first cup, of which the general tradition in 1 Corinthians and the other Synoptics "knows nothing." The Peshitto is cited as a good example.

I cannot be sure that this answer is decisive. No doubt it is as to general probabilities. But it is perfectly possible that the "shorter text," if not original, is due to one early archetype which by the fortunes of chance was early and widely reproduced. Now it is perfectly easy to imagine an obtuse or lazy scribe leaving out the second chalice rather than the first for no better reason than that he had already copied the first one (i.e. verses 17-18) before he noticed the "difficulty." No doubt such a scribe would wish he had noticed it sooner so that he could have remedied it the other way. But it was now too late. He was too lazy to erase, and too concerned with appearances to cancel. Such an explanation is not an attractive one, yet neither is it impossible nor, I should judge, extremely improbable.

Can such an explanation surmount the connected difficulty as to why 19*b* was omitted? Possibly. The same scribe had gone on as far as 19*a* before he realized that he was giving the Eucharistic Bread after the Cup. At once he says to himself: "There is something wrong here. I'll leave a blank space and go on with my job, coming back to it after I find

out what the trouble is." But he never found out, because *ex hypothesi* only the "longer text" was then in existence. So he postponed his filling in the blank until he could find out from some other MS. not then available, then forgot it, and before long it was taken elsewhere and reproduced as it stood. Only, of course, since his reason for leaving the blank was not known, that was not reproduced.

Such an account is surely itself improbable, but all others available are, as far as I can see, even less probable.[1] I would, then, be inclined to consider this argument to turn the scales decisively in favour of the "shorter text," were it not for the fact that I find it at least equally difficult to account for its origin on the assumption that it is what Luke originally wrote. Let us then look at this aspect of the case.

Luke had been a companion of St. Paul for many years, and must have known perfectly well the account of the origin of the Eucharist which St. Paul gave to his converts. What then can ever have led him to prefer to it so utterly different a version as the one contained in the "shorter text"? We cannot possibly suppose such a tradition to have been more widespread in the church than St. Paul's. The First and Second Gospels tell very strongly against such a possibility, and even the Fourth Gospel and the "longer text" (if not original) add considerable weight. It cannot have been the

[1] Let us consider briefly a few of the alternatives.

1. The suggestion that it is due to a premeditated decision as to how to relieve the problem of the two chalices faces the double insuperable difficulty that (*a*) the first cup rather than the second would have been omitted, and that (*b*) it gives no reason for the omission of 19*b*.

2. The idea of a purely accidental mutilation has strong odds against it because it is not likely the mutilation would occur at just the point which independently raised a problem of its own, nor at so good a stopping-point grammatically. Possibly the latter loses some of its force from the chance that the next scribe to copy the mutilated MS. may easily have omitted a superfluous τὸ or τὸ ὑπερ or may have added a missing μοῦ.

3. The idea of a dualistic intentional elimination of the Eucharistic chalice leaves the omission of 19*b* unexplained. So does any explanation based on wineless Eucharists for any other reason. This particular objection would not lie, however, against wineless Eucharists as explaining it on the assumption of originality rather than of derivation from the "longer text."

4. Possibly a copyist possessed of a double prejudice (against wine and also against an atonement doctrine) might account adequately for it. There is in this connection the possibility that Luke himself might have written the shorter text originally under the same influences. But this is open to the grave objections noted in the main text of this Appendix.

official tradition of the Jerusalem church. For then surely St. Paul would have known it, and still more St. Mark. We have, moreover, already seen above in our main text decisive reasons to exclude any probability of it being historical.

But unless it was, then how did it ever originate? From church practice of wineless Eucharists due to reasons of poverty? But we have seen in Appendix VII that the likelihood of any persons being continually unable to secure even a little cheap wine is considered by most authorities on first-century Judaism to be very slight. Still less likely is it that a *Haburah* as a whole would be unable. Among Christians, where the Eucharistic wine had a much greater importance than the closing wine in ordinary Judaism, it is still less likely. Presumably they would sooner sacrifice some other article of food at their meal in order to have the more important wine. The improbability mounts still higher when we ask whether any local community could so persistently lack wine as to be able to forget entirely what was the right way to have the Eucharist. Still more improbable is it that they would rehearse the account of the Last Supper so seldom as to be able to forget how it really ran, and to be able to "assume" it must have lacked the Eucharistic chalice. But poor indeed would have been the guardians of the tradition in such a community who would have allowed such an assumption to prevail, even if some did make it; poorer still, who would have allowed it actually to substitute a false for the true account. Moreover, how isolated would that community need to have been in order to avoid having this mistake corrected by visitors or other outside contacts even if it were allowed to prevail for a while. But how then could so isolated a community have produced the great source we call L? And how could it have given to L (supposing it did produce it) sufficient authority to cause Luke to prefer its tradition on a point on which he must have known the common and sharply diverging tradition for many years, from most august sources, and have been able to confirm it in innumerable churches, including the greatest.

Finally, even if all these grave difficulties could be surmounted, and we could suppose that Luke once preferred the "shorter text" when he wrote Proto-Luke, why should he

still prefer it when he wrote the completed Third Gospel with Mark's Gospel before him as an honoured source and in agreement with what he must have "received" and accepted as the true tradition all along until he came into possession of his L source? I am of course aware that supporters of the Proto-Luke theory hold, with much reason, that Luke respected the sources he combined into his first draft even more highly than he did our Second Gospel. But can this preference have been so absolute and mechanical as to lead him to prefer it even in such a case? All this seems to me near the summit of improbability.

We seem, then, to find it at least as difficult to explain the origin of this text on the assumption of its originality as on the contrary assumption. There is, moreover, another objection to its originality which seems to me grave. It is the wretched transition from 19*a* to 21 with which it leaves us. Surely such a good stylist as Luke shows himself elsewhere to be can never have left that transition, even if he could have found it in his source.

There are also other less serious objections to the originality of the "shorter text." How can we, e.g., account for receiving so anomalous and inferior an account of the institution of the Eucharist in a source which shows clear indications of having independent knowledge not only of the institution and its logia, but also of the Last Supper as a whole? It would seem that L's account of the Last Supper is incomparably the fullest and best we possess. Nor does it follow that it is L which is wrong when he puts at the Last Supper some material our other accounts put earlier. As Dr. B. S. Easton has remarked to me recently, sayings and teachings of Jesus at the Last Supper would, for catechetical and pedagogic reasons, have been grouped very early with similar teachings earlier in the ministry, and thus might easily find their way into Q or other documents at the earlier point.

Finally, the external attestation does not definitely necessitate that the "shorter text" should have been the reading of either the Old Latin version as such or of the Western text as a whole. No doubt both of these are probable. But in neither case is the conclusion inevitable. Only *e* of the "African" and *b i*

of the "European" contain it. And while the dissentients among the *Itala* are insufficient to raise much doubt that there at least it is the original sub-family reading, yet, according to Lake, the *Itala* is probably "a later form of the European, and cannot be separated from it in origin." This leaves open the probability, or at least a strong possibility, that it did not belong to the European or African, but only to the Italian, from which it infected an occasional MS. of the other sub-families. If so, it would hardly have been the reading of the Western text as such, either; though the evidence of the Old Syriac favours the view that it was. At least, however, it lacks many of the authorities which usually support the Western text. It is, to be sure, easy to explain this as a correction in these from the Neutral text. But it is not necessary that this should be the correct explanation.

In short, unless we posit the originality of the "shorter text," we cannot prove it to have as early attestation as seems to be inescapable in the case of the "longer text." The case for the "longer text" will be examined below.

To summarize, then, it appears that there are really very strong objections to the view that the "shorter text" is original. On the other hand, the arguments adducible in favour of its originality are weak, except the one of the difficulty of explaining its existence on the view that it is secondary. And this one loses much of its force when we realize that to hold it is original gives us little or no advantage in this respect.

5. This last point—the extreme difficulty of explaining the existence of the "shorter text" on the supposition that either it or the "longer text" is original—prompts us very strongly to seek some third alternative. Let us then try the view suggested by H. N. Bate, Gore, Wellhausen, Blass, and (formerly) Lietzmann. It is that only xxii. 15-18, then 21 ff. are authentic, and that all of verses 19-20 are interpolated.

This view has two great advantages. First of all, it gives a perfectly easy and simple explanation of the "shorter text," which no other view seems to do. A scribe simply took (or mistook—it does not matter) the cup of verses 17-18 to be the Eucharistic Cup, and noting the omission of all reference to the Eucharistic Bread, supplied it from the perfectly familiar

Markan (or "Matthæan") account. Thus the addition of 19*a* without 19*b* is easily explained.

This theory also finds it easy to explain the "longer text," though that is not so strong an argument in its favour, as the "longer text" is fairly easy to explain on the alternative assumptions of its own originality or the originality of the "shorter text" (see below). The explanation would be that a different scribe, troubled by the same difficulty as the one above, solved the problem by supposing that the cup of verses 17-18 was not the Eucharistic Cup, and hence by supplying a full account of the institution, either from St. Paul, or from Paul-Mark, or (perhaps more probably—see below) from his own local tradition.

The second great advantage of this "very short text" is that it gives us a better transition to verse 21 than either the "shorter" or the "longer" text. The transition from 19*a* to 21 is, as we noted above, wretched. Nor is the transition from 20 to 21 as good as from 18 to 21, though it is much better than from 19*a* to 21. From 18 to 21, however, is very good indeed, as 21 explains then why 18 is true.

Yet this "very short text" labours under very grave difficulties to offset these advantages. I consider three especially serious:

(*a*) How can we account for the Third Gospel giving no account at all of the institution of the Eucharist? It will not do to reply, "The same way as for the Fourth Gospel." For we saw above (Chapter VI) a fairly simple and, I believe, perfectly satisfactory explanation of that. But the same explanation will not hold for the Third Gospel. Its purpose, as avowed in Luke i. 1-4, is entirely different from that of St. John, avowed in John xx. 31. Nor does the Third Gospel have any substitute for it, like the sixth chapter of John. Neither will any explanation from the *disciplina arcani* be possible at so early a date.

(*b*) Of course the utter lack of any external evidence is a serious difficulty. The percentage of times in the N.T. text when it is probable that no single MS., version, or Father contains the correct reading is very infinitesimal.

(*c*) We have seen above that all the variant readings probably derive ultimately from the "shorter" or "longer" texts. Now

this would mean that two, and only two, ways of supplying the original omission were ever employed; or at least that if any others were employed they left no trace whatsoever. But surely this is contrary to all the laws of chance. Why did not someone follow the way of the "shorter text," but use 1 Cor. xi. 24 instead of Mark xiv. 22? Or the "longer text," but use Mark xiv. 22-24 instead of what we actually have, which is chiefly 1 Cor. xi. 24-25*a*? Or Matt. xxvi. 26-28?

On the whole, then, these objections are probably too strong to be overcome by the affirmative arguments. The case against this view does not seem to be so decisive, however, as against the first three texts considered.

6. We must last of all attempt to weigh the case as concerns the "longer text." Let us first study the reasons against it, then the reasons in its favour.

The serious objections seem to me to be only two. One of these we have already considered sufficiently. It is the impossibility of giving a satisfying explanation of how the "shorter text" originated if the "longer" is original. This we found to be a really very grave difficulty, but to lose much of its force once we realize that to hold the "shorter text" original does little if anything to alleviate the problem. Sufficient on this subject is said above.

The second objection must receive fuller treatment. It is that Luke xxii. 19*b*-20 is copied in from 1 Cor. xi. 24-25 to fill out the narrative left so truncated by the "shorter text." Now it is a commonplace of modern criticism that "Luke" has not used the Pauline epistles either in his Gospel or in Acts. Hence xxii. 19*b*-20 must proceed from a later hand than that of the Evangelist himself.

Here the formal logic is unassailable and the minor premise is well taken. The major premise, however, while not impossible, is not certain, nor in my judgment even probable. This point we must study at length.

It seems possible to explain the "longer text" at least four ways. Perhaps the key to our problem will be found in an effort to decide which of these four best explains the phenomena (especially the minute phenomena) of the text itself.

(*a*) and (*b*). On the assumption that it is derived from the

"shorter text," it can be due either to (*a*) an independent local tradition or (*b*) a combination of 1 Cor. xi. 24-25 with Mark xiv. 22-24, chiefly the former.

(*c*) and (*d*). On the assumption of originality, it can be derived by Luke himself either (*c*) from a written source such as L or an independent local tradition, or (*d*) from the tradition he himself originally received (most probably from St. Paul) supplemented or corrected by the Markan Gospel which we know independently he used as one of his major sources.

Which of these four explanations is best? It seems to me we may at once eliminate (*b*), not because it is impossible but because it is so obviously inferior to (*d*). The reasons for this judgment are these:

(1) The likelihood of Luke himself combining Mark with the Pauline account is greater than that of a later scribe doing so, since we know for certain he was using Mark as a source anyway. This is true even of his using Mark at all (unless he had simply filled the supposed lacuna completely from Mark). Still more is it true of the particular use he has made of Mark.

He has found in his L source a saying (xxii. 15-16) which (due to its Hebraic ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα) we can hardly suggest he has himself created. He has brought forward Mark xiv. 25 from what we saw in Chapter VII was probably its historical position for the sake of parallelism with this saying. He has, for purely stylistic reasons, altered expressions which would have repeated needlessly expressions occurring in xxii. 15-16. (It is also possible he considers the Messianic Banquet the "fulfilment" of the Passover, but in no sense at all of drinking ordinary wine.) Then 19*a* is much closer to Mark than to St. Paul. The only change from Mark not purely stylistic is the omission of ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, which the preceding four verses make unnecessary.

But at 19*a* Mark's account becomes divergent from the hallowed one long familiar to Luke, which he learned originally from St. Paul. Naturally he prefers this. However, he does not wish to lose the precious "which is shed for many," contained in Mark but lost from the Pauline tradition, probably because the twist the cup logion has there received made it awkward to try to retain it. (This of course does not apply to

Luke but happened earlier.) So he preserves them, even at the cost of a bad grammatical connection, not only because of their own preciousness, but for closer parallelism with the bread logion. It may be that the addition of διδόμενον to the Pauline bread logion is to make this parallelism still more complete. Probably the slight shift in the word-order in xxii. 20c is for the same reason. But, faithful to St. Paul's cardinal doctrine (or else for still more perfect parallelism), he has substituted ὑμων for πολλῶν, of which he probably does not catch the Isaianic allusion. These last changes especially all seem far more likely in the original evangelist who is already closely using his Markan source at this point than in a later scribe filling in a supposed lacuna. Isn't it very likely that all three of the parallelisms (of 15-16 with 17-18, of 19 with 20, and of τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον with τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκκυννόμενον) proceed from one and the same hand, and that the hand of a good stylist like Luke?

(2) Likewise it is easier to account for the Pauline form proceeding from Luke than from a later scribe, because it would in all probability have been the form most familiar to Luke the companion of St. Paul, while there is no reason why it should have held any primacy in the mind of any later scribe. This is not to attempt to "show cause" why it is improbable a later scribe should have used the Pauline form (for he could presumably choose indifferently from "Matthew," Mark, or 1 Cor. xi., all of which he would probably know). It is rather to show why there is a specially strong probability that Luke would be sure to know and use it.

(3) Still weightier is the particular way in which the Pauline account is employed. It is not 1 Cor. xi. 24-25 exactly, but with some differences. The position of the μου is transposed; διδόμενον is added to round out[1] the rather rough τὸ ὑπὲρ

[1] Or possibly, if added not in Luke's memory but at the time the Gospel was written, to complete the parallelism with τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκκυννόμενον (see just above). That this need not indicate complete independence of St. Paul is proved by the textual phenomena of 1 Cor. xi. 24 itself where several different ways of rounding out these words are attested. Of course the same evidence would show that such slight changes are not decisive against a scribe having been responsible. But they are more likely in an editor, redactor, or evangelist than in a mere scribe; and still more likely in one who has the tradition through his own memory rather than from a written source.

ὑμῶν; ὡσαύτως is transposed slightly; ἐστίν is omitted; ἐμῷ is changed into μου; and the whole second "command to repeat" is omitted. Now this sort of treatment of the Pauline "text" is more likely to represent the form in which Luke remembered the Pauline tradition, combined with the freedom of an editor or redactor, than the alterations of an interpolating scribe.

It would seem, then, that (*b*) must be deemed a much less likely explanation than (*d*). What, we must ask next, are the relative probabilities of (*a*) and (*d*)?

The same arguments that have just been used to suggest Luke's (unwritten) dependence on St. Paul would, I should judge, be equally compatible with some local church founded by St. Paul having the tradition with the same slight variations with which it has been suggested Luke has it. But this equality of probability would seem to extend only as far as the Pauline wording of the passage is concerned. The introduction of the Markan phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον and its possible (though not certain) effect in motivating the addition of διδόμενον to the bread logion are less likely to take place in a local tradition than in the editorial redaction of an evangelist known to be using Mark as a chief source and, moreover, to be inclined to like parallelisms. Especially is it unlikely the poor grammatical connection of the added Markan phrase would have been left uncorrected in a local tradition. It would probably have been corrected or improved long before the interpolating scribe came to use it.

Thus, though less conclusively than in the former case, it seems (*d*) is a better explanation than (*a*). Finally, we must compare (*c*) and (*d*).

The same difficulties just raised seem to be of equal cogency against Luke having received the passage from the tradition as preserved in some local church. In fact, it is probably even stronger. For this time we should consider not only 19*b*-20 but the whole account. In fact, once we assume (as this view does) that St. Luke put it in himself, the view suggested loses not only all its importance but any attractiveness it may have had as well. Why should Luke prefer the unwritten tradition of some local church to the one he himself knew from St.

Paul? But in any case, the "longer text" would be in that event original.

Last of all, what of the suggestion that the L source contained the "longer text" as we have it, and Luke has simply taken it over in its integrity from that source?

This would be a most gratifying theory to the historian, for it would provide him with an account earlier than the Third Gospel itself and independent of both the Gospel of Mark and 1 Corinthians. Yet this account would indirectly confirm both of these, at least in some measure. It does not seem likely, however, that we should get by accident an account which as a whole looked so much like an account based on the oral Pauline tradition and the written Mark, yet was not such in reality. But here again the view, if true, would favour—indeed require—the originality of the "longer text."

On the whole, then, I am inclined to give my judgment in favour of the explanation of the "longer text" labelled (*d*) and discussed above.[1]

The arguments favouring this conclusion are not the only ones in favour of the originality of the "longer text." The external evidence in its favour is also at the very least stronger than that in favour of the "shorter text." The weight of the Egyptian and lesser versions is itself considerable. But that only shows it to be in existence as early as those versions were made. Nor would the evidence of the Old Latin version itself take us back to as early a date as the unanimous testimony of the Greek MSS. probably does. At the very least, the "longer text" must have been already widespread at the time the Old Latin version was made. For if, as I think quite possible in order to explain the reading in the Old Latin and

[1] Possibly Marcion will supply us with the one thing needed to make this conclusion invincible. I am not enough at home in the difficult and complicated historical problem of Marcion to know whether his views can account for the omission of 19*b* and 20. (Certainly he doubted the reality of Christ's body, and rejected wine in the Eucharist.) But our external evidence in favour of the shorter text all leads back toward Rome about the middle of the second century. So if some Marcionic specialist could give an authoritative answer on these points, we might be able to clear up conclusively this difficult problem and trace the shorter text directly to Marcion. It will be remembered that inability to explain the origination of the shorter text from the longer is the one really serious difficulty against the originality of the longer text.

Old Syriac both, there must have been once some Greek MSS. containing the "shorter text," the "longer text" must have been much more widely spread in order to "overtake" the "shorter" one and keep it from surviving in a single unilingual Greek MS. This strongly suggests originality without necessarily requiring it. But it does not seem explicable at all unless the "longer text" was, if not original, then at least almost equally primitive in date.

The number of cases in which a reading preserved in no single Greek MS. is probably correct is a relatively very small percentage. The number in which all the Greek MSS. agree in giving a single wrong reading is smaller still. And in no case of which I know is it probable that such an error—where it does occur—is not extremely early in date. This would require that in all probability there was already a considerable number of MSS. giving the "longer text" before even the earliest version, the Old Latin, was made. And such a version really attests the reading of only one MS., even if it be taken as certain that in the second century some Greek MSS. contained it.

Thus the external evidence seems favourable to the "longer text" without being decisive in its favour. But it does *strictly require* that if it be not original, at least it must be very early; and we saw above it was in that case more likely to come from an independent local tradition than from purely scribal activity based on Mark and 1 Cor. xi. It is this entirely safe result I have used above in the main text. But I cannot but incline at the end of this study to the view that even more might rightly have been used, and that the "longer text" probably proceeds from Luke himself and gives us independent testimony to a Pauline form of the tradition he has known—in all probability—ever since his conversion. Moreover, his careful inquiries as a good historian have in no way caused him to lose his confidence in it. Such a result, if sound, is of real value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

READERS' NOTE.—Where a book or article is relevant, in any material degree, to more than one Chapter or Appendix, it is listed not under the subject or subjects of those Chapters, etc.—but under the classification "General," in the last section of the bibliography. No effort has been made to list by their titles all the articles that are relevant, even in recent times. And among books, I have not, as a rule, listed books more than a generation old, though of course some exceptions have been necessary, due to the special importance of certain books, or the fact that they have not been superseded.

CHAPTER I

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND

Bousset, W.—*Die Religion des Judentums* (earlier and revised ed.).

Danby, H.—*The Mishnah*; Clarendon Press, Oxford; 1933.

Elbogen, J.—in "*Festschrift zu I. Lewy's 70. Geburtstag*"; H. H. Marcus, Breslau; 1911.

Elbogen, J.—*Der Jüdische Gottesdienst*; J. Kauffmann, Frankfurt; 1931.

Goldschmidt, Lazarus—German Translation of the *Babylonian Talmud*; S. Calvary & Co., Berlin; 1897.

Idelsohn, A. Z.—*Jewish Liturgy*; Henry Holt & Co., New York; 1932.

Montefiore, C. G.—*Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching*; Macmillan, London; 1930. Also his earlier *Synoptic Gospels*.

Moore, G. F.—*Judaism* (3 vol.); Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.S.A.; 1927.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Box, G. H.—*Short Survey of Rabbinical Literature*; S.P.C.K., London; 1920.

Rodkinson, Michael L.—English Translation of the *Babylonian Talmud*; New Talmud Pub. Co., New York; 1896.

Schürer, E.—*The Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (and the German editions).

Schwab, Moise—French Translation of the *Jerusalem Talmud*; Paris; 1892.

Singer, S.—*The Standard Prayer Book.*

Williams, A. Lukyn—*Tractate Berakoth*; S.P.C.K., London; 1921.

(and see also the classification "General" below.)

CHAPTER II

THE AGAPE

Battifol, P.—*Études d'Histoire* (1st series), Essays on L'Agape.
Connolly, R. H.—*The So-called E.C.O.*; Camb. Univ. Press; 1916.
Cooper and Maclean—*The Testament of Our Lord*; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; 1902.
Easton, B. S.—*The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*; 1934.
Hauler and Horner for translations of the Church Orders.
Keating, J.—on the *Agape*.
Maclean, A. J.—*The Ancient Church Orders*; Cambridge Univ. Press; 1910.
Maclean, A. J.—Article on *Agape* in Hastings' *E.R.E.*
Riedel, K.—German Translation of the *Canons of Hippolytus*, in a volume on the *Church Law of the Patriarchate of Alexandria*.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY LITURGY

Brightman, A. F.—*Liturgies, Eastern, etc.*
Cabrol, Dom.—*The Prayer of the Early Christians.*
Clarke, W. K. L., and Harris, C.—*Liturgy and Worship.*
Dix, Gregory—Articles in *Theology* for March and April 1934.
Duchesne, L.—*Christian Worship* (and the French editions).
Fortescue, A.—*The Mass: A Study in the Roman Liturgy.*
Gummey—*The Consecration of the Eucharist.*
Hebert, A. G.—Article in *Theology* for October 1933.
Neale and Littledale—*Liturgies* (the texts).
Odo Cassel and Others in *Jahrbuch für Lit. Wiss.*, 1923-1926.
Procter and Frere—*The Book of Common Prayer.*
Tyrer, J. W.—*The Eucharistic Epiclesis*; Longmans; 1917.
Tyrer, J. W., and Connolly, R. H.—Articles concerning the *Epiclesis* in the *J.T.S.*, Vol. XXV, 1923-24.
Wetter, G. P.—*Altchrist. Liturg.*; Göttingen; 1921. Also the companion volume on the *Opfer*.
Wordsworth—*Bishop Serapion's Prayer Book*; S.P.C.K., London; 1899.

(and see also the classification "General" below.)

CHAPTERS IV AND V

EARLY EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

Bethune-Baker, J. F.—*Early History of Dogma.*
Goodenough, E. R.—*The Theology of Justin Martyr*; 1923.

Harnack, A.—*History of Dogma.*
Loofs, F.—*Leitfaden zum Dogmengesch.*; Halle; 1906.
Macdonald (and others)—*The Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion*; Cambridge; 1930.
Pusey, E. B.—*The Doctrine of the Real Presence*; 1855.
Renz—*Gesch. des Messopf. Begr.*
Rouet de Journel—*Enchiridion Patristicum*; 1922.
Sparrow-Simpson, W. J.—*Non-communicating Attendance, etc.*; Longmans; 1913.
Stone, D.—*History of Eucharistic Doctrine* (Vol. 1); Longmans; 1909.
Tixeront—*History of Dogma.*
Waterman, L.—*The Eucharistic Body and Blood*; Longmans, New York; 1919. (The Paddock Lectures.)
Various editions of the Fathers, especially K. Lake's "*The Apostolic Fathers.*"
(and see also the classification "General" below.)

CHAPTER VI

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Bacon, B. W.—*The Gospel of the Hellenists.*
Bauer, W.—*Das Joh. Evang.* in the *Handbuch zum N.T.* Series.
Bernard, J. H.—*I.C.C.* on; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York; 1929.
Bushsel, F.—*Commentary on John*, in *Das N.T. Deutsch* Series; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen; 1933.
Carpenter, J. Estlin—*The Johannine Writings.*
Gardner, Percy.—*The Ephesian Gospel.*
Garvie, A. E.—*The Beloved Disciple*; and the article on this Gospel in the Abingdon Commentary.
Heitmüller, W.—Comm. on John in *Die Schriften u.s.w.*, Vol. 4.
Holtzmann, H. J. (revised by W. Bauer)—*Gospel of John*; J. B. C. Mohr, Tübingen; 1908.
La Grange, M. J.—*Gospel of John*; Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Paris; 1925.
Loisy, A.—*Le Quatrième Évangile* (2nd edition); Emile Nourry, Paris; 1921.
Macgregor, G. H. C.—*The Gospel of John* (in the Moffatt Series).
Robinson, B. W.—*The Gospel of John.*
Scott, E. F.—*The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; 1906.
Strachan, R. H.—*The Fourth Evangelist, Dramatist or Historian*; George Doran, New York; 1925.
Tillmann, F.—*The Gospel of John*; Peter Hanstein, Bonn; 1931.

Weiss, B.—*Das Joh. Evang.*; Trowitzsch & Sons, Berlin; 1912.
Zahn, T.—*The Gospel of John*; A. Deichert, Leipzig; 1908.
(and see also the classification "General" below.)

HEBREWS

Goodspeed, E. J.—Hebrews in the *Bible for Home and School*; Macmillan, New York; 1908.
Moffatt, J.—Comm. on Hebrews in the *I.C.C.*; 1924.
Nairne, A.—Comm. on Hebrews in the *Cambridge Bible*; 1921.
Riggenbach, E.—Comm. on Hebrews in the Zahn Series; 1913.
Robinson, T. H.—Comm. on Hebrews in the Moffatt Series; London; 1933.
Seeberg, Alfred—Comm. on Hebrews in the *Evan. Theol. Bib.*; 1912.
Wickham, E. C.—Comm. on Hebrews in the Westminster Series; 1910.
Windisch, H.—Hebrews in the *Handbuch zum N.T.*; Tübingen; 1931.
(and see also the classification "General" below.)

ST. PAUL

Bachmann, Philip—Zahn Series on 1 Cor.; A. Deichert, Leipzig; 1905.
Bousset, W.—Comm. on 1 Cor. in *Die Schriften u.s.w.*
Heinrici, George—Comm. on 1 Cor. in the Meyer Series; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen; 1896.
Lietzmann, H.—Comm. on 1 Cor. in the *Handbuch zum N.T.*
Robertson and Plummer—*I.C.C.* on 1 Cor.; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
Schweitzer, A.—*The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*; A. & C. Black, London; 1931.
Tyson, S. L.—*The Eucharist in St. Paul*; Macmillan Co., New York; 1923.
Weiss, J.—Comm. on 1 Cor. in the Meyer Series.
Wendland, H. D.—Comm. on 1 Cor. in *Das N.T. Deutsch* Series; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen; 1933.
(and see also the classification "General" below.)

CHAPTER VII

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND ORIGINS

Creed, J. M.—*Comm. on Luke*; Macmillan, New York; 1929.

Dalman, G.—*Die Worte Jesu*; Leipzig; 1930. Also the English Translation; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; 1902.
Dausch, P.—*The Three Older Gospels*; Peter Hanstein, Bonn; 1932.
Easton, B. S.—*Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel*; 1926.
Kennett, R. H.—*The Last Supper: Its Significance in the Upper Room*; Cambridge; 1921.
Klostermann, E.—Comm. on Mark (1926), Matthew (1927), and Luke (1929), in the *Handbuch zum N.T.*
McNeile, A. H.—*Comm. on Matthew*; Macmillan, New York; 1916.
Manson, W.—*Comm. on Luke* in the Moffatt Series.
Rawlinson, A. E. J.—*Gospel of Mark* in the Westminster Series; 1925.
Robinson, T. H.—*Comm. on Matthew* in the Moffatt Series.
Smith, B. T. D.—*The Gospel of Matthew*; Cambridge Univ. Press; 1927.
Strack and Billerbeck—*Komm. zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*; München; 1924.
Weiss, J.—*The Three Older Gospels* in *Die Schriften des N.T.*
Wellhausen, J.—Comm. on Luke (1904), Mark (1909), and Matthew (1914); Georg Reimer, Berlin.
Westcott and Hort—*The N.T. in the Original Greek* (on the text of Luke, Vol. 2); New York; 1882.
(and see also the classification "General" below.)

GENERAL

Barton, G. A.—Article in *The Churchman*, New York; March 26, 1927.
Batiffol, P.—*Études d'Histoire* (2nd series); Victor Lecoffre, Paris; 1906. Also the later revised edition.
Brilioth, Y.—*Eucharistic Faith and Practice, etc.*; S.P.C.K., London; 1930.
Burkitt, F. C.—Article in the *Transactions of the Third International Congress of Religions*; Clarendon Press, Oxford; 1908.
Burkitt, F. C.—*Eucharist and Sacrifice*; W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge; 1921.
De la Taille, M.—*Mysterium Fidei*; Paris; 1931.
Dibble, C. L.—Article in *A.T.R.*, Vol. 5; 1922-23.
Dibelius, F.—*Das Abendmahl*; 1911.
Feine, P.—*The Religion of the N.T.*; Quelle & Meyer, Leipzig; 1921.
Frankland, W. B.—*The Early Eucharist*; C. J. Clay & Sons, London; 1902.
Gavin, F. S. B.—*The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*; S.P.C.K., London; 1928.
Goguel, Maurice—*L'Eucharistie*; 1910.

Goosens, Werner—*Les Origines de l'Eucharistie*; 1932.
Gore, Charles—*Can We Then Believe?*; 1927.
Gore, Charles—*The Body of Christ.*
Gore, Charles—*The Reconstruction of Belief*; Charles Scribner's Sons, New York; New Edition in 1 vol., 1926.
Guy, D. S.—*Was Holy Communion Instituted by Jesus?*; S.C.M., London; 1924.
Hall, Francis J.—*The Sacraments* (Volume 9) in his *Summa* on Dogmatic Theology.
Harris, Rendel—*Eucharistic Origins*; W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge; 1927.
Heitmuller, W.—Article on *Abendmahl* in *R.G.G.* (1st edition).
Horner, G.—*Pistis Sophia*; S.P.C.K., London; 1924.
Lietzmann, H.—*Messe und Herrenmahl*; 1926.
Macdonald, A. B.—*Christian Worship in the Primitive Church*; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; 1934.
Macgregor, G. H. C.—*Eucharistic Origins*; James Clark, London; 1928.
Meyer, Eduard—*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christenthums.*
Nock, A. D.—*Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (3); 1928.
Oesterley, W. O. E.—*The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*; Clarendon Press, Oxford; 1925.
Schmidt, K.—Article on *Abendmahl* in *R.G.G.* (2nd edition).
Völker, K.—*Mysterium und Agape*; Leopold Klotz, Gotha; 1927.
Weinel, H.—*Bib. Theol. des N.T.*; J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; 1928.
Weiss, J.—*Das Urchristenthum*; 1914.
Williams, N. P.—*The Origin of the Sacraments*, in *Essays Catholic and Critical*; S.P.C.K., London; 1926.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To all of the above authors, whose books I have used in very varying degrees, I wish to make here that grateful acknowledgment of indebtedness which it has been practically impossible to make at all the different relevant places in the text. I am also aware that I must have forgotten or failed to record many other books and especially articles which have been helpful. For these negligences, and especially if I have failed to make explicit recognition anywhere that I am *directly* dependent on anyone, I desire to crave indulgence in advance. This does not apply to the major conclusion concerning the *Epiclesis* in the third Chapter, which I had already reached before I saw the articles by Odo Cassel; though naturally its subsequent confirmation by such an authority was very encouraging to a mere tyro in the field like myself.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

In this Index and those that follow, the specially important references are printed in heavier type.

This list does not include the Bibliography, where many further names will be found.

INDEX OF ANCIENT AUTHORS AND SOURCES

INDEX OF SUBJECTS