

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02739935 1





FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE TORONTO



1914

La. W. J. Bowles.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE



THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

AN HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION
OF THE SACRIFICIAL CONCEPTION OF THE HOLY
EUCHARIST IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

BY THE

REV. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D.

Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia

Author of "Helps to Meditation," "Catholic Faith and
Practice," etc.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY THE

REV. T. T. CARTER

Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford,
and Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1901

27
825
.1167

COPYRIGHT, 1901, BY
ALFRED G. MORTIMER

All Rights Reserved

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

10475

MAR 27 1902

TO THE REV. T. T. CARTER,
HON. CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,
AND WARDEN OF THE HOUSE OF MERCY, CLEWER,
FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS SUPERIOR-GENERAL OF THE
CONFRATERNITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, AND FOR
MORE THAN HALF A CENTURY A REVERED TEACHER
OF EUCHARISTIC TRUTH IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
WITH DEEPEST RESPECT AND WARMEST AFFECTION,
I DEDICATE THIS BOOK.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following pages contain the first complete treatment in English of the important doctrine which they unfold and illustrate.

There have been many portions of the subject dwelt on already, full of interest, but this volume gives a full digest of the matter in its many details, so as to comprehend the whole under one view.

The author is well known from his former works, having devoted his active services to our brethren in America, himself an English priest with a wide experience, and ever giving himself enthusiastically to the work to which he has been called, and which he has embraced with constant energy.

This book comprises the entire subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which the author has undertaken to unfold from the beginning of Christianity, setting forth at length the many expressions of the Fathers, continuing the investigation down to the teachings of the present day, and giving a digest of the various modes in which this doctrine has been treated. The author especially points out the dangers of a subtle form of Socinianism which in its theory of the Atonement is inconsistent with the teaching of the Prayer Book, that upon the Cross our LORD made " (by His oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient Sac-

rifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”

It is this comprehensiveness, this carrying on from age to age the faith once delivered to the Saints, which constitutes our position in the Catholic Church.

We accept what can be proved to be true in the different ages, as the Church has advanced, but yet keep to the Apostolic teaching and to the unfolding of our LORD'S words under the guidance of the HOLY GHOST.

I trust that this book may be prospered, and may be helpful to the many who desire to live in the knowledge and practice of the truth, as it has been set forth by those who have given their minds and hearts to be an ever-growing witness, and by whose guidance, under our LORD'S overruling, we have been taught in all charity to contend earnestly for the faith of the Gospel, placing our whole trust only in the saving Blood which was shed once for all on the Cross of Calvary.

T. T. C.

CLEWER, September, 1900.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE purpose of this work is not so much to set forth or to prove any special theory in regard to the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, as to gather from various sources, not easily accessible to the ordinary reader, materials from which such theories must be constructed, and by which their authority can be tested.

The Church everywhere and always has taught that the Eucharist is a true and proper Sacrifice in which the LORD'S Death is shown forth, but the fact that she never made any attempt to formulate a doctrine of the mode of the Eucharistic Sacrifice until the sixteenth century, should lead, in the theological controversies of our own day, to diffidence in either asserting or rejecting any special view of this much-debated question.

That the Eucharist is a Sacrifice is indisputable among those who recognize the consensus of teaching in the Church to be the final authority. In what manner it is a Sacrifice has never been authoritatively decided by the Church, and is therefore at most, while a matter of deepest interest, only a matter of theological opinion.

The object of this work is therefore eirenical in so far as it would unite all schools in recognizing these two facts. It is controversial only in pointing out the

dangerous tendency of one particular view prevalent in a more or less developed form in our own day, which (though unintentionally) is in conflict with the doctrine of the Atonement as set forth in Holy Scripture, recognized by the Catholic Church, and distinctly taught in the formularies of the English Prayer Book.

It has been an unfortunate though unavoidable result of the circumstances of the Catholic revival in England, that not a few matters both of faith and practice have been taught as resting upon the authority of antiquity, which more careful investigation has shown to be traceable only to comparatively modern authorities. The tendency to be definite, often at the risk of accuracy, has led many to put forth opinions and statements which they have been compelled afterwards to modify or withdraw.

There are few questions of more interest to-day in theology than those which are connected with the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. In the first place, the Papal Bull of 1897 makes the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the ground for the condemnation of our Orders. In our controversy with Rome, therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we should be able to state clearly what we mean by the Sacrifice of the Eucharist; and that we should also be able to point out precisely where the Roman contention on this subject not only lacks the weight of antiquity, but in some respects is contradicted by testimony which Romanists, like ourselves, recognize as authoritative.

In other words, in the Roman controversy we need an accurate knowledge of the history of the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist in the Church in order to meet the arguments which are brought against our Orders on the ground that in our liturgy and ordinal the

sacrificial character of the Eucharist (and therefore of the priesthood) is not sufficiently recognized.

Secondly, our controversy with Protestantism, both within and without the Church, turns largely on the erroneous supposition that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is such an addition to, or a substitute for, the one Sacrifice of the Cross, as to take away from the full, perfect, and sufficient character of that Sacrifice.

Nothing can therefore be more important in meeting these questions than to show that the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice does not in any way detract from the sufficiency of our LORD'S Sacrifice upon Calvary, and that in many points the assumptions of modern Roman controversialists are not even supported by the earlier teachings of the great theologians of their own Church.

In 1896 Part I. of *Catholic Faith and Practice* appeared. While the reviews of it were generally very favourable, one prominent Church paper took exception to the following statement : " The passive pleading of the Sacrifice in heaven is our LORD'S Mediatorial work, His great Intercession. Some theologians, especially those of modern times, connect the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with this, but we must remember that this is not what is meant by the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, for the Sacrifice of the Eucharist on earth is an act, while the Oblation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST in heaven is a state, as is shown by the words in which S. John describes it." *

In connection with this, several of the clergy wrote asking me to recommend some modern English theological works on this subject, especially such as not only stated theories, but gave references to Fathers and

* *Catholic Faith and Practice*, Part I., p. 243.

theologians in support of them. As I myself knew of only one such English work, *The One Offering*, by Prebendary Sadler, and as I considered this not only very inadequate but on some points very misleading,* I wrote to several well-known professors of theology asking them to give me the names of some books in which this question was more fully treated. Their replies showed that, with the exception of a pamphlet by the Rev. F. A. Brightman, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, nothing on this subject had been written in English during the past forty years.

Previous to this period there were two admirable treatises, Dr. Pusey's tract on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, No. 81 of the *Tracts for the Times*, published in 1838, and the Bishop of Brechin's *Theological Defence*, published in 1860. While both these are of great value, they do not deal with questions in regard to the character of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which have arisen since that time, and therefore do not meet the need to which I have referred.

In deference to the request of several friends whose opinion I valued highly, I began the preparation of a pamphlet in which I proposed to deal with the present aspect of this question. During the past three years, however, the pamphlet has grown into a book considerably larger than the volume of *Catholic Faith and Practice*, to which it was intended to be an Appendix.

Being anxious to overlook no evidence which was favourable to the view maintained by certain modern scholars that the Eucharist receives its sacrificial character, not from the Sacrifice of the Cross but from an active sacrifice which our LORD is said to be now

* A brief discussion of Prebendary Sadler's book will be found in Appendix F, p. 546.

offering in heaven, I wrote to six prominent advocates of this view (four of them doctors of divinity and professors of theology in different universities and colleges) to ask three questions: (1) Whether they knew of any works in defence of this view ; (2) whether they could cite any definite passages from the Fathers in support of it, other than those found in Thomassinus (which are not *ad rem*); (3) what they considered to be the sacrificial act in our LORD'S Mediatorial work, so as to constitute it a sacrifice.

To the first question the answer was that they knew of no other works in English than Sadler's *The One Offering* and Mr. Brightman's pamphlet, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*.

To the second four replied that they could refer to no definite passages in the Fathers, though one thought that the germ of the theory was to be found in them, and another sent two passages, neither of which can be said definitely to support this view.*

Their answers to the third question differed, the majority adducing the wounds in our LORD'S glorified Body † as the sacrificial act ; others holding that while there was no external sacrificial action, the interior offering of our LORD'S Will was sufficient to constitute a true and proper sacrifice in heaven.

I also wrote to several well-known theologians in Germany and France who have devoted themselves especially to the study of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and whose works are recognized authorities on this subject to-day. From all I received most courteous and interesting replies.

* These passages are considered on pp. 230, 247, and 259.

† That these wounds are not an act but a state, is shown on p. 143.

I asked permission to publish several of these letters in an Appendix, and the Bishop of Durham, Mr. Brightman, Dr. Lepin, and Dr. Paul Schanz kindly gave their consent. The advocates, however, of the Modern view in England to whom I wrote, with the exception of Mr. Brightman, were not willing that their letters should be made public.

As I am desirous that the reader should clearly understand the standpoint from which this book is written and my purpose in writing it, I would here repeat very distinctly that it is not my aim to formulate or to defend any particular theory of the mode of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; that I am perfectly willing within certain limits to leave this an open question, as I believe it always has been.

The task therefore which I have set before me is to call attention to the various views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which are held in the present day, but especially to gather together material from various sources not easily accessible to those who have not a large library within reach, from which material each may be able to form an opinion for himself on the three following points:

(1) What theories of the Eucharistic Sacrifice must be carefully avoided as conflicting with dogmas which are essential parts of the Catholic Faith.

(2) What theories claiming the authority of theologians of weight in our own day, though lacking antiquity, may be held as not inconsistent with Catholic truth.

(3) What doctrines must be affirmed as necessary to the Catholic Faith, comprised therein, and clearly set forth in the formularies of the Church of England.

I would earnestly disclaim any desire to encourage acrimonious controversy on this subject in our Church.

I believe, however, that nothing can more tend to diminish such controversy and help towards a unity of opinion in this matter than to demonstrate historically how slender is the authority for any precise theory of the *mode* of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and yet how overwhelming is the testimony to the *fact* that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice.

I have felt it my duty, however, to combat one theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is not only unsupported by Patristic testimony, but is inconsistent with it, and which contradicts express statements of our Prayer Book, and indeed of all Catholic theology. This theory, which is really an insidious attack on the doctrine of the Atonement, is essentially based on the Socinian interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It *claims* the support of the great body of Anglican divines and Tractarians, but this claim is not only unsupported, but is positively refuted by their writings.

In order to make the evidence for the Eucharistic Sacrifice as direct and as simple as possible, I have omitted the treatment of many interesting questions (as, for instance, the purpose of sacrifice); and other matters I have relegated to Appendices.

I am conscious of having repeated, sometimes more than once, arguments which had already been used in previous chapters. I have done this in order to make each chapter, as far as possible, complete in itself. Certain phrases, too, will be found to recur quite often, the result of an attempt to state views (which I was combating) in the actual words of their exponents.

Any one of the chapters might have been greatly enlarged, but I do not believe the weight of the argument would have been changed, nor am I conscious of having omitted any important evidence on either side.

In quoting from Holy Scripture I have followed Bishop Westcott's translations of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In other books I have used the Authorized Version, or, where that was faulty, I have given what seemed to me the best translation.

I can scarcely dare to hope that all the references in the foot-notes will be found to be accurate. In the great majority of cases I have verified the passage myself before quoting it. From a few works to which I was unable to obtain access, I have been obliged to quote at second hand. These have been chiefly the works of writers from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, and therefore not contained in Migne's *Patrologia*. I fear, however, that typographical errors may have crept in, as most of my proof-reading of the book was done at a great distance from home, where I had no opportunity of verifying a second time these quotations. I shall be very grateful to those who will call my attention to any errors they discover.

For the assistance of the reader I have almost always, where a writer is mentioned for the first time, given the date of his death; in a few cases, where it is omitted, I have been unable to ascertain this date.

The relation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice to our LORD'S one Oblation of Himself upon the Cross and to His Mediatorial work in heaven, as revealed to us especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, imparts to the study of this subject a fascination which I venture to hope may lead many to investigate more deeply for themselves these great doctrines of our Faith.

Dr. Lepin, in a private letter referring to his book, *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne*, expresses this feeling when he speaks of it as "*la moitié de mon âme.*" Bishop Westcott says: "No work in which I

have ever been allowed to spend many years of continuous labour, has had for me the same intense human interest as the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews;" and Dr. Vacant finishes his essay, *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe*, with these words: " Il ressort, pensons-nous, de cette étude, que DIEU nous a fait dans le sacrifice eucharistique un don d'une richesse incomparable, et qu' après dix-neuf siècles, la théologie n'a pas encore fini d'approfondir ce que JÉSUS-CHRIST nous en a révélé en quelques paroles."

I trust that many of my readers, like these great theologians, may so feel the attraction of this sublime subject, that they may be led to pursue it not only as a matter of theological controversy, but of deep spiritual interest.

There remains to me the pleasant task of expressing my great obligations to many friends who have especially helped me in my work.

First to the Rev. Canon Carter of Clewer, who has shown his kindly interest in it by writing the Introduction. It is difficult to find words in which adequately to express my sense of obligation to him. As the last of those great teachers of the English Church who carry us back to the stirring times of the Tractarian movement, as connected with the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament from its beginning, and for twenty-five years its Superior General; as the author of *Spiritual Instructions on the Holy Eucharist*, as the editor of the *Treasury of Devotion*, and therefore in so many ways associated with the revival in the Church of England of Eucharistic truth and worship,—there is no name which I could more wish to have associated with my book, and certainly none which should carry more weight than that of Canon Carter. My obliga-

tion to him for this kind office has been increased by the generous expressions of sympathy and encouragement with which it has been accompanied.

To the Bishop of Durham I am not only indebted for two kindly and helpful letters in regard to the subject of this book, and for permission to print them in the Appendix, but for the main argument of that part of the work which treats of the testimony of Holy Scripture. This I have drawn chiefly from his masterly commentary on *The Epistle to the Hebrews*.

To the Rev. F. E. Brightman, for his kindness in answering certain questions in regard to views set forth in his pamphlet, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, and for giving me permission to print his letter. I would take this opportunity of expressing my regret that I have had to differ so widely from him. If I have severely criticised his theory, it has been because I honestly believe it to endanger faith in the doctrine of the Atonement. I trust, however, that I have not in any way overpassed what may be permitted in controversy between such good friends as we are.

To M. l'Abbé Lepin, S.T.D., priest of S. Sulpice and Director of the Grand Seminary of S. Irenæus at Lyons, I am greatly indebted not only for courteous replies to several letters, and the warm personal interest manifested in my work, but for three letters of considerable length in which his own view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is most clearly and beautifully stated, and his dissent from Mr. Brightman's view unmistakably expressed. These letters are given in Appendix G, and are worthy of the most careful study.

My thanks are also due to the Rev. C. W. E. Body, D.D., D.C.L., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation in the General Theological

Seminary, New York, for reading some parts of my manuscript, and for valuable suggestions in regard to Hebrew sacrificial terms.

To the Rev. J. R. Oliver, one of my fellow-clergy at St. Mark's, I am indebted for assistance in looking up references and for translations from the German of Dr. Thalhoffer and Dr. Schanz, and for the translation from Socinus in Appendix B.

To Mr. W. H. McClellan for much help in preparing the work for press, as well as in verifying references.

And last but not least, to the Rev. Shirley C. Hughson, for the laborious task of reading and correcting the proof-sheets of the whole book.

May the HOLY GHOST, Who searcheth all things, even the deep things of GOD, enlighten our minds and enable us more fully to comprehend the Sacred Mysteries of our LORD'S Body and Blood, that we may offer the Divine Sacrifice with greater devotion, feed on Him more worthily, and with deeper love adore Him present beneath the Sacramental veils. So will our Eucharists on earth prepare us to take our place in eternity in the worship of heaven.

A. G. M.

S. MARK'S CLERGY HOUSE,
PHILADELPHIA,
Christmas, 1900.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

SOME DANGERS AND DIFFICULTIES OF OUR TIMES.

	PAGE
Introductory: Human thought tends to exaggerated reaction.—Examples: the age of the Councils, and the Renaissance, or Reformation	I
I. THIS TENDENCY SEEN IN THEOLOGY IN CENTURY XVI. ; in polity, morals, worship, and dogma.—The revulsion greatest in priesthood and related questions.—On both sides a distortion of truth revealed by comparison with fundamental truths.—The importance of the “ <i>reductio ad absurdum</i> ” method in theology.—The likeness of century XVI. to our own age.—We should therefore avoid the mistakes of the Reformation period	I
II. REMEDY FOR EXAGGERATION NOT COMPROMISE, BUT THE “<i>VIA MEDIA</i>” OF ARISTOTLE. —The Catholic Faith not a series of isolated propositions, but a body of perfectly harmonious truth.—At the Reformation the Atonement isolated from the Incarnation.—Now the opposite tendency: the Atonement obscured, and humanitarian distortions of the Incarnation introduced.—In this work theories must be tested by other doctrines.—The violation of this principle illustrated from Dr. Milligan’s lectures on “The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our LORD.”—Two characteristics observed in his work:	3

	PAGE
1. The neglect of the writings of the Fathers and theologians of the Church, and the weight given to modern schismatics	5
2. His treatment of the Sacrifice of the Cross as a question still open for discussion.—Dr. Milligan denies that our LORD'S Priesthood had any connection with earth, and rejects various theories offered by schismatical writers to bring the Death of the Cross within the scope of His priestly work, and so to recognize it as a Sacrifice.—He considers that the universal conviction of the Christian Church is "not without force."—He proposes a theory of his own, based on the interpretation of one passage of Scripture.—He considers that the objection that it rests on one passage only has no weight, but that its inconsistency with S. Paul's language has a certain force.—Examples of this.—A theologian is discredited: (1) Who little values Catholic consent; (2) rests the Sacrifice of the Cross on one passage of Scripture; (3) and ignores the consensus of the Fathers	6
III. TWO PRINCIPLES RECOGNIZED BY ANGLICANS: . . .	10
1. The appeal to antiquity; i. e., to the writings of the Fathers as a whole, not merely to doubtful passages.—This test applied to the modern theory of our LORD'S Sacrifice in heaven . . .	10
2. The Church herself the interpreter of all truth.—The place therefore to be given to the writings of schismatics.—The modern view of the Kenosis started from Beron through Lutheran sources.—The modern interpretation of Hebrews comes from Socinus, and has been spread in England through Dr. Milligan.	11
IV. TWO QUESTIONS BEFORE US TO-DAY, PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE.—The questions which the Reformation and the Oxford Movement took up were first Apostolical Succession, then the Doctrine of the Eucharist.	

	PAGE
Little critical work done in regard to the nature of priesthood or sacrifice.—Renewed interest stimulated by the Papal Bull of 1896, and more scientific investigation, which may yet afford a better basis for the union of Christendom than Papal recognition.—The investigation of these questions must be made in many fields.—Many learned Roman Catholic treatises invalidated by faulty premises.—An illustration of this in the controversy as to the "form" in Holy Order	13
V. THE QUESTION OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE DEBATED WITH GREAT DILIGENCE AND LIBERALITY IN GERMANY.—Three German schools :	14
1. The extreme school of Thalhofer, started in 1870.—Its learning and literary industry.—But little known in England	15
2. On the opposite side the works of Stentrup	15
3. Between these the treatises of Scheeben and Schanz, and, in France, of Lepin, and Vacant.—In England Dr. Moberly's "Ministerial Priesthood" supplies an example of constructive treatment of priesthood, but we have practically nothing on the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—The only book on this subject Sadler's "One Offering."—Mr. Kidd's work confined to mediæval doctrine.—The subject is touched upon in various works on the Articles, and treated more fully in a paper by Mr. Brightman.—These authors do not meet the difficulties involved in their theory, nor give any substantial proofs of it.—The laborious work done by the modern school in Germany.—Bishop Westcott's great work on Hebrews entirely against the modern view	16
VI. THE PURPOSE OF THIS WORK CHIEFLY TO PRESENT EVIDENCE NOT EASILY ACCESSIBLE.—Four difficulties in treating the subject	21
1. The equivocal use of the term "sacrifice"	22
2. No adequate attempt to determine the nature of sacrifice till century XVI.	22

	PAGE
3. Entire absence of modern works on the subject in the English Church	23
4. The many departments of theology on which the subject trenches	23

CHAPTER II.

SACRIFICE.

<p>Introductory: Its origin and meaning.—Religion distinguishes man from other creatures.—Sacrifice the universal characteristic of religion.—Its primæval origin.—Sacrifice not necessarily of Divine institution.—Its meaning primarily the expression of Love.—Mediæval theology saw in Sacrifice a sense of sin, and a desire for reconciliation with GOD.—This view true, but not the primary conception.—Love itself is essentially self-sacrificing</p>	24
<p>I. THE PURPOSE OF SACRIFICE.—Sacrifice expresses man's true relation to GOD and dependence on Him.—This results first in inward acts or feelings, then finds expression in outward acts of worship, since man consists both of soul and body.—External worship not needed to reveal man's heart to GOD, but to enable man to fulfil his duty, and to confess GOD before his fellow-men.—Socially, as well as individually, man must worship God</p>	26
<p>II.—THE CHIEF ACT OF PUBLIC WORSHIP IS SACRIFICE.—Sacrifice is the union of two things.—Its true side is inward.—But this must be expressed by outward action.—The union of outward and inward essential to a true and proper Sacrifice</p>	28
<p style="padding-left: 2em;">1. The genus to which Sacrifice belongs is that of "a sacred sign."—S. Augustine's definition.—His treatment of the rationale of external sacrifice. — S. Augustine, "De Civ. Dei," l. x., c. 5.—S. Thomas' treatment of Sacrifice, 2a 2æ, q. 85, a. 1 and 2</p>	29
<p style="padding-left: 2em;">2. Sacrifice derives its essential character from its</p>	

	PAGE
institution.—This institution to be authoritative must be public.—In revealed religion this authority is GOD alone	32
3. The external form demands some appropriate sacrificial action	33
III. SCHANZ'S PROPOSITIONS IN REGARD TO SACRIFICE.—A twofold idea underlies Sacrifice: an outward expression of religion, and a type of the future.—Offering is the fundamental notion of Sacrifice.—Through acceptance of Sacrifice, GOD admits to communion with Him.—Its essential character not destruction, but consecration.—The killing only preparatory to the Sacrifice.—Greek, Latin, and Hebrew terms show that destruction is not the essential idea.—With the Hebrews the two sacrificial acts, effusion of blood and cremation.—Philo's explanation of the effusion.—In burning incense and oil the object is the sweet odour, not the destruction.—The meal a symbol of communion.—S. Irenæus.—Schanz's definition of Sacrifice	33
IV. VARIOUS DEFINITIONS OF SACRIFICE	37
1. S. Augustine's famous definition.—Of a true Sacrifice, not of Sacrifice in general.—The union of two parts in Sacrifice.—“ <i>Verum ac proprium sacrificium.</i> ”—Use of “true” illustrated from S. John xv. 1.—S. Augustine's definition of Sacrifice in general.—The sacrificial act illustrated from martyrdom	37
2. Definition of Alexander of Hales	41
3. Of S. Thomas	41
4. Of S. Isidore of Seville	42
5. Of Vasquez	42
6. Of Biel and de Castro.—Vasquez's final definition.	43
7. Suarez's definition	44
8. Scheeben's definition	45
V. RECAPITULATION OF THE ELEMENTS IN SACRIFICE	45
1. Two parts, an outward and an inward	45
2. The sacrificial action, on which the Sacrifice depends	46
3. This must be performed by a priest.	46

CHAPTER III.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS.

	PAGE
Introductory: THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS THE ONLY ABSOLUTE SACRIFICE.—All others are relative in that they gain their efficacy from it.—Investigate how the Sacrifice of the Cross fulfils the general definition of Sacrifice.—Not necessary here to examine any of the theories of the Atonement	47
I. HOLY SCRIPTURE DESCRIBES OUR LORD'S DEATH AS A SACRIFICE BY APPLYING TO IT SACRIFICIAL TERMS. — In Isa. liii. the word "niggas" in v. 7 is a sacrificial term, and the word "asham" in v. 10.—The "oblation and sacrifice" of 2 Cor. v. 21 and Eph. v. 2 are also sacrificial.—So 1 Cor. v. 7; Rom. iii. 25; 1 S. John ii. 1, 2, and 1 S. John iv. 10	47
II. FIVE ACTIONS IN THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS, CORRESPONDING WITH THOSE OF THE JEWISH LAW	49
1. The dedication of the victim	49
2. The identification of the victim with the offerer. —Our LORD not a mere substitute for man, but the Representative of man	49
3. The interior act: the offering in will of a life of perfect obedience	50
4. The shedding and presentation of the blood. — The significance of the victim's death, and of the sprinkling of the blood in the Levitical Law.—On the Cross both the slaying of the Victim and the sprinkling of the Blood find place.—The significance of the rending of the veil of the Temple	50
5. The cremation of the victim. —The significance of fire.—This is fulfilled on the Cross in two ways: i. As the great act of love by which the world was redeemed; ii. As offered "through the Eternal Spirit," the action of His Godhead in the Sacrifice.—Socinus' view of this passage.—Thus every rite of the Old Testament is fulfilled upon the Cross	53

	PAGE
III. OUR LORD WAS PRIEST AND VICTIM IN HIS HUMAN NATURE ALONE.—In His Divine Nature He receives the Sacrifice offered.—“Communicatio idiomatum.”—Our LORD is actively the Priest, passively the Victim.	54
IV. A DIFFICULTY REMAINS: In what precisely did our LORD'S sacrificial action consist?—Socinus claims that our Lord's Death was a martyrdom, not a Sacrifice.—The argument of Socinus drawn almost exclusively from Hebrews.—The system of Socinus.—Its kernel his view of our LORD'S Priesthood.—This Socinus limited to heaven.—Socinus treats of the relation of the Cross to the Jewish sacrifices and to the Mediatorial work in heaven.—He denies that all the Jewish sacrifices typify the Death of CHRIST, but confines this chiefly to that on the Day of Atonement.—He asserts that in Hebrews CHRIST'S Oblation refers only to His work in heaven.—He argues from the Day of Atonement that the Death of CHRIST was not a Sacrifice.—He also denies that any “satisfaction” was made by our LORD.—Alford and Bengel go beyond Socinus in teaching that our LORD'S Blood was presented by Him, separated from His Body, after the Ascension: Heb. xii. 24.—The issue raised by Socinus practically the basis of the Modern view of our LORD'S Sacrifice.—If the essentially sacrificial act took place in heaven, our LORD'S Offering upon the Cross was not a Sacrifice and the statement in the English Prayer of Consecration is untrue . . .	56
V. IF THE SOCINIAN POSITION BE ASSUMED, HOW ARE WE TO EXPLAIN:	59
1. The words, “It is finished”	60
2. Our LORD'S work in Hades	60
3. Our LORD'S gift of peace on Easter Day	60
4. Our LORD'S gift of absolution on Easter Day.	61
5. Our LORD'S claim, “All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth”?	61
VI. EXAMINATION OF THE SOCINIAN THEORY THAT ON THE CROSS OUR LORD WAS NEITHER PRIEST NOR SACRIFICE	61

	PAGE
1. When did our LORD'S Priesthood begin?— From Heb. x. 4-9, theologians unanimously answer, At the Incarnation.—The Unction of the HOLY GHOST at His Baptism con- sidered.—Summary of the argument from Heb. x. 4-9	61
2. Was our LORD'S Death a Sacrifice or a martyr- dom?—The elements of a true and proper sacrifice found in the Cross.—The difference between martyrdom and sacrifice examined. i. The martyrs were neither priests, ii. nor victims, iii. nor as sinners could they offer sacrifice	64
VII. THE LAST OBJECTION, THAT OUR LORD WAS SLAIN BY HIS PERSECUTORS, BUT NOT AS A SACRIFICE.—The proper sacrificial action indicated in S. John x. 17, 18. —The agents of our LORD'S Death did not act against His will.—A sacrificial action may be per- formed by a layman under the priest's direction, e. g., the Roman sacrifices, and those of the Jews.—Our LORD, therefore, on the Cross adequately fulfilled the law of Sacrifice.—The Socinian theory in regard to our LORD'S heavenly Priesthood the foundation of the Modern view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice	66
VIII. THAT MAN'S REDEMPTION WAS ACCOMPLISHED ON THE CROSS IS SHOWN BY MANY REFERENCES TO IT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.—The point at issue restated.— Passages in the New Testament which refer man's re- demption to the Cross: S. John iii. 14, 15; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. ii. 20; S. Matt. xx. 28; Rom. viii. 32; Eph. v. 2; Eph. v. 25; Titus ii. 13, 14; 1 S. Pet. iii. 16; S. John x. 11, 15, 18; S. John xv. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; 1 S. Pet. ii. 24; Rom. v. 10; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 21, 22; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Heb. ii. 14, 15; Heb. xiii. 12.—For the Socinian view no passage can be quoted.—Conclusion.—The Catholic Church teaches that upon the Cross our LORD offered His perfect Sacrifice	68

CHAPTER IV.
THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

	PAGE
Introductory: We are now able to examine the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—The best method is to give the three prevalent views, in the words of representative writers, and to notice the accretions attaching to each.—Then to consider the support for each in Scripture, the liturgies, history, the Fathers, theologians, Anglican divines, and Tractarians	73
I. THE CATHOLIC VIEW IN THE WORDS OF BOSSUET	74
1. He teaches that : the essence of the Sacrifice is in the Consecration ; CHRIST both consecrates and offers ; priests are only His ministers ; the Sacrifice is a consequence of the Real Presence ; in it is renewed the Death upon the Cross ; and this makes GOD propitious to us ; this Sacrifice does not take away from the sufficiency of that upon the Cross ; in the Holy Eucharist we apply the merits of the Cross ; there is no destruction of the Victim ; the Holy Eucharist, while a proper Sacrifice, depends entirely upon the Sacrifice of the Cross.—The salient features of this view	74
2. Summary : i. The essence of the Sacrifice consists in the Consecration ; ii. The Sacrifice is related directly and essentially to the Sacrifice of the Cross ; iii. The destruction of the Victim only mystical	77
3. A large school makes destruction an essential element, relying on S. Thomas as interpreted by Vasquez.—It finds its fullest expression in De Lugo.—There has always been a school which rejected this view.—In our day De Lugo's view represented by Franzelin.—The opposite opinion gaining ground : its exponents Scheeben, Schanz, Lepin, Tyrrell.—Destruction not a necessary element of the Catholic view	77

	PAGE
II. THE PROTESTANT VIEW; taught by Luther, held by most Protestant bodies	79
1. Well set forth by Burnet	79
2. Summary: i. This view agrees with the Catholic in recognizing the Cross as the only absolute Sacrifice; ii. a reaction from exaggerated claims for the Mass	80
3. Modifications of the Protestant view: i. Mede's theory of a material offering of bread and wine; ii. Spiritual sacrifices of prayer, etc.—Dr. Hickes' view.—Waterland's view	81
III. THE MODERN VIEW.—The name discussed.—The term "Anglican View" misleading	82
1. Mr. Brightman's paper its exponent.—Mr. Brightman's exposition.—The Eucharistic Sacrifice reproduces, <i>not</i> the moment of the Cross, but our LORD'S action in heaven.—The Cross only the initial act of the Sacrifice.—The other acts are fulfilled perpetually in heaven.—The assumption that the Holy Eucharist is pre-eminently the memorial of CHRIST'S Death, in its most exaggerated form, found in popular teaching.—In a less exaggerated form, in our own liturgy.—A denial that this exclusive reference of the Holy Eucharist to the Cross is found in the New Testament or the early Church.—"Do this in remembrance of Me" suggests no special reference to our LORD'S Death, but to Himself.—In the Institution nothing to suggest a relation to our LORD'S Death.—The mark of death only in the separate Consecration of the chalice.—The witness of the Holy Eucharist is not "I died," but "I am He that liveth."—The Holy Eucharist related to the Cross only through the eternal action of CHRIST in heaven.—The Holy Eucharist is an absolute Sacrifice.—And the Atonement ought to be interpreted by it, not it by the	

	PAGE
Atonement.—This view is most radical, but it is a clear-cut, definite system.	83
2. Summary : It differs from the Catholic view :	
i. In that it relates the Holy Eucharist not to the Cross but to what our LORD is now doing in heaven.—Its claim that only the initial act of Sacrifice was performed on Calvary ; that the essential act by which man was redeemed took place in heaven.—This view is precisely that which originated with Socinus. ii. It regards the Holy Eucharist as an “ absolute ” Sacrifice.—The sense in which some Romans have considered it an “ absolute ” Sacrifice.—Scheeben’s view that relativity is the specific “ form ” of this Sacrifice.—Mr. Brightman would interpret the Atonement by the Holy Eucharist. iii. In the Institution he sees no special reference to our LORD’S Death.—In spite of S. Paul’s words, 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26	88
3. These views are, however, repudiated by many of the Tractarian school : e. g., Bp. Forbes, “ Articles ; ” Rev. B. J. Kidd, “ Articles ; ” Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, “ Articles ; ” Dr. Mason, “ The Faith of the Gospel.”—Dr. Mason’s peculiar view in regard to the manner of our LORD’S Presence	92
4. The principal accretion to the Modern view, as stated by Alford.—Taken from Bengel.—And rejected by most writers except Sadler and Jackson.—Conclusion.—The essential difference between the Catholic and Modern views .	96

CHAPTER V.

THE TESTIMONY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Introductory : In this chapter the Catholic and Modern views are compared with the teachings of Scripture.— 100
Does Scripture teach :

	PAGE
I. THAT THE HOLY EUCHARIST IS A SACRIFICE? . . .	100
II. THAT ITS SACRIFICIAL CHARACTER DEPENDS ON ITS RELATION TO THE CROSS, OR TO OUR LORD'S WORK IN HEAVEN?	100
I. THE WITNESS OF SCRIPTURE TO THE FACT OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE	101
1. The evidence of the Old Testament: i. The Passover, Ex. xii. 3, 6, 8, 14; Lev. iii. 1, vii. 15; 1 Cor. v. 7.—In two points it is typical of the Holy Eucharist: (1) as a commemora- tive Sacrifice; (2) as a feast upon a Sacrifice. ii. The prophecy of Malachi i. 11: (1) re- fers to external worship; (2) contrasts the “pure Offering” with the legal sacrifices; (3) contrasts its universality with their local character; (4) the word used is “Minchah,” and the other terms are sacrificial.—The early Christian Fathers interpret the prophecy of the Holy Eucharist	101
2. The evidence of the New Testament: i. The Consecration of the chalice, S. Matt. xxvi. 28; S. Mark xiv. 24; S. Luke. xxii. 20. ii. The Consecration of the bread. iii. “This do in remembrance of Me,” S. Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24-26. iv. “We have an Altar,” Heb. xiii. 10.—Conclusion as to the fact that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice	103
II. THE TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE ABOUT THE MANNER IN WHICH THE HOLY EUCHARIST IS A SACRIFICE.—The Catholic theory.—Difference between the Catholic and Modern views.—Each school bases its view on the same passages of Scripture	106
1. The words of Institution: The Catholic view connects this with our LORD'S Death.—“Do this in remembrance of Me.”—Mr. Bright- man's interpretation of this passage.—He re- fers to Godet and Milligan for the force of <i>γάρον</i> in 1 Cor. xi. 26.—Godet, however, preserves the literal sense.—Milligan does not	

- notice the force of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, but extends the remembrance to our LORD'S exaltation in heaven.—Mr. Brightman questions whether the reference is to our LORD'S Death as an historical event.—He cites the liturgies as commemorating the Resurrection and Ascension.—The method of interpretation popular but vicious.—It would never have been thought of except to support an "a priori" theory.—No Father or Church commentator has advanced this interpretation 107
2. The Epistle to the Hebrews the battle-ground of the two views : i. A sketch of the purpose and argument of the Epistle.—From Melchisedec the writer contrasts the universal and eternal nature of CHRIST'S Priesthood with the local and transitory character of that of the Jews.—The two main points in regard to the Sacrifice are, that it was offered once for all, and that its effects, or merits, live on in our LORD'S Mediatorial work.—Thus far both views accord, but here they divide.—The Catholics teach that the Sacrifice was completed on the Cross, and that in heaven our LORD pleads only the merits of this Sacrifice.—The Modern school are split into different camps, the more radical denying that the Sacrifice was completed on the Cross, others trying to find some sacrificial action in our LORD'S Mediatorial work, or taking the word only in a passive sense.—The passages in the Epistle on this subject fall into two divisions : Our LORD'S Priesthood as typified by Melchisedec, or in the Day of Atonement.—The ruling thought is CHRIST'S High-Priesthood.—(1) Chaps. ii., iii., and iv. give a prefatory treatment of the subject and show the foundation of CHRIST'S Priesthood in the Incarnation (ii. 17, 18) ; (2) Chaps. v., vi.,

vii., set forth the nature of this Priesthood ; (3) Chaps. viii., ix., x., treat of the work of CHRIST as High Priest ; (4) In the remaining chapters the fruits of this Priesthood are applied to believers. ii. Our LORD'S Priesthood as typified by Melchisedec.—The statements and silence of Scripture about Melchisedec.—The universal character of this priesthood.—The special features tithes and blessings.—No reference to the bread and wine.—The Fathers assume that they were the materials of a Sacrifice.—The argument concludes that such an High Priest needs not to offer daily, for this He did once for all.—But that He is able to save all that come to GOD through Him, and ever liveth to make intercession for them.—Not only is there no mention of any Sacrifice offered in heaven, but it seems explicitly excluded.—The Modern school object that since our LORD is a Priest for ever, He must continually offer Sacrifice.—This objection answered.—Our LORD exercises His Priesthood in intercession, pleading the merits of His Sacrifice, in blessing, and in presenting to the FATHER His own glorified Humanity and His Mystical Body the Church.—In Chap. viii. we reach the main point, that we have an High Priest Who fulfils all the conditions required, and has sat down at the Right Hand of GOD.—The chief characteristic, that He reigns as royal High Priest, and that He is a Minister of the sanctuary.—*λειτουργός* not the same as "Sacrificator."—CHRIST reigning and serving shows forth His Divine Majesty and infinite love.—The idea suggested by the true tabernacle.—The earthly tabernacle symbolized three things : GOD dwelling among men, His holiness, His "approachableness."—The

Fathers consider the tabernacle to be our LORD'S Flesh or Humanity.—In this Body CHRIST ministers.—In Heb. viii. 3 are we to supply ἦν or ἐστίν?—This does not affect the argument.—What is the nature of CHRIST'S Offering?—Certainly not His Blood, but either Himself or His Body.

iii. Our LORD'S High-Priesthood as typified by the ritual of the Day of Atonement.—The signification of this ritual.—The effect of sin twofold: A sense of alienation from GOD, and a conviction of guilt.—The conception of Sacrifice also twofold, as a means of removing the guilt, of reconciling man with GOD.—The chief significance of the ritual, that till the sufficient Sacrifice is offered there is no free access to GOD, but that the yearly entrance of the high priest within the veil arouses hope.—The first tabernacle was open to the priests daily, the Holy of holies only to the high priest once a year.—The purpose for which the high priest went within the veil was not to sprinkle the blood, but to appear before GOD.—The sprinkling of the blood was not the "end," but the "means."—The details of the ritual.—Summary of teaching on this point: (1) The Old Testament teaches that (i.) Sacrifice was not offered in the Holy of holies, (ii.) but that in certain cases the blood of a sacrifice was applied to atone or reconcile; (2) The Epistle points out resemblances and contrasts between the high priest and our LORD: (i.) Resemblances: (a) The entry into the Holy of holies; (b) "Not without blood;" (c) To intercede; (d) The waiting people. (ii.) Contrasts: (a) Many times, and "once for all;" (b) A place made with hands, and heaven; (c) "With the blood of another," and through His own Blood.—The interpre-

tation of the type in the Epistle.—The contrast between the repeated entrance of the high priest, and our LORD'S entrance once for all.—The means in each case "through blood," but not "with blood."—The chief thought, that the blood was the means of access.—The preposition "μετά" is never found in the New Testament in connection with blood as the means of access to GOD.—**Examination of the eleven passages in the New Testament in which blood is thus referred to.**—From this it is evident that the Blood is the "instrumental means" of access.—The truth signified by the blood here is that "without shedding of blood there is no remission."—Most of the Modern school admit this: Alford and perhaps Sadler are exceptions.—In verses 13 and 14 the superiority of CHRIST'S Blood to that of animal sacrifices is shown.—The word ἄμωμον connects our LORD'S Sacrifice with the Cross.—Chap. ix. concludes by relating our LORD'S Intercession to His finished Sacrifice.—Two passages in Chap. x. to be considered: (1) Verse 10 implies that our LORD'S Sacrifice is the only absolute Sacrifice; (2) Verses 11-14 repeat this thought, but add to it our LORD'S Session.—Three points here: (1) The significance of "sitting," as indicating finished work, excludes any actual sacrifice from our LORD'S Intercession.—This is admirably expressed by Euthymius Zig.: (2) The Sacrifice was offered before He sat down; (3) The significance of CHRIST'S perfecting the faithful by one Offering.—The last passage quoted from this Epistle as favourable to the Modern view, xii. 24.—Bengel and Alford's interpretation.—The context shows that the sphere of the action is not heaven but earth.

	—An analysis of the whole passage proves this.—Summary: All the sacrifices under the Law foreshadowed different aspects of the Sacrifice of CHRIST.—The two great annual rites prefigure the Holy Eucharist and our LORD'S Intercession.—The Passover typifies the Holy Eucharist; the Day of Atonement our LORD'S Intercession.—Both rites point to the same source of merit, but to a different application of it.—No part of the rite on the Day of Atonement prefigures the Holy Eucharist	110
3.	Rev. v. 6, the "Lamb as It had been slaughtered."—The Modern school are here divided into two groups, the more moderate seeing only a description of our LORD as the Victim, which is quite justifiable.—Some of the Modern school see in the wounds a sacrificial action. Thalhofer's argument shown to be altogether invalid.—Illustration from the difference between a martyr and martyrdom.—Between a state and an act.—So the Lamb is the Sacrifice, but does not offer sacrifice	140
III.	SUMMARY OF SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY:	145
1.	Old Testament and New Testament both prove that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice	145
2.	The New Testament recognizes only one absolute Sacrifice.—The Holy Eucharist is therefore a relative Sacrifice, in which we make the memorial of our LORD'S Death	145
3.	There is no indication of any sacrifice being offered in heaven.—This is not inconsistent with our LORD'S being a Sacrifice in a passive sense, or with His offering a virtual Sacrifice.—The Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice because essentially identical with that of Calvary.—It is accidentally related to our LORD'S Mediatorial work.	145

	PAGE
4. Scripture affords no support to the view that the essentially sacrificial act took place in heaven, and that therefore the Cross is not a completed Sacrifice.	146

CHAPTER VI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE LITURGIES.

The witness of the liturgies to the Eucharistic Sacrifice is naturally of great importance.—We must not expect in them the accuracy of definition which belongs to a creed.—That the liturgies prove the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist may be assumed ; the only question is, whether they support the Modern view.—The controversy concerns only two classes of passages in the liturgies.—Mr. Brightman refers to both	148
I. HIS REFERENCE TO THOSE WHICH COMMEMORATE THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.—He says the liturgies do not confine the memorial to the act of our LORD'S Death, and gives examples from various sources.—The Roman rite.—The Anglican, Scotch, and American liturgies.—Mr. Brightman's inferences from these quotations.—The facts indisputable ; the inferences unwarranted.—Catholic writers teach that the Holy Eucharist is an extension of the Incarnation, as well as a memorial of the Passion, and brings before us our LORD'S whole Life both on earth and in glory.—The word <i>ἀναμνησις</i> has both a subjective and an objective force.—Mr. Brightman quotes that part of "the Oblation" in the Scotch and American rites in which it is used subjectively, but omits the context in which it is referred objectively only to our LORD'S Death.—Answers to the contention that the two are identical.—The valuable element in the Modern view, the relation of the Holy Eucharist to the Life of glory.—This does not involve a heavenly Sacrifice.—The charge that Reformation theology obscures the Incarnation	

and the great Intercession by dwelling exclusively on the Atonement.—The precise import of this, and the conclusion which follows from it.—The relation of our life now to the Life of glory.—The dangerous tendency of the day to ignore the more severe side of revelation.—The evidence of the Gospels to the importance of our LORD'S Passion.—A conclusion noted which does not follow from the premises.—The interpretation of Fathers and commentators must determine the significance of the passages in the liturgies. . . . 149

- II. THE SECOND CLASS OF PASSAGES ARE THOSE WHICH SPEAK OF A "HEAVENLY ALTAR."—Mr. Brightman's statement of his case.—He specially refers to the "Supplices Te" of the Roman rite.—The facts again are indisputable, but the inferences unwarranted.—This prayer supplies Thalhoffer with his main argument for a "heavenly Sacrifice."—He refers the "heavenly altar" of the liturgies to Isa. vi. 6 and Rev. viii. 3.—He argues that since these passages speak of a heavenly altar they imply a heavenly Sacrifice.—It is, however, evident that the Sacrifice must precisely correspond with the altar.—So that if the altar be only figurative, we cannot infer a literal Sacrifice.—A literal altar involves manifest difficulties.—The Fathers interpret this passage of Isaiah mystically: S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, Haymo, Philastrius, S. Basil, S. Cyril.—Cornelius á Lapede points this out.—All take the passage figuratively.—That the heavenly altar is only figurative is seen from the adjectives applied to it in the liturgies, e. g., *ὑπερουράνιον, νοερόν, πνευματικόν*.—The Fathers and later writers take this altar as our LORD Himself.—S. Chrysostom explains "heavenly" as equivalent to "spiritual," and applies it to the Church and her rites.—The importance of his evidence.—He was conversant with the liturgies, and Greek was his mother tongue.—The same interpretation given by Theophylact, and Primasius.—The Fathers speak often of a heavenly altar, but never of a heavenly Sacrifice. *Επουράνιος* is used in the New Testament of gifts

in the Church on earth : Eph. i. 3 ; Eph. ii. 6, 19 ; Phil. iii. 20 ; Col. iii. 1.—*Ἐπουράνιος* occurs six times in Hebrews of things on earth : Heb. iii. 1, vi. 4, viii. 5.—Having determined the sense of “heavenly altar,” we must investigate the liturgical meaning of the “Supplices Te.”—This prayer found only in the Roman and Ambrosian liturgies.—It differs from the corresponding prayer in Eastern liturgies.—This prayer in the Clementine liturgy.—In the liturgy of S. James.—Another prayer in the same.—Eastern liturgies have no mention of the angel carrying the gifts.—The Roman must be interpreted in accordance with the Eastern.—Liturgical writers differ on three points in this prayer : (1) Some refer “hæc” to the prayers, others to the sacramental gifts ; (2) Some take the “angel” of angels generally ; others of our LORD ; (3) The purpose of the prayer as expressed in the Roman and in the Eastern liturgies.—A peculiar interpretation in century IX.—Duchesne’s view of the “Supplices Te.”—The theological difficulties of the modern interpretation of the prayer.—The relation of this prayer to the words of S. Irenæus.—These words must be interpreted by their context, l. iv., c. xviii.—From the context it is doubtful whether “oblation” refers to the Holy Eucharist.—The passage itself shows that “altar” is only used figuratively.—The altar not one on which sacrifice is offered, but towards which “prayers and oblations” are directed.—It seems equivalent to the “throne of grace.”—The discussion of the heavenly altar thus summed up : 156

1. The phrase frequently found in the liturgies 173
2. *Ἐπουράνιος* signifies only what pertains to the Kingdom of heaven 174
3. The meaning of “hæc” doubtful. 174
4. The true and valuable element in the Modern view, the prominence given to the union of the worship of earth and heaven.—This must be earnestly asserted, but without admitting the Modern view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. 174

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORY OF THE SACRIFICIAL CONCEPTION OF
THE EUCHARIST.

	PAGE
A bird's-eye view of theological opinion of the Eucharistic Sacrifice from the sub-apostolic age to our own time. —This will enable us to relegate the various views to their place in history.—The field falls into three divisions :	176
I. THE EARLY AGES, FROM S. CLEMENT TO S. GREGORY THE GREAT ; the Holy Eucharist treated synthetically as a great whole	177
II. THE MIDDLE PERIOD, FROM S. GREGORY TO S. THOMAS ; the treatment practical, regarding effects and liturgical forms	178
III. THE MODERN, FROM S. THOMAS TO OUR OWN TIMES ; the treatment analytical, in determining the sacrificial act.—The strongest evidence of the fact of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is that till century XVI. there was no attempt to define it.—From century IX. to XVI. controversies about the Real Presence occupied theologians.—This began with the controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus.—S. Peter Damian apparently the author of the term “transubstantiation”	178
In the first period we shall find :	
1. The Holy Eucharist regarded by all as a Sacrifice	179
2. No trace of the Modern view	179
3. Certain Greek Fathers even deny that our LORD is now offering Sacrifice, except through His Church	179
4. The Fathers generally relate the Holy Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross	179
I. THE EARLY AGES BEGIN WITH S. CLEMENT OF ROME.—Writers trace analogies between Old Testament sacrifices and the Holy Eucharist.—The Holy Eucharist as the Church's Sacrifice and as the bond uniting her to her Head.—S. Clement sets forth its public and sacrificial character, and restricts its celebration to bishops and priests.—S. Ignatius speaks of the altar and calls the	

	PAGE
<p>Holy Eucharist the Flesh of CHRIST.—He confines its fruits to those in union with the Church.—He regards it as the centre of the Church's unity.—The "Didache" regards it rather from the moral standpoint of the sanctity required in the offerer.—S. Justin Martyr describes the liturgical service and affirms that the Holy Eucharist is a memorial of the Passion.—S. Irenæus associates the Holy Eucharist with our LORD'S Blood shed on the Cross; and calls the oblations the first-fruits of creation.—S. Cyprian teaches that the Holy Eucharist reproduces the Passion of JESUS CHRIST.—The priest in it fulfils the functions of the Sovereign Priest.—It is a proper Sacrifice in which the Passion is re-presented.—S. Ambrose says that in it the Sacrifice is the same as that of the Cross.—S. Augustine regards it as uniting us to GOD and depending for its effects upon right dispositions in the offerer.—He defines sacrifice and shows that our LORD'S Sacrifice is renewed daily in the Holy Eucharist.—S. Leo the Great sees in the Eucharistic Sacrifice the accomplishment of all mysteries</p>	180
The Eastern Fathers :	
1. connect the Holy Eucharist with the Passion ;	
2. and Incarnation ;	187
3. and point out that through the Church our LORD is now exercising His Priesthood	187
In this period both East and West dwell upon the relation between CHRIST'S Mystical Body and His Body in the Holy Eucharist, and between the Holy Eucharist and His Intercession in heaven ; but have no knowledge of any sacrifice now being offered in heaven	188
II. THE MIDDLE PERIOD BEGINS WITH S. GREGORY AND ENDS WITH S. THOMAS.—The Sacrifice of the Mass treated practically, and its character sought in its effects.—The image of our LORD'S Death sought in the liturgical forms.—S. Gregory teaches the efficacy of the Sacrifice for the souls in purgatory ; that in it the Passion is reproduced ; and that by it heaven and	

earth are united.—He gave an impulse to liturgical study.—S. Isidore of Seville contributes a definition of Sacrifice.—Bede's view is similar.—In century VI. one Mass only was allowed on the same day at any altar by the Synods of Auxerre and Merida.—In century IX. Strabo notices an increase in the number of Masses.—The Eucharistic writers of century IX. : Amalarius, Florus, Paschasius, Ratramnus, Strabo, Rabanus.—In century IX. a new current sets in, mystical rather than theological, resulting from liturgical study, and attempting to find in the liturgy itself the image of the Passion.—Amalarius its source.—His exposition of the liturgy.—His serious theological errors.—Stercorianism, and the triple form of our LORD'S Body.—These views were attacked by Florus and condemned at Quiercy.—Their strange reappearance in the works of other writers.—The views of the Pseudo-Rabanus Maurus.—Florus' "De Expositione Missæ" the most important contribution of century IX.—The controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus.—Walfrid Strabo.—Centuries X. and XI. added nothing to the subject.—The attack of Berengarius upon the Real Presence, century XI.—Century XII. a period of liturgical activity.—Odo of Cambrai, S. Ivo of Chartres, V. Hildebert of Mans.—The view of Peter the Ven. and William of S. Thiéry.—Robert Pulleyn.—Peter Lombard the first author to see in the double Consecration the image of the Passion.—His peculiar theory about the species.—Algerus of Liège the ablest writer on the Holy Eucharist of century XII.—Lombard's view reproduced by Innocent III., Albert the Great, Alexander of Hales, and S. Bonaventura.—A strange theory about the Consecration of each species.—William of Auvergne.—His definition of Sacrifice.—Albert the Great regards the Sacrifice from two standpoints.—But he places its essence in its effects.—His "Explanation of the Canon of the Mass."—His view of the "Elevation."—The Greek theologians of this period : S. John of Damascus, S. Dionysius the Areopagite.—

	PAGE
The commentators: Œcumenius, Euthymius Zigadenus, Theophylact.	183
III. POST-MEDLÆVAL AND MODERN EPOCH. — S. Thomas introduces this period.—While scarcely touching on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, he gives a definition of Sacrifice which changes the current of theological thought.—His definition, revived by Vasquez, became the basis of the treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—S. Thomas also held that Sacrifice was the sign of “latria.”—He lays great stress on the representative character of the priest.—On this point Scotus takes the opposite view.—The writers of centuries XIV. and XV. contributed nothing new.—The attacks of Protestantism led to attempts to define Sacrifice.—Luther entirely denied the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist.—He is refuted by Clichtovée, Eck, Cajetan, and others.—The theory that the Mass was for the remission of actual sin and the Cross for original sin was popularly held in century XVI., but its author is unknown.—Vasquez attributes it to Catharinus; and with Canus repudiates it.—Suarez charges Catharinus with teaching that the Mass was a separate source of grace.—Catharinus, however, was not the author of this view, for it is mentioned in the Augsburg Conference in 1530, and denied by Arnold Wesaliensis, John Cochlæus, and Peter Anspach.—Melanchthon traces it to the “Opusc. de Ven. Sac. Altaris,” ascribed to S. Thomas; but the statement there is capable of an orthodox interpretation, as shown by R. P. Dummermuth.—Dr. Paulus holds that the opusculum is not the work of S. Thomas, and attributes it to Albert the Great.—Dr. Vacant refutes this authorship.—The diversity of view at Trent in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—Corrionero places the sacrificial act in the Oblation; Canus in the fraction of the Host.—The Council only stated that the Holy Eucharist was a Sacrifice, without defining the mode.—In centuries XVI. and XVII. theologians who treat of this subject fall into three groups:	202

	PAGE
1. Those who eliminate destruction from their definition, as Salmeron	211
2. Those who find this only in the ritual action, as Canus, Vasquez, and in a less degree Suarez, Bellarmine, and Lessius	211
3. The third group represented by De Lugo, who is followed by the majority of Roman theologians.—In century XVII. the great Gallican theologians trace an accidental relation between the Holy Eucharist and our LORD'S Mediatorial work.—In century XVIII. Cienfuegos suggests a strange theory.—In England since the Reformation the Eucharistic Sacrifice has received but slight treatment.—Bishop Andrewes refers to it.—Overall and Taylor connect the Holy Eucharist more directly with our LORD'S Offering in heaven, and this view is followed by the Modern school.—Since 1870 a radical school has appeared in Germany, headed by Thalhofer.—The brilliant theologians, Scheeben and Schanz, follow Suarez.—The Eastern Church has contributed nothing new on the subject.—In century XIV. Cabasilas wrote an "Exposition of the Liturgy;" in 1643 the Catechism of Peter Mogila was approved; and in our own times Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza, has put forth a treatise on dogmatic theology; but all follow the Catholic view	213

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS.

Introductory: The Fathers of the first six centuries :	218
I. PASSAGES SUPPORTING THE CATHOLIC VIEW	219
II. THOSE ADDUCED IN FAVOUR OF THE MODERN VIEW	219
III. PASSAGES TREATING OF OUR LORD'S INTERCESSION	219

	PAGE
I. WITNESSES TO THE CATHOLIC VIEW, LIMITED HERE TO THOSE OF SPECIAL WEIGHT.—Realize first precisely what we are seeking,—not a theological theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but to show that the Fathers relate it to the Sacrifice of the Cross	219
The Greek Fathers : 1. S. Irenæus, 2. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, 3. S. Gregory of Nyssa, 4. S. Cyril of Alex., 5. S. Chrysostom, 6. S. Chrysostom—Thomassinus on this passage, 7. S. Chrysostom	220
The Latin Fathers : 8. S. Cyprian, 9. S. Cyprian, 10. S. Cyprian, 11. S. Ambrose, 12. S. Ambrose, 13. S. Augustine, 14. S. Augustine, 15. S. Augustine, 16. S. Augustine, 17. S. Augustine, 18. S. Augustine, 19. S. Augustine, 20. S. Augustine, 21. S. Gregory, 22. S. Gregory	224
Summary of passages supporting the Catholic view	228
II. PASSAGES THOUGHT TO SUPPORT THE MODERN VIEW.—This view stated in two propositions.—Mr. Brightman cites four passages : S. Ignatius, S. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, S. Cyril of Alex.—These passages considered.—English writers only refer to the Fathers generally in support of this view.—Thalhofer, however, adduces many passages.—Dr. Thalhofer is orthodox in his view of the Sacrifice of the Cross.—His innovation is an actual Sacrifice in heaven.—His assumption in regard to a “heavenly” Sacrifice.—The terms examined : (1.) “heavenly” as explained by S. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Primasius. (2.) The use of the word “altar” by S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp, Hermas, Clement of Alex., S. Methodius, S. Chrysostom, and S. Cyril of Alex. (3.) Different senses in which “sacrifice” is used.—Hence the character of the sacrifice must be determined by that of the altar in heaven	228
1. S. Irenæus	234
2. Origen. — Thalhofer’s argument. — Origen’s words in full.—Thalhofer’s exposition of them.—Other passages from Origen.—Thal-	

hofer omits the context, which refutes his interpretation.—The full context of the passage. —No allusion here to a heavenly altar or sacrifice	235
3. Origen.—Inference from this passage	239
4. Origen.—The passage examined	242
5. Origen.—Origen's teaching considered	243
6. Origen.—The sense of the passage examined	245
7. S. Chrysostom.—This passage refutes rather than supports Thalhoffer	246
8. A passage attributed to S. Chrysostom : Another passage of S. Chrysostom.—Which is inconsistent with Thalhoffer's view	247
9. S. Gregory.—The passage examined	248
10. S. Ambrose, quoted by both Brightman and Thalhoffer.—Neither Mr. Brightman nor Thalhoffer is the author of this misinterpretation of S. Ambrose, which is found in the works of Edmond Albertino and proves too much ; for it is inconsistent with S. Ambrose's words in other passages. Its fallacy exposed : i. By S. Ambrose's explanation of the term "imago ;" ii. By the clause omitted by Mr. Brightman ; iii. By the "reductio ad impossibile"	249
11. S. Augustine	255
12. S. Augustine : a second passage.—The passage examined	257
13. S. Gregory	259
Result of examination of Thalhoffer's authorities	260
(1.) No passage really supports his view	260
(2.) The Fathers teach that our LORD presents in heaven the worship of the Church, and therefore the Holy Eucharist	260
(3.) They explain the heavenly altar by our LORD'S Humanity, though some apply the term to the altar of the Church	260
III. PASSAGES WHICH EXPLAIN OUR LORD'S INTERCESSION, The Greek Fathers : 1. S. Chrysostom, 2. Theodoret, 3. Euthymius Zig., 4. S. Chrysostom,	

	PAGE
5. S. Chrysostom, 6. S. Cyril of Alex., 7. Eusebius Cæsar, 8. S. John of Damascus, 9. Euthymius Zig.	260
Latin Fathers. 10. Primasius, 11. S. Augustine, 12. S. Augustine, 13. S. Gregory the Great, 14. S. Gregory	265
Summary of Patristic testimony:	267
(1.) No passage supports the Modern view	267
(2.) Some passages inconsistent with it	268
(3.) The explanation of our LORD'S Intercession excludes it	268

CHAPTER IX.

THE TESTIMONY OF MEDIÆVAL AND POST-MEDIÆVAL WRITERS.

Introductory: IMPETUS GIVEN TO THE STUDY OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IN CENTURY IX.; which bore fruit in century XII. in mystical works on the liturgy.—Of these Mr. Brightman claims Paschasius Radbertus, Ivo of Chartres, and Hildebert of Tours as favourable to his view.—Thalhofer adds Guitmundus, Odo of Cambrai, Hugo of S. Victor, and Algerus.—Only passages adduced in support of the Modern theory considered here.—The mediæval writers frequently speak of a “heavenly altar,” from which Thalhofer infers a heavenly Sacrifice 269

I. EXAMINATION OF THE PASSAGES QUOTED 270

1. Paschasius Radbertus.—The passage considered.—Paschasius explains his meaning in the context, which refutes Thalhofer's inference.—Paschasius takes the heavenly altar as CHRIST'S Humanity, through which our prayers are offered to GOD.—Paschasius: another passage.—No trace here of any sacrifice other than the Holy Eucharist.—Mr. Brightman's reference to Paschasius 270

2. Thalhofer cites Guitmundus Aversanus, who is

	PAGE
defending S. Augustine against Berengarius in regard to his use of the word "sign."—Nothing in Guitmundus supports Thalhoffer's views.	277
3. Thalhoffer quotes from Odo of Cambrai.—He is discussing the "Supplices Te."—The full context.—The passage cited only a paraphrase of the prayer.—Its real purport.—Another passage from Odo.—Its interpretation.—A third passage from Odo.—Stentrup's comment on this passage.—Odo gives no support to Thalhoffer's theory	279
4. Mr. Brightman refers to S. Ivo of Chartres and Hildebert of Tours.—Mr. Brightman's statements both misleading and inaccurate.—S. Ivo's work on the Sacrifices of the Old and New Testaments.—A good example of the mystical treatment of the liturgy.—He divides it into two parts: the first is interpreted by our LORD'S first Advent and by the sacrifices offered without the veil; the second by our LORD'S Passion and Intercession and by the priest's action within the veil and after his return to the people.—S. Ivo the first to attempt this parallel.—Its difficulties avoided by S. Ivo.—Mr. Brightman's statement about S. Ivo's teaching is entirely unfounded.—S. Ivo's introduction to his treatment of the liturgy. i. The Introit and Litany.—The "Gloria in Excelsis."—The Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Creed, and Offertory.—S. Ivo's introduction to the Canon. ii. From the Offertory to the end of the Canon.—The three secrets correspond with the prayers in Gethsemane, and with the three sacrifices of the bullock, ram, and goat.—The "Sursum Corda" and the exhortation to "Watch and pray."—The Preface, the ministry of angels, and the cherubim.—The Canon.—The two goats signify CHRIST'S two Natures: the goat slain, His Human Na-	

ture ; the scapegoat, His Divine Nature.—The “ Memento of the Living,” the intercession of the Levitical priest, and of CHRIST on earth.—The incense of the Day of Atonement is connected with the fragrance of our LORD'S Humanity, and with the commemoration of the Apostles and Martyrs.—The significance of the breastplate noted.—The incense in the Apocalypse taken of the “ Quam Oblationem ;” its spiritual significance pointed out.—The sprinkling of the mercy-seat with blood typifies CHRIST'S Mediatorial work in heaven, and the sign of the Cross made over the elements before and after the Consecration.—The act of Consecration is referred solely to the Death on the Cross.—In the “ Unde et Memores” the Sacrifice is offered, and in the “ Supra Quæ” the priest prays that it may be accepted.—S. Ivo then takes the “ Supplices Te” of the scapegoat and the high priest's return to the camp as typifying our LORD'S Ascension and Intercession.—The mystery of our LORD'S Presence in the Holy Eucharist while still in heaven must be apprehended by faith.—S. Augustine quoted.—The washing of the high priest's garments taken of Baptism and Confession, and of our LORD'S work of reconciliation.—The mention of the Apostles and Saints connected with the high priest's breastplate and ephod.—Commemoration of the Saints and of their merits.—S. Ivo again asserts that the Holy Eucharist commemorates the Passion.—Mr. Brightman's statement compared with S. Ivo's words : i. The “ Anaphora,”—the Jewish ritual, paralleled with our LORD'S actions on earth. ii. The three sacrifices represent only the Passion. iii. The incense the fragrance of our LORD'S glorified Body

- which had been offered on earth. iv. The crucial point the act of Consecration.—The mercy-seat sprinkled with the blood of a sacrifice which had been offered.—The force of “*immolati*.”—The sprinkling in heaven of Blood which had made the FATHER propitious.—The force of “*fecit*.”—S. Ivo the author of the expression, “sprinkling the FATHER.”—V. Hildebert’s explication of S. Ivo’s words.—S. Ivo’s application of the blood-shedding to the liturgy.—The force of “*hanc aspersionem*” connects the action of the liturgy with that of the Cross.—The act of Consecration commemorates the Death on the Cross, and not our LORD’S action in heaven. v. The “*Supplices Te*” corresponds with the scapegoat and with the Ascension.—Duchesne considers this the Epiklesis, which is neither the act of Consecration nor the sacrificial act, and has no place in the English liturgy.—Our LORD’S Intercession corresponds with the high priest’s prayer and washing, and with Baptism and Penance in the Church.—The “*Memento*” and the “*Nobis quoque*” connected with the breastplate and ephod.—Mr. Brightman’s statement contrary to facts.—S. Ivo’s teaching summed up . 280
5. Mr. Brightman and Thalhoffer cite V. Hildebert of Tours.—His verses on the “*Supplices Te*.”—On the “*Te Igitur*.”—Some passages from his prose works 307
6. Hugo of S. Victor merely repeats Hildebert’s thought. 309
7. Algerus of Liège: his great authority, and his affinity with the Greek Fathers.—His discussion of the mode of CHRIST’S Presence in the Holy Eucharist and at the same time in heaven.—From which Thalhoffer quotes a passage.—The only heavenly sacrifice known to

	PAGE
Algerus is the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—Some passages overlooked by Thalhofer; in which Algerus clearly relates the Eucharistic Sacrifice to that of the Cross.—His other work on the Holy Eucharist, “De Sac. Missæ.”—His comment on the “Te Igitur,” in which he actually uses the words “heavenly sacrifice,” but of the sacrifice on earth in the Holy Eucharist.—The sign of the Cross tells of the sprinkling of blood.—He also treats of the “Supplices Te,” and makes clear his former statement.—No support for Modern view found in Mediæval writers	310
II. GALLICAN WRITERS OF CENTURY XVII.: De Bérulle, founder of the Oratory; de Condren, the theologian of the Resurrection; Olier, founder of S. Sulpice; Thomassin.—Theology of the latter two influenced by de Condren.—All three, but especially Thomassin, claimed by Modern school.—De Condren’s and Olier’s writings chiefly on ascetics.—Thomassin’s great work on dogmatics.—Restatement of the characteristics of the Modern view, that we may see what support can be found for it in Thomassin.—The headings of his chapters misleading.—He speaks of a heavenly Sacrifice, but explains his meaning, and does not support the Modern view.—He connects this Sacrifice with the Resurrection, not with the Ascension; with the “cremation,” not with the “sprinkling of blood.”—His exposition of this: l. x., c. xi.—The “cremation” has no place on the Day of Atonement.—He does not say that our LORD’S Blood is carried within the veil to be presented, but that His Body is carried there to be consumed in the fires of the Deity.—This view mystical, but unobjectionable, more fully set forth in c. xiv.—His treatment of our LORD as the eternal holocaust.—His quotations from S. Augustine and S. Gregory Mag.—Thomassin’s review of the chapter.—He speaks of a Sacrifice in heaven, and explains it by our LORD’S Intercession.—He says that the Sacrifice is figurative and	

	PAGE
metaphorical.—In c. xvii. he connects the Eucharistic Sacrifice with that of the Cross directly and distinctly. —The three propositions of the Modern view find no support in Thomassin	316
1. De Condren's view	329
2. and Olier's view.—Both are identical with that of Thomassin	330
3. Traces of the same idea in Benedict XIV.	331
4. and in Bossuet	331
III. THE WITNESS OF TWO EASTERN WRITERS	332
1. Cabasilas, century XIV., the first to attempt to formulate a theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—The value of his testimony to the views of the Greek Fathers.—Cabasilas is strongly anti-Latin.—Two passages in Cabasilas which refute Mr. Brightman's arguments.—Incidentally he sees in the Holy Eucharist a commemoration of the Resurrection and Ascension.—He devotes a chapter to the signification of "Do this in remembrance of Me," in which he explicitly repudiates Mr. Brightman's view.—Also a chapter on the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—He finds the sacrificial act in the Consecration, and relates the Sacrifice solely to that of the Cross.—The statements of Cabasilas and Mr. Brightman compared	332
2. The other Eastern writer, Macarius, century XIX.—He teaches that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice, and that it is related solely to the Cross.—No trace, therefore, of the Modern view in the Eastern Church.—Conclusion adverse to the claims of the Modern school	337

CHAPTER X.

THE TESTIMONY OF ANGLICAN DIVINES.

Introductory: MR. BRIGHTMAN CLAIMS THAT ANGLICAN THEOLOGIANS HOLD THE MODERN THEORY OF SACRI-

	PAGE
FICE, AND GIVES AS HIS AUTHORITY THE CATENA IN "TRACT 81"	339
I. BEFORE EXAMINING THE AUTHORITIES, CERTAIN FACTS TO BE NOTICED	340
1. The purpose of "Tract 81" was not to support any theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, only to show a consensus of Anglican divines as to the fact of the Sacrifice	340
2. The writers were prejudiced against everything Roman, and so avoided the terminology of Rome	341
3. Hence it is often difficult to determine the force of their statements	341
4. They certainly appealed to the Fathers; hence little trace of any clear theory of the mode of the Sacrifice is found in their writings.— The Tract contains extracts from sixty-three writers, of whom twelve make no allusion to the mode of the Sacrifice.—Of the fifty-one left, four, Overall, Taylor, Johnson, and Phil- potts, favour in some measure the Modern view.—Five others, Mede, Hammond, Thorn- dike, Fell, and Scandret, are claimed on in- sufficient grounds as on the same side.—Forty- two, however, clearly witness to the Catholic view.—The method pursued in selecting ex- tracts.—The Tract does not comprehend all Anglican writers, but represents the best	341
II. WE BEGIN WITH THOSE WHO FAVOUR THE MODERN VIEW	343
1. Overall quotes from Cassander.—The authen- ticity of the passage disproved	343
2. Jeremy Taylor.	346
3. Johnson.—His unorthodox views detract from his authority	349
4. Philpotts.—Other passages from his writings greatly modify this statement	353
III. THE FIVE WRITERS WHO ARE CLAIMED BY THE MODERN SCHOOL, BUT WITHOUT SUFFICIENT GROUND	353

	PAGE
1. Mede, 2. Hammond, 3. Thorndike, 4. Fell (?), 5. Scandret	354
Review of the opinions of these five writers . . .	362
IV. THE FORTY-TWO WRITERS WHO TEACH THE CATHOLIC VIEW	
1. Jewell, 2. Bilson, 3. Field, 4. Buckeridge, 5. Morton, 6. Andrewes, 7. Mason, 8. White, 9. Laud, 10. Hall, 11. Mountague, 12. Forbes of Edinburgh, 13. Bramhall, 14. Cosin, 15. Heylyn, 16. Sparrow, 17. Ferne, 18. Brevint, 19. Scrivener, 20. Patrick, 21. Towerson, 22. Bull, 23. Stillingfleet, 24. Beveridge, 25. Hickes, 26. Sharp, 27. Comber, 28. Leslie, 29. Nelson, 30. Wake, 31. Wilson, 32. Sher- lock, 33. Grabe, 34. Brett, 35. Potter, 36. Hughes, 37. Laurence, 38. Law, 39. Wheatly, 40. Ridley, 41. Daubeny, 42. Jolly . . .	363
SUMMARY OF OUR INVESTIGATION OF THESE PASSAGES.—In four writers are passages relating the Holy Eucharist to our LORD'S Intercession.—Only one, however, teaches that the Oblation was not "finished" upon the Cross.—Five passages in the other forty-seven writers which seem to relate the Holy Eucharist to our LORD'S action in heaven, but which are explained by other passages in their writings.—In forty-two writers clear reference of the Holy Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross.—We are therefore justified in affirming that Mr. Brightman's statement about Anglican au- thorities is not borne out by the facts, since, of sixty- three authors, only one really representative Anglican divine explicitly connects the Holy Eucharist with our LORD'S offering in heaven, and they do not favour that view which sees in the Cross only the initial stage of our LORD'S Sacrifice.—The explanation of the in- definite character of passages put forth by the Modern school considered and refuted.—"Tract 81" proves that there are no grounds for claiming that the Modern view is "the Anglican position."—It remains to trace to their source the two new currents in Anglican theology.	393

1. The view which relates the Holy Eucharist to our LORD'S Intercession, as taught by the Pseudo-Overall, Taylor, Philpotts, and others, can claim no authority from the Fathers, nor from any writer earlier than century XVI., but does not conflict with Catholic dogma.—Its source, so far as Anglican writers are concerned, is Cassander.—Cassander's history. — The passage in his "Consultatio" in which this view is stated.—The Pseudo-Overall's words compared with Cassander's.—Cassander the undoubted source of this view, so far as Anglicans are concerned.—Its attraction as a "via media."—Only one Anglican, however, follows Cassander in the objectionable feature of his theory; all others avoid, and therefore reject, it.—A passage in Watson's "Sermons" claims our notice at this point.—Watson's history.—His view of our LORD'S Intercession and of its relation to the Holy Eucharist.—He is the earliest writer in whom this teaching is found.—It is, however, balanced by an accurate exposition of the Sacrifice of the Cross. . . . 397
2. The source of the radical form of the Modern view, which holds that the Cross was only the initial act of our LORD'S Sacrifice.—Most of its English adherents admit that our LORD was then a Priest.—Dr. Milligan points out that this has a vital bearing on the Atonement.—He attributes the view to Grotius; we may trace it, a century earlier, to Socinus, who seems to be the real source of the theory, as shown by three arguments.—Reasons why the views of Cassander and Johnson should be rejected by members of the Anglican Church. . . . 407

CHAPTER XI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE TRACTARIANS.

	PAGE
Introductory: THE TRACTARIANS THE LEADERS OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL. —The great debt the Church owes to them.—Their wonderful lives.—Some difficulties of their task, especially from two assumptions, in part true but liable to bias the judgment	413
1. That Roman teaching was necessarily wrong.	414
2. That a “ <i>via media</i> ” between Romanism and Protestantism could be found in the Fathers.—The true “ <i>via media</i> ,” the touchstone of truth, considered	414
I. IT IS WONDERFUL HOW FULLY THE TRACTARIANS GRASPED THE CATHOLIC FAITH	415
1. A progress may, however, be observed in the views of the leaders: i. as is evidenced in a letter of Pusey to Rev. B. Harrison; ii. and in a letter to Bishop Wilberforce	415
2. The absence of a contemporary theological literature threw the Tractarians back on the Fathers and Anglican divines. — Hence their view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is that of the Fathers, coloured by Anglican writers.—They formulate no definite theory in regard to it, and if we find traces of modern influence, that is more than counterbalanced by their explicit recognition of its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross	417
II. THIS WILL BE EVIDENT FROM AN EXAMINATION OF THEIR PRINCIPAL WRITINGS ON THE SUBJECT. —This examination will be limited to the works of Pusey, Keble, and Forbes	418
1. Dr. Pusey’s view stated in “Tract 81:” i. The passage quoted. — Dr. Pusey first states the doctrine as he finds it in the Fathers, and then analyzes it.—No theory is formulated.—The Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice made in memory of the Cross, therefore a commemo-	

	PAGE
rative Sacrifice.—The Sacrifice was completed on the Cross, its merits presented in heaven.—His reference to a heavenly altar. ii. Three passages from his sermon on our LORD'S Intercession.—Dr. Pusey distinguishes between the Atonement finished on the Cross and its effects abiding in our LORD'S Intercession, and so gives no support to the Modern view.—He uses the word "sacrifice" only in a passive sense, quoting from S. Epiphanius.	419
2. Mr. Keble's view: i. It is expressed in passages from his sermon on "The Unchangeable Priesthood of CHRIST;" ii. in his treatise "On Eucharistical Adoration," iii. and in his "Considerations."—It differs but slightly from Dr. Pusey's view; it is less Patristic, and coloured by Cassander's theory, though without its objectionable features; but it sets forth the finished Sacrifice of the Cross	428
3. The most important witness to the Tractarian view is the Bishop of Brechin. i. The "Theological Defence" the joint work of Keble, Pusey, and Bishop Forbes.—The circumstances of the trial.—Keble's "Considerations."—The Bishop's presentation. ii. Extracts from his "Primary Charge." iii. Passages from his "Theological Defence." iv. A passage from his sermon on Manasseh. v. A review of the Bishop's teaching: (1) That the Sacrifice of the Cross is complete; (2) that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is substantially the same as that of the Cross; (3) that our LORD'S whole life has a sacrificial character; (4) but that the expression "celestial sacrifice" is only used in a passive sense.—The affinity of these views with those of Johnson; but the Bishop in three places seems to disown Johnson's authority.—Bishop Forbes	

	PAGE
makes two admissions in regard to Johnson's theory which are its condemnation. . . .	433
Conclusion: An examination of the Tractarian writings discloses a recognition of a relation between the Holy Eucharist and our LORD'S Intercession, but the Eucharistic Sacrifice is explicitly and directly connected with that of the Cross. The Tractarians would therefore have repudiated the more extreme form of the Modern view.	448

CHAPTER XII.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

Introductory:	450
I. THREE POINTS ESTABLISHED: (1) The Eucharist is a Sacrifice, (2) whose character depends on the Sacrifice of the Cross; (3) no theory of the mode "de fide."— Summary of the results of our investigation. . . .	450
1. Of Holy Scripture,	450
2. Of the liturgies,	450
3. Of the Fathers,	451
4. Of mediæval writers,	451
5. Of Anglican divines,	451
6. Of Tractarian writers	452
History shows that no theory of the mode of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is "de fide."—Some theories, however, are "contra fidem," for they conflict with the doctrine of the Atonement. — The Modern school falls into four divisions, three of which are entirely orthodox. — The school of Cassander, of Lepin, of Drs. Scheeben and Schanz.—These differ not only in degree but in kind from the extreme Modern view. . . .	452
II. THERE ARE THREE POINTS ON WHICH WE SHALL EXPRESS AN OPINION: (1) What views must be denied as "contra fidem;" (2) what may be held as not "contra fidem;" (3) what must be affirmed as "de fide." . . .	455
1. Propositions "contra fidem:" i. That the Sacrifice of the Cross was imperfect or unfinished;	

	PAGE
ii. That the Sacrifice of the Altar consists in aught else than doing what our LORD did, i. e., consecrating bread into His Body and wine into His Blood ; and that in our LORD'S Intercession there is any counterpart to this Consecration ; iii. That the mere presence of a once sacrificed Victim is a " proper " Sacrifice ; iv. that our LORD " offers " any Sacrifice in heaven.	456
2. Propositions not " contra fidem : " i. That there is an altar in heaven on which are offered the oblations of the Church ; ii. That our LORD may be in mystery styled a " perpetual Oblation " in heaven ; iii. That our LORD " is " a Sacrifice in heaven.	457
3. Propositions necessarily " de fide : " i. That our LORD offered upon the Cross a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice ; ii. That the Eucharistic Sacrifice though a true is not an absolute Sacrifice, but depends for efficacy on the Sacrifice of the Cross ; iii. That the remembrance of the mysteries of our LORD'S life, and the oblations and intercessions, are not essential parts of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which consists only in doing what our LORD did and commanded us to do.—These statements are not peculiar to any school, but belong alike to the teaching of every part of the Church.—An explanation of the purport of the foregoing propositions in their relation to modern theories.	457
III. CATHOLIC DOGMA EMBRACES ALL SIDES OF TRUTH.—The exaggeration at the Reformation, of the doctrine of the Atonement, which was then made the foundation and centre of all theology.—In correcting this, and supplying what was lacking, we must not abandon what was true ; the Tractarians acted on this principle.—In our day a danger of giving up truth in response to a popular clamour, which represents the " irreligious conscience."	

The attack not limited to the Atonement ; the Incarnation also assailed.—At the same time is seen a tendency to develop a view of our LORD'S Life in glory, which is made the centre of a new theology.—Much that is helpful in this if it be not allowed to conflict with other truths.—The value of a realization of our privileges as fellow-citizens with the Saints, but this is not the centre of Christian theology.—The Incarnation the centre ; its relation to the Atonement and to the Holy Eucharist.—The attraction of the life of glory, but first must come the life of suffering.—The remembrance of the Passion as a force in the our lives, and in the lives of the Saints 467

Conclusion: To be Catholic we must hold all sides of the truth 472

APPENDIX A.

An examination of the sacrificial terms used in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew 473

Latin sacrificial terms: *Sacrificare, Mactare, Litare, Immolare* 473

Greek sacrificial terms: *θυσία, σφάζειν, ποίειν, ἔρδειν, προσφέρειν, ἀναφέρειν, λειτούργειν, λατρεύειν* 475

Hebrew sacrificial terms: *Minchah, Korbân, Zebach, Ôlah, Shelem, Chattâth, Âshâm.* 478

APPENDIX B.

Faustus Socinus: "Disputation on Jesus Christ our Saviour." Part II., chapter xv. 480

APPENDIX C.

Tertullianus: "Adversus Judæos," chapter xiv. 492

APPENDIX D.

A catena of passages from the Fathers which bear witness to the fact that they regarded the Eucharist as a Sacrifice :

1. S. Irenæus, 2. S. Irenæus, 3. S. Hippolytus,	
4. Tertullian, 5. S. Cyprian, 6. S. Cyprian,	
7. S. Cyprian, 8. S. Cyprian, 9. S. Cyprian,	
10. S. Cyprian, 11. S. Cyprian, 12. S. Laurence,	
13. Council of Nicæa, 14. S. Ephrem Syrus,	
15. S. Optatus, 16. S. Cyril of Jerusalem,	
17. S. Macarius of Egypt, 18. S. Gregory of Nyssa,	
19. S. Ambrose, 20. S. Ambrose, 21. S. Ambrose,	
22. S. Ambrose, 23. S. Ambrose, 24. S. Ambrose,	
25. S. Chrysostom, 26. S. Chrysostom, 27. S. Chrysostom,	
28. St. Chrysostom, 29. S. Chrysostom, 30. S. Chrysostom,	
31. S. Chrysostom, 32. S. Chrysostom, 33. S. Chrysostom,	
34. S. Chrysostom, 35. S. Chrysostom, 36. S. Chrysostom,	
37. S. Chrysostom, 38. S. Jerome, 39. S. Jerome,	
40. S. Jerome, 41. S. Jerome, 42. S. Jerome,	
43. S. Jerome, 44. S. Jerome, 45. S. Gaudentius,	
46. S. Augustine, 47. S. Augustine, 48. S. Augustine,	
49. S. Augustine, 50. S. Augustine, 51. S. Augustine,	
52. S. Augustine, 53. S. Augustine, 54. S. Augustine,	
55. S. Augustine, 56. S. Augustine, 57. S. Cyril of Alexandria,	
58. S. Cyril, 59. S. Cyril, 60. S. Proclus, 61. S. Proclus,	
62. Theodoret, 63. Theodoret, 64. Theodoret,	
65. S. Leo, 66. S. Leo, 67. S. Leo, 68. S. Leo,	
69. S. Leo, 70. S. Gregory the Great .	495

APPENDIX E.

The reports of the Oxford Conference on Priesthood and Sacrifice and of the Fulham "Round Table" Conference	515
Conference held at Oxford, December 13, 1899.—It consisted of ten Churchmen and five Nonconformists.—The question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice only incidentally touched upon. Father Puller's view similar to Mr. Brightman's.—This view supported by no other mem-	

ber, but condemned by several in "obiter dicta."— Father Puller's speech at the first discussion.—Father Puller's second speech.—Father Puller's third speech.— Father Puller's "Statement."—Dr. Ryle's views, Canon Scott Holland's, Dr. Moberly's, Canon Bernard's, Canon Gore's, Rev. C. G. Lang's, Dr. Sanday's, Rev. A. C. Headlam's, Dr. Fairbairn's, Dr. Davison's.— Father Puller divides the process of Sacrifice into six acts,—three sacerdotal and three not sacerdotal.—He considers the priestly acts to be confined to heaven and to the Holy Eucharist; and that the Death on the Cross, not being a priestly act, cannot be a strictly sacrificial act.—Father Puller nowhere relates the Eucharistic Sacrifice to the Death on the Cross.—He quotes only two authorities, Dr. Milligan and Dr. Davison, both Presbyterians.—Mr. Lang's reference to Father Puller's view.—Dr. Ryle's "obiter dicta" inconsistent with Father Puller's theory; Canon Scott Holland's, Canon Bernard's, Canon Gore's, Dr. Sanday's, Mr. Headlam's, Dr. Fairbairn's, Dr. Davison's, Dr. Moberly's, Canon Bernard's.—Conclusion to be drawn from the Oxford Conference.	515
Fulham Conference.—Its constitution.—The subject dis- cussed was the Holy Eucharist.—A written statement invited in preparation for the Conference.—That of the Rev. N. Dimock taken as the starting-point for dis- cussion.—One entire session devoted to the Eucharistic Sacrifice.—The Modern view conspicuous by its ab- sence.—A practical agreement that the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist depends solely on its relation to our Lord's Sacrifice on the Cross; the only possible ex- ception Canon Gore's theory about S. Irenæus. . . .	535
I. Extracts from the statements: 1. Rev. N. Dimock, 2. Rev. H. E. J. Bevan, 3. Lord Halifax, 4. Rev. Dr. Moule, 5. Rev. Canon Newbolt, 6. Rev. Dr. Robertson, 7. Rev. Canon Robinson, 8. Rev. Dr. Wace	537
II. Extracts from the discussion: 1. Canon Gore, 2. Dr. Wace, 3. Lord Halifax, 4. Canon	

	PAGE
Gore, 5. Mr. Dimock, 6. Dr. Robertson, 7. Canon Gore, 8. Lord Halifax	539
Summary.—No one puts forth the Modern view.—All trace the Eucharistic Sacrifice solely to the Death upon the Cross.—Canon Gore's interpretation of S. Irenæus considered.—No reference of the Holy Eucharist to the ritual of the Day of Atonement.—Drs. Wace and Robinson connect it with the Passover.—Lord Halifax gives the Catholic view ; and even Mr. Dimock, so far as he sees any sacrificial action, traces it to the Death upon the Cross.—No one refers it to our Lord's Mediatorial work in heaven.—Conclusion	542

APPENDIX F.

On Sadler's "The One Offering"	546
------------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX G.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letter (first) from the Bishop of Durham to Dr. Mortimer	551
Letter (second) from the Bishop of Durham to Dr. Mortimer.	552
Letter from the Rev. F. E. Brightman to Dr. Mortimer	553
Letter from Dr. Mortimer to Dr. Paul Schanz	556
Letter from Dr. Schanz to Dr. Mortimer	557
Letter (first) from Dr. Mortimer to M. l'Abbé Lepin	560
Letter (first) from M. Lepin to Dr. Mortimer	563
Letter (second) from Dr. Mortimer to M. Lepin	571
Letter (second) from M. Lepin to Dr. Mortimer	574
Letter (third) from Dr. Mortimer to M. Lepin	578
Letter (third) from M. Lepin to Dr. Mortimer	581

LIST OF WORKS REFERRED TO IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS BOOK.

- Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, New York, 1892.
 Albert the Great, *Opera*, Lugdunum, 1651.
 Alexander of Hales, *Opera*, Coloniae, 1662.
 Alford, *Greek Testament*, London, 1874-1877, 4 vols.
 Algerus, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 180.
 Amalarius, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 119.
 S. Ambrose, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1853, 4 vols.
Ante-Nicene Fathers, Edinburgh, 1873, 24 vols.
 S. Augustine, *Opera Omnia*, Gaume, 11 vols.
 “ “ “ Migne, P. L., 16 vols.
 “ “ “ Rotterdam, 1535, 10 vols.
 S. Basil, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1834, 5 vols.
 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, Prague, 1721, 4 vols.
 Benedict XIV., *Opera Omnia*, Prati, 1843, 17 vols.
 S. Bernard, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1890, 2 vols.
 Biel, Gabriel, *Opera*, Lugdunum, 1527.
 Bingham, *Christian Antiquities*, London, 1878, 2 vols.
 Blunt, *Annotated Prayer Book*, London, 1876.
 “ *Dictionary of Sects and Heresies*, London, 1874.
 “ *Theological Dictionary*, London, 1870.
 Bona, *Opera Omnia*, Antuerpiæ, 1723.
 S. Bonaventura, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1864, 15 vols.
 Bossuet, *Œuvres Complètes*, Tours, 1862, 12 vols.
 Brightman, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*.
 Cabasilas, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. G., tom. 150.
 Cajetan, *Opera Omnia*, Antuerpiæ, 1612.
 Champion and Beaumont, *The Prayer Book Interleaved*, London, 1880.
 Canus, Melchior, *De Locis Theol.*, Venetiis, 1776.

- Cassander, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1616.
 S. Chrysostom, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1839, 26 vols.
 Cienfuegos, *Vita Abscondita*, Rome, 1728.
 S. Clement, Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, London, 1890, 4 vols.
Concil. Trident. Canones et Decreta, Münster, 1847.
 Cornelius à Lapide, *Comment.*, Paris, 1865, 10 vols.
 Cosin, *Works*, Oxford, 1843, 5 vols.
Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ, Rome, 21 vols.
 S. Cyprian, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1726.
 Cyril Alex., *Opera Omnia*, Basileæ, 1566 (also Migne, P. G., tom. 68-77, 10 vols.).
 Cyril Jerus., *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1720.
 De Augustinis, *De Re Sacramentaria*, Rome, 1889, 2 vols.
 De Lugo, *De Fide*, Paris, 1868, 2 vols.
 De Lyra, *Biblia Sacra*, Venetiis, 1638, 6 vols.
Dictionary of National Biography, London, 1885-95, 62 vols.
Didache, Funk, Tübingen, 1887.
 S. Dionysius Areop., *Opera*, Migne, P. G., tom. 3, 2 vols.
 Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, Paris, 1889.
 Duns Scotus, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1891, 26 vols.
 Eusebius Cæsar., *Opera Omnia*, Coloniae, 1688, 3 vols.
 Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, Rome, 1766, 5 vols.
 Florus, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 119.
 Forbes, *Articles*, London, 1878.
 " *Primary Charge*, London, 1858.
 " *The Creed*, London, 1866.
 " *Theological Defence*, London, 1860.
 Franzelin, *Opera*, Rome, 1887, 8 vols.
Fulham Conference, London, 1900.
 Gavantus, *Thesaurus*, Antuerpiæ, 1646, 3 vols.
 Gibson, *Thirty-Nine Articles*, London, 1896, 2 vols.
 Grancolas, *Anciennes Liturgies*, Paris, 1774.
 " *L'Antiquité des Ceremonies*, Paris, 1792.
 S. Gregory the Great, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1862, 5 vols.
 Grotius, Hugo, *Opera Omnia*, Amsterdam, 1679, 4 vols.
 Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1878.
 Hardwick, *Articles of Religion*, London, 1851.
 Hefele, *History of the Councils*, Edinburgh, 1871, 5 vols.
 Hildebert of Mans, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 171.
 Hiqualæus, *Comm. in Scot.*, Lugdunum, 1639.

- Hittorpius, *De Divinis*, Coloniae, 1568.
- Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, London, 1899.
- Hugo of S. Victor, *Opera Omnia*, Rothomagi, 1648, 3 vols.
- S. Ignatius, Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, London, 1889, 4 vols.
- Innocent III., *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 217.
- S. Irenæus, *Opera Omnia*, Stieren, Lipsiæ, 1853, 2 vols.
- S. Isidore of Seville, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1601.
- S. Ivo of Chartres, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 161, 162.
- S. Jerome, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1693, 5 vols.
- S. John of Damascus, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1864, 3 vols.
- S. Justin Martyr, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 6.
- Keble, *Considerations*, Oxford, 1872.
- “ *Eucharistical Adoration*, Oxford, 1872.
- “ *Life*, by Coleridge, Oxford, 1869, 2 vols.
- “ *Sermons on the Christian Year*, London, 1887.
- Kidd, *Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, London, 1898.
- Kidd, *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, London, 1899, 2 vols.
- Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, Paris, 1672, 18 vols.
- S. Leo, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 54.
- Lepin, *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne*, Paris, 1897.
- Lessius, *Opera Omnia*, Antuerpiæ, 1618-1620.
- Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, 89 vols.
- Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, London, 1898, 4 vols.
- Liturgiarum Orientalium Coll.*, Renaudot, Francofurti, 1847.
- Macarius, *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, Paris, 1859, 2 vols.
- Mackay, *Life of Bishop Forbes*, London, 1888.
- Magee, *The Atonement*, London, 1816, 3 vols.
- Martene, *De Antiquis*, Antuerpiæ, 1736, 4 vols.
- Masarello, *Cat. Conc. Trid.*, Agram, 1874.
- Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel*, London, 1890.
- Meyer, *Comm. on the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1883, 10 vols.
- Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood*, London, 1892.
- “ *The Resurrection*, London, 1894.
- Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, London, 1898.
- Neale, *History of the Eastern Church*, London, 1847, 4 vols.
- “ *Tetralogia Liturgica*, London, 1849.
- Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Buffalo, 1887, 28 vols.
- B. Odo of Cambrai, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 160.

- Origen, *Opera*, Basileæ, 1557.
Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church, London, 1898.
Pallavicini, *Hist. Conc. Trident.*, Antuerpiæ, 1673.
Palmer, *Origines Liturg.*, London, 1845.
Pearson, *The Creed*, Cambridge, 1859.
Pelliccia, *Polity of the Church*, London, 1883.
Percival, *Digest of Theology*, London, 1893.
Perrone, *Prælectiones Theolog.*, Lovanii, 1838, 8 vols.
Petavius, *Theol. Dogmat.*, Antuerpiæ, 1700, 6 vols.
Peter Lombard, *Sententiæ*, Lovanii, 1557.
Peter the Venerable, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 189.
Les Petits Bollandistes, Paris, 20 vols.
Pitisco, *Antiq. Roman.*, Venetiis, 1719, 3 vols.
Pulleynes, Robert, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 177.
Pusey, *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, London, 1883.
“ *Eirenicon*, Oxford, 1870, 3 vols.
“ *University Sermons*, London, 1872.
Rabanus Maurus, *Opera Omnia*, Colonix, 1626, 3 vols.
Radbertus, Paschasius, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 120.
Ratramnus, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 121.
Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, London, 1871, 5 vols.
Romsee, *Opera Liturgica*, Mechlin, 1830, 4 vols.
Sadler, *The One Offering*, London, 1889.
Salmeron, *Opera Omnia*, Colonix, 1604.
Sanday, *Priesthood and Sacrifice*, London, 1900.
Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, New York, 1894, 4 vols.
Schanz, *Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sacramenten*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1893.
Scheeben, *La Dogmatique*, Paris, 1882, 4 vols.
Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, London, 1872.
Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, London, 1877, 4 vols.
Smith and Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, London, 1876, 2 vols.
Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Boston, 1877, 4 vols.
Socinus, *Opera*, Eirenopoli, 1656, 2 vols.
Stentrup, *De Verb. Incarnat.*, Cœniponti, 1889, 2 vols.
Strabo, Walafrid., *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 114.
Suarez, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1856, 30 vols.

-
- Suicer, *Thesaurus*, Amsterdam, 1728, 2 vols.
Suidas, *Lexicon*, Cambridge, 1705, 3 vols.
Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theologiæ*, Tournai, 1897, 3 vols.
Tertullian, *Opera Omnia*, Migne, P. L., tom. 1, 2.
Thalhofer, *Das offer des alten und des neuen Bundes*, Regensburg, 1870.
Thalhofer, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1894.
S. Thomas Aquinas, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1882, 34 vols.
Thomassinus, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1868, 7 vols.
Tracts for the Times, Oxford, 1840, 7 vols.
Vacant, *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Église Latine*, Paris, 1894.
Vasquez, *Opera Omnia*, Lyons, 1631, 9 vols.
Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, London, 1889.
Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, London, 1854.
Wilhelm and Scannell, *Manual of Catholic Theology*, New York, 1899, 2 vols.
William of Auvergne, *Opera*, Paris, 1674.
William of S. Thiéry, *Opera*, Migne, P. L., tom. 180.
Zaccaria, *Bibliotheca Ritualis*, Rome, 1776, 3 vols.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

CHAPTER I.

SOME DANGERS AND DIFFICULTIES OF OUR TIMES.

THE tendency of the pendulum of human thought is always to swing to extremes, and in no department is this more evident than in theology. We see it in the age of the Councils swinging from Arianism to Apollinarianism, from Nestorianism to Eutychianism. But the epoch in which we are able to trace this tendency in its most exaggerated manifestation is, of course, that extraordinary period which followed the revival of classical learning, which we call, in literature and art, the Renaissance; in religion, the Reformation.

Everywhere the desire is manifested to abandon the old paths and to enter new ones, to leave the old doctrines and to seek their opposite poles; and this not only in dogma, but in morals and polity. Indeed, there seems to be no division of theology in which this strange revulsion was not exhibited. In church polity the change was from a theory of ecclesiastical despotism to one of downright Erastianism; in morals, from a standard of saintly asceticism to a positive repudiation of good works, which opened the door to the

Introductory:
Human thought tends to exaggerated reaction. Examples, the age of the Councils, and the Renaissance, or Reformation.

I. This tendency seen in theology in century XVI.;

in polity,

morals,

worship,
and dogma.

grossest licentiousness ; in worship, from excessive formalism to absolute irreverence ; from an overestimate of objective religion to the entire substitution of a subjective faith.

The revulsion
greatest in
priesthood
and related
questions.

When, however, we come to dogma, we find the most violent revulsion taking place in those doctrines which are more or less connected with the idea of priesthood : the doctrines of sacrifice and the Sacraments of merit and grace. From an almost mechanical theory of the operation of the Sacraments, we pass to their virtual reduction to mere symbols ; from a somewhat arithmetical doctrine of merit to a theory of indefectible and irresistible grace ; from an exaggerated sacerdotalism to a practical rejection of all priesthood ; from giving an excessive prominence to a distorted view of the Sacrifice of the Mass to a denial of any sacrifice except that of the Cross. Indeed, with the Reformers the Atonement became the one saving doctrine of Christianity, to the practical obscuration of the Incarnation and its extension and consequences in the Sacramental system of the Church.

On both sides a
distortion of
truth revealed
by comparison
with funda-
mental truths.

In all these antitheses we have on either side an exaggeration which practically amounts to a distortion of the truth. This becomes evident by comparing disputed doctrines with fundamental truths of the Catholic Faith. For since one truth cannot contradict or be inconsistent with another truth, where this contradiction or inconsistency is discovered we may fairly assume that there has been some overstatement or exaggeration of the doctrine in question. The importance of this method of testing and correcting theological opinions can scarcely be overestimated. It is of course the application to theology of the *reductio ad absurdum* or *ad impossibile* method in logic.

The import-
ance of the
" *reductio ad
absurdum* "
method in
theology.

The likeness which exists between the Reformation period and our own is most striking. Both were prepared for by an age of degeneracy and decay. The fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth centuries were sterile and unproductive, and the same may be said of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. In the sixteenth and nineteenth, forces which had long lain dormant began to manifest themselves, with very much the same results. In each period we recognize the same restless intellect, the same superficial reading, the same hasty, ill-considered judgments, the same desire for novelty, the same disregard of authority; and, on the other hand, the same forward leap in invention and artistic development. There was much of good, much of evil, in both.

The likeness of century XVI. to our own age.

To-day we should surely strive to learn from the mistakes of an age so like our own, and especially to be on our guard in theological controversy, against that tendency to the exaggeration of one aspect of a doctrine to the neglect of its complementary truth, of which we have such abundant example in the Reformation period. To this tendency may be traced the religious evils, the narrowness and prejudice from which our fathers so long suffered, and which we ourselves have not yet entirely shaken off.

We should therefore avoid the mistakes of the Reformation period.

But what is the remedy or safeguard for this? Certainly not compromise, which is absolutely fatal to truth, but that true Aristotelian *via media* which strives to avoid excess or defect, and in theology accomplishes this by comparing doctrinal statements with accepted truths, and examining whether they err in excess or defect, and so contradict, or are inconsistent with, the truths with which they are compared.

II. Remedy for exaggeration not compromise, but the "via media" of Aristotle.

We need to keep ever before us the fact that the

The Catholic Faith not a series of isolated propositions, but a body of perfectly harmonious truth.

Catholic Faith is not a series of theological propositions strung together without any necessary and intimate relation to each other, but a great body of truth, built up into such perfect unity that one part cannot conflict with another part, but that all cohere in perfect proportion and absolute harmony. From this it follows that the exaggeration or distortion of any truth is most easily exposed by showing that such a view does not fit in with the whole body of truth, but conflicts with some recognized doctrine.

At the Reformation the Atonement isolated from the Incarnation.

At the Reformation, as we have already observed, the doctrine of the Atonement was so isolated from the rest of the Christian Faith, and so developed as the sole foundation-doctrine of Christianity, as practically to obscure the dogma of the Incarnation and its consequences in the Sacramental system of the Church. In our own day the tendency is in the opposite direction. The Atonement in popular theology is relegated to the background. Its vicarious character is denied. Its sufficiency and completeness are, to say the least, called in question by a modern theory of a celestial Sacrifice without which the Sacrifice of the Cross would be incomplete ; while some even go so far as to teach that since our LORD'S Priesthood did not begin until after His Ascension into Heaven, the oblation of our LORD on the Cross was, strictly speaking, not a Sacrifice at all, the true Sacrifice being made when our Great High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies and offered Himself upon the heavenly Altar.

Now the opposite tendency : the Atonement obscured,

and humanitarian distortions of the Incarnation introduced.

On the other hand, the doctrine of the Incarnation has been brought into deserved prominence as the foundation-doctrine of the Christian Faith ; but in some quarters there has been a tendency to exaggerate it, from what might be called an humanitarian point of

view, by a Kenotic theory, which, in order to make our LORD more Human, makes Him less Divine.

In the subject which we are to treat in this volume, we must continually strive to avoid overstatement on either side, and to correct, by comparison of one truth with another, any tendency in this direction into which we may have inadvertently fallen.

It may be well at this point to illustrate the operation and the importance of this principle by a somewhat lengthy reference to a work by the late Rev. William Milligan, D.D., the well-known Presbyterian divine, which has deservedly attracted much attention in the Church, and is probably responsible for some of the ill-balanced views of later writers.

In 1891 Dr. Milligan chose for the subject of his Baird Lecture, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Our LORD*. This work, while not directly touching on the Eucharist, deals with the kindred questions of priesthood and sacrifice, and especially with the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The treatment of the subject is most devout, and shows remarkable freedom from the bias of Presbyterian theology, especially in the discussion of sacramental and sacrificial questions.

On the other hand, we must call attention to two typical characteristics. First: The neglect of any reference to the writings and views of the Fathers and theologians of the Church. Almost the only works with which Dr. Milligan seems familiar, or at least which he cares to quote as authorities, are those of writers of our own times, and while a few of these are divines of the Anglican Communion the great majority belong to schismatical bodies. It is true, as we shall see later, that before the sixteenth century no authority

In this work theories must be tested by other doctrines.

The violation of this principle illustrated from Dr. Milligan's Lectures

on "The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our LORD."

Two characteristics observed in his work: (1.) The neglect of the writings of the Fathers and theologians of the Church,

and the weight given to modern schismaticism.

can be found for the main contention of Dr. Milligan's treatise, and this may account for his entire neglect of patristic authority. And we, as members of a Church which bases its doctrine on the appeal to antiquity, especially to the primitive Church and to the Fathers, certainly ought to look askance at arguments which ignore this appeal entirely.

(2.) His treatment of the Sacrifice of the Cross

Second : If there be one doctrine which may be claimed as truly Catholic in the sense that it has been held and taught as a fundamental doctrine of Christianity always, everywhere, and by every part of the Catholic Church, it is the doctrine that upon the Cross our LORD "JESUS CHRIST . . . made there, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Therefore there can be no other absolute Sacrifice than that of the Cross, and nothing can be wanting to the completeness of that Sacrifice. While it is true that no particular definition of the Atonement has been set forth by the Church, it is also true that the fact of the Atonement is a fundamental doctrine of the Christian Religion. When, therefore, a view is put forth in our own days, which is inconsistent with this fact, or implies that our LORD'S Sacrifice upon the Cross was incomplete, it must certainly be rejected by all Catholics, and especially by all Priests of the Anglican Communion, since, in the most solemn service of the Church, they profess their belief that upon the Cross our LORD "made there, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

as a question still open for discussion.

Dr. M. denies that our

Dr. Milligan, discussing the questions, "When did the Priesthood of our LORD begin? Was our LORD at

any period of His earthly life a Priest, or did He only enter on His Priesthood when He entered Heaven?" * answers: "That the teaching . . . of [certain] passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews is so distinct as to admit of only one conclusion, that the order of Melchisedec is the only order of Priesthood to which our LORD belonged, and that the order has no connection with earth." † He then goes on to show that there are also texts of the "same Epistle which set before us the sufferings, and especially the death of CHRIST, as priestly acts, thus leading to the inference that CHRIST was a Priest when He endured them," and, therefore, that He offered Sacrifice upon the Cross. This, as he points out, is inconsistent with the conclusion which he has reached, "that the order of Melchisedec is the only order of Priesthood to which our LORD belonged, and that the order has no connection with earth."

He then takes into consideration various solutions which have been proposed by modern writers, mostly belonging to schismatical Communion: e. g., that on earth "our LORD is to be regarded as a destined, rather than as a consecrated Priest;" ‡ that "our LORD was indeed in Himself a High Priest on earth, while learning obedience by the things which He suffered, but that He did not become *fully* High Priest until through that obedience He had been perfected;" § and, "the idea of fulfilling different orders of the Priesthood . . . [rather than] of belonging to them." These solutions Dr. Milligan rejects, and pro-

LORD'S Priesthood had any connection with earth,

and rejects various theories offered by schismatical writers

to bring the Death of the Cross within the scope of His priestly work, and so to recognize it as a Sacrifice.

* Milligan, *The Ascension*, p. 72 ff.

† Ibid., p. 74.

‡ Jackson, *Priesthood of Christ*, chap. xi., 5.

§ Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii., 1, 402.

He considers that the universal conviction of the Christian Church is "not without force."

poses a solution of his own, after making the following extraordinary statement: "To all this may be added, as not without force in a controversy of the kind, the conviction of the Christian Church in every land and age, that the death of our LORD upon the Cross was an offering in which He was not merely a Victim, but a Priest, and as a Priest was engaged in carrying out that Mediatorship between GOD and man which always has been, and must be, the leading function of any Priesthood, either in its lowest or its highest form. Must we, then, abandon this idea, as has been done by some?"*.

Attention is here specially called to Dr. Milligan's opinion that "the conviction of the Christian Church in every land and age" is "not without force in a controversy of the kind." To those who believe that the conviction of the Christian Church in every land and age represents the undoubted teaching of the Church in all matters of dogma, and is the fulfilment of our LORD'S promise that the HOLY GHOST should guide the Church into all truth (cf. S. John xvi. 13), this extraordinarily inadequate statement must surely invalidate Dr. Milligan's opinion as to the basis of Christian doctrine, since it shows that he considers that a fundamental doctrine of the Faith, which rests upon "the conviction of the Christian Church in every land and age," is still unsettled and open to discussion.

He proposes a theory of his own, based on the interpretation of one passage of Scripture.

The solution which Dr. Milligan proposes is based, not merely upon a single text of Holy Scripture, but upon the rendering of a preposition in that text. He says † that the text (S. John xii. 32), "And I, if I be lifted up on high, out of the earth, will draw all men unto Myself," (his own translation), clearly shows

* Milligan, *The Ascension*, p. 75.

† *Ibid.*, p. 78.

that our LORD'S life of glory begins, not with the Resurrection, but with the Crucifixion, since our LORD was "lifted up on high, out of the earth (*ἐκ τῆς γῆς*)," and therefore that His Priesthood began from this moment, and that His Crucifixion, "instead of the extremity of shame," was "a weight of glory."

He ingenuously remarks* that "it may, perhaps, be objected, (1) that the explanation now offered rests too much upon one passage of Scripture; that if true, we might have expected allusion to be made to it in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and (2) that it is inconsistent with that language of S. Paul in which the Cross of CHRIST is regarded as humiliation rather than exaltation, and as shame rather than glory." He goes on to show that, in his opinion, "the first of these objections has no weight. . . . That there is a certain force in the second objection, may be allowed."

He considers that the objection that it rests on one passage only, has no weight

but that its inconsistency with S. Paul's language, has a certain force.

Of course, there come into our mind, among other passages, the two statements, (1) "He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore GOD also hath highly exalted Him." † Here the humiliation of the Cross is contrasted with the exaltation which followed, and therefore is certainly not considered as the same thing. And (2) "Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the Throne of GOD." ‡ And this latter text is from the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, truly, there is no support for Dr. Milligan's theory, but a clear "allusion" to the question before us, namely, whether the Sacrifice of the Cross belongs to the life of glory, or to a moment of humiliation and shame.

Examples of this.

* Milligan, *The Ascension*, p. 80.

† Phil. ii. 8, 9.

‡ Heb. xii. 2.

While the reference to Dr. Milligan's work in this place may seem a digression, inasmuch as we have not yet reached the exposition of the subject, it is introduced as an example of that ill-balanced and one-sided treatment of Christian doctrine against which we have to be so constantly on our guard in discussing a subject so controverted as the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We trust we may be pardoned for saying that a writer is entirely discredited as a theologian who (1) considers "the conviction of the Christian Church in every land and age" (in regard to a fundamental doctrine of Christianity) to be only "not without force" and to leave the question still open; who (2) thinks that the supreme question in regard to whether our LORD'S work upon the Cross was a Sacrifice or not, may fairly be allowed to rest upon his own interpretation of one passage of Holy Scripture; and who (3) ignores the whole consensus of the Fathers and theologians of the Christian Church in favour of opinions chiefly of schismatics of the present day.

A theologian is discredited :
(1) Who little values Catholic consent;

(2) rests the S. of the Cross on one passage of Scripture;

(3) and ignores the consensus of the Fathers.

III. Two principles recognized by Anglicans:

1. The appeal to antiquity;

It may not be amiss at this point to invite attention to two principles which should be steadily kept in view by all members of the Anglican Church.

First, that our Church appeals to antiquity; that it recognizes not only a principle of continuity in the Apostolical Succession of its Ministry, but of continuity in Apostolic doctrine; and that, while it does not shut the door to legitimate development in the interpretation of Holy Scripture and of the doctrines of the Church, that development only can be considered legitimate which is not inconsistent with those articles of faith which the whole Church has accepted as settled, either by formal definition or by universal consent and conviction.

Further, that an appeal to the Fathers must be fairly made, and must not be based upon a few equivocal passages, when the general trend of their teaching in other passages is inconsistent with the view for which their authority is claimed. It is quite legitimate to point out that, where the consideration of a subject was not fully before the Fathers, their silence does not imply disapproval. Yet, on the other hand, where passages of Scripture are *definitely expounded by them*, without any recognition of the doctrines which in the present day are drawn from these passages, the testimony of the Fathers must be considered as adverse rather than favourable.

For instance, in the commentaries upon the Epistle to the Hebrews written by Theodoret, S. Chrysostom, S. John of Damascus, and, indeed, by every commentator before the sixteenth century, we find no such view as that our LORD'S heavenly Priesthood is in any sense needed as a completion of His offering of Himself upon the Cross. That is regarded as the one complete Sacrifice, the finished work by which the world was redeemed, our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven being looked upon only as the pleading and application of this finished Sacrifice. This fact is certainly adverse, so far as the authority of the Fathers is concerned, to the modern view of a celestial Sacrifice which is not merely the pleading and application of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but is itself either a proper Sacrifice, or such an essential element of the Sacrifice of the Cross as leaves that Sacrifice incomplete without it.

The second point for our consideration is, that the Church herself, inspired as she is by the HOLY GHOST, is the teacher and interpreter of all truth. While, therefore, the researches of learned men outside of her

i. e., to the writings of the Fathers as a whole, not merely to doubtful passages.

This test applied to the modern theory of our LORD'S Sacrifice in heaven.

2. The Church herself the interpreter of all truth.

The place therefore to be given to the writings of schismatics.

fold and cut off from her unity, who possess only a valid Sacrament of Baptism, may be profitably employed in illustrating questions of scholarship, it is scarcely consistent with the view that the HOLY GHOST in the Church guides her into all truth, to accept readily the modern theories of schismatics and heretics, unless their arguments are irresistible. Many of these men deny the Church's Sacraments, the authenticity of Holy Scripture, and, in some cases, the Divinity of our LORD. It is inconceivable, on the supposition that the Church is the organ of the HOLY GHOST, that GOD in the nineteenth century should almost always choose those outside of the pale of the Church as the instruments by which He reveals new aspects of truth to the world.

The modern view of the Kenosis started from Beron through Lutheran sources.

And yet, such is the case with respect to the modern view of the Kenosis, which started in our own day from Lutheran and German Reformed sources; was introduced into England through the writings of Godet, a French Protestant; and may probably be traced, in its original source, to the heretics Marcion and Beron.

The modern interpretation of Hebrews comes from Socinus, and has been spread in England through Dr. Milligan.

The same is true of the more radical interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to which we have been referring. Its source seems to have been Socinus, the founder of Unitarianism, and its principal exponent in England in our own day, the Presbyterian Dr. Milligan. While fully recognizing and honestly admiring much in the latter's treatment of the subject, one may still claim that a Churchman ought to receive with great hesitation from such sources doctrines which are practically inconsistent with the authoritative teachings of the Church.

We venture to insist that these two points to which we have drawn attention, namely, the authority of antiquity, and the fact that the Church is herself the

teacher of truth, ought to be kept steadily in view in all theological controversies of the present day.

Among the questions most prominently before us now, as in the sixteenth century, are two which mutually connote one another, priesthood and sacrifice. As we have seen, in the Reformation period there was a strong reaction against the claims then made for priesthood and the Sacrifice of the Mass, this revulsion leading to a practical denial of any real priesthood in the Church, and of any proper sacrifice in the Eucharist. It is not surprising to find that at the beginning of the Catholic revival in our times the same questions in regard to priesthood and sacrifice were among the very first to which attention was directed, and which may be said to have been the cardinal points on which the whole movement turned. There was, first, the bringing forward the importance of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, which resulted in a higher appreciation of the Sacerdotal Office ; and then, as a necessary consequence, the restoration of the Holy Eucharist to its proper position in the Church's system.

While much was written in proof of the fact of Apostolical Succession and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, very little was done towards investigating the character and consequences of priesthood and sacrifice. This last question was, however, brought most prominently forward, and the keenest interest and closest inquiry stimulated, by the Papal examination and condemnation of Anglican Orders. Indeed, even now one can see in this action which at first only seemed so unjust and so prejudicial to Christian unity one beneficial result,—that it directed the attention, not merely of Anglicans, but of all theologians, to the question which

IV. Two questions before us to-day, priesthood and sacrifice.

The questions which the Reformation and the Oxford Movement took up were first Apostolical Succession, then the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

Little critical work done in regard to the nature of priesthood or sacrifice. Renewed interest stimulated by the Papal Bull of 1896,

and more scientific investigation,

which may yet afford a better basis for the union of Christendom than Papal recognition.

The investigation of these questions must be made in many fields.

Many learned R. C. treatises invalidated by faulty premises.

An illustration of this in the controversy as to the "form" in Holy Order.

V. The question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice debated with

had received such inadequate treatment: What are the essentials of priesthood and sacrifice? And we may surely be permitted to hope that when this question has been fully worked out, a better basis for the reunion of the divided Churches of Christendom will have been found than could possibly have been furnished by the mere recognition by the Bishop of Rome of the claims of the Anglican priesthood.

The investigation of these questions must be pursued in many fields, the chief of which are Holy Scripture, Liturgics, Patristics, History, and Theology. Further, special care must be taken to examine the foundations upon which theories are built up.

Hitherto, most of the Roman works upon these subjects, though exhibiting great learning and most patient research, have been invalidated by being based upon certain assumptions or premises which, although long accepted as indisputable, have been greatly weakened, if not positively overthrown, by the recently acquired evidence of antiquity, and especially of Liturgies and Ordinals. We have an example of this in the discovery that what was held by the great majority of Roman theologians to be the "form" in the Sacrament of Order, is not found in the ancient Roman Ordinals; and that the definition of sacrifice which has generally been put forth in Roman text-books cannot be traced farther back than the thirteenth century. This definition is no longer maintained by a large number of the most brilliant theologians of the Roman Communion.

A notable exception must, however, be made in the case of certain schools of Catholic theologians in Germany, who during the past thirty years have investigated, with painstaking research and in a most liberal

spirit, the whole question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They have ventured to go outside of the old beaten paths, and, breaking free from the fetters of long-accepted but untrustworthy tradition, have accumulated a vast store of valuable material, from which a sounder theory of sacrifice is being constructed. Indeed, to the abundant treasure which they have gathered this work owes much.

great diligence and liberality in Germany.

These theologians may be grouped in three divisions. There is, first, the new and extreme school of Thalhöfer. In 1870, in his work *Das Opfer des Alten und des Neuen Bundes*, he put forth a theory somewhat similar to that held by the modern school in our own Church, though far less radical. In 1887 and 1893 this work was followed by two volumes entitled *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik* (Freibourg im Breisgau); and in these three works his position is supported with great learning and industry. Indeed, one may venture to think that almost every conceivable argument in favour of a celestial Sacrifice, from which the Eucharist derives its sacrificial character, and which is the completion or culmination of our LORD'S redemptive work upon the Cross, may be found in these volumes. That they are little known in England seems to follow from the fact that those Anglican writers who take this view do not refer to the works of Thalhöfer nor use his arguments. He has many followers in Bavaria, among the most distinguished, perhaps, being Dr. Franz, to whose work, *Die Eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese der Griechischen und Orientalischen Liturgien* (in the Second Part), it may be sufficient here to call attention.

Three German schools:
1. The extreme school of Thalhöfer, started in 1870.

Its learning and literary industry.

But little known in England.

On the opposite side the most able opponent of this school was the Jesuit Professor at Innsbruck,

2. On the opposite side the

works of
Stentrup.

Ferdinandus A. Stentrup, who devoted a great part of the second volume of his *Soteriologia* to the examination and refutation of Thalhofer's arguments.

3. Between
these the
treatises of
Scheeben and
Schanz;

Between these stand the brilliant names of Scheeben and Schanz, who, while by no means accepting Thalhofer's most radical positions in regard to our LORD's sacrificial work in heaven, admit that His heavenly offering, while not an actual sacrifice, is a virtual sacrifice. A summary of their conclusions, rather than of their arguments, may be found in Wilhelm and Scannell's *Manual of Catholic Theology*, which is based on Scheeben's *Dogmatik*, and is probably the only English work which touches on this subject. They do not, however, notice the Thalhofer school, although it doubtless had its influence upon the work of Scheeben and Schanz. Unfortunately, neither of these wrote in Latin. Scheeben's *Dogmatik*, however, can be had in a French translation, published by Palmé, Paris.*

and in France,
of Lepin,

More recently, a French theologian has given us a most valuable contribution to the whole question of sacrifice as it is summed up and fulfilled in our LORD and Saviour JESUS CHRIST. In 1897 M. l'Abbé M. Lepin, Doctor of Theology, and Director of the Seminary of S. Sulpice at Issy, near Paris, put forth a work entitled *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne*. Following that illustrious school of French Oratorians in the seventeenth century, whose works even now remain a storehouse of dogmatic and ascetic theology, M. Lepin traces, in the work of the Incarnate Word as the representative of all creation, and especially of the human race, the fulfilment in time and in eternity of the great law of sacrifice which seems to be as innate in the human heart as the knowledge of GOD itself. The

*This does not contain the last three books on "Grace," "The Church and the Sacraments," and the "Last Things."

author regards our Blessed LORD first as the Representative of all creation in that glorious work of adoration for which the world was made, and in which every creature finds at once its true end and supreme happiness; and secondly, as the Restorer of the human race, whose nature He so perfectly assumed. He then shows that in this twofold work the law of sacrifice finds its true interpretation and fulfilment—in the work of restoration, until the end of time; in the work of adoration, continuing through all eternity.

In Part III. of his book M. Lepin treats of the Sacrifice of our Blessed LORD at the Incarnation, during both His hidden and public life, at the Passion, at the Resurrection and Ascension, and in His life of glory in heaven; and he ends this Part with the consideration of the Sacrifice of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist.

The whole work is most helpful and suggestive; and in his treatment of the celestial Sacrifice in its relation to that of the Holy Eucharist, M. Lepin preserves that theological balance which is disregarded by so many modern writers; and, while treating with much beauty the accidental relation of the Eucharist to our LORD'S life in glory, he clearly asserts its essential relation as a sacrifice to the one Sacrifice on the Cross.*

M. Lepin's work was preceded in 1894 by a most useful pamphlet, entitled *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Église latine*, the work of Dr. Vacant, a Professor in the Seminary of Nancy. Brief as this little treatise is, it contains a most scholarly and judicious examination of all the principal theories of

* In Appendix G will be found a correspondence with M. Lepin on this subject, in which he states with great clearness his position in relation to the opinions of certain English divines to whose writings his attention had been called.

the Eucharistic Sacrifice from the sub-Apostolic age to modern times. From an historical standpoint this little work is invaluable and should be read by all interested in the subject.

In England Dr. Moberly's "Ministerial Priesthood" supplies an example of constructive treatment of priesthood,

but we have practically nothing on the E. S.

The only book on this subject Sadler's "One Offering."

Mr. Kidd's work confined to mediæval doctrine.

The subject is touched upon

In regard to the question of priesthood, the most important contribution of our own Church in this direction is Dr. Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood*, which, while only claiming to be an introduction to the subject, devotes itself almost exclusively to an investigation of the principles and meaning of Christian Priesthood as exhibited in the New Testament and in the writings of the sub-Apostolic age. Many writers have pointed out that the same sort of treatment is needed in discussing the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but so far no one in our Communion has contributed any serious work on the subject. Indeed, with the exception of pamphlets, occasional papers, portions of chapters in works upon the Articles or general treatises on theology, our Church in recent times has produced practically nothing upon this subject, which is so prominently before men in the controversies of to-day. The largest treatise on the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a little book, entitled *The One Offering*, by the Rev. M. F. Sadler, published some twenty years ago, and chiefly intended to show that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is recognized by the Church of England in the writings of her principal divines, as well as in the works of the Fathers.

A most admirable little treatise, by the Rev. B. J. Kidd, published two years ago by the S. P. C. K., confines itself to the mediæval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in relation to the thirty-first Article of Religion. There is also a brief treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice under the heading of Article XXXI. in

the same author's contribution to the Oxford Church Text Books, on "The Thirty-Nine Articles."

in various works on the Articles,

Dr. Mason, in *The Faith of the Gospel*, devotes six pages to this question. Perhaps among the best-known monographs on the subject is a paper of sixteen pages on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, read before the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament in 1890.

and treated more fully in a paper by Mr. Brightman.

While these and other authors present a more or less similar theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, no one of them attempts to treat the subject at all exhaustively, or, indeed, to do more than to state a view, the proof of which does not seem to fall within the scope of their work. As a rule, they do not take into consideration the difficulties involved in their theory, nor do they meet the objection that it seems to conflict with the complete and finished character of our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross. They usually quote no authority for their view, unless it be from modern authors, although some of them refer in general terms to the Fathers as on their side. Mr. Brightman, in the paper mentioned above, quotes four passages,* one each from S. Ignatius, S. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, and S. Cyril of Alexandria, which he seems to think give some support to his view, and which we shall examine later on.†

These authors do not meet the difficulties involved in their theory, nor give any substantial proofs of it.

Another writer, in response to a request for some definite passages from the Fathers, refers in general terms to Thomassinus. Yet another, confesses himself unable to name any particular passages, while a fourth thinks that the germ of the theory may be found

* S. Ignat., *Ad Smyrn.*, vii. 1; S. Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, lxx.; S. Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 17, 18, v. 2; S. Cyril, *M. Ep. ad Nest. Œcum.*, ii. 7.

† Chapter VIII.

in the Fathers. No English writer, however, of this school seems to have carried his researches in this matter farther back than the sixteenth century.

The laborious work done by the modern school in Germany.

Very different is the work done in England from the painstaking and laborious research of German theologians of the school of Thalhofer, to which we have already referred. They have gone most carefully through the Fathers, with the result that, while Thalhofer confesses* that neither in the Fathers, nor in the theologians of the Middle Ages or even of later times, can he find any precise statements in regard to a celestial Sacrifice, yet he believes there are signs that the conception of this Sacrifice was by no means unknown to them. He then goes on to quote very fully every such passage. In Chapters VIII. and IX. we shall give these quotations, together with some discussion of their value in support of his theory, and in so doing we may fairly assume that we have before us practically every passage which has been thought in any way favourable to his view.

We have already referred to Dr. Milligan's Lecture on *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord*, which, while not touching directly on the Eucharist, deals with the kindred questions of priesthood and sacrifice, and especially with the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Bishop Westcott's great work on Hebrews entirely against the modern view.

In striking contrast to this work we have the great commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Bishop Westcott, the result, he tells us, of "many years of continuous labour;" a work by the greatest living authority on Biblical exegesis in England; a work exhibiting not only the most accurate scholarship and the most patient and impartial investigation, but

* *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, p. 229.

enormous reading. Almost every commentary, ancient and modern, seems to have been consulted; and, while the authority of the Fathers of the Church is not recognized as absolute, yet in all important questions it is placed before us and fairly weighed. The question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not discussed in this book, but the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews on which the modern view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice rests receives most thorough treatment and refutation.* This, in fact, would seem to be the necessary consequence of a study of the Fathers and of ancient commentaries; nor need we confine this remark to ancient commentaries, for most of the greater works on the Epistle to the Hebrews reach the same conclusions, the modern view being found not so much in treatises on the Epistle as in transient papers on theological controversies.

Of these various works we shall have more to say hereafter. They are introduced in this place only to show how inadequately the Eucharistic Sacrifice has been discussed in Anglican theology.

In the preface it has been stated that the purpose of this work is not to put forth a view, or to prove one already put forth, so much as to arrange materials gathered from divers sources and not easily accessible to those who have not a large theological library within reach; to collect authorities, examine and test arguments, and so to present to the reader in a compact form the evidence upon which the question must be decided.

At the outset it may be well to point out that for many reasons,—of which we shall briefly notice four,—the treatment of the subject presents unusual difficulty.

VI. The purpose of this work chiefly to present evidence not easily accessible.

Four difficulties in treating the subject.

* Westcott, *Heb.*, p. 230.

1. The equivocal use of the term "sacrifice."

First, the extreme looseness with which the term "sacrifice" is employed by theological and other writers. Sometimes it has an active sense, sometimes a passive, as when our LORD is said to offer the Sacrifice of Himself, and to be Himself the Sacrifice. Sometimes it is used of interior acts and dispositions of mind, as when we read in the Psalter: "The sacrifice of GOD is a troubled spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O GOD, shalt Thou not despise." At other times, it is referred to the external act or sign by which these feelings of devotion are manifested, as when we speak of the sacrifice of Isaac. Sometimes it is confined to the external act alone, as in the yearly Passover, which, as a commemoration of a past event, apparently did not necessarily demand any special disposition of heart other than that of obedience to the law. Sometimes the fruits of the earth are spoken of as sacrifices; sometimes the prayers of the people; sometimes the bread and wine placed upon the Altar at the Offertory in the Holy Eucharist.

From this it follows that before any progress can be made there must be such a careful examination of all the elements of sacrifice as may enable us to draw up a definition of the term which will really cover the whole ground. We have, on the one hand, to take into account the widest use of the word "sacrifice," and, on the other, to point out such limiting characteristics as shall distinguish between the word used in its strict and in its loose sense.

2. No adequate attempt to determine the nature of sacrifice till century XVI.

The next difficulty is that until the sixteenth century there was no adequate attempt to determine the *essential* characteristics of sacrifice, and that the endeavours then made were so biased by the theological prejudices of the different parties that the structures

built up were rendered unstable by the weakness of their foundations. Protestant writers confined themselves to what they called "spiritual sacrifices," by which they meant purely subjective acts, and Romanists were hampered by a definition which required them to find in the victim some change equivalent to destruction in order to constitute a proper sacrifice.

The third difficulty, which has already been touched upon, is the entire absence of any modern works in the Anglican Church which treat the subject of sacrifice scientifically or with any fulness. There are many Roman Catholic treatises, which, while they are all that can be desired in learning and scientific method, are rendered useless by the fact that they start with a wrong definition of sacrifice, and labour to prove as the essence of sacrifice a theory which cannot be traced back, in its full development, much beyond the seventeenth century.

The last difficulty which we shall notice is, that the subject branches out in so many directions and touches upon so many kindred topics that it is not easy to pursue any definite method which will enable us in moderate space adequately to present it in its entirety.

3. Entire absence of modern works on the subject in the English Church.

4. The many departments of theology on which the subject trenches.

CHAPTER II.

SACRIFICE.

Introductory :
Its origin and
meaning.

Religion dis-
tinguishes
man from
other
creatures.

Sacrifice the
universal char-
acteristic of
religion.

Its primæval
origin.

S. not neces-
sarily of Divine
institution.

IT has been well said that the characteristic which most perfectly distinguishes man from all other creatures is the knowledge of GOD, or, in other words, religion. For although we say that man differs from all other creatures in the gift of reason, yet we may perhaps trace some glimmer of this gift in instinct and memory in the higher animals; but the knowledge of GOD, the possession of religion, belongs, so far as we know, absolutely to man alone.

When in turn we take religion and examine its manifestations in the widely scattered human race, in nations separated from one another alike by time and distance, we find, on its objective side, that its most universal characteristic — one present in some form or other in every part of the human family — is sacrifice.

If we attempt to trace sacrifice back to its origin, revelation carries us to the gates of Paradise, and natural theology to the cradle of the human race. Expressed under different forms, often grotesque, sometimes terrible, but always testifying in the main to the same ideas, sacrifice is, and ever has been, practically coextensive with religion.

On this account some have held that sacrifice must have been originally of Divine institution, a survival of a primitive revelation from GOD to man. Others, on

the contrary, pointed out that in spite of this universality no inspired writer ever traces it to such an origin. They see in this an argument against it, and would rather ascribe it to an instinct implanted in human nature, as universal and as fundamental as the idea of GOD itself.

We may turn, perhaps, with more profit from the question of the origin of sacrifice to that of its meaning. And here, in the light of recent and exhaustive investigation, the answer seems to be that the meaning of sacrifice is LOVE.

An older theology generally answered the question differently, and saw in sacrifice the effort of man to express, on the one hand, his sense of sin, and therefore of alienation from GOD, and, on the other, his desire for reconciliation, pardon, and restoration to communion with GOD. In this view there is indisputable truth, and yet, when we come to examine the subject carefully, we find that sin, though a prominent factor in the concept of sacrifice, is not its root.

Sacrifices, in their simplest form, are gifts to GOD by which man strives to express certain feelings, desires, and ideas. And while in man's fallen state, in a sinful world, the presence of sin must necessarily enter into and colour his intercourse with GOD, yet a very little thought will show that sin is not the root idea of that which sacrifice strives to express. Before the Fall man's intercourse with GOD was the effect of that love which drew man to GOD with the knowledge that GOD loved him; and there was no obstacle to that perfect fellowship of love. Sacrifice before the Fall, therefore, would contain no propitiatory idea. As S. Augustine has so beautifully said, the heart of man was made for GOD, and is restless until it rests in Him, and while

Its meaning primarily the expression of Love.

Mediæval theology saw in S. a sense of sin, and a desire for reconciliation with GOD. This view true, but not the primary conception.

sin did much to destroy or distort what was fairest and best in human nature, it did not change the end for which man was made, the aim to which he must tend, the haven in which alone he can find happiness and rest,—GOD.

Love itself is essentially self-sacrificing.

Love, however, not only strives to express itself by gifts, which may be tokens of love, but is in itself essentially self-expending, self-sacrificing. In a sinless condition, such as that of man before the Fall or such as that of man in Heaven, this self-expenditure, this self-sacrifice involves no suffering, but is a source of ecstatic joy. In the sin-laden atmosphere of this world, however, pain and suffering are involved in almost every effort to express love, so that here below a sacrifice which costs us nothing is scarcely accounted a sacrifice.

While recognizing, therefore, the presence and potency of sin, we must not, in our examination of sacrifice, rest in what is but a secondary idea, superinduced by a factor not originally present in human nature, the terrible factor of sin, but we must seek its true meaning in that which is the very antithesis of sin, man's most godlike endowment, love.

We have thus far observed that religion is the characteristic which differentiates man from the rest of GOD's creatures, and that sacrifice is the most universal expression of religion. Let us now go on to consider the purpose of sacrifice, that is, what sacrifice is intended to express, and let us further examine to what extent, and under what authority, it does express man's religious feeling.

I. The purpose of Sacrifice.

I. We may notice that the relation in which man stands to GOD, as the First Principle and Final End of his being, demands, amongst other things, that he should recognize GOD's infinite excellence and His

absolute dominion over all things, especially over man himself, and therefore should profess his insignificance and absolute dependence on GOD.

In other words, the purpose of sacrifice is that of practical religion in general, to acknowledge GOD as the Beginning and End of man and of all things ; that is, to profess our entire dependence on Him, both for existence and for ultimate happiness.

This recognition first finds expression in inward acts, that is, in certain thoughts, religious emotions, and acts of the will. The very law of nature, however, requires that man should express these inward feelings by outward actions, since man consists not only of soul, but also of body, and must worship GOD with his whole being. Religion therefore demands outward acts expressive of inward feelings and beliefs.

This outward expression of religion is not required, as some have foolishly taught, because GOD needs sensible signs in order that He may know what is passing in our souls. There is no religion which does not teach that GOD knows the secrets of the heart, and has no need that any man should tell Him what is going on in his mind. But an outward expression of religious faith and feeling is necessary in man in order that he as man may worship GOD with his whole being, that is, with his body as well as with his soul. For though man's spiritual nature is the more exalted and important part of his being, it is not his whole being. Moreover, it is natural to man to manifest by external signs the inward thoughts and feelings of his soul, so that the very law of nature teaches him to express his religious faith and devotion by signs, which, while they are not necessary in order that GOD may know what is passing in the soul, are necessary in order

S. expresses man's true relation to GOD and dependence on Him.

This results first in inward acts or feelings, then finds expression in outward acts of worship, since man consists both of soul and body.

External worship not needed to reveal man's heart to GOD,

but to enable man to fulfil his duty,

and to confess GOD before his fellow-men.

that man may with his whole being worship GOD and profess his religious belief before his fellow-men.

Socially, as well as individually, man must worship GOD.

Then again, not only is man as an individual required to worship and serve GOD, but as a society he is bound to express the same recognition of his relation to GOD; for the relation of man as a society to GOD is precisely the same as the relation of man as an individual. Socially he is as dependent on GOD as he is individually, hence society is bound to show forth by fitting religious acts its recognition of its relationship to GOD. On this account, therefore, natural law demands public worship as it does private. But public worship is necessarily of an external character, since in no other manner can man as a society express his religious obligations.

II. The chief act of public worship is S. S. is the union of two things.

Its true side is inward.

II. When, however, we examine public worship, we find everywhere that its chief characteristic is, and ever has been, sacrifice. But what is sacrifice? It is clearly the union of two things, one of which is inward and the other outward. Its more important side, its true side, is the inward, the thoughts and feelings of devotion towards GOD, the motions in the soul of love, of penitence, of gratitude, of prayer, etc. This is the more important, the true side of sacrifice, because if it be wanting the mere outward act is clearly worthless, a body without a soul, and therefore dead. On the other hand, the interior feelings of devotion to GOD must be expressed by some outward action, in order that the sacrifice may be complete. A sacrifice, therefore, must be something more than an intention of the mind; it must be carried out in action, it must have an outward as well as an inward part, a body as well as a soul. For while the outward act of sacrifice without the inward devotion of the soul is dead and worthless, the

But this must be expressed by outward action.

The union of outward and

inward feeling without the outward action is incomplete, and therefore no proper sacrifice.

From this we may conclude with all theologians that the genus to which sacrifice belongs is the genus of "a sacred sign;" for, as S. Augustine says*: "A sacrifice is a visible sacrament, that is, a sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice." And this sign is not needed in order that GOD may know our feelings of devotion, but to enable us to give expression to them. In the same way, although GOD knows our needs, we are taught by Him to give utterance to them in prayer. S. Augustine treats of this point at some length.† In answer to certain objections to "the sacred ceremonies, the sacrificial victims, the burning of incense, and all other parts of worship in our temples," he says: "This question is obviously founded upon the passage in our Scriptures in which it is written that Cain brought to GOD a gift from the fruits of the earth, and Abel from the firstlings of the flock. Our reply, therefore, is, that the more proper inference to be drawn from this passage would be the great antiquity of the ordinance of sacrifice, which the infallible and sacred writings declare to be due to none other than the One and True GOD; not because GOD needs our offerings, seeing that in the sacred Scriptures He has most clearly written: 'O my soul, thou hast said unto the LORD, Thou art my GOD; my goods are nothing unto Thee'; but because, even in the acceptance or rejection or appropriation of these offerings, GOD considers the advantage of men, and of them alone. For in worshipping GOD we benefit ourselves, not Him. When, therefore, He gives an inspired revelation to teach us how

inward essential to a true and proper S.

1. The genus to which S. belongs is that of "a sacred sign." S. Augustine's definition.

His treatment of the rationale of external S.

* S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, l. x., c. 5.

† S. Aug., *Epist.*, cii., q. 3.

He is to be worshipped, He does this from no sense of need on His part, but only from a regard to our highest good. For all such sacrifices are significant, being symbols of certain things by which we ought to be roused to search for, or know, or recollect the thing which they symbolize."

S. Augustine,
"De Civ. Dei,"
l. x., c. 5.

Again we read* : " No one is so foolish as to think that those things which are offered in sacrifice are necessary for any purposes of GOD. For the whole reason why GOD must be rightly worshipped [that is, according to His law] is that man may be benefited, not GOD. For no man would say he bestowed a benefit on a fountain by drinking, or on the light by seeing. And the fact that the ancient Church offered animal sacrifices, which the people of GOD nowadays read about without imitating, proves nothing but this, that those sacrifices symbolized the things which we do for the purpose of drawing near to GOD and inducing our neighbour to do the same. A SACRIFICE, THEREFORE, IS A VISIBLE SACRAMENT, THAT IS, A SACRED SIGN OF AN INVISIBLE SACRIFICE. Hence that penitent in the Psalm, or, it may be, the Psalmist himself, entreating GOD to be merciful to his sins, says : ' Thou desirest no sacrifice, else would I give it Thee ; but Thou delightest not in burnt offerings. The sacrifice of GOD is a troubled spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O GOD, shalt Thou not despise.' Observe how, in the very words in which he is expressing GOD'S refusal of sacrifice, he shows that GOD desires sacrifice. He does not desire the sacrifice of a slaughtered beast ; He desires the sacrifice of a contrite heart. Thus that sacrifice which he says GOD does not wish, is the symbol of the sacrifice

* S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, l. x., c. 5.

which GOD does wish. GOD does not wish sacrifices in the sense in which foolish people think He wishes them, namely, to gratify His own pleasure ; for if He had not desired that the sacrifices He requires (as, for example, a heart contrite and humbled by penitent sorrow) should be symbolized by those sacrifices which He was supposed to wish for because pleasant to Himself, the Old Law would never have enjoined their presentation. And they were destined to be merged when the fit opportunity arrived, in order that man might not suppose that the sacrifices themselves, rather than the things symbolized by them, were pleasing to GOD or acceptable in us."

Here S. Augustine clearly teaches that the character of a sacred sign so pertains to the essence of sacrifice that sacrifice cannot by any means be separated from it ; that is, indeed, that sacrifice is itself contained in the "genus" of a sacred sign.

S. Thomas treats of sacrifice in the *Secunda Secundæ*, q. 85, a. 1 and 2. In the latter Article, while showing that it must be offered to GOD only, he uses this argument : "The offering of sacrifice is made for the purpose of signifying something. But sacrifice which is offered outwardly signifies an inward spiritual sacrifice, by which the soul offers itself to GOD, according to the words of the Psalmist, 'The sacrifice of GOD is a troubled spirit.' For, as has been before remarked, the exterior acts of religion are ordered with respect to the interior acts. But the soul offers itself to GOD in sacrifice as to Him Who is the Principle of its creation and the End of its happiness. Now, according to a true faith, GOD alone is the Creator of our souls, so that He is the Principle of our being, and in Him only the beatitude of our souls consists, as has been said before.

S. Thomas' treatment of S.:
2a, 2æ, q. 85,
a. 1 and 2.

Therefore, as we ought to offer spiritual sacrifice to the Most High GOD alone, so ought we to offer outward sacrifices to Him alone. . . . For we see that this is observed in every government, that the supreme ruler is honoured by some peculiar sign, which, if it were offered to anyone else, would be the crime of treason." S. Thomas, therefore, considers it a question about which there can be no doubt that sacrifice is contained in the "genus" of a sacred sign.

2. S. derives its essential character from its institution.

Again, we may observe that sacrifice, regarded as a sacred sign, obtains its essential character, that is, its power of signifying, from its institution. For, materially considered, as an action, it has not in itself that signification which constitutes it a sacrifice, but only an aptitude for assuming that signification. Indeed, when we examine the actual signification of sacrifice, that is, the force and power of signifying, we find that this is not anything intrinsically in the sacrifice, but is an extrinsic designation derived entirely from its institution, so that it is quite possible for us to conceive that the same signification could be conveyed by an entirely different sign, provided that this signification was attached to it by proper authority in its institution.

This institution to be authoritative must be public.

This brings us to the further question, What kind of authority is required in the institution of a sacrifice in order that the signification may be established in it? The natural aptitude of the gift to be the subject-matter of an act of worship receives its final form when, by authorized institution, certain sacrifices are set apart to express certain acts of worship. For public worship necessarily postulates public institution by lawful authority. This alone can determine the signification of the individual acts of the whole community,

and impart to the whole system the uniformity required by society considered as a unit.

In the supernatural order the lawful authority is GOD, and in revealed religion He alone determines what sacrifices He accepts, for what purpose He accepts them, and by whom they are to be offered. Holy Scripture is most explicit in this matter; nothing essential is left to the arbitrary decision of man. GOD reveals the matter, the form, and the minister of the sacrifices by which He commands men to worship Him, as well in the Old Testament Dispensation as in the Christian Church.

In revealed religion this authority is GOD alone.

The external form of sacrifice seems to demand some appropriate action done to the victim, or gift, by a lawful minister by which the gift is consecrated or handed over to GOD; and this is the essentially sacrificial action. This indeed is implied in the very word "sacrifice" (*sacrum facere*), to make a thing sacred, to consecrate it by some action of an appropriate minister, whether he be priest or layman. Such action of old was generally accomplished by the outpouring or sprinkling of the blood, or the libation of the drink-offering, or the consumption of the gift by burning. This, however, as we shall see later, did not necessarily imply that its destruction was essential to the idea of sacrifice, but was rather a means of handing it over to GOD and thus making it sacred.

3. The external form demands some appropriate sacrificial action.

III. We may sum up what has been said thus far in the following propositions, practically drawn from Dr. Paul Schanz's celebrated work, *Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sacramenten**:

III. Schanz's propositions in regard to S.

The idea which underlies the various sacrificial rites of the ancient world, whether Jewish or Pagan, seems

A twofold idea underlies S.:

* Quoted by Wilhelm and Scannell, pp. 450 sqq.

an outward expression of religion, and a type of the future.

Offering is the fundamental notion of S.

Through acceptance of S., GOD admits to communion with Him. Its essential character not destruction, but consecration.

The killing only preparatory to the S.

to be twofold. On the one hand, sacrifices are the symbols of certain feelings, desires, and ideas ; on the other, they are types of the future. The first we gather from the rites themselves ; the second from their fulfilment in the Christian Dispensation. The notion of offering (*oblatio*, *προσφορά*) may be taken as the fundamental notion of all sacrifices. Man gives to the Divinity part of his property, in order either to express his veneration and gratitude, or to secure the Divine favour, taking it for granted that GOD is pleased with such gift and with the dispositions of the giver. The Divine pleasure is supposed to be increased by the fact that the gift implies submission, adoration, and veneration on the part of the giver. The burning or outpouring of the gifts hands them over to GOD, and through their acceptance GOD admits the giver to communion with Him ; for the essential character of the sacrificial gift is not its destruction, but its handing over and consecration to GOD. The outpouring of the libations and the killing of the animals are but the means for handing over the gift to GOD and bringing the giver into communion with Him. The killing necessarily precedes the burning, but the killing is not the sacrifice. "The victim is killed in order to be offered" (S. Gregory, in Ezek., i., 2, *Hom.*, x., 19). In other words, the killing is preparatory to the sacrifice. The privation suffered by the giver in parting with his property, and the dispositions with which that privation is endured, may have a great moral effect on the giver, but they are not essential, since many sacrifices involve no appreciable privation,—the Sacrifice of the Mass probably none at all.

We may here remark that an examination of the sacrificial terms used in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew

quite bears out this view that destruction is not the essential element in sacrifice,* inasmuch as *σφάξειν* is the only Greek sacrificial word which contains the notion of slaughter, and of Latin terms not one in its original signification suggests this idea ; while in the Old Testament Hebrew, *Zebach* (זָבַח) alone of the seven terms used for sacrifice signifies “ the slaughtering of animals.”

Greek, Latin, and Hebrew terms show that destruction is not the essential idea.

In the Hebrew sacrifices, the two sacrificial actions seem to have been the outpouring of the blood and the burning of the offering. The greatest importance attaches to the blood of the victim, which is gathered and poured out at the Altar ; for, according to ancient ideas, the life, or the soul, is in the blood : “ For the life of the flesh is in the blood : and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make an atonement for your souls ; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” † When, therefore, the blood is offered, the highest that man can give—that is, a soul or a life—is handed over to GOD. This may be seen in that, while the pouring out of the blood is the especial function of the Priest, the killing may be performed by a layman.

With the Hebrews the two sacrificial acts, effusion of blood, and cremation.

In the sprinkling of the blood there is more than an act of propitiation, and in the cremation of the offering there is more than an act of supreme worship (*latria*). Both may well express, in the first place, the oblation of self to GOD, and the communion of self with GOD.

The sanctifying power of fire is as well known as the rôle it plays in heathen mythologies. GOD Himself

* As the discussion in this place of these various sacrificial terms would occupy several pages, and therefore would somewhat interrupt the course of our argument, the reader is referred, for a fuller treatment of them, to Appendix A.

† Lev. xvii. 11.

was the Fire : " Our GOD is a consuming Fire " (Heb. xii. 29); or the fire was a power sent from heaven, and frequently the heavenly fire is said to have consumed the victim.

Philo's explanation of the effusion.

Philo Judæus* explains the shedding of the blood as an oblation of the soul. Our LORD Himself says that He will give His soul (*ψυχήν*) for our redemption (S. Matt. xx. 28). The independent unbloody sacrifices can only be explained from the same point of view, namely, that they express oblation of self to, and communion with, GOD. In the most ancient sacrifices of incense and of oil, the sweet odour generated by the burning is the chief object in view. The Fathers † remark that burnt bones and flesh produce no sweet odour, and, consequently, that the pleasure GOD finds in the sacrifices must lie in the pious dispositions of those who offer.

In burning incense and oil, the object is the sweet odour, not the destruction.

The meal a symbol of communion.

Again, the sacrificial meal is an element to be considered in the interpretation of sacrifices, but taken by itself it affords no explanation for the outpouring of the blood, which is not food, nor of the incense offered. The eating of the victim accepted by GOD is simply the symbol of the communion with GOD intended by those who offer the sacrifice. This making perfect (*τελείωσις*, Heb. ix. 9, x. 1, 14) is the end and final object of all sacrifices. S. Irenæus ‡ says : " Sacrifices do not sanctify man, for GOD is not in want of sacrifices; but it is the conscience of him who offers that sanctifies the sacrifice, for when it is pure it causes GOD to accept the sacrifice as from a friend."

S. Irenæus.

Sacrifice in general, therefore, is defined by Schanz

* Philo J., 839 B. in the Paris edition of 1640.

† Theodoret, in Exod. q. 62.

‡ S. Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, l. iv., c. xviii., 3.

as "the presentation to GOD of a visible gift at the hands of a legitimate minister, through its transformation, for the purpose of recognizing the Divine Majesty, and as a means of propitiation and of union with GOD." *

Schanz's definition of S.

IV. Here we may well go on to consider some of the definitions of sacrifice in general, which have been put forth at different times by the Fathers and the theologians of the Church.

IV. Various definitions of S.

We begin with the famous quasi-definition of S. Augustine: "Every good deed, therefore, which is performed to unite us with GOD in holy fellowship, that is, having regard to that final good in which we are able to be perfectly happy, is a true sacrifice." †

I. S. Augustine's famous definition.

We must examine this definition with the greatest care, not only on account of the authority of the author, but because it is relied upon by a certain school of theologians in our own time as the chief support of a modern view of sacrifice which lays so much stress upon the inward dispositions of the offerer as practically to ignore the outward sign of the sacrificial action.

Now, what exactly is S. Augustine defining? Certainly not "sacrifice," since "sacrifice" is the predicate, and not the subject of his definition. In the chapter of the *De Civitate Dei* which immediately precedes this definition, S. Augustine has been pointing

Of a true S., not of S. in general.

* Schanz, *Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sacramenten der Katholischen Kirche*, p. 479.

† "*Proinde verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhæreamus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni quo veraciter beati esse possimus*" (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. x., cap. vi.). It is strange how many translate *sacrificium* as though it were the subject instead of the predicate; e. g., the translation of S. Augustine in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, and the Bishop of Brechin's *Primary Charge*, p. 48.

out that the important part of sacrifice is the inward part, that is, the dispositions of the offerer, so that GOD calls "a broken and contrite heart" a sacrifice. This chapter, which we have already given,* ends with the statement that in a certain sense mercy is a sacrifice, for GOD says, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." † The next chapter begins with the words of our definition, "*Proinde verum sacrificium.*" S. Augustine affirms that every good deed, therefore (and we must carefully notice the "therefore," which connects the statement with the argument of the last chapter), is a true sacrifice. He does not, however, imply that the terms "every good deed" and "sacrifice" are coextensive. If we may use a homely illustration, it would be as correct to say that in the proposition "Every man is an animal," we were defining the genus "animal," and that in putting into it the species "man," we were asserting that the two were coextensive, as to say that in this passage S. Augustine is defining sacrifice. He merely states that every good deed which is done to unite us with GOD in holy fellowship, etc., is a true sacrifice, that is, has those characteristics which entitle it to be considered not "a sacrifice," but "a true sacrifice."

At first sight "a true sacrifice" may seem an expression of wider significance than "sacrifice" without the qualifying attribute "true," but even a superficial examination shows us that this is not so, since the adjective "true," in distinguishing the word which it qualifies, really limits it and imparts to it a different meaning. S. Augustine is evidently only contrasting a true sacrifice with what is not a true sacrifice.

Now, we have already pointed out that sacrifice "is clearly the union of two things, one of which is inward,

The union of
two parts in S.

* Page 28.

† S. Matt. ix. 13.

and the other outward. Its most important side, its *true* side, is the inward, the thoughts and feelings of devotion towards GOD, the motions in the soul of love, of penitence, of gratitude, of prayer, etc. This is the most important, the true side of sacrifice, because if it be wanting the outward act is clearly worthless, a body without a soul, and therefore dead." It is through these interior acts that we are united to GOD, and so tend toward GOD as our supreme End, our highest Good, our truest Happiness. But the interior feelings of devotion to GOD must be expressed by some outward action, in order that the sacrifice may be complete ; in order, that is, that it may be not only a true sacrifice, but a sacrifice properly so called.

This is what theologians mean by the phrase *verum ac proprium sacrificium*. We can illustrate this best, perhaps, from our LORD'S own words, "I am the true Vine."* What do we understand by this? That the living union between our LORD and His Disciples was in such strict analogy to that interior relation which exists between a vine and its branches that He could speak of Himself as "the true Vine." But no one for a moment supposes that by this He meant to describe Himself as actually a vine, that is, as possessing the outward characteristics of a vine. The metaphor must be strictly confined to the interior relationship which exists between a vine and its branches, not to its outward form. So S. Augustine's *verum sacrificium* must be strictly confined to the inward side of sacrifice, without which the sacrifice would not be true or of any value.

This is at once evident by a reference to the context. In the passage † which precedes this and with which

* S. John xv. 1.

† Cap. v., which we have quoted in full on pp. 29-31.

"Verum ac proprium sacrificium." Use of "true" illustrated from S. John xv. 1.

it is connected by the conjunction "*proinde*," S. Augustine is treating of "the sacrifices which GOD does not require, but wishes to be observed for the exhibition of those things which He does require." That is to say, he is contrasting the outward acts of sacrifice, without any right dispositions of heart, with those dispositions of heart which express themselves by outward acts. He begins, indeed, by defining sacrifice, in its general sense, as "a visible sacrament, that is, the sacred sign, of an invisible sacrifice."* Here he clearly recognizes both the outward and the inward part in sacrifice, and, without any qualifying term, defines sacrifice. In the next chapter he goes on to treat of the inward part alone, and begins with the words of our definition: "A true sacrifice therefore [that is, an inward sacrifice] is any work," etc.

S. Augustine's definition of S. in general.

Thus we see that it would be most unfair to take S. Augustine's definition of a "true" sacrifice, that is, of one particular kind of sacrifice, apart from his definition of sacrifice in general. And, while no words can be too strong to insist upon the importance of right dispositions of heart in order that the sacrifice may be of any avail, either to the honour of GOD or to the sanctification of the offerer, yet right dispositions of heart alone are most certainly not a sacrifice properly so called, for S. Augustine says that "a sacrifice is a *visible* sacrament, that is, the sacred sign, of an invisible sacrifice." It is not alone the martyr's willingness to die that constitutes martyrdom, but this will carried into action. So, it is not alone feelings of devotion to GOD that constitute sacrifice properly so called, although they are in themselves a true sacrifice; but it is this devotion

The sacrificial act illustrated from martyrdom.

* "*Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum, est.*"—*De Civ. Dei*, l. x., c. 5.

expressed by a sacred sign divinely instituted for the purpose of honouring GOD and benefiting the offerer.

We have dwelt at great length upon S. Augustine's definition because it is so important and has been so often misapplied.

Alexander of Hales, following S. Augustine, defines sacrifice thus : " Sacrifice is an oblation which in the offering becomes sacred and sanctifies the offerer." * 2. Definition of Alexander of Hales,

S. Thomas has several definitions, or quasi-definitions ; e. g. : " In the oblations and sacrifices man offered to GOD things of his own, to acknowledge that he held them from GOD." † " Properly speaking, a sacrifice is something done to give GOD the honour due to Him and to appease Him " ‡—" in order perfectly to unite the spirit of man with GOD." § " The term ' sacrifice ' signifies that man makes something sacred." " Sacrifices are properly so called when something is done to things offered to GOD, as when [by the Jews] animals were slain and burned, and [now] bread is broken and eaten and blessed. And this the word itself signifies, for sacrifice is so named from the fact that man makes something sacred." ¶ 3. of S. Thomas,

* " *Sacrificium est oblatio quæ sacra fit offerendo et sanctificat offerentem.*"

† " *In oblationibus et sacrificiis . . . homo ex rebus suis, quasi in recognitionem quod haberet ea a Deo, in honorem Dei ea offerebat*" (1a 2æ, q. cii., a. 3).

‡ " *Sacrificium proprie dicitur aliquid factum in honorem proprie Deo debitum, ad eum placandum*" (3 q. xlviii., a. 3).

§ " *quod spiritus hominis perfecte Deo uniatur*" (3 q. xxii., a. 2).

¶ " *Sacrificia proprie dicuntur quando circa res Deo oblatas aliquid fit ; sicut quod animalia occidebantur et comburebantur, quod panis frangitur et comeditur et benedicitur. Et hoc ipsum nomen sonat, nam sacrificium dicitur, ex hoc quod homo facit aliquid sacrum*" (2a 2æ, q. lxxxv., a. 3, ad. 3).

4. of S. Isidore
of Seville,

Although S. Thomas here repeats the etymology of "*sacrificium*" given by S. Isidore of Seville* in his definition of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, yet he introduces a new idea, although rather in an "*obiter dictum*" than a definition; for he practically confines the "something which is done to things offered to GOD" to a destruction, or physical modification, of the offering, when he adds, "as when animals were slain and burned, and now bread is broken and eaten and blessed." While his own treatment of the Sacrifice of the Mass is most brief, yet in these few words defining sacrifice in general, he started a theory which has led to many controversies, especially since the sixteenth century, concerning the manner in which this destruction or physical modification of the victim is to be found in the Holy Eucharist, and how the Eucharist may be brought under the definition of sacrifice in general, that is, under the genus sacrifice.

5. of Vasquez,

Vasquez narrows the notion of sacrifice by describing the "*confectio rei*" as "*destructio*," the "*immutatio*" as "*demutatio*," "a change for the worse," and the "*dominium Dei*" as the Divine dominion over life and death. This idea of the destruction, started by S. Thomas, revived and emphasized by Vasquez, is developed by De Lugo, whose most distinguished pupil in our own day, Cardinal Franzelin, makes the notion of sacrifice to include the following elements: "Sacrifice is an offering made to GOD by the destruction, or quasi-destruction, of some sensible object, such offering having been instituted by public authority, to acknowledge GOD's supreme dominion over all things and man's

* "*Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis*" (S. Isid., Sev., *Etymolog.*, l. vi., cap. xix., n. 38).

absolute dependence on GOD for life and everything ; after the Fall it also expresses a sense of sin, for which Divine justice must be satisfied." * This, however, we shall notice more fully in the following chapter.

Vasquez, in his 220th Disputation, "On the Essence and Nature of Sacrifice in General," discusses the different opinions and definitions of sacrifice given in his own day. He shows that Gabriel Biel and Alphonsus de Castro adopt S. Augustine's definition verbatim. He points out, however, as we have already noticed, that S. Augustine's definition, introduced as it is by the conjunction "*proinde*," is the conclusion of a previous chapter, in which, after defining sacrifice in general, he contrasts the *verum sacrificium*, the broken and contrite heart, with the outward sign of slaughtered beasts unaccompanied by right dispositions on the offerer's part. He reminds us also that S. Augustine ends this chapter by saying that *mercy* is a true sacrifice, which he justifies from Hosea vi. 6: "I desired mercy, and not sacrifice." After this S. Augustine introduces his definition of *verum sacrificium* by the conjunction "*proinde*."

6. of Biel and de Castro.

Vasquez, in his first chapter on sacrifice in general, goes on to discuss different definitions by heretics. In the next chapter he treats of definitions given by Catholic theologians of his own day, and then, in the third chapter, presents his own views on the subject. The whole treatment is most interesting, especially from the historical standpoint, but far too diffuse to be quoted here.

Finally, he defines sacrifice partly by its form or signification, partly by its matter. The first part of the definition, which has regard to the form of sacrifice, is

Vasquez's final definition.

* Franzelin, *De Euch. Sac.*, Thes. ii.

as follows : " Sacrifice is a mark existing in a thing by which we acknowledge GOD to be the Author of life and death." * To this he adds that by the " mark existing in the thing " we are to understand a sign which is in the thing itself, and not merely in the words ; " because," he says, " the Divine Omnipotence as seen in the power of preserving or destroying all things, is rightly signified *in the change of the thing that is offered*, and without that change, it cannot be fitly represented."

The second part of the definition, which treats of the matter of sacrifice, he expresses thus : " A thing which by a change in itself is offered to GOD, or the change of a thing which is offered to GOD, is a sacrifice." † This definition treats of the material sacrifice, or thing offered, as the former does of the action of sacrificing. In the introduction of the idea of a change in the thing offered, effected by the act of sacrifice, Vasquez, as we have already said, started anew the fruitless controversy about destruction as a necessary characteristic of sacrifice in general.

His contemporary, Suarez, introduces the term "*conficere rem*," and points out that since sacrifice is a sensible action for the purpose of recognizing the sovereign excellence of GOD, this purpose is accomplished as well by a productive as by a destructive act ; that a change for the better in the victim fulfils this condition as adequately as a change for the worse.

Suarez, like Vasquez, gives a twofold definition of sacrifice, partly physical, partly metaphysical.‡ The

7. Suarez's definition.

* "*Sacrificium est nota existens in re: qua profitemur Deum auctorem vitæ et mortis.*"

† "*Sacrificium est res quæ per sui immutationem Deo offertur, seu immutatio rei quæ Deo offertur.*"

‡ Suarez, *Disput*, lxxii., § vi., 3. Tom. xxi., p. 617.

first part is : " Sacrifice is an offering made to GOD by the change of anything for the purpose of testifying, in a manner lawfully instituted, to GOD'S Majesty and our reverence for Him." The other definition is longer, and is as follows : " Sacrifice is a sensible sign instituted for the purpose of immediately signifying the Divine excellence and the worship due to it, through the immutation of something ; or, in other words, it is an external act of religion containing the supreme worship of ' *latria*, ' due to GOD alone." To this Suarez adds that, in order that the definition may be adequate, we must understand by " an external act " an action distinct from the mere utterance of words, or from such praise and worship as may be expressed by words.

To bring our list down to our own day, we shall close it with the definition of Tanner, adopted by Scheeben : " Sacrifice is an oblation of a corporeal thing, in which oblation this thing, by means of a transformation, is made and consecrated in recognition of the Divine Majesty, and of the subordination of the creature to GOD, its First Principle and Last End."

V. Since the whole doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice must necessarily be founded upon a clear and accurate conception of what is meant by " sacrifice," it will be well, even at the risk of repetition, to close this chapter with a brief recapitulation of those elements which go to make up the idea of sacrifice in revealed religion, and which must be present in every offering in order that it may be a true and proper sacrifice.

Sacrifice has distinctly two parts, an outward and an inward. While the latter may be the more important, and may, indeed, be called the true sacrifice, inasmuch as without it there can be no true sacrifice,—

8. Scheeben's definition.

V. Recapitulation of the elements in S.

I. Two parts, an outward and an inward.

yet this inward part, or act alone, is not a sacrifice properly so called.

2. The sacrificial action, on which the S. depends.

The sacrificial action, which alone can constitute a sacrifice in the proper sense of the term, belongs strictly to the outward part. While it ought to signify or express the inward part, yet it gains its character, not from this, but from the authority by which it was instituted. Hence, where the inward part is wanting, as, for instance, when the offerer approaches without right dispositions, there is a proper sacrifice, but not a true sacrifice. To constitute a true and proper sacrifice both parts must be combined.

3. This must be performed by a priest.

This sacrificial action is something done to the offering by a priest, by which the offering is consecrated, and the sacrifice effected.

CHAPTER III.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS.

FOR the Christian there is but one absolute Sacrifice,—that which our LORD and Saviour JESUS CHRIST offered upon the Cross on Calvary, and by which the world was redeemed. All other sacrifices are relative to the Sacrifice of the Cross. To it point the sacrifices of the Jewish Law, and even those of the heathen world ; and from it the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist gains its value.

In the last chapter we examined the essential elements in the general notion of sacrifice. We must now apply these to a consideration of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and see how far they are fulfilled in it.

It is not necessary here to investigate any of the *theories* of the Atonement, or even to inquire in what *manner* the world was redeemed by our LORD'S Sacrifice. We must, however, most carefully examine our LORD'S Offering of Himself for our redemption, in order that we may not only be assured that it fulfils all the conditions of a sacrifice, but that we may clearly understand in what way these conditions are fulfilled.

I. First, we may observe that the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, distinctly speak of our LORD'S Death as a Sacrifice; that is, they apply to it sacrificial terms. A consideration of all the passages bearing upon this part of the subject is quite

Introductory :
The S. of the Cross the only absolute S.
All others are relative, in that they gain their efficacy from it.

Investigate how the S. of the Cross fulfils the general definition of S.

Not necessary here to examine any of the theories of the Atonement.

I. Holy Scripture describes our LORD'S Death as a S. by applying to it sacrificial terms.

unnecessary. It will be sufficient to quote a few of the most important.

In Isa. liii.

“ He was abused, while He willingly suffered, and opened not His mouth, like the lamb that is led to the slaughter.” * In this passage the word “ *niggas* ” (נִגַּס) is by many considered a sacrificial word and equivalent to “ He is sacrificed,” the manner of the sacrifice being indicated in the next clause, “ like the lamb that is led to the slaughter.”

the word “ *niggas* ” in v. 7 is a sacrificial term,

Without, however, pressing this, since it has been differently rendered by some scholars, we find in the tenth verse : “ And it pleased the LORD (JEHOVAH) to bruise Him ; He laid sickness on Him ; if His soul were to make a guilt offering, He should see posterity.” † The word “ *asham* ” (אָשָׁם), “ trespass-offering,” is clearly sacrificial, and denotes that the Death of CHRIST, here prophesied, was a propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of man.

and the word “ *asham* ” in v. 10.

S. Augustine, S. Ambrose, and others refer to this S. Paul’s statement, “ He hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin ; ” ‡ and, “ CHRIST also . . . gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to GOD, for an odour of a sweet smell.” § In this place not only the phrase “ gave Himself up for us ” (παρέδωκεν), but the terms προσφοράν καὶ θυσίαν are clearly sacrificial, showing that the Death of CHRIST was not only an Offering, but a Sacrifice, and a Sacrifice “ of a sweet smell.”

The “ oblation and sacrifice ” of 2 Cor. v. 21 and Eph. v. 2 are also sacrificial.

So 1 Cor. v. 7.

Again : “ For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even CHRIST ; ” || where it is distinctly said that CHRIST has been sacrificed, and it is implied that in this He, as the Lamb of GOD, fulfilled the typical sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb.

* Isa. liii. 7. † Isa. liii. 10. ‡ 2 Cor. v. 21. § Eph. v. 2. || 1 Cor. v. 7.

And again : " CHRIST JESUS, Whom GOD set forth to be a propitiation through faith by His Blood ; " * and, " We have an Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the Righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins ; " † and again : " Herein is love, not that we loved GOD, but that He loved us, and sent His SON to be the propitiation for our sins. " ‡

Rom. iii, 25,

1 S. John ii. 1, 2,

and 1 S. John
iv. 10.

There are many more passages ; it is not necessary, however, to quote them. These are sufficient to show that the Death of CHRIST is distinctly spoken of in Holy Scripture as a Sacrifice and as a Propitiation.

II. In our LORD'S Sacrifice we may notice five distinct acts, accurately corresponding with the five stages in sacrifice which are clearly set forth in the different sacrifices under the Jewish Law.

II. Five actions in the S. of the Cross, corresponding with those of the Jewish Law :
1. The dedication of the victim.

1. There was the dedication of the victim by the offerer. " If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish : he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD. " §

The dedication of the offering in our LORD'S case has been variously seen in the institution of the Holy Eucharist ; in the great High Priestly Prayer in the seventeenth chapter of S. John, where our LORD says, " For their sakes I consecrate Myself ; " || and in the Garden of Gethsemane : " O My FATHER, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me : nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt. " ¶

2. The identification of the victim with the offerer. " He shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering ; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. " **

2. The identification of the victim with the offerer.

* Rom. iii. 25. † 1 S. John ii. 1, 2. ‡ 1 S. John iv. 10.

§ Lev. i. 3. || Verse 19. ¶ S. Matt. xxvi. 39. ** Lev. i. 4.

Our LORD not a mere substitute for man, but the Representative of man.

While, as we have said, it is not our purpose to enter upon the various questions which arise in connection with our LORD'S Atonement, we may observe here, that, whereas the victim under the Law was a mere symbolical substitute for the offerer, our Blessed LORD was in the truest sense the Representative of the human race. The Jewish victims were irrational creatures, distinct from the person of the offerer; in CHRIST, on the contrary, the Gift offered up is included in the Person of the offering Priest. It is His living human Flesh, animated by His rational Soul, and therefore, in the language of Scripture, a spiritual (*πνευματική*) and rational (*λογική*) Offering. Hence, the sacrificial Victim offered by CHRIST is not a merely symbolical, but a real and equivalent Substitute for mankind, on whose behalf It is sacrificed. Again, It is a Victim of immaculate holiness: "The Precious Blood of CHRIST, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."* †

3. The interior act: the offering in will of a life of perfect obedience.

3. As S. Augustine points out from Holy Scripture, a true sacrifice must be associated with certain interior acts, with which it is offered. Our LORD'S Offering upon the Cross was the consummation and expression of a life of perfect obedience to the Will of GOD, and therefore the dispositions which accompanied that Sacrifice began at the first moment of the Incarnation, and only culminated in the supreme moment of the Sacrifice on the Cross. There our LORD offered in will His whole life, all His acts, all the devotion of a sinless and perfect life.

4. The shedding and presentation of the blood.

4. The effusion of the blood. In the Jewish sacrifices, while the slaughtering of the victim was a part, the presentation of the blood was the essential act of

* 1 S. Pet. i. 19.

† Wilhelm and Scannell, p. 202.

the sacrifice. Some have thought that the slaughter of the victim was merely for the purpose of obtaining the blood which was to be offered. Others, with deeper appreciation of the mystery, see in the act of death a recognition of the penal consequences of sin, and a special character, therefore, given to the blood,—that as the life was in it, and the life was offered, it was a life which had passed through death, a life which had paid the debt due to sin.

The significance of the victim's death,

The blood, by the Levitical Law, was sprinkled seven times before the veil of the Sanctuary,* the veil, that is, which separated the Holy place from the Holy of holies, and which signified “that the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest,” † free access to GOD being barred by man's sin, for within the Holy of holies was the Mercy Seat, symbolical of GOD's Presence. Into the Holy of holies, and therefore into the Presence of GOD, the high priest alone, the representative of the people, entered once a year. The fact that, although the blood of each victim was sprinkled towards the veil, it still remained unmoved, signified that the blood of the legal victim was not able to take away that effect of sin typified by the veil, namely, separation from GOD.

and of the sprinkling of the blood in the Levitical Law.

The priest then put some of the blood upon the horns of the Altar of Sweet Incense, which was in the Holy place in the Tabernacle of the Congregation, after which he poured all the blood of the victim at the bottom of the Altar of Burnt Offering, which was at the entrance of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. This symbolic act seems to mean that the blood had been offered, and had failed to remove the obstacle which barred free access to GOD. Some of the blood was then put upon

* Lev. iv. 5-7.

† Heb. ix. 8.

the horns of the Altar, to plead for the individual offerer, and the rest was poured at the bottom of the altar, in token that it was powerless to take away this effect of sin.

On the Cross both the slaying of the Victim and the sprinkling of the Blood find place.

In our Blessed LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross we have clearly brought before us both the slaughtering of the Victim and the presentation of the Blood. As all the blood of the victim was used in the sacrifice, so our LORD there shed all His Precious Blood for us. But what the blood of the legal victim could never effect was at once accomplished by the Precious Blood of CHRIST; for (unlike the sprinkling of the blood before the veil of the tabernacle), the effect of the shedding of our LORD'S Blood was seen in the rending of the veil of the Temple, thus showing that the Sacrifice was efficacious, accepted by GOD for the pardon of man's sin, and that the way of access to GOD was opened.

The significance of the rending of the veil of the Temple.

There seems to be no other possible explanation of the rending of the veil of the Temple. That veil had always stood as the symbol of separation from GOD. Once a year the high priest, the representative of the people, entered within it, to signify that the day should come when the true Representative of humanity would enter for ever into the Presence of GOD, through His own Blood, and so become THE WAY* by which man might freely approach GOD. When, therefore, our LORD, "by His one Oblation of Himself once offered," made upon the Cross "a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," we are explicitly told by all three of the Synoptists that "the veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom." †

* S. John x. 9, xiv. 6.

† S. Matt. xxvii. 51; S. Mark xv. 38; S. Luke xxiii. 45.

5. There is but one ceremony of the sacrificial rite still to be noticed,—the cremation of the victim, which, in the case of the burnt-offering, was wholly consumed upon the altar, while in that of the sin-offering, only certain parts of it were burned. This action expressed the idea of the sacrifice ascending as a sweet savour before GOD. The fire which consumed the sacrifice originally descended from heaven upon the altar of the first Tabernacle, and afterwards upon the altar of Solomon's Temple, as we are expressly told.* There is, too, a similar tradition in regard to the sacrificial fire in the second Temple.

5. The cremation of the victim.

The descent of the fire from heaven was a sign of GOD's acceptance of the offering; a symbol of the God-head, especially of the HOLY GHOST; and also a token of love: e. g., "The LORD thy GOD is a consuming Fire;" † the Burning Bush; ‡ "I am come to send fire on the earth;" § the HOLY GHOST at Pentecost.||

The significance of fire.

In two ways we may trace the fulfilment of this ceremony in our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross. First, it was the great act of love of GOD for man. As S. Paul says, "CHRIST also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a *sweet smelling savour*;" ¶ in which text, as we have already seen, the terms are distinctly sacrificial, and the words "a sweet smelling savour" evidently refer to the burnt-offering of the Jews. On the Altar of the Cross, therefore, the Victim was consumed in the flames of Divine Love. "GOD so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten SON."**

This is fulfilled on the Cross in two ways:
i. As the great act of love by which the world was redeemed.

* Lev. ix. 24; 2 Chron, vii, 1,

† Deut. iv. 24.

‡ Ex. iii. 2.

§ S. Luke xii. 49.

|| Acts ii. 3.

¶ Eph. v. 2.

** S. John iii. 16.

CHRIST so loved us that He "gave Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a sweet smelling savour."

ii. As offered "through the Eternal Spirit," the action of His Godhead in the Sacrifice.

Secondly, it was THE action in which our LORD'S Godhead had part; for while our LORD in His Human Nature was both Priest and Victim, yet His Divine Personality had its part in the offering of this Sacrifice, since we are told of CHRIST that He "through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to GOD." * Here "the Eternal Spirit" is not to be taken for the HOLY GHOST, the Third Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, but "as the seat of His Divine Personality in His Human Nature;" † "His Godhead, which from before time acquiesced in and wrought with the redemptive purpose of the FATHER." ‡

Socinus' view of this passage.

It is impossible, with Socinus, to refer the moment of this offering to our LORD'S entry into Heaven, since, as Delitzsch and others have rightly pointed out, the ritual word ἄμωμον here shows that the Offering on the Cross, which corresponds to the slaying, and offering of the victim on the altar, is intended.

Thus every rite of the Old Testament is fulfilled upon the Cross.

We have now shown that every ceremony of the Old Testament sacrifice finds its counterpart in our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross; that is, He adequately fulfils all the conditions prescribed in the typical sacrifices of the Levitical Law.

III. Our LORD was Priest and Victim in His Human Nature alone.

III. In treating of our LORD'S Sacrifice upon the Cross, we ought, perhaps, to touch upon the fact (about which, however, there is no controversy) that He was Priest and Victim in His Human Nature alone, as the Son of Man. In His Divine Nature He is One with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST. As

In His Divine Nature He

* Heb. ix. 14.

† Westcott in *loc.*, p. 262.

‡ Alford in *loc.*

the Fathers have pointed out,* it follows necessarily from this that, as One with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST, He receives the Sacrifice which is offered to Them. He Who upon the Altar of the Cross offered the Sacrifice in His Human Nature, in His Divine Nature as One with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST received that Sacrifice. receives the S.
offered.

While no one who believes that by virtue of the Hypostatic Union CHRIST was perfect GOD and perfect Man can doubt this truth, yet the question has been asked by some, how one and the same person is able at the same time to offer and to receive sacrifice ; since no one can offer sacrifice to himself. CHRIST the Incarnate SON of GOD, as a Priest, offered Sacrifice on the Altar of the Cross, not in His Divine, but in His Human Nature; and it is still more evident that the SON of GOD was offered as a Victim on the Altar of the Cross, only in His Human Nature. The Victim *is* indeed the SON of GOD, and therefore the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, but He is the Victim, not in relation to that Nature in which He is consubstantial with the FATHER and the HOLY SPIRIT, but in relation to that Nature which He assumed, and in which He is consubstantial with us. And hence we find Holy Scripture speaking of the LORD of Glory as crucified, † of the Prince of Life as slain, ‡ of GOD as purchasing the Church with His own Blood. § Communicatio
idionatum.

Since that Human Nature in which CHRIST is the Victim was assumed by the SON of GOD, and therefore belongs to Him, we must believe the Victim in the Sacrifice of the Cross to have been the LORD of Glory, the Prince of Life, GOD Himself. If, however, the Priest

* Theodoret, in Psalm cix. 4.

† Acts iii. 15.

‡ 1 Cor. ii. 8.

§ Acts xx. 28.

Our LORD is actively the Priest, passively the Victim.

and the Victim are not different, but absolutely one and the same, and that not according to different natures but according to the same nature, the relation of Priest can be distinguished from the relation of Victim *in thought only*, not in fact. So the CHRIST is the Priest in so far as He acts, but the Victim in so far as He suffers.

IV. A difficulty remains : In what precisely did our LORD'S sacrificial action consist? Socinus claims that our LORD'S Death was a martyrdom, not a S.

IV. There remains, however, one further question to be treated, one serious difficulty to be met. The question is, In what precisely did the sacrificial action in our LORD'S Offering on the Cross consist? The difficulty is the objection of Socinus, that, unless this sacrificial act can be clearly shown, our LORD'S Death was a martyrdom for truth, but not a Sacrifice. It is of great importance that we should both grasp and fully meet the objection of Socinus, for much that concerns our treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice later on must depend upon the elucidation of this question and our answer to this objection.

The argument of Socinus drawn almost exclusively from Hebrews.

The works of Socinus are probably but little read by English theologians of the present day, and yet a certain class of modern theology is largely permeated with his views of our LORD'S Sacrifice. Many of the arguments drawn from the Epistle to the Hebrews, by which it is sought to establish a celestial Sacrifice in the strict acceptation of the term, are simply the arguments which Socinus first introduced to the world, the interpretation which he first put upon these passages of Holy Scripture.

The system of Socinus.

It is not necessary here to review the whole system of Socinus. It was not unlike that of the Channing School of Unitarianism in America in the present day, for, while denying the Divinity of our Blessed LORD, it allowed worship to be given to Him as the Representative and Viceroy of GOD. We must, however,

draw attention to one special feature, which is the very kernel of the Socinian system, namely, his view of our LORD'S Priesthood.

Socinus limited the Priesthood of CHRIST strictly to heaven.* He denied that our LORD was in any sense a Priest on earth, or that His Death was in any sense a Sacrifice. It was, he held, a martyrdom for truth.

In the second volume of the works of Socinus is a treatise *De Jesu Christo Servatore*, in the form of a disputation with Covetus, in the Second Part of which the relation of our LORD'S Offering on the Cross to the Jewish sacrifices, and to His Mediatorial work in heaven, is very fully treated.

In the ninth chapter of the Second Part, he denies that *all* the sacrifices under the Law foreshadowed the Death of CHRIST. This he confines to those offered for the whole people, and especially to that offered on the Great Day of Atonement. In the twelfth chapter he treats of the sacrifice offered on that Day; and in the fifteenth he gives his interpretation of Hebrews, chapters xiii. and xiv.

Starting from the text, "Who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to GOD," he maintains that this is not to be referred only to the Death of the Cross, but to the entrance into the Holy place, that is, into heaven itself. He further asserts that throughout the whole Epistle to the Hebrews "the Oblation of CHRIST" is to be understood only of His presentation of Himself before GOD for us in heaven. He claims that the slaying of the victim was not the essential part of the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement, but the presentation of the blood in the Holy of holies. He therefore asserts that the Death of CHRIST was

Its kernel his view of our LORD'S Priesthood.

This Socinus limited to heaven.

Socinus treats of the relation of the Cross to the Jewish sacrifices and to the Mediatorial work in heaven.

He denies that all the Jewish sacrifices typify the death of CHRIST, but confines this chiefly to that of the Day of Atonement.

He asserts that in Hebrews CHRIST'S Oblation refers only to His work in heaven.

He argues from the Day of Atonement that the Death of CHRIST was not a Sacrifice.

* See Appendix B.

in no real sense a Sacrifice, but that after GOD had raised Him from the dead and exalted Him to heaven, CHRIST presented in heaven the Blood which He had shed, and that this was His true Oblation or Sacrifice.

He also denies that any "satisfaction" was made by our LORD.

He also denies that any satisfaction was made to the justice of GOD in our LORD'S Atonement. This last point, however, does not affect the question before us, which is whether our LORD on the Cross "made there, by His one Oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," or whether, as Socinus says, no Sacrifice was made on the Cross, since our LORD was not then a Priest. For, as he rightly observes, "Priest and Oblation are relative terms, so that where there is not a true Priest there cannot be a true Oblation or Sacrifice."

Alford and Bengel go beyond Socinus in teaching that our LORD'S Blood was presented by Him, separated from His Body, after the Ascension: Heb. xii. 24.

Alford, in his note on Heb. xii. 22-24, "Ye are come unto Mount Sion, . . . and to JESUS the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the Blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel," says the writer of the Epistle "assigns to the Blood of sprinkling, by which we are redeemed unto GOD, a place in the heavenly City next to, but separate from, JESUS Himself in His glorified state." He goes on to contend that our LORD'S Resurrection Body was bloodless, and that the Blood which our LORD shed upon the Cross did not corrupt, but is mentioned separately from the LORD Himself as an item in the glories of the heavenly City, and as yet speaking. Alford refers to a long excursus on the point in Bengel's note *in loco*; indeed he takes his idea entirely from Bengel, who asserts that "at the time of the Ascension the Blood, separated from the Body, was carried into heaven." Dean Jackson seems to hold this view, and

Sadler, in his *The One Offering*, quotes it with apparent approval.* Milligan notices this theory, but regards it as "too carnal," although he seems to hold that the presentation of our LORD'S Precious Blood took place in heaven.

While the opinions of Alford and Bengel go somewhat beyond even that of Socinus, they are all to be traced to the interpretation which he gave to the Epistle to the Hebrews. As all practically agree that the essential act of sacrifice was not merely the effusion of the blood, but its presentation by a priest, the whole issue resolves itself into two questions: Was our LORD a Priest when He died on the Cross? and, Did He there and then make the presentation of His Precious Blood, and so complete His Sacrifice? If He was not a Priest until after His Ascension, as Socinus and others teach, then the Cross was not an Altar, and our LORD'S Death was therefore not a Sacrifice. Even if He were then a Priest, and yet did not make the presentation of His Blood until after His Ascension into heaven, the Sacrifice was only begun upon the Cross, was, therefore, incomplete, and the statement in the Canon of the English Liturgy that He "made there, by His one Oblation of Himself once offered, a *full, perfect, and sufficient* Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world" is not consistent with this fact. There is no possible escape from one of two facts,—that our LORD'S Sacrifice was finished on the Cross, and that mankind was there and then redeemed, or that its essential part was offered in heaven, and that man's Redemption did not take place until after the Ascension.

V. If, for the sake of argument, we assume for a

* Sadler, *The One Offering*, p. 44.

The issue raised by Socinus practically the basis of the modern view of our LORD'S Sacrifice.

If the essentially sacrificial act took place in heaven, our LORD'S Offering upon the Cross was not a S.

and the statement in the English Prayer of Consecration is untrue.

V. If the Socin-

ian position be assumed, how are we to explain

1. the words, "It is finished;"

2. our LORD'S work in Hades;

3. our LORD'S gift of peace on Easter Day;

moment the latter alternative, how are we to explain not merely "the conviction of the Christian Church in every land and age," but the following statements in Holy Scripture?

1. The words of our LORD upon the Cross: "It is finished,"* which have always been interpreted in connection with His other saying, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work," † as CHRIST'S own testimony on the Cross to the fact that His FATHER'S work was done and man was redeemed.

2. The statement of S. Peter that CHRIST was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." ‡ This, together with other passages, has led to the belief that our LORD as Victor, through the power of His *completed* Redemption, brought out from Hades the "prisoners of hope," the Fathers of the Old Covenant. In connection with this we may notice that S. Leo, speaking of the triumph of the Cross, says: "So swift was the effect of faith, that of the robbers crucified with CHRIST, he who believed in CHRIST the SON of GOD entered Paradise justified." § But how could he have been so "swiftly" justified if the meritorious cause of his justification, the Sacrifice of CHRIST, was not to be offered for some forty-three days?

3. The salutation which our LORD addressed to His Disciples immediately after His Resurrection, "Peace be unto you." || It has been pointed out again and

* S. John xix. 30.

† S. John iv. 34.

‡ 1 S. Pet. iii. 18, 19.

§ Leo Magnus, Sermo lv. (*alias liii.*), *De Passione Domini*.

|| S. John xx. 19.

again by the Fathers of the Church, that this gift of peace implied that peace had been made between GOD and man, which would not have been the case if that which was the meritorious cause of our justification had not then been completed.

4. On the evening of Easter Day, when our LORD breathed upon the Apostles, He said: "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."* This surely implied that the gift of pardon was already His to bestow, and was not something still in the future, awaiting the presentation of His Blood, and therefore the accomplishment of the Sacrifice.

4. our LORD'S gift of absolution on Easter Day;

5. But perhaps the strongest passage of all is our LORD'S statement made to the Disciples assembled on the mountain in Galilee: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth."† This power was certainly given to the Son of Man only as the consequence of the accomplishment of His redeeming work, as *merited* by His finished Sacrifice.

5. our LORD'S claim, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth."

VI. We have now to investigate carefully the objection that our LORD was not a Priest, and that His Death was not a Sacrifice, but a martyrdom. The most satisfactory way of meeting these difficulties will be to show when our LORD became a Priest, and precisely in what manner His sacrificial act as a Priest was performed.

VI. Examination of the Socinian theory that on the Cross our LORD was neither Priest nor S.

I. Was our LORD a Priest when He died on the Cross? And if so, when did He become a Priest? Catholic theologians have generally taken the following passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews as the basis of their answer to this question:

I. When did our LORD'S Priesthood begin?

"For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats

* S. John xx. 22, 23.

† S. Matt. xxviii. 18.

should take away sins. Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith,

From Heb. x.
4-9,

Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not,
But a body didst Thou prepare for Me ;
In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou
hadst no pleasure :
Then said I, Lo, I am come
(In the roll of the book it is written of Me)
To do Thy will, O GOD.

Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to the law), then hath He said, Lo, I am come to do Thy will. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second." *

Theologians
unanimously
answer, At the
Incarnation.

The Unction of
the HOLY
GHOST at His
Baptism con-
sidered.

Since these words are evidently to be referred to the moment of the Incarnation, theologians have unani- mously taught that CHRIST then became a Priest ; that the unction of the Priesthood was the anointing of His Human Nature by the HOLY GHOST at the moment of the Incarnation. Some of the Fathers see in the de- scent of the HOLY GHOST at our LORD'S Baptism, and the declaration, " This is My beloved SON, in whom I am well pleased," an unction to the Priesthood and a proclamation of that office, † as they also see in the Voice from heaven at the Transfiguration the proclamation of our LORD'S Prophetical Office, and in the Voice in the Temple on Palm Sunday that of His Regal Office. Yet they do not thereby imply that our LORD was *con- stituted* Prophet, Priest, and King by these respective proclamations, but on the contrary they recognize that,

* Heb. x. 4-9.

† Cf. S. Peter Damian, *Opusc.*, vi., c. 4.

since from the first moment of His Incarnation He was Prophet, teaching by His whole life as well as by His words, and since at His Nativity His Kingship was recognized by the royal gifts offered by the Magi, so His Priesthood also dates from his Incarnation. Indeed, the three gifts of the Magi are commonly considered as a testimony that He was then Prophet, Priest, and King. The proclamation at His Baptism, therefore, is generally explained, not as the beginning of His potential Priesthood (as Socinus takes it), but as the beginning of His public ministry, and, therefore, of the exercise of His Office.*

That the above passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews is distinctly sacrificial, is most obvious. It has been thus paraphrased : " Behold, I come ; in the roll of the Pentateuch (which, through the typical ritual of the Law, witnesses not only in a general sense to Me, but to My unique Sacrifice) it is written of Me that I should fulfil Thy will. But this will refers to a sacrifice quite different from any under the Law, to that Sacrifice which consists in the offering of My Body. Moreover, in saying that GOD did not desire legal oblations, and that He did not find satisfaction in legal sacrifices, and then in adding, ' Behold, I come to do Thy will,' the legal sacrifices are abrogated, and a new Sacrifice instituted. But the character of this new Sacrifice is clearly intimated in the revelation of that will of the FATHER which CHRIST came to fulfil, the will, that is, that He should offer the Sacrifice of His Body. But the purpose of this will was that through that offering, once for all, of the Body of CHRIST we

Summary of
the argument
from Heb. x.
4-9.

* The whole subject is treated in Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, l. xii., c. xi., n. 5, and in Pearson, *On the Creed*, at great length.

might be wholly sanctified. For this Sacrifice was perfect, whereas all the legal sacrifices were imperfect. Here the Incarnation is regarded as providing the Victim. Therefore CHRIST in the Incarnation itself, and by it, and not in any other external and visible consecration, is constituted a Priest. That is, at the very moment of His Incarnation, CHRIST conceived the will to offer the Sacrifice desired by GOD, and therefore CHRIST was then a Priest. So that it was by the Incarnation that He became Priest." *

2. Was our LORD'S Death a S. or a martyrdom?

2. The other objection of Socinus in regard to our LORD'S Offering on the Cross is, that it was not a Sacrifice, but a martyrdom, in that, although our LORD willingly submitted to His Passion, He only did what martyrs have done who have willingly died for their faith. This objection raises a question which needs the most careful answer, and in order to give it we must state precisely the elements which constitute a true and proper sacrifice.

As we have seen in the last chapter, there are in sacrifice an outward and an inward part. The inward part is determined by the will of the offerer, and the outward part must fitly express this will. This outward part or sign must, moreover, be some sensible thing, an offering, which has an aptitude for assuming that signification which has been attached to it by its institution; and, furthermore, something must be done to this offering by a priest, in order to constitute it a proper sacrifice. So that, as regards the outward part, there must be the priest, the victim, or offering, and the sacrificial act; and all these must have been ordained by lawful authority. In revealed religion that authority is GOD. In the Levitical sacrifices GOD

* Stentrup, *Soteriologia*, Part II., p. 195.

appointed the outward part or sign, in that He designated the priest, the victim, and the sacrificial act in every detail.

We have already shown that in our LORD'S Offering upon the Cross the various actions of a proper sacrifice are to be found. These actions could only be performed by a Priest, and we have proved that our LORD was a Priest. But there is still a difficulty. Was it He who performed the acts? Or was it not rather His executioners, who certainly were not priests, nor intentionally offerers of a sacrifice?

The elements of a true and proper S. found in the Cross.

This is what Socinus seems to mean in his really acute, though mistaken, criticism that our LORD'S Death was a martyrdom, but not a Sacrifice; for a martyr has the intention and will to offer up his life to GOD in confession of his faith; but his persecutors actually take his life.

The difference between martyrdom and S. examined.

The sacrificial action, so far as the slaying is concerned, is practically the same as in our LORD'S case, and the martyr has the will to offer himself to GOD.

i. But martyrs were not priests destined to offer themselves to GOD as sacrifices, and in this they differed from our LORD, Who was a Priest, destined* to offer Himself as the One Sacrifice by which the world was to be redeemed.

i. The martyrs were neither priests

ii. The martyrs not only were not priests, but were not proper victims, as our LORD was, since their bodies were not without spot and sinless, designated by GOD for sacrifice; whereas our LORD'S Body was without spot, and was "prepared" † by GOD for sacrifice, as we read, "Him hath GOD the FATHER sealed," † where reference is made to the mark put upon the victim after

ii. nor victims;

* Heb. x. 5-7.

† Heb. x. 5.

‡ S. John vi. 27.

it had been examined by the priest, to signify that it was without blemish and fit for sacrifice.

iii. nor as sinners could they offer S.

iii. The martyrs, though saints, were not without sin, and needed salvation, and therefore could offer no sacrifice for the salvation of others.

VII. The last objection, that our LORD was slain by His persecutors, but not as a S.

VII. This part of the difficulty, therefore, is removed. But there still remains the objection that our LORD was slain by His persecutors, and could not lawfully have taken His own life. This, however, is answered when we consider that it was not essential that the priest himself should slay the victim. Certainly, in many cases in the Jewish Law the mactation was performed by a layman, who in this acted as the priest's assistant, since, although the offerer could slay the victim, there could be no sacrifice without the priest to present the blood and to perform the other accompanying rites.

The proper sacrificial action indicated in S. John x. 17, 18.

Can the slayers of CHRIST, however, in any sense be said to have assisted Him in offering the Sacrifice, when they were acting altogether against His will? This is precisely the point where a proper sacrificial action can be shown, since our LORD distinctly stated of Himself that He gave His life for the sheep, when He said : " Therefore doth My FATHER love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." *

The agents of our LORD'S Death did not act against His will.

Hence we see that the agents of our LORD'S Death were, in a sense, not acting against His will, not taking from Him what He could not withhold. For, though we must not say that He willed that they should put Him to death, yet, on the other hand, when they willed

* S. John x. 17, 18.

to put Him to death, and He had the power to withdraw Himself out of their hands, He did not do so, but on the contrary willed to give Himself as the Sacrifice.

An action, as we have seen, may be termed in the truest sense sacrificial, when, although not performed by the priest himself, it is performed by another under his direction. In the ancient Roman sacrifices, the *popa*, or *victimarius*, who slew the victim, was not a priest, but an assistant to the priest, and performed the act under his direction, the priest sprinkling the salted spelt upon the victim and offering the sacrifice. In a somewhat similar way, under the Jewish Law, to repeat what we have already said, the offerer brought the victim to the priest, and under his direction slew the victim ; but the priest offered the sacrifice.

Thus our LORD, Who was both Priest and Victim, adequately fulfilled the sacrificial act. Not only had He the will to die as a Sacrifice to redeem mankind, but at any moment during the Sacrifice He could have withdrawn Himself from the hands of His enemies. Instead of this, however, He carried out His will to die, by submitting Himself to their cruelty, and upon the Altar of the Cross not merely died, but offered to GOD the Blood which others caused to be shed. The Sacrifice, meanwhile, was consumed in the fires of love ; and the rending of the veil of the Temple was GOD'S testimony that the Sacrifice was perfect, and therefore had effected the salvation of the world, for which it was offered.

It may seem that we are devoting unnecessary space to an examination of the Socinian theory of our LORD'S Sacrifice. That this is not the case will be evident when we come to consider the doctrinal founda-

A sacrificial action may be performed by a layman under the priest's direction, e. g., the Roman sacrifices,

and those of the Jews.

Our LORD, therefore, on the Cross adequately fulfilled the law of S.

The Socinian theory in regard to our LORD'S heavenly

Priesthood the foundation of the modern view of the E. S.

tion of the modern theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which is precisely the theory which Socinus introduced to the world in his interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Therefore it is of supreme importance that at this stage of our work we should grasp clearly the Socinian theory of our LORD'S Sacrifice, and effectually meet the objections which Socinus and his modern disciples bring against the Church's doctrine that the Sacrifice was offered and completed upon the Cross.

VIII. That man's redemption was accomplished on the Cross is shown by many references to it in the N. T.

VIII. There can be no doubt that for a Christian the most satisfactory evidence in regard to this great question is that which is supplied by the inspired writers of the New Testament; throughout which are many allusions to the mystery of man's Redemption. The fact that these passages are found scattered through the various books, and are often little more than references to a doctrine which is assumed as not only familiar to every Christian, but the accepted basis of man's salvation, manifestly increases their evidential value.

The point at issue restated.

Before examining these passages of Holy Scripture, let us state precisely the point at issue. We have seen that, as typified in the Jewish sacrifices, not only the death of the victim, but the presentation of the blood was essential to the completion of the sacrifice. The Catholic doctrine of the Atonement closely connects these two acts, and teaches that both were accomplished upon the Cross. It points, amongst other proofs of this, to the rending of the veil of the Temple, which signified that the Blood shed had been efficacious for the removal of the barrier between GOD and man, and therefore that the Sacrifice by which the world was redeemed had been consummated and accepted.

The Socinian view.

The Socinian view, on the other hand, separates the offering of the Blood from the Death of CHRIST by an

interval of time extending from our LORD'S Crucifixion to His Ascension, and by a change of scene and place from earth to heaven. In the many references in the New Testament to the fact of CHRIST'S Atonement, do we find this fact generally associated with the Passion, or the Ascension ; with a work done on earth, or with an event which took place in heaven? The issue is clearly dogmatic, and ought not to be obscured by mystical references to the fellowship which now exists between the Church on earth and our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven.

We shall now proceed simply to quote certain passages which clearly relate to the act by which our LORD redeemed mankind.

“ As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up : that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life ” (S. John iii. 14, 15). “ GOD hath lot appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Who died for us ” (1 Thess. v. 9, 10). “ If one died for all, then were all dead : and . . . He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him Which died for them, and rose again ” (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). “ I am crucified with CHRIST : nevertheless I live ; yet not I, but CHRIST liveth in me : and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the SON of GOD, Who loved me, and gave Himself for me ” * (Gal.

Passages in the N. T. which refer man's Redemption to the Cross.

S. John iii. 14, 15.

1 Thess. v. 9, 10.

2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

Gal. ii. 20.

* In the large number of passages in which the phrase “ gave Himself for us ” occurs, the expression is distinctly sacrificial, and refers always to the Death upon the Cross as the act by which our LORD “ gave Himself,”—*παρέδωκεν*, e. g., Eph. v. 2, 25 ; and sometimes without the preposition, as S. Matt. xx. 28.

- ii. 20). "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (S. Matt. xx. 28). "He . . . spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all" (Rom. viii. 32). "CHRIST . . . hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an Offering and a Sacrifice to GOD for a sweet smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2). "CHRIST . . . loved the Church, and gave Himself for it" (Eph. v. 25). "Our Saviour JESUS CHRIST . . . gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity" (Titus ii. 13, 14). "CHRIST also hath once suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to GOD" (1 S. Pet. iii. 18). "Hereby perceive we the love of GOD, because He laid down His life for us" (1 S. John iii. 16). "I am the Good Shepherd: the Good Shepherd giveth (*τιθεσιν*) His Life for the sheep. . . . I lay down My Life for the sheep. . . . No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (S. John x. 11, 15, 18). "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (S. John xv. 13). "When we were yet without strength, in due time CHRIST died for the ungodly. . . . But GOD commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, CHRIST died for us" (Rom. v. 6, 8). "Who His own self bare our sins in His own Body on the tree" (1 S. Pet. ii. 24). "For . . . when we were enemies, we were reconciled to GOD by the Death of His Son" (Rom. v. 10). "That He might reconcile both unto GOD in one Body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. ii. 16). "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the
- S. Matt. xx. 28.
Rom. viii. 32.
Eph. v. 2.
Eph. v. 25.
Titus ii. 13, 14.
1 S. Pet. iii. 18.
1 S. John iii. 16.
S. John x. 11, 15, 18.
S. John xv. 13.
Rom. v. 6, 8.
1 S. Pet. ii. 24.
Rom. v. 10.
Eph. ii. 16.

Body of His Flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in His sight" (Col. i. 21, 22). "He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore GOD also hath highly exalted Him" (Phil. ii. 8, 9). "He . . . took part of [flesh and blood], that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. ii. 14, 15). "JESUS also, that He might sanctify the people with His own Blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. xiii. 12).

Col. i. 21, 22.

Phil. ii. 8, 9.

Heb. ii. 14, 15.

Heb. xiii. 12.

These passages are probably more than sufficient to prove our contention that in the New Testament our LORD's atoning Sacrifice is always associated with His work on the Cross, and not with anything which took place after His Ascension into heaven. For the Socinian view, we believe, no passage can be quoted. Those which Socinus cites in regard to our LORD'S appearing in the presence of GOD for us, evidently refer to His present Mediatorial work, and not to the act by which He redeemed the world.

For the Socinian view no passage can be quoted.

We may therefore bring this chapter to a close by asserting that the Catholic Church teaches, that upon the Cross our LORD "made . . . by His one Oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world"; that this is proved by showing that upon the Cross all the essentials of Sacrifice, as typified in the Jewish Law, are fulfilled; that the writers of the New Testament invariably refer to the work of our LORD upon the Cross as that by which man was redeemed; and that the objections brought against the Catholic view by the Socinians are of no

Conclusion.
The Catholic Church teaches that upon the Cross our LORD offered His perfect S.

weight. On the other hand, we maintain that the Socinian theory that the Sacrifice of our LORD really took place after His entrance into heaven, finds no support in Holy Scripture, and is contrary to the teaching of the Church.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

WE are now in a position to begin the treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, having clearly before us the essential characteristics of sacrifice in general, and their fulfilment in the one and only absolute Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of our LORD upon the Cross.

The simplest method of treating the subject seems to be to give in this chapter the three views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which are found among Christians to-day, all of which, with some modifications, may be traced back to the sixteenth century. These views will be stated as far as possible in the words of representative writers of the three schools, and will be accompanied by such extracts from their writings as will leave no doubt in regard to their opinions. We shall then notice various developments of each view, which may be regarded as accretions, or exaggerations, and as unessential to the fundamental theory.

It will be further necessary to examine briefly the different theories, so as to bring out clearly the real purport of each, and to show on what ground the accretions must be rejected. When we have thus distinctly before us the questions in dispute we shall in successive chapters consider what support can be found for each in Holy Scripture, in the ancient liturgies, in the his-

Introductory:
We are now able to examine the E. S.

The best method is to give the three prevalent views,

in the words of representative writers,

and to notice the accretions attaching to each.

Then to consider the support for each in Scripture, the liturgies,

history, the Fathers, theologians, Anglican divines, and Tractarians.

tory of this doctrine in the Church, in the writings of the Fathers, theologians, Anglican divines, and Tractarians. We shall then be in a position to draw certain inferences from our work, by which we may reach some general conclusion in regard to the doctrine of the Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist.

I. THE CATHOLIC VIEW.

I. The Catholic view in the words of Bossuet.

It seems best, for several reasons, to give the Catholic view in the words of Bossuet. He was not only a theologian of recognized authority, but he represented that great school in the Gallican Church which sought a basis for the unity of Christendom in Catholic theology as distinguished from Ultramontanism. Then the statement which follows was used by him in his negotiations with the French Calvinist, M. Ferry, and its terms were therefore carefully considered; and furthermore it is quoted by Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon** with apparent approval.

I. He teaches that:

the essence of the S. is in the Consecration.

Bossuet writes †: "The essence of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist consists precisely in the Consecration, whereby, in virtue of the words of JESUS CHRIST, His Body and Precious Blood are placed really on the holy Table, mystically separated under the species of bread and wine. By this action taken precisely, and without anything added by the priest, JESUS CHRIST is really offered to His FATHER, inasmuch as His Body and His Blood are placed before Him, actually clothed with the signs representing His Death.

CHRIST both consecrates and offers;

"As this consecration is done in the Name, in the Person, and through the words of JESUS CHRIST, it is

* Part III., pp. 44 sqq. We follow Dr. Pusey's translation.

† Bossuet, *Œuvres*, tom vi., pp. 116, 117, 118.

He in truth Who both consecrates and offers, and the priests are only simple ministers. . . .

priests are only His ministers ;

“ It appears that this real oblation of the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST is a consequence of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and that the Church is not to be asked to produce any other commission to ‘ offer ’ than that which is given her to consecrate, since the oblation in its essence consists in the Consecration itself. . . .

the S. is a consequence of the Real Presence ;

“ We believe that this action, whereby the SON of GOD is placed upon the holy Table under signs representative of His Death, viz., the Consecration, carries with it the recognition of the high sovereignty of GOD, in that JESUS CHRIST, present, renews in it the memory of His obedience even to the Death of the Cross, and in some sort perpetuates it.

in it is renewed the Death upon the Cross ;

“ We believe, also, that this same action makes GOD propitious to us, because it sets before His eyes the voluntary Death of His SON for sinners, or rather His SON clothed, as was said, with the signs representative of that Death whereby He had been appeased.

and this makes GOD propitious to us ;

“ On this ground we say that JESUS CHRIST still offers Himself in the Eucharist ; for having once given Himself for us to be our Victim, He does not cease to present Himself to His FATHER, as the Apostle says that ‘ He appears before GOD for us.’ . . .

“ We believe, then, that His Presence on the holy Altar, in this figure of death, is a continual oblation which He makes of Himself, of His Death and His merits, for the human race. . . .

“ It is not good reasoning to say, that the Oblation of the Cross is not sufficient, supposing that JESUS CHRIST still offers Himself in the Eucharist, any more than it would be to say that, because He continues to intercede for us in Heaven, His Intercession on the

this S. does not take away from the sufficiency of that upon the Cross ;

in the H. E.
we apply the
merits of the
Cross;

Cross was imperfect and insufficient for our salvation. . . .

“ We know that the whole merit of our Redemption is in such wise attached to this great Sacrifice of the Cross that there is nothing left for us to do in that of the Eucharist but to celebrate its memory and to apply to us its virtue.

there is no
destruction of
the Victim;

“ Moreover, let us not think that the Victim, which we present in the Eucharist, is to be there in truth anew destroyed; because the SON of GOD has once most abundantly satisfied this obligation by the Sacrifice of the Cross, as S. Paul the Apostle proves divinely in his Epistle to the Hebrews; in such wise that, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist being established in commemoration, we ought to seek therein only a mystical death and destruction, wherein the effectual Death which the SON of GOD once suffered for us is represented.

the H. E.,
while a proper
S., depends
entirely upon
the S. of the
Cross.

“ Such is the Sacrifice of the Church, a spiritual Sacrifice, where the Blood is shed in mystery only, where death intervenes only in mystery; still a very true sacrifice, in that JESUS CHRIST, Who is the Victim, is really contained there under this figure of death; but a commemorative sacrifice, which *subsists only through its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross*, and derives therein all its virtue.”

The salient
features of this
view.

From this somewhat lengthy statement we may frame the following simple expression of the Catholic view:

By the double Consecration in the Holy Eucharist our LORD'S Body and Blood are produced, under the species of bread and wine, separated as by death. In this is made that memorial of our LORD'S Death and Sacrifice on Calvary which He commanded us to make,

and thus the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice, in that it is a re-presentation and renewal of that perfect and finished Sacrifice once for all offered upon the Cross in propitiation for the sins of the world.

We may especially note in Bossuet's exposition the following points :

That he makes the essence of the Sacrifice consist precisely in the Consecration.

That he relates this Sacrifice directly and essentially to the Sacrifice which our LORD offered once for all upon the Cross. From this it derives its value ; and its sacrificial action is the showing forth of our LORD'S Death. Although he recognizes a relation between the Eucharist and our LORD'S Intercession for us in heaven, yet he does not base the sacrificial character of the Eucharist upon this. This accidental relation to our LORD'S Offering in heaven is also touched upon in his *Explication de quelques Difficultés sur les Prières de la Messe, à un nouveau Catholique*, which we shall consider in its place. We may notice here, however, that this relation is not an essential element in his definition of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

He explicitly discountenances the view that the destruction of the Victim is necessary to the Sacrifice, when he says : " Let us not think that the Victim, which we present in the Eucharist, is to be there in truth anew destroyed. . . . We ought to seek therein only a mystical death and destruction."

A large school in the Roman Church, influenced by certain great Jesuit theologians, has added, as essential to the definition of sacrifice, the element of destruction, real or equivalent. This idea, which, as we have already said, originated in an *obiter dictum* of S. Thomas, was taken up again by Vasquez. It is true that Vasquez

Summary :

i. The essence of the S. consists in the Consecration.
ii. The S. is related directly and essentially to the S. of the Cross.

iii. The destruction of the Victim only mystical.

2. A large school makes destruction an essential element, relying on S. Thomas as interpreted by Vasquez.

was satisfied with a mark or sign in the Eucharist which represented the actual immolation of the Victim which took place upon the Cross. But this was because he regarded the Eucharist only as a commemorative Sacrifice, and therefore found the real immolation in that of which it was a commemoration, the Sacrifice of the Cross. His best exponent in modern times is Perrone.*

It finds its fullest expression in De Lugo.

This theory of destruction was treated as an essential characteristic of the Eucharistic Sacrifice by the great Jesuit controversialists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and finds its fullest expression in the theory of De Lugo.

There has always been a school which rejected this view.

There has, however, always been in the Roman Church a school which rejected or greatly modified the theory that some real destruction or its moral equivalent must be found in the victim of every sacrificial act. Salmeron (ob. 1585) taught on this point practically the same view which Bossuet so well expresses; and Melchior Canus, Bellarmine, Suarez, and others each put forth a theory in which, while the element of destruction is not entirely eliminated, M. Canus satisfies it by the fraction of the consecrated Host, Bellarmine by the Communion, and Suarez by the production, rather than the destruction, of the Victim.

In our day De Lugo's view represented by Franzelin.

In our own day De Lugo's view has many followers, and is most ably presented in Franzelin's work on the Eucharist.

The opposite opinion gaining ground: its exponents

On the other hand, in the Roman Church a large and increasing school is returning more and more to a view of sacrifice which eliminates the element of destruction altogether. This school numbers among its followers

* Perrone, *Prælect. Theolog.*, vol. v.; *Tract. de Euch.*, Part 2.

many distinguished theologians ; e. g., in Germany, Scheeben and Schanz ; in France, Lepin ; in England, Tyrrell. It points out that such an element does not correspond to the notion of sacrifice in the ancient world, nor does it express the significance of the Jewish sacrifices, where the victim was not infrequently killed by the person offering it, and not by the priest ; and that, whatever change may take place in the bread and wine, the Victim Which is offered in the Eucharist is not the bread and wine, but CHRIST, Whose glorified Humanity is impassible and can suffer no change in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Scheeben,
Schanz, Lepin,
Tyrrell.

We have said enough, however, to show that the theory of destruction is no essential part of the Catholic view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but may be considered as an accretion, or illegitimate development, of a particular school in the Roman Church.

Destruction
not a necessary
element of the
Catholic view.

II. THE PROTESTANT VIEW.

At the opposite pole we have the Protestant view, taught by Luther, and held by most of the Protestant bodies, and by many members of our own Church: that the Eucharist is not a Sacrifice, since our LORD upon the Cross fulfilled all sacrifice ; and that any further claim of a sacrifice, or priesthood, or altar, detracts from the one Sacrifice of the Cross, and is therefore to be condemned.

II. The Pro-
testant view ;
taught by
Luther, held
by most Pro-
testant bodies.

This view is well expressed by Bishop Burnet in his history of the Articles :

I. Well set
forth by
Burnet.

“ It is clear that in the strictest sense of the word, CHRIST Himself is the only Priest under the Gospel ; and it is also no less evident that His Death is the only Sacrifice, in opposition to the many oblations that were

under the Mosaical Law to take away sin, which appears very plain from these words : ' Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up Sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the people's : for this He did once, when He offered up Himself.' He opposes to the annual expiation made by the Jewish high priest, that, ' CHRIST entered in once to the Holy place, having made redemption for us by His own Blood;' and, having laid down that general maxim that ' without shedding of blood there is no remission,' he says, ' CHRIST was offered once, to bear the sins of many.' He puts a question to show that all sacrifices were now to cease : ' When the worshippers are once purged, then would not sacrifices cease to be offered?' And he ends with this, as a full conclusion to that part of his discourse : ' Every priest stands daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin : but this Man, after He had offered up one Sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of GOD.' Here are not general words, ambiguous expressions, or remote hints, but a thread of a full and clear discourse, to show that in the strict sense of the words, we have but one Priest and likewise but one Sacrifice under the Gospel." *

Summary :

i. This view agrees with the Catholic in recognizing the Cross as the only absolute S.

In regard to the Protestant doctrine we may observe : That it agrees with the Catholic view in asserting that the Sacrifice of our LORD upon the Cross was a full, perfect, and complete Sacrifice, which could never be added to or repeated by anything done either in heaven or in earth. This view (as strongly as the Catholic) condemns the opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that the presentation of the Blood of the Victim, which was the essential act of Sacrifice,

* Burnet, *Expos. XXXIX Articles*, Art. XXXI., p. 352.

took place in heaven ; for this, as a necessary part of the Sacrifice, was offered once for all upon the Cross, though in our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven it is continually pleaded as meriting our salvation.

The Protestant view was a reaction from the exaggerated teaching of a certain class of Roman writers at the Reformation, who practically taught that the Eucharist was a Sacrifice independent of the Sacrifice of the Cross, possessing its own merit, and available as a propitiation for actual sin, as the Sacrifice of the Cross was for original sin.*

As Protestants denied any real Presence of our LORD'S Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, they could not, of course, admit a relative Sacrifice, such as is taught in the Catholic Church.

In the seventeenth century certain modifications of the Protestant view were adopted by those who realized that in denying the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, they had the authority of the Fathers, and practically of all Church writers, against them. They therefore proposed two modifications of this bald denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

In 1635 Mede endeavoured to show that it was a material Sacrifice, in that at the Offertory bread and wine were ritually offered as gifts to GOD. He pointed out that this offering of bread and wine in the Eucharist was associated by many early writers with the offering

ii. A reaction from exaggerated claims for the Mass.

2. Modifications of the Protestant view.

i. Mede's theory of a material offering of bread and wine.

*The Thirty-first Article was directed against this last view, which was very prominent in the practical teaching of the first half of the sixteenth century. It is not clearly found in the writings of theologians. Vasquez refers it to Catharinus, but it is very doubtful whether he was really its *author*. Indeed, it is doubtful whether it can be definitely traced to any Roman writer. See p. 206.

of first-fruits, and regarded as part of the sacrificial rite.

ii. Spiritual sacrifices of prayer, etc.

In the next century the ground was entirely shifted by writers of the type of Waterland, who, reviving S. Augustine's definition of "a true Sacrifice," claimed that the only sacrifices which were possible after the Sacrifice of the Cross were spiritual sacrifices, as of prayer, and thanksgiving, and praise. Indeed, as early as 1697 Dr. Hickes had said: "Vocal sacrifices are commonly called spiritual. . . . These are true, real sacrifices, . . . and therefore our Saviour is said to have offered them up,* and they are expressly called sacrifices." † And again: "The sacrifice of praise and prayers unto GOD . . . is a proper, but spiritual sacrifice." ‡ This whole subject is very fully and ably treated by Waterland in his two essays, "The Christian Sacrifice Explained," and "Distinctions of Sacrifice." §

Dr. Hickes' view.

Waterland's view.

As the purpose of our work is to show in what way the Holy Eucharist may be regarded as a true and proper Sacrifice, we may here dismiss from any further consideration the Protestant view, which, in rejecting the Real Presence, asserts that in no way is the Eucharist a proper Sacrifice.

III. The Modern View.

III. A MODERN VIEW WHICH RELATES THE EUCHARIST DIRECTLY TO OUR LORD'S WORK IN HEAVEN.

The name discussed.

It is very difficult to find a convenient term by which to designate this view. It has been called, by

* Heb. v. 7.

† Heb. xiii. 15; 1 S. Peter ii. 5.

‡ Hickes, *Two Disc.*, pp. 53, 61.

§ Waterland's *Works*, vol. viii.

some of its adherents, "The Anglican view;" but, inasmuch as we shall show that it is not the view of the majority of those whom we are accustomed to consider representative Anglican divines, and as the only theologians who have written anything larger than a pamphlet in its defence are to be found in the Presbyterian Church in Scotland and the Roman Church in Germany, it scarcely seems fair, and is somewhat misleading, to term it "the Anglican view." To avoid the difficulty we shall in this work designate it simply "The Modern view," a title which is certainly not inappropriate, since the theory in its essential features cannot be traced back beyond the sixteenth century, and in its fully developed form is scarcely thirty years old.

The term "Anglican View" misleading.

We shall give it in the words of Mr. Brightman, whose paper on "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," read before the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament in 1890, contains the most explicit statement and the fullest discussion which this particular view of the subject has yet received from any English divine. It is true that his treatment only extends to sixteen pages, but it is from the pen of one who has evidently weighed carefully the words which he has used. And, in the light of some further explanations by the same writer,* it affords the clearest and most logical exposition of this view; which indeed is touched upon by many writers, but to the direct explication of which few have devoted even as much as a page. Further, it may be remarked that in corresponding with those theologians who are representative teachers of the modern view, several have quoted Mr. Brightman's tract as the most satisfactory and authoritative exponent of their opinion.

i. Mr. Brightman's paper its exponent.

* In a private letter to the author.

Mr. Brightman's exposition.

The E. S. reproduces, *not* the moment of the Cross, but our LORD'Saction in heaven.

The Cross only the initial act of the Sacrifice.

The other acts are fulfilled perpetually in heaven.

The assumption that the H. E. is pre-eminently the memorial of CHRIST'S Death, in its most exaggerated form, found in popular teaching.

Mr. Brightman's words are as follows: "There is the succession [of Anglican theologians] which fully accepts and enforces the Eucharistic Sacrifice as ordinarily stated—as the representation and commemoration before the Eternal FATHER of the One Sacrifice of CHRIST. But what is more characteristic among our theologians is the theory which is remarkable by its general absence in the Roman writers—the interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, *not of the moment of the Cross*,* but of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven, as the Minister of the True Tabernacle." †

"[In the account of the Levitical Sacrifice] the slaying of the victim is the initial act and one moment in a process which included many subsequent acts: and . . . the object of the Epistle to the Hebrews is largely to show that, whereas that act [the slaying of the victim] in our LORD'S Sacrifice was fulfilled when He died once for all upon the Cross, He has passed into the heavens, and is the Minister of the True Tabernacle, to fulfil perpetually the other acts of His Sacrifice which the slaying of the Victim made possible.

"The other assumption . . . is . . . [that] *the Holy Eucharist is directly related to our LORD'S Offering of Himself on the Cross*, as pre-eminently and exclusively the memorial of His Death, the commemoration of His Passion. This assumption in its most exaggerated expression is familiar to us all. There is a popular teaching which dwells upon the broken bread and the outpoured wine as representing our LORD'S Suffering and Death, His Body broken on the Cross and His Blood shed there, and this as an adequate and fairly exhaustive account in general terms of the meaning of

* Italics are ours.

† Brightman, p. 2.

the Eucharist. And it is not confined to popular teaching. In a less exaggerated form it is prominent in our own formulæ. . . . And of course so far as it goes it is true, but it is not the whole truth. And it is to this that I want especially to call your attention, and to remind you that in the New Testament and in the early mind of the Church this reference of the Holy Eucharist to one moment in the life of our LORD, and to one act of His Priesthood, is not found in this exclusive sense.

“ Now the charter of the Eucharist and the basis of the Eucharistic Sacrifice lies in our LORD’S words, ‘ Do this in remembrance of Me,’ ‘ for My commemoration.’ And in this there is nothing which suggests a special reference to our LORD’S Death ; it suggests rather the thought of His whole work, of His Person in the fulness of Its significance as perfected in that work. It suggests Himself, not merely His work. It leads us, therefore, to relate the Holy Eucharist to Himself as He is known in the full Catholic belief as to His Person, and only through this to any particular act or acts of His earthly life. We should expect, therefore, the commemoration of the acts of His life, and among them of the supreme act of His Offering of Himself on the Cross, to fill the same place, if one may so speak, and to bear the same proportion to the whole Eucharist in its full conception as the act itself to the fulness of His Person. We should expect the mark of death on the Eucharist to be analogous, not to its place, if again one may so speak, in His History at the moment of the Cross, but to its place in His glorified Person. We should look in the Eucharist for something analogous, not to the Agony of the Cross, but to the Wounds in the Hands and the Feet and the Side of His Risen

In a less exaggerated form, in our own liturgy.

A denial that this exclusive reference of the H. E. to the Cross is found in the N. T. or the early Church.

“ Do this in remembrance of Me ” suggests no special reference to our LORD’S Death,

but to Himself.

Body. We should expect it to be the commemoration of the Lamb, 'as It had been slain,' but yet 'standing in the midst of the Throne.'

In the Institution nothing to suggest a relation to our LORD'S Death.

"And so, in fact, we find it in our LORD'S Institution. . . . 'This is My Body, which is for you,' or, in S. Luke, 'is given,' or 'is being given for you.' There is here no necessary suggestion of death and nothing to relate the Institution with our LORD'S Death; it is only so far implied in it as it is in 'GOD so loved the world that He gave His only begotten SON.' The degree of the reality of that giving was, in fact, measured by its perseverance 'unto Death, even the Death of the Cross,' but the giving does not, in itself, imply death. Where the mark of death on the Eucharist really lies is in the separate Consecration of the chalice. 'This is My Blood' is not the whole Institution, but the singling out, as it were, of one side of it, the giving of His Blood in isolation from the Body, in which it has been already given—the added gift of His life no longer as it is in virtue of the Incarnation, but as it is in virtue of having passed through Death and been resumed eternally. Even here it is not Death *as an event* that is marked—not the momentary shedding of our LORD'S Blood on the Cross. The word represented by 'shed' is the word used for the outpouring of the blood of the sacrifice in the Old Testament, and it suggests the eternal significance of the blood, rather than its momentary liberation in death. The witness of the Eucharist is not merely 'I died,' but 'I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore.' In it we realize that we 'are come to Mount Sion . . . and to JESUS, the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the Blood of Sprinkling.' " *

The mark of death only in the separate Consecration of the chalice.

The witness of the H. E. is not "I died," but "I am He that liveth."

* Brightman, pp. 4-7.

“ For such an interpretation as relates the Eucharist immediately to our LORD’S ‘perfected’ and glorified Person, the foundation is laid as we saw in earlier divines and in the Liturgies. If it is so related, and if its relation to the unique act of the Cross is only through His Person ‘as He is’—if, that is, it is related to the Cross as the eternal act of our High Priest in heaven is related to the Cross—then it is a simple inference; it seems to lie in its nature that it is an action parallel to our LORD’S present work in heaven, where, because He is a High Priest, ‘He must needs have somewhat to offer.’ ” *

The H. E. related to the Cross only through the eternal action of CHRIST in heaven.

To this statement we may add, from another source: †

“ The results of comparative religion . . . are quite illuminating for this subject. So far, they mean that the Eucharist requires no discussion as to the fact of its being obviously, *absolutely*, ‡ and primarily a Sacrifice. It simply satisfies the definition and embodies the idea, and this becomes the fundamental fact from which we start, not the result at which we arrive, in all theorizing and speculation upon it. And, in fact, it seems to be implied that we ought to have begun with the Eucharist as the Sacrifice, and derived our conception of sacrifice from it, and interpreted the Atonement by it.”

The H. E. is an absolute S.

And the Atonement ought to be interpreted by it, not it by the Atonement.

Some of the positions taken by Mr. Brightman are most radical and startling, in that they demand a revolution in the doctrine of the Atonement taught by theologians of the Church in all its branches, not merely from the Reformation, but, so far as we can judge, from the beginning of Christianity. It is, however,

This view is most radical,

* *Idem.*, pp. 12, 13.

† From a private letter to the author, explaining certain points in the Tract. Cf. p. 553.

‡ The italics are ours.

only fair to point out that Mr. Brightman thinks that some such theory, while not found explicitly in the writings of the early Fathers, was not unknown to them ; indeed he contrasts the treatment of the Incarnation in S. Athanasius' *De Incarnatione* with that in S. Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, with a view to showing that in the latter the Cross and Passion had become isolated from what followed and interpreted them, i. e., the Resurrection and Ascension.

but it is a clear-cut, definite system.

Summary : It differs from the Catholic view :

i. In that it relates the II. E. not to the Cross but to what our LORD is now doing in heaven.

Its claim that only the initial act of S. was performed on Calvary ; that the essential act by which man was redeemed took place in heaven.

We have, however, in Mr. Brightman's paper a clear-cut and definite system, in striking contrast to the vague and inconsequential sketches so often found elsewhere. The salient points in which it differs from the Catholic view are the following :

That " the interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice [is] the reproduction on earth, *not of the moment of the Cross*, but of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven, as the Minister of the 'True Tabernacle.'" This is further explained by pointing out that in the Levitical sacrifice " the slaying of the victim is [but] *the initial act* and one moment in a process which included many subsequent acts : and that the object of the Epistle to the Hebrews is largely to show that, whereas that act [the slaying] in our LORD'S Sacrifice was fulfilled when He died once for all upon the Cross, He has passed into the heavens, and is the Minister of the True Tabernacle, to fulfil perpetually the other acts of His Sacrifice which the slaying of the Victim made possible."

Here we have most distinctly set forth the kernel of this theory. The Levitical sacrifice, as we have seen, consisted of several acts, viz., the slaying of the victim, the presentation of the blood, and the burning of the whole or of a part of the victim. Of these, the first was

scarcely a sacrificial act, except in the widest application of the term, since it was often performed not by a priest, but by a layman. The essentially sacrificial act was the presentation of the blood, and this was followed by the cremation, which implied GOD'S acceptance of the gift and His communion with man in the fruits of the sacrifice. Hence the inference of the modern school is that upon the Cross our LORD accomplished *only the initial act* of the Sacrifice, the slaying of the Victim, which was effected by His murderers, and was not the priestly act of Sacrifice. The essential act of Sacrifice, according to this theory, was not accomplished until His Ascension into heaven, when He presented Himself before the FATHER and there completed the Sacrifice.

While, of course, Mr. Brightman and the school of which he is so distinguished a member believe in the Divinity of our Blessed LORD, in other respects this view is precisely that of Socinus; namely, that our LORD'S Death upon the Cross was not a Sacrifice, but that the Sacrifice was offered after His entry into heaven. And we must admit that the interpretation which Socinus gives of the type — the entrance of the high priest into the Holy of holies with the blood of the victim on the Day of Atonement — is not without force,—if we ignore the purpose for which the high priest entered the Holy of holies, and isolate the sacrifice on that day from all the other sacrifices of the Jewish Law, which is precisely what Socinus contends we ought to do.*

That the Eucharist is "obviously, absolutely, and primarily a Sacrifice. It simply satisfies the definition and embodies the idea. . . . And in fact it seems to be implied that we ought to have begun with the

This view is precisely that which originated with Socinus.

ii. It regards the H. E. as an "absolute" S.

* See p. 57.

Eucharist as the Sacrifice, . . . and interpreted the Atonement by it." *

The sense in which some Romans have considered it an "absolute" S.

Some of the more extreme theologians of the Roman Church of the sixteenth century, against whom our thirty-first Article was principally directed, taught that the Eucharist was an absolute Sacrifice, independent, in its effects and in its merits, of the Sacrifice of the Cross; and there are some in the present day who assert that the Eucharist is an absolute Sacrifice, although they explain it in a very different sense. † But almost all great Roman theologians teach that the Eucharist is only a relative Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of the Cross being the only absolute Sacrifice. Indeed, Scheeben considers this relativity to be the specific "form," and to give the proper essence, the true nature, the essential character, to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. He says: "In the definition of man as 'a rational animal' the specific element (reason) fixes the generic element (animal), as the form fixes and determines the matter. The genus is the secondary, the specific difference the primary, element in the compound. Hence in the definition of the Mass as 'a Sacrifice relative to the Sacrifice on the Cross,' the element 'relative' is the form, and gives us the proper essence, the true nature, the essential character, of the 'Mass.' The relativity is founded extrinsically upon the will of CHRIST, and intrinsically on the identity of the Sacrificer and Victim on Cross and Altar, and on the similarity between the mystical and the real effusion of Blood. The representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST is, therefore, the proper essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass." ‡

Scheeben's view that relativity is the specific "form" of this S.

* Private letter from Mr. Brightman.

† Tanquerey, vol. ii., p. 435.

‡ Quoted in Wilhelm and Scannell, vol. ii., p. 459.

Mr. Brightman, in teaching that the Eucharist is an absolute Sacrifice, differs from almost all theologians not only in the use of the term, but in its extension, since he not only considers the Sacrifice of the Eucharist an absolute Sacrifice in itself, but would interpret the Atonement by it, thus reversing whatever relativity there may be.*

Mr. Brightman would interpret the Atonement by the H. E.

That the sacrificial phrase, "Do this in remembrance of Me," suggests no special reference to our LORD'S Death, but "rather the thought of His whole work, of His Person in the fulness of Its significance as perfected in that work. It suggests Himself, not merely His work. . . . We should expect the mark of death on the Eucharist to be analogous, not to its place . . . in His History at the moment of the Cross, but to its place in His glorified Person ; . . . not to the Agony of the Cross, but to the Wounds in the Hands and the Feet and the Side of His Risen Body."

iii. In the Institution he sees no special reference to our LORD'S Death.

It is true that S. Paul states, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." † Mr. Brightman, however, thinks this passage can be explained otherwise than as the Church has always received it, and in accordance with his view that the celebration of the Holy Eucharist is a commemoration of our LORD'S Death only to the same extent as it is a commemoration of His Resurrection and Ascension.

In spite of S. Paul's words, 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

We must also observe that, while stating that the relation of "the Holy Eucharist . . . to our LORD'S Offering of Himself on the Cross, as pre-eminently and exclusively the memorial of His Death,"

* See quotation from private letter, p. 87. † 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

is found in its most exaggerated form in certain specified popular teachings, Mr. Brightman considers that “*in a less exaggerated form it is prominent in our own formulæ.*” He is, of course, referring to the opening words of the Canon in our Prayer Book : “ Who made there (by His one Oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world ; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious Death and Sacrifice, until His coming again.” He seems to characterize this as an “ exaggeration ” and as a *suppressio veri*, “ true so far as it goes, but not the whole truth.” * This must surely impose a very serious strain upon the consciences of those priests who hold the Modern view, every time they perform the most solemn function of their priesthood by celebrating the Holy Eucharist.

These views are, however, repudiated by many of the Tractarian school, e. g. :

Before we pass to an examination of the accretions which have attached themselves to this theory, and which would be repudiated by most of its followers, it is only fair to point out that many of those who hold that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice on account of its relation to what our LORD is now doing in heaven, rather than on account of its relation to what He once did upon the Cross, emphatically repudiate any intention of detracting from the completeness of the Sacrifice of the Cross. That is to say, they hold that upon the Cross our LORD made “ a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world,” and, therefore, that while His Mediatorial work in heaven may be a *virtual* Sacrifice, it is not an *actual* Sacrifice, since the sacrificial action was

* Quoted, pp. 84, 85.

completed on the Cross. To prove this we quote from a few of the more prominent writers of this school.

Bishop Forbes of Brechin, in his work on the Articles, which had Dr. Pusey's co-operation and approval, says :

Bp. Forbes,
"Articles";

"One common argument against the Eucharistic Sacrifice is, that according to this belief [that it is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead] one must hold and teach the blasphemy . . . that one must deny that the Oblation of CHRIST was finished upon the Cross. . . . We have nothing apart from that one Sacrifice ; our Eucharistic Oblation is not something in and for itself, something independent of that One Sacrifice, even while it pleaded it. Such is its union with that Sacrifice that it is a perpetual application of its virtue. . . . On the Cross that offering was made once for all with shedding of Blood; on earth the offering is made in unbloody manner, as the ancient Church attests. . . . No Christian can say otherwise than that the Sacrifice of the Cross was 'the One Oblation of CHRIST.' . . . It is one and singular in the Victim, the act, and the result. There is only one CHRIST, one offering for sin, one purchase of man's redemption. The Sacrifice of the Cross was CHRIST'S offering of Himself, performing an act which was unique in itself, and securing a purchase which was entire in itself."*

While Bishop Forbes elsewhere traces the relation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice to the Mediatorial work of our LORD in heaven, there can be no doubt that he repudiates any view which implies that the act of Sacrifice by which the world was redeemed was not finished upon Calvary. Indeed he says that for one to deny

* Forbes, *XXXIX Articles*, pp. 614-619.

that the Oblation of CHRIST was *finished* on the Cross, is *blasphemy*.

Rev. B. J. Kidd, "Articles";

Again, the Rev. B. J. Kidd, in his work on the Thirty-Nine Articles, says :

"As to the perfection of His Sacrifice on the Cross, the Epistle to the Hebrews is conclusive. He 'made there (by His One Oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.'" And yet he says : "The Death on Calvary is consummated by the entry of the High Priest 'into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of GOD for us;'" and considers that "the sufficiency of the Sacrifice on the Cross is to be reconciled with the reality of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, by their common relation to the eternal self-oblation of our LORD in heaven." And again he says : "The Lamb of GOD exhibits Himself to the FATHER, and *pleads* the Atonement as once finished in act but ever living in operation. The notion that it was *not* unique or perfect, but could be reiterated or supplemented, in heaven or on earth, was justly denounced as a 'blasphemous fable' in Art. 31."*

Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, "Articles";

Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, on the Thirty-Nine Articles (after quoting Heb. vii. 26, 27, ix. 11-14, 24-28, x. 10-14), says : "These passages are absolutely conclusive as to the perfection of the Sacrifice once offered on Calvary. The language of the Article is entirely covered by them, and exception to this first clause in it could hardly be taken by any well-instructed theologian. But if so much is admitted, an important consequence follows, for the words are entirely destructive of any notion that in the Eucharist there can be any Sacrifice suppletory or additional to the Sacrifice made

* Kidd, *XXXIX Articles*, vol. ii., pp. 243, 244.

'once for all' on the Cross."* He then goes on to quote the passage which we have just given from Mr. Kidd's work.

The last quotation is from Dr. Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel*:

Dr. Mason,
"The Faith of
the Gospel."

"The way, then, in which the Sacrifice must be conceived of is this: CHRIST is present with us at the Altar *in the same manner as in heaven*. He allows us at the Altar to do with Him what He Himself does in heaven. Although He is for ever seated there, as one whose toils are over, yet He is 'a Priest upon His throne' (Zech. vi. 13), and is perpetually engaged in presenting on our behalf the life which He once for all laid down and has taken again, and never needs to lay down from henceforth. . . . In the living Person of CHRIST, the eternal Sacrifice of Calvary remains an ever fresh fact, neither needing nor admitting of a renewal. CHRIST presents Himself in heaven for us in the inexhaustible virtue of His past suffering; and all the efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is derived from the same." †

It is not quite clear whether or not Dr. Mason, like Mr. Brightman, regards the Sacrifice of the Cross as not complete until the presentation of our LORD Himself before the FATHER in heaven; he seems, however, to relate the Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross. But he makes an original contribution to the Modern view of the Eucharist, which is worthy of our notice, when he says, "CHRIST is present with us at the Altar *in the same manner as in heaven*." At first sight the phrase, "in the same manner," would seem certainly to be a slip of the pen, but a careful perusal

Dr. Mason's
peculiar view
in regard to
the manner of
our LORD'S
Presence.

* Gibson, *XXXIX Articles*, vol. ii., p. 690.

† Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 330, 331.

of the article shows it to be intended; and therefore we can only say that in this Dr. Mason differs from all other theologians, who have taught that our LORD is present in heaven alone "naturally, corporally, and locally," and in the Eucharist only "supernaturally, spirit-wise, supra-locally, and sacramentally." Indeed, it is difficult to conceive that which Dr. Mason's statement implies.*

There are many who, like the Bishop of Brechin (and Dr. Pusey), would consider it "blasphemy" to "deny that the oblation of CHRIST was finished upon the Cross." These in relating the Eucharist to our LORD'S Sacrifice in heaven mean no more than that in heaven our LORD is still and *for ever* "the Sacrifice," "the Lamb as it had been slain;" and that whatever sacrificial character His Mediatorial work possesses depends *solely* on the pleading of the merits of that finished Sacrifice which CHRIST offered once for all upon the Cross. From this view Mr. Brightman's theory differs "*toto cælo*;" since he places the essentially sacrificial act in heaven only, and thereby implies that the Cross was not in any proper sense a sacrifice.

2. The principal accretion to the Modern view, as stated by Alford.

The principal accretion to the Modern view, which is explicitly rejected by Mr. Brightman, † and Dr. Mason, ‡ is well stated in Alford's note on, "Ye are come unto Mount Sion, . . . and to JESUS the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the Blood of Sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." § Alford says that the writer of the Epistle "assigns to the Blood of sprinkling, by which we are redeemed unto GOD, a place in the Heavenly City next to, but separate from,

* Cf. Newman, *Via Media*, vol. ii., p. 200.

† Private letter to the author.

‡ Mason, pp. 323-324.

§ Heb. xii. 22-24.

JESUS Himself in His glorified state." He goes on to contend that our LORD'S Resurrection Body was bloodless, and that the Blood which our LORD shed upon the Cross did not corrupt, but is mentioned separately from the LORD Himself as an item in the glories of the Heavenly City, and as yet speaking. Alford refers to a long excursus on the point in Bengel's note *in loco*; indeed he takes his idea entirely from Bengel, who asserts that "at the time of the Ascension the Blood, separated from the Body, was carried into heaven." Dean Jackson seems to hold this view, and Sadler, in his *The One Offering* quotes it with apparent approval.* Milligan notices this theory, but regards it as "too carnal," although he apparently holds that the presentation of our LORD'S Precious Blood was in heaven.

Taken from Bengel.

And rejected by most writers except Sadler and Jackson.

As this opinion has but few followers, and is explicitly rejected by so many of the holders of the modern theory, it is not necessary to comment on it further than to say that it is founded upon a misreading of the text, as is shown in Bishop Westcott's masterly analysis of the passage, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. †

Before closing this chapter we would repeat that we quite realize that there are many who, while relating the Eucharistic Sacrifice to our LORD'S Mediatorial work, would repudiate any view which seemed to make the Sacrifice of the Cross incomplete. These, like the Tractarians, probably hold that our LORD is in heaven a Sacrifice only in a passive sense, that He is "the Lamb as it had been slain;" and that substantially (*quoad substantiam*) He is in the Eucharist what he is in Heaven, that is, the Sacrifice.

Conclusion.

* Sadler, *The One Offering*, p. 44.

† Westcott, *Heb.*, pp. 412-417.

This is entirely true, and quite unobjectionable ; indeed, it is what the Fathers again and again assert, but it must be remembered that it does not recognize or provide for *any sacrificial action*, by which the Eucharist becomes, *in an active and therefore proper sense*, a sacrifice.

This sacrificial action in the Eucharist consists precisely in “ doing ” that which our LORD Himself did and commanded His Apostles to continue, namely, taking bread and consecrating it into His Body, taking wine in the cup and consecrating it into His Blood. This double consecration is the sacrificial act in the Eucharist ; for by it our LORD’S Body and Blood are produced, under the diverse species, as severed by death ; and this act certainly has no counterpart in our LORD’S Mediatorial work in heaven, but does find its only counterpart in the Sacrifice of the Cross.

The mere presence of a sacrificed victim is not a proper sacrifice, that is, in the active sense of the word ; and while our LORD’S glorified Humanity, sitting at the Right Hand of the FATHER, and now appearing in the presence of GOD for us, may be analogous to His continued presence in the reserved Sacrament, yet it certainly is not analogous to the act of Consecration, which is in the Eucharist the act of Sacrifice.

We must therefore carefully bear in mind that the Catholic view differs from the Modern, not in denying that our LORD is, in heaven and in the Eucharist, “ the Sacrifice,” “ the Lamb as it had been slain,” but in teaching that this alone does not constitute the Eucharist a sacrifice. According to the Catholic view the sacrificial act consists in doing what our LORD commanded us to do, when He said, “ Do this in remembrance of Me,” that is, in consecrating bread and wine into His

The essential difference between the Catholic and Modern views.

Body and Blood; and, further, the Catholic doctrine teaches that "upon the Cross for our Redemption" our LORD made "by His one Oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" and that our LORD "did institute and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual Memory of that His precious Death and Sacrifice until His coming again."

The Catholic doctrine teaches, then, that the double consecration in the Eucharist is that Memorial of our LORD's Death which He commanded us to make, and hence that, as a sacrificial act, the Eucharist depends solely upon the Sacrifice of the Cross.

CHAPTER V.

THE TESTIMONY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Introductory :
In this chapter
the Catholic
and Modern
views are com-
pared with the
teachings of
Scripture.

WE have now clearly before us the three views in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice which are to be found among Christians in the present day. Our work henceforth must be to consider what testimony and arguments can be drawn from various sources for or against two of these theories, since it will not be necessary to give any further consideration to the Protestant view, because, as it is purely negative, recognizing no real Sacrifice in the Eucharist, whatever testimony is brought forward in support of either of the other views will be in itself a refutation of the Protestant contention.

Does Scripture
teach,
I. That the H.
E. is a S.?
II. That its
sacrificial char-
acter depends
on its relation
to the Cross, or
to our LORD'S
work in
heaven?

The first testimony which we must consider, both in order of time and in weight of authority, is, of course, Holy Scripture. We must examine whether it can be proved from Holy Scripture that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, and, further, whether its sacrificial character is to be traced to its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, or to our LORD'S present Mediatorial work in heaven. The sacrificial character of the Eucharist is alike recognized by the supporters of both the Catholic and the Modern views, but the one school relates this character to the Sacrifice of the Cross, the other to our LORD'S Oblation of Himself in heaven.

I. Our first endeavour, then, must be to show that in Holy Scripture there is ground for our belief that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice.

1. The evidence of the Old Testament :

“ They shall take to them every man a lamb ; . . . and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening ; . . . and they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread. . . . And this day shall be unto you for a memorial ; and ye shall keep it a feast to the LORD throughout your generations ; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever.” *

“ And if his oblation be a sacrifice of peace offering, if he offer it of the herd ; whether it be a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the LORD. . . . And the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving shall be eaten the same day that it is offered.” †

The Church has always seen in the Passover the great type of our LORD'S Sacrifice. Indeed, S. Paul makes this evident when he says : “ CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast.” ‡ It differs from the other sacrifices under the Law, in that a yearly commemoration of it was enjoined by GOD, and this commemoration, while in itself a sacrifice in the same sense as the other Jewish sacrifices, differed from them in that it was related to, and commemorated, an event in the past. Thus it was in two points especially typical of the Eucharist, (1) as a relative and commemorative Sacrifice, (2) as being a feast upon the Sacrifice. This last aspect, however, it shared with the peace offering. Hence the

I. The witness of Scripture to the fact of the E. S.

1. The evidence of the O. T.

i. The Passover, Ex. xii. 3, 6, 8, 14.

Lev. iii. 1, vii. 15.

1 Cor. v. 7.

In two points it is typical of the H. E.

(1) As a commemorative S.
(2) As a feast upon a S.

* Ex. xii. 3, 6, 8, 14.

† Lev. iii. 1, vii. 15.

‡ 1 Cor. v. 7.

Passover and the peace offering find their distinct fulfilment only in such a Sacrifice as the Eucharist.

ii. The prophecy of Malachi i. 11.

“ From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My Name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure Offering : for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts.” *

The whole prophecy of Malachi is essentially Messianic, foretelling the coming of the Messenger of the Covenant, the Sun of Righteousness, and of His Forerunner, who should come “ in the spirit and power of Elias.” It is therefore fitting that Malachi should also foretell the Christian Sacrifice. We may observe, (1) that from the passage itself, and from the context,† it is evident that the Prophet is dealing exclusively with external worship. As the sacrifices to be abolished are real and true sacrifices, so the pure Oblation to be substituted for them is a real and true Sacrifice. (2) That he contrasts this Sacrifice with the legal sacrifices, in which GOD had no pleasure. (3) That he contrasts its universality—“ from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same,” “ in every place,” “ among the Gentiles ”—with the Jewish sacrifices, which were local. (4) That the word used for “ Offering,” *Minchah* (מִנְחָה, LXX. *θυσία*), is the same as that used for the meat offering in Lev. ii. ; and that all the technical terms in the Hebrew of the text are distinctly sacrificial. The word *muqtâr* (מִקְטָר), a form of *qâtâr* (קָטַר), to burn incense, is used 146 times in the Old Testament in a sacrificial sense ; *muggâsh* (מִגֵּשׁ), from *nâgash* (נָגַשׁ), “ to offer,” at least 12 times ; and *Minchah* about 154 times. Nowhere are these words used

(1) Refers to external worship.

(2) Contrasts the “ pure Offering ” with the legal sacrifices.

(3) Contrasts its universality with their local character.

(4) The word used is “ *Minchah*,” and the other terms are sacrificial.

* Mal. i. 11.

† Vs. 5-10.

in connection with internal worship ; nowhere are they applied to oblations other than proper sacrifices. Taking, then, the three words together, we have a threefold argument in favour of the sacrificial character of the promised new worship. The early Christians saw the force of the prediction,—that sacrifice was contrasted with sacrifice ; the bloody sacrifices, which were ended when the One Sacrifice was made by our LORD upon the Altar of the Cross “ for the sins of the whole world,” with that Sacrifice which He commanded to be made on our Altars as a memorial of Him. S. Justin Martyr, and in fact practically all the Fathers,* interpret this prophecy of Malachi of the Holy Eucharist, and, indeed, there is no other way in which we can explain its fulfilment.† We may therefore say that at the least it would lead us to expect a sacrifice in the Christian Dispensation, and a sacrifice which should be offered “ in every place ;” and this is fulfilled only by the Catholic view of the Eucharist.

The early Christian Fathers interpret the prophecy of the H. E.

2. We shall pass now to the New Testament, and first consider the sacrificial character of the records of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist. As this

2. The evidence of the N. T.

* Cf. Petavius, *De Incarn.*, l., xii., § 12 sqq.

† It is not necessary here to consider the objection made by higher critics, that the construction of the whole passage may be taken as present instead of future, and that Malachi is contrasting the insincere though legal sacrifices of the Jews with the devout sacrifices of the heathen,—further than to say that it never has been so taken by the Christian Fathers, and that its position in a prophecy which, as we have said, is essentially Messianic, is a strong argument against such a view ; and, further, that it is scarcely conceivable that a Jewish patriot and prophet, like Malachi, would assert that the offerings of the heathen were “ a pure Minchah,” acceptable to GOD.

character is most clearly indicated in the Consecration of the chalice, let us begin with it.

i. The Consecration of the chalice.

S. Matt. xxvi.

28.

S. Mark xiv. 24.

S. Luke xxii.

20.

In S. Matthew we read, "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" * in S. Mark, "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many;" † and in S. Luke, "This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you." ‡

While differing slightly in words, they all speak of the Blood of CHRIST, and of that Blood being shed, while S. Matthew and S. Mark add the purpose for which It is shed: "for many, for the remission of sins" (S. Matt.), "for many" (S. Mark). Here we have a distinctly sacrificial action, not only the shedding the Blood, but the shedding It for the remission of sins, as a sacrificial act.

ii. The Consecration of the bread.

The words used in the Consecration of the bread are, "Take, eat; this is My Body," § and, "This is My Body which is given for you;" || to which we may add: "This is My Body, which is [broken] for you," ¶ (where the word "broken" is of doubtful authority), and, "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh [which I will give] for the life of the world," ** (where the bracketed words "which I will give" are also of doubtful authority).

Whether we consider the giving of the Body or the breaking of the Body as the giving It in food, or, with others, the giving It for the Sacrifice, the sacrificial character of the expression is the same, the difference being that the one has regard to the feast upon the Sacrifice, and the other to the act of Sacrifice. ††

* S. Matt. xxvi. 28. † S. Mark xiv. 24. ‡ S. Luke xxii. 20.

§ S. Matt. xxvi. 26; S. Mark xiv. 22. || S. Luke xxii. 19.

¶ I Cor. xi. 24.

** S. John vi. 51.

†† Franzeliu, *De Euch.*, Thesis xi.

S. Luke adds: "This do in remembrance of Me;"* and S. Paul, besides placing these words after the Consecration of the bread, has a similar expression connected with the Consecration of the cup, namely: "This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." † Here again we have a distinctly sacrificial expression, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (S. Luke), which indicates the purpose for which the action is to be performed,—as a commemorative Sacrifice.

It has been pointed out by many that the words "This do" (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε) are also distinctly sacrificial, and are used of a sacrifice some seventy-six times in the Septuagint Version. As, however, the Greek Fathers have never taken them in this sense, it is better to pass over this argument.

"We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." ‡ In this passage "the position of ἔχομεν and the absence of the personal pronoun indicate that the passage presents a contrast to some supposed deficiency. Christians as such, so it appears to have been urged, are in a position of disadvantage; they have not something which others have. The reply is, We have an Altar. . . . There is not a sharp opposition between Christians and Jews at first, but this comes in later. The main contention is that the exclusion from the sacrificial services of the Temple is compensated by something which answers to them, and is of a nobler kind. . . . From the connection it seems that the Altar (θυσιαστήριον) must correspond to the Temple Altar, as including both the

iii. "This do in remembrance of Me." S. Luke xxii. 19.
I Cor. xi. 24-26.

iv. "We have an Altar." Heb. xiii. 10.

* S. Luke xxii. 19. † I Cor. xi. 24-26. ‡ Heb. xiii. 10.

idea of Sacrifice, and the idea of food from the Sacrifice." *

It is scarcely necessary to develop this thought further than to say that, while this Altar has been applied almost universally in its primary sense to the Altar of the Holy Eucharist, it has also been taken by the Fathers for the Cross, and for our LORD Himself.

Conclusion as to the fact that the H. E. is a S.

We may therefore conclude that both type and prophecy in the Old Testament point to the Eucharist as a Sacrifice; that every record of its Institution, by the sacrificial terms used, confirms the view that the Eucharist is the Christian Sacrifice; and that this view is further proved by the assertion "We have an Altar."

II. The teaching of Scripture about the manner in which the H. E. is a S.

II. So far we have considered the testimony of Scripture only in regard to the fact that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, which, as we have seen, is demanded alike by the Catholic and the Modern views. We must now interrogate Holy Scripture in regard to the manner in which the Eucharist is a Sacrifice; and to do this we must examine the passages which each of the two schools adduces in support of its theory.

The Catholic theory.

The Catholic theory is that the Eucharist is a true and proper Sacrifice, in that it fulfils the conditions of a sacrifice, and is related to the one absolute Sacrifice of our LORD upon the Cross, in such sense that it is not a mere commemoration of it, but is identical with it, for in it are found the same Priest, the same Victim, and a *real sacrificial action* (although the manner of offering is different); and further, that it is the Sacrifice instituted by our LORD Himself in His Church.

The Catholic view sees in the *production* of our LORD'S Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine, separated as in death, the mystical immolation

* Westcott, on *Heb. in loc.*

of the Victim, and His real presentation of Himself to GOD upon the Altars of the Church, by which act the Sacrifice of Calvary, without being reiterated, is renewed and applied for the needs of the whole Church. This view sees the essential act of Sacrifice in the double consecration, by which, as we have said, our LORD is mystically immolated and offered; and relates the Sacrifice directly to that Offering of Himself which our LORD made once for all upon the Cross.

It is in this latter point that the Modern view chiefly differs from the Catholic, since it refers the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, not to the moment of the Cross, but to our LORD'S Mediation now in heaven; and, while seeing in it some notes of Calvary analogous to the marks of the wounds in His Risen Body in heaven, relates it more directly to that state of glory wherein He reigns at the Right Hand of GOD the FATHER.

The solution of this point depends upon the interpretation put upon certain important passages of Holy Scripture, which each school claims as supporting its own view.

1. The first and most important of these is contained in the words of Institution, "Do this in remembrance of Me." The Catholic school points out that the whole background, so to speak, of the Institution of the Eucharist was connected with our LORD'S Death. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."* The Death on the Cross was the great act of love in which our LORD gave Himself sacrificially for us, gave Himself through suffering and death on our behalf; and that which the Eucharist commemorates is this act of love in which

Difference between the Catholic and Modern views.

Each school bases its view on the same passages of Scripture.

1. The words of Institution: The Catholic view connects this with our LORD'S Death. "Do this in remembrance of Me."

* S. John xv. 13.

His whole life of love culminated. Therefore, while the Eucharistic Sacrifice brings to remembrance His whole life, His Incarnation, His glorious Resurrection and Ascension, its most prominent feature, and that, indeed, which gives it this sacrificial aspect, is the showing forth of the LORD'S Death. In support of this S. Paul's words are quoted: "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." Here it seems almost impossible to avoid the conviction that S. Paul interprets the phrase "Do this in remembrance of Me" as a command to show forth our LORD'S Death. It may be asserted, too, that this has been the view taken by the Fathers and all commentators on this passage until very recent times.

Of course, if we accept this interpretation, the question is practically settled in favour of the Catholic view. But let us see what is said on the other side.

Mr. Brightman's interpretation of this passage.

Mr. Brightman points out that the phrase "Do this in remembrance of Me" does not command a commemoration of our LORD'S Death, but of His Person, — "of Me," by which he understands His whole life; and in regard to S. Paul's interpretation, he considers that the words, "For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death," are not to be taken as equivalent to, or strictly interpretative of, the phrase, "Do this in remembrance of Me."

He refers to Godet and Milligan for the force of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ in 1 Cor. xi. 26.

First he calls in question the force of the word "for" ($\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$), referring to Godet and Milligan. Let us see what they say. Godet does not consider that the objections brought forward by Ewald and Hofmann* are

* Meyer (*1 Cor.*, *in loc.*, pp. 343, 344) recognizes the inferential force of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$.

of much force, for he says : “ But what so great difficulty is there in preserving the literal sense of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$? All that is needed is to connect it with the words ‘ in remembrance of Me.’ ‘ If JESUS so expressed Himself, it is because *in fact* the action you perform every time you celebrate the Supper is a memorial of His Person, for the meaning of the action is *to show His Death !* ’ ” * That is to say, he considers “ a memorial of His Person ” equivalent to “ to show His Death.” Milligan, † however, says : “ In the LORD’S Death, therefore, which we proclaim in the Sacrament of Communion, we proclaim not only JESUS on the Cross, but the LORD exalted in heaven.” He makes no reference to the interpretation of “ for,” but simply makes the assertion that “ the LORD’S Death ” does not mean only the death of “ JESUS on the Cross,” but “ the LORD exalted in heaven ; ” a method of interpretation by which almost any results could be obtained, and which is too unreasonable to be worthy of further notice.

Godet, however, preserves the literal sense.

Milligan does not notice the force of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$,

but extends the remembrance to our LORD’S exaltation in heaven.

Mr. Brightman then goes on to say that, admitting that the LORD’S Death is shown forth in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the question is in what order it is shown forth ; whether primarily, as an historical event, or as existing in His Person perfected through suffering. In support of the second alternative he quotes from the Liturgies, which “ make an addition to S. Paul’s words, and say not only, ‘ ye do shew the LORD’S Death,’ but, ‘ ye do shew the LORD’S Death, and confess His Resurrection,’ and sometimes, also, ‘ and His Ascension,’ ‘ till He come.’ ” To this it may be replied, that the very fact that the Liturgies add to the words “ ye do shew the LORD’S Death ” the further expression “ and

Mr. Brightman questions whether the reference is to our LORD’S Death as an historical event. He cites the Liturgies as commemorating the Resurrection and Ascension.

* Godet, *1 Cor.*, vol. ii., p. 161.

† Milligan, *The Resurrection*, p. 299.

confess His Resurrection," and sometimes, also, "and His Ascension," seems to show that these latter events *are not contained* in the first phrase, since, if they were, why should the Liturgies add, "and confess His Resurrection," and sometimes, "and His Ascension" ?

The method of interpretation popular, but vicious.

Again, if we are to interpret S. Paul's definite expression, "For as often as ye eat, . . . ye do shew the LORD'S Death," as referring, not to an historical event in our LORD'S life, but to something quite different, we are clearly pursuing a method of interpretation most popular indeed in the present day among higher critics, who first say what *they think* the author ought to have meant, and then interpret his words in the light of this assumption ; but one indeed from which no trustworthy results can be obtained, and which must be emphatically rejected by those who do not accept the canons of higher criticism. To be told that when S. Paul speaks of our LORD'S Death, which all knew to have taken place upon the Cross, he is not referring to that event only, but to His life at the right hand of the FATHER in glory, is most unsatisfactory, since S. Paul certainly knew the meaning of words ; and, except to support an *a priori* theory, no one would argue that by the word "death" he meant "life."

It would never have been thought of except to support an "a priori" theory.

No Father or Church commentator has advanced this interpretation.

2. The Epistle to the Hebrews the battle-ground of the two views.

The fact that no Father, or commentator of the Church until this modern theory was started, has ever understood the words of S. Paul in this sense, is also strong evidence against this interpretation.*

2. The real battle-ground of these two views is the Epistle to the Hebrews, for the Modern view in its application of other passages of Holy Scripture reads into them (as we have already seen in regard to the

* It may be observed that all the persons quoted in its favour are modern schismatics.

words of Institution) an *a priori* theory which is certainly not suggested by them, but which the writers of this school think they are justified in assuming from certain passages in the Epistle. Before considering these passages, therefore, it may be well to give a slight sketch of the purpose and argument of this Epistle as it has been understood by all commentators before the sixteenth century, and by all who have written on the subject since then, with the exception of Socinus and those who hold the Modern view.

The Epistle, as its title indicates, was written to Jews, and its chief purpose, like that of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, was to show that the Ancient Covenant, as represented by the Law with its priesthood and sacrifices, had but "a shadow of the good things to come," and was unable to "make perfect them that drew nigh." * And further, it showed that this Law, priesthood, and sacrifice, was abrogated when the New Covenant in CHRIST'S Blood took its place, which not only fulfilled all that by type and ceremony had been foreshadowed, but far excelled in dignity, scope, and power the brightest hopes of Judaism.

Taking up the two questions of priesthood and sacrifice, the Epistle shows that the Priesthood of our LORD was foreshadowed in the priesthood of Melchisedec *before* the legal Covenant had any existence. From this the writer draws a contrast between the universal and eternal nature of CHRIST'S Priesthood, and the local and transitory character of the Levitical priesthood. He contrasts, too, the sacrifices which were offered daily by the Levitical priests, and yearly by the high priest, and which by their very reiteration implied their imperfection, with the One "full, perfect, and sufficient

i. A sketch of the purpose and argument of the Epistle.

From Melchisedec the writer contrasts the universal and eternal nature of CHRIST'S Priesthood with the local and transitory character of that of the Jews.

* Heb. x. 1.

Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction” “once offered” by our LORD upon the Cross “for the sins of the whole world.”

The two main points in regard to the S. are, that it was offered once for all, and that its effects, or merits, live on in our LORD'S Mediatorial work.

The two points upon which the writer of the Epistle especially dwells with regard to the Sacrifice are: first, that it was once for all, and, being perfect, in that it effected its purpose it needs not to be repeated; and, second, that its effects, or merits, live on in heaven in the great Mediatorial work of CHRIST upon His Throne of Glory. This is illustrated in the Epistle by reference to the function of the high priest on the great Day of Atonement.

Thus far both views accord, but here they divide.

The Catholics teach that the S. was completed on the Cross, and that in heaven our LORD pleads only the merits of this S.

Thus far both views are practically in agreement. But here they part company. The Catholic school, with all writers before Socinus, teaches that the Sacrifice was offered once for all, completed and finished upon the Cross, that is, before the Ascension into heaven, and that in heaven our LORD presents Himself “before the face of GOD for us,” pleading the merits of His Sacrifice, offering, if you will, a *virtual* Sacrifice, but not an *actual* Sacrifice, or Sacrifice properly so called, inasmuch as He performs no sacrificial action in connection with His great Intercession.

The Modern school are split into different camps, the more radical denying that the S. was completed on the Cross, others trying to find some sacrificial action in our LORD'S Mediatorial work,

The Modern school, on the other hand, puts forth several theories. Its more advanced representatives, like Mr. Brightman, place our LORD'S sacrificial act, the presentation of the Blood, after the Ascension into heaven, and thus implicitly deny that the Sacrifice was completed and finished upon the Cross. Others, while fully holding that the Sacrifice was complete on the Cross, either try to find some sacrificial action in our LORD'S Mediatorial work, or teach, with Bishop Forbes, the perfectly unobjectionable doctrine that in speaking of our LORD'S Sacrifice in heaven, the word “sacri-

“fice” is to be understood, not in an active, but in a passive sense. They point out that He is in heaven what He was upon the Cross, “the Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sin of the world,” and that, having been once for all offered, He therefore abides continually the Sacrifice, although He performs no proper sacrificial act.

With this introduction we shall proceed to an examination of the passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews bearing upon the subject. They fall practically into two divisions: those which refer to the Priesthood of our LORD as typified by Melchisedec, and those which exhibit it as fulfilling the typical functions of the high priest on the great Day of Atonement. Thus regarded, they yield the following analysis:*

The ruling thought of the whole Epistle is, CHRIST’S High-Priesthood. It is indicated in the opening verses, where the culminating characteristic of the SON is that “after He had Himself made purification of sins,” He “sat down on the Right Hand of the Majesty on high.” † Here the priestly and royal offices of CHRIST are placed together in the closest connection, and the whole Epistle is the development of this thought.

In chapters ii., iii., and iv. we have a preparatory treatment of the subject. First the foundation of CHRIST’S High-Priesthood is shown to be in the Incarnation (ii. 17, 18); then follows an exhortation to a careful study of this aspect of our LORD’S work (iii. 1, 2); and, finally, we have a recapitulation of this introductory argument, showing that CHRIST is a High Priest Who has fulfilled the conditions of His Office, and therefore can feel with men, and is alike able and ready to succour them (iv. 14-16).

* Cf. Westcott on *Heb.*, pp. 70, 71.

† Heb. i. 3.

or taking the word only in a passive sense.

The passages in the Epistle on this subject fall into two divisions: our LORD’S Priesthood as typified by Melchisedec, or in the Day of Atonement.

The ruling thought is CHRIST’S High-Priesthood.

(1) Chaps. ii., iii., and iv. give a prefatory treatment of the subject and show the foundation of CHRIST’S Priesthood in the Incarnation (ii. 17, 18)

(2) Chaps. v., vi., vii. set forth the nature of this Priesthood.

In chapters v., vi., vii. the nature of CHRIST'S High-Priesthood is set forth, showing the characteristics of the Levitical high-priesthood as realized in CHRIST (v. 1-10); the Priesthood of CHRIST after the order of Melchisedec (vi. 20, vii. 14-19); and His characteristics as absolute and eternal High Priest (vii. 26-28).

(3) Chaps. viii., ix., x. treat of the work of CHRIST as High Priest.

The work of CHRIST as High Priest is considered in chapters viii., ix., and x. The scene of this work is shown to be a heavenly and not an earthly Sanctuary (viii. 1-6); His atoning work is contrasted with that of the high priest on the Day of Atonement (ix. 11-28); and the abiding efficacy of His One Sacrifice is set forth (x. 1-18).

(4) In the remaining chapters the fruits of this Priesthood are applied to believers.

In the remaining chapters we have the application of the fruits of CHRIST'S High-Priesthood to believers.

Thus we see that the characteristics of our LORD'S High-Priesthood are deduced from two types: that of Melchisedec; that of the high priest on the great Day of Atonement. Let us consider what the writer of the Epistle tells us of each.

ii. Our LORD'S Priesthood as typified by Melchisedec.

Our LORD'S High-Priesthood as typified by Melchisedec (Heb. v., vi., vii.). The writer of the Epistle bases his arguments on two passages of the Old Testament. He starts from the verse in the Psalm,* "Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec," and determines the idea suggested by this phrase from an investigation of the single record of Melchisedec found in the Book of Genesis. He argues partly from what is there told us, and partly from what is there omitted; that is, both from the statements and from the silence of Scripture. His treatment is distinctly typi-

The statements and silence of Scripture about Melchisedec.

* Ps. cx. 4.

cal, not allegorical, the difference being that a type presupposes a purpose wrought out in history from age to age, while an allegory rests finally in the imagination. From the silence of Holy Scripture in regard to the parentage or genealogy of Melchisedec and the commencement or close of his priestly office, he distinguishes between the Priesthood of our LORD as the Eternal SON, "having neither beginning of days nor end of life,"* and the Levitical priesthood. He points out that both rest upon an authoritative institution: the Levitical upon GOD'S command to Moses, and our LORD'S upon the Divine utterances, "Thou art My SON, to-day have I begotten Thee," and, "Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec" (vv. 5-7). And he shows that the superior excellence of the Melchisedecan priesthood over the Levitical is not only seen in the nature of the priest and in the circumstances of His Ordination, but that it is typically manifested in Abraham's attitude towards Melchisedec. The victorious patriarch, himself a priest and the ancestor of the Levitical priesthood, recognizes the greater dignity of the royal priesthood of Melchisedec by paying tithes, and *receiving* Melchisedec's blessing.

We have already touched on the fact that the inferior priesthood of Levi was but local and Judaic, while that of Melchisedec was universal. We must point out, however, that the only features of the type upon which the writer of the Epistle dwells are the payment of tithes and the receiving of blessing. He passes over in complete silence the gifts of bread and wine. The Fathers, from Clement of Alexandria † and Cyprian ‡

The universal character of this priesthood. The special features—tithes and blessing. No reference to the bread and wine.

* Ch. vii. 3.

† Clement of Alex., *Strom.*, iv. 25, § 163; also *Strom.*, ii. 5, § 21.

‡ *Ep. ad Cæcil.*, lxiii., 4.

The Fathers assume that they were the materials of a S.

downward, have assumed that the bread and wine were the materials of a sacrifice offered by Melchisedec, and S. Jerome* distinctly states that they were offered for Abraham. This silence in regard to the gifts Bishop Westcott thinks very significant as indicating that the writer presents Melchisedec as priest, not in sacrificing, but in blessing; that is, in communicating the fruits of an efficacious sacrifice already made. And if we adopt the opinion that the bread and wine had already been offered in sacrifice, it falls in well with the Catholic view of our LORD'S Intercession, that He is now in heaven, pleading and dispensing on earth the fruits of His Sacrifice once offered upon the Cross.

The argument concludes that such an High Priest needs not to offer daily,

The verses in which the argument from Melchisedec concludes, are: "He, because He abideth for ever, hath His Priesthood inviolable. Whence also He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto GOD through Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an High Priest [in truth] became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and become higher than the heavens; Who hath no need daily, as the high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for their own sins, then for the sins of the people, for this He did once for all in that He offered up Himself" (vii. 24-27). From this we may gather, in support of the Catholic view, that though our LORD'S Priesthood is "inviolable" and continuous (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*), that is, it cannot pass to another, yet "He hath no need daily to offer up sacrifices, for this He did once for all (*ἐφ' ἅπαξ*) when He offered up Himself;" but that, being "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and become higher than the heavens," "He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto

for this He did once for all.

But that He is able to save all that come to

* S. Jerome, *Ad Matt.*, xxii. 41; cf. *Ad Matt.*, xxvi. 26.

God through Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Here the phrase "to make intercession" (*εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν*), as has often been pointed out, implies the work of a Mediator interacting between GOD and man, being able as Man from "the things which He suffered" to sympathize with man, and being able as GOD "to save to the uttermost" those for whom He intercedes.

GOD through Him, and ever liveth to make intercession for them.

There is here not only no mention of the offering of Sacrifice, but this is explicitly excluded by the statement that He "hath no need daily to offer up Sacrifice," either "for Himself" or "for the people," "for this He did once for all in that He offered up Himself." This certainly seems purposely to exclude from the idea of intercession or mediation the offering of any actual sacrifice.

Not only is there no mention of any S. offered in heaven, but it seems explicitly excluded.

The objection of the Modern school to this is, that since it is the function of a priest to offer sacrifice, and our LORD is admittedly "a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec," He must not only "have something to offer,"* but must continually offer it. This objection does not seem well taken, since a priest does not cease to be a priest when he is not actually offering sacrifice, and there are other sacerdotal functions besides sacrifice. Aaron was high priest from the day of his consecration to the day of his death, and not only at the time when he was exercising his peculiar office on the great Day of Atonement. And if we accept the Catholic view that our LORD was a Priest from His Incarnation, we believe that He passed thirty-three years of His life without actually exercising the sacrificial function, although doubtless daily in will offering up to God His interior purpose to consummate on the Cross

The Modern school object that since our LORD is a Priest for ever, He must continually offer S. This objection answered.

* Heb. viii. 3.

the Sacrifice by which the world was to be redeemed. There is, therefore, no difficulty in believing that, having offered this One Sacrifice, as we are so distinctly told, "once for all," and needing not to offer any other Sacrifice, He "abideth a Priest perpetually."

Our LORD exercises His Priesthood in intercession, pleading the merits of His Sacrifice, in blessing, and in presenting to the FATHER His own glorified Humanity and His Mystical Body the Church.

For He exercises His sacerdotal functions in intercession, by pleading the merits of His Sacrifice once offered, by presenting to the FATHER with His own glorified Humanity His Mystical Body the Church, which He has redeemed with His Precious Blood. Like Melchisedec His work is to bless; and this is indicated in S. Luke's account of His Ascension: "It came to pass, while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven."* And like Melchisedec also He feeds His people on earth with the fruits of His Sacrifice, in the Holy Eucharist.

In Chap. viii. we reach the main point, that we have an High Priest Who fulfils all the conditions required, and has sat down at the Right Hand of God.

We now pass to the opening verses of the next chapter: "Now in the things which we are saying the chief point is this: We have such a High Priest as sat down on the Right Hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a Minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the LORD pitched, not man. For every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; whence it was necessary that this [High Priest] also should have something to offer. Now if He were [still] upon earth, He would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to law, such as serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly order, even as Moses is warned of GOD, when about to make the tabernacle, for, See, saith He, thou shalt make all things according to the pattern that was shewed thee in the mount. But, as it is, He hath obtained a Ministry so much the more excellent as also He is

* S. Luke xxiv. 51.

Mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises" (viii. 1-6).

Our attention is here directed to the chief point of the writer's argument. It is that "we have such a High Priest" as has been described in the last chapter, that is, One Who fulfils all the conditions of priesthood; and that He has "sat down on the Right Hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a Minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle."

The principal feature, we are told, in our great High Priest's work, is that He reigns as a royal High Priest. The Fathers are never weary of pointing out that to sit down is not the attitude of a sacrificing priest, and is, indeed, entirely inconsistent with the idea of offering sacrifice. But while reigning as our High Priest, He is also a Minister (*λειτουργός*) of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle. Thalhofer and his school contend that *λειτουργός* is equivalent to *sacrificator*, but an examination of the history of the word shows that this was not its meaning in classical Greek, nor is it the meaning in which it is used in other passages in the New Testament. The adoption of the word *λειτουργία* to describe the Sacrifice of the Eucharist led in later times to a sacrificial idea being associated with *λειτουργός*, but we must not anticipate by five centuries this meaning of the word, and there are certainly no grounds for associating the idea of sacrifice with the word in the New Testament.*

The chief characteristic, that He reigns as royal High Priest,

and that He is a Minister of the sanctuary.

Λειτουργός not the same as "Sacrificator."

Bishop Westcott points out that there is a significant contrast here between the Session of CHRIST and His "serving;" that the two words, in fact, present the two complementary aspects of CHRIST'S Person and

CHRIST reigning and serving shows forth His Divine Majesty

* For the history of this word and a discussion of its use in the New Testament, see Appendix A.

and infinite love.

work, His Divine Majesty and His infinite Love. The true tabernacle (*ἀληθινή*) is the ideal tabernacle, of which the earthly was a symbol. But no local distinction can be attached to this term. The general thought here expressed is that of the immediate Presence of GOD, not of a place which corresponds in heaven to the tabernacle on earth.

The idea suggested by the true tabernacle.

The idea is taken up again in the eleventh verse of the next chapter, where we have the expression "CHRIST, having come a High Priest of the good things realized, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle," etc. In both places we observe that it is not "a tabernacle," but "the tabernacle"; in one, "the true tabernacle," in the other, "the greater and more perfect tabernacle." And it may be worth while to consider somewhat carefully the conception suggested by this image.

The earthly tabernacle symbolized three things: GOD dwelling among men, His holiness, His "approachableness."

The earthly tabernacle symbolized three main ideas: the idea of the dwelling of GOD among men, of His holiness, and of His "approachableness." It was that through which He was pleased to make His Presence and His Nature known, under the conditions of earth, to His people Israel. And the antitype of the tabernacle, whether on earth or in heaven, must fulfil the same office, and fulfil it perfectly. The Fathers, both Greek and Latin, commonly understood this tabernacle to be the LORD'S Flesh, or Humanity.* In our LORD'S historical work on earth He was the perfect revelation of the FATHER, and the Way to Him. In the ideal archetype of the tabernacle we must take account of our LORD'S Ministry in heaven. In this the heavenly High Priest and the heavenly tabernacle are in some sense distinguished, and the LORD acts as High

The Fathers consider the tabernacle to be our LORD'S Flesh or Humanity.

* Cf. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, Primasius, Euthymius, Theophylact, *in loc.*

Priest in His Human Nature. In this relation, then, it may be said that "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" of which CHRIST is Minister, and in which the Saints worship, gathers up the various means by which GOD reveals Himself in the spiritual order, and through which men approach to Him. Under one aspect these are represented by the union of the redeemed and perfected hosts made one in CHRIST, as His Body. Through this glorified Church, answering to the complete Humanity which CHRIST assumed, GOD is made known, and in and through this each believer comes nigh to GOD. In this Body, as a spiritual temple, CHRIST ministers. As members in this Body, believers severally enjoy the Divine Presence. This vision enables us to connect redeemed humanity with the glorified Human Nature of the LORD, and to consider how it is that humanity, as the summing up of creation, may become in Him the highest manifestation of GOD to finite being, and, in its fulness, that through which each part is brought near to GOD. This heavenly tabernacle is spoken of as "greater and more perfect;" greater in comparison with the narrow limits of the earthly tabernacle, more perfect as answering to the complete development of the Divine plan.*

In this Body
CHRIST min-
isters.

In the third verse of the eighth chapter we have a disputed passage: "For every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; whence it was necessary that this [High Priest] also should have something to offer."

In Heb. viii. 3
are we to sup-
ply ἦν or ἐστὶ?

Here we have first to notice a controversy in respect to the tense of the verb which must be supplied with ἀγαγαῖον. Is it ἦν or ἐστὶ? Our version and the Vulgate read "is." Scholars of many different

* Cf. Westcott, on *Heb.*, pp. 214, 240, 256-258.

This does not
affect the argu-
ment.

schools consider that it should be "was." The point is not easily decided. The aorist subjunctive *προσενέγκη* would seem to suggest ἦν, as has been pointed out by Bengel, Meyer, and others, and adopted by Westcott and Thalhofer. The aorist subjunctive, however, has not any necessary temporal significance, and therefore others have thought that the tense must be decided by the general context of the passage, which they consider demands the present. The matter is really of little consequence to our argument, as may be seen by the fact that Thalhofer and Bengel, who hold the Modern view, read ἦν, and from it support their own position, while Catholic writers generally read ἐστὶ, and refer it to the Sacrifice of the Cross. It is simply asserted that it is necessary that a high priest should have something to offer; and this is equally well satisfied, whether we refer it to the Offering once made upon the Cross, or to an Offering made immediately after our LORD'S Ascension, or, again, to a continuous Offering.

We may therefore pass over this passage with the remark that *προσενέγκη* reminds us that in the next chapter it is said, ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπαξ προσενεχθεὶς,* where the idea of the Offering being "once for all" is again insisted on.

What is the
nature of
CHRIST'S
Offering?

The other question suggested by this passage is, the nature of the Offering which CHRIST made. "It was necessary that He should have something to offer." What was this something? Bishop Westcott justly observes that it seems necessary to supply that object which is elsewhere used with *προσφέρειν* in the same connection. Some have interpreted the *τὶ* of the Blood, but, as we shall see later, the blood was not properly offered in the Holy of holies on the Day of

Certainly not
His Blood,

* Heb. ix. 28.

Atonement, but was used rather as the means of entrance and purification. So CHRIST entered into the Divine Presence "through" (*διὰ*), not "with" (*μετά*), His own Blood, and by that purifies the heavenly things and people, but we do not read that He offered it. We should rather supply either "Himself" (vii. 27, ix. 14, 25) or "His Body" (x. 19).

but either Himself or His Body.

iii. We now come to the second part of the argument of the Epistle, that which is drawn from our LORD'S High-Priesthood as typified by the high priest on the Day of Atonement (ix., x.). After describing the tabernacle, with the Holy Place and its furniture, and the Holy of Holies and its contents, we read: "But when these things have been thus prepared, the priests enter into the first tabernacle continually, accomplishing the Divine services; but into the second, once in the year, the high priest alone, not without blood, which he offereth for himself and for the ignorances of the people, the HOLY GHOST thus signifying that the way into the Holy Place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle hath still an appointed place; which is a parable for the season now present" (ix. 6-9).

iii. Our LORD'S High-Priesthood as typified by the ritual of the Day of Atonement.

Before we pass to the second part of the chapter, in which our LORD'S fulfilment of the type is indicated, it will be well for us to pause and carefully consider exactly what was signified by the ritual of the Day of Atonement.

The significance of this ritual.

The effect of sin on the human soul is twofold: first, a sense of alienation from GOD, Who is the Source of all true life; and, flowing from this, when the consequences of this separation from GOD are realized, an intense longing for reconciliation or restoration to communion with GOD. Secondly, an even more deeply

The effect of sin twofold: A sense of alienation from GOD, and a conviction of guilt.

The conception of S. also twofold as a means of removing the guilt, of reconciling man with GOD.

The chief significance of the ritual, that till the sufficient S. is offered there is no free access to GOD,

but that the yearly entrance of the high priest within the veil arouses hope.

The first tabernacle was open to the priests daily, the Holy of Holies only to the high priest once a year.

grounded conviction of guilt, which must be removed before such access to GOD and communion with Him can be restored. We find also a twofold conception of the effects of sacrifice as remedying these consequences of sin : first, by removing the guilt which prevents man from standing in GOD'S Presence ; and, secondly, by thus making an access to GOD, and so reconciling man with GOD.

The fundamental significance of the great Day of Atonement (which is often overlooked) is its teaching that, while the first tabernacle was in existence, that is, before CHRIST'S Sacrifice had been offered, there was no possibility of *free access* to GOD, "the HOLY GHOST thus signifying that the way into the Holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle hath still an appointed place." And furthermore the great Day of Atonement was the earnest and pledge of this access as a thing to be hoped for ; and the whole purpose of the entrance of the high priest once a year into the Holy of holies was to keep alive this hope by typifying the work of CHRIST, the true High Priest, Who "when He had overcome the sharpness of death, opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers."

The first tabernacle, that part of the sanctuary which was called the Holy place, was open to the priests daily, but the second, the Holy of holies, only upon one single day of each year, and then to the high priest alone. And on this occasion his entrance was accompanied by a ritual which, while it inspired hope, pointed clearly to the means by which alone the barrier between GOD and man could be removed, namely, the Precious Blood of CHRIST, the Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sin of the world. We must keep

distinctly in mind that the purpose for which the high priest went into the Holy of holies was not to sprinkle the blood, but "to appear in the Presence of GOD," to typify the entrance into heaven of Him Who "having obtained eternal redemption [for us]," "through His own Blood entered in once for all into the Holy place," "to appear openly before the face of GOD on our behalf." * The sprinkling of the blood was not, as we have said, the *end* for which the high priest entered the Holy of holies, but typified the *means* by which this end was to be attained. The end was access to GOD, the removal of the barrier symbolized by the veil, which none but the high priest could pass. The sprinkling of the blood showed the means, the Precious Blood of CHRIST, by which the world was to be redeemed, and also typified the application of that Blood as the fruits or merits of a finished sacrifice for the propitiation of sin. For, as S. Paul says, "It pleased the FATHER that in Him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the Blood of His Cross by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether things in earth or things in heaven." † And S. John, "The Blood of JESUS CHRIST His SON cleanseth us from all sin." ‡ And again, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the Righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins." §

We must now examine carefully the ritual which accompanied the high priest's entrance, and inquire into its significance. On the day itself, after bathing, the high priest put on his white linen robes || as representing the people before GOD, not the golden robes,

The purpose for which the high priest went within the veil was not to sprinkle the blood, but to appear before GOD.

The sprinkling of the blood was not the "end," but the "means."

The details of the ritual.

* Heb. ix. 12, 24.

† Col. i. 19, 20.

‡ 1 S. John i. 7.

§ 1 S. John ii. 1, 2.

|| Lev. xvi. 4.

which represented him as the messenger of GOD to the people. Then the victims for the congregation and for the high priest were prepared and presented : for sin offerings, a bullock for the high priest and two goats for the people ; for burnt offerings, a ram for each.* One of the goats was assigned by lot to the LORD, and the other to Azazel. Then the high priest killed the bullock and made an atonement for himself and for his house (i. e., the priesthood), entering within the veil under cover of a cloud of incense, that he might not die. After this (and, according to the later ritual, he returned meanwhile from the Holy of holies, and re-entered it with the blood) he took of the blood and sprinkled it with his finger upon the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat seven times. So the high priest and the scene of the manifestation of GOD were duly atoned, and the high priest was able to act for the people. Then the goat, the sin offering for the people, was killed, and his blood treated as the blood of the bullock. Afterwards the high priest made atonement for the Holy place, being there alone,† and for the altar of burnt offering.‡ Having thus made atonement for priests and people and the whole place of service, that is, the sanctuary in its three parts, the high priest laid his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessed over it all the iniquities of the Children of Israel, putting them upon the head of the goat, and sent it away into the wilderness.§ Thus the special service ended. ||

Here let us pause to gather up in a concise form the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews in regard to our

* Lev. xvi. 3, 5, 6. † Ex. xxx. 10. ‡ Lev. xvi. 16-20. § Vv. 20, 21.

|| This description is taken from Westcott, on *Heb.*, pp. 279, 280.

LORD'S work as typified by the ritual of the Day of Atonement. (1) From the Old Testament we learn that:

(i.) Sacrifice under the Jewish Law was not offered within the Holy of holies, but in the Court of the Tabernacle where was the altar of burnt offering, upon which the blood was sprinkled round about (*zarak*, זרק, in its original Assyrian form, means "to scatter" (Arabic, to throw), hence in Hebrew "to pour out or sprinkle in large quantities"); at the foot of which, after the sprinkling, the remainder of the blood was poured out; and upon which the victim was burned.* This surely teaches that only upon earth sacrifice was to be offered.

(1) The O. T. teaches that (i.) S. was not offered in the Holy of holies,

(ii.) Besides this the blood was applied (*nathan*, נתן, to give) to the horns of the burnt offering in the case of a sin offering for one of the common people; to the horns of the altar of incense and some sprinkled with the finger before the veil seven times, in the case of a sin offering for a priest or for the congregation. The word used for this sprinkling (*hizzah*, הִזָּה, from נוה) in its Aramaic and Syriac forms means "to spring or spirt up," and in Hebrew "to sprinkle in smaller quantities" as with the finger, an application, that is, of the blood of the sacrifice which had been offered.† And on the Day of Atonement only some of the blood was carried into the Holy of holies and sprinkled (הִזָּה not זרק) with the finger upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat seven times. ‡ Here we have the application of the merits of a sacrifice, which had been offered, to the cleansing or atoning or reconciling of articles symbolical of things on earth and in heaven. §

(ii.) but that in certain cases the blood of a S. was applied to atone or reconcile.

* Lev. i. 5, iii. 2, vii. 2; Lev. iv. 7, iv. 30, v. 9. Lev. i. 9, iii. 3-6, iv. 8-11.

‡ Lev. xvi. 14, 15, 18, 19.

† Lev. iv. 30, iv. 7, iv. 6.

§ Col. i. 19, 20.

(2) The Epistle points out resemblances and contrasts between the high priest and our LORD.

(2) In the Epistle to the Hebrews the action of the Jewish high-priest and the ritual of the Day of Atonement is put in parallel with our LORD'S Atoning work, and our attention is directed both to the likeness and to the contrast between them.

(i.) Resemblances:

(i.) We find the points of resemblance chiefly in chapter ix. They are four:

(a) The entry into the Holy of holies.

(a) The entry into the Holy of holies of the high priest *alone*. So we as priests offer the sacrifice which CHRIST has commanded us to offer, but He alone has entered within the veil.

(b) "Not without blood."

(b) "Not without blood," that is, not apart from blood (*οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος*) (v. 7). We may observe here how carefully the inspired writer avoids the phrase "*with blood*" (*μετὰ αἵματος*); since in this the high priest *differs* from our LORD in His entry into heaven, as is afterward noted (in v. 25).

(c) To intercede.

(c) "To appear in the presence of GOD for us" (v. 24). So the Fathers* speak of the very presence of our LORD'S Humanity at the Right Hand of the FATHER as His Intercession, and they point out that this Intercession is not merely verbal prayer. Surely this, too, is typified by the fact that the high priest within the veil uttered no words, but bore upon his heart the breastplate engraven with the names of the tribes of Israel.

(d) The waiting people.

(d) The multitude who waited without for the high priest's return; so are we told of our LORD that He "shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him unto salvation" (v. 28).

(ii.) Contrasts:

(ii.) The points of difference and contrast are even more strongly emphasized. They are chiefly:

(a) Many times,

(a) That whereas the high priest entered into the

* Euthymius Zigadenus, *in Heb.* ix. 25.

Holy of holies many times and with the blood of many victims, our LORD "once for all, at the close of the ages, hath been manifested to disannul sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

and "once for all."

This contrast is dwelt upon again and again and brought out by the use of ἅπασι* and ἐφάπασι,† and excludes the possibility of any repetition of the One Sacrifice of our LORD.

(b) That our LORD did not, like the high priest, enter a Holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself.

(b) A place made with hands, and heaven.

(c) That whereas the high priest entered *with* (ἐν)‡ blood not his own, our LORD entered through (διὰ) His own Blood.

(c) "With the blood of another," and through His own Blood.

Thus the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would teach us that as under the Jewish Law things were atoned or reconciled by the application of the blood of a sacrifice which had been offered ; so the application of the Precious Blood of CHRIST, shed and offered once for all upon the Cross, avails for ever as a propitiation, and for the cleansing of sin.

Having now clearly in view the significance of the entrance of the high priest into the Holy of holies, namely, to symbolize the access of man to GOD through the great High Priest JESUS CHRIST ; and the means which were employed, the sin offerings for himself and for the people, showing that this access could only be obtained through the Precious Blood of CHRIST ; we shall pass to the second part of this chapter, and at the

* ἅπασι, Heb. ix. 26.

† ἐφάπασι, Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10.

‡ ἐν with the dative in general use is applied to that with which one is furnished, which he brings with him. Cf. Winer, Part III., § 48.

risk of considerable repetition examine in detail the manner in which the writer of the Epistle interprets the type and shows how far it was fulfilled by CHRIST Himself.

The interpretation of the type in the Epistle.

“ But CHRIST, having come a High Priest of the good things realized, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made by hands, that is, not of this creation, nor yet through blood of goats and calves, but through His own Blood, entered in once for all into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption ” (ix. 11, 12).

The contrast between the repeated entrance of the high priest, and our LORD'S entrance once for all.

In contrast with the repeated entrance of the Jewish high priest into the Holy of holies with the blood of the appointed victims, CHRIST once for all entered into the true sanctuary, the actual Presence of GOD, through His own Blood, and thus obtained, not a temporal, but an eternal deliverance.

The means in each case “ through blood.”

Here we must carefully observe the force of the phrase οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια. There is not in this the slightest ground for the theory put forth by some of the Modern school, that as the high priest entered the Holy of holies *with* the blood of the victims, so CHRIST entered heaven *with* His own Blood, that is to say, carried it into heaven. The fact that the high priest entered the Holy of holies with the blood is not the point to which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews draws attention, since it was a mere detail of the ritual. The prominent idea connected with the blood is that it was the *means* through which the priest was *enabled to enter* the Holy of holies, by making an atonement. Indeed, it is extraordinary that such a theory as the one just mentioned should have been propounded by any one familiar with the

but not “ with blood.”

The chief thought, that the blood was the means of access.

The preposi-

Greek Testament, since not only would it have required *μετά* in this place instead of *διά*, but there are no less than eleven other passages in Holy Scripture referring to the Blood as the means of access to GOD, and in not one case is *μετά* used. In one case we have *οὐ χωρίς*, in another *διά*, and in the other nine *ἐν*. The passages are as follows: Heb. ix. 7, *οὐ χωρίς αἵματος*; Eph. i. 7, *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*; Heb. ix. 22, *ἐν αἵματι*; x. 19, *ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ*; xiii. 20, *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου*; Rom. iii. 25, *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*; v. 9, *ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ*; Eph. ii. 13, *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; Rev. i. 5, *ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ*; v. 9, *ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου*; vii. 14, *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου*.

A study of these passages shows that there can be no question that the blood, whether of the type or of CHRIST Himself, is always regarded as the instrumental means of access to GOD, under whatever name that access may be described, as reconciliation, redemption, etc. If, then, CHRIST, "having obtained eternal redemption, entered in once for all into the Holy place, through His own Blood," we are certainly to understand this expression, as in every other reference to the Blood, as indicating the condition of redemption; not as implying that the Blood accompanied our great High Priest, but that It was the means by which humanity in Him, its first-fruits and crown, entered into the Presence of GOD. The truth which was signified by the use of the blood on the Day of Atonement, was that which all the sacrifices alike signify, that without shedding of blood there is no remission.* And in its application to our Blessed LORD precisely the same idea is set forth, that our great High Priest, as the

tion "*μετά*" is never found in N. T. in connection with blood as the means of access to GOD. Examination of the eleven passages in N. T. in which blood is thus referred to.

From this it is evident that the Blood is the "instrumental means" of access.

The truth signified by the blood here is that "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

* Heb. ix. 22.

Representative of humanity, entered once for all into the Holy place, the Presence of GOD in heaven, having obtained eternal redemption, not by means of the blood of goats and calves, but by means of His own Blood. In the case of all the other Jewish sacrifices, which pointed to CHRIST just as much as that of the Day of Atonement, the sprinkling of the blood was the essentially sacrificial act, and indicated the means by which the world should be redeemed. But in none of these was the blood carried within the Holy of holies.

Most of the Modern school admit this : Alford and perhaps Sadler are exceptions.

We may therefore conclude our examination of this passage by remarking, what the majority of the Modern school admit, that "through His own Blood" implies only the instrumental means of the access of humanity to GOD, and affords no ground for the theory of Alford and Bengel, that the Precious Blood was carried into heaven, or, indeed, that apart from our LORD'S glorified Humanity It pleads in heaven.*

In verses 13 and 14 the superiority of CHRIST'S Blood to that of animal sacrifices is shown.

In verses 13 and 14 we have a very distinct reference to CHRIST'S Offering of Himself : "For if the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctifieth unto the cleanness of the flesh, how much more shall the Blood of CHRIST, Who through [His] eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish to GOD, cleanse our conscience from dead works, to the end that we may serve a living GOD ?"

* Mr. Brightman writes in a private letter : "In speaking of Him as presenting His Blood, I conceive one means that He is doing, or rather He is, what was symbolized by the presentation of the blood. In fact, His Blood is merely Himself in a certain relation resulting from His historical acts. Accordingly, I do not wish to find myself within measurable distance of the appalling view of Alford and Bengel."

Here, from two typical examples of Levitical sacrifices,—that of goats and bulls on the Day of Atonement,* and the occasional sacrifice of the red heifer, †—the writer draws attention to the superior efficacy of CHRIST'S Blood, which cleanses not from the merely external impurity, but from moral defilement. The sacrificial term “without blemish” (*ἄμωμον*) carries our thought to the moment when the victim is handed over to the priest for sacrifice. And the fact that the aorist “He offered Himself” (*προσήνεγκεν*) is so closely associated with it, certainly indicates that this priestly Offering of Himself took place in close connection with the initial act of His Sacrifice, and is inconsistent with the Modern view that this Offering did not take place until after His Ascension.

The word *ἄμωμον* connects our LORD'S S. with the Cross.

This chapter concludes with a striking passage in regard to our LORD'S Intercession and Sacrifice: “FOR CHRIST entered not into a Holy place made with hands, like to the pattern of the true, but into the heaven itself, now to appear openly before the face of GOD on our behalf; nor yet [did He enter] in order that He may often offer Himself, as the high priest entereth into the Holy place year by year with blood not his own; since in that case He must often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once for all, at the close of the ages, hath He been manifested to disannul sin by the Sacrifice of Himself. And inasmuch as it is appointed for men once to die, and after this [cometh] judgment; even so CHRIST also, having been once offered to carry the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him, unto salvation” (ix. 24-28).

Chap. ix. concludes by relating our LORD'S Intercession to His finished S.

Here we are told that the purpose for which CHRIST

* Lev. xvi.

† Num. xix.

entered heaven was not that He might often offer Himself, for this He had done once for all ; but that He might “ appear openly before the face of GOD on our behalf ; ” where, although the great Intercession and Mediatorial work of our LORD is indicated as the presenting of Himself on our behalf in the Presence of GOD (pleading, therefore, the merits, that is, the effects of His Sacrifice), there certainly seems to be no room for the modern idea that our LORD entered into heaven for the purpose of offering a Sacrifice, which it is said He even now continues to offer.

There are two interesting passages in the tenth chapter, which are germane to our subject.

Two passages in Chap. x. to be considered. (1) Verse 10 implies that our LORD'S S. is the only absolute S.

“ In which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the Body of JESUS CHRIST once for all ” (verse 10). Here we need only notice the word “ once for all ” (*ἐφ' ἅπαρ*), which occurs also in vii. 27 and ix. 12, and qualifies the Offering. Its introduction in these three passages would seem to make it impossible to believe that there could be any other absolute Sacrifice than the Sacrifice of our LORD'S Body offered once for all upon the Cross. Whatever other sacrifice there may be, whether on earth or in heaven, it can only be relative to this one and only absolute Sacrifice.

(2) Verses 11-14 repeat this thought, but add to it our LORD'S Session.

In the following verse we read : “ And while every priest (high priest) standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never take away sins, He, when He had offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the Right Hand of GOD, henceforth waiting till His enemies be made the footstool of His feet. For by one Offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified ” (x. 11-14).

In this passage there are three points to which we must draw attention.

First, the contrast between "every priest" standing to minister and offer sacrifice, and CHRIST, who, after He had offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the Right Hand of GOD. The idea of standing is that of work still to be done, service still to be rendered. So the angels stand before GOD. The significance of sitting, or rather of taking one's seat (for the verb is καθίξειν, not καθῆσθαι), implies that work has been finished, although its effects continue. S. Chrysostom* says: "As standing is the mark of ministering, so sitting is the mark of being ministered unto." We have already noticed how much importance the Fathers attach to this statement that our LORD "sat down" on the Right Hand of GOD, as indicating His finished work, and therefore as inconsistent with any actual Sacrifice finding place in His great Intercession. That Intercession was simply the abiding Presence of His glorified Humanity at the Right Hand of GOD. His Humanity pleads for us with all-prevailing power. This is admirably expressed in the commentary of Euthymius Zigadenus on this verse: "His very Humanity, therefore, pleads with the FATHER on our behalf." †

We notice that He did not sit down on the Right Hand of GOD until after He had offered the one Sacrifice for sins for ever. While this is not incompatible with

Three points here:

(1) The significance of "sitting," as indicating finished work,

excludes any actual S. from our LORD'S Intercession.

This is admirably expressed by Euthymius Zig.

(2) The S. was offered before He sat down.

* S. Chrys. *In Heb.*, Hom. xviii., § 3.

† *Αυτὴ οὖν ἡ ἐπανθρώπησις αὐτοῦ παρακαλεῖ τὸν Πατέρα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.* I am indebted to the kindness of the Bishop of Durham for calling my attention to this quotation in a private letter. This work of Euthymius, which was first published at Athens in 1887, is not well known.

such an Offering having been made in Heaven immediately after the Ascension and before the Session, it certainly does not suggest this, and is more easily satisfied by the Catholic view that the one Oblation once made was accomplished upon the Cross, and that our LORD ascended into heaven to take His place at the Right Hand of GOD. This view, too, is entirely in accord with our LORD'S statement before His Ascension, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth."* It seems impossible to reconcile these words with the idea that the Sacrifice of which this power was the fruit had not yet been made.

(3) The significance of CHRIST'S perfecting the faithful by one Offering.

"By one Offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Here we need only point out that it is not said that the Offering sanctifies, but that our LORD sanctifies by the Offering. That is, that He sanctifies those who from time to time, by using the means of grace, realize in fact that which was once potentially obtained for them.

The last passage quoted from this Epistle as favourable to the Modern view, xii. 24.

There is but one other passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews which has been quoted by the Modern school as favourable to their theory. It is as follows: "But ye are come to mount Sion, and to the city of the Living GOD, a heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels in festal assembly, and to the Church of the firstborn, enrolled in heaven, and to the GOD of all as Judge, and to spirits of just men made perfect, and to the Mediator of a new Covenant [even] JESUS, and to the Blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than Abel" (xii. 22-24).

Bengel and Alford's interpretation.

Bengel, Alford, and others, as we have already pointed out, have constructed from the last words of this passage an extraordinary theory that our LORD'S

* S. Matt. xxviii. 18.

glorified Body was bloodless, and that He carried into heaven His Precious Blood separated from His Body, and presented It to GOD, and continues to present It. While there are few who hold this "appalling" theory, the words are quoted by many to show that there is now in heaven a sacrificial action in connection with the Precious Blood, equivalent to the sprinkling of the blood under the Law. As Abel's blood cried for vengeance upon Cain, so the Blood of CHRIST in heaven is thought to plead for mercy on sinful man.

We have only to examine the context carefully to see that the sphere of the action of the "Blood of sprinkling" is not heaven, but earth. We must begin at the eighteenth verse, where we have the scene at Sinai at the giving of the Law vividly set before us. In striking contrast with this we have in the passage quoted the privileges of the Christian Dispensation (verses 22-24). (1) In the first two verses the Christian Revelation is seen in its fulfilment from the Divine side. We have (a) the foundation, (b) the structure, (c) the persons (angels and men). (2) Then follows the Christian Revelation seen in its efficacy from the human side: (a) the judgment (earthly life over): the Judge, and those who have been perfected; (b) the gift of grace (earthly life still lasting): the Covenant, and the Atonement. The words which we have to consider form the latter of the two members of the last subdivision. The former member is the Covenant, i. e., "the Mediator of a new Covenant, even JESUS;" then the Atonement, "the Blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better than Abel." This Blood was shed once for all upon the Cross, and is contrasted with the blood of Abel, which was shed once for all and cried to GOD for vengeance. The Blood of CHRIST both pleads to GOD

The context shows that the sphere of the action is not heaven but earth.

An analysis of the whole passage proves this.

for mercy, and is itself the means by which man is cleansed from sin. There is, however, no indication here that this cleansing takes place in heaven ; indeed, we are told elsewhere that nothing impure, that is, uncleaned, can ever enter heaven, and there is no system of theology in existence, we believe, which holds that sinners are to be cleansed *after* their entrance into heaven. We know that the cleansing takes place on earth, through the Sacraments, in which the soul is sprinkled with the Precious Blood for the remission of sins in Baptism and Penance, and is refreshed, as well as cleansed, by the Precious Blood in the Holy Eucharist. Further, the words, "Ye are come to mount Sion," etc., were addressed to men still living in this world, and only signified that as members of CHRIST'S Mystical Body the Church, they had fellowship with the Saints and Angels, and were partakers of all the privileges of members of CHRIST, having entered into covenant with Him by Baptism, and being supplied with grace through the other Sacraments, especially those Sacraments which are efficacious in applying to the soul the Precious Blood.

The actual phrase, "the Blood of sprinkling," of course carries us back in thought to the Jewish ritual, in which all things were cleansed by the sprinkling of blood. In the Christian Sacraments, however, the cleansing of the soul takes place on earth, not in heaven, and the Precious Blood is applied through the Sacraments to penitent sinners here, not to perfected Saints in heaven.*

Summary:
All the sacri-
fices under the

Before leaving the Epistle to the Hebrews we would draw attention to the fact, recognized by all but Socin-

* For a full discussion of this passage see Westcott, on *Heb. in loc.*

ians, that the whole sacrificial system of the Jews foreshadowed different aspects of the One Sacrifice which our LORD was to offer for the redemption of the world.

Law foreshadowed different aspects of the S. of CHRIST.

In the Book of Leviticus we find a complete sacrificial system instituted, in which were regulated the different sacrifices offered both for individuals (whether priests or laymen) and for the congregation. In addition, however, to these we also find two special annual sacrifices appointed, to which were attached extraordinary solemnities, namely, the Passover, and the sacrifices on the great Day of Atonement ; and in seeking in the Christian dispensation the significance of these, we observe that they correspond, respectively, to the Holy Eucharist, and to our LORD'S Intercession in heaven.

The two great annual rites prefigure the H. E. and our LORD'S Intercession.

For the Passover was a representative sacrifice, commemorating the redemption of the Israelites from the bondage of Egypt, the Passover then celebrated, and it was also a feast upon a sacrifice, for the Paschal Lamb was eaten. This is fulfilled in the Holy Eucharist, and in the Holy Eucharist only ; since in it alone we show forth the LORD'S death till He come, and in it alone we feed upon the Body and Blood of Him Who is the Lamb of GOD. The ritual of the Day of Atonement, on the other hand, clearly typifies our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, and that only ; for on the Day of Atonement the Jewish high priest entered the Holy of holies with the blood (*ἐν αἵματι*) of a sacrifice which he had offered, not in order that he might offer sacrifice there, but that he might appear in the presence of GOD as representing the people of GOD. In GOD'S presence he uttered no word of prayer, but bore over his heart the breastplate on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes of Israel.

The Passover typifies the H. E. ;

the Day of Atonement our LORD'S Intercession.

His presence there and his intercession were possible

only through the application of the blood of the sacrifice. So our Great High Priest entered heaven through His own Blood, that He might appear in the Presence of GOD for us, and this is His Intercession for us.

Both rites point to the same source of merit, but to a different application of it.

Both rites alike point to the same source of merit, the Sacrifice of our LORD upon the Cross, but they foreshadow different applications of it.

The Passover points to its renewal by commemoration in the Holy Eucharist, in which also the offerer feeds upon the sacramental gifts of our LORD'S Body and Blood.

No part of the rite on the Day of Atonement prefigures the H. E.

The entry of the priest into the Holy of holies typifies most distinctly the great Intercession of our LORD in heaven, but there is absolutely no part of the rite which recalls either the double Consecration in the Eucharist or the sacramental feast attached to it.

Mystical writers may find a parallel between it and the *prayers in the Liturgy*, but they can point to nothing which theology can recognize as fulfilled by our LORD in His institution of the Holy Eucharist.

3. Rev. v. 6, the "Lamb as It had been slaughtered."

3. After leaving the Epistle to the Hebrews, one other passage only demands our consideration. In the Book of Revelation we read: "I saw in the midst of the throne, and of the four living beings, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing, as though slaughtered" (*ὡς ἐσφαγμένον*).*

The Modern school are here divided into two groups,

the more moderate seeing only a

Upon this text the followers of the Modern school rely to a great extent for proof of the existence of a celestial sacrifice. They are, however, divided here into two distinct groups, the more moderate of which claims that the title by which our LORD is described, "a Lamb as though slaughtered," represents Him distinctly as still a Sacrifice. And in this claim they are undoubtedly

* Rev. v. 6.

justified, since He is in heaven what He is in the Eucharist, what He was on the Cross, what He was by GOD'S predestination from the first moment of His Incarnation,—the Victim. First He was the Victim destined for Sacrifice, "for Him hath GOD the FATHER sealed;" * "wherefore, when He entereth into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a Body didst Thou prepare for Me." † Then, after the Sacrifice had been consummated upon the Cross, He became the Victim slaughtered, raised from the dead, yet still the Lamb of GOD, though standing in the midst of the throne. But here we must most distinctly observe that our LORD is the Sacrifice only in the passive sense of the word. He stands in the midst of the throne with the marks of slaughter, the wounds still showing in His glorified Body; as the ancient Easter office-hymn has it,

description of
our LORD as
the Victim,
which is quite
justifiable.

"The wounds, the riven wounds, He shows,
In that His Flesh, with light that glows."

Yet here is no sacrificial action. As Bishop Forbes ‡ points out, He is the Victim, the Sacrifice, in a passive sense; but the action of Sacrifice took place upon the Cross.

Indeed, it would seem impossible to understand the

* S. John vi. 27.

† Heb. x. 5.

‡ "The matter may be made clearer by the distinction between 'the active and passive sacrifice,' i. e., sacrifice as 'the action of offering,' and sacrifice as 'the thing offered.' . . . Theologians [Anglicans] use the word 'sacrifice' in the one English sense of 'the thing offered.' Those who object to their teaching take it in the other, of 'the act of offering.' . . . As an act of immolation, atonement, satisfaction, the offering of CHRIST was 'finished once for all.'"—Forbes *On the Articles*, pp. 617, 618.

words ὡς ἐσφαγμένον in any other sense. The latter word is a perfect participle, and indicates an action which has taken place in past time, the effects of which are still enduring. It implies that the Lamb had been slaughtered at some time in the past, and still remains in the condition in which that act had placed Him, i. e., a Victim, a Sacrifice. We have a similar instance of the use of the perfect participle in the first verse of the fourth chapter : " Behold, a door set open in Heaven " (Ἴδου θύρα ἠνεωγμένη ἐν τοῦ οὐρανῶ). Here ἠνεωγμένη signifies that the act of opening the door had taken place at some past time, as we say in the *Te Deum*, " When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers ; " but that in his vision S. John beheld the door still open. In a word, the perfect participle asserts the effects of a past act and nothing else ; but *the effects of a thing cannot be the thing itself*. The effects of our LORD'S Sacrifice, its fruits, or, as we say, His merits, are pleaded in his great Intercession,* but the pleading of His merits is not, strictly speaking, the offering of a Sacrifice.

Some of the
Modern school

A group of the Modern school, as represented by Thalhoffer, and perhaps Brightman, † try to find in the

* " He, when he had offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever (εἰς τὸ διήνεκες), sat down. " — Heb. x. 12.

† " We should expect the mark of death on the Eucharist to be analogous, not to its place, if one may so speak, in His history at the moment of the Cross, but to its place in His glorified Person. We should look in the Eucharist for something analogous, not to the agony of the Cross, but to the wounds in the Hands and the Feet and the Side of His risen Body. We should expect it to be a commemoration of the Lamb ' as it had been slain, ' and yet ' standing in the midst of the throne. ' " — Brightman, p. 6.

wounds some sacrificial action. Thalhoffer calls this "the outward form of the sacrificial action." * In the Sacrifice of the Cross he distinguishes between the inward and the outward form of the Sacrifice. The outward form, he says, was the actual shedding of the Blood and the death of the Cross, in which, alone, a sacrificial character is not found. But the inward form he holds to be the patient and enduring obedience and the tender love which were manifested by the voluntary shedding of His Blood. In the celestial Sacrifice, as in the Eucharist, he tries to find this same twofold form in the inward and spiritual act of resignation (*die innere Entsagung*) by which our LORD wills, as He did upon the Cross, to do His FATHER'S will, and in the outward act by which He expresses this inward disposition, and which, inasmuch as it is a manifestation of it, imparts the essentially sacrificial character to the act. He considers the marks of the wounds in our LORD'S glorified Body as the outward form, since they are the effect of the inward form, that is, the manifestation of this interior act of resignation, inasmuch as it was through these wounds that our LORD shed His Blood.

see in the wounds a sacrificial action. Thalhoffer's argument,

A very slight examination of Thalhoffer's argument suffices to show that it is altogether vicious and invalid. Although the wounds originally manifested our LORD'S voluntary obedience in dying upon the Cross,—that is to say, in that act of Sacrifice the inward and the outward form were connected as cause and effect,—yet it cannot be asserted from this that the marks of the wounds, which live on in our LORD'S Body, are the effect of the inward spirit of resignation to His FATHER'S will which lives on in our LORD'S human will. On the other hand, it is evident that the marks of the wounds

shown to be altogether invalid.

* Thalhoffer: *Das Opfer*, S. 214.

are entirely independent of any *present* interior disposition of our LORD's human will. By this we are not in the slightest degree denying that our LORD in His glorified Humanity preserves the same desire to die for us which He manifested in act upon the Cross. We do assert, however, that this desire is altogether independent of the marks of the wounds, which simply bear witness to a past Sacrifice, and have no necessary connection with any present sacrificial disposition.

Illustration from the difference between a martyr and martyrdom.

We may illustrate this by the example of a confessor, or martyr in will, who, though so grievously tortured as to bear to the day of his death the marks of his martyrdom, escaped with life. Such an one at the time of his martyrdom had the will to die for CHRIST, and the scars and marks of mutilation are the testimony that this inward disposition was carried into act. Therefore they confer upon him a right to the title of martyr, since they indicate that, in will at least, he suffered martyrdom. As long as he lives, the marks of these scars prove that he is a martyr ; but we cannot from this draw the conclusion that every day of his life he suffers martyrdom. The scars are the witness to a past, not to a present, act; and though it may be argued that the martyr still retains the same inward disposition and readiness to die for CHRIST, this disposition is quite independent of the scars which he bears, since if he were to apostatize from the Christian Religion, the scars would remain, though the inward disposition would have changed. So the scars exhibited in the "Lamb as though slaughtered, standing in the midst of the throne," testify that He is the Sacrifice, that He once consummated the act of Sacrifice ; but they are not " the external form," as Thalhofer calls it, of a present Sacrifice.

Between a state and an act.

So the Lamb is the S., but does not offer S.

Hence we may conclude our examination of this last

passage by saying that the interpretation put upon it by the moderate school of Bishop Forbes is quite unobjectionable ; but that the attempt of the Thalhoffer school to find in these scars a sacrificial action which will constitute a celestial Sacrifice, properly so called, fails absolutely, and, indeed, does little credit to their logical perception.

We may further observe that the Lamb is *standing* in the midst of the throne of GOD, not lying upon an altar, as would be expected if He were, strictly speaking, a celestial Sacrifice. For a celestial Sacrifice demands, not a throne, but an altar ; not the attitude of standing, but of a slaughtered Victim laid upon that altar.

III. We may now sum up the results of our investigation of Holy Scripture in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, somewhat as follows:

1. From type and prophecy in the Old Testament, and from the use of sacrificial terms in connection with the Institution of the Eucharist in the New, it is proved that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice.

2. That our great High Priest JESUS CHRIST upon the Cross made one Sacrifice of Himself once offered, is the reiterated teaching of the New Testament. Hence it follows that this is the only absolute Sacrifice which Holy Scripture recognizes, and the Eucharist is, therefore, a relative Sacrifice, a Sacrifice of commemoration, of re-presentation, by which the Sacrifice of the Cross is renewed, but not repeated. This follows from S. Paul's exposition of the words, " This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me ; " which he thus explains : " For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." *

3. There is no indication of any Sacrifice, properly

* I Cor. xi. 25, 26.

III. Summary of Scripture testimony :

1. O. T. and N. T. both prove that the H. E. is a S.

2. The N. T. recognizes only one absolute S.

The H. E. is therefore a relative S.,

in which we make the memorial of our LORD'S Death.

3. There is no

indication of any S. being offered in heaven.

This is not inconsistent with our LORD being a S. in a passive sense,

or with His offering a virtual S.

The H. E. is a S. because essentially identical with that of Calvary.

It is accidentally related to our LORD'S Mediatorial work.

4. Scripture affords no support to the view that the essentially sacrificial act took place in heaven, and that therefore the Cross is not a completed S.

so called, being offered by our LORD in heaven. This does not conflict with the doctrine that in the passive sense of the word "sacrifice," He is in heaven what He was on the Cross, what He is in the Eucharist,—the Sacrifice, the propitiation for the sins of the world. Nor is it inconsistent with the view that, since in our LORD'S Mediatorial work He presents His glorified Humanity, and so pleads with the FATHER for man, He continues to offer a *virtual*, but not an *actual* Sacrifice; for He offers the fruits of His one Sacrifice upon the Cross, pleading His merits for the remission of our sins. To this virtual Sacrifice the Sacrifice of the Eucharist stands in a very true relation, but a relation which is *accidental* rather than essential.* The Eucharist is a Sacrifice because it is essentially identical with the Sacrifice of Calvary, which it reproduces and re-presents. It is accidentally related to our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven, because in it the same Priest officiates and the same Victim is present. But in the Eucharist there is a sacrificial action, the act of Consecration, by which the Body and Blood of CHRIST are produced under the forms of bread and wine, separated as by death; whereas in our LORD'S heavenly Offering no such sacrificial action can be found.

4. The witness of Holy Scripture, especially of the Epistle to the Hebrews, affords no support for the view that the real sacrificial act in our LORD'S great Offering took place after His Ascension, and not upon the Cross. On the contrary, such a view is quite incompatible with the many passages in which it is stated that man'S redemption was purchased upon the Cross, and that by CHRIST'S Death we were redeemed.†

* See Lepin's exposition of this point, Appendix G.

† These passages have been discussed, pp. 69-71., G.

While not strictly pertaining to this part of our treatment of the question, we may here state that in no commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews before the sixteenth century are any traces of this view to be found. It is entirely unknown to the Fathers,* and there are many passages in their writings which absolutely conflict with this view.† And, further, since the sixteenth century we know of no commentary on this Epistle of any weight which adopts this view, unless it be the works of some of the German schismatics. Therefore, so far as the text and interpretation of Holy Scripture is concerned, we may confidently affirm that this theory has no authority whatever.

* "In regard to the 'modern conception of CHRIST pleading His Passion in Heaven,' the thought is, as far as I know, not found in the Fathers."—Private letter of the Bishop of Durham.

† S. Chrysostom, *Hom.*, xiii., § 3; Euthymius Zigadenus, *Ep. ad Heb.* vii. 27; Theodoret, *in Psal.* cix. 4. These passages will be considered later.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE LITURGIES.

AFTER the testimony of Holy Scripture in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, we take up next, both in order of time and of importance, the witness of the liturgies of the Church. For they not only express her teaching, but, inasmuch as they are exclusively concerned with her Eucharistic worship, we naturally expect to find in them, more than in any other authoritative documents, an indication of her view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The witness of the liturgies to the E. S. is naturally of great importance.

We must not expect in them the accuracy of definition which belongs to a Creed.

That the liturgies prove the sacrificial character of the H. E. may be assumed; the only question is, whether they

It is well, however, to bear in mind that in the liturgies we ought not to look for the accuracy of expression or clearness of definition which belongs to a Creed. The liturgies grew simply and naturally out of the devotional needs of the Church, whereas the Creeds were the definite expression of the Church's mind at a time when most of the doctrines contained in them had already been called in question.

It is scarcely necessary for us here to show to what extent the liturgies bear witness to the fact that the Church's Eucharistic worship was regarded as distinctly sacrificial. Our work is rather to inquire whether the liturgies afford any support to the Modern view, which regards the Eucharist as a Sacrifice only in so far as it is related to a Sacrifice which our LORD

is supposed to be now offering in heaven. We shall therefore proceed at once to consider those passages which are cited as evidence that in the earliest ages of Christianity, when the liturgies took form, this view was in the minds of those who compiled them.

support the
Modern view.

It is not our purpose to examine the structure of the liturgies as a whole, or to investigate the different families into which they are divided. For our present need all we have to consider is two classes of passages, which are so admittedly found in almost all liturgies that our controversy is narrowed down simply to an investigation of their significance. These are, first, those which commemorate the Resurrection and Ascension; and, second, those which speak of a "heavenly altar."

The contro-
versy concerns
only two
classes of pas-
sages in the
liturgies.

Mr. Brightman, in his paper, refers to both classes of passages. In regard to the first, he says:

Mr. Brightman
refers to both.

"It is common, if not usual, to add to the recital of the Institution, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' S. Paul's words, 'for as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come,' or 'ye do shew My Death till I come.' Now it is not uncommon to treat these two phrases, 'do in remembrance of Me' and 'shew the LORD'S Death,' as if they were equivalent, so that 'remembrance of Me' is limited and interpreted to mean 'shew My Death.' We might question whether this is justifiable or required by the text of S. Paul. But without discussing the force of 'for' in 1 Cor. xi. 26, we may say that the question is not whether 'the LORD'S Death' is 'shewn forth,' but in what order—whether primarily, and as a historical event, or as existing, so to speak, in His Person, perfected through suffering. And at

I. His refer-
ence to those
which com-
memorate the
Resurrection
and Ascension.

He says the liturgies do not confine the memorial to the act of our LORD'S Death, and gives examples from various sources.

least the liturgies embody this second alternative: they do not treat the memorial as confined to the act of our LORD'S Death on the Cross—for, in order to make these two phrases more explicitly equivalent, they commonly make an addition to S. Paul's words, and say not only, 'ye do shew the LORD'S Death,' but 'ye do shew the LORD'S Death and confess His Resurrection,' and sometimes, also, 'and His Ascension' 'till He come.'

“Again, the next paragraph of the liturgy expressly interprets the words ‘in remembrance of Me.’ Beginning ‘we therefore remembering,’ it proceeds to detail what is included in the commemoration—what ‘the remembrance of Me’ embraces and implies. And in every liturgy I know, the scope of the commemoration includes more than our LORD'S Death, while in some cases this latter is not particularized at all. The commonest types include the moments of our LORD'S Life from the Cross to the Second Advent. In some cases it includes all from the Incarnation to the Coming of the HOLY GHOST and the Second Advent. To give an example—in the Roman rite: ‘Wherefore, O LORD, we Thy servants and Thy holy people, remembering as well the blessed Passion of the same CHRIST Thy SON our LORD, and His Resurrection from the dead and His glorious Ascension into heaven, offer unto Thee,’ etc. Or in the Greek rite: ‘Wherefore, O LORD, we also remembering His saving Sufferings, His quickening Cross, His three days' burial, His Resurrection from the dead, and His Ascension into heaven, His Session at Thy right hand, GOD and FATHER, and His glorious and fearful Second Advent, we offer unto Thee,’ etc. Or, once more, in the Anglican rite, the Scotch and American liturgies, following that

The Roman rite.

The Anglican, Scotch, and

of 1549, read: 'Having in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension,' etc. The liturgies, therefore, plainly interpret the memorial of the Eucharist, not as a historical memorial of the past fact of His Death and Passion, but as the memorial of Himself as He reveals Himself and manifests His eternal Person and Its significance in His acts, past, present, and to come : as He is in His exaltation, not merely as He was in His humiliation : the memorial of His historical acts only as they reveal the meaning of His present Life : the memorial in which we 'know Him and the power of His Resurrection,' and, therefore, 'the fellowship of His Sufferings.' " *

American liturgies.

Mr. Brightman's inferences from these quotations.

As one would expect, the facts to which Mr. Brightman calls our attention are indisputable, although we cannot admit that they will bear the weight of the arguments which he hangs upon them. There is probably scarcely a treatise on the Eucharist by any Catholic writer of repute which does not set forth the truth that in the Eucharist the whole mystery of our LORD'S Life is brought before us ; that it is an *extension* of the Incarnation, as well as a *memorial* of the Passion ; that it is related to " His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension," since the Body there present is not His dead Body, but that glorified Body which, " being raised from the dead, dieth no more," over which " death hath no more dominion ;" and which, while present upon our altars " clothed with signs representative of His Death," † still reigns glorious at the Right Hand of GOD. While thankfully making the memorial our LORD has commanded of the crowning act of love by which we were redeemed, the Sacrifice

The facts indisputable ; the inferences unwarranted.

Catholic writers teach that the H. E. is an extension of the Incarnation, as well as a memorial of the Passion, and brings before us our LORD'S whole Life both on earth and in glory.

* Brightman, pp. 8 and 9.

† Bossuet.

of the Cross, we also rejoice in the remembrance of "His mighty Resurrection," by which He overcame death, and of "His glorious Ascension," by which He, as the First-fruits of redeemed humanity, entered heaven and sat down at the Right Hand of GOD.

The word

ἀνάμνησις has both a subjective and an objective force.

The word *ἀνάμνησις* includes both a subjective action in the mind and an objective representation of a past event. Now it is evident that our remembrance of the mysteries of our LORD'S Resurrection and Ascension must be subjective only; but in the mystery of His Death upon the Cross the subjective remembrance becomes in the Eucharist an objective representation since we offer there our LORD'S Body and Blood, present under the diverse species severed as by death.

Mr. B. quotes that part of "the Oblation" in the Scotch and American rites in which it is used subjectively,

Mr. Brightman says: "In the Anglican rite, the Scotch and American liturgies, following that of 1549, read, 'Having in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension,' " etc., but strangely and conveniently he omits the passage which precedes these words: "Wherefore, O LORD and Heavenly FATHER, according to the institution of Thy dearly Beloved SON our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the Memorial Thy SON hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same." We have given here the whole of the Oblation in order that the position of the passage quoted by Mr. Brightman may be clearly apprehended.

It is surely both unfair and misleading to quote only one passage from the Oblation and to omit the words which show that *in addition* to the subjective remembrance of the great mysteries of the Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, an objective MEMORIAL is *made*, which is contrasted with the subjective remembrance which follows.

but omits the context in which it is referred objectively only to our LORD'S Death.

If it be suggested that the two are identical, the answer is (1) that the structure of the passage excludes this, since an objective memorial commanded by our LORD is *made* by means of offering certain holy Gifts, the Body and Blood of CHRIST ; and together with this objective memorial are associated two subjective acts, the remembrance of the Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, and hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

Answers to the contention that the two are identical.

(2) And further that in what our LORD commanded us *to do* in the Holy Eucharist there is clearly no act which can be shown to be an objective memorial or counterpart of His Resurrection and Ascension, whereas the separate consecration of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our LORD, severed as by death under the diverse species, is the objective memorial which our LORD instituted and commanded us to make.

At this point we gladly draw attention to what we believe to be the true and valuable element in the Modern view, namely, the relation of the Eucharist to our LORD'S Life in glory ; although we distinctly deny that this involves what the Modern view, as expressed by Mr. Brightman, claims, namely, a celestial Sacrifice in the proper sense of the term "sacrifice," or the transference of the sacrificial act in our LORD'S Offering of Himself, from the moment of the Cross to His entrance into heaven.

The valuable element in the Modern view, the relation of the H. E. to the Life of glory. This does not involve a heavenly S.

The charge that Reformation theology obscures the Incarnation and the great Intercession

by dwelling exclusively on the Atonement.

The precise import of this,

and the conclusion which follows from it.

The relation of our life now to the Life of Glory.

It is quite true that under the dominance of Reformation theology, the Life of Suffering, the Sacrifice by which we were once for all redeemed, has been allowed to obscure the Life of Glory, the great Intercession, the continual presentation to GOD of CHRIST'S Mystical Body, the Church, through His Mediatorial work in heaven. It is also true, as Mr. Brightman points out, that this tendency to dwell too exclusively upon the Atonement can be traced back far beyond the Reformation. It is even true that the writers of the early Church lay more stress on our LORD'S Resurrection and present exaltation at the Right Hand of the Majesty on high, as the Son of Man, the Firstborn from the dead, the Head of His Church, than they do upon His Life of suffering, and upon His Death of shame.

But what is the actual import of these facts? Not that in the treatment of the Holy Eucharist *only* the doctrine of the Atonement was allowed so to preponderate as to obscure, on the one hand, the doctrine of the Incarnation, and, on the other, its relation to His Life of Glory; but *that this was the case in every department of theology*. What, then, is the conclusion which follows from this? Surely, that we are to endeavour to correct this tendency by bringing forward the great importance of the Incarnation as the foundation of all Christian dogma, and of the Life of Glory as the goal of all moral effort; but *not that we are to go to the opposite extreme*, and practically forget the Cross and Passion in the ecstatic joy of the heavenly Life. It is true that "our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," only "while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen." Yet

it is also true that one of the most dangerous tendencies of the present day, manifesting itself as much in doctrine as in practice, is to ignore the more severe side of revelation ; to keep in the background the Cross in the life that now is, and the possibility of eternal loss in the life to come ; to wear the Cross in jewelled form, as the symbol of a victory which but few are striving to win, rather than to bear daily that Cross of CHRIST in which S. Paul gloried because by it the world was crucified unto him and he unto the world.

The dangerous tendency of the day to ignore the more severe side of revelation.

In view of this undoubted tendency, it would be well to observe the relative space which the writers of the Gospels devote to the record of our LORD'S Passion and to that of His Resurrection and Ascension. In S. Matthew the story of the Passion occupies 141 verses, that of the Resurrection only 20. In S. Mark the proportion is 119 to 20 ; in S. Luke, 127 to 53 ; and in S. John (if we include the discourses after the Last Supper), 237 to 56. So that, even if the Church for the last thousand years has given greater prominence to the Death and Passion of our LORD than to " His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension," she may, perhaps, plead some justification, in that she has only followed in the steps of the inspired writers of the Gospels.

The evidence of the Gospels to the importance of our LORD'S Passion.

A conclusion which most certainly *does not follow* from the premises just stated, is that because the doctrine of the Atonement has in every department of theology obscured that of the Incarnation and of the Life of Glory, therefore the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is related to the Life of Glory rather than to the Sacrifice of the Cross. A more complete *non sequitur* than this can scarcely be imagined. S. Paul explicitly says : " This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in

A conclusion noted which does not follow from the premises.

The interpretation of Fathers and commentators must determine the significance of the passages in the liturgies.

II. The second class of passages are those which speak of a "heavenly altar." Mr. Brightman's statement of his case.

He specially refers to the "Supplices Te" of the Roman rite.

The facts again are indisputable, but the inferences unwarranted. This prayer supplies Thalhofer with his

remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." And it is no argument against the interpretation which has been put upon these words by practically every Father, theologian, and commentator of the Church, that in the liturgies a remembrance was also made of His Resurrection and Ascension, and that S. Justin Martyr * speaks of the Eucharist as a memorial of His Incarnation.

II. The second class of passages which the Modern school cites in support of its theory Mr. Brightman refers to in the following extract : †

" Or again, to put it in another way, It [the Eucharist] is that in which the Church offers 'on the heavenly altar,' in which it presents its material gifts on earth that they may be gathered up into the action of the Great High Priest as He ministers at the altar on high. This figure of the 'heavenly altar' is a common one in the liturgies, most strikingly in the Roman canon, where the celebrant prays : ' We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these gifts to be carried by the hands of Thy holy Angel on to Thine altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that all we who by this participation of the altar shall receive the most holy Body and Blood of Thy SON, may be fulfilled with all grace and heavenly benediction.' "

Here, again, we must say that there is no question in regard to the facts which Mr. Brightman cites, but the inferences which he draws from these facts seem quite unwarranted.

As Thalhofer treats this prayer from Mr. Brightman's point of view, only much more elaborately, we

* S. Justin M., *Trypho*, lxx.

† Brightman, p. 13.

shall at once proceed to consider the arguments put forth by the former.

In the first place, he considers that those passages of the liturgies which refer to a heavenly altar are distinctly based upon two passages of Holy Scripture, Isa. vi. 6, and Rev. viii. 3: "Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar: and he laid it upon my mouth." "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne."

Thalhofer asserts that if we admit that there is an altar in heaven, whatever may be the conception which we otherwise form in regard to it, we must necessarily admit a heavenly Sacrifice corresponding to it. So that he conceives that in proving the existence of this heavenly altar, he at the same time proves the existence of a heavenly Sacrifice, since the term "altar" necessarily connotes the term "sacrifice."

But at this point we must insist upon its being clearly recognized that this heavenly Sacrifice can be conceived of only *in precisely the same sense* as the heavenly altar. That is, if the altar be an actual and proper altar, we must of course admit the Sacrifice to be an actual and proper sacrifice; but if the altar is to be understood only in a symbolical, figurative, metaphorical sense, then the Sacrifice must be understood in precisely the same sense. With this principle of interpretation clearly in our minds, let us now examine these two passages of Holy Scripture which Thalhofer quotes.

"Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the

main argument for a "heavenly S." He refers the "heavenly altar" of the liturgies to Isa. vi. 6 and Rev. viii. 3.

He argues that since these passages speak of a heavenly altar they imply a heavenly S.

It is, however, evident that the S. must precisely correspond with the altar.

So that if the altar be only figurative, we cannot infer a literal S.

tongs from off the altar : and he laid it upon my mouth." " And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer ; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne."

A literal altar involves manifold difficulties.

The question upon which the whole argument depends is this : Are we to understand by these verses that there is in heaven an altar upon which fire burns, and at which an angel offers sacrifice and incense with the prayers of the saints ? And was it from such a material altar that an angel, with material tongs, took a piece of coal glowing with fire, with which he touched the lips of Isaiah ?

If this is what we are to understand by the passage, it would be natural to pass on to the consideration of the physical effect upon the lips of Isaiah of contact with this live coal. Probably there is no one, not even excluding Thalhoffer and the Modern school, who understands this passage otherwise than in a metaphorical and figurative sense. Certainly the Fathers, to whose interpretation Thalhoffer appeals, understood the heavenly objects only as symbolical ; for S. Ambrose says that the live coal represented the grace of the HOLY SPIRIT, which purified and sanctified Isaiah from sin. S. Jerome, Haymo, and Philastrius regard the coal as the Word of GOD, and the altar as Holy Scripture, from which the Word of GOD is taken. S. Basil and S. Cyril see in the coal the mystery of the Incarnation, for as fire is united to coal, and coal to fire, so humanity was united hypostatically to the Word, and the Word Incarnate is as a glowing coal, which by contact kindles us with the fire of love. Others have seen in the coal a type of the fiery tongues at

The Fathers interpret this passage of Isaiah mystically : S. Ambrose ;

S. Jerome, Haymo, Philastrius ; S. Basil, S. Cyril.

Pentecost. Cornelius à Lapede, after remarking that, this being a vision, all things are to be considered as figurative, not real, even draws attention to the very difficulty we have noticed,—that if a hot coal had touched the lips of Isaiah they would have been injured and rendered unfit for preaching, whereas symbolically the contact with the coal signified not only the forgiveness of sin, but that GOD thereby imparted to him the gift of prophecy, together with faith and courage to overcome the difficulties of his great task.

Cornelius à Lapede points this out.

But it is unnecessary to go through all that the Fathers have written in regard to this passage, since it is evident that they all take it simply in a metaphorical or figurative sense. But if the passage is metaphorical, and the altar, therefore, only figurative, it follows that the sacrifice connected with it can only be taken in a metaphorical or figurative sense, which is not the sense required by Thalhoffer's argument.

All take the passage figuratively.

That the liturgies themselves imply that the altar is not an altar in the proper sense of the term, but only a figurative altar, may be shown from the adjectives by which this altar is described. While some liturgies simply pray that GOD will take the Sacrifice *εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον*,* others qualify *θυσιαστήριον* with various adjectives, e. g., *θυσιαστήριον νοερόν*.† Perhaps the fullest example is in the Liturgy of S. James, ‡ where we have *εἰς τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὑπερουράνιον, νοερόν, καὶ πνευματικὸν αὐτοῦ θυσιαστήριον*. Here the adjective *νοερόν* certainly conflicts with any idea of an actual altar, for

That the heavenly altar is only figurative is seen from the adjectives applied to it in the liturgies, e. g., *ὑπερουράνιον, νοερόν, πνευματικόν.*

* Liturgy of Constantinople, Prayer of Oblation ; Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 89.

† Liturgy of S. Basil, Prayer of Second Oblation ; Hammond, p. 104.

‡ Hammond, p. 46.

θυσιαστήριον νοερόν connotes *θυσία νοερά*, since an altar apprehended only in thought demands a sacrifice of the same character.

The Fathers and later writers take this altar as our LORD Himself.

We may here notice what will be considered more fully in Chapters VIII. and IX., that, while the Fathers and liturgical commentators very frequently speak of a heavenly altar in much the same terms as those which are used in the prayer *Supplices Te*, they almost unanimously take the altar as our LORD Himself, or as His Body, which ill accords with the Modern view that the Sacrifice of our LORD'S Body and Blood offered upon the altars of the Church on earth is a Sacrifice only because we are doing in the Eucharist what our LORD is doing in heaven.

While the full discussion of this particular point belongs rather to our treatment of patristic authorities, it is well to draw attention to it in this chapter, since in using the expression "heavenly altar" the Fathers are doubtless quoting from the liturgies.

S. Chrysostom explains "heavenly" as equivalent to "spiritual," and applies it to the Church and her rites.

Fortunately we have in S. Chrysostom's homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews a very full discussion of the sense in which we are to understand the term "heavenly." He is treating of the passage "[Priests] such as serve that which is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things,"* and he says :

"What are the 'heavenly things' spoken of here? Spiritual things. For although they are done on earth, yet nevertheless they are worthy of the heavens. For when our LORD JESUS CHRIST lies slain [*έσφαγμένος*]; when the SPIRIT is with us; when He who sitteth on the Right Hand of the FATHER is here; when sons are made by the laver; when they are fellow-citizens with those in heaven; when we have a

* Heb. viii. 5.

country, and a city, and citizenship there ; when we are strangers to things here, how can all these be other than 'heavenly things' ? But what ! Are not our hymns heavenly ? Do not we also, who are below, utter in concert with them the same things which the divine choirs of bodiless powers sing above ? Is not the altar also heavenly ? . . . How, again, can the rites which we celebrate be other than heavenly ? . . . Nay, one would not be wrong in saying even this, for the Church is heavenly, and is nothing else than heaven." *

No one will dispute that S. Chrysostom was not only thoroughly conversant with the liturgies in which occurs the expression "heavenly altar," but that he certainly was a better interpreter of the ideas which these words were intended to convey than anyone in the present day, not even excepting those writers of the Modern school who are so fond of appealing to him. And, commenting on the very passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews in which the earthly priesthood, sacrifice, and tabernacle are compared with the heavenly, he says over and over again that by "heavenly" we are to understand "spiritual" as opposed to carnal ; that is, the altars of the Church as contrasted with the altars of the Mosaic Dispensation. He claims that the whole services of the Church on earth are heavenly, since they are united to the services of the choirs on high. "Are not our hymns heavenly ? Do not we also, who are below, utter in concert with them the same things which the divine choirs of bodiless powers sing above ? Is not the altar also heavenly ?" What can be clearer than his exposition of this passage ? And it is entirely in agreement with other

The importance of his evidence. He was conversant with the liturgies, and Greek was his mother tongue.

* S. Chrysostom in Heb., *Hom.* xiv. 3.

passages of the Fathers. For example, Theophylact almost repeats his argument, though with greater brevity:

The same interpretation given by Theophylact,

“Our possessions are heavenly; for when nothing is earthly, but all spiritual things are being fulfilled in the Sacraments (since in them are the angelic hymns, in them are the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and the remission of sins, and again, on the other hand, the bonds); when our citizenship is in heaven, surely our possessions are heavenly.” *

and Primasius.

And again, Primasius, † the Latin writer, defining “heavenly,” says: “Heavenly things, that is, spiritual, are those which in truth are celebrated only in the Church.”

The Fathers speak often of a heavenly altar, but never of a heavenly S.

It is not worth while to multiply quotations from the Fathers. We frankly admit that they speak often of a heavenly altar, although *never* of a heavenly sacrifice; but they tell us most distinctly, in passages such as we have cited, exactly in what sense they use the word “heavenly.” And with good reason do they understand “heavenly” in this sense, since the language of the New Testament was the mother tongue of many of them, and the greatest commentators of our own day agree in translating this very word *ἐπουράνιος* as referring, in many passages of the New Testament, not to things which are locally in heaven, but to those heavenly gifts which are even now in the possession of the Church on earth. For example: “Blessed be GOD, . . . Who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in CHRIST” (Eph. i. 3), where Lightfoot ‡ observes: “The believer, in the language of this Epistle, has been already seated in

Ἐπουράνιος is used in the N. T. of gifts in the Church on earth.

Eph. i. 3.

* Theophylact, *Ad Heb.* viii. 5.

† “*Cœlestia, id est spiritualia quæ in veritate modo in Ecclesia celebrantur.*”—*Ad Heb.* ix. 23. ‡ Lightfoot, *in loco.*

heaven with CHRIST (ii. 6). He is an alien upon earth, but a citizen of GOD'S Kingdom (ii. 19). There is his *πολίτευμα* Phil. (iii. 20). There, consequently, he enjoys his privileges and receives his blessings. The heaven of which the Apostle here speaks is not some remote locality, some future abode; it is the heaven which lies within and about the true Christian." Eph. ii. 6, 19.
Phil. iii. 20.

With this we may compare S. Paul's words: "If, then, ye were raised with CHRIST, seek those things which are above" (Col. iii. 1), where he is referring to the duties and privileges of the baptized, which he speaks of under this imagery because they are related to that heavenly Kingdom into which the believers were admitted by Baptism, but into the complete fruition of which they do not come while they are still in this world. Col. iii. 1.

The word *ἐπουράνιος* occurs no less than six times in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. 1, vi. 4, viii. 5, ix. 23, xi. 16, xii. 22). In the first passage, "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling," etc., it is quite clear that the "heavenly calling" is something which is possessed in this world, and "is heavenly, not simply in the sense that it is addressed to man from GOD in heaven, but has been a calling to a life fulfilled in heaven, in a spiritual realm," *—the Kingdom of heaven. 'Επουράνιος
occurs six
times in Heb.
of things on
earth:
Heb. iii. 1.

Again: "For in the case of those who were once for all enlightened, having both tasted of the heavenly gift, and being partakers of the HOLY SPIRIT," etc. (vi). 4. The "heavenly gift" is evidently something which is tasted on earth, and is heavenly as pertaining to that Kingdom of heaven of which they are members. Heb. vi. 4.

"[Priests] such as serve a copy and shadow of the

* Westcott, *in loco*.

Heb. viii. 5.

heavenly order (viii. 5). Here 'heavenly order' is equivalent to the scene of the spiritual life, with the realities which belong to it." *

It is, however, superfluous to quote in detail the various passages which we have indicated in which *ἐπουράνιος* is applied to things belonging to the Kingdom of heaven on earth, and not to heaven locally.

Having determined the sense of "heavenly altar," we must investigate the liturgical meaning of the "Supplices Te."

Having sufficiently investigated the sense in which the Fathers and liturgical writers use the term "heavenly altar," we must now investigate the liturgical significance of the prayer *Supplices Te rogamus*, which both Thalhoffer and Mr. Brightman cite in support of their theory. Its words are as follows: "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty GOD, command these [gifts] to be carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angel on to Thine Altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that all we, who by this participation of the altar shall receive the most holy Body and Blood of Thy SON, may be fulfilled with all grace and heavenly benediction." †

This prayer found only in the Roman and Ambrosian liturgies.

It differs from the corresponding prayer in Eastern liturgies.

This prayer is found only in the Roman and Ambrosian liturgies. It is not infrequently referred by liturgical writers to the Clementine liturgy found in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and to a passage in S. Irenæus. ‡ But while we must obviously interpret it in the same sense as the corresponding prayers in the Eastern liturgies, yet it differs from them to a very marked extent.

* Westcott, *in loco*.

† "*Supplices Te rogamus, Omnipotens Deus, jube hæc præferri per manus sancti Angeli Tui in sublime altare Tuum, in conspectu divinæ Majestatis Tuæ, ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione, sacrosanctum Filii Tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione cælesti et gratia repleamur.*"

‡ S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, 1. iv., c. xviii. 6.

In the Clementine liturgy we find in the same position (that is, immediately after the Consecration and Great Oblation) in the Invocation the following words : “ We beseech Thee that Thou wouldest look graciously upon these gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficient GOD (*σὺ ὁ ἀνευθενής θεός*), and accept them to the honour of Thy CHRIST ; and send down Thy HOLY SPIRIT, the witness of the sufferings of the LORD JESUS, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy CHRIST, and this cup the Blood of Thy CHRIST ; that all who shall partake of It may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his wiles, may be filled with the HOLY GHOST, may be made worthy of Thy CHRIST, and may obtain everlasting life ; Thou, O LORD Almighty, being reconciled to them.” *

This prayer in the Clementine liturgy.

In the liturgy of S. James the corresponding prayer of the Invocation is : “ Have mercy upon us, O GOD, according to Thy great goodness, and send upon us, and upon these gifts now lying before Thee, Thy Most HOLY GHOST, the LORD and Life-Giver, . . . that coming upon them with His holy and good and glorious Presence, He may hallow and make this bread the Holy Body of Thy CHRIST.” † And later in the Litany we find this prayer : “ That the LORD our GOD, having received these [gifts] to His holy, heavenly, intellectual, and spiritual altar for the odour of a sweet-smelling sacrifice, would send down in their stead to us Divine grace and the Gift of the Most HOLY GHOST.” ‡

In the liturgy of S. James.

Another prayer in the same.

We observe that in the Eastern liturgies there is no reference to the “ gifts ” being carried by the hands of

Eastern liturgies have no

* Clementine liturgy, Invocation ; Hammond, p. 18.

† Liturgy of S. James, Invocation ; Hammond, p. 42.

‡ Liturgy of S. James, Litany ; Hammond, pp. 46, 47.

mention of the angel carrying the gifts.

The Roman must be interpreted in accordance with the Eastern.

Liturgical writers differ on three points in this prayer.

an angel to the heavenly altar. The prayer is simply that GOD would accept them, in the Clementine liturgy, "to the honour of Thy CHRIST," and in S. James' liturgy, "for the odour of a sweet-smelling sacrifice." While the Roman liturgy employs different imagery, we must certainly interpret this imagery by the more simple statement of the Eastern liturgies. That is, we must not infer from the Roman prayer the existence of ideas or doctrines which cannot be traced in any of the Eastern liturgies.

If we turn now to the principal liturgical writers of the Church, we find that there has always been great diversity of interpretation in regard to the first two of the three questions raised by the prayer *Supplices Te*: (1) To what does "hæc" refer? (2) Who is the "angel" mentioned? (3) For what purpose do we ask that the "gifts" may be carried to the altar on high? Indeed, in the ninth century, when liturgical study may be said almost to have had its beginning in the works of Florus and Amalarius, we find Florus saying: "Who can understand words so profound, so wonderful, so marvellous, and who can worthily treat of them? In explaining their meaning, reverential awe is better than discussion."* And later, Innocent III. † re-echoes the sentiments of Florus when he writes: "So great is the depth of these words that the human mind is scarcely able to grasp them."

(1.) Some refer "hæc" to the prayers, others to the sacramental gifts.

The great majority of liturgical writers take "hæc" simply of the prayers which are offered, while some, like Le Brun, refer it to the sacramental gifts. ‡

* Florus, *De Expositione Missæ*.

† Innocent III., *De Mysterioriis*, l. v., c. vi.

‡ Granelas, *Ancienne Liturgie*, tom. II., p. 795; *L'Antiquité des Ceremonies*, p. 414; Romsée, *Opera Liturgica*, tom. III., p. 263.

There is the same diversity of opinion with regard to the "angel" spoken of in the prayer, some seeing here a reference only to the ministry of angels, which has ever been so closely associated with the Holy Eucharist; e. g., "with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name." This is well expressed by Odo of Cambrai as follows: "CHRIST needed not the help of angels when by His own power He ascended into heaven. Why, then, do we ask that this sacrifice may be carried by the hands of an angel into the presence of GOD, since the offices of angels are unnecessary to this translation? But what is said is this: that by the translation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST we ask that our prayers may be carried [to the throne of grace]. There are, however, angels appointed for us, who daily offer our prayers to GOD, whence it is written that 'their angels do always behold the Face of my FATHER.'* So in mentioning CHRIST we ask that our prayers may be carried by the hands of an angel, that under the plea of so great a Sacrifice, good angels may bear our prayers to the throne of grace." †

(2.) Some take the "angel" of angels generally;

Other writers, among whom is Le Brun, ‡ see in the "angel" mentioned in the prayer none other than our LORD Himself; and Le Brun points out that in the Clementine liturgy our LORD is called "the Angel of Great Counsel." The passage is: "Thou createdst all things out of nothing by Thine Only Begotten SON, . . . GOD the Word, . . . the Living Wisdom, the Firstborn of every creature, the Angel of Thy

others of our LORD.

* S. Matt. xviii. 10.

† Odo Cam., *Expos. in Can. Miss.*, Diss. III.; Migne, P. L., tom. 160, col. 1066.

‡ Le Brun, *Explication de la Messe*, vol. i., p. 518.

Great Counsel, Thy High Priest." * It must, however, be observed that this passage in the Clementine liturgy has nothing whatever to do with the question before us, since it occurs in the Eucharistic Preface before the Consecration, and is simply one of the titles given to our LORD, and, as we have already shown, there is no mention in any Eastern liturgy of an angel in connection with the carrying of the sacramental gifts to the heavenly altar.

(3.) The purpose of the prayer as expressed in the Roman

The prayer in the Roman canon clearly specifies the purpose for which the gifts are to be carried to the heavenly altar; not that they may be offered as a sacrifice, or may become part of a sacrifice which is there offered, but "that all we, who by this participation of the altar shall receive the most holy Body and Blood of Thy SON, may be fulfilled with all grace and heavenly benediction." The Sacrifice is offered upon the altar of the Church, and we pray that those who offer it may enjoy its fruits, that is, may be fulfilled with all grace and heavenly benediction.

and in the Eastern liturgies.

In the Greek liturgies, as we have seen, the object of the corresponding prayer is that GOD would accept the gifts to the honour of His CHRIST, † or for the odour of a sweet-smelling sacrifice. ‡ This last expression in the liturgy of S. James evidently refers to the effects of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as fulfilling the type of the burnt offering among the Jews. In this the smoke ascended to heaven, typifying the sweet-smelling savour with which GOD was pleased; and, as we are told by S. Paul § that CHRIST "gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for an odour of a sweet smell," so we pray, what we know is accord-

* Clementine liturgy, Eucharistic Preface; Hammond, p. 12.

† Clementine liturgy. ‡ Liturgy of S. James. § Eph. v. 2.

ing to GOD'S will, that the fragrance, so to speak, of our Eucharistic Offering may ascend to Him, and that His grace and blessing may descend upon us.

There is an interesting though mistaken interpretation of these words in a writer of the ninth century. In a letter* written against Paschasius Radbertus, which has been attributed, probably without reason, to Rabanus Maurus, the author explains that in this prayer the priest asks that the virtue of the Body of JESUS CHRIST, which ever lives in heaven, may be communicated to that Body which is on the altar, for the sanctification of those who communicate worthily. The author of this letter evidently held those peculiar views in regard to the triple Body of CHRIST to which we call attention in Chapter VII.†

A peculiar interpretation in Cent. IX.

Our work would indeed be incomplete, if we were to pass from this point without giving the opinion of Duchesne, who is probably our greatest living authority on liturgical questions.

He considers that the Roman canon corresponds practically with that of the Eastern liturgies; so that the Invocation or Epiklesis is to be found not in the prayer, *Quam oblationem*, preceding the Consecration, but in the *Supra quæ*, in which he includes the *Supplices Te*.

Duchesne's words are as follows: "The recitation of the Institution (*Qui pridie*) and the Anamnesis (*Unde et Memores*), which is the continuation of it, offers no peculiarity. It is not so, however, with the Epiklesis. This part of the Canon is thus expressed: '*Supra quæ . . . et gratia repleamur.*'

Duchesne's view of the "Supplices Te."

"This passage is far from having the precision of the Greek formularies, in which the grace asked for is

* Migne, P. L., tom. 112, col. 1510-1518.

† P. 193.

clearly specified, namely, the intervention of the HOLY GHOST to effect the transformation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of CHRIST.

“ It is nevertheless true : (1) that it occupies, in the material and logical sequence of the formula, exactly the same place as the Greek *Epiklesis* ; (2) that it is also a prayer addressed to GOD that He may intervene in the mystery. But where the Greek liturgies express their meaning in clear and simple words, the Roman is here involved in mystical images.

“ It prays that the angel of the LORD may take the Oblation on the visible altar, and carry it to the highest heavens, to an invisible altar erected before the throne of the Divine Majesty.

“ The symbolic movement is in the opposite direction to that of the Greek formularies. It is not the HOLY SPIRIT Who descends towards the Oblation, it is the Oblation which is carried to heaven by the angel of GOD. But, in both cases alike, it is after His approach, His communication, with divine virtue, that the Oblation is spoken of as the Body and Blood of CHRIST.”*

Duchesne evidently implies that the *Supplices Te* is precisely equivalent to the Greek *Epiklesis*, by which it is therefore to be interpreted ; since the Greek liturgies express their meaning in clear and simple words, and in them the grace asked for is clearly specified, while the meaning of the Roman prayer is involved in symbolic figures and mystical images. Hence it can afford no foundation for a view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is foreign to the Greek rite.

In addition to the great diversity of opinion among liturgical writers, we may draw attention to the serious

* Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétienne*, pp. 172, 173 (ed. 1889).

theological difficulties which arise if this prayer is used to support a heavenly sacrifice, since not only is there in it no explicit mention of such a sacrifice, but the idea suggested by such a sacrifice seems incomprehensible. For what does this modern theory ask us to conceive? Let us remember, in the first place, that the prayer is not offered until the Consecration has been completed, and therefore the Sacrifice consummated. Now the Modern theory asserts that something is carried up from the altar on earth to an altar in heaven. But what? Is it the Body and Blood of our Blessed LORD, under the species of Bread and Wine? We know that the species sensibly remain upon the altar, and we are taught that the Presence of our LORD remains with the species. Therefore, it must remain upon the altar. If not, we are adoring One who is no longer present. Then, too, as the Communion almost immediately follows, are we to suppose that the Body and Blood of CHRIST, having been carried up to heaven by angel hands, are brought back again for the purposes of Communion? Such a view is, of course, not inconsistent with the Lutheran doctrine that our LORD'S Presence in the Eucharist is only for the purpose of Communion, but it certainly is not suggested in the slightest degree by the prayer *Supplices Te*, or by the corresponding prayers in the Eastern liturgies.

Many liturgical writers associate this prayer in the liturgy with the passage in S. Irenæus: "There is, therefore, an altar in the heavens, for thither our prayers and oblations are directed;"* and the phrase in the Clementine liturgy, *σὺ ὁ ἀνευδὲς θεός*, certainly justifies this reference; for, although this passage of S. Irenæus does not exist in the Greek, we find in the

of the modern interpretation of the prayer.

The relation of this prayer to the words of S. Irenæus.

* S. Iren., *Adv. Her.*, l. iv., c. xviii., n. 6.

Latin, "*Offerimus enim ei non quasi indigenti,*" and S. Irenæus evidently had in mind the words of the liturgy which he used so often.

These words must be interpreted by their context, 1. iv., c. xviii.

As we should expect, Thalhoffer lays great stress upon this quotation from S. Irenæus as one of the strongest supports of his theory. In order that we may apprehend its meaning, it will be necessary for us to consider it together with its context.

The whole of Chapter XVIII. (Book IV.) of the *Adv. Hæreses* is devoted to a consideration of sacrifices and oblations, and of those who rightly offer them. The Christian offerings are contrasted with the Jewish offerings and with the offerings of the heathen, and the importance of right dispositions in the offerer is noticed as a condition of a true sacrifice. The Eucharist is instanced; and the chapter ends as follows: "God, Who stands in need of nothing, takes our good works to Himself for this purpose, that He may grant us a recompense of His own good things." Then follows an enumeration of the corporal works of mercy, as found in the twenty-fifth chapter of S. Matthew, followed by the comment: "As, therefore, He does not stand in need of these [services], yet does desire that we should render them for our own benefit, lest we be unfruitful, . . . therefore it is also His will that we too should offer a gift at the altar, frequently and without intermission." Then comes the passage: "There is, therefore, an altar in the heavens, for thither our prayers and oblations are directed; and a temple, as John saith in the Apocalypse, 'And the temple of GOD was opened;' and a tabernacle, for 'Behold,' he says, 'the tabernacle of GOD, in which He will dwell with men.'"

What light does the context throw upon the passage which Thalhoffer quotes?

First, we may observe, from what precedes it, that it is doubtful whether the "oblations" in the expression "thither our prayers and oblations are directed," have *any reference* to the Eucharist at all. They seem to be the *good works*, which GOD teaches us to offer, not because He has any need of them, but lest we should be unfruitful.

From the context it is doubtful whether "oblation" refers to the H. E.

Secondly, if by the phrase "there is an altar in the heavens" we are to understand an altar in the proper sense of the word, then we must also understand a temple and a tabernacle in the proper sense of the words. We do not do so, but take the Temple of GOD as symbolizing His Presence in heaven, and the Tabernacle (with the Fathers) as His Humanity, through which He represents man. And this shows that we must also understand the altar only in a figurative sense.

The passage itself shows that "altar" is only used figuratively.

Thirdly, S. Irenæus does not say that there is an altar in heaven *on which* a heavenly Sacrifice is offered, but, what is very different, an altar towards which our prayers and oblations are directed. That is, the prayers and oblations which are offered on earth are directed heavenward, so that, as our altar on earth symbolizes our LORD'S throne amongst us, so the altar in heaven would seem to be equivalent to the "throne of grace."

The altar not one on which S. is offered, but towards which "prayers and oblations" are directed.

It seems equivalent to the "throne of grace."

We have now examined very carefully the passages in the liturgies in which a heavenly altar is mentioned, and to which the Modern school appeals in support of its view of a heavenly sacrifice. And our discussion may be thus summed up :

The discussion of the heavenly altar thus summed up :

1. The expression "heavenly altar" (*θυσιαστήριον ἐπουράνιον* or *ὑπερουράνιον*) is found frequently in the Greek liturgies, and the similar expression *altare sublime* in the Latin.

1. The phrase frequently found in the liturgies.

2. Ἐπουράνιος signifies only what pertains to the Kingdom of heaven.

3. The meaning of "ἡεε" doubtful.

4. The true and valuable element in the Modern view, the prominence given to the union of the worship of earth and heaven.

2. The sense in which Ἐπουράνιος is to be understood is the sense in which it is used in similar passages in the New Testament, and in which the Greek and Latin Fathers clearly explain it; that is, of things pertaining to the Kingdom of heaven, or spiritual things.

3. It is not certain what precisely we are to understand by the word "ἡεε" in the prayer *Supplices Te*; and it is difficult to conceive in what sense the sacramental gifts can be actually carried up to the altar in heaven. It seems more satisfactory to understand by this term either "prayers," or the "sweet savour" of the Sacrifice already offered.

4. There is a true and valuable element in the Modern view, especially as it was set forth by the Tractarians. The passages quoted from the liturgies and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the explanation of them found in the Fathers, all point to a union between the Church on earth and the Church in heaven, a fellowship not only of interest but of life and worship. This finds itself most perfectly realized in that act by which "GOD is most honoured and man most blessed," the offering of the Holy Eucharist. There the spiritual energies of the Kingdom of GOD are brought together for an act of worship in which is expressed the adoration of the Church on earth and in heaven. The oneness of this worship is such that we speak of the "angels and archangels and all the company of heaven" as joining with us in the Church on earth in our service of praise and adoration. And we think of ourselves as carried, with our offerings, into the very Presence of GOD in heaven, so that the altar of the Church becomes the heavenly altar, the Eucharist of the Church the heavenly worship. And JESUS our great High Priest, the true Priest in every Eucharist,

appears for us before the face of GOD, " His very Human Nature interceding for us." *

No words can be too strong to express the closeness of this joyous fellowship, which in the dark days of the past three hundred years has indeed been obscured by the cold, unsacramental worship of the Church in England. While striving, however, to surround the Holy Eucharist with those glorious adjuncts of Catholic ritual which help us to realize our oneness with the worship of heaven, and at the same time to teach those doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice upon which this fellowship depends, let us be very careful not to go to the opposite pole and teach as the fundamental doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice a theory unheard of by the Church in the days of its glorious unity, unknown to its Fathers and theologians, rejected alike by East and West, and inconsistent with the express teaching of the English Prayer Book.

This must be earnestly asserted,

but without admitting the Modern view of the E. S.

* Euthymius Zig., *in Heb.*, cap. vii., v. 25.

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORY OF THE SACRIFICIAL CONCEPTION OF THE EUCCHARIST.

BEFORE proceeding to an examination of the testimony of the Fathers and theologians of the Church, we shall find it useful to stop and take a bird's-eye view of the growth and fluctuations of the conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice from the sub-apostolic age to our own time. An exhaustive treatment of the historical aspect of this question would, of course, require of itself a large volume ; but such a treatment is unnecessary for two reasons : first, because we shall consider the principal theories of the Eucharistic Sacrifice more fully in the succeeding chapters, which deal with the opinions of the Fathers and theologians of the Church ; and secondly, because what we here need is a general survey of the whole subject, which will enable us hereafter to relegate the teachings of the various authors to their proper places in the history of the development of this doctrine. For our purpose, then, a sketch will be more useful than a full history of this subject, and in tracing such a sketch we shall follow the outline indicated by Dr. Vacant in the valuable essay to which attention has already been directed.*

* *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Église Latine.* Delhomme et Briguet, Paris, 1894.

A bird's-eye view of theological opinion of the E. S. from the sub-apostolic age to our own time.

This will enable us to relegate the various views to their place in history.

This would seem to be the best point in our argument at which to introduce a review of the history of the question, since it divides the testimony of Holy Scripture and of the liturgies from that of the Fathers and theologians, and thus draws attention to the fact that the difference in the weight of the authority of these two groups is a difference not only in degree but in kind. The authority of Holy Scripture is, of course, absolutely unique, since it is the authority of GOD Himself, Who inspired Holy Scripture ; and next in evidential value is the testimony of the liturgies, which, as the official documents of the Church, carry a weight greater than that of any individual writer of the Church, however much revered for his learning and sanctity.

When we survey the field of history, we are at once struck with the clearness and simplicity of the three divisions into which it is marked out. To adopt Dr. Vacant's suggestive classification, we see, in the first, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist regarded synthetically, as a great whole, as the Church's Sacrifice. In the second it is treated almost exclusively from a practical standpoint ; with respect partly to the effects of the Sacrifice upon the offerers, and partly to the lessons taught in the liturgical forms of the Church. In the third the treatment is essentially analytic and theological. In it we find that theologians are looking chiefly for such an analysis of the Sacrifice as may enable them to determine precisely in what the sacrificial act consists.

These divisions, as we have said, fall into clearly defined epochs, the first extending through some five centuries, from the writings of S. Clement of Rome in the sub-apostolic age to the beginning of the papacy of

The field falls into three divisions :

I. The Early Ages, from S. Clement to S. Gregory the Great;

the H. E. treated synthetically as a great whole.

II. The Middle Period, from S. Gregory to S. Thomas; the treatment practical, regarding effects and liturgical forms.

III. The Modern, from S. Thomas to our own times; the treatment analytical, in determining the Sacrificial act.

The strongest evidence of the fact of the E. S. is that till cent. XVI. there was no attempt to define it.

From cent. IX. to XVI. controversies about the Real Presence occupied theologians.

S. Gregory the Great; the second, from S. Gregory the Great, or the earliest years of the seventh century, to the age of S. Thomas Aquinas; and the last, from the age of S. Thomas, or the middle of the thirteenth century, to our own times.

The first period may be termed the "Early Ages" of the Church; the second, the "Middle Period;" and the third, the "Post-Mediæval and Modern Epoch."

Before we turn our attention to an examination of these three periods, there is one point which it is very important we should state most distinctly. It is, that until the controversies of the sixteenth century brought into question the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, no serious attempt was made by the theologians of the Church to investigate the *nature* of the Sacrifice itself. In a way this is disappointing; and yet it is, perhaps, the strongest evidence we could produce of the fact that the Eucharist was always regarded as a true and proper Sacrifice. The history of dogma shows us that doctrines are never fully discussed or defined until their truth is assailed. So we find that from the earliest writer of the sub-apostolic age, S. Clement of Rome, the Eucharist is spoken of and treated as a Sacrifice, without any attempt to analyze or define its sacrificial character, until this was called in question in the sixteenth century.

From the ninth century, theologians were so engrossed in their attempts, first to define the doctrine of our LORD'S Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and then to defend their definition, that they gave but little attention to the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, about which, as we have said, there was no controversy until the sixteenth century.

In the ninth century the attempt to define the mode

of our LORD'S Sacramental Presence in the Holy Eucharist began with the controversy between Paschasius Radbertus (ob. 865) and Ratramnus of Corbey (ob. circa 868). The term "transubstantiation" seems to be found first in an Exposition of the Canon of the Mass, by S. Peter Damian (ob. 1072); and the discussion received a new impetus from the writings of Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers (ob. 1088). From this time on, the mode of our LORD'S Presence so monopolized the disputations of the schoolmen that the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice can scarcely be said to have received any serious consideration.

On this account, as we have said, we must not expect to find in the first fifteen centuries of the Church's history any definite theory in regard to the precise character of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. What we shall find to be abundantly evident is,

1. That the Eucharist was regarded as a Sacrifice by all Christian writers.

2. That no one in any way refers to it as dependent, for its sacrificial character, on our LORD'S present work in heaven; but

3. That some of the Greek Fathers, among whom are Theodoret, S. Chrysostom, and Euthymius, explicitly deny that our LORD is now exercising His Priesthood in heaven or otherwise than through His Church on earth in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and in the administration of the Sacraments.

4. That a very large number of the Fathers, both East and West, speak of the Eucharist as related only to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

With these facts clearly before us, let us now review in order the three periods into which the history of the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist is divided.

This began with the controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus.

S. Peter Damian apparently the author of the term "transubstantiation."

In the first period we shall find:

1. The H. E. regarded by all as a S.

2. No trace of the Modern view.

3. Certain Greek Fathers even deny that our LORD is now offering S., except through His Church.

4. The Fathers generally relate the H. E. to the S. of the Cross.

I. THE EARLY AGES.

I. The Early Ages

begin with S. Clement of Rome.

Writers trace analogies between O. T. sacrifices and the H. E.

H. E. as the Church's S. and as the bond uniting her to her Head.

S. Clement sets forth its public and sacrificial character, and restricts its celebration to bishops and priests.

S. Ignatius speaks of the altar and calls the H. E. the

We shall naturally examine with special interest the age in which the great Fathers of the Church lived, in which the General Councils of the Church were held, and in which the doctrines of the primitive Church may best be studied. This period, as we have said, begins with S. Clement of Rome, and ends just before the accession of Gregory the Great to the papal throne. Throughout it we find the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice clearly and distinctly taught, though without any attempt at definition. The Eucharist is regarded as a whole, and considered as the continual memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross, without, however, any effort being made to show how or why it is a Sacrifice, or to determine whether the sacrificial act is to be sought in the liturgical forms or in the act of Consecration.

The writers of this period occupy themselves with tracing analogies between the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the sacrifices of the Old Testament which prefigured it, and in establishing its relation to the whole body of Christian dogma and morals. The characteristic view of this era represents the Eucharist as the Church's Sacrifice and as the bond by which she was united to her Head, JESUS CHRIST.

In the first Epistle of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written about A.D. 94, we find the public and sacrificial character of the Eucharist clearly set forth. S. Clement compares the celebration of the Eucharist with the sacrifices of the Jews, and restricts to bishops and priests the power of offering the Eucharist.

S. Ignatius (ob. circa 115), who wrote some years later, calls the Holy Table an altar; the Eucharist, the Flesh of JESUS CHRIST, Which suffered for us and

for our sins, and Which the FATHER raised again from the dead.* He teaches that the fruits of the Eucharist are preservation from death, and life in JESUS CHRIST ; but he adds that these fruits of the Kingdom of GOD cannot be found amongst those who are in heresy or schism.† As there is only one Flesh of JESUS CHRIST and one chalice of His Blood, so there is but one altar upon which the Bread of GOD is found, and this is the altar of the lawful Bishop.‡ Schismatics find in this Sacrament death rather than life.§ S. Ignatius thus regards the Eucharist as the centre and instrument of the Church's unity.

Flesh of CHRIST.

He confines its fruits to those in union with the Church.

He regards it as the centre of the Church's unity.

In the *Didache* of the Twelve Apostles the Eucharist is treated from a somewhat different standpoint, perhaps because the schisms and heresies to which S. Ignatius refers were unknown to its writers. The *Didache* regards the Sacrifice of the Eucharist rather from a moral point of view, dwelling upon the sanctity which it requires in the offerer. It is interesting to notice that it applies our LORD'S command, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs," || to the Eucharist ; and some have therefore been led to think that these words of our LORD were an inculcation of that *disciplina arcani* which we know was practised among the early Christians with respect to the Eucharist. What is, however, more to our purpose, the *Didache* teaches that the Eucharist is that Sacrifice foretold by Malachi, which was to take the place of the sacrifices of the Old Testament.¶

The "Didache" regards it rather from the moral standpoint of the sanctity required in the offerer

* S. Ignat., *Ad. Ephes.*, xx. 2 ; *Ad. Smyrn.*, vii. 1.

† *Ad. Ephes.*, v. 2 ; *Ad. Smyrn.*, vii. ; *Ad. Philadelph.*, iii. 3 and 4.

‡ *Ad. Ephes.*, v. 7.

§ *Ad. Smyrn.*, vii.

|| S. Matt. vii. 6.

¶ *Didache*, ix., x., xiv., and xv. 1.

S. Justin Martyr describes the liturgical service and affirms that the H. E. is a memorial of the Passion.

S. Justin Martyr (ob. circa 165), like S. Ignatius and the writers of the *Didache*, speaks of the Eucharist as the union of the Church with the Sacrifice of her Head. In his first Apology, written for the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius, he describes a celebration of the Eucharist, carefully choosing terms which would be more intelligible to a gentile than the ordinary liturgical language of the Church. He points out that it is the "president" who alone pronounces the Eucharistic Prayer, that is, the Prayer of Consecration, the people only responding with the "Amen;" that this prayer contains the words of our LORD, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood;" and that by these words bread and wine become the Body and Blood of CHRIST.* He affirms that the Eucharistic Sacrifice was instituted by our LORD JESUS CHRIST at the Last Supper *in memory of His Passion*.† It is not, however, a bloody Sacrifice, but a Sacrifice of praise and prayer. Like his predecessors he shows that the Eucharist as a Sacrifice fulfils the prophecy of Malachi.

S. Irenæus associates the H. E. with our LORD'S Blood shed on the Cross;

S. Irenæus (ob. circa 202), in his great work *Adversus Hæreses*, refers in many places to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. His principal treatment of the Eucharist is found in the fourth book, chapter xviii., and the fifth book, chapter ii. The first passage we have already quoted ‡ in connection with the prayer *Supplices Te*. In the second passage he associates the Eucharist with our LORD'S Blood shed upon the Cross. For, when treating of those Gnostic heretics who, because they believed matter to be essentially evil, rejected the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, and therefore of any salvation of the flesh, he says: "But if this [the

* S. Just. Mart., *Apol.*, n. 65, 66.

† *Apol.*, n. 66, 67; and *Dialog.*, n. 41.

‡ Page 172.

flesh] indeed do not attain salvation, then neither did the LORD redeem us with His Blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the Communion of His Blood, nor the bread which we break the Communion of His Body." *

When S. Irenæus speaks of the Eucharistic oblations as " the first-fruits of creation " it is difficult to be sure about his meaning. Perhaps he is referring to our Blessed LORD as " the first-begotten of every creature ; " † or possibly he means that the bread and wine in the Sacrifice, which become the Body and Blood of CHRIST, are thus the first-fruits of that new creation to which our LORD refers when He says, " I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My FATHER'S kingdom." ‡

and calls the oblations the first-fruits of creation.

* S. Iren., 1. v., c. ii., n. 2. Mr. Brightman, after referring to this very passage, and to 1. iv., c. xvii., xviii., says : " In S. Irenæus, so far as I can remember, there is no exclusive relation of the Eucharist to the Passion suggested. Of course his allusions are limited by his particular aim, but his argument for our resurrection, drawn from the Eucharist, suggests a relation between the Eucharist and our LORD'S Resurrection " (p. 7). We would point out that the passages before us suggest no relation between the Eucharist and *our LORD'S* Resurrection. They are very well summed up by Vacant as follows : " Le sacrifice eucharistique, complété par la communion que tous les chrétiens y reçoivent, sert de trait d'union entre la passion de JÉSUS-CHRIST et la résurrection glorieuse *qui en est le fruit* et à laquelle on rattachait alors tous les bien éternels " (p. 11). The Eucharist is here essentially related to the Passion, to the Blood by which our LORD redeemed us, and its fruits are said to be life eternal and the resurrection of *our* bodies (S. John vi. 54) ; there is no suggestion whatever of its relation to our LORD'S Resurrection.

† Col. i. 15.

‡ S. Matt. xxvi. 29.

Tertullian (ob. circa 245) speaks in many places of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as offered not only for the living and in honour of the martyrs, but for the souls of the faithful departed.* †

S. Cyprian teaches that H. E. reproduces the Passion of JESUS CHRIST.

So far the writers quoted have treated of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist only incidentally. In the writings of S. Cyprian we find the first distinct treatise on this subject. It takes the form of a letter (*Epist.* lxiii.) in which S. Cyprian shows that in consecrating the Holy Eucharist the mixed chalice only should be used, and that the Eucharist reproduces in its fulness the Passion of JESUS CHRIST, ‡ and that in its form it ought to represent the Last Supper, at which it was instituted.§

The priest in it fulfils the functions of the Sovereign Priest.

The priest who celebrates fulfils the functions of JESUS CHRIST the Sovereign Priest.|| The wine of the Sacrifice is the Blood of our LORD shed during His Passion.¶ The water mingled with wine, as well as the grains which compose the bread, represent the people, whose sins our LORD bore upon the Cross, and who are united with Him at the altar.**

* Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, c. 2, *Apol.*, c. 30.

† Dr. Vacant (p. 15), in referring to Tertullian, makes the following statement, which the author has been unable to verify: "Mais il voit surtout dans la célébration des saints mystères, une prière dont JÉSUS-CHRIST est le souverain pontife. Il rattache donc ces mystères venerables a l'intercession glorieuse de JÉSUS-CHRIST ressuscité pour nous." He gives as his authority Tertullian, *Adv. Judæos*, c. 14. This chapter, however, contains no reference whatever to the Eucharist. One finds the same statement in Thomassinus (*De Incarn. Verbi*, l. x., c. xii., § 5, tom. iv., p. 339), with precisely the same reference (Tert., *Adv. Judæos*, c. 14). Dr. Vacant has therefore probably simply followed Thomassinus. In Appendix C we give the passage of Tertullian in full.

‡ S. Cyp., *Epist.* lxiii., n. 17.

¶ *Ibid.*, n. 11.

§ *Ibid.*, n. 14.

|| *Ibid.*, n. 14.

** *Ibid.*, n. 13.

The fruits of the Sacrifice, S. Cyprian teaches, are the bestowal of all virtues, even the grace of martyrdom ;* the remission of sins, † and the inheritance of heaven. These fruits, he tells us, can be applied to those who are absent, ‡ and to the faithful departed, § whom the priest names, and for whom he prays at the altar. || In a word, S. Cyprian clearly recognizes in the Eucharist a proper priesthood possessing a proper sacrifice, in which the Passion of JESUS CHRIST is represented, the Body and Blood of CHRIST being the matter of the Sacrifice.

It is a proper S. in which the Passion is re-presented.

The Western Fathers after S. Cyprian, while showing the influence of his teaching, dwell upon the Eucharist in its relation to the mysteries of the Incarnation and of grace. S. Ambrose (ob. 397) lays stress upon the fact that in the Eucharist our LORD offers Himself in His Humanity for the remission of our sins. ¶ In it there is the same Priest, the same Victim, and consequently the same Sacrifice as on the Cross.**

S. Ambrose says that in it the S. is the same as that of the Cross.

S. Augustine's (ob. 430) idea of the Eucharist has affinities with that of S. Irenæus. The Sacrifice has for its end our union with GOD. This is for our good alone, for this union is our true end and ought to be our supreme happiness. †† Such a union must depend largely upon the interior dispositions of the offerer.

S. Augustine regards it as uniting us to GOD and depending for its effects upon right dispositions in the offerer.

* S. Cyp., *Epistola Synodica*, n. 3.

† Idem., *De Lapsis*, n. 16.

‡ Idem., *Epist.* lx., n. 4.

§ Idem., *Epist.* lxvi., n. 2.

|| Idem., *Epist.* lx., n. 4.

¶ S. Ambr., *De Officiis*, l. i., c. lxxviii., n. 238.

** Idem., *In Psalm.*, xxxiii., n. 26.

†† S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, l. x., c. 5, 6.

He defines S.

While sacrifice properly so called is "the visible sacrament, that is, the sacred sign, of an invisible sacrifice," in order that it may be a true sacrifice there must be joined with it the invisible sacrifice of the will in acts of penitence, humility, and love. Every man who lives for GOD is himself a sacrifice. Moreover, the Church herself is a sacrifice, in which JESUS CHRIST is the great High Priest, and of which the Sacrament of the Altar is the outward sign.* The one absolute Sacrifice was offered by our LORD Himself, Who "took upon Him the form of a servant" that He might offer Himself to His FATHER. And by this Sacrifice our LORD unites man to GOD in the closest fellowship.† Our LORD'S Sacrifice, which was typified by the sacrifices of the Old Testament, is renewed daily in the Eucharist upon our altars, so that the Church, which is His Mystical Body, unites herself to the Sacrifice of her Head.‡

and shows that our LORD'S S. is renewed daily in the H. E.

S. Leo the Great sees in the E. S. the accomplishment of all mysteries.

S. Leo the Great (ob. 461) sees in the offering of our LORD'S Body and Blood in the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sin of the world, the accomplishment of all mysteries. For him the Eucharist is that Sacrifice which supersedes all the various carnal sacrifices and offerings, both of the heathen world and of the Jewish Church, and which unites all nations in one great Kingdom.§

The Eastern Fathers

We must now turn from the West to the East and notice briefly the treatment of the Eucharist by those Greek Fathers of the fourth century whose voluminous works contribute so greatly to the theological treasures

* S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei.*, 1. x., c. 6.

† S. Aug., *De Trinitate*, 1. iv., c. xiv.

‡ S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, 1. x., c. vi., ct. xx.

§ S. Leo, *Serm.*, lix., c. vii.

of the Church. We shall not need here to do more than draw attention to the general features of their teaching, since in the next chapter we shall have to bring forward and carefully examine many passages from their writings. We may observe :

1. That they connect the Eucharist most closely with the Passion, one of them, in speaking of the " triduum " of the Passion, even insisting that the Institution of the Eucharist must be counted in this period, since the Sacrifice of the Eucharist was so entirely one with the Sacrifice of the Cross that it practically contained it, and was therefore an essential part of the Passion.* Besides this, they recognize the Eucharist as the Sacrifice in which the Passion is continually reproduced.†

i. connect the H. E. with the Passion ;

2. They see in the Eucharist an extension of the Incarnation.‡

2. and Incarnation ;

3. They associate the Priesthood of our LORD with that of Melchisedec, especially pointing out that He is now, through His priests in the Church, offering in the Eucharist that Sacrifice which was typified by Melchisedec's offering of bread and wine.§

3. and point out that through the Church our LORD is now exercising His Priesthood.

* S. Greg. Nyss., *In Christ. Resurrect.*, Oratio i. ; Migne, P. G., tom. 46, col. 611 ; S. Cyril Alex., *Homil. Div.*, x., *In Mysticam Cœnam* ; Migne, P. G., tom. 77, col. 1018.

† S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, Hom. vii. ; Migne, P. G., tom. 63, col. 130 ; *ibid.*, col. 131.

‡ S. Chrys., *In Joan.*, Hom. xlvii., n. 2, 3 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 59, col. 260 ; *ibid.*, n. 3, col. 261 ; S. Cyril Alex., *in Joan.*, iii. 6 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 73, col. 519 ; *ibid.*, tom. 74, col. 528, 529 ; Isid. Pelus., *Epist.*, l. iii., 195 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 78, col. 879 ; Thomassin., *De Incarn.*, tom. iv. ; l. x., c. 21.

§ Euseb. Cæs., *Dem. Evangel.*, v. 3 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 22, col. 367 ; S. Chrys., *In Genes.*, Hom. xxxv., n. 5 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 53, col. 328 ; *ibid.*, Hom. xxxvi., n. 3, col. 336 ; S. Cyril Alex., *In Genes.*, l. ii., n. 10 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 69, col. 107.

In this period both East and West dwell upon the relation between CHRIST'S Mystical Body and His Body in the H. E., and between the H. E. and His Intercession in heaven; but have no knowledge of any S. now being offered in heaven.

We may bring our notice of this first period to an end by saying that the Fathers, both Eastern and Western, dwell upon the relation between the Mystical Body of CHRIST and His Body in the Eucharist, and recognize also a relation between the Eucharist and our LORD'S great Intercession in heaven. But of any Sacrifice now being offered in heaven they not only have no knowledge, but expressly state, either that our LORD offered His Sacrifice once for all, and is now set down at the Right Hand of GOD,* or that He is now exercising His sacerdotal functions only through the priesthood of His Church in offering the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist.†

II. THE MIDDLE PERIOD.

II. The Middle Period begins with S. Gregory and ends with S. Thomas. The S. of the Mass treated practically,

This period, which begins with the accession of S. Gregory the Great to the papacy and ends with the early days of S. Thomas Aquinas, extends from the close of the sixth to the middle of the thirteenth century. As the point of view from which the Sacrifice of the Mass was regarded in the early ages of the Church was clearly synthetic, so we may consider its treatment during the period we are now to survey as distinctly practical. There was no change of view in regard to the nature of the Sacrifice or of its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, but its sacrificial character was sought in the effects which it produced; and, above all, in the dispositions which were required in the offerer that he might appropriate the fruits of the Sacrifice. No attempt was yet made to determine in

and its character sought in its effects.

* S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, Hom. xiii., 8.

† Theodoret, *In Psalm.*, cix., 4; Migne, P. G., tom. 80, col. 1773.

what manner the Eucharist was to be regarded as a Sacrifice, or where the essentially sacrificial action in it was to be found. While the writers of this period recognized in the Mass an image of the Death of the Saviour, yet they often sought this image outside of the act of Consecration, and ordinarily placed it in the liturgical ceremonies instituted by the Church.

S. Gregory the Great (ob. 604) led the way in this new departure by his teaching both in his *Dialogues* and in his *Letters*. In these he sets forth the efficacy of the Mass to obtain various graces, and especially the deliverance of souls from purgatory.* He shows that our LORD renews His Sacrifice for us in the Eucharist, and that this Sacrifice is an unceasing reproduction of the image of His Passion for the remission of our sins. At the moment of our LORD'S daily immolation of Himself in the Eucharist, according to S. Gregory, heaven opens at the voice of the priest, to unite itself with the Church on earth.†

S. Gregory also gave an impulse to the study of the Mass from a liturgical point of view, by introducing the Roman liturgy into Gaul. In the ninth century the liturgical writings of Amalarius, Florus, and others testify to the greater value set upon the liturgies, especially upon that of the Roman Church.

S. Isidore of Seville (ob. 636) adds to the theological stores of the Church a definition of the word "sacrifice" which long held sway: "The term 'sacrifice,' " he says, "is equivalent to 'a thing made holy,' since the sacrifice is mystically consecrated by prayer in memory of our LORD'S Passion for us." ‡

The image of our LORD'S Death sought in the liturgical forms.

S. Gregory teaches the efficacy of the S. for the souls in purgatory; that in it the Passion is reproduced;

and that by it heaven and earth are united.

He gave an impulse to liturgical study.

S. Isidore of Seville contributes a definition of S.

* S. Greg. Mag., *Dialog.*, iv., c. xlvi., xlviii.

† *Ibid.*, c. xlviii.

‡ " *Sacrificium dictum, quasi sacrum factum, quia prece*

Bede's view is similar.

The Venerable Bede (ob. 735) treated the subject on much the same lines.

In cent. VI. one Mass only was allowed on the same day at any altar by the Synods of Auxerre and Merida.

A development of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist which was practical rather than doctrinal may be noticed about this time. In the sixth century a comparatively small number of Masses were celebrated, the Synod of Auxerre (578) in its tenth canon forbidding the saying of two Masses on the same day at the same altar;* while in the Council of Merida, in Spain (666), the nineteenth canon directs that all the intentions of the assistants and of the benefactors of the Church should be recommended together at the Mass. A little later than this the opinion seems to have gained ground that the offering of a Mass for one intention exclusively was more efficacious than the commemoration of many intentions in the same Mass. This naturally led to a multiplication of Masses in order to give people an opportunity of offering them with special intentions, and in the ninth century Walafrid Strabo tells us that some of the faithful were in the habit of going from one Mass to another in order to assist at as many Masses as they had intentions to present.† As a result of this, many priests were in the habit of saying two or three Masses a day in order to satisfy the

In cent. IX. Strabo notices an increase in the number of Masses.

mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis" (S. Isidore Hispal., *Etymol.*, l. vi., c. xix.). Kidd, in his *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 43, quoting from Vacant, p. 26, gives this reference as l. v., c. xix. In Vacant, p. 26, it is l. iv., c. xix., but on p. 23 he quotes it correctly as l. vi., as it is in the Paris edition of 1601, which we use. In this place other definitions of the word "sacrifice" are found, and, indeed, that part of the chapter which refers to the Eucharist deserves to be read.

* Hefele, vol. iv., p. 411.

† Strabo, *De Rebus Eccles.*, pt. i., c. xxii.

demands of the faithful, and also for their own intentions.* In the beginning of the eleventh century this practice had become so much abused that it was forbidden, or at least regulated, by the decrees of several local Councils.†

The ninth century witnessed unusual literary activity in regard to the Holy Eucharist, especially in the writings of Amalarius and his opponent Florus, the Deacon of Lyons; Paschasius Radbertus and his adversary, Ratramnus, the monk of Corbey; Walafrid Strabo and Rabanus Maurus. Amalarius was the first who treated the liturgy as mystically setting forth the Passion of our LORD, and so laid the foundation for the mystical writers of the twelfth century.

About this time we observe the setting in of a new current of opinion, flowing side by side with the prevailing theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which, as we have said, viewed it in its effects rather than in its essential character. The new current was mystical rather than theological, and while at first in conflict with the theological conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as evidenced by the controversy between Amalarius and Florus, the two were harmonized in the writings of Paschasius Radbertus.

This new current of thought was the result of the impetus given to liturgical study. It endeavoured to

The Eucharistic writers of cent. IX.: Amalarius, Florus, Paschasius, Strabo, Rabanus.

In cent. IX. a new current sets in, mystical rather than theological,

resulting from liturgical study,

* Strabo., *De Rebus Eccles.*, pt. i., c. xxi.

† The Council of Seligenstadt (1022) forbade priests saying more than three Masses a day; and later they were forbidden to say more than one Mass, unless in exceptional cases. Cf. Alexander II. (A.D. 1065), *Decret.*, 3 p., *De Consecratione*, Cap. liii.; Innocent III. (1212), *Decret.*, 1. iii., tit. xli., c. 3; Council of Westminster (1199), Canon 2; of Oxford (1222), Canon 6; of Treves (1227), Canons 3 and 9; of Rouen (1231), Canon 12; of Tarragona (1239), Canon 6.

and attempting to find in the liturgy itself the image of the Passion.

find in the liturgical services the image of the Passion, and therefore the accomplishment of S. Paul's words, "As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." The writers of this school considered these words as a precept enjoined especially upon the priest who celebrated, to make remembrance of our LORD'S Passion in the Mass; and they thought that the Church, having instituted and arranged the ceremonies and prayers which precede and follow the Consecration, intended by them to aid the priest to fulfil this precept. They were therefore led to seek in the ceremonies of the Mass a picture intended to recall the Death, and even the Life of our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Amalarius
its source.

His exposition
of the liturgy.

Amalarius (ob. 837), who was distinctly the leader in this new method of regarding the Eucharist, sketches the picture somewhat as follows: The Introit and the Kyrie, he says, remind us of the preparation by the Prophets of the Old Testament for the coming of the Messiah. The *Gloria in Excelsis* tells of the Birth of CHRIST; the Epistle, of the preaching of S. John the Baptist; the Gospel, of the preaching of our LORD Himself. The Offertory represents His triumphal entrance into Jerusalem; the Preface, the hymn which was sung after the Institution and before proceeding to Gethsemane. The *Te igitur* he takes of the Prayer in the Garden of Olives; the Consecration, of the Crucifixion; the *Unde et memores*, of the elevation of the Cross. According to his view, the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, pronounced with a loud voice in the midst of the silence of the Canon, expresses the cry of the dying LORD. By the number seven, which corresponds to the sabbath, the petitions of the Paternoster tell of the rest of His Burial. The particle of the Host min-

gled with the Wine after the fraction symbolizes the Resurrection, which reunites His Soul to His Body ; and the final benediction recalls that blessing which JESUS gave to His Apostles at His Ascension.*

When, however, Amalarius dealt with the question of the mode of our LORD'S Presence at the same time in heaven and in the Eucharist, he fell into grievous error. For he taught that our LORD'S glorious Body divides and multiplies Itself in different Bodies as new Hosts are consecrated. He even speculated whether after the Communion our LORD'S Body re-ascended to heaven, or remained in our bodies until their burial, or whether It passed away in the processes of digestion.† These gross views were branded with the name of Stercorianism. He also fell into another error when trying to find the signification of the three fragments into which the priest after the Consecration divides the Host. For Amalarius says that the Body of JESUS CHRIST has a triple form: the Body born of the Blessed Virgin and raised from the dead being represented by the fragment placed in the chalice ; the Body which is on earth, represented by the fragment which serves for the Communion of the priest and people ; and finally, the Body which lies in the sepulchre, represented by the third fragment, which is left upon the altar for the reservation for the sick.‡ In a later work § Amalarius makes no reference to this triple Body of JESUS CHRIST, but teaches that the fraction of the Host recalls the appearance to the disciples at

His serious theological errors.

Stercorianism,

and the triple form of our LORD'S Body.

* Amal., *De Eccles. Offic.*, l. iii. Migne, P. L., tom. 105, col. 986-1242.

† Amal., *Epist. ad Gunther*, col. 1336-1339.

‡ Amal., *De Offic.*, l. iii., c. xxxv., col. 1154.

§ Amal., *Eclogæ*, col. 1328.

Emmaus. He sees a difficulty, however, in the fact that only a particle of the Host is put into the chalice, whereas JESUS CHRIST rose from the dead whole and entire. He endeavours to solve this difficulty by saying, JESUS CHRIST is in part risen and living in heaven, partly still upon earth.

These views were attacked by Florus and condemned at Quiercy. Their strange reappearance in the works of other writers.

These extraordinary views of Amalarius were assailed by Florus, and after discussion were condemned by the Council of Quiercy-sur-Oise (837) and Amalarius was compelled to retract them. But afterwards they had a most curious history, in that they passed into the additions made to the *Glossa Ordinaria* of Walafrid Strabo, and also into the additions made to the treatise of Rabanus Maurus, *De Institutione Clericorum*. They were also introduced by Remi d'Auxerre (908) into a treatise, *De Officiis*, and in such a way connected with the statement that Pope Sergius revived the custom of reciting the *Agnus Dei*, that a careless reader would think that this opinion of Amalarius was really attributed to Sergius.* On this account it attracted the attention of many theologians, e. g., Peter Lombard, Innocent III., and S. Thomas Aquinas, though all these authors explain the supposed pontifical utterance in an orthodox manner, as indicating the effects produced by the Body of JESUS CHRIST in heaven, on earth, and in purgatory.

The views of the pseudo Rabanus Maurus.

In a letter attributed, probably without reason, to Rabanus Maurus, this idea of a triple Body of our Blessed LORD is differently explained as referring to His Mystical Body the Church ; to His Living and Integral Body, which pronounced the words of Consecration at the Last Supper, and reigns, risen from the dead, in heaven ; and to His Body deprived of life and grace (sic), which was produced by the words of Con-

* Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, p. 381, n. 82.

secration at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, and is still present in the Blessed Sacrament.

These unorthodox views of Amalarius were bitterly attacked by Florus (ob. circa 860), the learned Deacon and head of the Cathedral School at Lyons, and were, as we have said, condemned by the Synod at Quiercy-sur-Oise. Florus, whose work, *De Expositione Missæ*,* is the most valuable production of the ninth century on this subject, regards the Sacrifice of the Mass as the representation of the LORD'S Death, not on account of the words which are used in the liturgy, but by reason of the mysteries which are fulfilled in the Eucharist. He regards the Consecration as the essential part of the Sacrifice, and dwells on the substantial transformation which it produces. In his view the Consecration represents the Passion of our LORD because it is produced by the same love with which He loved us unto the end, and because it produces the same effects, applying to us through each Eucharist the blessings and graces which were merited for us by CHRIST upon the Cross.†

Paschasius Radbertus (ob. 865) is best known for his investigations into the mode of our LORD'S Presence in the Eucharist. His work is generally considered to have started the discussion of that great mystery which has engrossed the attention of theologians even down to our own days. The controversy began with an answer to the view set forth by Radbertus, written by Ratramnus of Corbey (ob. circa 868). Radbertus is theologically in accord with Florus, and refutes the Stercorianism of Amalarius, whose mystical treatment of the subject, however, he does not reject.

Florus' "De Expositione Missæ" the most important contribution of cent. IX.

The controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus.

* Florus, *De Expos. Miss.*, Migne, P. L., tom. 119, col. 15 to 71.

† Florus, *De Expos. Miss.*, n. 63, col. 54, 55.

Walafrid
Strabo.

Rabanus Maurus (ob. 856) and Walafrid Strabo (ob. 849) placed the memorial of the Passion in the prayer *Unde et memores*.

Cents. X. and
XI. added
nothing to
the subject.

We may pass over the tenth and eleventh centuries without remark, since the works which they produced were either compilations from Florus and Amalarius, * or liturgical treatises. † During this period the Eucharistic Sacrifice was still regarded in its effects, and the representation of the Passion of JESUS CHRIST was referred rather to the liturgical acts which He Himself performed at the Last Supper than to the ceremonies of the liturgy.

The attack of
Berengarius
upon the Real
Presence,
cent. XI.

In the eleventh century, however, the attack of Berengarius upon the Real Presence of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament, while it stimulated inquiry in this one direction, served to divert the attention of theologians from the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist.

Cent. XII. a
period of litur-
gical activity.

In the next century we have another period of liturgical activity, for the twelfth century produced Odo of Cambrai, S. Ivo of Chartres, V. Hildebert of Mans (or of Tours), Peter the Venerable (of Cluny), the Englishman Robert Pulleyne, Algerus of Liége, William of S. Thiéry, and Peter Lombard, the "Master of the Sentences." Of these Odo of Cambrai (ob. 1113), S. Ivo of Chartres (ob. 1116), and V. Hildebert of Tours (ob. 1134) wrote works on the liturgy. As their support is claimed by the Modern school, we shall here pass them over, and consider their works more fully in Chapter IX.

Odo of
Cambrai,
S. Ivo of
Chartres, V.
Hildebert of
Mans.

The view of
Peter the Ven.

Peter the Venerable (ob. 1156) and William of S. Thiéry (ob. 1150) placed the representation of the

* E. g., the work of Peter d'Auxerre.

† E. g., the *Micrologus*, sometimes ascribed to S. Ivo of Chartres, and the *Libellus* of Bernon de Reichenau.

Passion of our LORD in the fraction of the Host, Peter seeing it in the fraction together with the Communion.

and William of S. Thiéry.

Robert Pulleyne (ob. circa 1147) is of special interest to Englishmen, in that his *Summary of Theology* preceded the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, which was so long the basis of the majority of theological treatises.

Robert Pulleyne.

Peter Lombard (ob. circa 1160) himself devoted but small space in his great work to the treatment of the Sacrifice of the Mass, but he was the first author of the Middle Ages who placed the representation of the Passion in the double Consecration of the bread and wine; and so he may probably be considered as the source to which may be traced the view which sees in this double Consecration our LORD'S Body and Blood separated as by death. Peter Lombard, however, was far from grasping this whole conception, although he is entitled to the credit of having given the first hint which was afterwards developed into the theory so well stated by Bossuet. He had a peculiar theory about the sacramental species, in that he referred the Consecration of the bread to the Flesh of CHRIST, and that of the wine to the Soul of CHRIST, because, he says, the blood is the seat of the soul, and our LORD willed the Consecration to be made under the species of bread and wine, to show that He had taken human nature wholly, body and soul, in order to redeem it wholly, that is, to redeem our bodies and souls.*

Peter Lombard the first author to see in the double Consecration the image of the Passion.

His peculiar theory about the species.

Algerus of Liège (ob. circa 1135) is by far the most important writer on the Eucharist in the twelfth century. While the purpose of his work was to refute the errors of Berengarius, he takes a wider survey of the Eucharist than any of his contemporaries, and shows consider-

Algerus of Liège the ablest writer on the H. E. of cent. XII.

* Lombard, *Sent.*, 1. iv., dist. xi., n. 6.

able affinities with the early Greek Fathers, especially S. Gregory Nazianzen, in dwelling upon the oneness of the Eucharistic Service with the worship of heaven.

The Middle Period ends with Albert the Great, the master and predecessor of S. Thomas. We have therefore still to notice the writers of the early part of the thirteenth century: Innocent III., William of Auvergne, Alexander of Hales, and Albert the Great.

Lombard's view reproduced by Innocent III., Albert the Great, Alexander of Hales, and S. Bonaventura.

The theory started by Peter Lombard, that the species of bread represents our LORD'S Body and the wine His Soul, we find reproduced in the thirteenth century by Innocent III., Albert the Great, Alexander of Hales, and S. Bonaventura. These theologians also still saw the image of the Passion in the liturgical ceremonies instituted by the Church, and make the Sacrifice of the Mass consist principally in the application of the effects of the Sacrifice of the Cross. With the exception of Alexander of Hales* none of them considered the double Consecration as producing the Body and Blood of our LORD separated as by death, and he only throws out as a passing thought this suggestion, which, as we have seen, had been hinted at by Peter Lombard.

A strange theory about the Consecration of each species.

A strange tendency was then prevalent among theologians to insist upon the powerlessness of the words of each Consecration to produce exclusively that which they express; for, under the pretext that the Body of the risen Saviour could not be separated from His Blood, many held that JESUS CHRIST did not become present upon the altar until after the two Consecrations had taken place.

William of Auvergne.

William of Auvergne (ob. 1249) contributes a striking thought, which was developed by later theologians.

* Alex. Hales, *Summa*, 1. iv., 9; x., 11. 2, a. 2.

Starting from the fact that the immolation of the victims of the Old Testament implied a substitution of these victims for men, and a voluntary abasement of man before GOD,* he shows that the only perfect sacrifice would be that of a man free from all sin, who with every power of body and soul should perfectly fulfil the will of GOD; for this victim would be a sweet-smelling savour and a live coal of charity offered to GOD.† Such, he says, was JESUS CHRIST, sacrificed in Soul and Body upon the Cross, where, to reconcile man to GOD, He presented to Him sacrifice and reparation infinitely greater than the offence of our sins.‡ He sees in the Passion the ransom of the whole world, and in the Eucharist the application which our Blessed LORD makes of this ransom to those whom He finds rightly disposed. He also adds to our conception of sacrifice an interesting definition: "To sacrifice, properly speaking, is this: to make sacred the gift itself by offering it, and so to sanctify the offerer as well as the person for whom it is offered." §

His definition of S.

The voluminous writings of Albert the Great (ob. 1280) close this period and prepare the way for the work of his illustrious disciple, S. Thomas. We find in Albert the Great a theory of the Mass far more fully worked out than in any of his predecessors, whose views to a certain extent he gathers up and harmonizes. He regards the Sacrifice from two points of

Albert the Great regards the S. from two standpoints.

* William of Auvergne, *De Legibus*, c. xxiv.

† Ibid., c. xxviii.

‡ Idem., *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ*, c. ii.

§ "Hoc est proprie sacrificare, ipsum scilicet munus offerendo sacrum facere, et tam offerentem quam eum pro quo offertur sacrificare [sanctificare]" (*De Legibus*, c. xxiv.). He speaks also of the priest "*qui sacramental seu sanctificat populum*" (*De Sac. Eucharist.*, c. ii.).

view. For CHRIST, he says, is immolated and offered in Sacrifice to GOD His FATHER. But "immolation" signifies the act of oblation from the point of view of the thing offered, and "sacrifice" the same act from the point of view of the effect produced.* Further, in comparing the Eucharist with the sacrifices of the Law, he calls it "the one Sacrifice of truth," because it alone produces and contains that which it signifies, the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST; and because it alone comprises the source of an abundant sanctification.†

But he places
its essence in
its effects.

Albert, however, places all the essence of the Sacrifice in its effects, but, regarding it from this twofold aspect, he sees a double effect: on the one hand, our union with JESUS CHRIST in His oblation; on the other, our participation in the fruits of His Sacrifice. And this double effect manifests itself to him in the twofold matter of the Eucharist, for he regards the bread, formed from many grains, as the symbol of the union of the faithful with JESUS CHRIST, and the wine, as the symbol of the application of the Redemption which is made for us in the Eucharist. He even thought that our LORD had in view this double element of the Eucharistic Sacrifice when He said: ‡ "He that eateth My Flesh [under the species of bread] and drinketh My Blood [under the species of wine], dwelleth in Me [by reason of the union with Me signified by the species of bread], and I in him [by reason of the Redemption applied to him by My Blood, which is signified by the species of wine]."§

* "*Immolatio dicit actum offerendi ex parte rei oblatæ, et sacrificium dicit eundem actum ex parte effectus*" (Albert Mag., *Sent.*, l. iv., d. xii., a. 23).

† Idem, *De Sac. Euch.*, d. v., c. 4.

‡ S. John vi. 56.

§ Albert Mag., *Sent.*, l. iv., d. viii., a 13, ad 1.

It is the consideration of this double relation of the faithful to JESUS CHRIST offered in the Eucharist which furnished Albert the Great with the main thought of his *Explanation of the Canon of the Mass*. In the three prayers which precede the Consecration he traces our union with our LORD ; and in the prayers which follow, our participation in the fruits of His Sacrifice. For he sees in the three prayers at the beginning of the Canon what he calls " the triple Communion of the Church " with the Victim about to be offered : (1) in the *Te igitur*, the union of the Universal Church ; (2) in the *Memento* of the living, the union of individuals ; (3) in the *Communicantes*, the union of the saints in heaven. Then, he says, follows the completion of the Eucharist by the Consecration ; and after that completion, another part begins, which he terms the " Elevation," because with him it extends as far as the elevation of the Host which precedes the Paternoster. It is in this part that the fruits of the Sacrifice, and our participation in those fruits are described. They are, glory rendered to GOD, and graces produced in us ; for, according to Albert, it is by participating in the fruits of the Sacrifice that we are sanctified, and, being thus sanctified, are brought nearer to GOD, Whom we thus glorify. He points out that this elevation begins with the offering of the Body of JESUS CHRIST and of all those who are united to Him by means of the triple Communion which precedes the Consecration. This offering is made through the prayers which follow the completion of the Consecration, as far as the *Supplices Te*. The elevation continues throughout the prayers which ask the application of the fruits of the Mass to the dead (the *Memento etiam Domine famulorum*, etc.), and to the living (*Nobis quoque peccatoribus*).

His " Explanation of the Canon of the Mass."

His view of the " Elevation."

It ends in the elevation of the Host with the ascription, *Per quem hæc omnia*. This elevation, Albert says, recalls the lifting up of our LORD upon the Cross, and is the climax of the Sacrifice of the Mass, since the Sacrifice consists in the effects of the offering, and these effects are expressed in the Mass by this elevation.

The Greek theologians of this period. S. John of Damascus.

During this period the Greek theologians contributed practically nothing to the elucidation of our subject. The celebrated work of S. John of Damascus (ob. 756), *De Fide Orthodoxa*, was largely the basis of the theological summaries of the Western Church in the Middle Ages. It had been translated into Latin a few years before Peter Lombard wrote his book of the *Sentences*, and was itself probably not a little influenced by the writings of S. Dionysius the Areopagite. In this, the only systematic work on dogmatic theology in the Greek Church, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is dismissed in a few words which contribute nothing new to the conception of it.

S. Dionysius the Areopagite.

The commentators: Œcumenius, Euthymius Zigadenus, Theophylact.

The later Greek commentators, Œcumenius (ob. circa 950), Euthymius Zigadenus (fl. about 1100), and Theophylact (fl. about 1100), simply repeat the teaching found in the commentaries of S. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and S. John of Damascus.

III. Post-Mediæval and Modern Epoch. S. Thomas introduces this period. While scarcely touching on the E. S., he gives a definition of S. which changes the current of

III. THE POST-MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN EPOCH.

This period begins with the works of S. Thomas Aquinas, who, while he contributed but little to the treatment of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, incidentally changed the whole current of theological thought in regard to this subject, by his view, not so much of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as of sacrifice in general. With respect to the former, we find in S. Thomas

indications of the old conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which regarded it from the point of view of its effects. In tracing in the Eucharist the image of the Passion, S. Thomas introduces a new idea, in that he sees in the act of offering, not merely a moral effect upon the offerer, but a physical transformation of the thing offered. This new thought is expressed in the following general definition of sacrifice :

theological
thought.

“ Sacrifices are properly so called when something is done to things offered to GOD, as when [among the Jews] animals were slain and burned, when [with us] bread is broken and eaten and blessed. And this, indeed, the word itself signifies; for sacrifice is so named from the fact that man makes something sacred.” *

His definition,

While the old view still lived on for some time, yet in the sixteenth and following centuries this definition was, from the time of Vasquez, the basis of most of the theological treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And it is responsible for importing into the definition of sacrifice, as a necessary condition, the idea of a physical destruction, or of its moral equivalent.

revived by
Vasquez,

became the
basis of the
treatment of
the E. S.

Another element in the conception of sacrifice, which originated with William of Auvergne and Albert the Great, but gained new force from its adoption by S. Thomas, was the view that sacrifice was the exterior sign of that worship of *latria*, which we render to GOD as the Author and End of our being, and by which GOD is reconciled to man. †

S. Thomas also
held that S.
was the sign
of “ latria.”

A third point on which S. Thomas enlarges in his

* S. Thom., *Summa 2a 2æ*, q. lxxxv., a. 3, ad 3. For the Latin of this passage see footnote, page 41.

† “ *Sacrificium proprie dicitur aliquid factum in honorem proprie Deo debitum ad eum placandum* ” (S. Thom., *Summa 3a*, q. xlvi., a. 3).

He lays great stress on the representative character of the priest.

treatment of the Eucharist, and which clearly shows that he regards the whole Sacrifice as fulfilled by the act of Consecration, is the representative character of the action of the priest in the Mass. For he teaches that the priest who consecrates so represents JESUS CHRIST as to consecrate in His Person and power, and therefore that the Priest and the Victim in the Eucharist are the same as in the Sacrifice of the Cross.* As a development of this, the later Thomists taught that JESUS CHRIST Himself co-operates as the principal Priest in the Sacrifice of the Mass, by an act of intellect and will ; that in it He is the immediate Minister, and that the priests who celebrate in His Name simply lend Him, as it were, their voices for the Consecration, although they determine by their intention the application of the Mass. † Hence these priests are personally the ministers of JESUS CHRIST Himself, and not merely the ministers of His Church ; and the Eucharistic Sacrifice has the same value as the Sacrifice of the Cross, since it is offered immediately by JESUS CHRIST.

On this point Scotus takes the opposite view.

Duns Scotus (ob. 1308), however, took exactly the opposite view. Although he admitted that our LORD might be the principal Priest of the Mass, yet he asserted that He did not directly co-operate in it, since it was offered, not by an act of His will, but by an act of the will of the officiating priest. Scotus also regarded the recital of the entire Institution, and not merely of the words "*Hoc est Corpus Meum*," etc., as necessary for the Consecration. Hence the Scotists taught that the officiating priests were not directly the ministers and representatives of JESUS CHRIST Himself, but

* S. Thom., *Summa*, 3a, q. lxxxviii., a. 1, ad. 3.

† Suarez, disp. lxxvii., § 1, tom. xxi. ; De Lugo, *De Sac. Euch.*, tom. iv., disp. xix., § vii.

rather of the Church, since they offer the Sacrifice in the name of, and in dependence upon, the Church, to which our LORD has confided it. From this they conclude that the Mass, not being directly the act of our LORD, has not the same value as the Sacrifice of the Cross, since it only applies part of the benefits of that Sacrifice ; and that this application is made, not on account of an actual offering of the Victim by our LORD Himself, but by reason of the prayer of the Church.

The writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries contributed nothing new to the sacrificial conception of the Mass. Pighius, Gabriel Biel, and Alfonsus de Castro, as Vasquez shows, treat the subject quite inadequately, basing their work simply upon S. Augustine's quasi-definition, "*Proinde verum sacrificium,*" etc.

The writers of cent. XIV. and XV. contributed nothing new.

When, however, the storm of Protestantism burst upon the Church in the sixteenth century with a denial of any sacrificial character to the Eucharist, the attention of theologians was directed, as never before, to the work of defining the term "sacrifice" and of proving that the Eucharist fulfilled this definition.

The attacks of Protestantism led to attempts to define S.

Luther, as the leader of the Protestants, while admitting in some sense a Real Presence of our LORD in the Eucharist, regarded it simply as a feast instituted by Him and received by Christians in mere remembrance of His Death. He therefore denied that there was in the Mass any oblation of the Body of JESUS CHRIST, or any "satisfactory" value.

Luther entirely denied the sacrificial character of the H. E.

Catholic theologians at once met these two negations by proofs from tradition, and especially from Holy Scripture, showing that the Mass was not a mere commemorative feast, but an Offering made to GOD of the Body of JESUS CHRIST, and that it had, as a Sacrifice,

He is refuted by Clichtovée, Eck, Cajetan, and others.

through its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, a "satisfactory" value. Such was the line taken by Clichtovée, Eck, and Cajetan.

The theory that the Mass was for the remission of actual sin and the Cross for original sin

Here, however, we must notice a theory of the Sacrifice of the Mass which in its consequences led to most serious errors both in doctrine and practice. It assigned to the Mass a quantitative value equivalent to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and even a virtue of its own, by teaching that while the Sacrifice of the Cross was for the remission of original sin, that of the Mass was needed for actual sin. It was against this doctrine and its practical results in the enormous multiplication of Masses, that our thirty-first Article was directed.

was popularly held in cent. XVI., but its author is unknown.

While there seems little doubt that such a doctrine was popularly held and taught in the sixteenth century, it is almost impossible to trace it to its source, and here we cannot do more than outline the history of this view. The best method will be to start with the statements of Vasquez and Suarez in regard to it, and work backward.

Vasquez attributes it to Catharinus ;

Vasquez attributes it to Catharinus, one of the Dominican theologians at the Council of Trent, Bishop of Minori, and afterwards Archbishop of Conza. He says that Catharinus* teaches that there are two kinds of sin to be expiated by priesthood and sacrifice : original sin, and those sins which are committed after Baptism ; and that for each a sacrifice has been provided. For the remission of original sin and those sins which are associated with it, Catharinus teaches that the Priesthood of CHRIST and His Sacrifice on the Cross are required, and the Sacrament of Baptism, which applies the merits of that Sacrifice. For post-baptismal sins he states that the unbloody Sacrifice of

* Catharinus, *De Veritate Incruenti Sacrificii*.

the Mass is the remedy, since such sins are committed voluntarily and daily, and so demand a sacrifice which can be offered daily.

Vasquez * and Melchior Canus † both repudiate this teaching of Catharinus as contrary to the Catholic Faith and manifestly absurd. Suarez charges Catharinus with teaching that the Sacrifice of the Mass is in itself a source of grace in a sense co-ordinate with the Sacrifice of the Cross ; and, like Vasquez and Canus, he condemns in the severest terms this opinion. ‡

and with Canus repudiates it. Suarez charges Catharinus with teaching that the Mass was a separate source of grace.

Whether the inferences which these theologians draw from the writings of Catharinus are entirely justified, is very questionable, since there are passages in his work which not only modify the crude expressions quoted from him, but show that he held the Catholic view that the Eucharist depended for its sacrificial character upon the Sacrifice of the Cross. §

One thing, however, is very evident,—that whether or not Catharinus taught this view, he was not its author, since his work, *De Veritate Incruenti Sacrificii*, was not published until 1552, and therefore is scarcely likely to have been known to those who drew up our Article. Moreover, we find practically the same charge brought against Catholics in the Augsburg Confession in 1530, namely, that they taught that CHRIST by His Passion satisfied for original sin, and

Catharinus, however, was not the author of this view,

for it is mentioned in the Augsburg Conf. in 1530,

* Vasq., *Comment. in tert. part. S. Thom.*, q. lxxxiii., a. 1 ; disp. 221, c. iv., tom. vii., pp. 402 sqq.

† Canus, *De Locis Theol.*, l. xii., c. xii., pp. 307, 308 (quoted in Kidd, *The Later Mediæval Doctrine*, etc., from Migne as c. ix.).

‡ Suarez, *In tert. part. S. Thom.*, disp. 79, § 1, n. 2 ; §§ 6, 15 ; *Opera*, tom. 21, p. 709.

§ This side of the question is well treated in Kidd's *The Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, pp. 85-96.

instituted the Mass, in which an offering could be made for daily sins, both mortal and venial. *

and denied by
Arnold
Wesaliensis,
John Cochläus,
and Peter
Anspach.

This charge was at once denied by Arnold Wesaliensis (ob. 1534) and John Cochläus (ob. 1552), two of the most prominent theologians on the Roman side, and later it was again repudiated by the committee of divines appointed by the Emperor to draw up the confutation of the Protestant contention. In 1553 Peter Anspach, the Dominican court theologian, alluding to this accusation, branded it as a lie, and fifty years later Bellarmine repudiated it in the same terms.

Melanchthon
traces it to the
"Opusc. de
Ven. Sac. Al-
taris," as-
cribed to
S. Thomas ;

In 1531, however, Melanchthon attempted to prove this charge by appealing to a work supposed to have been written by S. Thomas, and found in his *Opuscula*, under the title, *De Venerabili Sacramento Altaris*. In the first sermon of this work the following passage occurs : " The second cause of the institution of this Sacrament is the Sacrifice of the Altar against certain daily ravages of our sins, that, as the Body of our LORD was offered once upon the Cross for original sin, so It may be offered continually for our daily sins upon the altar, and that in this Sacrifice the Church may have a gift with which to propitiate GOD, more precious and acceptable than all the Sacraments or sacrifices of the Law."

but the state-
ment there is
capable of an
orthodox inter-
pretation,

This accusation has been recently most thoroughly refuted in a series of articles in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, Nos. 23, 24, and 51. In all three articles it is shown from other passages of the treatise that the words were intended to bear an entirely orthodox construction ; that again and again the Sacrifice of the Cross is asserted to be the only Sacrifice for the remission of sin, and that the Sacrifice of the Mass properly

* *Conf. Aug.*, pt. ii., art. 3.

related to that of the Cross ; and further, that in this passage the daily sins referred to are evidently not mortal, but venial sins.

Of these articles, the second, by the R. P. Dummermuth, O. P., is devoted to proving the orthodoxy of the expression. The first, by the Rev. Dr. N. Paulus, shows clearly that the sermon is not the work of S. Thomas ; and, on the authority of Peter of Prussia, who about the year 1486 wrote a biography of Albert the Great, Dr. Paulus asserts that Albert was the author of the sermon. The third article, by Dr. Vacant, of Nancy, refutes Dr. Paulus' contention by showing that it rests only upon a supposed recognition of Albert's handwriting by Peter of Prussia, who lived more than two hundred years after Albert's death ; that in no ancient manuscript actually known or existing are these sermons attributed to Albert the Great ; and further, that there are many passages in these sermons which are quite inconsistent with views expressed by Albert the Great in his recognized works.

as shown by R. P. Dummermuth. Dr. Paulus holds that the opusculum is not the work of S. Thomas, and attributes it to Albert the Great. Dr. Vacant refutes this authorship.

Here we shall leave the subject, referring the reader for further information to the very interesting articles in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*,* and merely remarking that while it is evident that this doctrine was popularly taught in the sixteenth century, its author and source cannot be determined.

In September, 1562, the twenty-second session of the Council of Trent met to define the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Several preliminary congregations had been held both in this year and in 1551 for the purpose of discussing this doctrine and determining the

The diversity of view at Trent in regard to the E. S.

* The article by Père Dummermuth will be found in vol. ii., p. 302 ; that by Dr. Paulus in vol. ii., p. 252 ; and that by Dr. Vacant in vol. iii., p. 723.

form of its definition, at which it became evident that there was absolutely no agreement among the theologians present with respect to the mode in which the Mass was to be regarded as a Sacrifice. Some even doubted whether the Eucharist were a true Sacrifice. Others considered it a Sacrifice because in it was made a commemoration of the Sacrifice of our LORD upon the Cross.

Corrionero places the sacrificial act in the Oblation ;

Canus in the fraction of the Host.

Corrionero, Bishop of Almeria, contended that a priest does not offer any sacrifice by consecrating, but that it is the Oblation afterwards that constitutes the Sacrifice. Melchior Canus, who took a prominent part in the discussion, seems to have considered the fraction of the Host an essential feature of the Sacrifice, since, while admitting that a sacrifice is the offering of a consecrated gift, he did not think a mere offering sufficient, but thought that some external sacrificial act such as fraction supplied was required.*

The Council only stated that the H. E. was a S., without defining the mode.

The Council of Trent in its definition, while stating that the Eucharist is *verum et proprium sacrificium*, really did nothing to determine in what the sacrificial act consisted. Thenceforth the history of this question is a record of the attempts made by theologians to solve this problem.

In cent. XVI. and XVII. theologians who treat of this subject fall into three groups :

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Eucharistic Sacrifice engrossed the attention of theologians as never before, and all their efforts were directed to determining in what manner the Eucharist was a sacrifice, and in what the sacrificial action consisted. They can scarcely be arranged in clearly defined schools, but, speaking loosely, we may divide them into three groups :

* Massarello, *Acta Conc. Trid.*, tom. i., pp. 608, 609 ; Melch. Can., *De Locis Theol.*, l. xii., c. xii., p. 295.

1. The first class, with the Jesuit Salmeron (ob. 1585), practically eliminate the element of destruction from their definition of sacrifice, or substitute for physical destruction a mystical action.* These are more in accord with the ante-Tridentine writers, such as De Castro, Biel, Pighius, and Contarini, all of whom base their views of sacrifice more or less on S. Augustine's definition.

1. Those who eliminate destruction from their definition, as Salmeron.

The other two classes accept S. Thomas' dictum that some sort of destruction of the victim is a necessary element of a proper sacrifice, and labour to find in the Eucharist some act which will satisfy this condition.

2. The second class, however, find this change only in the ritual action of the Eucharist.

2. Those who find this only in the ritual action, as Canus,

Melchior Canus (ob. 1560), who was one of the theologians who took part in the discussion of the Sacrifice in the congregation of the Council of Trent held in 1551, considers that the fraction of the consecrated Host satisfies the requirements of destruction and so constitutes a true sacrifice.

Vasquez (ob. 1604), teaching † that the Eucharist is only a commemorative Sacrifice, is content to find in it some *nota* or mark, of a physical destruction which took place in the Sacrifice of the Cross. This he finds in the separate Consecration of the species of bread and wine. Not that he gives up destruction as a necessary condition of a proper sacrifice, but that he limits it to the Cross, and considers the Eucharist to be only a presentation of the Victim sacrificed on Calvary, clothed with signs representative of His Death.

Vasquez,

* Salmeron's definition of sacrifice is: "*Res sensibilis soli Deo oblata per mysticam actionem*" (*Opera*, tom. ix., pp. 216-225).

† Vasquez, *In tert. part.*, q. lxxxiii., disp. 220, 222.

and in a less
degree Suarez,

His contemporary Suarez * (ob. 1607), while recognizing the necessity of some physical modification of the victim as a condition of a proper sacrifice, holds that this is satisfied as well by a productive act as by a destructive act. Suarez therefore sees in the supernatural production of the Victim on the altar by the words of Consecration the essence of the Sacrifice, which consists, not in the destruction of the Victim, but in Its production; not in the “*demutatio*” of Vasquez, or the placing of our LORD in a lower condition, the “*status dedivior*” of De Lugo, but in the production of our LORD’S glorified Body upon the altar.

Bellarmino,

Bellarmino † (ob. 1621) seems to have found the sacrificial act in the Consecration and Communion taken together (though he would probably not consider the latter as essential to the Sacrifice, but only to its integrity), the first being necessary to put the Victim in a condition for immolation or destruction, and the second to complete it. His definition is as follows: “Sacrifice is an outward oblation made to GOD alone, by which, in recognition of human weakness and acknowledgment of the Divine Majesty, some sensible and permanent thing is in a mystic rite consecrated and transmuted by a lawful minister.” ‡

Bellarmino’s opinion is followed by the Salmanticenses, Tournely, S. Liguori, and others.

and Lessius.

Lessius § (ob. 1623), instead of seeing in the double
* Suarez, *In tert. part.*, disp. 73-79; *Opera*, tom. xxi., pp. 600-766.

† Bellarm., *De Missa*, l. i., c. xxvii.

‡ Idem, *De Missa*, l. i., c. ii.

§ Lessius, *De Perfectionibus Divinis*, l. xii., c. xiii. In his earlier work, *De Justitia et Jure*, l. ii., Lessius seems to have held Bellarmine’s view, which, however, he afterwards abandons.

consecration an image of the Sacrifice of the Cross, considers the words of Consecration as a sacrificial sword, so that, in place of the material sword with which the victims of old were slain, the words pronounced by the priest at the Consecration are a spiritual sword, and by their power put the Body of JESUS CHRIST under the species of bread, and His Blood under the species of wine, and while respecting the Victim's life, nevertheless place Him in a state of immolation.

3. The third class is represented by De Lugo* (ob. 1660) and his followers. This great theologian presents the most complete development of the theory of destruction. By the Consecration the Body of CHRIST is destroyed (*humano modo*). It assumes the lower condition of meat and drink, so that it is rendered worthless for the ordinary functions of a human body. This induced victim-state sufficiently corresponds to the essentials of sacrifice, for our LORD'S Eucharistic Presence involves a lowering of the condition of His glorified Human Body.†

3. The third group represented by De Lugo,

The majority of Roman theologians have followed De Lugo, and in our own day his best representative is Franzelin, ‡ who elaborates De Lugo's view and ingeniously strives to answer the objections brought against it.

who is followed by the majority of Roman theologians.

In the seventeenth century we have a most brilliant school of theologians, of whom Père de Condren, Superior of the French Oratory, M. Olier, founder of S. Sulpice, and the great Bossuet were representatives.

In cent. XVII. the great Gallian theologians trace an

* De Lugo, *De Sacr. Eucharist.*, tom. iv., disp. xix., § 5, pp. 198-203.

† Kidd, *The Later Mediæval Doctrine*, pp. 131-134.

‡ Franzelin, in his work, *De Eucharistia*.

accidental relation between the H. E. and our LORD'S Mediatorial work.

They taught that the Eucharistic Sacrifice was essentially relative to, and dependent upon, the Sacrifice of the Cross; and that the Consecration, by which our LORD'S Body and Blood were produced under the forms of bread and wine, separated as by death, was the sacrificial act. They rejected from their definition of sacrifice the element of destruction, and especially devoted themselves to tracing the accidental relation between the Eucharist and our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven.

In cent. XVIII. Cienfuegos suggests a strange theory.

In the eighteenth century Cardinal Cienfuegos* added to the theory of De Lugo by suggesting that, after having exercised at the moment of Consecration certain physical acts, our LORD laid aside the power of action until the commingling of the bread and wine in the chalice, which symbolized the Resurrection; and that He immolated Himself in the Sacrifice by thus stripping Himself of His vital functions. This theory, however, has had practically no followers.

In our own day Cardinal De Lugo's view is predominant, as we have said, largely as the result of Franzelin's masterly presentation of it. The theory of Vasquez has found its best exponent in Perrone, while that of Suarez has been followed, with some modification, by Scheeben and Schanz.

In England since the Reformation the E. S. has received but slight treatment.

Bp. Andrewes refers to it.

In England since the Reformation the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice has received but little attention, the great Anglican divines accepting the Catholic teaching in regard to the fact of the Sacrifice, though without discussing the Jesuit speculations in regard to its mode. This Bishop Andrewes (ob. 1626), in his controversy with Bellarmine, points out in the following words: "Take away from the Mass your doctrine of

* Cienfuegos, *Vila Abscondita*.

transubstantiation, and there will be no longer any dispute between us in regard to the Sacrifice." *

In the works of Overall and Jeremy Taylor the Eucharistic Sacrifice is connected more directly with our LORD'S Offering in heaven than with the Sacrifice of the Cross. This theory, however, received but slight consideration in their works ; although within the last ten years a radical development of it has appeared in certain quarters. † This development is founded upon an interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews which places the essential act of our LORD'S Sacrifice, the Presentation of His Precious Blood, after His Ascension into heaven, and so makes His Offering upon the Cross incomplete as a sacrifice. Since 1870 this view (though without in any way depraving the completeness of the Sacrifice of the Cross) has shown itself in Germany in the writings of Thalsofer, Franz, and others ; and side by side with it we find the orthodox school of Scheeben and Schanz, who follow Vasquez and Suarez and have affinities with the views of Bossuet and the Gallican school of the seventeenth century. These represent, perhaps, the latest and best theological work on this difficult and interesting question.

We must bring the chapter to an end by pointing out that during this last period the writers of the Eastern Church have contributed nothing new to the conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Eastern Church clearly holds that it is a sacrifice because it is identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross, but her theo-

Overall and Taylor connect the H. E. more directly with our LORD'S Offering in heaven, and this view is followed by the Modern school.

Since 1870 a radical school has appeared in Germany, headed by Thalsofer. The brilliant theologians, Scheeben and Schanz, follow Suarez.

The Eastern Church has contributed nothing new on the subject.

* "*At vos tollite de Missa transubstantiationem vestram; nec diu nobiscum lis erit de sacrificio*" (Andrewes, Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol., *Responsio ad Bellarminum*, p. 251).

† E. g., Milligan's *The Ascension*, and Brightman's *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*.

logians have made no attempt to discuss the manner in which the Eucharist is a sacrifice, or to determine in what the sacrificial act consists.

In cent. XIV. Cabasilas wrote an "Exposition of the Liturgy;"

About the middle of the fourteenth century Nicholas Cabasilas, Bishop of Thessalonica, wrote a work entitled *An Exposition of the Divine Liturgy*,* which seems to have been the only treatise on the Holy Eucharist produced by the Greek Church for many centuries. In the thirty-second chapter of this Exposition he treats of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, but adds nothing to the ordinary Western idea. He holds that there is in the Eucharist a true immolation of our LORD'S Body and Blood, and that the Eucharist depends upon the Sacrifice of the Cross.

in 1643 the Catechism of Peter Mogila was approved;

In the year 1643 the Catechism of Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kieff, was approved and recommended by the four Patriarchs as "a safe and faithful guide for all orthodox Christians," and has since been known as "the Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church." In Question 107 of this Catechism we find the following reference to the Eucharistic Sacrifice: "This holy Mystery is also offered as a sacrifice for all orthodox Christians, as well living as those who sleep in hopes of a joyful resurrection; and this Sacrifice shall never fail nor be discontinued, even unto the end of the world. The fruits of this Mystery are chiefly these: First, a commemoration of the sufferings and of the Death of CHRIST, wherewith He was afflicted not for His own, but for our transgressions; secondly, this Mystery is a propitiation or atonement with GOD for our sins, both of the living and of the dead." †

* Cabasilas, *De Expos. Missæ*, Migne, P. G., tom. 150.

† *Orthodox Conf.*, Resp. 107, p. 81.

In our own times a systematic work on dogmatic theology has been put forth by Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza and Rector of the Theological Seminary of S. Petersburg. It was written in Russian, and a French translation appeared in 1860.* In this the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is treated in much the same way as in Latin theology, Macarius asserting that the Eucharist is a sacrifice offered to GOD, in its nature the same as that of the Cross.

Here our survey of the history of the growth and fluctuations of the sacrificial idea of the Eucharist ends. It may enable us in the succeeding chapters to treat the opinions of individual authors with a better appreciation of their historical position in the theology of the Catholic Church.

* *Theologie dogmatique orthodoxe par Macaire.* Paris, 1860.

and in our own times Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza, has put forth a treatise on dogmatic theology; but all follow the Catholic view.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS.

Introductory :

IN the last chapter we took a bird's-eye view of the whole history of the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist. We must now go over the ground more carefully, examining in detail those passages of the Fathers which throw light upon the subject. It is not, however, necessary for our purpose to give the many passages in which the Eucharist is spoken of merely as a Sacrifice,* without any indication of its relation either to the Sacrifice of the Cross or to our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven. We shall therefore in this place only notice those which may be claimed in support of one of the two views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We mean, of course, the Catholic view, which relates the Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the Modern view, which makes it depend upon a sacrifice which our LORD is supposed now to be offering in heaven.

The Fathers of
the first six
centuries :

In this chapter we shall consider the testimony of the Fathers of the first six centuries, so as to make our inquiry cover the first historical period of the last chapter.

* The introduction of such passages at this point would tend to obscure rather than to help our present argument ; as they are however of value in establishing the fact that the Fathers regarded the Eucharist as a Sacrifice we give them in Appendix D.

Our treatment of the subject will therefore necessarily fall into three divisions: first, the witness of the Fathers to the Catholic view ; second, an examination of all the passages which have been adduced in support of the Modern view ; and third, a consideration of the teaching of the Fathers in regard to our LORD'S present Mediatorial work, His Intercession in heaven.

This last part of the subject is of great importance, since, in treating of our LORD'S High-Priestly work, not only do the Fathers never say that He is offering any proper sacrifice in heaven, but, as we shall see, they use language which is entirely incompatible with any such view.

I. Passages supporting the Catholic view.
 II. Those adduced in favour of the Modern view.
 III. Passages treating of our LORD'S Intercession.

I. THE WITNESS OF THE FATHERS TO THE CATHOLIC VIEW.

It will not be necessary to quote all the Fathers. It will suffice for our purpose to select those whose authority is greatest and whose treatment of the particular point before us is clearly *ad rem*.

Before we begin this investigation, let us understand precisely what we expect to find. We shall not find in the Fathers any discussion of the double Consecration as the essential sacrificial act in the Eucharist, since, as we have already pointed out, this theory cannot be traced back beyond the twelfth century. Nor is it necessary to the Catholic view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. What is essential is to show that in the writings of the Fathers the Sacrifice of the Eucharist has always been related to, and made to depend upon, the Sacrifice of the Cross. The question, therefore, now before us, is, Can we find in the Fathers conclusive evidence of this fact ? And first we take the Greek Fathers.

I. Witnesses to the Catholic view, limited here to those of special weight.

Realize first precisely what we are seeking, not a theological theory of the E. S., but to show that the Fathers relate it to the S. of the Cross.

The Greek
Fathers:
1. S. Irenæus.

S. Irenæus,* after relating the Institution of the Eucharist, adds: "He [JESUS CHRIST] established the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers to GOD throughout the whole world." And again, speaking of those who disbelieve in the resurrection of the body, he says: "If this [the flesh] indeed do not attain salvation, then neither did the LORD redeem us with His Blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His Blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His Body. . . . By His own Blood He redeemed us, . . . and as we are His members, we are also nourished by means of the creation. . . . He has acknowledged the cup, which is a part of the creation, as His own Blood, from which He bedews our blood, and the bread, also a part of the creation, He has established as His own Body, from which He gives increase to our bodies." †

S. Irenæus is here treating of Gnostic heresies, and only mentions the Holy Eucharist incidentally, but in the latter quotation he twice connects it with the Blood of Redemption, that is, with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

2. S. Cyril of
Jerusalem.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem (ob. 386), ‡ speaking of the Eucharist, says: "Then, after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the bloodless service, upon that sacrifice of propitiation [the Cross] we entreat GOD, . . . and offer this sacrifice." And again: "We offer up CHRIST sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful GOD both for them and for ourselves." § In both

* S. Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, l. iv., c. xvii., n. 5.

† *Ibid.*, l. v., c. ii., n. 2.

‡ Dates given in the last chapter are not repeated.

§ S. Cyril, Jer., *Myst. Cat.*, xxiii., n. 8, 10.

these passages S. Cyril seems to relate the "spiritual sacrifice" to that Sacrifice of propitiation which was offered up on the Cross. In the second passage he speaks as though the two sacrifices were identical.

S. Gregory of Nyssa (ob. circa 395): "In a hidden kind of sacrifice, which could not be seen by men [the Holy Eucharist], He offers Himself as a Sacrifice and immolates a Victim, being at the same time the Priest and the Lamb of GOD which taketh away the sin of the world. When did He perform this? When He gave to His assembled disciples His Body to eat and His Blood to drink. Then He clearly showed that the Sacrifice of the Lamb was now perfect, for the body of a victim is not fit to eat if it be living. Wherefore, when He gave to His assembled disciples His Body to eat and His Blood to drink, then in a hidden and mysterious manner His Body was immolated."*

3. S. Gregory of Nyssa.

This passage of S. Gregory of Nyssa is preceded by a computation of the triduum of CHRIST'S Death, the beginning of which he places in the very sacrifice itself of the original Eucharist. Hence we see that S. Gregory considers that the Death of the Cross is truly anticipated in the first Eucharist, and that this Eucharist is a sort of premature Cross and anticipatory Death, since the time of the Death is computed from it. From this we may understand how closely he associated the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with that of the Cross.

S. Cyril of Alexandria (ob. 444): "CHRIST to-day receives us to a feast; CHRIST to-day ministers to us. CHRIST Himself, the Lover of men, warms us back into life again. What is said is wonderful, what is done is awe-inspiring. The fatted Calf Himself is slain. The

4. S. Cyril of Alex.

* S. Greg., Nyss., *In Christ. Resurrect.*, Ratio i.; Migne, P. G., tom. 46, col. 611.

Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sin of the world, is slain. The FATHER rejoices ; the SON is willingly immolated ; not, indeed, to-day by the enemies of GOD, but by Himself, in order that He may signify that He endured the sufferings of the Cross voluntarily for the salvation of men." *

Here S. Cyril teaches that our LORD voluntarily immolates Himself in the Eucharist to signify that He voluntarily endured the sufferings of the Cross.

5. S. Chrysostom.

S. Chrysostom (ob. 407) : " What then ? Do not we offer [the Eucharist] daily ? We offer, indeed, but by making a remembrance of His Death ; and this [Sacrifice] is one, and not many. How is it one and not many ? Because it was offered once for all, like that offering which was carried into the Holy of holies. The latter was the figure of that Offering [on the Cross], and this [the Eucharist] is the remembrance of that [the Cross]." " He is our High Priest, who offered upon the Cross the Sacrifice that cleanseth us. We also offer now that which was then offered, which is inexhaustible. This is done in remembrance of what was then done, for He saith, ' Do this in remembrance of Me.' It is not another victim that we offer, as the high priest offered then, but we offer always the same, or rather, we make a remembrance of the [same] Sacrifice." †

It would be difficult to find a clearer expression of the relation of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist to that of the Cross. S. Chrysostom says that, as on the Cross and in the Eucharist the Victim is one and the same,

* S. Cyril, Alex., *Homil. Div. in Mysticam Cœnam* ; n. x. Migne, P. G., tom. 77, col. 1018.

† S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, Hom. xvii., n. 3 ; Gaume, vol. xii., pp. 241, 242.

so the Sacrifice is one and the same ; and in this passage there is not the slightest reference of the Eucharist to our LORD'S work in heaven, although the allusion to the high priest entering the Holy of holies would have suggested to S. Chrysostom such a reference, had he been of the opinion that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist was dependent upon our LORD'S work in heaven, and only through this indirectly related to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Again S. Chrysostom says : " Let us, therefore, reverence this Table of which we are all partakers, CHRIST slain for us, the Sacrifice placed upon this Table." * Thomassinus † has the following interesting note on this passage : " The Victim slain upon the Cross is in the Eucharist forthwith given for food. The slaying is interwoven with the eating, the eating is joined with the slaying. The Cross serves the Eucharist, the Eucharist leans upon the Cross. One is the Sacrifice of the Victim slain upon the Cross, consumed upon the altar. And the very eating of the Victim is indeed a commemoration of the same slaying upon the Cross, not, indeed, a mere empty remembrance, but the very re-presentation (both the presence and the fruit of the Sacrifice itself), since the very eating of the Victim is a renewed immolation of the Victim."

6. S. Chrysostom.

Thomassinus on this passage.

And again, commenting on the words of S. Chrysostom : " Believe, therefore, that even now this is that Supper at which He Himself sat down. For this is in no respect different from that ; nor doth man do this, and Himself the other, but He offers both this and

7. S. Chrysostom.

* S. Chrys., *In Rom.*, Hom. viii., 8 ; Gaume, vol. ix., p. 558.

† Thomassin., vol. iv., p. 365.

that," *—Thomassinus says : † " But who can doubt that CHRIST's Supper pertained to the Cross ? "

The Latin
Fathers:

Let us now turn to the Latin Fathers.

8. S. Cyprian. S. Cyprian : " For if JESUS CHRIST our LORD and GOD is Himself the High Priest of GOD the FATHER, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Him, he is indeed a priest who truly officiates in the place of CHRIST, who copies that which CHRIST did ; and he then offers in the Church to GOD the FATHER a true and full sacrifice, if he so take in hand to offer according to that which he sees that CHRIST Himself offered." ‡ And again : " Since we make mention of His Passion in every sacrifice (for the Sacrifice which we offer is the Passion of the LORD), we do nothing else than that which He did." § And again : " The Blood of CHRIST being offered, the LORD's Sacrifice is not celebrated by a lawful consecration unless our Oblation and Sacrifice correspond to His Passion." ||
9. S. Cyprian.
10. S. Cyprian.

In these passages S. Cyprian most definitely states that in the Church a true and full sacrifice is offered, and explains this by saying that the Sacrifice which we offer is the Passion of the LORD. S. Cyprian certainly sees the essential character of the Eucharistic Sacrifice only in its relation to that which our LORD Himself did in His Passion.

11. S. Ambrose. S. Ambrose (ob. 397) on the passage, " Thou lettest us be eaten up like sheep," says : " Our good LORD JESUS CHRIST, since He was made the Sheep of our ban-

* S. Chrys., *In Matt.*, Hom. 1. (al. li.), n. 3 ; Gaume, vol. vii, p. 581.

† Thomassin., vol. iv., p. 366.

‡ S. Cypr., *Epist. lxxiii.*, *De Sacramento Dom. Cœn.*, n. 14 ; Migne, P. L., tom. iv., col. 385.

§ *Ibid.*, n. 17.

|| *Ibid.*, n. 12.

quet ! Do you ask how He was made ? Hear him who says, 'CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us,' and consider how our forefathers, in a figure rending it, ate a lamb, signifying the Passion of JESUS, upon the Sacrament of which we daily feed." * Again : " ' My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed.' You hear of flesh, you hear of blood, you understand the mysteries of the LORD'S Death. For as often as we receive these mysteries, which by the mystical prayer are transfigured into His Flesh and Blood, we show forth the Death of the LORD." †

12. S. Ambrose.

Nothing can be clearer than that S. Ambrose in these passages relates the Eucharistic Sacrifice to that of the Cross, and to that alone.

S. Augustine : " The Hebrews, in the victims of the flock which they offered to GOD in many and various ways, proclaimed, as was fitting in so great a matter, a prophecy of the future Victim which CHRIST offered. Whence Christians now celebrate the memorial of the same finished Sacrifice in the sacred offering and communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST." † Here we are told that the Eucharist is the memorial of the Sacrifice which was *finished* upon the Cross.

13. S. Augustine.

Again : " The Flesh and Blood of this Sacrifice, before the advent of CHRIST, was prophesied by figurative victims ; in the Passion of CHRIST it was rendered in very truth ; after the Ascension of CHRIST it was celebrated in the Sacrament of its commemoration." § In

14. S. Augustine.

* S. Ambrose, *In Psalm.*, xliii., n. 37 ; Migne, P. L., tom. xiv., col. 1107.

† Idem, *De Fide*, l. iv., c. x. (al. v.), n. 124 ; Migne, P. L., tom. 16, col. 641.

‡ S. Aug., *Contra Faustum*, l. xx., c. xviii. ; Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 382.

§ Ibid., l. xx., c. xxi. ; Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 385.

this passage S. Augustine affirms that in the Passion of CHRIST His Sacrifice was rendered in very truth, and that after the Ascension this Sacrifice was celebrated, *not by a sacrifice in heaven*, but in the Sacrament of its commemoration, that is, in the Holy Eucharist.

There are four passages in S. Augustine's *Confessions* which are very much to the point. In describing his mother's burial he says: "For . . . in those prayers which we poured forth unto Thee when the *Sacrifice of our Redemption* was offered up unto Thee for her,"* etc. And again: "She . . . only desired to have her name remembered at the altar, which she had served without the omission of a single day; whence she knew that *the Holy Sacrifice* was dispensed, *by which the handwriting that was against us was blotted out.*" † Again: "Who will restore to Him the innocent Blood? Who will repay Him the price with which He bought us, so as to take us from Him? Unto *the Sacrament of which our ransom* did Thine handmaid bind her soul by the bond of faith." ‡ And again: "I consider *my ransom*, and eat and drink and communicate it." §

In every one of these passages the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is so interwoven with that of the Cross as to be spoken of as one and the same Sacrifice, the Eucharist being called "the Sacrifice of our Redemption," "the Holy Sacrifice by which the handwriting that was against us was blotted out," "the Sacrament of our ransom;" S. Augustine also saying, "I eat and drink my ransom."

* *Confessions*, l. ix., c. xii., 32; Migne, P. L., tom. 32, col. 777.

† *Ibid.*, c. xii., 36. Cf. Col. ii. 14.

‡ *Ibid.*, c. xii., 36.

§ *Ibid.*, l. x., c. xliii., 70.

15. S. Augustine.

16. S. Augustine.

17. S. Augustine.

18. S. Augustine.

Again, S. Augustine says : “ Whilst the Body is broken, whilst the Blood from the chalice is poured into the mouths of the faithful, what else is it but the immolation of the LORD’S Body upon the Cross, the shedding of the Blood from His side ? Therefore also He broke His Body and gave it, that He might signify that of His own will He would break and give Himself for us in His Passion, Who alone had the power of laying down His own life ; and that He might also signify that upon the altar in His stead priests imitate Him in order that by outward action they may re-present the same, that is, the Body of CHRIST, the Sacrament of CHRIST and of the Church.” *

19. S. Augustine.

And again : “ Because by the Death of CHRIST we are set free, we signify that we are mindful of this in eating and drinking the Flesh and Blood which were offered for us. For that the Body of CHRIST in the Sacrament is laid in the hands of the faithful, is broken, is bruised by the teeth, and is incorporated into the faithful, signifies that He was tried in His Passion by the hands of the wicked, and broken unto death, and bruised for our sins, and that His Church, that is, His Body, *by the imitation of this His Passion*, is incorporated and conformed to Him.” †

20. S. Augustine.

In these last two passages S. Augustine is most explicit in saying that the Eucharist is nothing else than “ the immolation of the LORD’S Body upon the Cross, the shedding of the Blood from His side ; ” that in His stead priests at the altar re-present the same Passion ; that since by the Death of CHRIST we are set free, in the Eucharist we signify that we are mindful of this ;

* S. Aug., *In Sent. Prosperi*, quoted by Algerus ; Migne, P. L., tom. 180, col. 795.

† *Ibid.*, col. 796.

that the Eucharist signifies our LORD'S Passion, and that His Church, by the imitation of this Passion, is incorporated into Him in the Eucharist.

21. S. Gregory the Great.

S. Gregory the Great: "For this unique Victim saves the soul from eternal death, and by a mystery renews for us the Death of the Only Begotten." And

22. S. Gregory.

again: "From this, therefore, let us consider what kind of a sacrifice for us this is, which for our salvation continually re-presents the Passion of the Only Begotten SON." And again: "For the Victim of the sacred

23. S. Gregory.

altar, offered with tears and a willing mind, pleads effectually, because He Who in Himself rising from the dead dieth no more, still through this Victim suffers for us in His mystery. For as often as we offer to Him the Victim of His Passion, so often we renew for the remission of our sins that Passion."* From these three passages there can be little doubt that S. Gregory connected the Sacrifice of the Eucharist most directly with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Summary of passages supporting the Catholic view.

Here we bring to an end the first division of this chapter. It would, of course, be quite easy to multiply quotations from the Fathers, but we venture to think that the explicit statements of such writers as S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, and S. Chrysostom are alone sufficient to show that in the first six centuries of the Church's life the Eucharist was looked upon as a Sacrifice because it renewed the Sacrifice of the Cross.

II. THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS TO THE MODERN VIEW.

II. Passages thought to support the Modern view.

In examining the passages from the Fathers which are brought forward in support of the Modern theory

* S. Greg. Mag. *Hom. in Evang.*, l. ii., Hom. xxxvii., n. 7; Migne, P. L., t. 76, col. 1279.

of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it is only fair to recall what we have already said, that we must at the outset understand precisely the point in the Modern view for which the authority of the Fathers is claimed. It is that the Eucharist, in so far as it is a sacrifice, is directly related to, and depends upon, a sacrifice which our LORD is now offering in heaven. This thesis embraces two propositions: (1) that our LORD is now offering in heaven a sacrifice, by which, of course, an actual or proper sacrifice is understood; (2) that the Eucharist is a sacrifice through its essential relation to this heavenly sacrifice.

This view stated in two propositions.

It is, then, in their bearing upon these two points, and these two points only, that we are to consider the passages from the Fathers and other writers cited by the modern school.

Mr. Brightman brings forward only four passages from the Fathers. He says (the italics are his):

Mr. Brightman cites four passages: S. Ignatius,

“S. Ignatius* describes certain heretics as holding aloof 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 in His goodness the FATHER raised up.*’ And S. Justin Martyr,† while he speaks of the Eucharist as the memorial of the Passion, speaks also more explicitly of ‘the Bread which our CHRIST delivered unto us to offer for a *memorial of His Incarnation* for the sake of those that believe on Him, for whose sakes also He became capable of suffering.’ In S. Irenæus,‡ so far as I can remember, there is no exclusive relation of the Eucharist to the Passion suggested. Of course his allusions

S. Justin Martyr,

S. Irenæus,

* S. Ignat., *Ad Smyrn.*, vii, § 1.

† S. Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, 70.

‡ S. Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 17, 18; v. 2.

S. Cyril of
Alex.

are limited by his particular aim ; but his argument for our Resurrection, drawn from the Eucharist, suggests a relation between the Eucharist and our LORD'S Resurrection. Add to these S. Cyril of Alexandria,* 'showing forth the Death, according to the flesh, of the only-begotten Son of GOD, to wit JESUS CHRIST, and confessing His Resurrection from the dead and His Ascension into heaven, so we celebrate the unbloody service in the Churches.' "

These passages
considered.

It is quite unnecessary to make any comment on these passages, as they evidently have not the remotest reference to the two propositions which we are considering. In justice to Mr. Brightman we should point out that they are quoted by him as showing only, what no Catholic writer would dream of disputing, that in the Eucharist we have "in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension." But they are given here because, so far as we know, they are the only passages quoted by an Anglican writer in any way in support of the modern theory.†

English writers only refer to the Fathers generally in support of this view.

While Anglican writers of the modern school refer to the Fathers generally, and to S. Chrysostom especially, as supporting their view, yet so far as we are aware they have not, with the exceptions that we have mentioned, cited any definite passages. We must therefore

* S. Cyril, Alex., *Epist. ad Nest. œcum.*, ii., 7.

† As we have stated in the Preface, an application to six professors of theology who are advocates of this theory, for definite passages from the Fathers in its support, resulted in one only citing S. Gregory (Greg. Mag., *Moral.*, in *Job*, l. i., xxxii.) and S. Chrysostom as quoted in Wordsworth on Heb. viii. 4 ; no such words, however, are to be found in S. Chrysostom's *Hom. in Heb.* These passages will be noted in their place ; the first is also quoted by Thalhofer. See page .

turn to the German school, who, as we have said, have gone into the subject with characteristic thoroughness and learning.

In the works of Thalhoffer, *Das Opfer des alten und des neuen Bundes* and *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, a number of passages are quoted, and when we have discussed these we are inclined to believe that we shall have met most of the authorities that can be brought together from the Fathers and mediæval writers.

Thalhoffer, however, adduces many passages.

In justice to Dr. Thalhoffer we must point out that his view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice differs "*toto cælo*" from that of Mr. Brightman; since it is entirely free from any unorthodox or Socinian tendency so far as the Sacrifice of the Cross is concerned; for, with all Catholic theologians, he teaches that upon the Cross our LORD made a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, and that His blood-shedding on the Cross was the sacrificial action.*

Dr. T. is orthodox in his view of the S. of the Cross.

Where, however, Dr. Thalhoffer introduces an innovation is in his attempt to find an *actual* sacrifice in our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven, to which the

His innovation is an actual S. in heaven.

* *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik* (2nd ed., vol. i., 1894). Cf. "On the Sacrifice of the Cross, complete and found essentially in the blood-shedding," pp. 212-220; "The death on the Cross the most complete of ceremonial acts," p. 213.

"Shedding of blood, forcible, painful separation of it from the Body, is the foundation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST," pp. 213, 214.

"The entire power of the Sacrifice of CHRIST lay in the blood-shedding," p. 214.

"The Sacrifice of Him Who was essentially the SON OF GOD, was absolutely acceptable to the FATHER, and of endless potentiality," p. 216.

"The Sacrifice of the Cross, the most complete of thank-offerings," p. 217.

Eucharist may be related. This celestial sacrifice, like the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, he considers a pleading of our LORD'S Passion, a showing forth of His Death "till He come." We must, however, remember that in heaven (in a passive sense) our LORD is the Sacrifice "for ever;" *not only* till He comes to judge the world.

His assumption in regard to a "heavenly" S.

We shall now examine Thalhofer's authorities. He starts with the assumption that from all those passages of the Fathers which speak of an altar in heaven we may conclude that a sacrifice is offered in heaven, since an altar implies a sacrifice. Before we proceed to the consideration of the passages which he adduces in support of this claim, we must pause for a moment to investigate the exact meaning of the terms used.

The terms examined.

In the expressions "heavenly altar" and "heavenly sacrifice" three terms are employed.

(1.) "Heavenly" as explained by S. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Primasius.

(1.) The first, "heavenly," we have very fully discussed in Chapter VI.* on the liturgies, and we learned from the teaching of S. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Primasius, and others, that it often implied nothing more than that the subject which it qualified belonged to the Kingdom of GOD, the Church on earth.

(2.) The use of the word "altar" by S. Ignatius,

(2.) If we investigate the meaning of the term "altar" (*θυσιαστήριον*), we shall find that it is also frequently used in an equivocal sense. S. Ignatius in his Epistles often uses it figuratively; in one place, for the arena in which he expected to die; † in three other passages as expressing the unity of the Christian society. ‡ In the last passage he speaks of our LORD as Himself the

* Pp. 160-164.

† S. Ignat., *Ad Rom.*, ii.

‡ Idem., *Ad Ephes.*, v.; *Ad Trall.*, vii.; *Ad Magn.*, vii.

Altar. S. Polycarp uses the image of an altar for the widows of the Church, since, as he says, the alms of the faithful on them are offered to GOD, and because they themselves offered to GOD sacrifices of service and prayer. * Hermas uses it twice in a purely spiritual sense. For him the altar is that whereon the offerings of men are placed that they may be brought to GOD, † and in the second passage this idea is extended so as to include man himself, who, after being tested by the scrutiny both of angels and men, is himself offered to GOD. Clement of Alexandria speaks of our altar on earth as the assembly of those devoted to prayer. ‡ S. Methodius uses it of the assembly of the holy. § S. Chrysostom speaks of the poor as a living altar on which the alms of the faithful are offered ; || while S. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of Christians as living stones which are framed together into an altar, as well as into a temple. ¶

S. Polycarp,

Hermas,

Clement of
Alex.,

S. Methodius,
S. Chrysostom,
and
S. Cyril of Alex.

From these passages we are certainly justified in assuming that the Greek Fathers were frequently in the habit of using the term *θυσιαστήριον* in a figurative sense, and therefore, as with the terms "heavenly" and "sacrifice," we must from a careful consideration of the context in each case determine in what sense the word is used before we can deduce from it any argument.

(3.) We have already shown in Chapter I.** that the

* S. Polycarp, *Ad Philipp.*, iv.

† Hermas, *Mand.*, x., 3, 2f.

‡ S. Clem., Alex., *Strom.*, vii. 31.

§ S. Methodius, *Symp.*, v. 6.

|| S. Chrys., *in Joan.*, 4, Hom. xiii.

¶ S. Cyril, Alex., *Glaph. in Deut.*; Migne, P. G., tom. 69, col. 668.

** Page 22.

(3.) Different senses in which "sacrifice" is used.

word "sacrifice" has several different meanings. In an active sense, which is the only proper sense of sacrifice, it is used of the action by which some sensible thing is offered to GOD. In a passive sense it is used of the victim which is to be, or has been, slain. In a figurative sense it is used of those interior acts of the soul which should accompany the actual offering, and also employed as symbolizing Christian graces, prayers, praises, etc.

Hence the character of the S. must be determined by that of the altar in heaven.

From this it follows that the character of the sacrifice which Thalhofer claims must be admitted in the mention of an altar in heaven, will depend entirely upon the character of the altar. If the altar in heaven be an altar properly so called, that is, having a sensible and objective existence, we quite agree with him that it implies a proper sacrifice, that is, the offering of something which has a sensible and objective existence, such as the Body of our LORD. If, however, we find only a figurative altar, for instance, one that is apprehended only in thought (*θυσιαστήριον νοερόν*), and which has no sensible or objective existence, then we can only infer from this a figurative sacrifice.

In examining, therefore, the passages cited by Thalhofer we must carefully bear in mind this fact, that all three of the terms, "heavenly," "altar," and "sacrifice," are equivocal terms, and that before any argument can be based upon their use, we must discover from the context precisely in what sense they are employed.

I. S. Irenæus.

S. Irenæus says: "There is, therefore, an altar in the heavens, for thither our prayers and oblations are directed." *

This passage has already been fully discussed in

* S. Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, iv., xviii., 6.

Chapter VI., * but we will briefly repeat the principal points of the argument.

First, that it is very doubtful from the context † whether the “oblations” in the expression “thither our prayers and oblations are directed,” have any reference whatever to the Eucharist. They seem to be the good works which GOD teaches us to offer, “not because He has any need of them, but lest we should be unfruitful.”

Secondly, that the passage goes on to speak of a temple and a tabernacle; and if we are to understand that there is in heaven an altar in the literal sense of the word, we must also understand a temple and a tabernacle in the literal sense of the words, which no one has ever asserted.

Thirdly, that S. Irenæus does not say that there is an altar in heaven *on which* a heavenly sacrifice is offered, but, what is very different, an altar *towards which* our prayers and oblations are directed. That is, the prayers and oblations which are offered on earth are directed heavenward, so that, as our altar on earth symbolizes our LORD'S throne among us, the altar in heaven would seem to be equivalent to “the throne of grace.”

The next authority Thalhoffer cites is Origen: “On ² Origen. the Day of Atonement He enters into the Holy of holies; that is, with the completed dispensation He penetrates the heavens, and goes in to the FATHER that He may make Him propitious to the human race, and that He may plead for all those who believe in Him. . . . A day of propitiation, therefore, remains for us until the sun sets, that is, until the world receives its end.” †

* Pp. 172, 173. † See page 172, where the context is given.

‡ Origen, *In Levit.*, c. xvi., Hom. ix., p. 169.

Thalhofer's
argument.

Thalhofer says, in regard to this passage, that Origen considers the functions of the Aaronic high priest on the Day of Atonement as the type of the functions of CHRIST in heaven, which is the true Holy of holies, in which, until the consummation of the ages, He exercises the gift of reconciliation. Origen, he says, often speaks of the altar of incense in the Holy of holies as the altar in heaven, where CHRIST, assisted by angels, offers to GOD prayers and good works as a sweet savour, and he calls those Christians blessed to whom it may be granted to supply the heavenly High Priest with incense of this kind.

Origen's words
in full.

Origen's words are : " Do you think my LORD the true High Priest will deign to receive from me any part of the incense compounded of grains [of spices] which He bears with Him to the FATHER? . . . Blessed is he, the coals of whose burnt offering He shall find so living and so glowing that He may consider them fit to place upon the altar of incense. Blessed is he in whose heart He shall find a disposition so subtle, so minute, so spiritual, and so compounded of the fruits of different virtues, that from it He may deign to fill His hands and to offer to GOD the FATHER a sweet odour of this disposition."

Origen observes that the sacerdotal function of CHRIST in heaven, however, was not fulfilled by this one offering of incense. For not only did the Aaronic pontiff on the Day of Atonement offer incense in the sanctuary, but he also sprinkled blood, so that it is necessary to find also in the true sanctuary that of which this may be the type. But how can we find the sprinkling of blood in heaven? Origen therefore says : " Do not cling to the carnal blood, but understand rather the Blood of the Word, and hear Him saying to

thee, 'This is My Blood, which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.' He who is initiated in the mysteries has known both the Flesh and Blood of the Word."

Thalhofer thinks that this saying of Origen's is obscure, but that the context makes it clear. He says there is, according to Origen, in heaven a place for some sprinkling of blood, not material blood, but rather spiritual; and Origen intimately connects this heavenly sprinkling of blood with the celebration of the Eucharist, so much so as to identify them. For unless it be granted that the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice, and that the celebration of it is identical with the heavenly sprinkling of the blood, the words of Origen do not supply a sense which conforms to the context.

Thalhofer's exposition of them.

He also says that Origen indicates the function of CHRIST, by which He offers a propitiatory sacrifice in heaven itself, in his homilies on Leviticus, where he says of CHRIST our Advocate, "He goes up to the altar in order that He may reconcile me a sinner."* In Homily vii. on Judges, n. 2, he speaks of the martyrs "who attain to the altar in heaven . . . that they may there assist in the divine sacrifices." †

Other passages from Origen.

So far we have Thalhofer's argument, which indeed seems very far-fetched. For, to take the first passage, in which Origen refers to the Aaronic high priest entering the Holy of holies once in the year, we observe that Thalhofer has omitted much of the context. We give it here in full.

Thalhofer omits the context, which refutes his interpretation.

"If, therefore, I consider my LORD JESUS CHRIST, the true High Priest, how indeed when in the flesh He

The full context of this passage.

* Origen, *In Levit.*, Hom. vii., n. 2, p. 150.

† Idem, *In Judic.*, Hom. vii., n. 2, p. 393.

was the whole year with the people, that year of which He Himself said, 'He sent Me to preach the Gospel to the poor, to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of remission' [here follows the passage quoted by Thalhoffer]; consider how once in that year, on the Day of Atonement, He enters into the Holy of holies, that is, with the completed dispensation He penetrates the heavens and goes in to the FATHER, that He may make Him propitious to the human race, and that He may plead for all those who believe in Him." [Then follows what is omitted by Thalhoffer :] "John the Apostle says of this atonement by which He propitiates the FATHER, 'This I say, little children, that ye sin not ; but if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the righteous, and He is the propitiation with the FATHER.'* But Paul also in the same way speaks of this propitiation when he says of CHRIST, 'Whom GOD hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood.' " † [Then comes the remainder of the passage quoted by Thalhoffer :] "Therefore a day of propitiation remains for us, until the sun sets, that is, until the world receives its end. For we are standing now without the gates, awaiting our Pontiff, who lingers within the Holy of holies, that is, with the FATHER, and pleads for the sins of those who are awaiting Him." ‡

No allusion here to a heavenly altar or S.

In this passage, part of which is quoted by Thalhoffer, there is certainly not the slightest allusion either to a heavenly altar or to a heavenly sacrifice ; and Origen's treatment of our LORD'S Intercession is in strict accordance with that of all Catholic theology, that our Great High Priest "ever liveth to make

* 1 S. John ii. 1, 2.

† Rom. iii. 25.

‡ Origen, *In Levit.*, Hom. xi., n. 5.

intercession for us," that He is our Propitiation, our Advocate ; but that is all.

In the next passage, towards the end of the same homily, Origen writes : " Let us [first understand what the narrative describes, and then let us inquire what is its spiritual meaning. The sanctuary of the tabernacle or of the temple of the LORD is a double structure. In the first sanctuary is the altar of burnt offering, on which the perpetual fire burns, where the priests alone are allowed to be present and to perform the rites and ministries of the sacrifices. . . . But there is a second, interior structure, separated from this only by a veil, within which veil is the ark of the testimony and the mercy-seat. . . . Into this the high priest entered once only in the year, having first offered the sin offering, which we have already explained, and with both hands full, in one carrying a censer of coals, in the other the incense compounded [of various spices], so that when he had entered he might immediately put the incense on the coals, that the smoke might ascend and fill the whole sanctuary. . . . If you are familiar with the ancient custom of sacrifice, you will see what these things mystically signify. You have heard of two sanctuaries, one visible and open to the priests, the other invisible and inaccessible excepting to the high priest alone, the others being without. This first tabernacle I think we should understand as that in which we are now living in the flesh, i. e., the Church, in which priests minister at the altar of burnt offerings, having kindled that fire of which JESUS speaks, ' I came to send fire upon earth, and what will I but that it be kindled ? ' * And I am not surprised that this sanctuary should be open

* S. Luke xii. 49.

only to priests, for all who are anointed with the unction of the sacred chrism have been made priests, as Peter says to all the Church, 'Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation.'* Ye are therefore a priestly race, and therefore ye enter the sanctuary. But each one of us also has a burnt offering in himself, and himself kindles the altar of burnt offering, that it may be always burning. If I give up all that I possess, and take up my cross and follow CHRIST, I offer a burnt offering at the altar of GOD. . . . If I mortify my members from all fleshly desires, if the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world, I offer a burnt offering at the altar of GOD, and I myself act as the priest of my sacrifice. In this manner, therefore, the priesthood is exercised in the first sanctuary, and sacrifices are offered; and from this sanctuary the high priest, clad in his sacred vestments, goes forth and enters within the veil, as we said above in the words of S. Paul, 'CHRIST is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the Presence of GOD for us.'† Heaven itself, therefore, and the very throne of GOD is signified by the figure and image of the inner sanctuary. But the order of the mysteries is wonderful to behold. The high priest entering into the Holy of holies carries with him fire from this altar and takes incense from this sanctuary, and the vestments also in which he is arrayed he took from this place. Do you think my LORD the true High Priest will deign to receive from me any part of the incense compounded of grains [of spices] which He bears with Him to the FATHER? Do you think He will find in me any little spark of fire, and my burnt offering glowing, that He may deign of it to fill His censer with

* 1 S. Peter ii. 9.

† Heb. xi. 24.

coals, and on them to offer to GOD the FATHER an odour of sweetness? Blessed is he the coals of whose burnt offering He shall find so living and so glowing that He may consider them fit to place upon the altar of incense. Blessed is he in whose heart He shall find a disposition so subtle, so minute, so spiritual, and so compounded of the sweetness of different virtues, that from it He may deign to fill His hands and to offer to GOD the FATHER a sweet odour of this disposition. But, on the other hand, miserable is that soul whose fire of faith is extinguished, whose ardour of charity is growing cold, to whom, when our celestial High Priest comes seeking from it living and glowing coals upon which He may offer incense to the FATHER, He finds in it dead cinders and cold ashes." *

This is the whole passage of which Thalhofer has quoted only a part. In it mention is certainly made of a priesthood, of sacrifice, of an altar, of fire, of incense. But in what sense? Figurative or literal? There cannot be, it seems to us, the slightest doubt, since Origen explicitly says that the burnt offering is self-denial, self-discipline, mortification; that the incense is compounded of dispositions of heart and the fragrance of different virtues; and he qualifies the dispositions of heart by saying that they are most subtle and most spiritual. Hence it is evident that all the other images used are also figurative; that he is speaking of an altar only in a figurative sense, upon which these dispositions of heart are offered as a sacrifice. He tells us that he is speaking of a priesthood which includes all who have been anointed with the sacred chrism, that is, all the baptized. And the whole passage, while most beautiful, leaves no room whatever to suppose

Inference from
this passage.

* Origen, *In Levit.*, Hom. ix., n. 9, p. 173.

that Origen ever conceived that there was in heaven an altar or a sacrifice in the strict sense of the words.

4. Origen.

There is yet another passage quoted from this homily : * “ ‘ And he shall place incense on the fire in the sight of the LORD ; and the smoke of the incense shall cover the mercy-seat, which is above the testimony, and he shall not die. He shall take of the blood of the bullock, and shall sprinkle it with his finger above the mercy-seat towards the east.’ † He taught how among the ancients the rite of atonement for men, which was made to GOD, should be celebrated. But thou who dost come to CHRIST the true High Priest, Who by His own Blood made GOD propitious to thee and reconciled thee to the FATHER, dost thou cling to the carnal blood? Do not cling to the carnal blood, but understand rather the Blood of the Word, and hear Him saying to thee, ‘ This is My Blood, which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.’ He who is initiated in the Mysteries has known both the Flesh and Blood of the Word. Let us not, therefore, linger upon those things which are known to the initiated but are hidden from the ignorant.”

The passage
examined.

Here again we must repeat that there seems to be nothing in this passage which in any way supports Thalhofer's contention for a heavenly altar or a heavenly sacrifice. The point to which he draws attention is the sprinkling of blood, which he thinks takes place in heaven, and so implies a heavenly sacrifice. But this is the very ritual act which Origen takes special pains so to explain as to make Thalhofer's application of it impossible. For Origen exhorts Christians, who have been reconciled to GOD by the Blood of CHRIST, not to cling to the thought of the blood

* Origen, *Ibid.*, n. 10, p. 173.

† Lev. xvi. 13, 14.

sprinkled by the priest in the sanctuary, but with their whole mind to apprehend that of which it was the type, the Blood of the Word, which was shed upon the Cross (*and nowhere else*) for the remission of sin, and which is given to us in the Holy Eucharist. For he adds: "Hear our LORD saying, 'This is My Blood, which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.' He who is initiated in the Mysteries has known both the Flesh and Blood of the Word." Even Thalhofer admits that this refers to the Eucharist, and we fail to see a single word which indicates that it is to be associated with anything that is now being done in heaven. Indeed, the very passage refutes the idea of a sacrifice in heaven, for Origen, treating of the sprinkling of the Blood by the Levitical high priest in the Holy of holies, distinctly refers it to the Eucharist.

In the next passage which Thalhofer quotes* 5. Origen. Origen is explaining our LORD's saying, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My FATHER'S Kingdom." † "My Saviour," he says, "even now grieves over my sins. ‡ My Saviour cannot rejoice while I remain in sin. Why cannot He? Because He is the Advocate with the FATHER for our sins, as S. John, to

* Origen, *Ibid.*, hom. vii., n. 2.

† S. Matt. xxvi. 29.

‡ S. Bernard, in a sermon entitled "On the Words of Origen," seriously objects to this phrase, pointing out that our LORD in His life of glory is impassible and cannot mourn over our sins. Genebradus, on the other hand (*Collect.*, c. vi.), defends Origen, quoting S. Paul's words, "The SPIRIT Itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26). Strictly, of course, S. Bernard may be right; but there is a sense in which the words of Origen can be justified.

whom our LORD made known the mysteries, proclaims, saying, 'If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the Righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins.' How then is He, Who is the Advocate for my sins, able to drink the wine of gladness, Whom I sadden by my sins? How can He, Who goes to the altar to make reconciliation for me a sinner, be joyful, to Whom the piteous cry of my sins is always ascending? . . . For all this, therefore, He stands in the Presence of GOD, interceding for us. He stands at the altar that He may offer an atonement for us, and therefore, when about to approach that altar, He said, 'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My FATHER'S Kingdom.' "

Origen's teaching considered.

In these words of Origen we indeed see a setting forth of our LORD'S work of propitiation, but we are not told that CHRIST is offering a propitiatory sacrifice in heaven. Origen says that CHRIST goes to the altar "to make reconciliation for me a sinner," indeed "that He stands at the altar that He may offer to GOD an atonement for us." But he clearly indicates the sense in which he uses this expression, by putting it side by side with the passage of S. John, "He is the propitiation for our sins." He makes mention, indeed, of an altar, for CHRIST is the propitiation for our sins, having offered once for all upon the altar of the Cross that Sacrifice by which we were redeemed. In heaven itself He is our propitiation only by the presentation of the merits of His Sacrifice. Origen is therefore using the word "altar" figuratively, as he clearly shows by intimating that his words are to be understood as equivalent to the passage which he quotes from S. John, "If any man sin, we have an

Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins." We are quite aware that some of the modern school have claimed the last clause of this passage as supporting their theory. For, they say, if JESUS CHRIST is now the propitiation for our sins, He must now be offering a propitiatory Sacrifice. The answer is not difficult. Whatever our LORD'S Offering was, and whenever and wherever it took place, we are told over and over again that it was offered "once for all," that is, by one act. Whether, with the Catholic Church, we locate this act, both as regards time and place, in our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross, or, with Socinus and the modern school, to a period after His Ascension, and in heaven, the act is completed before our LORD sits down at the Right Hand of GOD, since, indeed, this session is the result of that act. That He is the propitiation for our sins is, therefore, also the result of that act, and not of any sacrifice which our LORD offered *after He had sat down* at the Right Hand of GOD. He is the propitiation for our sins because He is our Mediator, because He ever lives to make intercession for us, because the very presence of His Humanity upon the throne of GOD, as the Greek Fathers say, pleads for us.

We shall now consider Thalhofer's last quotation 6. Origen. from Origen: "Who can follow the soul of a martyr, which, mounting above all the powers of the air, makes its way to the heavenly altar? For there, under the altar of GOD, the souls of the martyrs are placed, who day and night are said to cry, 'How long, O LORD, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?'"* Placed there, they assist at the divine sacrifices." †

* Rev. vi. 10.

† Origen, *In Judic.*, Hom. vii., n. 2.

The sense of the passage examined.

Here certainly we have mention of a heavenly altar, and of the altar of GOD, but surely we are not to understand either the altar or the sacrifice in their literal sense. We have already many times shown that the heavenly altar is to be understood figuratively, but in addition to this we may remark that some commentators refer this whole passage in Revelation, from which Origen is quoting, to the saints, not of Christianity, but of Judaism. And further the martyrs are said to assist, not at "a divine sacrifice," but at divine "*sacrifices*" (plural), i. e., the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving offered by the Church Triumphant. But no one has ever taught that our LORD in heaven is offering *sacrifices*, except in so far as He presents to the FATHER the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving offered by His whole Church.

7. S. Chrysostom.

The next authority whom Thalhoffer quotes is S. Chrysostom, and, strangely, he claims S. Chrysostom's comment on Heb. viii. 5 as supporting his view. We have already drawn attention to it.* It is as follows: "What are the 'heavenly things' spoken of here? Spiritual things. For although they are done *on earth*, yet nevertheless they are worthy of the heavens. For when our LORD JESUS CHRIST lies slain; when the SPIRIT is with us; when He Who sitteth on the Right Hand of the FATHER is here; when sons are made by the laver; when they are fellow-citizens of those in heaven; when we have a country, and a city, and citizenship there; when we are strangers to things here, how can all these things be other than 'heavenly things'? But what! are not our hymns heavenly? Do not we also, who are below, utter in concert with them the same things which the divine choirs of bodi-

* In Chap. VI., p. 160.

less powers sing above? Is not the altar also heavenly?
 . . . How, again, can the rites which we celebrate
 be other than heavenly? . . . Nay, one would
 not be wrong in saying even this, for the Church is
 heavenly, and is nothing else than heaven."*

It would seem difficult to find any passage which
 was a more complete refutation of the Modern view
 than this, for S. Chrysostom (who certainly knew in
 what sense the term "heavenly altar," as used in the
 liturgies, was understood in his day) tells us that
 "heavenly" is to be taken as equivalent to "spiritual,"
 and refers to that which is done in the Church on
 earth, especially at the Eucharist, since the Church on
 earth is part of our LORD'S Mystical Body, and in the
 Eucharist is so joined to the worship of heaven as to
 be one with it.

This passage
 refutes rather
 than supports
 Thalhofer.

One other passage said to be from S. Chrysostom,
 not alluded to by Thalhofer, is claimed as favouring the
 Modern view of a heavenly sacrifice. It is as follows:
 "He ascended into heaven in order that He might have
 heaven as His Sanctuary, wherein to officiate as
 Priest." †

8. A passage
 attributed to
 S. Chrysostom:

Perhaps the simplest answer to this interpretation of
 the passage is to place side by side with it S. Chrysostom's
 comment on Heb. vii. 27: ‡ "Do not, then, having heard
 that He is a Priest, suppose that He is always executing
 the Priest's office, (offering sacrifice) for He executed it
 once, and thenceforward sat down."

Another
 passage of S.
 Chrysostom.

* S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, Hom. xiv., n. 3.

† Quoted by Wordsworth, *on Heb.*, c. viii., 4, but the author
 has been unable to verify the passage, which is certainly not
 in S. Chrysostom's Homilies on the Hebrews.

‡ S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, Hom. xiii., 3; Gaume, vol. 12, p. 191.

Which is
inconsistent
with Thal-
hofer's view.

S. Chrysostom is here discussing the words, "Who hath no need daily, as the high priests, to offer up sacrifices first for their own sins, then for the sins of the people, for this He did once for all in that He offered up Himself." And he asserts that though CHRIST abides a Priest, and so exercises certain priestly functions, especially through His Church in the Eucharist, yet in thinking of Him as a Priest we are not to suppose that He is always sacrificing (*ἱεραῖσθαι*),* for this He did once for all (*ἀπαξ γὰρ ἱεράσατο*). CHRIST indeed has heaven as His Sanctuary wherein to officiate as our Great High Priest in His Mediatorial work, but S. Chrysostom expressly points out that this does not mean that He there offers sacrifice.

9. S. Gregory.

Thalhofer next quotes the following passage from S. Gregory the Great : † " From this, therefore, let us consider what kind of a sacrifice for us this is, which for our salvation continually re-presents the Passion of the Only Begotten SON. For who is there of the faithful who doubts that at the very time of the immolation, at the voice of the priest the heavens are opened, that in that mystery of JESUS CHRIST the choirs of angels are present, the lowest things are linked to the highest, earthly things are joined with heavenly, and things visible and invisible become one? For this unique Victim saves the soul from eternal death, and by a mystery renews for us that Death of the Only Begotten, Who, although being risen from the dead He now dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over Him, ‡ nevertheless in Himself, living,

* S. Chrysostom seems to use *ἱεράομαι* as equivalent to *ἱερεῖω*, which is often found in Theodoret.

† S. Greg., *Dialog.*, l. iv., c. lviii.

‡ Rom. vi. 9.

immortal, and incorruptible, offers Himself again in this mystery of the sacred oblation. There, indeed, His Body is eaten, there It is divided for the salvation of the people. His Blood is poured, not now upon the hands of unbelievers, but into the mouths of the faithful.”

These words of S. Gregory merely state what every Catholic has always held, that in the Eucharist heaven and earth are joined in one great act of worship. They give no countenance, however, to the idea that there is a heavenly altar or a heavenly sacrifice. The moment of immolation which is spoken of is the moment when the Priest pronounces the words of Consecration. In the beginning of the passage, S. Gregory refers to our LORD'S Death upon the Cross, by which man's salvation was accomplished ; and he says that our LORD in His Resurrection life immolates Himself again *in this mystery* of the sacred oblation, that is, in the Holy Eucharist. It is quite inconceivable that S. Gregory could have written these words if he had had the slightest idea of a heavenly sacrifice such as the Modern theory requires, for in that case he would have said that, having risen from the dead, CHRIST offers Himself in sacrifice in heaven.

We pass next to S. Ambrose, whom both Thalhoffer and Mr. Brightman claim as supporting their view. They both cite the same passage : * “ We must, therefore, seek those things in which is perfection, in which is truth. Here is the shadow, here the image ; there the truth. The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the truth in heavenly things. Before a lamb was offered a bullock also was offered ; now CHRIST is offered. But He is offered as Man, as

**

The passage examined.

10. S. Ambrose, quoted by both Brightman and Thalhoffer.

* S. Ambrose, *De Offic.*, l. i., c. xlviii.

renewing His Passion ; and He as Priest offers Himself, that He may take away our sins. Here in image, there in truth, where with the FATHER He, as Advocate, intercedes for us. Here, therefore, in the image we walk, in the image we see ; there, face to face, where is full perfection ; for all perfection is in truth."

We fail to see in these words the slightest proof either of a heavenly altar or of a heavenly sacrifice. Mr. Brightman, however, renders this passage somewhat differently ; his translation reads : " Beforetimes a lamb was offered, a calf was offered ; now CHRIST is offered. Himself offers Himself, as a Priest for the remission of our sins : here in symbol, there in fact (*hic in imagine, ibi in veritate*), where He intercedes, as our Advocate, with the FATHER."

Neither Mr. Brightman nor Thalhofer is the author of this mis-interpretation of S. Ambrose,

Before we proceed to discuss this passage we may observe that neither Mr. Brightman nor Thalhofer is the author of the misinterpretation of S. Ambrose which in rendering "*imagine*" by "in symbol" implies that in the Eucharist our LORD is only offered in symbol, the real offering being in heaven ; and further that the "pathology of interpretation" is often instructive, for in tracing an opinion to its source we are sometimes enabled to see the point of view or theological bias which really underlies it.

which is found in the works of Edmond Albertino and proves too much ;

So far as we know, the first writer to put this construction on the words of S. Ambrose was Edmond Albertino, a Calvinist minister of Charenton in France (ob. 1652), who, in his work, *Traité contre Eucharistie*, which became very popular among Protestants, uses this passage to show that S. Ambrose believed neither in the Real Presence nor in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And, indeed, if we admit with Mr. Brightman Albertino's premise that our LORD in the Eucharist is

offered only in symbol, it is difficult to see how we can deny his conclusion that in the Eucharist S. Ambrose saw no objective Presence of our LORD'S Body and Blood, and therefore no proper sacrifice.

Mr. Brightman's interpretation does not prove his contention that S. Ambrose considered the Eucharist a sacrifice depending upon our LORD'S action now in heaven, but it does imply what Albertino maintains, that the Saint did not believe in any Real Presence or proper sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Such a view, however, is inconsistent with S. Ambrose's treatment of the subject in many other places, and, indeed, with his words in this passage. The fallacy of Mr. Brightman's interpretation is evident from the following considerations :

i. His translation, " Here *in symbol*, there in fact " (*hic in imagine, ibi in veritate*), is misleading and unjustifiable ; for not only is " symbol " a very far-fetched rendering of " *imago*," the primary meaning of which is " a copy," while that of " *symbolum* " is " a mark or sign or token," but S. Ambrose in another passage takes pains to tell us exactly in what sense he here uses this term ; for he says : " In what image then does man walk ? Surely he walks in that [image] in the likeness of which he was made, that is, in the image of GOD. But the image of GOD is CHRIST ; Who is the splendour of His glory and the image of His substance. CHRIST, therefore, the image of GOD, came to earth that we might not walk in the shadow, but in the image ; for in CHRIST, he who follows the Gospel walks in the image. Therefore He says to His disciple, ' Get thee behind Me (S. Mark viii. 33), that thou mayest follow Me.' " *

Does Mr. Brightman teach that the image of GOD in

* S. Ambrose, *Enarrat. in Ps.*, xxxviii., n. 24.

for it is inconsistent with S. Ambrose's words in other passages. Its fallacy exposed :

i. By S. Ambrose's explanation of the term " *imago*."

man is only symbolic? or, if with reverence we may ask the question, would he say that our LORD is the express image of the FATHER only in a symbolic sense? Yet these are the two passages cited by S. Ambrose as showing the sense in which he uses the term. By what principle of scholarship, then, does Mr. Brightman substitute "symbol" for "image"?

ii. By the clause omitted by Mr. Brightman.

ii. S. Ambrose, in the first half of the sentence, explains in what sense CHRIST is offered here in image, viz., "as Man, as renewing His Passion,"* that is, in the Eucharist the immolation by which His Passion is renewed is a mystical immolation.†

It will scarcely be credited that Mr. Brightman not only omits this clause, but omits it without any dots to indicate a *lacuna*. His translation is as follows: "Beforetimes a lamb was offered, a calf was offered; now CHRIST is offered. Himself offers Himself, as a Priest for the remission of our sins: here in symbol, there in fact (*hic in imagine, ibi in veritate*), where He intercedes, as our Advocate, with the Father." ‡

* We often find "*quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem*" translated, "as a Man, as capable of suffering;" but "*recipiens*" has not the sense of "*capax*," and CHRIST is not now capable of suffering, for His resurrection Body is impassible. On the other hand, the primary meaning of "*recipiens*" is to take back, to bring back, and therefore to renew, and in the Eucharist our LORD'S Passion is mystically renewed; for in it we "shew forth His death."

† Cf. note in Migne's edition of S. Ambrose, P. L., tom. xvi., col. 99, in which Albertino's objection is answered.

‡ "*Ante agnus offerebatur et vitulus, nunc Christus offertur, sed offertur quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem, et offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat; hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit.*"

It will be observed that there is in Mr. Brightman's quotation no indication whatever that an inconvenient clause has been omitted.

iii. The *reductio ad impossibile* argument ; for S. Ambrose is showing that the Church on earth is in a condition intermediate between the synagogue and heaven. In the synagogue all was shadow, all was type ; but in heaven all is open truth, for shadow and type will have passed away. The Church on earth, however, under the Gospel dispensation is intermediary, for in it truth is not joined with the shadow, which is unreal, but with the image ; since, as S. Paul says, " Now we see as in a mirror in riddle but then face to face : now I know in part ; but then shall I know even as I was known." *

iii. By the " reductio ad impossibile."

But neither the Incarnation nor the Sacrifice of the Cross took place in heaven. Are we then to regard these fundamental verities of the Christian Faith as mere shadows, as partial truths ? Such a supposition would, of course, be absurd ; for, while we can only partially apprehend these mysteries in their full significance in this life, and it will be one of the joys of heaven to comprehend them in their fulness in the life to come, yet they are absolutely true. So while the Presence and Sacrifice of our LORD in the Eucharist is a mystery, which is apprehended now by faith alone, yet it is none the less true. In heaven the veil will be lifted and we shall see Him face to face Whom here we worshipped beneath the sacramental veils ; but our LORD will not be more truly in heaven (though present there after a different manner) than He is in the Holy Eucharist.

iv. By examining another passage from S. Ambrose's Commentary on the Psalms,† which has

iv. By the parallel passage.

* I Cor. xiii. 12. † S. Ambrose, *In Psalm.*, xxxviii., n. 25.

evidently been overlooked by the Modern school, we see clearly his meaning : " The shadow, therefore, went first ; the image followed ; truth is to come. The shadow in the Law, but the image in the Gospel ; truth in heavenly things. The shadow of the Gospel and of the congregation of the Church is in the Law ; the image of future truth [that is, of full truth] is in the Gospel ; truth itself in the judgment of GOD. So it is in regard to the things that are celebrated in the Church ; their shadow was in the words of the Prophets ; their shadow was in the flood, in the Red Sea, when our fathers were baptized in the cloud and in the sea ; the shadow was in the Rock from which water flowed, and which followed the people. Was not that in shadow a sacrament of this Holy Mystery ? The water from the rock, was it not in shadow as the Blood from CHRIST, which followed the people who fled from it, that they might drink and not thirst, that they might be redeemed and not perish ? But now the shadow of the night and of the darkness of the Jews has departed, the day of the Church has come. *We see now good things through the image, and we hold the good things of the image. We see the High Priest coming to us ; we see and hear Him offering His Blood for us ; we priests follow, so far as we can, in order that we may offer sacrifice for the people ; for even though we are weak in merit, we are honourable in the Sacrifice. For though now CHRIST is not seen to offer, nevertheless He Himself offers on earth when He offers the Body of CHRIST. Moreover, He Himself manifestly offers in us, whose word sanctifies the Sacrifice which is offered ; and He indeed takes His place with the FATHER as our Advocate, but now we see Him not ; then we shall see Him, when the image shall pass*

away and the truth shall come. Then indeed, not through a glass, but face to face will be seen those things which are perfect."

There is no more satisfactory method of determining the meaning of a passage than by the author's own writings elsewhere; and in this second quotation, which contains the same thought as the first, S. Ambrose, if we may so say, seems to have anticipated the misuse that has been made of the first passage, and so, while using precisely the same imagery and almost the same words, he explicitly adds that "although now CHRIST is not seen to offer, nevertheless He offers *on earth* when He offers the Body of CHRIST," that is, of course, in the Eucharist. But he does not give the slightest hint of any heavenly sacrifice which our LORD is offering, but only states that in heaven "He indeed takes His place with the Father as our Advocate;" and we may repeat what we said in regard to S. Gregory, that it is inconceivable that S. Ambrose could have written this if he had any knowledge of a proper sacrifice which CHRIST was now offering in heaven.

The last of the Fathers quoted by Thalhoffer is S. Augustine, from whose writings he brings forward two passages.

The first is from his Commentary on the Psalms:*

"You wash your hands, not indeed with visible water, but when you reflect devoutly on your works and are innocent in the sight of GOD, since that altar is in the Presence of GOD, whither the Priest has entered Who

II. S. Augustine:

* *Enarrat. in Psalm.*, xxv., n. 10. We may notice here that S. Augustine wrote two commentaries on this Psalm, and that the passage in question is found in the second of these commentaries.

first offered Himself for us. There is a heavenly altar, and he only compasses that altar who washes his hands in innocence. For many who are unworthy touch this altar [of the Church], and GOD permits His sacraments to suffer outrage at the time. "But, my brethren, the heavenly Jerusalem will not be like these walls [i. e., of the material Church]. In Abraham's bosom you will not receive [the Sacrament] together with the wicked, as you now receive it with the wicked, within these walls of the Church. But fear not; wash your hands.

"And 'I will compass the altar of GOD.' There you offer to GOD your vows; there you pour out your prayers; there your conscience is pure; there you confess to GOD what you are, and if by chance there is in you anything which displeases GOD, He to Whom you confess heals it. Wash, therefore, your hands in innocence, and compass the altar of GOD, that you may hear the voice of praise."

Here it is scarcely necessary to do more than point out that S. Augustine is using the term "heavenly altar" as it is used in the liturgies, and in the books of Isaiah and Revelation,—in a figurative sense. So in Psalm xxiv. 3 we read: "Who shall ascend into the hill of the LORD? or who shall rise up in His holy place?"—where David, as in so many places, evidently uses the hill of Sion as a type or figure of GOD's heavenly sanctuary. Yet from this passage we do not suppose anyone ever thought of attempting to prove that there were hills in heaven. S. Augustine's argument is that although the good and wicked together approach the altar of GOD's Church when they make their Communion, and both receive the Sacrament of our LORD'S Body and Blood, yet only those who ap-

proach with right dispositions really feed on CHRIST, and therefore may be said to approach His heavenly altar, and to join in the heavenly worship of angels and archangels, and so "to hear the voice of praise."

The second passage is taken from one of S. Augustine's sermons.* In this passage S. Augustine is appealing to a man who is conscious of being in mortal sin "to judge himself unworthy of the participation of the Body and Blood of our LORD, so that he, who fears to be separated from the Kingdom of heaven by the final sentence of the Great Judge, may for a while be separated by ecclesiastical discipline from the Sacrament of the heavenly Bread. Let him put before his eyes," he says, "the image of the judgment to come, so that when others approach the altar of GOD, whither he himself does not approach, he may reflect upon the terrible character of that sentence by which, while some receive eternal life, others are cast into eternal death. For many, even of the wicked, are able to approach this altar which is now placed in the Church on earth, exposed to earthly eyes, for the purpose of celebrating the symbols of the Divine Mysteries. GOD indeed now in time commends His patience, that in future He may show His severity. The ignorant, truly, approach, since the patience of GOD leads them to penitence. . . . But to this altar whither our forerunner JESUS is entered for us, whither the Head of the Church is gone before, while His other members follow,—to this altar none of those is able to approach, of whom, as I have already noticed, the Apostle said, 'They who do such things shall not possess the Kingdom of GOD.' †

"For there the Priest alone stands, but this clearly

* S. Aug., *Serm.*, cccli., n. 7.

† Gal. v. 21.

12. S. Augustine: a second passage.

[implies] the whole Priest, that is with that Body added of which He is the Head, which already has ascended into heaven. He it is of whom the Apostle Peter said, 'a royal priesthood, an holy nation.'* How, therefore, shall he either adore, or be able to enter within the veil and into that invisible sanctuary, who, despising the medicine of heavenly discipline, is unwilling for a little while to be separated from the visible Church? For he who will not be humiliated in order that he may be exalted, when he wills to be exalted shall be cast down, and in eternity shall be separated from the eternal saints, who in time by the merit of obedience and the satisfaction of penitence has not secured for himself a place in the Body of the Priest."

The passage
examined.

In this very beautiful passage S. Augustine evidently considers that "to approach that altar whither our forerunner JESUS is entered for us, whither the Head of the Church is gone before, while the other members follow," is equivalent to "possessing the Kingdom of heaven," to "entering within the veil into the invisible sanctuary," and to being "joined for ever with the eternal saints." That is, he is expressing in sublime language the mystical union which now exists between CHRIST and every living member of His Church.

The worship in heaven is represented in the Book of Revelation as the mystical worship of the Lamb standing in the midst of the throne of GOD; and yet in a sense the Lamb, as the Great High Priest, leads the worship of heaven, and in His Humanity offers to GOD the worship of His whole Church, both in heaven and on earth.

The Fathers and the liturgies, as we have many

* 1 S. Peter ii, 9.

times pointed out, represent the same idea under the figure of a heavenly altar, and they take pains explicitly to say that by this altar they mean CHRIST Himself. S. Augustine in the passage before us employs the term " altar " in this sense, and represents our Head, our Great High Priest, offering the worship of heaven and earth, while the lowest members of His Body, those who communicate worthily at His altar on earth, join in that act of worship and are offered by their Great High Priest.

There is, however, nothing here which indicates any idea of a literal sacrifice in heaven, or any other sacrifice than that which was once offered upon the Cross, and which our LORD, by the very presence of His Human Nature, pleads for us.

Our last quotation from the Fathers under this division is taken from S. Gregory's *Morals on the Book of Job* : * " Job does not cease to offer sacrifice every day, because our Redeemer without intermission offers for us a burnt offering, Who always exhibits to the FATHER on our behalf His Incarnation. For His Incarnation is itself the offering of our purification, and while He shows Himself as Man, He washes away by His Intercession [*interveniens*] the sins of man, and in the mystery of His Humanity He immolates a perpetual sacrifice, even because those things which He cleanses are eternal ; " that is, He *is* the abiding Propitiation for our sins.

13. S. Gregory

Here, while S. Gregory uses the term " sacrifice," he shows in the context that by it he means nothing more nor less than our LORD'S Intercession, and that he understands this Intercession to be our LORD'S showing of Himself as Man to the FATHER for us.

* S. Greg., *Moral.*, 1. i., c. xxiv., n. 32.

We shall see that this is precisely what the Fathers generally teach.

Result of examination of Thalhofer's authorities.

This is the last of the passages from the Fathers which have been brought forward by the supporters of the view that our LORD is now offering an actual or proper sacrifice in heaven. Before passing to the third division of this chapter, we may sum up the testimony of the Fathers thus far by saying :

1. No passage really supports his view.

2. The Fathers teach that our LORD presents in heaven the worship of the Church, and therefore the H. E.

3. They explain the heavenly altar by our LORD'S Humanity, though some apply the term to the altar of the Church.

1. That not one passage has been adduced which lends any real support to the Modern view.

2. That the Fathers teach that our LORD upon His throne of glory is presenting to the FATHER through His own Humanity His Mystical Body the Church, with all her prayers and sacrifices, so that in this sense her worship in the Eucharist is presented by Him to GOD.

3. They speak of a "heavenly altar," by which some of them explicitly state that they understand our LORD Himself in His Humanity. Others show that they understand it only in a figurative sense, as that whereon the offerings of men are placed when brought to GOD ; while others, again, explain that the altar of the Church is the heavenly altar, because the worship of the Eucharist is one with the worship of heaven.

III. THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS IN REGARD TO OUR LORD'S PRESENT MEDIATORIAL WORK.

III. Passages which explain our LORD'S Intercession.

It will be obvious to everyone that the class of patristic passages which really have most bearing on our subject, and which indeed may be considered as decisive of the matter in controversy, are those which treat of our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven, those which

explain His great Intercession. For if this Mediatorial work, this great Intercession, be the offering in heaven of a sacrifice in the proper sense of the term, then it is absolutely inconceivable that the Fathers should interpret it again and again without the slightest reference to any such sacrifice,—inconceivable, that is, on the supposition that the early Church believed that our LORD as the Great High Priest was now offering an actual sacrifice in heaven.

To avoid extending this chapter to an unnecessary length we shall confine our quotations to a few passages, which, however, will quite suffice for our purpose.

The Modern school generally claim that the Greek Fathers are especially favourable to their view. We shall therefore begin with them.*

The Greek Fathers.

And, first, S. Chrysostom: “Do not, then, having heard that He is a Priest, suppose that He is always offering sacrifice, for he offered sacrifice once for all, and thenceforward sat down.” †

1. S. Chrysostom.

Theodoret: “But CHRIST is now a Priest sprung from Judah according to the flesh, Himself not offering anything, but acting as the Head of those who offer. For He calls the Church His Body, and through her exercises His Priesthood as Man, but as GOD receives those things which are offered. For the Church offers the symbols of His Body and Blood, sanctifying the whole lump by the first-fruits.” ‡

2. Theodoret.

* It will be convenient here to group the writers with reference to the argument rather than chronologically.

† *Μη τοίνυν αὐτὸν ἱερέα ἀκούσας, ἀεὶ ἱεράσθαι νόμιζε. ἅπαξ γὰρ ἱεράσατο, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκάθισεν* (*In Heb.*, Hom. xiii., 3; Gaume, vol. xii., p. 191).

‡ Ἰερατεύει δὲ νῦν ὁ ἐξ Ἰουδα κατὰ σαρκὰ βλαστήσας Χριστός, οὐκ αὐτός τι προσφέρων, ἀλλὰ τῶν προσφερόντων

3. Euthymius
Zig.

Euthymius Zigadenus : “ These [the Levitical priests] indeed offered sacrifice daily throughout their whole life, but CHRIST offered Sacrifice once for all.” *

4. S. Chrysos-
tom.

S. Chrysostom, commenting on the verse, “ Having become a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec” (Heb. vii. 20), says : “ For behold we have in heaven a Victim, in heaven a Priest, in heaven a Sacrifice. For we offer such sacrifices as can be offered on that altar, no longer sheep and oxen, no longer blood and odour. All these things have been abolished, and in their place a rational worship introduced. But what is a rational worship? Those things which are offered through the soul, those things which are offered through the spirit. ‘ GOD is spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.’ † Which things have no need of body, have no need of organs, have no need of place. But of *what kind are these sacrifices?* Modesty, prudence, mercy, long-suffering, forbearance, humility.” ‡

5. S. Chrysos-
tom.

In another place S. Chrysostom writes : “ He [S. John Baptist] says not [of the Lamb of God], ‘ Who shall take away,’ or ‘ who *did* take away,’ but, ‘ who *taketh* away the sin of the world,’ speaking of Him as doing this continually. For He did not then only take

κεφαλή χρηματίζων. Σῶμα γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν καλεῖ, καὶ διὰ ταύτης ιερατεύει ὡς ἄνθρωπος, δέχεται δὲ τὰ προσφερόμενα ὡς Θεός. Προσφέρει δὲ ἡ Ἐκκλησία τὰ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος σύμβολα, πᾶν τὸ φύραμα διὰ τῆς ἀπαρχῆς ἀγιάζουσα (In Psalm., cix., 4; Migne, P. G., tom. 80, col. 1773).

* Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν δι’ ὅλης ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς καὶ ἡμέραν ιεράτευον, ὁ δὲ Χριστός ἅπαξ ιεράτευσεν (In Heb., vii., 27).

† S. John iii. 24.

‡ S. Chrys., In Heb., Hom. xi., 3; Gaume, vol. xii., p. 163.

away [sins] when He suffered, but from then until now He takes them away ; not by being continually crucified (for He offered [once] one Sacrifice for sins), but by that one Sacrifice He is continually cleansing us from sin." *

It seems strange that Thalhofer and others should have overlooked these passages, which so explicitly refute their contention that our LORD is offering sacrifice in heaven.

Again, S. Cyril of Alexandria, commenting on the verse, " We have such an High Priest, who is set on the Right Hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," says : " That ancient tabernacle of the Old Testament was well adapted to priests, but the tabernacle appropriate to CHRIST was that supernal and glorious city heaven itself, which is truly a Divine and perfect tabernacle, not the work of human art, but holy and wrought by GOD. After CHRIST has entered this tabernacle He offers to GOD and the FATHER those who believe in Him and who through the SPIRIT have attained to sanctification." †

6. S. Cyril of
Alex.

What a disappointing conclusion this must be to Thalhofer ! One would have expected here at least, if S. Cyril had known anything of a heavenly sacrifice, that after this glowing description of the tabernacle appropriate to CHRIST, he would have said, " In it He offers to GOD and the FATHER the sacrifice of Himself." But He only says that He presents the offering of His Church.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, speaking of our LORD as a Priest after the order of Melchisedec, says : " For as

7. Eusebius
Cæsar.

* S. Chrys., *In Joan.*, Hom. xviii., 2 ; Gaume, vol. viii., p. 121.

† S. Cyril, Alex., *Ad Reginas de Recta Fide*, n. 44 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 76, col. 1395.

he [Melchisedec], who was the priest of the Gentiles, nowhere seems to have exercised sacrificial functions, except with bread and wine only, when he blessed Abraham, so certainly our LORD and Saviour first, and those afterwards who went out from Him as priests into all nations performing the spiritual gift of the priesthood according to ecclesiastical ordinances, represent with bread and wine the mysteries both of His Body and of His Saving Blood. Which mysteries, indeed, Melchisedec had recognized before in so divine a spirit, and had used in images of corporeal things, as the writings of Moses signify : ‘ And Melchisedec King of Salem brought forth bread and wine.’ ” *

8. S. John of
Damascus.

And S. John of Damascus says: “ Melchisedec received Abraham, returning from the slaughter of the aliens, with bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God. That table prefigured this mystical Table, as also that priest set forth the figure and image of CHRIST the true Priest.” †

It will be observed that Eusebius here points out that the only priestly function which Melchisedec exercised was the offering of bread and wine, and he therefore draws the conclusion that our LORD’S priestly functions were thus exercised, first, at its Institution, and then through His priests in the Holy Eucharist ; and S. John of Damascus seems to have very much the same idea. And yet, in the treatment of our LORD’S Melchisedecan Priesthood, one would have expected these Fathers, had they known of a sacrifice in heaven, to

* Euseb., Cæs., *Demonstrat. Evangel.*, v. 3 ; Migne, P. G., tom. 22, col. 367.

† S. Joan., Damasc., *De Fide. Orthod.*, l. iv., c. xiii. ; Migne, P. G., tom. 94, col. 1150.

speak of such a sacrifice as the distinguishing characteristic of this Priesthood, instead of interpreting it, as they do, by the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

Before we turn to the Latin Fathers, there is a passage to be noticed in the commentary of Euthymius Zigadenus which expressly set forth what they understand by our LORD'S Intercession.

The passage in Euthymius, as the Bishop of Durham remarks, "expresses the true conception of the LORD'S Intercession with singular terseness and force." Euthymius says: "His very Human Nature, therefore, pleads with the FATHER on our behalf." * This brief sentence is really a summing up of the patristic view of our LORD'S Intercession.

9. Euthymius
Zig.

We shall only add the opinions of three Latin Fathers:

Latin Fathers.

Primasius (ob. circa 560) expresses this idea in other words when, commenting on the phrase, "Who also intercedes for us," he says: "In this Intercession it is affirmed that as true and eternal High Priest He shows and offers to the FATHER, as our pledge, man, taken into Himself and for ever glorified." †

10. Primasius.

Again, interpreting Heb. vii. 25, Primasius says: "But He intercedes for us in this very fact, that He took human nature for us, which He continually presents to the FATHER for us."

S. Augustine: "To obtain GOD'S pardon, propitiation is made through some sacrifice. One, therefore, hath come forth, sent from GOD the LORD, One Who is

11. S. August-
tine.

* *Αυτὴ οὖν ἡ ἐπανθρώπησις αὐτοῦ παρακαλεῖ τὸν Πατέρα υπὲρ ἡμῶν* (*Comm. in Heb.*, vii., 25). I am indebted to the Bishop of Durham for calling my attention to this passage.

† Primas., *In Epist. ad Rom.*, viii., 34; Migne, P. L., tom. 68, col. 466.

our Priest. He took upon Him from us that which He might offer to the LORD. We are speaking of those holy First-fruits of the flesh from the womb of the Virgin. This holocaust He offered to GOD. He stretched out His hands upon the Cross in order that He might say, 'Let My prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the incense, and let the lifting up of My hands be an evening sacrifice.' " *

In this passage we see that S. Augustine connects the offering of the holocaust with the lifting up of our LORD'S hands upon the Cross, and so clearly shows that he considers the burnt offering to have been made upon the Cross, and not upon the altar of heaven.

12. S. Augustine.

Again S. Augustine says: "In the victims of the flock which the Hebrews offered in many and various ways to GOD, they proclaimed, as was fitting in so great a matter, a prophecy of the future Victim which CHRIST offered. Whence Christians now celebrate the memorial of the same *finished* Sacrifice in the sacred offering and Communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST." †

In this passage S. Augustine speaks of our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross being a finished Sacrifice, which leaves no room for the offering of the Blood in heaven as the essentially characteristic act of sacrifice.

13. S. Gregory the Great.

S. Gregory writes: "For He Himself is our High Priest, Who upon the altar of the Cross for the salvation of the whole world offered as a Victim His Body; a High Priest, that is, of good things to come, Who by

* S. Aug., *Enarrat.*, in *Psalm*, lxiv., n. 6; Migne, P. L., tom. 36, col. 777.

† S. Aug., *Contra Faustum*, c. xx., 18; Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 382.

His own Blood entered once for all into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." *

S. Gregory teaches that it was upon the altar of the Cross that our LORD offered His Body as a Victim ; that He was then our High Priest, since He was a High Priest of good things to come ; and that He entered once for all into the Holy place by His own Blood, when He had obtained eternal redemption, that is, after His redemptive work was complete.

Again, S. Gregory, explaining the words of S. Paul, "CHRIST . . . Who is even at the Right Hand of GOD, Who also maketh intercession for us" (Rom. viii. 34), says: "To intercede for man is for the Only Begotten SON to present Himself as Man in the Presence of the co-eternal FATHER ; and to plead for human nature is for Him to have taken that same nature into the exaltation of His Divinity." †

14. S. Gregory.

Here S. Gregory, like Euthymius, is definitely explaining — or we might almost say, defining — what he understands by our LORD'S Intercession. He makes no reference to any offering of sacrifice in heaven, but, like the other Fathers, considers that the Presence of our LORD'S Humanity there is His Intercession for us.

We end this third section, and indeed the chapter generally, by saying that an investigation of the writings of the Fathers, both East and West, shows:

Summary of patristic testimony :

1. That not one passage cited from the Fathers gives any real support to the theory of a proper sacrifice being now offered in heaven.

1. No passage supports the Modern view.

2. That in this last division S. Chrysostom,

* S. Greg., in *Psalm Pœnit.*, Psalm 1., n. 9 ; Migne, P. L., tom. lxxix., col. 587.

† S. Greg., *Moral.*, l. xxii., c. xvii., n. 42 ; Migne, P. L., tom. 76, col. 238.

2. Some passages inconsistent with it.

Theodoret, and Euthymius expressly assert that such a sacrifice was offered but once, and that though our LORD remains a Priest for ever we are not therefore to think of Him as offering sacrifice, except through His Church. In another passage S. Chrysostom, after saying, "For behold, we have in heaven a Victim, in heaven a Priest, in heaven a Sacrifice, for we offer such sacrifices as can be offered on that altar," goes on to tell us that these sacrifices are "modesty, prudence, mercy, long-suffering, forbearance, humility."

3. The explanation of our LORD'S Intercession excludes it.

3. That Primasius, S. Gregory, and Euthymius, in giving what is practically a definition of our LORD'S Intercession, say that it is simply the Presence in heaven of His glorified Humanity. And such a definition is the best evidence that any other sacrifice in heaven than CHRIST'S mystical offering of His Church and the prayers and good works of her members was entirely unknown to the Fathers.

CHAPTER IX.

THE TESTIMONY OF MEDIÆVAL AND POST-MEDIÆVAL WRITERS.

IN the ninth century, as we pointed out in Chapter VII., a great impetus was given to the study of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, both from a dogmatic and a mystical standpoint, by a group of writers of marked and original ability, among the more prominent of whom were Rabanus Maurus, Walafrid Strabo, Amalarius, Florus, and Paschasius Radbertus.

These gave a new direction to the treatment of this subject, especially in its mystical and liturgical aspects, and the seed sown by them produced fruit in the twelfth century in several valuable mystical commentaries on the liturgy, such as the writings of S. Ivo of Chartres, B. Odo of Cambrai, V. Hildebert of Le Mans, Peter the Venerable, Algerus of Liége, Hugo of S. Victor, and Guitmundus Aversanus.

Mr. Brightman refers to passages in Paschasius Radbertus, Ivo of Chartres, and Hildebert of Le Mans or Tours, as favourable to his view, while Thalhofer quotes from Paschasius Radbertus, Odo of Cambrai, Hildebert of Le Mans, Hugo of S. Victor, Algerus, and Guitmundus Aversanus.

In this chapter we shall examine the passages cited from these authors, and shall then pass to the considera-

Introductory:
Impetus given
to the study of
the E. S. in
cent. IX. ;

which bore
fruit in cent.
XII. in mys-
tical works
on the liturgy.

Of these Mr.
Brightman
claims Pas-
chasius Rad-
bertus, Ivo of
Chartres, and
Hildebert of
Tours as fa-
vourable to his
view.

Thalhofer adds

Guitmundus, Odo of Cambrai, Hugo of S. Victor, and Algerus.

Only passages adduced in support of the Modern theory considered here.

The mediæval writers frequently speak of a "heavenly altar," from which Thalhofer infers a heavenly S.

I. Examination of the passages quoted.
1. Paschasius Radbertus.

tion of a school of Gallican writers in the seventeenth century, to whom we have already referred,—De Conden, Olier, Thomassin, and Bossuet,—who are also claimed as giving countenance to the Modern theory.

We shall not, as heretofore, bring forward passages in support of the Catholic view, and for two reasons : (1) Because to do so would require far more space than could be devoted to it in this chapter, and (2) because in the examination of the writers quoted in favour of the Modern school (whom we are quite willing to accept as fair representatives of their age), we shall incidentally show that they all hold the Catholic view and teach that the Eucharist is essentially related to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

The liturgical writers of the Middle Ages, following the precedent of the Fathers and of the ancient liturgies, frequently speak of a "heavenly altar." Thalhofer, therefore, claims them as supporting the Modern view. He says : " All these, without exception, intimately connect that heavenly altar with the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which descends from the heavenly altar to the earthly, and from it ascends again to the heavenly altar, as the Sacrifice of the priest and of the faithful, and is there finally offered with full efficacy."

I. Without commenting on this misleading statement let us examine Thalhofer's authorities in chronological order. His first quotation is from Paschasius Radbertus (ob. 865): * " Do you think that there is any other altar at which CHRIST, the High Priest, stands, than His own Body, through which and on which the prayers of the faithful and the faith of believers are offered to GOD the FATHER? But if you truly believe that heavenly altar to be the Body of

* Pasch. Radb., *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. viii.

CHRIST, you will not now think that you receive the Flesh and Blood from anywhere else than from that very Body of CHRIST." In another place in this same chapter, Paschasius says: "The Flesh of CHRIST is never rightly received unless from His Hand and from the altar on high, where CHRIST, the High Priest of good things to come, stands for us."

Here Paschasius teaches what we have already learned from S. Augustine,* that those who receive the Eucharist unworthily, receive the Sacrament from the hands of the earthly priest, from the altar of the Church on earth; but though they receive the Sacrament, they do not feed on CHRIST, they do not receive from His Hands, from His heavenly altar, His Body and Blood to their souls' health. Therefore Paschasius says: "The Flesh of CHRIST is never rightly received unless from His Hand and from the altar on high."

The passage considered.

This will be still more evident if we give the whole context of the passage quoted by Thalhoffer. It is as follows: "The unhappy man [the unworthy communicant] fears not the presence of the Divine Majesty, since he considers only the things which are seen, nor understands that the Flesh of CHRIST is never rightly received unless from His Hand and from the altar on high where CHRIST, the High Priest of good things to come, stands for us. Wherefore the priest, when he begins to offer these gifts, amongst other things says: 'Command these gifts to be carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angel on to Thine altar on high in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty.' And dost thou, O man, think to receive It from anywhere else than from that altar where, transported on high, It is consecrated?"

This last sentence may at first sight seem favourable

* S. Aug., *Enarrat. in Psalm.*, xxv., n. 10; cf. pp. 255, 256.

Paschasius explains his meaning in the context,

to Thalhoffer. But let us observe carefully the explanation of Paschasius which immediately follows. For in answer to the objection, "How can it be carried away so unexpectedly into heaven, into the presence of the Divine Majesty, when here, whether it be called 'bread' or 'Flesh,' it is all the time held visibly in the hand of the priest," Paschasius replies: "Learn to apprehend something different from what is tasted by the mouth of flesh; to see something different from what is manifested to these fleshly eyes. Learn that GOD, as a Spirit, is locally everywhere. Understand that these things are spiritual, so that neither locally nor indeed carnally are they carried on high into the presence of the Divine Majesty. Consider, then, if anything corporeal can be more sublime than the substance of bread and wine inwardly and efficaciously changed into the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, so that then, after the Consecration, the true Flesh and Blood of CHRIST is believed to be present, and is judged by believers to be nothing else than CHRIST the Bread of heaven. [Then follows Thalhoffer's quotation:] Do you think that there is any other altar at which CHRIST the High Priest stands, than His own Body, through which and on which the prayers of the faithful and the faith of believers are offered to GOD the FATHER? But if you truly believe that heavenly altar to be the Body of CHRIST, you will not now think that you receive the Flesh and Blood from anywhere else than from that very Body of CHRIST."

which refutes Thalhoffer's inference.

As usual we find that the context, which Thalhoffer does not quote, entirely refutes the inference drawn from the passage which he does quote. Paschasius certainly says that the Flesh of CHRIST should never be received except from the Hand of CHRIST and from

the heavenly altar where CHRIST, the High Priest of good things to come, stands ; and he quotes in support of this statement the liturgical prayer *Supplices Te*. But in answer to the objection, How can the gifts be carried to the altar on high when they are visibly held in the hand of the priest, he explains that GOD, as pure spirit, is everywhere, so that you are not to think of the oblations being carried to the altar of GOD on high by any local translation which could be discerned by bodily eyes, but you are to apprehend these things spiritually.

Certainly, he says, there is nothing corporeal which is more sublime than the substance of the bread and wine changed inwardly and efficaciously into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, so that after the Consecration it is no longer considered by the faithful to be bread and wine, but the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST Himself, Who is the Bread from heaven. But, he says, the altar at which CHRIST the High Priest stands, is the very Body of CHRIST, that is, the Humanity of CHRIST, on which and through which the devotions and prayers and faith of believers are offered to the Eternal FATHER. So that, when we ask that our oblations may be carried on to the altar on high in the sight of GOD, we simply pray that through CHRIST'S Intercession for us they may become efficacious. And when we say that the Flesh of CHRIST is taken from the altar on high, we mean that the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST pertains to that Humanity in which He now " appears in the presence of GOD for us."

Paschasius takes the heavenly altar as CHRIST'S Humanity, through which our prayers are offered to GOD.

Besides, Paschasius had said that the Flesh of CHRIST is never rightly received except from the Hand of CHRIST, which he explains more fully in these words : " Each [communicant] ought to consider how

terrible it is amongst the multitude of the angels to approach unworthily to Communion. How terrible, indeed, is that very Sacrament of the Body and Blood, in which the virtue of CHRIST is so fully received, and which is bestowed by no other than by CHRIST Himself, the High Priest, although the visible priest seems to be present, and to distribute to each. . . . For who worthily receives His Flesh and Blood, unless from Him whose Flesh it is? ” There is certainly nothing in these words to support Thalhofer’s view.

Paschasius :
another
passage.

He quotes, however, some other passages. From the twelfth chapter of the same work he cites the following: “ Holy Scripture shows that He always stands at the altar of the altar on high, so that from His immolation we may receive His Body and Blood.” * But Paschasius in many places shows what he means by this “ immolation ” on the heavenly altar, as, for instance, when in the same connection, treating of the functions of the Mediator in heaven, he writes as follows: “ He is made High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, as the Apostle teaches, in order that He may intercede for us, offering Himself to the FATHER.” And again: “ A fitting Advocate, He intercedes for those who are sinning against Him (as He had before done upon the Cross), by offering Himself to the FATHER.” †

Here Paschasius shows that the Intercession of CHRIST in heaven involves more than mere prayer ; that it is an act of offering in the presence of the FATHER. But it is very clear from the former passages that in speaking of immolation Paschasius is referring, not to the heavenly altar, but to the altar of

* Pasch. Radb., *Ibid.*, c. xii.

† *Ibid.*, c. viii., cf. also the end of chap. xii.

the Eucharist ; for he says : “ Behold what faith has instituted, behold what CHRIST has granted, that we may have His Body and Blood, that through these we may be daily translated into the Body of CHRIST. But before the Body of CHRIST becomes present by Consecration, there is the offering of the priest, or, as he says [in the Commemoration of the Living], the offering of each congregation of offerers. But in the word and power of the HOLY SPIRIT a new creature is made in the Body of the Creator, for the restoration of our salvation. [Then follows Thalhofer’s quotation:] Whence Holy Scripture shows that He always stands at the altar of the altar on high, so that from His immolation we may receive His Body and Blood.” *

Again Thalhofer ignores that which precedes this passage and which explains it. Paschasius is only saying in other words that it is not the earthly priest who is the real priest that offers and sacrifices upon the Eucharistic altar, but the GOD-Man, the High Priest for ever.

This is confirmed by another passage, in which he says : † “ But now as it is He Who baptizes, so is it He Who by the HOLY SPIRIT makes this His Flesh and transmutes the wine into His Blood. For Who else could so create in the womb, that the Word might become Flesh ? Thus indeed in this Mystery we must believe that by the same virtue of the HOLY SPIRIT and by His invisible operation, through the word of CHRIST His Flesh and Blood are produced. Whence also the priest says : ‘ Command that these gifts be carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angel on to Thine altar on high in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty.’ But how does He ask that these things may be carried

* Pasch. Radb., c. xii. ad fin.

† Ibid., n. i.

there, unless it be understood that these things are done through His Priesthood? For He is made High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, as the Apostle teaches, in order that He may intercede for us, offering Himself to the FATHER. For this purpose, then, He entered once for all into the Holy place, not by the blood of another, but by His own Blood. From this [we learn that] what is His own is not rightly received from another, but from Himself the great High Priest; nor are His Flesh and Blood produced by any other than by Him Who produced them in the womb of the Virgin, that the Word might be made Flesh."

No trace here of any S. other than the II. E.

In this passage taken as a whole we certainly find no trace of any sacrifice other than that of the Eucharist. And this is the more evident from the title of the chapter, which is, "Whether this Mystery conveys more grace if celebrated by a good priest, or less if offered by a wicked priest."

Mr. Brightman's reference to Paschasius.

Mr. Brightman also sums up the teaching of Paschasius as follows: "According to his [Paschasius'] representation, the Church on earth offers its gifts and devotions through the hands of its organ, the earthly priest; and so far it can be called the Sacrifice of the priest or of the Church. But then in Consecration, by the Word and HOLY SPIRIT, it passes out of our hands, and is translated into the heavenly places, is borne on to the heavenly altar, which is the Body of CHRIST, Who as our High Priest ministers it before the throne of the FATHER, and identifies it with His own 'immolation' of Himself, so that in it (through the double Consecration), 'spiritually, not carnally,' 'in mystery, not in fact,'—for He 'dieth no more,'—His self-immolation is reproduced and commemorated, and so He

gives it back to us as His Body and Blood, in its new power and significance." Mr. Brightman infers from this passage that Paschasius " strives to represent the reality and the mystery of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, to give reality to our action, while limiting it and preserving the unique prerogative of CHRIST our LORD — to represent our co-operation with Him and the absorption of our action into His, and to insist on the reality of His true and abiding Priesthood in His Church, as ' the High Priest of our offerings '—to negative the thought of the Eucharist as a ' bringing down CHRIST from above,' and to enforce that of our gathering round the altar on high, ' with Him in the heavenly places. ' " *

His inference is perfectly just, and all this is entirely consistent with the Catholic doctrine upon the subject ; it proves that our LORD is now, through His Priesthood, offering a proper sacrifice *on earth*, but it in no way proves that He is offering a proper sacrifice in heaven upon which the Eucharist depends for its sacrificial character.

Thalhofer, again, quotes Guitmundus Aversanus † (ob. circa 1090) as teaching that CHRIST at the Right Hand of the FATHER exercises His function of Mediator; that He intercedes and re-presents to the FATHER a universal sacrifice offered on earth ; that He substantially repeats it ; and that the celebration of the Eucharist is a real sign of the functions of the Mediator in heaven.

The passage in Guitmundus from which Thalhofer quotes is as follows : " When CHRIST also in time past

* Brightman, pp. 13, 14.

† Guitmund. Avers., *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi veritate*, l. ii. ; Migne, P. L., tom. 149, col. 1455 sqq.

2. Thalhofer
cites Guitmundus
Aversanus,

was teaching, working miracles, living a most righteous life among men, eating, drinking, sleeping, and manifesting in Himself all the other properties of our humanity, what else was He signifying to us, but that He Himself was GOD and Man? But even now also in His Intercession for us, showing daily His Body with the wounds, in the presence of the FATHER, He signifies that He was born for us, suffered and rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven. The Divine Oblation, also, may, without danger to our faith, be considered to signify these same things."

who is defend-
ing S. Augus-
tine against
Berengarius

In the context, which is too long to quote, Guitmundus is meeting the contention of Berengarius and his followers that S. Augustine* teaches that the food of the LORD'S altar is only a sign and figure of the Body of CHRIST. Guitmundus first points out that no such statement is to be found in S. Augustine; that in the passage referred to S. Augustine says, not that the food of the LORD'S altar is a sign and figure of His Body, but that "the celebration of the Body and Blood of the LORD is a sign of the Passion of CHRIST."

in regard to his
use of the word
"sign."

Guitmundus then goes on to discuss several other passages from S. Augustine, showing in what sense he uses the word "sign," and that the sign and the thing signified may be identical, since CHRIST speaks of Himself as a sign of GOD'S power manifested in His Resurrection,† but He was GOD, and also said, "I am the Resurrection;" ‡ and Simeon also refers to Him as "a Sign which shall be spoken against." §

After this we find the passage in question, from which Thalhofer deduces such an unwarranted conclu-

* S. Aug., *De Doctr. Christ.*, l. iii., c. ix.

† S. Luke xi. 30.

‡ S. John xi. 25.

§ S. Luke ii. 34.

sion. All that Guitmundus says is that as our LORD's life on earth was a sign of His true Humanity; and as His Intercession in heaven, and presentation there of His Body still bearing the marks of the wounds, is a sign that for us He was born, suffered, rose again, and ascended into heaven (since it is the presentation of that same Body in which these acts were performed); so also may it be asserted without danger to our faith, that the Eucharist signifies these same things, since in the Eucharist the same Body is offered.

His reference to the wounds in our LORD's Body merely recalls Rev. v. 6, where our LORD is described as "a Lamb as it had been slaughtered." But the inference which he draws is not what Thalhoffer implies, that our LORD is substantially renewing a sacrificial act in heaven, but rather that by the presence of His Body in heaven He is showing that He was born, suffered, rose again, and ascended into heaven for us, and that in the Eucharist without danger to our faith we may say that the same is signified. What "same"? That He was born, suffered, rose again, and ascended into heaven for us; in other words, that the Eucharist is an extension of the Incarnation, a memorial of the Passion, and commemorates our LORD'S "mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension" by the fact that His glorified Body is there present, and that in it we are united to the worship of the Church in heaven. There is certainly nothing in Guitmundus which supports Thalhoffer's view.

Again, Thalhoffer quotes from B. Odo of Cambrai (ob. 1116): "Wherefore we pray that as CHRIST, when He was about to send the gift of the HOLY GHOST, was translated from earth to heaven in the presence of His disciples, and became invisible to earthly sight, so

Nothing in Guitmundus supports Thalhoffer's views.

3. Thalhoffer quotes from Odo of Cambrai.

this Host may be carried from the earthly altar on which It is immolated, to the altar on high, in the sight of GOD, that from thence we may be filled with all spiritual benediction and grace, so that what is visibly performed on earth may be invisibly done in heaven." *

He is discussing the "Supplices Te."

The full context.

This passage is taken from Odo's comment on the *Supplices Te*, and is, indeed, nothing more than a paraphrase of that prayer. In order that we may understand Odo's view, it will be well to examine the context. He says: "Here it is difficult to understand how we pray that the Body and Blood of our LORD may be carried into the presence of GOD, when it is written that CHRIST always stands before the face of the FATHER, interceding with GOD for us, and we read that CHRIST when He ascended into heaven was exalted over all, sitting at the Right Hand of the FATHER. How, then, do we pray that CHRIST may be carried to a place where He always is? Before this, however, we prayed that GOD's face might be made propitious and favourable towards the Sacrifice of His SON, not as though the FATHER could be unpropitious to His SON, but that in the mention of the SON as propitiating the FATHER we are including ourselves [that is, we are praying], that for love of the SON He will have mercy on us, and intimating that if for His sake He does not receive us, He is slighting the SON. So in this prayer also we ask that the SON may be carried to the FATHER (although on our behalf He always is with the FATHER), in order that our prayers and devotions may come to the FATHER through the SON, and that by the virtue of so great a Sacrifice our prayers

* Odo Cam., *Expos. in Can. Miss.*, dist. iii.; Migne, P. L., tom. cxi.

may be carried into the presence of GOD. For if our prayers do not make their way thither, it would be as though the SON had not ascended to the FATHER."

Then follows the passage quoted by Thalhofer : " Wherefore we pray that as CHRIST, when He was about to send the gift of the HOLY GHOST, was translated from earth to heaven in the presence of His disciples, and became invisible to earthly sight, so this Host may be carried from the earthly altar *on which It is immolated*, to the altar on high, in the sight of GOD, that from thence we may be filled with all spiritual benediction and grace, so that what is visibly performed on earth may be invisibly done in heaven."

Odo continues : " Here the Sacrifice is offered, there it is accepted, not by change of place, nor by succession of time ; not that the translation as a movement begun in this place is afterwards completed in another place, but in the same place that which was bread becomes the Flesh of the Word. There is no translation of place, that from bread it may become Flesh, but it is translated from the altar to heaven because it is translated from bread to GOD. But since GOD is everywhere, it is not by change of place that the Flesh made from bread is joined to GOD. In an unseen manner it is translated inwardly to GOD ; outwardly it does not move visibly from the altar. The Sacrifice offered on the altar by the devotion of man is accepted in heaven by the propitiation of GOD. For it is then in a certain sense accepted by GOD when GOD is made propitious to us, and a heavenly benediction is sent from Him to us. But CHRIST needed not the help of angels when by His own power He ascended into heaven. Why, then, do we ask that this Sacrifice may be carried by the hands of an angel into the presence of GOD,

since the offices of angels are unnecessary to this translation? But what is said is this: that by the translation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST we ask that our prayers may be carried [to the throne of grace]. There are, however, angels appointed for us, who daily offer our prayers to GOD, whence it is written that 'their angels do always behold the face of the FATHER.'* So in mentioning CHRIST we ask that our prayers may be carried by the hands of an angel, that, under the plea of so great a Sacrifice, good angels may bear our prayers to the throne of grace."

This is perhaps a good place at which to call attention to the unsatisfactory character of some of Thalhofer's quotations. Because he finds the phrase, "We pray that this Host may be carried from the earthly altar to the altar on high, in the sight of GOD," he quotes Odo as believing in a heavenly sacrifice, whereas the context clearly shows two things: First, that in these words Odo is simply paraphrasing the prayer on which he is commenting, and that he understands this prayer only in a mystical sense, and as equivalent to a petition that in union with the Sacrifice of the Eucharist our prayers may ascend to GOD, and that the Sacrifice has a propitiatory character. Secondly, that Odo believed that "here the Sacrifice is offered, there it is accepted," that "it is immolated on the earthly altar and carried to the altar on high."

Odo, however, continues his commentary on this prayer as follows: "We pray Thee . . . that those things which Thou dost behold with propitious and favourable regard may also be borne to Thine invisible and sublime [places], and that Thou wouldest admit them to the presence of Thy Majesty. Herein

* S. Matt. xviii. 10.

The passage cited only a paraphrase of the prayer. Its real purport.

Another passage from Odo.

is need of humiliation, herein of supplication ; herein the consummation of all our labour is, that this Sacrifice may be borne to Thine altar on high in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty. But what does this mean ? What is it to carry the Sacrifice to the altar on high, unless it be to place the sheep upon the shoulders of the Shepherd ? And what does this placing of the sheep on His shoulders mean, except that man was assumed by the Word ? And what is more exalted than the Word of GOD ? Daily the Word of GOD takes into Himself the faithful in the participation of this Sacrifice. The Word of GOD, then, is the altar on high, to which we pray that the Sacrifice may be carried into the presence of GOD, and that we may be presented by Him. The presence of GOD is the Word of the FATHER, in Whom He sees all that He has done. For everything that the FATHER does is in His SON ; for ‘ that which was made in Him was life ; ’ * and ‘ in the beginning GOD created the heavens and the earth, ’ † that is, in the Word ; and ‘ by the Word of GOD were the heavens made ; ’ ‡ and ‘ in Wisdom hath He made all things. ’ § What is more properly called the presence of GOD than His Wisdom, in which He sees all that He does ? What, then, does it mean that the Sacrifice is carried to the altar on high in the sight of GOD, but that our Oblation is joined to the Word, is united to the Word, becomes GOD, and through it we are taken into GOD, and our prayers accepted ? ”

The interpretation of this passage is somewhat difficult, but it seems best to interpret it as referring to ourselves, so that the expression “our Oblation is joined to the Word, is united to the Word, becomes GOD,” means

Its interpretation.

* S. John i. 4 (the ancient reading).

† Gen. i. 1.

‡ Ps. xxxiii. 6.

§ Ps. civ. 24.

that we ourselves, through our Oblation, are joined and united to the Word, and so in a sense are deified, and almost taken into GOD, and in this way our devotions are accepted. For Odo is speaking of a Sacrifice which is already the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Word subsisting under the species, which therefore is rightly said to be the Incarnate Word Himself. But how can the Incarnate Word be "joined to the Word, united to the Word," how can He be conceived of as "becoming GOD"? Besides, whatever interpretation of these words we choose, it is evident that there is no reference whatever to a celestial altar properly so called, to which can be referred a heavenly sacrifice properly so called.

And further, it is evident that Odo at least does not agree with those who consider that the altar on high is CHRIST Himself in His Human Nature, since in this place the altar on high is clearly interpreted of the Word Himself as He is GOD the Word, not as He is the Word Incarnate.

A third passage
from Odo.

Finally, Odo, commenting on the words, "That as many of us as by the participation of this altar shall have received the most holy Body and Blood of Thy SON may be filled with all spiritual benediction and grace," says: "The Church has a visible altar on earth. There is also an invisible altar in heaven with GOD. The Sacrifice which we offer on our altar is joined to GOD and becomes GOD. In this Sacrifice earthly things are joined with heavenly, the creature is united to GOD; since on this altar we receive His creature, we receive GOD from on high. Since here we receive the Body and Blood of CHRIST, we receive GOD from heaven, in Whom we are filled with all spiritual benediction and grace. We receive here visibly the

Body and Blood of CHRIST ; invisibly we receive from heaven, from whence they are sent, the benediction and grace of GOD.”

Stentrup* observes that the meaning of this passage is made clear by what Odo has already said, so that, when Odo writes that the Church has a visible altar on earth, and that there is an invisible altar in the heavens, he does not distinguish two altars properly so called, separated in place, but signifies the character of the Sacrifice which is *immolated on our altar*, which by the change of the bread becomes the Flesh of GOD the Word, and therefore is not moved outwardly or visibly from the altar, but inwardly and invisibly by change of substance is translated into the substance of the Word of GOD.

Stentrup's
comment on
this passage.

For we must remember that in Odo's time the term “transubstantiation” had already been coined, and that the doctrine which it represented was keenly discussed. Wherefore you have in the Eucharistic Sacrifice earthly things joined with heavenly, that is, an earthly altar with a heavenly altar, earthly accidents with heavenly substance ; the creature, therefore, with GOD. Whence if we receive from our visible altar the Body and Blood of CHRIST under the species of bread and wine, we receive GOD, since these are His Body and Blood. But in GOD we are filled with all benediction and grace. Here, indeed, we receive visibly the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST ; but invisibly from heaven, whither they are carried, we receive the benediction and grace of GOD.

From these passages we are justified in asserting not only that Odo of Cambrai gives no support to the idea of a heavenly sacrifice as distinct from the Eucharist,

Odo gives no
support to
Thalhofer's
theory.

* Stentrup, *Soteriologia*, tom. 2, pp. 324, 325.

but that his explanation of the *Supplices Te* is inconsistent with any such view.

4. Mr. Brightman refers to S. Ivo of Chartres and Hildebert of Tours.

Mr. Brightman (not Thalhofer) next cites S. Ivo of Chartres (ob. 1113). He says that the interpretation of Paschasius "is identical with that suggested by some mystical exponents in the Middle Ages—like S. Ivo of Chartres and S. Hildebert of Tours—who expound the liturgy by putting it in parallel with the Levitical sacrifice of the Day of Atonement and with our LORD'S work, as expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews—and in this parallel the Consecration and Sacrifice of the Eucharist are made to correspond, not to the slaying of the victim and the act of the Cross, but to the sprinkling of the blood within the Holiest, and to our LORD'S continuous propitiatory work on the Throne of the FATHER." *

Mr. Brightman's statements both misleading and inaccurate.

In this passage we have to deal both with facts and inferences. Let us take S. Ivo of Chartres first :

Mr. Brightman here makes certain definite statements in regard to S. Ivo of Chartres, which seem to us both misleading and singularly inaccurate, and which must therefore be investigated with the greatest care. He gives no references, but is of course referring to the Fifth Sermon of S. Ivo, otherwise known as his *Opusculum de convenientia veteris et novi Sacrificii*. This opusculum is longer than S. Ivo's other sermons. It is a most interesting treatise on the points of agreement between the sacrifices of the Old and New Testaments; that is, a comparison of some of the most striking types in the Jewish sacrifices with their fulfilment in the sacrificial work of our BLESSED LORD. In Migne's edition † it occupies rather more than twenty-seven

S. Ivo's work on the S. S. of the Old and New Testaments.

* Brightman, p. 15.

† S. Ivo Carn., Migne, P. L., tom. clxii., col. 535-562.

columns, of which less than one-half are devoted to those types which are fulfilled in the liturgy.

As S. Ivo's sermon is a good example of that mystical treatment of the liturgy so prevalent in the twelfth century (of which Amalarius in the ninth century may be considered the author), and as he is one of the earliest, if not the earliest, writer in whom we find the conception of our LORD'S Intercession in heaven as a pleading of His Passion, we shall give a full account of this work with a translation of those parts to which Mr. Brightman refers.

S. Ivo divides the liturgy into two parts. The first, the *Missa Catechumenorum*, from the Introit to the Offertory, he interprets by our LORD'S first Advent, and by those sacrifices which the Jewish priests offered without the veil, within sight and hearing of the people. The second, the *Missa Fidelium*, from the Offertory to the end, he interprets by our LORD'S Passion on earth and Intercession in heaven, and by the action of the Jewish priest on the Day of Atonement not only within the veil, but in sending the scapegoat into the wilderness, in washing his garments, and in the other ritual acts which took place after he had returned to the people from the Holy of holies.

S. Ivo is the first, so far as we know, who attempted to put the liturgy in parallel with the ritual of the Day of Atonement. That he has accomplished this with great ingenuity and in a most striking manner, we gladly concede; but we have already called attention* to the fact that while the ritual of the Day of Atonement typifies our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us, it has no essential relation to the Holy Eucharist. Certain

A good example of the mystical treatment of the liturgy.

He divides it into two parts: the first is interpreted by our LORD'S first Advent and by the sacrifices offered without the veil; the second by our LORD'S Passion and Intercession and by the priest's action within the veil and after his return to the people.

S. Ivo the first to attempt this parallel.

* Cf. p. 140.

analogies may be traced between the two, but this is only to be expected, since both are related to the Sacrifice of our LORD ; the one as a typical, the other as a commemorative sacrifice. While, however, this accounts for certain points of resemblance, it does not constitute type and anti-type, in the Biblical sense of the terms.

Its difficulties

The analogies which mystical writers discover in Holy Scripture are often edifying, but they seldom afford a good foundation upon which to build a doctrinal position. Of this we have a very striking illustration in this work of S. Ivo of Chartres, for we shall notice that in applying the ritual of the Day of Atonement to our LORD'S Intercession in heaven and to the Eucharist on earth, he has to be constantly on his guard against falling into the very doctrinal errors which Mr. Brightman ascribes to him. S. Ivo most skilfully avoids them, as we shall show, but in doing so more or less sacrifices the consistent application of his type. Mr. Brightman apparently has overlooked this.

avoided by S. Ivo.

It will facilitate our investigation of S. Ivo's treatise if we put clearly before us what Mr. Brightman tells us we shall find there. He says that S. Ivo expounds "the liturgy by putting it in parallel with the Levitical sacrifices of the Day of Atonement, and with our LORD'S work as expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews ;" and so far he is correct. He goes on to assert that "in this parallel the Consecration and Sacrifice of the Eucharist is made to correspond, not to the slaying of the victim and the act of the Cross, but to the sprinkling of the Blood within the Holiest, and to our LORD'S continuous propitiatory work on the Throne of the FATHER." This statement we believe to be entirely unfounded.

Mr. Brightman's statement about S. Ivo's teaching is entirely unfounded.

We now turn to S. Ivo, and we find that after discussing various sacrificial rites of the Jews, he introduces his treatment of the liturgy with these words : " The sacrifices of which we have spoken, and others which the law commanded to be offered on divers occasions, prefiguring the Priesthood of CHRIST and the events of His Life, of which indeed they were types, the Church renews in a brief representation, when she solemnizes the mysteries of the Mass in her daily celebration throughout the world."

S. Ivo's introduction to his treatment of the liturgy.

S. Ivo begins with the Introit and Litany, which he says represent the devotion and expectation of those who, like Simeon, Anna and others, were longing for the advent of CHRIST. He takes the approach of the priest to the right side of the altar as teaching that our LORD was sent only to " the lost sheep of the House of Israel." After the Introit, he says, follows the Angelic Hymn (the *Gloria in Excelsis*), which reminds us of our LORD'S Nativity in time. Then follows the Collect, which tells of our LORD on the Mount teaching the LORD'S Prayer, and so instituting a form of prayer. The Epistle comes next, representing the preaching of those disciples whom our LORD " sent two and two before His face into every city and place whither He Himself would come." Then the Gospel, when the priest passes to the left side of the altar, signifies that the Apostles offered the Gospel first to the Jews, and, when they rejected it, turned to the Gentiles.

i. The Introit and Litany.

The "Gloria in Excelsis."

The Collect,

Epistle,

Gospel,

After the Gospel comes the Creed, then the offering of the bread and wine, and the general offerings of the people, which latter S. Ivo refers to the offerings at the dedication of Solomon's Temple, the former being connected with the bread and wine which Melchisedec

Creed, and Offertory.

brought forth to Abraham. Many other illustrations from the different Jewish sacrifices follow here.

S. Ivo's introduction to the Canon.

S. Ivo says that "we must notice that all the things which are commemorated from the Introit to the Offertory are properly compared with those sacrifices which the priests offer in the outer tabernacle," since as they were offered in the sight of the people, so the first part of the liturgy is open to catechumens and to those who are not communicants. "Now," he says, "it remains that we show, as GOD shall give us grace, in what way those things which our priests do in the prayers or services of the Mysteries agree with those which the Jewish high priests did within the Holy of holies." *

ii. From the Offertory to the end of the Canon.

The three secrets correspond with the prayers in Gethsemane, and with the three sacrifices of the bullock, ram, and goat.

The "Sursum Corda" and the exhortation to "Watch and pray," The Preface, the ministry of angels, and the cherubim.

The Canon.

S. Ivo then from this point compares the things done within the veil in the type, with the liturgy, and with our LORD'S High-Priestly work. First, he says, the secret prayers which the priest makes after the Offertory correspond with our LORD'S threefold prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, by which He consecrated Himself as the Lamb for the burnt offering. This threefold prayer of our LORD also corresponds to the offering of the bullock, the ram, and the goat upon which the lot fell, each of which typified our LORD as the Sacrifice under a different aspect. The *Sursum Corda* he takes as reminding us of our LORD'S injunction to His disciples in Gethsemane to watch and pray; for he says it is only by watching that we can be worthy to join with angels and archangels in praising and adoring GOD. With the Preface and Sanctus he also associates the cherubim above the mercy-seat in the Holy of holies.

Then begins the Canon of the Mass; and here it will be best for us to give S. Ivo's words more fully. † He

* S. Ivo Carn., Serm. v.; Migne, P. L., clxii., col. 551 et 553.

† S. Ivo Carn., Ibid., col. 554.

says: "The priest prays GOD the FATHER that through our Mediator, to Whom is given all power in heaven and earth, the sacramental offerings may be blessed ; that is, may be translated into that truth which was foreshadowed by the sacrifices offered on the Day of Atonement ; for these were three : a bullock, a ram, and two goats, and these are commemorated under the three terms, '*hæc dona,*' '*hæc munera,*' '*hæc sancta sacrificia,*' although," he remarks, "they represent only the one mystery of the LORD'S Passion, by which He reconciled things human and divine. The two goats signify the two Natures in CHRIST. The Human Nature, in which He suffered for our redemption, is typified by the goat slain for sin, and the Divine Nature by the scapegoat, which was sent 'by the hand of a fit man,' that is, by Himself, into that wilderness in which, having left the ninety-and-nine sheep, the Good Shepherd came to seek the one that was lost. With [*cum*] the blood of these animals, that is, of the bullock and the goat, the high priest entered the Holy of holies ; and our LORD JESUS through [*per*] His own Blood, which was prefigured by the blood of the aforesaid animals, entered into the Holy of holies, having obtained eternal redemption. Our priest also enters for the purpose of celebrating the Holy Mysteries with [*cum*] the Blood of CHRIST, that is, *with the memorial of the LORD'S Passion.* The Levitical priest, as he is entering the tabernacle of the testimony, prays for himself and for his family. CHRIST, when He is *about to ascend into heaven* [*ascensurus*], prays for Himself, saying, 'FATHER, glorify Thy SON, that Thy SON also may glorify Thee.'* He prays also for His family, saying, 'Keep through Thine own Name those whom

The two goats signify CHRIST'S two Natures: the goat slain, His Human Nature; the scapegoat, His Divine Nature.

The "Memento of the Living," the intercession of the Levitical priest, and of CHRIST on earth.

* S. John xvii. 1.

Thou hast given Me.'* Our priest also, when he begins to perform the Sacred Mysteries, prays for the chief Pontiff and for the Holy Church of GOD, and for those in bliss, according to the Apostle, 'that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.' †

The incense of the Day of Atonement is connected with the fragrance of our LORD'S Humanity,

and with the commemoration of the Apostles and Martyrs.

The significance of the breastplate noted.

The incense in the Apocalypse taken of the "Quam Oblationem;"

"The Levitical priest carries with him into the sanctuary coals from the altar on which is burnt the flesh of animals, filling thence his censer. Our High Priest ascends into the tabernacle not made with hands, carrying with Him a Body redolent with the fragrance of every virtue, which as living coals from the altar His Humanity takes from the fire of the HOLY SPIRIT, that burns up the flesh of evil desire. Our priest also carries with him coals taken from the same altar, when he commemorates the Apostles and certain Martyrs, who, quickened from the dead by the love of the SPIRIT, themselves also burn in themselves with divine love, and strive by their example to quicken others from the dead."

S. Ivo points out that this memorial was typified by the breastplate of the Aaronic high priest, on the stones of which were inscribed the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel; and he says that "this signifies that, besides faith in the Holy Trinity and evangelical doctrine, the priest in celebrating ought to make a memorial of our forefathers."

He then says: "In the Apocalypse also we read of our High Priest, who was the Angel of Great Counsel, that when He fills the censer from the fire of the altar, that is, from the Omnipotent Divinity dwelling in the Body of CHRIST, so great a cloud of virtues goes forth from Him that it surpasses all human understanding.

* S. John xvii. 2.

† 1 S. Tim. ii. 2.

‘ For GOD giveth not the SPIRIT by measure unto Him.’* And when our priest celebrates the Mysteries of the New Testament and prays, the subtlety of the prayer [of the liturgy] is as great as that of the smoke of incense directed to GOD ; which prayer also surpasses human reason and all understanding. For the priest prays that our LORD may make the oblation placed upon the altar ‘ blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable,’ ” each of which terms S. Ivo explains in the usual manner.

Then we read : “ After these general expressions the priest spiritually indicates what he is asking for, that is, that these bodily materials [the bread and wine] may become to us the Body and Blood of CHRIST. This prayer covers the mercy-seat with the smoke of the most subtle perfumes, and asks that the earthly and corruptible matter may be incorporated with His heavenly and incorruptible Body. But faith alone is used for this depth of the Divine Counsel, and goes forth to things within the veil, into which faith could have no entrance if it strove to prove by the arguments of human reason the mysteries which are there contained.”

“ The priest, who serves the shadow, turning to the east, sprinkles the mercy-seat, the sanctuary, and the tabernacle with the blood of the bullock, and, with the same rite, with the blood of the goat which had been sacrificed (*immolati*) ; for the same CHRIST Who was prefigured by the bullock, and was signified by the goat offered for sin (even CHRIST ascending to the east, that is, to the FATHER from Whom He came forth), sprinkles (*aspergit*) Him, that is, the FATHER, Whom by the sprinkling of His Blood He *had made* (*fecit*) propitious

its spiritual
significance
pointed out.

The sprinkling
of the mercy-
seat with
blood

typifies
CHRIST'S
Mediatorial
work
in heaven,

* S. John iii. 34.

to us. He sprinkles also the sanctuary and the tabernacle, for, entering into the sanctuary by His own Blood, He reconciled things human and divine, as the Apostle says : ' It pleased the FATHER . . . by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself ; by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.' * That is, the Church, which on earth, on account of the disobedience of our first parents, was lost, but in heaven, through the fall of the rebel angels, was diminished. Our priest in the sacred ministry, as within the veil, copies this sprinkling (*hanc aspersionem*) † of the Blood of CHRIST *as often as*, turning to the east from whence the SAVIOUR came to us, when naming the Mysteries themselves by their typical or proper names, *he signs the same with the sign of the Cross.*"

and the sign of the Cross made over the elements before and after the Consecration.

We must notice that S. Ivo is here interpreting only the prayer *Quam oblationem*, which *precedes* the Consecration.

He continues : " For what does it mean, in the Mysteries themselves, to sign the sign of the Cross over the things which have been or are to be consecrated, *unless it be to commemorate the Death of the LORD?* Whence also the LORD, when delivering the form of Consecration of His Body and Blood, says, ' Do this in remembrance of Me ' — ' As often as ye do this, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come.' The sprinkling of the Blood of CHRIST having been commemorated in the LORD'S words, the words of the Mysteries follow, commemorating the same sprinkling

The act of Consecration is referred solely to the Death on the Cross.

* Col. i. 19, 20.

† "*Hanc aspersionem*," that is, the last-mentioned sprinkling, by which CHRIST *had made* the FATHER propitious to us; the tense of "*fecit*" shows this to have been the blood-shedding upon the Cross, not the sprinkling in heaven, which is indicated by the present tense "*aspergit*."

of the Blood [on the Cross] by the voice of the priest addressing his prayer to the FATHER: 'Wherefore, O LORD, we Thy servants, as also Thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Thy SON, offer to Thy Majesty,' etc. That is, we commemorate through these Thy visible gifts, the Sacrifice offered to Thee, a pure Sacrifice, a holy Sacrifice, an unspotted Sacrifice; pure, that is, without the leaven of malice; holy, that is, consecrated to Thee; unspotted, that is, such as was signified by those animals without spot which were sought for sacrifice. And the priest thus prays, that this commemoration of the true Sacrifice may be accepted by GOD the FATHER, as were accepted the gifts of Abel, of Abraham, of Melchisedec, in whose offerings the Sacraments of the new priesthood were typically begun. For what is figured by Abel but CHRIST, who though innocent was slain by the wicked? What by Abraham, but the obedience by which He was obedient to the FATHER, even unto death? What, again, by Melchisedec, but that the same CHRIST changes bread and wine into His Body, and entrusts to His disciples this rite of the new priesthood?"

S. Ivo goes on to point out* that after the offering of incense and the sprinkling of the sanctuary and tabernacle and altar with the blood of the bullock and the goat, the sons of Aaron laid their hands on the head of the scapegoat, and when they had imprecated upon it the sins of the Children of Israel, sent it living into the wilderness. Then the high priest returned into the camp, praying for his household and for all the congregation of the people of Israel. He interprets this of the Jews, who in our LORD'S Passion laid their

In the "Unde et Memores" the S. is offered,

and in the "Supra Quæ" the priest prays that it may be accepted.

S. Ivo then takes the "Supplices Te" of the scapegoat, and the high priest's return to the camp as typifying our LORD'S Ascension and Intercession.

* S. Ivo Carn., Ibid., col. 557.

hands upon Him, and imprecated upon themselves His Blood when they cried, " His Blood be on us and on our children." * Then he says : " They sent our LORD living into the wilderness, for they could not touch His Divinity. They sent Him away to ascend, freed by the death of the flesh, to that solitary glory which He had with the FATHER ; ' by a fit man,' that is, by Himself ; ' carrying the sins of the Children of Israel,' that is, taking away the sins of the world, not retaining them. This our priest commemorates by saying to GOD the FATHER : ' Command these gifts to be carried by the hands of Thine Holy Angel on to Thine altar on high.' Who is this Angel, but the Angel of Great Counsel, Who with His own Hands, that is, by works endued with peculiar dignity, merited to ascend the heavens and to raise Himself upon the altar on high, that is, to intercede for us at the Right Hand of the FATHER ? The high priest then returned into the camp ; and our LORD said to His disciples, telling them of His Ascension, ' I am with you always, unto the end of the world.' " †

" Both these acts the priest imitates, first, by his prayers, raising the Body of CHRIST above all the height of heavenly things; then, as if returning to the camp, he prays ' that as many as by the participation of this altar shall have received the holy Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved SON, may be fulfilled with all heavenly benediction.' Behold, the words of the blessed Apostle Andrew come to mind, in which he asserts both that the Body of our LORD is in heaven and that the Body of the LORD can be received from the altar ; Whose Flesh, he says, although it be eaten and His Blood drunk by the people on earth, nevertheless

The mystery of our LORD'S Presence in the H. E. while still in heaven must be apprehended by faith.

* S. Matt. xxvii. 25.

† S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

He Himself continues whole and living in heaven at the Right Hand of the FATHER until the time of restitution of all things. If you seek how this can be, I shall briefly answer that the mystery is of faith ; that it is *possible* to inquire into it with advantage, but that it cannot be inquired into without danger."

Then, after alluding to the disciples who left our LORD because they stumbled at His words, " Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," * he quotes S. Augustine's Exposition of the Fifty-fourth Psalm : † " Until the age is finished the LORD is above; but nevertheless it is true that the LORD is here with us. Behold, we have CHRIST whole in heaven, through the exhibition of the Flesh interceding with the FATHER for us. We have also His Body whole in the Sacrament of the altar."

S. Augustine
quoted.

" In the heavens the prayer of the SON is: ' FATHER, I will that where I am, there may also My servant be.' † This prayer is for His family, for His members, and signifies that the high priest, when he has returned into the camp, washes his garments. For CHRIST in the camp, that is, in the Church, washes His garments when through Baptism or through Confession He cleanses our sins ; for we are His garment, as the prophet says, ' Thou shalt be clothed with all these as with a garment.' The priest also washes his garments when, descending from the height of the Mysteries to the care of lower things, he mourns for the sins of the people who cling to him, and strives to reconcile them

The washing
of the high
priest's gar-
ments taken of
Baptism and
Confession,

* S. John vi. 53.

† S. Aug., *Ennar. in Psalm.*, liv., n. 3 (a paraphrase rather than a quotation).

‡ S. John xvii. 24, xii. 26.

and of our
LORD'S work
of reconcilia-
tion.

The mention
of the Apostles
and Saints con-
nected with the
high priest's
breastplate
and ephod.

Commemora-
tion of the
Saints

and of their
merits.

to GOD by his prayers, saying with the prophet, ' Who shall give water to Mine Head, and fountains of tears to Mine Eyes, that I may mourn the slain of my people.' * The following prayers, which make mention both of the dead and of the living, contain these things. But we must note that among these prayers the suffrages of the Saints, of the Apostles, and of the Martyrs are employed, by whose example the present Church asks to be moulded, and that she may be fortified by their merits. But this commemoration of the Fathers who have gone before agrees with the ancient priesthood. For the high priest entering into the sanctuary carried upon two of his vestments the names of the patriarchs, that is, on the breastplate and on the ephod, which were bound together, the HOLY SPIRIT signifying that the priest of CHRIST should strive to put in operation that righteousness and truth which he has in his heart ; for the place for carrying the burden is the shoulder."

" Corresponding with this in our sacraments a twofold commemoration of the Saints is made, in order that our priests may both meditate upon in heart and imitate in act, the deeds of the Saints. After this commemoration of the Saints, the priest, presuming nothing on his own merits, prays that by the merits of the Saints we may attain to that which we cannot by our own merits gain, and this only through the Mediator, Who for us was made a propitiation, redemption, and sanctification, by Whom these sacraments were instituted for us, as a medicine for our wounds." And then follows: "*Per quem hæc omnia creas.*"

Here S. Ivo's treatment of the Canon ends. It is not necessary that we should give his exposition of the

* Jer. ix. 1.

Communion and Post-Communion, further than to call attention to one point. He notices the fact that "on the Day of Atonement the priest, after the flesh of the bullock and goat had been burnt outside the camp, did not return into the camp until he had washed his vestments and his flesh, which signified the cleansing of things exterior and interior. Yet, according to the law, although thus washed, he was considered unclean until the evening, for those who burnt the flesh of the victims without the camp prefigured the Passion which CHRIST suffered without the city; but *our priests in the celebrations of the Mass commemorated the Passion* [which our LORD] *suffered*, which Passion [the Jewish priests] as we have said, prefigured." *

S. Ivo again asserts that the H. E. commemorates the Passion.

We have now before us S. Ivo's treatment of the liturgy, in which we are unable to discover the slightest support of Mr. Brightman's theory. Indeed, the only part of Mr. Brightman's statement which seems to us warranted is that S. Ivo puts in parallel, not with the Holy Eucharist, but with the prayers and ceremonies of the liturgy, the ritual of the Day of Atonement, and our LORD'S life and work on earth and in heaven. In order to make this clear we shall draw special attention to those parts of S. Ivo's treatise which throw light upon Mr. Brightman's statement.

Mr. Brightman's statement compared with S. Ivo's words.

i. S. Ivo distinguishes between what was done on the Day of Atonement in the presence of the people, and what took place within the veil. This he parallels in the liturgy with the *Pro Anaphora* and *Anaphora*, the *Missæ Catechumenorum* and the *Missæ Fidelium*, the Ordinary of the Mass and the Mysteries or Canon.

i. The "Anaphora," the Jewish ritual, paralleled with our LORD'S actions on earth.

The first corresponds to our LORD'S public life. The second, within the veil, the Mysteries, corresponds

* S. Ivo Carn., *Ibid.*, col. 560, 561.

with His Passion, which took place *on earth, not in heaven*; for he says of the three Secrets, the prayers immediately after the Offertory, that they accord with our LORD'S prayers in the Garden of Gethsemane; while he connects the *Sursum Corda* with the injunction to the disciples to watch and pray, and the angelic Preface and *Sanctus* with the ministry of angels and with the cherubim over the mercy-seat.

He tells us that the sign of the Cross made in the Mysteries themselves over the unconsecrated as well as the consecrated elements, commemorates the Death of the LORD. S. Ivo also puts into this part of his parallel the prayers which our LORD made before His Ascension. "FATHER, glorify Thy SON, that Thy SON also may glorify Thee;" and "Keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me." Thus far, therefore, we may observe that the things within the veil correspond at least to many things which occurred before our LORD'S Ascension, and not to His Intercession in heaven only.

ii. The three sacrifices represent only the Passion.

ii. S. Ivo says that three sacrifices were offered on the Day of Atonement, "a bullock, a ram, and two goats," and that "these are commemorated under the three terms *hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia*, although they represent only the one mystery of the LORD'S Passion, by which He reconciled things human and divine." Here, then, we are told that the terms in the *Te Igitur* commemorate on the one hand the sacrifices offered on the Day of Atonement, and on the other *only the one mystery of the LORD'S Passion*, not His Intercession.

iii. The incense the fragrance of our LORD'S glorified Body

iii. The incense which the high priest carried into the Holy of holies, S. Ivo tells us, represents our LORD'S Body fragrant with every virtue, and this corresponds

in the liturgy with the commemoration of the Apostles, Martyrs, and others. The breastplate worn by the Aaronic high priest, on the stones of which were inscribed the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, typifies our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, which is not the utterance of prayer, but the presence of His Humanity, in which is comprehended His mystical Body the Church ; and the incense represents, as we have seen, the fragrance of our LORD'S glorified Body, of a Sacrifice, that is, which had been offered on earth, and the sweet savour of which had ascended to heaven.

which had been offered on earth.

iv. We now reach the crucial point. Is Mr. Brightman correct in saying that S. Ivo makes " the act of Consecration and Sacrifice of the Eucharist . . . correspond not to the slaying of the Victim and the act of the Cross, but to the sprinkling of the Blood within the holiest, and to our LORD'S propitiatory work on the Throne of the FATHER ? " To answer it we must examine S. Ivo's words with care, and translate them accurately.

iv. The crucial point the act of Consecration.

S. Ivo says : " The priest who serves the shadow, turning to the east, sprinkles the mercy-seat, the sanctuary, and the tabernacle with the blood of the bullock, and, with the same rite, with the blood of the goat which had been sacrificed (*immolati*). " S. Ivo uses the word *immolati*, and by this shows that in his opinion the sacrifice had been made, and that it was therefore the blood of a finished sacrifice which was carried into the Holy of holies to be sprinkled or applied to the mercy-seat. If he had held Mr. Brightman's view, he would have used the word *immolandi*, the goat that was going to be sacrificed ; or, *mactati* or *cæsi*, the goat which had been slain as the initial act of

The mercy-seat sprinkled with the blood of a S. which had been offered. The force of " *immolati*. "

a sacrifice ; but in using the word *immolati* he employs a term which, while it does not necessarily convey any idea of slaughter, does imply that the sacrificial action had been performed.

We must carefully bear this in mind as we proceed to examine S. Ivo's application of it to our LORD's fulfilment of the type. He says : " For the same CHRIST Who was prefigured by the bullock, and was signified by the goat offered for sin (even CHRIST ascending to the east, that is, to the FATHER from Whom He came forth), sprinkles (*aspergit*) Him, that is, the FATHER, Whom by the sprinkling of His Blood He *had made* (*fecit*) propitious to us."

We cannot but be struck with the care with which S. Ivo avoids saying what Mr. Brightman appears to think he says ; for as he employed the past participle *immolati* to show that the blood carried within the Holy of holies was the blood of a finished sacrifice, so in applying the type he says that our LORD, ascending into heaven, sprinkles the FATHER (*aspergit*, the present tense), Whom by the sprinkling of His Blood He had made (*fecit*, perfect tense) propitious to us. Here the sprinkling by which the FATHER was made propitious to us is *not the sprinkling which took place on our LORD'S Ascension* into heaven, but the sprinkling which had been made on the Cross.

There is no other way to explain the contrast between the present *aspergit* and the perfect *fecit* ; and if it be asked, What then does S. Ivo mean by sprinkling the FATHER in heaven ? the answer is clear. He means our LORD'S Intercession, which with all theologians of his day he conceived to be the application of a finished sacrifice.

This expression, " the sprinkling of the FATHER," so

The sprinkling
in heaven of
Blood which
had made the
FATHER pro-
pitious.
The force of
"fecit."

far as we know, originated with S. Ivo, but it is often met with in later writers of the twelfth century. It reappears in the works of Hildebert of Le Mans or Tours, a younger contemporary of S. Ivo, whose mystical verses, *De Mysterio Missæ*, are little more than a commentary in verse on S. Ivo's sermon. Hildebert, however, makes clear what we have said, namely, that "the sprinkling in heaven" is nothing more than a commemoration or mention of the blood-shedding on the Cross, for he says : * "The priest [in heaven] therefore then sprinkles the FATHER when the mention of the Blood once for all sprinkled appeases Him."

*"Tunc ergo Sacrifex aspergit sanguine Patrem,
Quum semel aspersi mentio placat eum."*

Again, we must observe accurately in what way S. Ivo applies this type to the Eucharist. He says : "This last (*hanc*) sprinkling of the Blood of CHRIST [that is, the blood-shedding on the Cross by which the FATHER had been propitiated] our priest imitates in the sacred Mysteries, as if within the veil, as often as, turning to the east, from whence the SAVIOUR came to us, and naming the Mysteries themselves by their typical or proper names, he signs the same with the sign of the Cross. For what does it mean in the Mysteries themselves, to sign the sign of the Cross over the things which have been, or are to be, consecrated, *unless it be to commemorate the Death of the LORD?* Whence also, the LORD, when delivering the form of Consecration of His Body and Blood, says, 'Do this in remembrance of Me'—'As often as ye do this, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come.' The sprinkling of the Blood of CHRIST having then been commemo-

S. Ivo the author of the expression, "sprinkling the FATHER."

Ven. Hildebert's explanation of S. Ivo's words.

S. Ivo's application of the blood-shedding to the liturgy.

* Ven. Hildebert Cenoman, *De Mysterio Missæ*; Migne, P. L., tom. clxxi., col. 1188.

rated in the LORD'S words, the words of the Mysteries follow, commemorating the same sprinkling of the Blood by the voice of the priest addressing his prayer to the FATHER : ' *Unde et memores* ' "—etc.

The force of " *hanc aspersionem* " connects the action of the liturgy with that of the Cross.

Once more we notice how carefully S. Ivo by the very words he uses guards against Mr. Brightman's error, for he says, " *Hanc aspersionem*," this last sprinkling of the Blood of CHRIST, that is, the last one he has spoken of, by which the FATHER was made propitious, the blood-shedding of the Cross. This sprinkling our priest imitates in the sacred Mysteries as often as, naming the Mysteries themselves by their typical or proper names (*hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia*, etc.), he signs the same with the sign of the Cross. We may observe, too, that these signs of the Cross occur in the prayer *Te Igitur*, which *precedes* the Consecration, and therefore is neither the act of Consecration nor the Sacrifice; and that S. Ivo says, " This commemorates not our LORD'S work in heaven, but the Death of the LORD."

The act of Consecration commemorates the Death on the Cross,

Then passing to the words of Consecration, the essentially sacrificial act, he adds : " Whence also the LORD when delivering the form of Consecration of His Body and Blood says, ' Do this in remembrance of Me '—' As often as ye do this, ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come. ' " Here is no intimation that S. Ivo considers the act of Consecration to refer to our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, but an assertion that it commemorates the Death of the LORD, since the sentence which immediately precedes the word " whence " is, " For what does it mean in the Mysteries themselves to sign the sign of the Cross over the things which have been, or are to be, consecrated, unless it be to commemorate the Death of the LORD ? "

and not our LORD'S action in heaven.

He continues: "The sprinkling of the Blood of CHRIST [upon the Cross] having been commemorated in the LORD'S words, the words of the Mysteries follow commemorating the same sprinkling of the Blood by the voice of the priest addressing his prayer to the FATHER."

It is clear, therefore, that S. Ivo traces no connection between what is, strictly speaking, the act of Consecration, and our LORD'S action in heaven, but distinctly makes it correspond to the Death upon the Cross.

v. After the *Unde et Memores* S. Ivo interprets the *Supplices Te*, and this he takes not of the *sacrifice* on the Day of Atonement, but of the scapegoat which was sent into the wilderness by the hands of "a fit man" after the sins of the people had been imprecated upon it. And he refers this to our LORD'S Ascension. For he says that "the Jews who laid their hands upon our LORD in His Passion imprecated upon themselves His Blood, and then sent Him living into the wilderness freed by the death of the flesh, sent Him away to ascend to that solitary glory which He had with the FATHER, 'by a fit man;' that is, by Himself, carrying the sins of the Children of Israel; that is, taking away the sins of the world, not retaining them." This he tells us the priest at the altar commemorates in the prayer, "Command these gifts to be carried by the hands of Thine Holy Angel on to Thine altar on high." This is the first prayer of the liturgy which is referred to our LORD'S action in heaven, and this prayer comes *after* the act of Consecration. Duchesne points out, as we have already noticed,* that it corresponds with the Greek Epiklesis. Some

v. The "Supplices Te" corresponds with the scapegoat and with the Ascension.

Duchesne considers this the Epiklesis, which is

* Pp. 169, 170.

neither the act of Consecration nor the sacrificial act,

and has no place in the English liturgy.

Our LORD'S Intercession corresponds with the high priest's prayer and washing, and with Baptism and Penance in the Church. The "Memento" and the "Nobis quoque" connected with the breastplate and ephod.

Mr. Brightman's statement contrary to facts.

theologians of the Greek Church and a few in the English Church (of whom we believe Mr. Brightman is one), teach that the Consecration is not validly accomplished until the Epiklesis has been said. But Bessarion, speaking for the Greeks at the Council at Florence, pointed out that this was not the teaching of S. Chrysostom and the ancient Greek Fathers.* As there is no invocation of the HOLY SPIRIT in the English liturgy, it is a little difficult to see how an English priest can hold that it is essential to the Consecration. This, however, is outside our argument, and we have only to draw attention to the fact that our LORD'S Ascension is connected by S. Ivo with the *Supplices Te*, which is found after the act of Consecration.

Our LORD'S Intercession is made to correspond with the prayer of the high priest for his family and with the washing of his garments after his return to the camp. This S. Ivo refers to our LORD'S ministry in His Church, through Baptism and Confession, by which He cleanses us from our sins; for we are His garments. He also says that the following prayers, that is, the *Memento etiam Domine* and *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, in which mention is made of the dead and of the living, contain these things and correspond to the breastplate and ephod of the high priest upon which were written the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel.

We have devoted much space to the discussion of S. Ivo's work, partly on account of its intrinsic interest, but chiefly because Mr. Brightman makes a statement about S. Ivo which seems to us absolutely contrary to facts, and in order to prove this a very full examination

* Baronius (Raynaldus), tom. xxviii., p. 281; cf. also Mansi, tom. xxxi., p. 1006; and Bessarion, *De Eucharistia*, tom. xxvi., p. 796.

was necessary of that part of S. Ivo's treatise to which Mr. Brightman refers.

Our readers will see that S. Ivo *does not* make the act of Consecration in the Holy Eucharist correspond with our LORD'S action in heaven, but with our LORD'S Death upon the Cross. His action in heaven is connected with the *Supplices Te*, the *Memento etiam Domine*, and the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*; three prayers which come *after* the act of Consecration, and which S. Ivo refers, not to the sprinkling of the blood in the Holy of holies, but to the sending of the scapegoat into the wilderness, the washing of the priest's garments, and the wearing of the breastplate. It is inconceivable how anyone who had read S. Ivo's treatise could have so misrepresented his teaching.

Both Thalhoffer and Mr. Brightman quote the Ven.* Hildebert of Le Mans or Tours (ob. 1134) as favourable to their view, because they say that he speaks of a sprinkling of our LORD'S Blood in heaven, from which they infer a heavenly sacrifice.

The work which they cite is Hildebert's verses, *De Mysterio Missæ*. In the following lines (to a part of which we have already referred), Hildebert treats of the prayer *Supplices Te*:

"Tunc ergo sacrificex aspergit sanguine Patrem.
 Quum *semel aspersi* mentio placat eum.
 Tunc idem cœtus aspergit cœlicolarum,
 Quum *semel aspersi* mentio supplet eos.
 Tunc aspergit et hos, quos abluit unda salutis,

S. Ivo's teaching summed up.

5. Mr. B. and Thalhoffer cite V. Hildebert of Tours.

His verses on the "Supplices Te."

* Mr. Brightman calls this writer *Saint* Hildebert; he was, however, never canonized, though very generally entitled "Blessed" or "Venerable." Cf. *Histoire de L'Eglise du Mans*, tome iii., pp. 431-628, and *Histoire Littéraire de la France* (by the Benedictines), tome xi., pp. 250-412.

Quum *semel aspersi* mentio purgat eos.
 Presbyter hæc satagens, sumpta sibi supplici forma,
 In sublime geri mystica dona rogat.
 Addit et erectus, ut participatio mensæ,
 Quotquot eam sument, prosit et intus alat.”

Here, by the sprinkling of our LORD'S Precious Blood, Hildebert evidently understands the application of the Blood shed upon the Cross in His Intercession in heaven, in the Eucharistic Sacrifice on earth, and in the administration of the Sacraments. For he explicitly states that the High Priest in heaven sprinkles the FATHER with Blood when by the mention of the Blood shed once for all upon the Cross He makes Him propitious, and that those on earth are sprinkled with this Blood when the mention of it is applied to the washing away of the sins (in Penance) of the baptized, and the faithful are filled with spiritual benediction and grace by participation in the Holy Communion. For Hildebert says that as often as the Blood is sprinkled, so often is a commemoration made of the Blood once for all sprinkled, or shed.

We see this still more clearly in Hildebert's exposition of the prayer *Te Igitur, Clementissime Pater* :

On the “*Te Igitur*.”

“Intrabat præsul vitulorum sanguine sacrum,
 Intravit proprio Christus et ipse polum.
 Intrat agens sacrificex in sanguine semper ad aram,
 Effusi semper sanguinis ipse memor.
 Nam quoties fusum verbo, cruce, mente retractat,
 Hunc specie toties in sacrosancta gerit.
Quippe velut quidam cruor est meminisse cruoris,
Hujus nos memores crux iterata facit.
Mentio mortis adest, ubicunque perennibus escis
Imprimit uncta manus mystica signa crucis :
 Sic Aaron, Christumque sequens, altare frequentat
 Presbyter ; hunc haustum sanguinis ipse gerit.”

Hildebert, however, did not write all his theology in verse, and we may possibly obtain a better idea of his teaching from his book, *De Expositione Missæ*, in which he treats of every part of the Mass. Commenting on the words of Consecration, he says : “ He Himself also broke the bread which He distributed to the disciples, that He might show that the breaking of His Body and His Passion did not happen without His consent, as He had said before, ‘ I have power to lay down My life.’ ” In this passage Hildebert connects the fraction at the time of Consecration with the Passion.

Some passages from his prose works.

Treating of the words by which the chalice is consecrated, “ For this is the chalice of My Blood of the New and Eternal Testament,” he says : “ In the same way the New Testament, that is, the Gospel, in which are contained the promises of eternal life and of the heavenly country, is confirmed in the Blood of the Passion of CHRIST, which is daily celebrated in the Church ; for every testament is confirmed in the death of the testator.’ ”

In both these passages, it would appear, Hildebert explicitly connects the act of Consecration with our LORD’S Passion and Death, and not with the sprinkling of the blood in the Jewish tabernacle, nor with any sacrifice which our LORD is supposed to be offering now in heaven.

The next author quoted by Thalsofer is Hugo of S. Victor (ob. 1141), who in his work, *In Speculo de Mysterioris Ecclesiæ*, commenting on the prayer *Supplices Te*, not only treats it in the same manner, but in almost precisely the same words as Hildebert. For he says : *

6. Hugo of S. Victor merely repeats Hildebert’s thought.

* Hugo, S. Vict., *In Spec. de Myst. Eccl.*, c. vii.

appeasing blood ; and CHRIST sprinkles the FATHER with Blood as often as He appeases Him by the Flesh which He has assumed. He sprinkles the altar, as long as (until) He restores the number of the angels.* He sprinkles the outward sanctuary when He signs men [with the Cross in Baptism] and reconciles to the FATHER those things which are on earth. The priest [on earth] sprinkles the same, because he propitiates the FATHER *by this Sacrifice* [the Eucharist] and prays for pardon, and so sprinkles [the Blood] upon us.”

In this passage Hugo explains that by the sprinkling of the FATHER with Blood he means propitiating Him through the Human Nature which CHRIST has assumed, that is, through the Human Nature which is now in heaven. This is in accordance with the patristic view of our LORD’S Intercession and does not imply the idea of a sacrifice in heaven, and, further, we may observe that the only *sacrifice* of which Hugo speaks is the Eucharistic Sacrifice, for he says that the priest on earth sprinkles men when by the Eucharistic Sacrifice he propitiates GOD. It is strange that anyone should have seen in these words an indication of a sacrifice in heaven.

The last quoted, and by far the greatest mediæval writer on the Eucharist, is Algerus of Liège (ob. 1132 vel 1135). His work, *De Sacramentis Corporis et Sanguinis Dominici*, marks a great advance in the theological conception of the Eucharist. In his treatment of the Eucharist, Algerus has in some respects closer affinities with the Greek Fathers than with those of the Western Church. He meets the heresy of Berengarius by a treatise on the Eucharist so thoughtful, so accurate, and so complete that it leaves little to be desired.

* I. e., until their places are filled by the redeemed.

7. Algerus of Liège : his great authority,

and his affinity with the Greek Fathers.

In the fourteenth chapter* Algerus discusses the question how our LORD'S Body can be said to be truly present in the Sacrament of the Eucharist whilst It is at the same time ever present at the Right Hand of GOD. From this chapter Thalhofer quotes the following passage :

“ Whence also the priest, in the place of CHRIST, making the LORD'S Body upon the earthly altar, not, however, attributing anything to his own merits, but all to Divine power and grace, prays GOD the FATHER in the canon, saying, ‘ Command these offerings to be carried to Thee by the Hand and power of Thy SON, of Thy Angel, who is the Angel of Great Counsel ; not on to this Thy humble and visible altar, where now He is, but on to Thine altar on high, that is Thy SON, Whom Thou hast exalted to Thy Right Hand, in the Presence of Thy Majesty ; that they may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy beloved SON ;’ showing that the SON Himself, by the bidding of His FATHER, is in heaven offering the Sacrifice [of the Eucharist], and is That upon which it is offered. For we depend entirely on His faith and His grace that earthly bodies [the bread and wine] are changed into CHRIST ; and we believe that He Who sits in heaven at the Right Hand of the FATHER intercedes for us, and in the Sacrament of the Altar is consecrated and is present.”

The whole chapter, as we have already observed, is a discussion of the question how CHRIST can at the same time be at the Right Hand of the FATHER in heaven, and upon the altar on earth. Algerus is here showing that CHRIST is at the same time in heaven, sitting at the Right Hand of the FATHER and interced-

* Alger. Leod., *De Sac. Corp. et Sang. Dom.*, l. i., c. xiv. ; Migne, P. L., tom. 180, col. 781, 786, 787.

His discussion of the mode of CHRIST'S Presence in the H.E. and at the same time in heaven.

From which Thalhofer quotes a passage.

ing for us (but not offering any sacrifice in heaven), and is also in His Sacrament. The argument which Algerus uses, while entirely true, is not quite accurate, in that he confuses two prayers, one of which, the *Supplices Te*, comes after the Consecration, while the other, *Quam Oblationem*, precedes it. The words: "Command these offerings to be carried to Thee by the hand and power of Thy SON, of Thy Angel, Who is the Angel of Great Counsel; not on to this Thy humble and visible altar, where now He is, but on to Thine altar on high, that is, Thy SON, Whom Thou hast exalted to Thy Right Hand, in the presence of Thy Majesty," are an explanatory paraphrase of the *Supplices Te*; the rest of the passage — "that they may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy beloved SON," etc. — is an explanatory paraphrase of the latter part of the *Quam Oblationem*.

In this passage Algerus is interpreting the words of S. Chrysostom,* "He Who sits at the Right Hand of the FATHER is nevertheless at the time of the Sacrifice [the Eucharist] contained in the hands of men," and is showing that in this Sacrifice of the Eucharist CHRIST Himself, Who sits at the Right Hand of the FATHER, is at the same time the Priest who offers the Sacrifice, and in a sense the Altar upon which it is offered, and therefore that He is at the same moment sitting at the Right Hand of GOD in heaven, and is present in His Sacrament on earth.

The only heavenly S. known to Algerus is the E. S.

It is difficult to see in what way Thalhofer proves the existence of a heavenly sacrifice from this passage. The words on which he lays stress are, "that the SON Himself, by the bidding of His FATHER, is in heaven offering the Sacrifice [of the Eucharist], and is That

* S. Chrys., *De Sacerdotio*, l. iii., c. iv.

upon which it is offered." If these words are taken as referring to a sacrifice offered in heaven, then we must affirm that Algerus was of opinion that the Eucharistic Sacrifice itself is that heavenly sacrifice, and not that it is related to it ; and his treatment of the same prayer in another work shows clearly that he indeed knows no other heavenly sacrifice than the Eucharist, in which our LORD is the true Priest.

We might quote many passages from this most interesting work in favour of the Catholic view. We will, however, confine ourselves to two, which Thalhoffer seems to have overlooked. They are found in the sixteenth chapter. Commenting on a passage in S. Chrysostom, Algerus says :

Some passages overlooked by Thalhoffer ;

" We must therefore notice that he says our daily Sacrifice is the very same as that in which CHRIST was offered once for all upon the Cross, inasmuch as the same true substance of the Body of CHRIST is here and there. But when he says that our daily [Sacrifice] is an example, that is, a figure or form, of that offered once for all, he does not mean that in this or in that he understands an essentially different CHRIST, but shows that the same [Person] is immolated and offered once for all upon the Cross, and in a different manner daily upon the altar: there, in the reality of that Passion in which He was slain for us ; here, in a figure and representation of that Passion, in which [figure] CHRIST suffers not again in reality, but a remembrance of that His Passion is daily made by us." The second passage is as follows :

" It may therefore be regarded as certain that, although the Oblation of CHRIST once for all upon the Cross is true, while the daily Oblation on the altar is figurative, yet here and there the grace of our salvation

in which Algerus clearly relates the E. S. to that of the Cross.

is the same, here and there is it true, sufficient, and ever needful; for here and there the same true CHRIST is all-powerful."

In both these passages Algerus expresses in the clearest and most explicit terms his opinion that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and that of the Cross are the same in substance, although differing in mode.

His other work
on the H. E.,
"De Sac.
Missæ."

In addition to the great work of Algerus, *De Sacramentis Corporis et Sanguinis Dominici*, we have a brief treatise by him, *De Sacrificio Missæ*, which is quite worthy of our attention. Its opening words are as follows:

"The solemn celebration of the whole Mass was instituted for this purpose, that it might be a memorial of CHRIST'S coming in the Flesh, and might mystically renew His Passion."

Algerus then divides the Mass into two parts, saying that from the Introit to the end of the Offertory our LORD'S first Advent and ministerial life are brought before us; then, that with the three secret prayers which follow the Offertory, we have the introduction to His Passion, in reference to which the rest of the Mass is interpreted. There is one most interesting passage, in which, treating of the *Te Igitur*, he says:

His comment
on the "Te
Igitur,"

"When the priest begins the *Te Igitur* it is as though entering the Holy of holies. First he offers a general prayer for the whole Church, and by making the sign of the Cross he sprinkles that oblation with the Blood of CHRIST, who [the priest], as often as he applies the sign of the Cross to the *heavenly Sacrifice*, so often sprinkles with the Blood of CHRIST the oblation placed upon the altar."*

* "*Imprimens signum crucis, et oblationem illam Christi sanguine superfundit, qui quoties cœlesti sacrificio similitud-*

What gives this passage its peculiar interest is that Algerus actually uses the phrase "heavenly sacrifice" for which Thalhofer so industriously seeks in the theological writings of the twelfth century. How is it, then, that Thalhofer does not quote this passage? Because the term "heavenly sacrifice" is applied to that Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist on earth, to which the earthly priest applies the sign of the Cross, and we are told that as often as he does this he sprinkles it with the Blood of CHRIST. The interpretation of the sign of the Cross as symbolizing the sprinkling of our LORD'S Blood is, as we have seen, common to nearly all the writers of the twelfth century; but here we have one who, from a theological standpoint, is the most important writer of his day, actually applying the term "heavenly sacrifice," on which Thalhofer and the Modern school have built up so much of their theory, to the *unconsecrated* oblations over which the priest makes the sign of the Cross in the prayer *Te Igitur*.

We may also observe that Algerus in this treatise explains the *Supplices Te* by saying that here the priest prays the LORD to command these gifts to be borne by the hands of His Holy Angel on to His altar on high, "that in that hour the mystery may be made plain that that bread is united to the LORD'S Body, and by the communication of the one substance is joined to It." This brief expression of Algerus' opinion makes clear his meaning in his interpretation of the same passage in the prayer which we have already discussed, namely, that for him the heavenly sacrifice is the Holy Eucharist.

How Thalhofer, after reading these passages, could *inem crucis Christi sanguine superaspergit.*"—Alger., *De Sacrificio Missæ*; Migne, P. L., tom. 180, col. 855.

in which he actually uses the words "heavenly sacrifice,"

but of the S. on earth in the H. E.

The sign of the Cross tells of the sprinkling of blood.

He also treats of the "Supplices Te,"

and makes clear his former statement.

claim that Algerus makes the Sacrifice of the Eucharist depend upon a sacrifice which is supposed to be offered in heaven, entirely passes our understanding. It would seem as though, when looking for passages treating of the *Supplices Te*, upon finding such he carefully abstained from reading any farther in the author's works, lest he should come across a passage which entirely disproved his interpretation of the author's meaning.

No support for Modern view found in Mediæval writers.

In taking our leave of the writers of the Mediæval period we may assert that, having examined every passage cited in favour of the Modern view, we have not found one which gives it the slightest support ; and on the other hand, we have found many in the writings of the authors cited, often in the same chapter, sometimes in the very context of a passage quoted, which absolutely refute the claim that the author in question favours this view.

II. Gallican writers of cent. XVII. :

II. Our next task must be to examine the works of a most interesting group of Gallican writers who lived in the seventeenth century. A wonderful revival of spiritual life, especially among the Clergy, at that time had swept over France. With its earliest stages the names of Cardinals du Perron (ob. 1618) and de Bérulle (ob. 1629) are associated. The latter in the year 1611 founded the Congregation of the Oratory in France, and in 1617 Charles de Condren (ob. 1641), who in a sense may be said to have been the theologian of the movement, joined the Congregation.

De Bérulle, founder of the Oratory ; de Condren,

the theologian of the Resurrection ;

While de Condren was well read in theology generally, he was especially attracted to the doctrine of our LORD'S Resurrection and its fruits both in the Church on earth and in our LORD'S life of glory in heaven ; so that he has been termed " the theologian of the Resurrection." To the study of this doctrine

he devoted himself with great assiduity, and in his writings one sees that it was what one may call his "special devotion," although his excellent theological training preserved him from the exaggerations which so often attach to a special devotion.

Those who are familiar with the life of de Condren know how deep was the influence which he exercised on the great souls who came within his reach.

We need only speak of two, Jean Jacques Olier (ob. 1657), founder of S. Sulpice, and Louis Thomassin (ob. 1697), the great theological writer. In 1629, on the death of Cardinal de Bérulle, de Condren was elected Superior General of the Oratory in France. Three years later Louis Thomassin entered the Congregation of the Oratory, and so came under the influence of de Condren.

Olier, founder of S. Sulpice; Thomassin.

Theology of the latter two influenced by de Condren.

After teaching philosophy at Lyons, and theology at Saumur and in the Seminary of S. Magloire in Paris, Thomassin devoted the last thirty years of his life to theological study and the production of theological works, among which we may notice his *Dogmata Theologica* in seven volumes, a complete system of dogmatic theology. In his treatise *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei* we find (especially in the tenth book) evidences of de Condren's theological views.

Some members of the modern school, who seem to have read only parts of this treatise superficially, claim Thomassin as perhaps their greatest supporter, and his treatise, *De Incarnatione*, as the storehouse from which to draw patristic authority for their view.

All three, but especially Thomassin, claimed by modern school.

Thomassin is indeed a storehouse of patristic lore. It is both interesting and remarkable, in reading the works of the writers of later times and different nationalities, to observe how largely they have all drawn

from Thomassin, using his arguments, but especially quoting his authorities, and even reproducing the typographical errors in his references. While we must touch upon de Condren and Olier as well as Thomassin, since all three are claimed more or less as favouring the Modern view, it will be best to examine Thomassin most fully, for, although he was not the source of the special treatment of our LORD'S Resurrection, we find it discussed in his works with far greater fulness and theological acumen than in the writings of either of the others.

De Condren's and Olier's writings chiefly on ascetics.

Both de Condren and Olier devoted themselves chiefly to ascetic subjects, and but few of their works have come down to us. The only work, in fact, bearing de Condren's name which treats of this subject is *L'Idée du Sacerdoce et du Sacrifice de Jésus-Christ*, and it is more than doubtful whether this is an authentic work. Perhaps the most that can be said is that it contains the views of de Condren, although the language in which they are clothed is largely the work of another. We have many works of M. Olier, among them *La Journée Chrétienne*, *Le Catéchisme Chrétien pour la Vie Intérieure*, *L'Introduction à la Vie aux Vertus Chrésiennes*, *Lettres Spirituelles*, and *L'Explication des Ceremonies de la grand' Messe de Paroisse*. In the last work we find his views on the Eucharist fully set forth.

I. Thomassin's great work on dogmatics.

All these writings, however, fall into insignificance in comparison with the great work of Thomassin, to which we shall now turn our attention. We have said that some who seem only to have read his work superficially claim his support for the Modern view. Before we investigate the validity of these claims, it will be useful if we once more put before ourselves the main characteristics of the Modern view. They are :

Restatement of the characteristics of the Modern view,

1. That the essential act of our LORD'S Sacrifice, the presentation of the Blood, took place, not upon the Cross, but after His Ascension into heaven.

2. That our LORD is now offering in heaven a proper Sacrifice, upon which the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends.

3. That the Eucharist is therefore only indirectly related to the Sacrifice of the Cross, that is, related to it through a Sacrifice which our LORD is now supposed to be offering in heaven.

Let us see what support can be found in Thomassin for these three propositions.

To a superficial reader it would certainly seem that the opinion that our LORD is offering a Sacrifice in heaven was held by Thomassin, and therefore that his support could be claimed for the second proposition. For in the edition of his works published by Vives at Paris in 1868, the headings of the chapters and the marginal analyses quite suggest this view.

For example, the heading of chapter xiii. is, "It is again shown that CHRIST in heaven is Priest and Victim, the Sacrifice of the Cross being in a certain sense perpetuated ;" that of chapter xiv. is, "CHRIST after His Resurrection is then specially a Priest, and the very Church of the Blessed, raised from the dead, is His burnt offering ;" chapter xvi., "CHRIST is a Priest after the Order of Melchisedec, principally through the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, which therefore is none other than that of the Cross and of heaven ;" chapter xxiv., "The Eucharist is a Sacrifice of Love and of Thanksgiving, and is the same as the Sacrifice of heaven;" chapter xxv., "Again, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the same as that of heaven."

that we may see what support can be found for it in Thomassin.

The headings of his chapters misleading.

We must, however, carefully inquire what sort of a

He speaks of a

heavenly S.,
but explains
his meaning,

and does not
support the
Modern view.
He connects
this S. with
the Resurrec-
tion, not with
the Ascension;
with the "cre-
mation," not
with the
"sprinkling of
blood."

His exposition
of this: 1. x.,
c. xi.

The "crema-
tion" has no
place on the
Day of Atonement.

sacrifice Thomassin thinks that our LORD is offering in heaven. The Modern school teaches that our LORD is offering a sacrifice in heaven which is practically the presentation of His Blood, and which they especially associate with a sacrificial act, represented as taking place, not upon the Cross, but after our LORD'S Ascension. Attention must be drawn to the fact that Thomassin does not connect the Sacrifice in any way with our LORD'S Ascension. Imbued with the spirit of de Condren, he associates our LORD'S heavenly life with the Resurrection, not with the Ascension, and he makes our LORD'S mystical immolation of Himself in heaven to consist, not in the fulfilment of the typical act of the high priest on the Day of Atonement,—the presentation of the blood,—which is the very keystone and foundation of the Modern view, but in the fulfilment of a rite which he expressly observes *does not take place at all* in the ritual of the Day of Atonement, the cremation of the burnt offering.

We may illustrate this from book x., chapter xi., section 8: "Hence you regard the Sacrifice of the Cross and that of heaven as one and the same. For the High Priest enters once each year into the sanctuary for the purpose of performing the sacred rites, that is, not without blood, since the blood of the victim slain without is carried in thither. There, indeed, is, as it were, the perfecting of the sacrifice begun outside, through the offering of the blood, or through the offering of the victim as if slain. For other victims were consumed, at least in part, by fire; but here there is no mention of fire, no room for it, but *in its place* the blood is carried into the sanctuary, and there the sacrifice is completed.

"The Sacrifice, therefore, of heaven is none other

than the Sacrifice of the Cross. But here the victim is slain once for all; there through the veil, that is, through His Flesh, He is carried into the inner sanctuary, that is, into the inmost Deity. There He is consumed and eternally fed upon by the Deity as by a fire intensely subtle and fervent; whence S. Paul says of CHRIST, 'Who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to GOD;'* and S. Chrysostom says, 'For he means by this, through the HOLY SPIRIT, not through fire, not through any other things.'† The slaughtered victims remain in order that part of them at least, placed upon the altar, may be consumed by its fires, and thus they are wafted to GOD, Who receives them, as Holy Scripture tells us, as an odour of sweetness. Moreover, the victim of a holocaust, slaughtered once for all, was wholly consumed by fire, and so wholly given to GOD, Who either consumed it through fire—for 'GOD is a consuming fire'‡—or received it as an odour of sweetness. CHRIST, therefore, in the same way, slain once for all, is incorruptibly consumed, not by typical fire, but by true fire, by GOD, I say; and through His Resurrection and Immortality, His Human Nature is absorbed into the Deity and, as it were, consumed by the Deity."§

In this passage Thomassin distinctly states his view with respect to two points: first, the relation which exists between the Sacrifice of the Cross and that which he calls the Sacrifice of heaven; second, the significance of the action of the high priest on the Day of Atonement as interpreted by our LORD'S entrance

He does not say that our LORD'S Blood is carried within the veil to be presented, but that His Body is carried there to be consumed in the fires of the Deity.

* Heb. ix. 14.

† S. Chrys., *Hom.*, xv. 2; Gaume, t. 12, p. 218.

‡ Heb. xii. 29.

§ Thomassin., *De Incarn. Verbi*, l. x., c. xi., 8, pp. 333, 334.

into heaven. In regard to the first point he says that the Sacrifice in heaven is precisely identical with that on the Cross, and this he explains elsewhere.* Concerning the second, which is for us the more important, he not only does not say that the Blood is presented in heaven, but he most explicitly affirms that this particular part of the rite is fulfilled by the fact that in heaven our LORD'S glorified Humanity is taken into the fires of the Deity and there [like the bush of Moses] eternally burns, yet is never destroyed. He further points out that on the Day of Atonement the place of the fire was supplied by the blood, which was carried into the sanctuary because in the Holy of holies there was no opportunity for the introduction of the typical fire; so that he most carefully avoids the very view which the modern school teaches. And we may further observe that the cremation of the victim upon the altar, while pertaining to the perfection of the rite, was not the essentially sacrificial act, since it was absent entirely on the Day of Atonement. We may also suggest that the meaning of the typical burning of the victim seems to have been that, although the sacrificial act was completed by the presentation of the blood, the smoke of the victim ascending to heaven signified that the effects of the sacrifice lasted on.

This view mystical, but unobjectionable,

This doctrine of Thomassin is unobjectionable, and, indeed, is only a mystical statement of that which, as we have seen, so many of the Fathers set forth as their exposition of our LORD'S great Intercession, namely, that our LORD'S very Human Nature in the midst of the Throne, or, as Thomassin would say, in the midst of the fires of the Deity, pleads for us.

Thomassin's view is more fully set forth in his four-

* Thomassin, *De Incarn. Verbi*, l. x., c. xii. et xiii.

teenth chapter, from which we shall give some extracts. This chapter has for its thesis, "That CHRIST after His Resurrection is then especially a Priest, and that the very Church of the Blessed, raised from the dead, is His burnt offering." The chapter begins as follows:

more fully set forth in c. xiv.

"The Church of the saints, of the angels, and of men, offers to GOD in the bliss of heaven an eternal holocaust, continually fed upon and imperishably to be fed upon by the fire of love. CHRIST is the eternal Priest of this holocaust, and since He is also the Victim, He therefore burns in the same fire. But when all the elect have risen, the Catholic and Immortal Body of CHRIST will then be wanting in no one of its members, for then indeed it will be the most precious victim of an eternal burnt offering; for CHRIST whole and entire [that is, comprehending all the members of His mystical Body] will be at once both the Priest and the Victim."

His treatment of our LORD as the eternal holocaust.

Thomassin then quotes with great fulness S. Augustine's commentary on Psalm lxxv. 13,* "I will go into Thine House with burnt offerings, and will pay Thee my vows," and from S. Gregory's commentary on Ezekiel. † The latter says: "The holy Church has two lives: one which she lives now in time, the other in eternity. In both of these lives she offers a sacrifice: here the sacrifice of compunction, there the sacrifice of praise. Of the first it is said, 'The sacrifice of GOD is a broken spirit;' of the other it is written, 'Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifice of righteousness, with the burnt offerings and oblations.' In both of these sacrifices flesh is offered,

His quotations from S. Augustine and S. Gregory Mag.

* S. Aug., *Enarrat. in Psalm.*, lxxv. 13.

† S. Greg. Mag., *Hom. in Ezek.*, l. ii., hom. x.; Migne, P. L., tom. 76, col. 1060.

because here the offering of the flesh is the mortification of the body; there the offering of the flesh is the glory of the resurrection in the praise of GOD."*

This most interesting chapter should be read by all who really desire to understand the doctrine of Thomassin, and, one may say, of his master de Condren. Thomassin himself reviews the chapter as follows :

Thomassin's
review of the
chapter.

" Let me now sum up the arguments by which we have established that a princely and universal sacrifice, and therefore a burnt offering, is to be offered to GOD at the resurrection from the dead, and afterwards in the immortal life of eternity. (1) Certain passages of Holy Scripture clearly teach that there are a celestial temple, and a place within the veil, and a Holy of holies, heavenly and *apprehended by the mind alone*, and an altar on high. There ' the Forerunner is for us entered, even JESUS, ' † Himself both Victim and Priest. But do you object that these things are said metaphorically? I do not deny that they are metaphorical, but in such sense that the figure pertains to us on earth, the truth, as is fitting, to heaven. Here first we are fed by the shadow or image of things; there we shall be satiated with the very truth of the things themselves. . . . (2) . . . Whither, then, are our prayers directed? Whither are our hearts and aspirations lifted when we sing these Psalms of David, unless it be to that heavenly altar where we shall offer burnt offerings to GOD, and shall be ourselves offered? not there in metaphor only, and here truly, but in both truly; in heaven, however, our offerings will be both truer and more blessed. (3) In Holy Scripture the term ' resurrection ' brings before

* Thomassin., l. x., c. xiv., pp. 344-347.

† Heb. vi. 20.

us the whole idea of sacrifice, for it is often spoken of as a regeneration. But who can be regenerated and born again, unless the former substance has been destroyed in sacrifice? He is clearly unborn (*denascitur*) who is born again; he dies who is regenerated; he is sacrificed who rises again. Nor do we in resurrection assume, as in Baptism, only a sort of initial and preliminary regeneration, but a whole and entire regeneration, renewing soul and body and the whole man absolutely, and in the same manner entirely destroying and exterminating [sin]. (4) Every sacrifice implies a change in the victim. There are two kinds of change, the one for the worse [by destruction], the other for the better [by production]. But which of these changes, I ask, is more pleasing to GOD? The fullest change of the whole man takes place in resurrection. But as [by death] only that is destroyed which is destructible, so in resurrection both soul and body are raised into a life which far surpasses their former mode of existence. (5) Reason itself recognizes a fitness in the customary burnt offering. For fire, as in a sense the conqueror and destroyer of death, seems to change into itself the victim lying slain, and in this way sets before us the very work of GOD. For as fire entirely consumes the burnt offering which man offers in his own stead, so GOD in the work of justification takes man into Himself, changing and remaking the whole man." *

Thomassin finishes the chapter with a quotation from S. Augustine: "It follows, indeed, that the whole redeemed city and congregation and community of the Saints is offered as a universal sacrifice to GOD, through the great High Priest, Who, in order that we might be

* Thomassin., pp. 347, 348.

the Body of this glorious Head, offered Himself in His Passion for us, in the form of a servant. For it was this form He offered ; in this He was offered ; in this form He is the Mediator ; in this He is the Priest ; in this He is the Sacrifice." * On this passage Thomassin makes the following comment : " S. Augustine here very beautifully describes a true, proper, original, external, corporeal sacrifice, that is, the Sacrifice of CHRIST Himself in His Passion, of which the Eucharist is the commemoration and (since the same Victim is there present) the renewal. In heaven there is a certain eternal perpetuation of this Sacrifice through the eternal offering, intercession, and appearance before GOD of the same Victim. To which original and only proper Sacrifice, any other sacrifice whatever is but an addition, and a sacrifice in a less proper sense, a sacrifice moreover in no wise separable from it, whether [we see this sacrifice] in the fires of contemplation and of blessed charity, or in the destruction of death and mortality through resurrection ; whether here by martyrdom, or by any acts of virtue which have GOD as their end. These spiritual graces indeed are sacrifices, and if they be compared with the Mosaic sacrifices, or with any of those other sacrifices which GOD in His goodness for a time permitted, but at last abrogated, they seem to be true sacrifices, and, indeed, so much truer as they are more spiritual and acceptable to GOD ; but if they be compared with the one true and proper Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, in the Eucharist, and in heaven, they are only sacrifices in an improper sense, and are only sacrifices in so far as they form a part of the Sacrifice of CHRIST, and derive from it whatever sacrificial character they possess."

* S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, l. x., c. vi.

In this long extract we have the views of Thomassin expressed in his own words. He speaks of a sacrifice in heaven. He explains it to be our LORD'S "Intercession and appearance before GOD." He says that it is one with the Cross, by which he means, it is the fruit of the Cross, the merits of CHRIST, upon which His Intercession depends. He also says that this heavenly sacrifice is "metaphorical" and "figurative." He says of it, that we ourselves are the burnt offering, in that we are members of CHRIST'S mystical Body, and that its supreme oblation will not be until after the resurrection, when all the members of CHRIST'S mystical Body will be made up and all will be offered eternally upon the altar, which is CHRIST Himself. He says that both the Sacrifice of heaven and the Sacrifice of the Eucharist are the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, and that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the commemoration of the Passion of CHRIST. How unlike Thomassin's idea of a burnt offering in heaven is the conception of the Modern school, that the sacrifice is a presentation of the Blood! That, in Thomassin's opinion, took place once for all upon the Cross, and the blood, which of old was carried into the Holy of holies, he tells us, is in heaven represented by the Humanity of our LORD taken *into the fires* of the Deity.

He speaks of a S. in heaven, and explains it by our LORD'S Intercession.

He says that the S. is figurative and metaphorical.

In his seventeenth chapter he shows that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the same as that of the Cross. The chapter is too long to quote in full; we shall merely give the opening words: "If it be established that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the same as that of the Cross, it will be proved by the same means that in the Eucharist a most true Sacrifice is celebrated (for no one ever questioned the Sacrifice of the

In c. xvii. he connects the E. S. with that of the Cross directly and distinctly.

Cross*), and it will also be shown that the Sacrifice of the Cross did not differ from the rite of Melchisedec, since the Sacrifice of the Cross is most closely bound together with the sacrifice of bread and wine; and, lastly, the Sacrifice of CHRIST is one, and in its extent embraces heaven, and earth, and all the scroll of the ages." †

The three propositions of the Modern view find no support in Thomassin.

If we now take the three propositions in which above we stated the Modern view,—(1) that the essential act of our LORD'S Sacrifice, the presentation of the Blood, took place, not upon the Cross, but after His Ascension into heaven; (2) that our LORD is now offering in heaven a proper sacrifice, upon which the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends; and (3) that the Eucharist therefore is only indirectly related to the Sacrifice of the Cross, that is, related to it through a sacrifice which our LORD is now offering in heaven,—we may certainly affirm of the first and the third, not only that they find no support in Thomassin, but that he explicitly repudiates them. The only sacrificial act which he recognizes—and he says so over and over again—is the act by which our LORD offered Himself upon the Cross. There is no suggestion of our LORD'S *completing* His Sacrifice by offering His Blood after His Ascension. For Thomassin, that Blood was offered on the Cross, and the sprinkling of blood on the Day of Atonement finds its fulfilment in heaven only in our LORD'S Intercession, which, he tells us, is the taking of the Humanity into the Deity, in the mystical fires of which it ever burns. Thomassin devotes a whole chapter, of which we have quoted only the opening sentences, to

* Thomassin had not the advantage of an acquaintance with the theology of Dr. Milligan and the modern school.

† Thomassin., c. xvii., p. 363.

proving that the Eucharist is the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross.

If at first sight he seems to give some countenance to the second proposition, by saying that there is a sacrifice in heaven, he takes very great care to explain in what sense he means it,—that it is the holocaust of our LORD'S mystical Body which He is offering, His Body the Church, represented by its first-fruits, His Human Nature, taken into the fires of the Deity, and there ever burning but never destroyed. This sacrifice, he tells us, will not be absolutely complete until the general resurrection of the dead, when the Body of CHRIST will be lacking in no member, and the supreme holocaust will be offered through eternity. Here there is no trace of a sacrificial act, no trace of a presentation of our LORD'S Blood, nothing which in any wise corresponds to the "heavenly sacrifice" of Thalhoffer and the modern school.

We have devoted so much space to the view which Thomassin sets forth in regard to the heavenly sacrifice, that we shall do no more than quote a passage from de Condren and one from M. Olier to show that their view was precisely similar.

De Condren says: "After the Sacrifice of that Body *immolated* on the Cross, after the destruction of His human life, it was still needful that all that remained there of the traces of His mortality in the wounds which He had received, all that He still retained of disfigurement, of meanness, and of earthiness, all the likeness to the flesh of sin and to the infirmity of the children of Adam, should be entirely destroyed, effaced, and consumed in glory. The consumption and burning of the Body of JESUS CHRIST as the Victim is, therefore, accomplished in His Resurrection. He 'was

2. De Condren's view

raised up from the dead by the glory of the FATHER.* He has been raised to life by this Divine Fire of the glory of His FATHER, which has consumed all that was not worthy of the Body of a GOD in the Body of JESUS CHRIST dead on the Cross. For the burning, as has been said, took place for this reason, that the Victim might be as it were changed and transformed into GOD. There was nothing in nature which was better able to represent this in the sacrifices of the Law than the fire, which was the symbol of GOD. But the burning of the Sacrifice in the New Law, which is without comparison more perfect, and is no longer in figure but in truth, is so effected that the Victim has not only been changed into the type of GOD, but has been as it were transformed into the glory of GOD Himself, nevertheless without losing anything of the reality of His Human Nature. For it is by the Resurrection that this sacred Victim has been freed from all which was of earth and mean; that He has been entirely re clothed and penetrated with such glory as becomes the only SON of the FATHER; that He no longer lives but for GOD (*vivit Deo*); that He has been laid in the Bosom of GOD Himself; and that He has entered into a state altogether Divine." †

3. and Olier's
view

The following passage is from M. Olier: "On the day of the Resurrection, finding His SON immolated in the tomb, the FATHER came in the glorious light of His Divinity, to complete in Him the Sacrifice, not leaving in Him any remains of His weakness and of His former state, of His state of flesh, dense, passible, mortal; so that, consuming it entirely, He causes it to pass into a Divine state, as iron passes into the very state of fire." ‡

* Rom. vi. 4.

† De Condren, *L'Idée du Sacerdoce*, Part II., chap. iv.

‡ Olier, *Explic. des Cerem.*, l. vii, c. ii.

These two passages show how faithfully both Thomassin and Olier have reproduced the teaching of their master.

Both are identical with that of Thomassin.

A century later we find probably a trace of this teaching in Benedict XIV. (ob. 1758), who, in his work *De Sacrificio Missæ*, writes : " In the Jewish sacrifices the victim was burned upon the altar of burnt offering, so that whatever there was in it of imperfection might be consumed in the flames, and the smoke might rise to heaven as an odour of sweetness, as Holy Scripture says. In the New Law the Victim was consumed in the Resurrection and Ascension of CHRIST ; for in the Resurrection all that in CHRIST belonged only to this mortal life was consumed, as S. Paul says, ' For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality ; ' * and in the Ascension the Victim, received by GOD as an odour of sweetness, was placed at His Right Hand." †

4. Traces of the same idea in Benedict XIV.

Bossuet (ob. 1704) also, while most accurately defining the Sacrifice of the Eucharist as depending entirely upon its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, as we have seen, ‡ speaks of it as related to what our LORD is now doing in heaven in His great Intercession. His words are : " JESUS CHRIST having said that He sanctified Himself for us, § that is, that He offered and devoted Himself in order that we might become saints, let us not be afraid to say that this sanctification and this offering of JESUS CHRIST still continues on our altars, and that it consists essentially in the Consecration. And it is easy to understand it, since the placing before GOD the Body and Blood, into which the

5. and in Bossuet.

* I Cor. xv. 53.

† Benedict XIV., *De Sacrificio Missæ*, l. ii., c. xi., n. 5 ; Opera, tom. 8, p. 71.

‡ P. 76.

§ S. John xvii. 19.

bread and wine were changed, was in effect to offer it to Him. It was to imitate on earth what JESUS CHRIST does in heaven when He prays for us in the presence of His FATHER." *

While many of the theologians of this age and school speak of a sacrifice being offered in heaven, they explain, as we have seen, the sense in which they use this expression, and thus show that they have no real affinity with the Modern view. †

III. Before we close this chapter we would call attention to some extracts from the writings of two theologians of the Eastern Church, to whom reference has already been made in Chapter VII.

In the middle of the fourteenth century Nicholas Cabasilas, Bishop of Thessalonica, wrote a treatise on the liturgy, ‡ which was the first systematic work on that subject produced by the Greek Church. Mr. Brightman alludes to this treatise as "the first formal attempt" "to formulate the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice." It will therefore be interesting and very much to our purpose to inquire what view of the subject is set forth in it. The testimony of the Greek Church has always a special value on account of the

III. The witness of two Eastern writers.

I. Cabasilas, cent. XIV.,

the first to attempt to formulate a theory of the E. S.

The value of his testimony

* Bossuet, *Explication de quelques Difficultés sur les Prières de la Messe*, No. 8, tom. 5, p. 685.

† We would here again call attention to a very striking and thoughtful treatise by M. l'abbé Lepin, entitled, *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne, principalement d'après le Père de Condren et M. Olier*. In this work the views of the French theologians of the seventeenth century are most brilliantly elaborated. In a letter to the author (cf. Appendix F), M. Lepin clearly shows where he parts company with the Modern view.

‡ Nich. Cabas., *Sacræ Liturgiæ Interpretatio*; Migne, P. G., tom. 150.

tenacity with which its theologians have clung to the views of the early Greek Fathers. Indeed, it has sometimes been said that they have made no advance in dogmatic theology since the time of S. John of Damascus.

to the views of the Greek Fathers.

In Nicholas Cabasilas, therefore, we may expect to find an authoritative presentation of the mind of the Greek Fathers. The fact that he wrote shortly after the Council of Florence, and was strongly opposed to the Latins and to the views expressed by them in that Council, would almost certainly ensure his bringing forward such a doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the Modern school claims to discover in the Greek Fathers,—that is, of course, if he had ever heard of such a view. And the fact that he does not is in itself no inconsiderable evidence that the Greek Fathers never held any such doctrine.

Cabasilas is strongly anti-Latin.

There are two passages in Cabasilas's work on the liturgy which unmistakably meet two of the main arguments in Mr. Brightman's paper. First, Mr. Brightman holds that because we find in the liturgies a commemoration of our LORD'S Resurrection and Ascension, and sometimes of His Incarnation, as well as of His Passion, therefore the words of the Institution, "Do this in remembrance of Me," do not "suggest a special reference to our LORD'S Death," but "suggest rather the thought of His whole work, of His Person in the fulness of Its significance as perfected in that work." *

Two passages in Cabasilas which refute Mr. Brightman's arguments.

In chapter xvi. † Cabasilas says incidentally that "the Sacrifice shows the Death and the Resurrection and Ascension of our Blessed LORD, since the precious

Incidentally he sees in the H.E. a commemoration of the

* Brightman, p. 1.

† Migne, P. G., tom. 150, col. 404.

Resurrection
and Ascension.

He devotes a
chapter to the
signification of
"Do this in re-
membrance of
Me,"

gifts are changed into our LORD'S very Body, which rose again and ascended into heaven." But he devotes one whole chapter to a discussion of the meaning of the word "remembrance,"—chapter vii.,* *Τί ἐστὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάμνησις*. In it Cabasilas says: "CHRIST says, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' and He says this not only of the bread, but of the whole Mystery which is celebrated, as here beginning to offer sacrifice. For after the LORD had performed the whole Mystery, He added these words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' But what is this remembrance, and in what way do we remember the LORD in the celebration of the sacred act? What do we remember Him as doing? In what situation? But again I ask, thinking what about Him? Relating what? That He raised the dead? That He gave sight to the blind? That He rebuked the winds, and from a few loaves of bread satisfied thousands? Things which showed Him both to be GOD and to be Omnipotent? By no means, but *rather the things which signified weakness*:† the Cross, the Passion, Death; in these He commands us to make a memorial of Him. And from whence can we prove this? S. Paul so understood it, who clearly apprehended the things of CHRIST. For writing about this Mystery to the Corinthians, after relating that the LORD said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' he added, 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the LORD'S Death.' This also the LORD Himself showed in the Institution of the Mystery. For when He said, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' He did not add miraculous things to these,

* Migne, P. G., tom. 150, col. 381-384.

† By no possible interpretation can the Resurrection and Ascension be taken as "the things which signified weakness."

saying that He had raised the dead, that He had cleansed lepers, but what? Only His Passion and Death,—‘ which is broken for you,’ ‘ which is shed for you.’ And what is the reason? That He calls to our mind not His miracles, but His Passion; that these sufferings are so much more needful than those miracles; that these sufferings are indeed the efficacious cause of our salvation, and that without them man cannot rise.”

In justice to Mr. Brightman it should be noted that while he refers to Nicholas Cabasilas, he does not claim him as supporting his view. It is also true that he does not point out how emphatically Cabasilas repudiates that view. For while, with all Catholic writers, Cabasilas recognizes the commemoration of the Resurrection and Ascension, as well as of the Passion, in the Eucharist, yet in his exposition of the sacrificial words “ Do this in remembrance of Me ” he asks, “ Do we here commemorate our LORD’S works? ” and replies, “ By no means, but rather the things which signified weakness.” We commemorate “ *only His Passion and Death.* ” If Cabasilas had been answering Mr. Brightman’s paper he could scarcely have met his argument more completely.

in which he explicitly repudiates Mr. Brightman’s view.

Secondly, Mr. Brightman teaches that the Eucharist is related to our LORD’S perfected and glorified Person, and that hence, “ if its relation to the unique act of the Cross is only through His Person ‘ as He is,’ if, that is, it is related to the Cross as the eternal act of our High Priest in heaven is related to the Cross—then it is a simple inference, it seems to lie in its nature, that it is an action parallel to our LORD’S present work in heaven, where, because He is a High Priest, ‘ He must needs have somewhat to offer ’ (Heb. viii. 3). ”* And

* Brightman, pp. 12, 13.

again, Mr. Brightman interprets "the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, *not of the moment of the Cross*, but of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven, as the Minister of the 'True Tabernacle.'" *

Also a chapter
on the nature
of the E. S.

In chapter xxxii. Cabasilas treats of the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice itself. He says: "It is worth while to inquire into the Sacrifice itself. For it is not a figure of a sacrifice, nor an image of blood, but it is truly a mactation and sacrifice. Let us, then, inquire what is sacrificed, bread or the Body of the LORD? That is, when are the gifts sacrificed, before they are consecrated, or after? And if, indeed, it is bread that is sacrificed, first, what, pray, might the sacrifice of bread be? Then again, the Mystery we are considering is not to see bread sacrificed, but the Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world. But if the very Body of the LORD is sacrificed, this surely is impossible. For that Body can no more be smitten or slain, for It is now incorruptible and immortal. But if It could still suffer any such thing, there ought to be the executioners who crucified Him, and all the other things ought to be present which effected that Sacrifice, since it is understood that it is not a figure of mactation, but a true mactation. Then in what manner did CHRIST once for all die, and rise again, and 'dieth no more,' and suffered 'once for all in the end of the world,' †? and how is He said to have been 'once for all offered to bear the sins of many' ‡? For if in each celebration of the Mystery He Himself is sacrificed, He dies in each celebration. What, then, can we reply to this? That the Sacrifice takes place neither before the bread is consecrated nor after it is conse-

He finds the
sacrificial act
in the Conse-
cration,

* Brightman, p. 2 (*italics ours*),

† Heb. ix. 26.

‡ Heb. ix. 28.

crated, but at the very moment in which it is consecrated. For thus it is necessary that every word of God should be observed, and that nothing should fall to the ground. But what, I ask, should be observed? That this Sacrifice is not an image and a figure of a sacrifice, but a true sacrifice; that it is not bread which is sacrificed, but the very Body of CHRIST. And moreover, that the sacrifice of the Lamb [in the Eucharist] and that Sacrifice which was once for all made [upon the Cross] *are one Sacrifice.*”

and relates the S. solely to that of the Cross.

Here we may first observe that Cabasilas makes the sacrificial act to consist precisely in the Consecration itself. Secondly, that the conclusion of his whole argument is that the Eucharist is a sacrifice because it is one with the Sacrifice of the Cross. There is not in the chapter, nor, so far as we know, in the whole work, the slightest trace of any theory which connects the sacrificial character of the Eucharist with what our LORD is doing now in heaven. Indeed, Cabasilas could not more completely repudiate Mr. Brightman's position that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is “the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross, but of our LORD's perpetual action in heaven;” for at the end of a long argument, he says that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is a sacrifice because it is one and the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross.

The statements of Cabasilas and Mr. Brightman compared.

The other Eastern theologian from whom we shall quote is Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza and Rector of the Seminary at S. Petersburg. In his work entitled *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, he treats of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. He says :

2. The other Eastern writer, Macarius, cent. xix.

“In believing and professing that the Holy Eucharist is a true sacrament, the Orthodox Church also believes and professes, in spite of the errors of

He teaches that the H. E. is a S.,

Protestants, that the Eucharist is at the same time a true and real sacrifice, that is, that in the Eucharist the Body and Blood of the Saviour, which are offered to us as food, are offered also to GOD as a sacrifice for man." *

and that it is related solely to the Cross.

Under the heading, "The relation of this Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of the Cross," he says: "The Sacrifice offered to GOD in the Eucharist is in its character precisely the same as that of the Cross. For to-day we still offer on the altars of the Church the same Lamb of GOD Who offered Himself of old on the Cross for the sins of the world; the same Flesh, infinitely pure, which suffered there; the same Blood, infinitely precious, which was then shed. To-day this mysterious Oblation is still invisibly accomplished by the same Royal and Eternal High Priest who offered Himself on the Cross." †

No trace, therefore, of the Modern view in the Eastern Church. Conclusion adverse to the claims of the Modern school.

There can be no question but that Macarius relates the Sacrifice of the Altar to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and finds its sacrificial character only in that relation.

We bring this long chapter to a close by repeating that among the writers of the Middle Ages and those of the seventeenth century, and throughout the Greek Church, we find not only no support for the Modern view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but, on the contrary, much in their writings which is absolutely inconsistent with it; that, after examining every passage cited in its favour, we find not one which, when fairly considered in its context, and taken together with the author's views elsewhere expressed, sustains the Modern view.

* Macaire, *Théol. Dogmat. Orth.*, tom. 2, p. 492.

† *Ibid.*, p. 498.

CHAPTER X.

THE TESTIMONY OF ANGLICAN DIVINES.

IN Chapter VII. we briefly sketched the outline of the history of the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist from sub-apostolic times to our own day, and in the two chapters which followed we carefully compared the treatment of this subject in the writings of the principal Fathers and theologians with the fundamental positions of the Catholic and of the Modern view. In doing this, however, all reference to Anglican writers of the post-Reformation period was purposely omitted, these being reserved for a separate examination, to which we shall now proceed.

Introductory :

Mr. Brightman says : “ What is more characteristic among our theologians is the theory which is remarkable by its general absence in the Roman writers—the interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross, but of our LORD’S perpetual action in heaven, as the Minister of the True Tabernacle. I do not mean that this interpretation is confined to Anglican theologians, or that it is the only interpretation current among us—but that, while it is extraordinary how far it is ignored by both Protestant and Roman writers, it is the interpretation to which Anglicans tend to gravitate.”*

Mr. Brightman claims that Anglican theologians hold the modern theory of S.,

* Brightman, p. 2.

. . . "I have already said that this type of interpretation is characteristic of Anglican writers. This may easily be verified by looking through Dr. Pusey's catena from the Anglican divines in No. 81 of *Tracts for the Times*." *

and gives as his authority the catena in Tract 81.

Mr. Brightman, in making the assertion that it is characteristic of Anglican writers to interpret "the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross, but of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven," gives us his authority for this statement, namely, Dr. Pusey's catena of Anglican divines in No. 81 of *Tracts for the Times*. It will therefore be very easy, as he says, to verify, or as we should say, to *refute*, his statement by an examination of the passages to which we are referred.

I. Before examining the authorities, certain facts to be noticed.

I. It will help us to reach a fair judgment in the matter if, before taking up the passages themselves, we draw attention to a few points which must be kept carefully before us in order that we may really apprehend the mind of each writer.

1. The purpose of Tract 81 was not to support any theory of the E. S., only to show a consensus of Anglican divines as to the fact of the S.

1. The purpose of the writer of Tract No. 81 was not to formulate or support any theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but to show that there was a consensus among a large number of Anglican writers in regard to the fact that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. We therefore find that in the passages selected the various writers speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, some incidentally showing with more or less fulness the sense in which they regard it, while others, indeed no less than twelve, give no indication of their opinion concerning the manner in which it is a sacrifice, but merely state the fact.

2. The writers themselves by education and environ-

* Brightman, p. 15.

ment were deeply prejudiced against everything Roman, and this was especially the case in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. However true the position of a Roman theologian might be, an Anglican divine of post-Reformation times would always look askance at it. This led, moreover, to another inconvenience,—that Roman terminology was largely repudiated, and as there was then no other theological terminology to take its place, new words were introduced, some writers using a word in a loose, others in a strict sense, so that we are compelled to investigate the meaning of the terms used by each writer.

3. From this last circumstance it follows that where we find what seems to be an unusual view expressed, we must compare it with other statements of the same writer before reaching a conclusion as to the author's real opinion on the subject.

4. About one matter there is no room for doubt,—that all the great Anglican writers appealed to the Fathers as their authority, and, whether they did so or not, sincerely believed that they were setting forth the patristic view of the Eucharist. As we have shown in Chapter VII., we find in the Fathers no attempt to formulate any theory in regard to the *mode* of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, although we find abundant witness to the *fact*, and to its essential relation to our LORD'S Death on the Cross, and further that they regarded the Eucharist as the bond of union between the worship of the Church on earth and in heaven.

The Tract which we are to examine extends to 424 octavo pages, and contains extracts from the writings of sixty-three authors, not including the compilers of the Scotch and American Prayer Books. Of these, twelve, while speaking of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, express

2. The writers were prejudiced against everything Roman,

and so avoided the terminology of Rome.

3. Hence it is often difficult to determine the force of their statements.

4. They certainly appealed to the Fathers;

hence little trace of any clear theory of the mode of the S. is found in their writings.

The Tract contains extracts from sixty-three writers, of whom twelve make no allusion to

the mode of
the S.

Of the 51 left,
4, Overall, Tay-
lor, Johnson,
and Philpotts,
favour in some
measure the
Modern view.

Five others,
Mede, Ham-
mond, Thorn-
dike, Fell, and
Scandret, are
claimed on in-
sufficient
grounds as on
the same side.
Forty-two,
however,
clearly witness
to the Catholic
view.

The method
pursued in
selecting ex-
tracts.

no opinion as to the manner of the sacrifice. They are Hooker, Duppa, Nicholson, Barlow, Sancroft, Smith, Hooper, Dodwell, Collier, Bennet, Jones, and Horsley.

We therefore have remaining fifty-one writers,—who are certainly representative Anglican divines,—and a careful examination of the passages quoted from their writings seems to show that four, the Pseudo-Overall, Taylor, Johnson, and Philpotts, may fairly be claimed as favourable to the Modern view, at least so far as to relate the Sacrifice of the Eucharist to our LORD'S work in heaven rather than to the Sacrifice of the Cross, since statements can be found in their works which may bear this interpretation, although from other parts of their writings we should gather that they held the Catholic view.

Five others—Mede, Hammond, Thorndike, Fell, and Scandret—use expressions which, taken by themselves, might seem to favour the Modern view, but in other passages (quoted in the Tract) they make statements which are quite inconsistent with such an interpretation. This leaves forty-two writers whose treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is unmistakably Catholic. In this majority we find the names of Jewell, Bilson, Andrews, Laud, Forbes, Bramhall, Brevint, Patrick, Bull, Beveridge, Wake, Wilson, Grabe, Brett, Law, and Wheatly ; so that the majority is not merely one of numbers, but of overwhelming authority.

To facilitate the examination of these authors, all the passages in which are found a distinct statement of the relation of the Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross, or to our LORD'S action now in heaven, have been carefully marked, and are here given.* Where,

* In this the author has had the kind assistance of a distinguished Professor of theology, who favours a very modified

as is often the case (especially in regard to the Sacrifice of the Cross), there are many such passages, the most explicit have been chosen, but in no case is any passage omitted which would tend to modify the writer's opinion, and it is scarcely necessary to add that no passage has been intentionally omitted which would give any support to the Modern view.

As the author of the Tract points out, these sixty-three names do not include every writer of repute during the three centuries which followed the Reformation, but they do cover the representative Anglican theologians who in their works have treated of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

II. Let us now proceed to an examination of the extracts which have been selected. We shall begin with those which seem to favour the Modern view, and first, with the four in which this view is most clearly expressed.

John Overall, Bishop of Norwich (ob. 1619) :

“ Therefore this is no new Sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to GOD by CHRIST in heaven, and continueth here still on earth, by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation, or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross. Neither is the Sacrifice of the Cross, as it was once offered up there, *modo cruento*, so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it be commem-

form of the Modern view. All the passages cited by him are here given, although as several do not seem to the author justly capable of this interpretation, they are not included in the first or second class.

The Tract does not comprehend all Anglican writers, but represents the best.

II. We begin with those who favour the Modern view.

i. Overall quotes from Cassander.

orated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in heaven in His everlasting Priesthood, and thereupon was, and should be still the *juge Sacrificium* observed here on earth as it is in heaven, the reason which the ancient Fathers had for their daily Sacrifice." *

" This word refers to the Sacrifice mentioned before, for we still continue and commemorate that Sacrifice which CHRIST once made upon the Cross: and this Sacrifice which the Church makes, as a Sacrifice is taken *pro mactatione et occisione victimæ*, is only commemorative and sacramental." †

" ' That by the merits and death of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church,' etc. This is a plain Oblation of CHRIST'S Death once offered, and a representative Sacrifice of it." ‡

In the first passage the author distinctly says that the Sacrifice of the Cross is not " so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it be commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in heaven in His everlasting Priesthood "; and although in the other two passages quoted he speaks of the Eucharist as commemorating the Cross, yet the explicit statement in the first extract must be considered fairly to outweigh the less definite expressions in other places. The first passage is undoubtedly taken from Cassander's *Consultatio*. §

We must, however, at this point call attention to some facts which greatly weaken, if they do not entirely destroy, any authority these passages derive from

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, pp. 71, 72.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 71.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 74.

§ See page 400.

The authenticity of the passage disproved.

their association with the great names of Overall and of Cosin.

These extracts are taken from an interleaved folio Prayer Book, in Bishop Cosin's library at Durham, the MS. notes of which, on the authority of Dr. Barrow, editor of Cosin's *Works* in the Anglo-Catholic Library,* have been said to be in the handwriting of Bishop Cosin himself, and to represent his recollections of the teaching of Bishop Overall, with whom, when a young man, he lived as secretary. On this testimony Dr. Pusey in Tract 81 ascribes these passages to Overall. It will be evident that, even if Dr. Barrow's theory about these notes is correct, they at best represent only a second-hand report of Overall's views, and one not written till after his death, for he died in May, 1619, the year in which the Prayer Book was published.

Further investigations have, however, demonstrated that neither Bishop Overall nor Bishop Cosin can be held responsible for the notes in this book. For, first, it has been discovered that the handwriting of the notes is not in the least like that of Bishop Cosin; and, secondly, in a small quarto volume in the Bodleian Library (in the Sancroft Collection), which consists of a series of notes upon the Prayer Book, entirely in MS., and in Sancroft's handwriting, we find that a large number of the extracts are identical with those in Cosin's book (i. e., the interleaved Prayer Book of 1619), and on the top of the first page is an explanatory note in Archbishop Sancroft's handwriting: "Many of these discourses and some of ye marginal notes in my great Service Book I transcribed out of Mr. Haywood's Book of Coton, which was partly his

* See Dr. Barrow's Preface to vol. v. of Cosin's *Works* in the Anglo-Catholic Library.

own collection, and partly taken out of Bishop Andrewes his own Service Book," etc.

This is incidental but positive testimony that the passages quoted above are the work of neither Overall nor Cosin, but of an obscure person named Haywood, a nephew of Overall's; and further, the notes themselves are largely extracts from well known authors, the passage in question being taken from Cassander; and its appearance in a note-book in no way implies that it represents the views even of the compiler. For, as Canon Meyrick has well observed: "There are few students whose orthodoxy would pass muster, if all the passages they have copied into their text-books from various quarters were taken as representing their statements." *

The only evidential value, therefore, of this passage is such as attaches to a passage of Cassander found copied into the note-book of an obscure clergyman.

Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down and Connor (ob. 1667):

"First: for whatsoever CHRIST did at the Institution, the same He commanded the Church to do, in remembrance and repeated rites; and Himself also does the same thing in heaven for us, making perpetual intercession for His Church, the body of His redeemed ones, by representing to the FATHER His Death and Sacrifice. There He sits, a High Priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect Sacrifice: that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate in order to perpetual and never-failing events. And this also His ministers do on earth;

* Cf. Correspondence in the *Guardian* (September 26, October 3, and October 10, 1900) between the Bishop of Edinburgh, Canon Meyrick, and Mr. Cawley, all of whom favour this view.

they offer up the same Sacrifice to GOD, the Sacrifice of the Cross, by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to His holy institution." *

"As CHRIST is a Priest in heaven for ever, and yet does not sacrifice Himself afresh,—nor yet without a Sacrifice could He be a Priest,—but, by a daily ministration and intercession, represents His Sacrifice to GOD, and offers Himself as sacrificed ; so He does upon earth, by the ministry of His servants : He is offered to GOD, that is, He is, by prayers and the Sacrament, represented or ' offered up to GOD, as sacrificed ; ' which, in effect, is a celebration of His Death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church, as we are capable, by a ministry like to His in heaven." †

"To this end CHRIST was made a Priest for ever ; He was initiated or consecrated on the Cross, and there began His Priesthood, which was to last till His coming to judgment. It began on earth, but was to last and be officiated in heaven, where He sits perpetually representing and exhibiting to the FATHER that great effective Sacrifice which He offered on the Cross, to eternal and never-failing purposes." ‡

"As CHRIST is pleased to represent to His FATHER that great Sacrifice as a means of atonement and expiation for all mankind, and with special purposes and intendment for all the elect, all that serve Him in holiness ; so He hath appointed, that the same ministry shall be done upon earth too, in our manner, and according to our proportion ; and therefore hath constituted and separated an order of men, who, by ' shewing forth the LORD'S Death ' by sacramental

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, pp. 180, 181.

† *Ibid.*, p. 181.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

representation, may pray unto GOD after the same manner that our LORD and High Priest does." *

"When I said that the Sacrifice of the Cross, which CHRIST offered for all the sins and all the needs of the world, is represented to GOD by the minister in the Sacrament, and offered up in prayer and sacramental memory, after the manner that CHRIST Himself intercedes for us in heaven (so far as His glorious Priesthood is imitable by His ministers on earth), I must of necessity also mean, that all the benefits of that Sacrifice are then conveyed to all that communicate worthily." †

"That He is a Priest in heaven, appears in the large discourses and direct affirmatives of S. Paul. That there is no other Sacrifice to be offered, but that on the Cross, it is evident, because 'He hath but once appeared, in the end of the world, to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself;' and, therefore, since it is necessary that He hath [have] something to offer, so long as He is a Priest, and there is no other Sacrifice but that of Himself, offered upon the Cross,—it follows that CHRIST, in heaven, perpetually offers and represents that Sacrifice to His heavenly FATHER, and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for His Church." ‡

"Having received my dearest LORD into my soul, I humbly represent to Thy Divine Majesty the glorious Sacrifice, which our dearest JESUS made of Himself upon the Cross, and, by a never-ceasing intercession, now exhibits to Thee in heaven, in the office of an eternal Priesthood." §

These seven passages from Bishop Taylor show without doubt that he regarded the Eucharist as chiefly related to our LORD'S action in heaven. It

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, pp. 183, 184.

† *Ibid.*, p. 185.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

will be interesting to examine, later on, the source from which he probably drew this view.

John Johnson (ob. 1725), author of *The Unbloody Sacrifice*: 3. Johnson.

“ If the Eucharistical elements be considered not only as an oblation, but as symbols and figures of CHRIST’S crucified Body and effused Blood, it will from thence appear, that they are a propitiatory offering. That by them ‘ we shew forth CHRIST’S Death ’ (1 Cor. xi. 26), the Apostle affirms ; and if they are an oblation, as has been proved, then this oblation is directed to GOD, and shows forth CHRIST’S Death to Him, as well as to the communicants ; and if the Holy Eucharist be an oblation, in which we show forth CHRIST’S Death to GOD, then, I think, no more need be said to show that it is a propitiatory oblation.” *

“ They were instituted by CHRIST, not only to call Him and His sufferings to remembrance, but to be to us all that His natural Body and Blood, crucified and poured out for us, could be, if we had them actually lying on our altars.” †

“ CHRIST cannot be represented as actually dead, but He must be represented as actually sacrificed. He was not sacrificed whilst alive ; that is inconsistent ; but when His Blood was poured out, then the Sacrifice was offered ; for it was the blood of sacrifices with which the atonement was made. . . . Therefore the bread and wine represent CHRIST as just now dead, and fit to be offered. And it is scarce to be conceived how our SAVIOUR could have expressed Himself more clearly, when He says, ‘ This is My Body given ’ (*διδόμενον*), just now given ‘ for you.’ By this repre-

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, pp. 315, 316.

† *Ibid.*, p. 316.

sentation, our SAVIOUR offered Himself in effigy, as I may say, before He offered Himself on the Cross ; and by this representation, what passed near one thousand seven hundred years ago, is set forth and exhibited to us, as if it were but now done." *

" A perfect representation of His Sacrifice, and, to all intents and purposes, as effectual to our good as if JESUS CHRIST had been crucified before our eyes, and as if we had His very Body and Blood to present to the FATHER, in order to avert His indignation against our sins, and to atone for them." †

" The sense of what these Fathers teach us is, that CHRIST entered upon His Priestly office in the Eucharist ; that there He began the one oblation ; there He offered Himself in a spiritual mystical manner, as He afterwards did corporally upon the Cross. . . . These two parts of the oblation were but one continued solemnity ; nay, we add, that the Ascension of CHRIST into heaven many days after, was but the finishing of this one oblation. The distinguishing the oblation in the Eucharist from that on the Cross, and that afterwards performed in heaven, is really a confounding or obscuring the whole mystery, and rendering it perplexed and intricate. We ought no more to reckon them two or three several oblations, than we would say an animal was three several sacrifices because it was first immolated, then slain, afterwards burned, and the blood of it ritually sprinkled. Any one of these actions may be called an oblation ; and the animal, by having any one of these actions passed upon it, was rightly called a sacrifice ; and yet the whole process was really but one and the same sacrifice." ‡

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, p. 319.

† *Ibid.*, p. 329.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 333, 334.

“ It seems clear to me, that the one personal oblation performed by our SAVIOUR Himself, is not to be confined to any one instant of time ; but commenced with the Paschal solemnity, and was finished at His Ascension into heaven there to appear in the Presence of GOD for us. And if our adversaries will restrain the oblation to the Cross alone, then they must exclude CHRIST’S sacerdotal entry into heaven, as the Holy of holies, and say that the oblation was finished before the blood of the sacrifice was brought into the Most Holy place and there offered ; contrary to what the Apostle teaches us, Heb. ix. 7 ; and, therefore, few, I suppose, will presume thus far. And if it was consistent with the one oblation to be made in the Holy of holies, as well as on the altar ; in heaven, as well as on the Cross ; then I cannot conceive why the oblation made in the Eucharist should make the oblation cease to be one, any more than the double offering it, on the Cross and in the Holy of holies, already mentioned.” *

Of these six passages, the first four represent the Eucharist as the memorial of the Cross, while the last two favour the Modern view, not so much in referring the Eucharistic Sacrifice to our LORD’S action in heaven, as in teaching that the presentation of the Blood, and therefore the essential act of our LORD’S Sacrifice, took place, not upon the Cross, but after His Ascension into heaven.

The Unbloody Sacrifice is severely criticised by Waterland in his appendix to *The Christian Sacrifice Explained*. † While Waterland attacks it from the Protestant standpoint, he also points out the inaccurate and confused statements which Johnson makes.

* *Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, p. 336.

† Waterland’s *Works*, vol. viii., pp. 180-223.

That we may estimate the value of Johnson's opinion on this matter, attention is drawn to three statements found in the passages quoted from him in Tract 81.

His unorthodox views detract from his authority.

(1) "That not the Divinity and Human Soul of CHRIST JESUS, but His Body and Blood only, are offered in the Eucharist." *

(2) "That not His substantial, but sacramental Body and Blood are there offered." †

These two propositions are distinctly set forth as theses to be defended in his discourse. The first involves a separation between CHRIST'S Body and Blood and His Divinity and Human Soul, which is inconsistent with the Hypostatic Union, since even in the triduum, after His Death, His Body and Blood were never for a moment separated from His Divinity, though they were separated from His Human Soul. The second proposition shows that Johnson held that our LORD had two distinct Bodies, a substantial and a sacramental Body, which is, of course, the rankest heresy.

(3) He says: "I have already declared against the personal presence or Sacrifice of CHRIST in the Eucharistical elements. Nor do I suppose that the bread and wine represent His whole Person, as He is GOD and Man, but only His sacrificed Body and His effused Blood. His Soul was separated from the Body before the Sacrifice was consummated. We have in the Sacrament His Body and Blood consecrated and administered apart, which is a demonstration that we have not there His entire living Person." ‡

Here Johnson declares against "the personal presence of CHRIST in the Eucharistical elements," and in saying, "His Soul was separated from the Body before the Sacrifice was consummated," implies probably the

* Tract No. 81, p. 311. † Ibid., p. 311. ‡ Ibid., p. 317.

Socinian view of our LORD'S Sacrifice. As he thus held erroneous and indeed heretical views of our LORD'S Incarnation and Atonement, his opinion in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice can scarcely be considered of much value.

Henry Philpotts, Bishop of Exeter (ob. 1869): 4. Philpotts.
 “. . . The commemorative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST ; in which the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to GOD on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven ; the Church on earth doing, after its measure, the same thing as its Head in heaven ; CHRIST in heaven presenting the Sacrifice, and applying it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously ; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to GOD (with thanksgiving) in the virtue and merit of that Sacrifice which it thus exhibits.” *

There are other passages in Bishop Philpotts's writings (which we shall notice later) which considerably modify this statement. This, however, is the only extract given in Tract 81, and we therefore in this place confine ourselves to it. We may point out that Bishop Philpotts, who died in 1869, is too late in date to be numbered among those whom we ordinarily understand by “ the great Anglican divines,” and, while in some ways in sympathy with the Tractarian movement, he can certainly not be claimed as belonging to it. We grant, however, that he does connect the Eucharist with our LORD'S action in heaven in less guarded language than was used, as we shall show, by the Tractarians.

Other passages from his writings greatly modify this statement.

III. We shall now pass to a consideration of the five

III. The five writers who

* Tract No. 81, p. 423.

are claimed by the modern school, but without sufficient ground.

writers who have been claimed as favouring the Modern view because some expressions are found in their writings which, taken by themselves, seem to support it. We shall show that there are other passages (quoted in the 'Tract') which, in our opinion, are inconsistent with this conclusion.

i. Mede.

Joseph Mede (ob. 1638) : " So that this Sacrifice, as you see, hath a double object or matter : first, praise and prayer, which you may call *Sacrificium quod* ; secondly, the commemoration of CHRIST'S Sacrifice upon the Cross, which is *Sacrificium quo*, the Sacrifice whereby the other is accepted." *

" The mystery of which rite they took to be this : that as CHRIST, by presenting His Death and Satisfaction to His FATHER, continually intercedes for us in heaven ; so the Church on earth semblably approaches the Throne of Grace, by representing CHRIST unto His FATHER in these Holy Mysteries of His Death and Passion. '*Veteres enim* [saith Cassander] *in hoc mystico Sacrificio,*' etc. . . . 'The ancients did not, in this mystical Sacrifice, so much consider and respect the Oblation once made upon the Cross (the memory whereof is here celebrated), as the everlasting Priesthood of CHRIST, and the perpetual Sacrifice which He, our High Priest for ever, doth continually offer in heaven ; the resemblance whereof is here on earth expressed by the solemn prayers of GOD'S ministers.' " †

" There may be a sacrifice which is a representation of another sacrifice and yet a sacrifice too. And such a Sacrifice is this of the New Testament ; a Sacrifice wherein another Sacrifice, that of CHRIST'S Death upon the Cross, is commemorated." †

* Tract No. 81, p. 111. † Ibid., p. 116. ‡ Ibid., p. 118.

“ Though the Eucharist be a Sacrifice (that is, an oblation wherein the offerer banquets with his GOD), yet is CHRIST in this Sacrifice no otherwise offered, than by way of commemoration only of His Sacrifice once offered upon the Cross, as a learned Prelate of ours [Bishop Morton] hath lately written, *objectivè* only, not *subjectivè*.” *

“ In a word, the Sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that one Sacrifice of CHRIST once offered upon the Cross, again and again commemorated.” †

In these five passages, four refer the Sacrifice of the Eucharist only to the Sacrifice of the Cross. One, the second, has been claimed as countenancing the Modern view. We must notice, however, that all that Mede says is, “ that as CHRIST, by presenting His Death and Satisfaction to His FATHER, continually intercedes for us in heaven, so the Church on earth semblably approaches the Throne of Grace by representing CHRIST unto His FATHER in these Holy Mysteries of His Death and Passion.” In this statement Mede does not relate the Eucharist in any way to what is going on in heaven. He only says that as CHRIST is interceding for us in heaven, so is the Church on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, representing CHRIST unto His FATHER. Then follows a passage from Cassander, on which Mede makes no comment whatever. It begins thus : “ ‘ *Veteres enim* [saith Cassander] *in hoc mystico Sacrificio,* ’ ” where the “ *enim* ” is a part of the passage from Cassander. Mede does not close his statement with the words, “ *For* Cassander says,” but simply adds the passage from Cassander ; and certainly Mede’s opinion is to be gathered from his own words rather than from Cassander’s, especially as in the other four

* Tract No. 81, p. 122.

† *Ibid.*, p. 125.

passages he unhesitatingly speaks of the Eucharist as related to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

2. Hammond.

Henry Hammond, Chaplain to Charles I. (ob. 1660) :
 “ Thirdly, a specifying of the end to which this was designed, a commemoration of the Death of CHRIST, a representing His Passion to GOD, and a coming before Him in His Name, first, to offer our sacrifices of supplications and praises, in the Name of the crucified JESUS, (as of old, both among Jews and heathens all their sacrifices were rites in and by which they supplicated GOD, see 1 Sam. xiii. 12) ; and, secondly, to commemorate that His daily continual Sacrifice or Intercession for us at the Right Hand of His FATHER now in heaven.” *

“ This commemoration hath two branches, one of praise and thanksgiving to Him for this mercy, the other of annunciation or showing forth, not only first to men, but secondly, and especially, to GOD, this Sacrifice of CHRIST’S offering up His Body upon the Cross for us. That which respecteth or looks towards men, is a professing of our faith in the Death of CHRIST ; that which looks towards GOD, is our pleading before Him that Sacrifice of His own SON.” †

“ The end of CHRIST’S instituting this Sacrament was on purpose that we might, at set times, frequently and constantly returning (for that is the meaning of ‘ continual,’ parallel to the use of ‘ without ceasing ’ applied to the sacrifice among the Jews, and the duty of prayer among Christians), remember and commemorate before GOD and man this Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST.” ‡

In the first of these passages Hammond tells us that the end for which the Eucharist was designed was “ a

* Tract No. 81, p. 160. † Ibid., p. 162. ‡ Ibid., p. 163.

commemoration of the Death of CHRIST as representing His Passion to GOD," and secondly "to commemorate His daily continual Sacrifice, or Intercession for us." We may observe here that he puts the Sacrifice of the Cross first, and that while he associates the Eucharist with it as a commemoration of our LORD'S Intercession, it is only as a secondary relation. And in the last passage, where he is again defining the end for which the Sacrament was instituted by CHRIST, he leaves out this secondary relation altogether, as he does also in the second of the passages. He cannot, therefore, be considered as holding that the Eucharist was essentially related in its sacrificial character with our LORD'S action in heaven.

Herbert Thorndike (ob. 1672): "For, seeing the Eucharist not only tendereth the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, but separated one from the other, under and by several elements, as His Blood was parted from His Body by the violence of the Cross; it must of necessity be as well the Sacrifice as the Sacrament of CHRIST upon the Cross." * 3. Thorndike.

"And why should the commemoration and representation (in that sense of this word 'representation' which I determined afore) of that one Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, which mankind was redeemed with, be less properly a Sacrifice, *in dependence upon* † and denomination from that one which the name of Sacrifice upon the Cross was first used to signify? For all conceit of legal sacrifice is quite shut out, by supposing the Sacrifice past, which the Sacrifice of the Eucharist represents and commemorates." ‡

"Seeing the same Apostle hath so plainly expounded us the accomplishment of that figure, in the offering of

* Tract No. 81, p. 166. † Italics ours. ‡ Ibid., p. 167.

the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross to the FATHER in the highest heavens, to obtain the benefits of His Passion for us ; and that the Eucharist is nothing else but the representation here upon earth of that which is done there." *

" I stick not to yield and maintain, that the Consecration of the Eucharist, in order to the participation of it, is indeed a Sacrifice, whereby GOD is rendered propitious to, and the benefits of CHRIST'S Death obtained for, them that worthily receive it." †

" It is therefore enough, that the Eucharist is the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, as the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross is represented, renewed, revived, and restored by it, and as every representation is said to be the same thing with that which it representeth ; taking ' representing ' here not for barely signifying, but for tendering and exhibiting thereby that which it signifieth." ‡

" I say, then, that having proved the Consecration of the Eucharist to be the production of the Body and Blood of CHRIST crucified, or the causing them to be mystically present in the elements thereof, as in a Sacrament representing them separated by the crucifying of CHRIST ; and the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross being necessarily propitiatory and impetratory both ; it cannot be denied that the Sacrament of the Eucharist, inasmuch as it is the same Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross (as that which representeth is truly said to be the thing which it representeth), is also both propitiatory and impetratory by virtue of the Consecration of it, whereby it becometh the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross." §

* Tract No. 81, p. 169.

† Ibid., p. 170.

‡ Ibid., p. 171.

§ Ibid., pp. 171, 172.

“ If the consecrated elements be the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, then are they the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified upon the Cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST as in His Body, while it was whole, but as separated by the Passion of His Cross. Not that CHRIST can be sacrificed again ; for a sacrifice, being an action done in succession of time, cannot be done the second time being once done, because then it should not have been done before ; but because the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified is represented, commemorated, and applied, by celebrating and receiving the Sacrament, which is that Sacrifice.” *

“ How can Christians think their prayers so effectual with GOD, as when they are presented at the commemoration of the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified, the representation whereof to GOD, in heaven, makes His Intercession there so acceptable? . . . However, the ancient Church manifestly signifieth that they did offer their oblations, out of which the Eucharist was consecrated, with an intent to intercede with GOD for public or private necessities: and that, out of an opinion that they would be effectual, alleging the Sacrifice of CHRIST crucified then present, which renders CHRIST’s Intercession effectual for us. And this is the true ground why they attributed so much to this commemoration of the Sacrifice.” †

In these eight passages from the writings of Thorn-dike we have his views on the Eucharistic Sacrifice very definitely expressed. In seven of them he refers it in *unmistakable* words to the Sacrifice of the Cross. In one passage alone does he use language which seems to favour the Modern view. It is as follows : “ Seeing the same Apostle hath so plainly expounded

* Tract No. 81., p. 179.

† Ibid., p. 179.

us the accomplishment of that figure, in the offering of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross to the FATHER in the highest heavens, to obtain the benefits of His Passion for us ; and that the Eucharist is nothing else but the representation here upon earth of that which is done there." If this passage be examined closely we shall see that Thorndike says no more than that the Eucharist is the representation here upon earth of that which is done in heaven, namely, the offering of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross to the FATHER. He does not make the Eucharist depend for its sacrificial character upon what is done in heaven even in this passage; and in the other seven he distinctly connects the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with that of the Cross, and in the second says that it *depends* upon that of the Cross.

4. Fell (?).

John Fell, Bishop of Oxford (ob. 1686) : " His Melchisedeckial or eternal Priesthood, joined with Kingship, was consummated in His Resurrection, and is now continued in His service in the heavenly sanctuary. In which heavenly sanctuary, He perpetually offers His Blood and Passion to GOD ; and, as Man, makes perpetual prayers and intercessions for us. . . . As also He hath instituted the same oblation of His holy Body and Blood, and commemoration of His Passion, to be made in the Holy Eucharist to GOD the FATHER by His ministers here on earth, for the same ends, viz., the application of all the benefits of His sole meritorious Death and Sacrifice on the Cross, till His second return out of this heavenly sanctuary." * This passage attributed to Bishop Fell is from the *Oxford Commentary on the Epistles of S. Paul*, page 365, edited by Jacobson. It is incorrectly assigned to Bishop

* Tract No. 81., pp. 206, 207.

Fell. We, however, give the passage as quoted in Tract 81.

In saying that our LORD in the heavenly sanctuary perpetually offers His Blood and Passion to GOD, the writer seems to favour the gross view held by Alford and Bengel, Dean Jackson, and, perhaps, Sadler. But, objectionable as this may be, he does not make the Eucharist depend upon what our LORD is doing in heaven. All that he says is, that CHRIST has instituted the same oblation, that is, of His Body and Blood, in remembrance of His Passion, to be made in the Holy Eucharist to GOD the FATHER by His ministers here on earth, for the same ends, that is, the application of all the benefits of His sole meritorious Death and Sacrifice on the Cross. And further, this passage can scarcely be claimed as a witness to the Modern theory, unless we are prepared to identify that theory with the appalling view of the offering of the Blood in heaven, which is rejected by practically all the modern school.

As this passage is from the *Oxford Commentary*, and not from Bishop Fell's writings, we must leave the question of his view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice open.

J. Scandret (ob. (?)) : " These creatures being offered before GOD, by being brought to His altar, and by the manual ceremonies appointed in the rubrick of His Service, the Priest holding them to and before GOD, breaking the bread to make a memorial to GOD of CHRIST'S Body torn with nails upon the Cross, lifting up the wine as a memorial of His Blood shed for us, laying his hands on both, to signify that on Him was laid the sins of the world, as having undertaken them in the covenant of grace ; this is the outward

5. Scandret.

visible part or thing in GOD'S great worship, the Christian Sacrifice in the Christian Church."*

" But I cannot but believe that the great Christian Sacrifice is, and must be, performed by a representation of CHRIST'S obedience to Death ; by a representation of the worship of our heavenly Priest made in heaven, by appearing for us there, with His crucified Body and His Blood ;— a representation, I say, not only of what He did on the Cross, but also of His now and ever Intercession in heaven ; whence the Blessed Apostle, when he speaks of the exercise of CHRIST'S Priesthood, does chiefly refer to CHRIST'S appearance for us there. ' For if He were on earth, He should not be a priest ; ' which priests ' serve to the example and shadow of heavenly things.' And again, ' CHRIST is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true ; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the Presence of GOD for us.' " †

The first passage is entirely in accord with the Catholic view. In the second, Scandret teaches that the Eucharist is not only a representation of the Death of CHRIST, but also of His Intercession in heaven. This, however, while entirely lacking the authority, either of Holy Scripture or of the Fathers, is altogether different from the Modern view, since he does not in any way make the Eucharist to *depend* for its sacrificial character on that Intercession.

Of the five writers comprised in this group, we do not think that any one clearly supports the modern contention. The fact that in each one passage only can be found associating the Eucharist with our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, indicates that no more should be inferred than that (like the Gallican theologians of

* Tract No. 81, p. 297.

† Ibid., pp. 298, 299.

the seventeenth century, and M. Lepin in our own day) they see an *accidental* relation between the Eucharist and our LORD's action in heaven. Its essentially sacrificial character they seem to have related only to the offering on the Cross.

IV. We shall now give the extracts from the forty-two writers whose teaching is in entire accord with the Catholic view.

John Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury (ob. 1571) : "The Sacrifice [after the order of Melchisedec] which is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, is only JESUS CHRIST the SON of GOD upon the Cross. And the ministration of the Holy Mysteries, in a phrase or manner of speech, is also the same Sacrifice, because it layeth forth the Death and Blood of CHRIST so plainly and so evidently before our eyes."*

"Certainly our Sacrifice is the very Body of CHRIST, and that for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec, evermore standing in GOD'S Presence, and evermore obtaining pardon for us : not offered up by us, but offering us up unto GOD the FATHER."†

In the second passage Bishop Jewell seems to associate our Sacrifice with our LORD'S Intercession in heaven. But it must be observed that he does this only in that passive sense of the word "sacrifice" which the Fathers use so often. He says, "It is the very Body of CHRIST, evermore standing in GOD'S Presence." He does not refer to our LORD as offering anything in heaven, unless, indeed, it be His Church on earth, when he says, "offering us up unto GOD the FATHER."

Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester (ob. 1616) :

"The very Supper itself is a public memorial of that

* Tract No. 81, p. 44.

† Ibid., p. 63.

IV. The forty-two writers who teach the Catholic view.

1. Jewell.

2. Bilson.

great and dreadful Sacrifice, I mean, of the Death and Blood-shedding of our SAVIOUR. . . . The visible Sacrifice of bread and wine, representing the LORD'S Death." *

" Mark well the words of Cyprian, ' The Passion of the LORD is the Sacrifice which we offer : '—of Ambrose, ' Our High Priest is He that *offered* (on the Cross) a Sacrifice to cleanse us ; the very same we offer now ; which being then offered cannot be consumed, this Sacrifice is a sampler of that, we offer that very Sacrifice for ever : ' . . . of Austin, ' We sacrifice to GOD in that only manner in which He commanded we should offer to Him at the revealing of the New Testament : the Flesh and Blood of this Sacrifice was yielded in very truth when CHRIST was put to death : *after His Ascension it is now solemnized by a Sacrament of memory.*' " †

" The LORD'S Death is figured, and proposed to the communicants, and they, for their parts, no less people than priests, do present CHRIST hanging on the Cross to GOD the FATHER, with a lively faith, inward devotion, and humble prayer, as a most sufficient and everlasting Sacrifice for the full remission of their sins, and assured fruition of His mercies. Other actual and propitiatory sacrifice than this the Church of CHRIST never had, never taught." ‡

" Peter Lombard, in his 4th Book and 12th Distinction [says] ' I demand whether that which the priest doth, be properly called a sacrifice or an oblation, and whether CHRIST be daily offered, or else were offered only once. To this our answer is brief : that which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory and

* Tract No. 81, p. 64.

† Ibid., p. 66.

‡ Ibid., p. 67.

representation of the true Sacrifice and holy oblation made on the altar of the Cross. Also CHRIST died once on the Cross, and there was He offered Himself, but He is offered daily in a Sacrament, because in the Sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done once.' " *

In the majority of these extracts Bishop Bilson expresses his opinion in the words of the Fathers, whose views he makes his own. We would especially call attention to the last sentence of the second extract, where, quoting from S. Augustine, the Bishop says : " The Flesh and Blood of this Sacrifice was yielded in very truth when CHRIST was put to death. *After His Ascension it is now solemnized by a sacrament of memory.*" S. Augustine and Bishop Bilson apparently had no knowledge of any other sacrifice which our LORD was offering after His Ascension than that of the Eucharist. They neither recognized a presentation of Blood after His Ascension as a completion of the Sacrifice of the Cross, nor a sacrifice now offered in heaven.

Richard Field, Dean of Gloucester (ob. 1616) : " In ^{3. Field.} this sort CHRIST offereth Himself and His Body once crucified daily in heaven : Who intercedeth for us, not as giving it in the nature of a gift, or present, for He gave Himself to GOD once, to be holy unto Him for ever ; *not in the nature of a sacrifice*, for He died once for sin, and rose again, never to die any more ; but in that He setteth it before the eyes of GOD His FATHER, representing it unto Him, and so offering it to His view, to obtain grace and mercy for us. And in this sort we also offer Him daily on the altar, in that commemorating His death, and lively representing His

* Tract No. 81, p. 68.

bitter Passion, endured in His Body upon the Cross, we offer Him that was once crucified, and sacrificed for us on the Cross, and all His sufferings, to the view and gracious consideration of the Almighty, earnestly desiring, and assuredly hoping, that He will incline to pity us, and show mercy unto us, for this His dearest SON's sake, Who, in our nature, for us, to satisfy His displeasure, and to procure us acceptance, endured such and so grievous things." *

"In that, therefore, the Church doth offer the true Body and Blood of CHRIST to GOD the FATHER, it is merely a representative Sacrifice, and all that is done is but the commemorating and representing of that Sacrifice which was once offered on the Cross." †

In the first passage Dean Field says of our LORD'S Intercession that it is "not in the nature of a sacrifice," but in the setting before the eyes of GOD the FATHER His Body once crucified, and so offering it to His view to obtain grace and mercy for us. Like Bishop Bilson, Field seems to repudiate any possibility of a Sacrifice in heaven.

4. Buckeridge.

John Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester and Ely (ob. 1631): "And CHRIST our High Priest, that sitteth at the Right Hand of GOD, doth at that instant execute His office, and maketh intercession for us, by representing His wounds and scars to His FATHER." †

"But this Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, as a more ample and perfect image, doth more fully represent CHRIST'S Death, and by way of memorial offer it to GOD, as being instituted and commanded for a representation and commemoration thereof." §

* Tract No. 81, p. 78.

† Ibid., p. 80.

‡ Ibid., p. 86.

§ Ibid., p. 86.

Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham (ob. 1659): "It is . . . to signify a sacrifice in the Eucharist, . . . the commemorative representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Body crucified upon the Cross." * 5. Morton.

" . . . His Sacrifice once offered upon the Cross, to be the all and only sufficient sacrifice for the remission of sins; which, by an Eucharistical and thankful commemoration, . . . they present unto GOD as an effectual propitiation both for the quick and the dead." †

Launcelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester (ob. 1626): "For they 'believe that the Eucharist was instituted by our LORD' for the commemoration of Him; even of His Sacrifice; or, if we may so speak (*si ita loqui liceat*), for a commemorative sacrifice: and not only for a 'sacrament,' or 'spiritual food.'" † 6. Andrewes.

"But do ye [Romanists] take away from the Mass your 'Transubstantiation, and there will not be long any controversy with us concerning the Sacrifice.'" §

"Two things CHRIST there gave us in charge, 'remembering' and 'receiving.' . . . The first in remembrance of Him, CHRIST: what of Him? *mortem Domini*, His Death (saith S. Paul): to 'show forth the LORD'S Death.'" ||

"Will ye mark one thing more: that *epulemur* doth here refer to *immolatus*? To CHRIST, not every way considered, but as when He was offered. CHRIST'S Body that now is; true: but not CHRIST'S Body as now it is, but as then it was, which was offered, rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not as now He is glorified; for so, He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*;

* Tract No. 81, p. 92.

† Ibid., p. 93.

‡ Ibid., p. 94.

§ Ibid., p. 95.

|| Ibid., p. 96.

for He is immortal, and impassible. But as then He was, when He suffered death (that is) passible and mortal. Then, in His passible estate, did He institute this of ours, to be a memorial of His *passibile*, and *passio*, both. And we are, in this action, not only carried up to CHRIST (*sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to CHRIST; as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him." *

"In a word, we hold with S. Augustine, in the very same chapter which the Cardinal citeth, *Quod hujus Sacrificii caro et sanguis, ante adventum Christi, per victimas, similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi, per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum Christi, per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.*" †

The great authority of Bishop Andrewes as a theologian, and the fact that his controversy with Bellarmine shows that he was thoroughly familiar with the Roman position in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, gives special weight to his statement, "Do ye take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation, and there will not be long any controversy with us concerning the Sacrifice." This does not, of course, imply that Andrewes was prepared to accept all the Roman theories which had gathered around this doctrine, but it does show that he was at one with them in the main contention that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist renews the Sacrifice of the Cross, to which it is essentially related. There is abundant evidence of this in the other four extracts, not one of which shows any leaning to the modern theory, while in the last two it is explicitly excluded; for he says, "not CHRIST'S

* Tract No. 81, pp. 97, 98. † Ibid., pp. 98, 99; cf. also p. 509.

Body . . . as now He is glorified; for so, He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*; . . . But as then He was when He suffered death." And again: "We hold with S. Augustine . . . *Quod hujus Sacrificii caro et sanguis, ante adventum Christi, per victimas, similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi, per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adventum Christi, per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.*" It is inconceivable that Bishop Andrewes could have written the last clause if he had recognized a sacrifice of our LORD in heaven.

Francis Mason, Archdeacon of Norfolk (ob. 1621): 7. Mason.
 "For, first, though the LORD'S Supper be called a sacrifice, by S. Cyprian, as well as the rest of the Fathers, yet it is not so called properly, but only because it is a memorial and representation of that one sacrifice which was made upon the altar of the Cross." *

"The representative was made in the Eucharist, the real upon the Cross. In the first celebration, the representative was before the real: in all the rest, the real is before the representative. Neither can you conclude that there is a real Sacrifice properly in the Eucharist because there was a representative one." †

Francis White, Bishop of Ely (ob. 1637): 8. White.
 "And the Fathers term the Holy Eucharist an unbloody Sacrifice, not because CHRIST is properly and in His substance offered therein, but because His bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross is by this unbloody commemoration represented, called to remembrance, and applied." ‡

William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 1645): 9. Laud.
 "For as CHRIST offered up Himself once for all, a full and all-sufficient Sacrifice for the sin of the whole world, so did He institute and command a memory of

* Tract No. 81, p. 101. † Ibid., p. 101. ‡ Ibid., p. 101.

this Sacrifice in a Sacrament, even till His coming again." *

" We say, that forasmuch as our priests have authority to minister the Sacraments, and, consequently, the Eucharist, which is a representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST ; therefore they may be said to offer CHRIST in a mystery, and to sacrifice Him by way of commemoration." †

" Nor doth any man of learning question it, that I know, but that, according to our SAVIOUR'S own command, we are to do whatsoever is done in this office, as a memorial of His Body and Blood offered up and shed for us (Luke xxii.)" ‡

" And if Bellarmine do call the Oblation of the Body and the Blood of CHRIST a Sacrifice for praise, sure he doth well in it ; (for so it is) if Bellarmine mean no more by the Oblation of the Body and the Blood of CHRIST than a commemoration and a representation of that great Sacrifice offered up by CHRIST Himself." §

10. Hall.

Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich (ob. 1656) : " That in the sacred Supper there is a sacrifice (in that sense wherein the Fathers spoke) none of us ever doubted ; but that is there, either Latreutical (as Bellarmine distinguishes it not ill) or Eucharistical : that is here (as Chrysostom speaks), a remembrance of a sacrifice ; that is, as Augustine interprets it, a memorial of CHRIST'S Passion, celebrated in the Church." ||

11. Mountagne.

Richard Mountague, Bishop of Norwich (ob. 1641) : " [' Neither do we celebrate the LORD'S Sacrifice with a lawful hallowing, except our Oblation and Sacrifice answer to the Passion : '] and that cannot be without

* Tract No. 81, p. 102.

† Ibid., p. 104.

‡ Ibid., p. 105.

§ Ibid., p. 106.

|| Ibid., p. 106.

pouring out of wine, that representeth the shedding of His Blood." *

“ ‘ For if JESUS CHRIST, our LORD and GOD, be Himself the High Priest of GOD the FATHER, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the FATHER, and commanded that this should be done for the commemoration of Him, then verily that priest doth truly fulfil his office in CHRIST’S stead, who copieth that which CHRIST did ; and doth then offer in the Church to GOD the FATHER a true and full Sacrifice, if he so begin to offer, even as he seeth CHRIST Himself *did* offer.’ ” †

Both these passages are quoted by Bishop Mountague from S. Cyprian, but, of course, as expressing the Bishop’s own opinion.

William Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh (ob. 1634) :
 “ The holy Fathers, also, very often say that the very Body of CHRIST is offered and sacrificed in the Eucharist, as is clear from almost innumerable passages, but not properly and really, with all the properties of a sacrifice preserved, but by a commemoration and representation of that which was once accomplished in that one Sacrifice of the Cross, whereby CHRIST, our High Priest, consummated all other sacrifices ; and by pious supplication, whereby the ministers of the Church, for the sake of the eternal Victim of that one Sacrifice, Which sitteth in heaven at the Right Hand of the FATHER, and is present in the holy table in an unspeakable manner, humbly beseech GOD the FATHER that He would grant that the virtue and grace of this eternal Victim may be effectual and salutary to His Church, for all the necessities of body and soul.” †

12. Forbes of Edinburgh.

John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh (ob. 1663) :

13. Bramhall.

“ If the Sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the

* Tract No. 81, p. 107. † Ibid., p. 108. ‡ Ibid., p. 109.

Sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves : we place our whole hope of salvation in it." *

" We do readily acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of prayers and praises ; we profess a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross ; and, in the language of Holy Church, things commemorated are related as if they were then acted." †

" He who saith, ' Take thou authority to exercise the office of a Priest in the Church of GOD ' (as the Protestant consecrators do), doth intend all things requisite to the priestly function, and among the rest, to offer a representative Sacrifice, to commemorate and to apply the Sacrifice which CHRIST made upon the Cross. . . ." ‡

14. Cosin.

John Cosin, Bishop of Durham (ob. 1672) : " Almighty LORD, Who hast of Thine infinite mercy vouchsafed to ordain this dreadful Sacrament for a perpetual memory of that blessed Sacrifice which once Thou madest for us upon the Cross. . . ." §

" Regard, we beseech Thee, the devotion of Thy humble servants, who do now celebrate the memorial which Thy SON our SAVIOUR hath commanded to be made in remembrance of His most blessed Passion and Sacrifice, that by the merits and power thereof, now represented before Thy Divine Majesty, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins." ||

" It is peculiar to this celebration, that the Death of the LORD is commemorated therein, not by bare words, as in other prayers, but also by certain sacred symbols, signs, and sacraments." ¶

* Tract No. 81, p. 130.

† Ibid., p. 131.

‡ Ibid., p. 132.

§ Ibid., p. 134.

|| Ibid., p. 134.

¶ Ibid., p. 135.

“ Nor do we say, it is so made a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but that by our prayers, also added, we offer and present the Death of CHRIST to GOD, that for His Death’s sake we may find mercy ; in which respect we deny not this commemorative Sacrifice to be propitiatory.” *

“ In the celebration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, GOD’S SON and His SON’S Death (which is the most true Sacrifice) is represented by us to GOD the FATHER, and by the same representation, commemoration, and obtestation, is ‘ offered;’ and that (as will appear from what will be afterwards said) for the living and for the dead, i. e., for the whole Church : for, as CHRIST Himself, now He is in heaven, does appear in the Presence of GOD for us, making intercession for us (Heb. ix. 20, Rom. viii. 34), and does present and offer Himself and His Death to GOD ; so also the Church upon earth, which is His Body, when it beseeches GOD for His sake and His Death, does also represent and offer Him, and His Death, and consequently that Sacrifice which was performed on the Cross.” †

“ But nothing hinders, but that the Eucharist may be accounted and called the commemorative Sacrifice of the proper Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST.” ‡

Peter Heylyn (ob. 1662) : “ The Passion of our SAVIOUR, as, by the LORD’S own ordinance, it was prefigured to the Jews in the legal sacrifices *à parte ante* ; so by CHRIST’S institution, it is to be commemorated by us Christians in the holy Supper *à parte post*. A Sacrifice it was in figure, a Sacrifice in fact, and so, by consequence, a Sacrifice in the commemorations, or upon the post-fact.” §

* Tract No. 81, p. 136.

‡ Ibid., p. 138.

† Ibid., pp. 137, 138.

§ Ibid., p. 141.

“ ‘ Who the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, etc. . . . Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.’ Which words, if they express not plain enough the nature of the Sacrifice to be commemorative, we may take those that follow by way of commentary ; ‘ for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the LORD’S Death till He come.’ ” *

“ The memory or commemoration of CHRIST’S Death thus celebrated, is called (Prayer after the Communion) a Sacrifice, a ‘ Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; ’ a Sacrifice representative of that one and only expiatory Sacrifice which CHRIST once offered for us all.” †

“ So that we may behold the Eucharist or the LORD’S Supper, first, as it is a sacrifice, or the commemoration of that Sacrifice offered to GOD; by which both we and the whole Church do obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of CHRIST’S Passion.” ‡

16. Sparrow.

Anthony Sparrow, Bishop of Exeter (ob. 1685) : “ For, the Holy Eucharist being considered as a sacrifice, in the representation of the breaking of the bread, and pouring forth the cup, doing that to the holy symbols which was done to CHRIST’S Body and Blood, and so showing forth and commemorating the LORD’S Death, and offering upon it the same Sacrifice that was offered upon the Cross, or rather the commemoration of that Sacrifice.” §

“ But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz., the unbloody Sacrifice, as it was anciently called, the commemorative Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST, which does as really and truly ‘ show forth the Death

* Tract No. 81, p. 141.

† Ibid., p. 144.

‡ Ibid., p. 147.

§ Ibid., p. 151.

of CHRIST' as those sacrifices under the Law did fore-show it." *

Henry Ferne, Bishop of Chester (ob. 1660): "The Fathers usually expressed the celebration or work of the Eucharist by the words of Sacrifice, or offering up the Body of CHRIST, for themselves and others, because there was a representing of the real Sacrifice of the Cross, and a presenting (as we may say) of it again to GOD, for the impetration or obtaining of the benefits thereof." † 17. Ferne.

"This we know, that CHRIST, our High Priest (according to the Apostle, Heb. vii. 25 and ix. 24), is in heaven, at GOD'S Right Hand, executing His eternal Priesthood, by interceding for us, and in that representing still what He hath done and suffered for us. And we know, and we have warrant and His appointment to do the like sacramentally here below, i. e., in the celebration of the Eucharist, to remember His Death and Passion, and represent His own Oblation upon the Cross, and by it to beg and impetrate what we or the Church stands in need of." †

In the first passage Bishop Ferne is quoting with approval the words of Peter Lombard. In the second, while speaking of our LORD'S Intercession, it is to be observed that he does not connect the Eucharist with that Intercession, but with the Death and Passion, the Oblation upon the Cross.

Daniel Brevint, Dean of Lincoln (ob. 1695): "Nevertheless this Sacrifice, which by a real Oblation was not to be offered more than once, is by an Eucharistical and devout commemoration to be offered up every day. That is what the Apostle calls, to 'set forth the Death of the LORD,'—to set it forth, I say, as well before the 18. Brevint.

* Tract No. 81, p. 153. † Ibid., p. 157. ‡ Ibid., p. 158.

eyes of GOD His FATHER, as before the eyes of all men." *

" Lastly, JESUS, our eternal Priest, being from the Cross, where He suffered without the gate, gone up into the true sanctuary which is in heaven, there above doth continually present both His Body in true reality, and us as Aaron did the Twelve Tribes of Israel, in a memorial (Exod. xxviii. 29). And, on the other side, we, beneath in the Church, present to GOD His Body and Blood in a memorial, that, under this shadow of His Cross, and image of His Sacrifice, we may present ourselves before Him in very deed and reality." †

" The other time most favourable and proper, next to that of His real Passion, is that of the Holy Communion ; which, as it hath been explained, is a Sacramental Passion, where, though the Body be broken and the Blood shed but by way of representative mystery, yet both are as effectually and as truly offered for our own use, if we go to it worthily, as when that Holy and Divine Lamb did offer Himself the first time." ‡

" The first [the Sacramental and commemorative Sacrifice of CHRIST], as representing the Sacrifice offered on the Cross, is the ground of the three others." §

" We must also celebrate, and in a manner offer to GOD, and expose and lay before Him the holy memorials of that great Sacrifice on the Cross, the only foundation of GOD'S mercies and of our hopes." ||

In the second quotation Dean Brevint very accurately describes our LORD'S Intercession, but he does not imply that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is in any way dependent upon it.

* Tract No. 81, p. 193.

† Ibid., p. 195.

‡ Ibid., p. 198

§ Ibid., p. 199.

|| Ibid., p. 201.

Matthew Scrivener (ob. 1688) : “ First, because here we call to remembrance CHRIST’S Sacrifice upon the Cross, according as He instituted and required that at our hands, saying, ‘ Do this in remembrance of Me.’ Secondly, as it is a Sacrifice rememorative, so it is a Sacrifice representative, insinuating and signifying unto us the Death and Passion of CHRIST.” * 19. Scrivener.

“ In like manner, and much more effectually, may we say that the action of the Eucharist presents to GOD the Sacrifice of CHRIST’S Death, and mediation made by Him for mankind, especially those that are immediately concerned in that Sacrament; from which metonymical Sacrifice what great and rich benefits may we not expect? Thus is the Host a Sacrifice, but not essentially, as the sacrifices of the Law, or CHRIST’S offering Himself; but analogically and metonymically, by virtue of the Sacrifice of CHRIST.” †

Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely (ob. 1707) : “ We do show forth the LORD’S Death unto GOD, and commemorate before Him the great things He hath done for us. We keep it (as it were) in His memory and plead before Him the Sacrifice of His SON, which we show unto Him.” ‡ 20. Patrick.

“ It will not be unprofitable to add, that this was one reason why the ancients called this action a Sacrifice (which the Romanists now so much urge), because it doth represent the Sacrifice which CHRIST once offered.” §

“ When we take the bread into our hands, it is a seasonable time to do that act which I told you was one end of that Sacrament, viz., ‘ commemorate, and show forth, or declare the Death of CHRIST unto GOD the

* Tract No. 81, p. 205.

‡ Ibid., p. 209.

† Ibid., p. 206.

§ Ibid., p. 210.

FATHER.' Let us represent before Him the Sacrifice of atonement that CHRIST hath made; let us commemorate the pains which He endured, let us entreat Him that we may enjoy all the purchase of His Blood, that all people may reap the fruit of His Passion, and that, for the sake of His Bloody Sacrifice, He will turn away all His anger and displeasure, and be reconciled unto us." *

21. Towerson. Gabriel Towerson (ob. 1697) : " It is evident, from Mr. Mede, that the ancients meant no more by that Oblation or Sacrifice than a commemorative one, by that sacred rite of bread and wine representing to GOD and the FATHER the expiatory Sacrifice of His SON upon the Cross, and, as it were, putting Him in mind of it, that so be He would, for the sake of that SON, and the valuableness of His Sacrifice, be propitious to them, and to all those whom they recommended to His grace and favour." †

22. Bull, George Bull, Bishop of S. David's (ob. 1710): " In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before GOD the bread and wine, as ' figures or images of the Precious Blood of CHRIST shed for us, and of His Precious Body ' (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to GOD the merit of His SON'S Sacrifice once offered on the Cross for us sinners, and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching Him, for the sake thereof, to bestow His heavenly blessings on us." ‡

23. Stillingfleet.

Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester (ob. 1699), in his *Conferences Concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome*, making Thorndike's words his own, says : " ' It is, therefore, enough, that the Eucharist is the Sacrifice of CHRIST on the Cross, as the Sacrifice of

* Tract No. 81, p. 216.

† Ibid., pp. 221, 222.

‡ Ibid., pp. 227, 228.

CHRIST on the Cross is represented, renewed, revived, and restored by it, and as every representation is said to be the same thing with that which it representeth.' '*

William Beveridge, Bishop of S. Asaph (ob. 1708) : 24. Beveridge.
“ So is the LORD’S Supper the memorial of our redemption from the slavery of sin, and assertion into Christian liberty; or, rather, it is a solemn and lively representation of the Death of CHRIST, and offering it again to GOD, as an atonement for sin, and reconciliation to His favour.” †

“ In which words we may first observe, that every time that the Sacrament of the LORD’S Supper is administered, His Death is thereby shown and declared to all that are there present.” ‡

“ When we eat the bread, and drink the cup, according to CHRIST’S institution, we thereby declare the reasons of it, though not by words, yet by the very act itself, and the several circumstances of it. By the breaking of the bread, we declare CHRIST’S Body to be broken and wounded to death; by the cup we declare His Blood to be shed, or poured out for the sins of the world.” §

“ For men first offer to GOD bread and wine, which creatures, offered to Him and consecrated to be symbols of the great Sacrifice accomplished by CHRIST, GOD imparts again to men : by which means they by faith in very deed partake of the great Sacrifice of CHRIST.” ||

George Hickes, titular Bishop of Thetford, Non-juror (ob. 1715) : 25. Hickes.
“ For if they could not eat of the sacrifices of atonement and expiation, which prefigured

* Tract No. 81, p. 230.

† Ibid., pp. 231, 232.

‡ Ibid., p. 232.

§ Ibid., p. 232.

|| Ibid., p. 240.

the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, how could they partake at the Christian altar of the Christian Sacrifice, which was the mystical Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, by which the Sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross was represented according to His own institution, under the new Law, as it was under the old by the sacrifices of expiation? ” *

“ To speak more properly of it, it is a Christian Sacrament or mystery, as a federal commemorative Sacrifice, in which as CHRIST represents unto GOD His Passion and the merits of it, as our High Priest in heaven, so, in this Sacrifice, the priests upon earth, in conjunction with it, present and commemorate the same unto Him, by setting before Him the symbols of His dead Body and Blood effused for our sins.” †

“ Those moral effects are the solemn and comfortable commemoration of His all-sufficient Sacrifice upon the Cross, and representing it before GOD on earth as He represents it before Him in heaven.” †

“ The ancient notion of this Holy Sacrament’s being a commemorative Sacrifice, in which we represent before GOD the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, perfectly secures the Holy Mystery from that corrupt and absurd notion.” §

“ Another respect in which the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice, is because it is a commemoration, and representation to GOD, of the Sacrifice that CHRIST offered for us upon the Cross. Upon these accounts we do not deny but that the Eucharist may be well called a Sacrifice.” ||

“ The other are dedicated and offered for the service of GOD in the Holy Eucharist, and to that end to be

* Tract No. 81, pp. 255, 256. † Ibid., pp. 259, 260.

‡ Ibid., p. 272. § Ibid., pp. 273, 274. || Ibid., p. 275.

consecrated unto a memorial of the sufferings and Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, in remembrance of His Death and Passion, and thereby become in the mystery, or Sacrament, the Body and Blood of CHRIST to the faithful receivers." *

"Were I to define the Eucharistical Sacrifice, it should be in these forms: The Eucharistical Sacrifice is an Oblation of bread and wine, instituted by JESUS CHRIST, to represent and commemorate His Sacrifice upon the Cross." †

John Sharp, Archbishop of York (ob. 1714): "To complete the Christian Sacrifice, we offer up both the aforesaid oblations or sacrifices with a particular regard to that one Sacrifice of CHRIST which He offered upon the Cross, and which is now lively represented before our eyes in the symbols of bread and wine." † 26. Sharp.

Thomas Comber, Dean of Durham (ob. 1699): "And for a perpetual memorial thereof, we are not only taught to mention His Name in our daily prayers (John xiv. 13 and xv. 16) but are also commanded by visible signs to commemorate and set forth His Passion in the LORD'S Supper (1 Cor. xi. 26) wherein, by a more forcible rite of intercession, we beg the Divine acceptance. That which is more compendiously expressed in the conclusion of our prayers, 'through JESUS CHRIST our LORD,' is more fully and more vigorously set out in this most Holy Sacrament; wherein we intercede on earth in imitation of and conjunction with the great Intercession of our High Priest in heaven; pleading here in the virtue and merits of the same Sacrifice which He doth urge there for us." § 27. Comber.

"Besides, when can we more effectually intercede

* Tract No. 81, p. 281,

† Ibid., p. 287.

‡ Ibid., p. 286.

§ Ibid., pp. 288, 289.

with GOD for the whole Church than when we represent and show forth that most meritorious Passion on earth, by the virtue whereof our great High Priest did once redeem, and doth ever plead for His whole Church even now that He is in heaven? This Sacrament, therefore, hath been accounted the ‘great intercession;’ and accordingly all the ancient liturgies did use such universal intercessions and supplications while this mystery was in hand.” *

“GOD hath provided His own dear SON, whose Blood, being already spilt, is so efficacious and all-sufficient that there is now no need of any other but this unbloody Sacrifice to be offered, and that in memorial of that great sin-offering which taketh away the sins of the world (1 Pet. ii. 5).” †

In the first passage Dean Comber speaks of our intercession of the Eucharist being in imitation of and conjunction with the great Intercession of our High Priest in heaven. But he does not make the Eucharist depend on this Intercession. On the contrary, he says that we plead here “the virtue and merits of the same Sacrifice [that of the Cross] which He doth urge there for us;” and in the other passages he refers the Eucharist only to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

28. Leslie.

Charles Leslie (ob. 1722): “Will any say, that the Death of CHRIST and the shedding of His Blood is not more lively expressed, and better understood, in the Christian Sacrifice than in the Jewish; in the breaking of the bread and pouring out of the wine with us, than in the death of a beast and shedding its blood among the Jews?” †

“Let it increase the knowledge and stir up the zeal

* Tract No. 81, pp. 289, 290.

† Ibid., pp. 291, 292.

‡ Ibid., p. 293.

of the devout, who come to the great Christian Sacrifice in full faith, beholding CHRIST our High Priest offering up the same Sacrifice of Himself to GOD in heaven, which His priests, representing His Person, offer up on earth in the sacred symbols which He has commanded, and dignified with the name of His own Body and Blood." *

In the latter passage Leslie speaks of our LORD as offering up the same Sacrifice of Himself to GOD in heaven (that is, the Sacrifice of the Cross) as His priests do in the Holy Eucharist. He does not, however, make the Eucharist dependent on our LORD'S heavenly action, and in the former passage he speaks of it as expressing the Death of CHRIST and the shedding of His Blood.

Robert Nelson (ob. 1717) : " So were all Christians hereby engaged to receive from them and their successors these symbols of CHRIST'S Body and Blood. By this precept, therefore, the Communion of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, as represented by bread and wine in the Holy Sacrament, is made the standing memorial of His Death and sufferings in all Christian assemblies to the end of the world." †

" . . . the principal act whereby we partake of the Sacrifice of CHRIST made upon the Cross, and without which our public service wants its due perfection." ‡

" What surer method have we to procure our pardon from GOD than by showing forth the LORD'S Death, by representing His bitter Passion to the FATHER, that so He would, for His sake, according to the tenour of His covenant in Him, be favourable and propitious to us miserable sinners ? " §

* Tract No. 81, p. 293.

‡ Ibid., p. 300.

† Ibid., p. 299.

§ Ibid., pp. 300, 301.

“ We thereby represent to GOD the FATHER the Passion of His SON, to the end that He may, for His sake, according to the tenour of His covenant in Him, be favourable and propitious to us miserable sinners ; that, as CHRIST intercedes continually for us in heaven, by presenting His Death and satisfaction to His FATHER, so the Church on earth, in like manner, may approach the throne of Grace, by representing CHRIST unto His FATHER in these Holy Mysteries of His Death and Passion.” *

“ It was also established as a sacred rite to supplicate GOD the FATHER by the merits of our SAVIOUR’S Passion, representing to Him the images of His Body and Blood, that thereby He may become favourable and propitious to us.” †

30. Wake.

William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 1737) : “ In like manner, our Blessed SAVIOUR being now about to work out a much greater deliverance for us, by offering up Himself upon the Cross for our redemption, He designed by this Sacrament to continue the memory of this blessing ; that ‘ as often as we eat of this bread and drink of this cup, we might shew forth the LORD’S Death till His coming.’ ” †

“ Monsieur de Meaux has represented it to us with so much tenderness that, except, perhaps it be his foundation of the corporeal presence, on which he builds, and his consequence, that this service is a true and real propitiatory Sacrifice, which his manner of expounding it we are persuaded will never bear, there is little in it besides but what we could readily assent to.” §

“ This Consecration, being separately made, of His Body broken, His Blood spilt for our redemption, we

* Tract No. 81, p. 302.

† Ibid., p. 304.

‡ Ibid., p. 306.

§ Ibid., p. 308.

suppose represents to us our Blessed LORD in the figure of His Death, which these holy symbols were instituted to continue the memory of. And whilst thus with faith we represent to GOD the Death of His SON, for the pardon of our sins, we are persuaded that we incline His mercy the more readily to forgive them." *

Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man (ob. 1753): "After this, the bread and wine are consecrated, the bread is broken, and the wine poured out, to represent the Death of CHRIST, whose Body was broken, and whose Blood was shed for us." †

31. Wilson.

"When he sees that done before his eyes that JESUS CHRIST Himself did ; Who the same night in which He was betrayed, having devoted Himself an Offering and a Sacrifice to GOD for the sins of the whole world, did institute this Holy Sacrament, by taking bread and wine, and blessing them, and making them, by that blessing, the true representatives of His Body and Blood, in virtue and power, as well as in name." ‡

"He then offered, as a Priest, Himself under the symbols of bread and wine, and this is the Sacrifice which His priests do still offer." §

"For all this is done to represent the Death of JESUS CHRIST, and the mercies which He has obtained for us ; to represent it not only to ourselves, but unto GOD the FATHER." ||

William Sherlock (ob. 1707): "It is a commemoration of the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross, 'a showing forth the LORD'S Death until He come ;' and therefore is a mysterious rite of worship, as all sacrifices were under the Law." ¶

32. Sherlock.

* Tract No. 81, p. 308.

† Ibid., p. 362.

‡ Ibid., pp. 365, 366.

§ Ibid., p. 366.

|| Ibid., p. 367.

¶ Ibid., p. 370.

“ Thus, when we offer up to GOD the memorials of CHRIST'S Death and Passion, it is a visible Sacrifice of praise, and speaks such kind of language as this : ‘ Behold, LORD, here is the token of Thy love to us, Thy own SON bleeding and dying for our sins ; Thy eternal SON, the SON of Thy love, in whom Thy soul is well pleased, dying upon the Cross, a shameful, accursed, lingering, tormenting death ; scorned and reproached of men, and forsaken of GOD. We will never forget such love as this ; we will perpetually celebrate this holy Feast, and offer up the memorials of a crucified JESUS, as a Sacrifice of praise to His FATHER, to His GOD, and to our GOD.’ ” *

“ Now under the Gospel, GOD has sent His own SON into the world, to be both our Priest and our Sacrifice ; the acceptation of our prayers depends upon the power of His Intercession ; and the power of His Intercession upon the merit of His Blood : for ‘ with His own Blood He entered once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.’ We must now go to GOD in His Name, and plead the merits of His Blood, if we expect a gracious answer to our prayers. Now for this end was the LORD'S Supper instituted, to be a ‘ remembrance ’ of CHRIST, or of the Sacrifice of the Cross, to ‘ shew forth the LORD'S Death till He come ; ’ which, as it respects GOD, is to put Him in remembrance of CHRIST'S Death, and to plead the virtue and merit of it for our pardon and acceptance.” †

33. Grabe.

John Ernest Grabe (ob. 1711) : “ But, in truth, in the Sacrifices of these [christians] there was yet another general end regarded, namely, a representation of the Oblation of CHRIST upon the Cross, through which all other oblations are accepted of GOD, whereas, without

* Tract No. 81, pp. 370, 371.

† Ibid., p. 371.

respect to that, they are hateful, or, at all events, useless." *

" This point, namely, (to pass by the refinements of others,) was disputed ; whether, in the Eucharist, the bread and wine, and after the mystical Consecration, the Flesh and Blood of the LORD, are offered upon the holy table, as upon an altar, to GOD, for the testifying of His supreme dominion, and the commemoration or representation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST finished on the Cross." †

" Now the oblation of bread and wine to GOD the FATHER, partly to agnize Him as the Creator and supreme LORD of all the world, partly to represent before Him the oblation of CHRIST'S Body and Blood on the Cross, to the intent that He might be propitious to them that offered, and for whom it was offered, and make them partakers of all the benefits of CHRIST'S Passion." ‡

Thomas Brett, Nonjuror (ob. 1742) : " Proving, by all the arguments the thing is capable of, that our Blessed SAVIOUR did leave His own Supper as a commemorative, Eucharistical, material Sacrifice, a Sacrifice of impetration, as well as gratulatory, showing forth our SAVIOUR'S Death, presenting it before GOD as our all-sufficient propitiation, and so being an especial means of obtaining the benefits of it for us ; and, in a word, that it is propitiatory." §

" The bread and wine, therefore, representing CHRIST'S Body as broken, and His Blood as shed and poured out from it, can by no means represent, much less really be, the very individual glorified Body of CHRIST now in heaven, and personally united, not

* Tract No. 81, p. 373.

† Ibid., p. 374.

‡ Ibid., p. 382.

§ Ibid., pp. 383, 384.

only to the Human Soul, but also to the Divine Nature. But it plainly represents CHRIST'S Body as given, that is, offered or sacrificed for us, for so our LORD Himself appointed it to do, saying, 'This is My Body which is given,' or offered, 'for you.' *

"The consequence of all this is, that the bread and wine, in the Holy Eucharist, do by the very institution represent the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Body broken, and His Blood shed; and that if we do not know and understand this, we cannot rightly 'discern the LORD'S Body.' †

"This doctrine, therefore, of a true and proper Sacrifice in the Eucharist, representing the one great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST." ‡

"Wherein we set before GOD the bread and wine as figures or images of the precious Blood of CHRIST shed for us, and of His precious Body; an unbloody Sacrifice instituted by GOD, instead of the many bloody sacrifices of the Law." §

"If the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice which, by our SAVIOUR'S institution, fully and perfectly represents the one great and meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross." ||

"Since the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice perfectly representing, by virtue of its institution, that great and truly meritorious Sacrifice of CHRIST Himself, so that the bread and wine which we offer is accepted in the sight of GOD, as the very Body and Blood of His only-begotten SON, and as such is communicated to us; then, whensoever we rightly and duly make this oblation, we set before GOD the

* Tract No. 81, p. 385.

† Ibid., p. 386.

‡ Ibid., p. 386.

§ Ibid., p. 387.

|| Ibid., p. 388.

memorial of His SON'S Death, put Him in mind of that meritorious Sacrifice which has made a full, perfect, and complete satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." *

"But if there be a particular memorial offered to GOD in the Holy Eucharist, a memorial of CHRIST'S all-sufficient and most meritorious Sacrifice, as undoubtedly there is, and that JESUS CHRIST is there 'evidently set forth, crucified amongst us;' and if evidently set forth as crucified, then evidently set forth as offered for us; it plainly follows, that when such a memorial is made to GOD, to put Him in mind of all that His SON has done or purchased for us thereby to induce Him to confer on us all the mercies and graces obtained for us by CHRIST'S Death." †

"The essence of this Sacrifice, therefore, consists not, as he pretends it does, barely in the remembrance of CHRIST, and expressing that remembrance by partaking of bread and wine as memorials of His Body and Blood, but likewise in the doing or offering them in the same manner *He did.*" ‡

"He offered bread and wine as representatives of His Body and Blood, in order that He might suffer and bear our sins in His Body on the Cross: we offer the same in remembrance that He did suffer and bear our sins there." §

John Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 1747): 35. Potter.
 "So that it is plain, both from the design and nature of the LORD'S Supper, and from the concurrent testimony of the most primitive Fathers, who conversed with the Apostles or their disciples, that it was reckoned through the whole world to be a commemorative

* Tract No. 81, pp. 391, 392.

† Ibid., p. 396.

‡ Ibid., p. 393.

§ Ibid., p. 397.

Sacrifice, or a memorial of our LORD offered upon the Cross."*

36. Hughes.

John Hughes (ob. (?)) : " It was our Blessed SAVIOUR'S will, that the commemoration of His bloody Passion should have the chief place in the public offices; and that it should have the nature of a commemorative Sacrifice." †

37. Laurence.

Richard Laurence, Archbishop of Cashel (ob. 1838): " If by ' proper sacrifice ' your lordship means something material offered to GOD, and, by Divine institution, appointed to represent to Him the one only proper meritorious Sacrifice of the Death of His SON ;—if your lordship designs such a Sacrifice as is representative of the Sacrifice of CHRIST'S Death, and calls this a ' proper sacrifice,' then, my lord, it is acknowledged that such a ' proper sacrifice,' in this secondary sense, has been taught, and not only warmly asserted, but firmly proved to be offered to GOD in the Sacrament of CHRIST'S Body and Blood." †

" The Christian sacrifice of bread and wine has no real intrinsic worth or excellency in itself ; that it is only a Sacrifice representative of CHRIST'S one meritorious Sacrifice of Himself, as the Jewish sacrifices were only types thereof, and not proper satisfaction in themselves to propitiate the Divine nature ; that its whole worth and value is owing only to Divine institution, as that of the Jewish sacrifices was ; and that it was only a Sacrifice, or offering, made to GOD to put Him in mind (as it were) of the all-sufficient Sacrifice of His SON ; to beseech Him for the sake thereof, and of that only, to be propitious and merciful to us ; and to express our unfeigned thankfulness and gratitude for the infinite

* Tract No. 81, p. 405.

† Ibid., p. 407.

‡ Ibid., p. 408.

benefit of our redemption, purchased by the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST." *

William Law (ob. 1761) : " The reason why this 38. Law. Sacrament is said in one respect to be a ' propitiatory ' or ' commemorative ' Sacrifice, is only this : because you there offer, present, and plead before GOD such things as are, by CHRIST Himself, said to be His ' Body ' and ' Blood given for you : ' but if that which is thus offered, presented, and pleaded before GOD, is offered, presented, and pleaded before Him only for this reason, because it signifies and represents, both to GOD, and angels, and men, the great Sacrifice for all the world, is there not sufficient reason to consider this service as truly a Sacrifice ? " †

Charles Wheatly (ob. 1742) : " Nor can we at any 39. Wheatly. time hope to intercede more effectually for the whole Church of GOD, than just when we are about to represent and show forth to the Divine Majesty that meritorious Sacrifice, by virtue whereof our great High Priest did once redeem us, and forever continues to intercede for us in heaven." ‡

" For during the repetition of these words, the Priest performs to GOD the representative Sacrifice of the Death and Passion of His SON. By taking the bread into his hands, and breaking it, he makes a memorial to Him of our SAVIOUR'S Body broken upon the Cross ; and by exhibiting the wine, he reminds Him of His Blood there shed for the sins of the world." §

Gloucester Ridley (ob. 1774) : " For this reason 40. Ridley. types were instituted to prefigure the Sacrifice of CHRIST before He suffered; and for the same reason a memorial instituted to commemorate it after He

* Tract No. 81, pp. 409, 410.

‡ Ibid., p. 413.

† Ibid., p. 412.

§ Ibid., p. 414.

suffered; both of them appointed for the same purpose, to represent the Death of CHRIST: they are equally memorials, and equally sacrifices, differing from one another only as the morning and evening shadow." *

41. Daubeny.

Charles Daubeny (ob. 1827): "The Holy Eucharist is a commemorative Sacrifice, offered up to GOD, by way of memorial, or bringing to remembrance that grand Sacrifice, once offered on the Cross, and for the purpose of applying the merits of it to the parties who, in faith, offer it up." †

"They consider it to be a commemorative Sacrifice and typical representation, by way of memorial, of the grand Sacrifice that had been offered upon the Cross by JESUS CHRIST." ‡

42. Jolly.

Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray (ob. 1838): "Our resort, therefore, must ever be to the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST, which was prefigured, for the support of man's hope, by instituted typical sacrifices from the beginning, as we see in Adam's family; looking forward to it before its actual accomplishment, and now perpetuating the sacrificial remembrance of it, in that Divine institution, which He Himself ordained, to show it forth before GOD, and plead its merit, till He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead." §

"In the highest heavens, He presents the substance of His Body and Blood, once offered and slain upon earth, and which must in heaven remain until the times of the restitution of all things; and His Church upon earth, by the hands of those whom He commissioned, and promised to be with them, in succession from His Apostles, to the end of the world, offers the instituted representations of them, in commemorative Sacrifice,

* Tract No. 81, p. 417.

† Ibid., p. 420.

‡ Ibid., p. 421.

§ Ibid., p. 422.

to plead the merit, and pray for all the benefits of His Death and Passion, pardon of sins, increase of grace, and pledge of glory." *

We have now before us every passage in *Tract 81* which bears directly upon the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and we are therefore in a position to state the results of an examination of these one hundred and fifty-one passages from fifty-one representative Anglican divines.

We find in four writers, the Pseudo-Overall, Taylor, Johnson, and Philpotts, passages in which the Eucharistic Sacrifice is more or less distinctly related "to the perpetual and daily offering of it [the Sacrifice of the Cross by CHRIST] now in heaven in His everlasting Priesthood." † It should, however, be noticed that only one of these authors, Johnson, teaches that the Oblation was not "finished before the Blood of the Sacrifice was brought into the most Holy place and there offered." ‡ The Pseudo-Overall neither says nor implies this; indeed he explicitly states that what is offered in heaven is the same Sacrifice as was once offered, and that "the Church intends . . . to make that effectual . . . which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross." Taylor even more definitely states, in the first passage quoted from his writings, that our great High Priest, in offering still the same one perfect Sacrifice, "represents it as having been once *finished* and *consummate*." In the third passage he says that in heaven our LORD "sits perpetually representing and exhibiting to the FATHER that great effective Sacrifice which He offered on the Cross." In the sixth passage he says: "That there is no other Sacrifice to be offered,

Summary of our investigation of these passages.

In four writers are passages relating the H. E. to our LORD'S Intercession.

Only one, however, teaches that the Oblation was not "finished" upon the Cross.

* Tract No. 81, p. 422. † The Pseudo-Overall. ‡ P. 351.

but that on the Cross, it is evident ;” and again : “ There is no other Sacrifice but that of Himself offered upon the Cross.” And in the seventh passage : “ I humbly represent to Thy Divine Majesty the glorious Sacrifice which our dearest JESUS made of Himself upon the Cross.” The extract from Bishop Philpotts contains no statement from which it might be inferred that he held the Modern view that the presentation of the Blood, and therefore the completion of the Sacrifice, did not take place until after the Ascension. And, in a passage in his pastoral letter of 1851, he leaves us in no doubt what was his mind on this question, for he says : “ Whether we regard them [the consecrated elements] in correspondence with the meat offerings and drink offerings of the Old Testament, as a memorial of the one great Sacrifice, and so, in union with that Sacrifice, by virtue of CHRIST’S appointment, representing and pleading to the FATHER the Atonement *finished* on the Cross.” Hence we find that Johnson is the only one who gives any support to the view that the sacrificial act in our LORD’S Oblation took place, not on the Cross, but in heaven.

Five passages in the other forty-seven writers which seem to relate the H. E. to our LORD’S action in heaven, but which are explained by other passages in their writings.

In forty-two writers clear

In five other writers five passages are found which have been thought by some of the modern school to have some affinity with their view. This affinity, however, is very doubtful, and certainly does not extend to that which is the main contention of the Modern view, namely that the sacrificial act in our LORD’S Oblation is to be found, not on the Cross, but after His Ascension into heaven ; since in fifteen other passages these authors connect the Eucharistic Sacrifice directly and solely with that of the Cross.

In the forty-two authors who remain we find in one hundred and sixteen passages clear and unmistakable

reference of the Holy Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and to that of the Cross only. We are therefore certainly justified in affirming that the view put forth by Mr. Brightman — namely, “the interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross, but of our LORD’S perpetual action in heaven,” and further, that only the initial act in our LORD’S Sacrifice was fulfilled once for all when He died upon the Cross, the other acts of His Sacrifice taking place in heaven—is not the teaching of representative Anglican divines. He tells us that his statement “may easily be verified by looking through Dr. Pusey’s catena from the Anglican divines in No. 81 of *Tracts for the Times*.” We have looked carefully through it, and we find no traces whatever of this view in the passages cited from such representative Anglican divines as Bilson, Andrews, Laud, Sparrow, Brevint, Patrick, Bull, Beveridge, Nelson, Wake, Wilson, Grabe, etc.; while of the four, the Pseudo-Overall, Taylor, Johnson, and Philpotts, who refer the Eucharistic Sacrifice directly to our LORD’S action in heaven, Johnson and Philpotts are certainly not representative Anglican divines, the latter being too near our own times, and the former apparently denying the hypostatic union in our LORD’S Incarnation, and holding Socinian views in regard to the Atonement; while the passage from Overall is admittedly quoted at second hand and is almost certainly the work of another.

We may therefore say that, of the sixty-three authors quoted in Dr. Pusey’s catena, only one really representative Anglican divine, Taylor, at all explicitly connects the Eucharist with our LORD’S offering in heaven, and he uses language which proves that he believed that our LORD’S one Oblation of Himself

reference of the H. E to the S. of the Cross.

We are therefore justified in affirming that Mr. Brightman’s statement about Anglican authorities is not borne out by the facts,

since of sixty-three authors only one really representative Anglican divine explicitly connects the H. E. with our

LORD'S offering in heaven, and they do not favour that view which sees in the Cross only the initial stage of our LORD'S S.

took place and was completed upon the Cross ; and he therefore cannot be claimed as in any sense favouring that extreme form of the Modern view which sees in the Cross only the initial stage of our LORD'S Sacrifice. Only one, Johnson, definitely teaches this theory ; possibly the *Oxford Commentary* attributed to Fell may imply it. The other sixty-one show no trace of it.

The explanation of the indefinite character of passages put forth by the modern school, considered and refuted.

When the indefinite character of most of the passages claimed as favourable to the Modern view is pointed out, we are often met with the statement that the full theory was not clearly before the writers. If this be so, it is in itself a complete admission that the theory is entirely modern. But it is not the case, since the works of Jeremy Taylor, in which the relation of the Eucharist to our LORD'S action in heaven is most frequently set forth, were probably well known to all subsequent writers ; and although the single passage quoted from the Pseudo-Overall may well have escaped the notice of the majority, yet almost all these writers were probably familiar with the works of George Cas-sander, in which the view attributed to Overall is taught in its most extreme form ; and the fact that they did not adopt it implies that they rejected it.

"Tract 81" proves that there are no grounds for claiming that the Modern view is "the Anglican position."

We think we have proved that there are no grounds for calling the Modern view "the Anglican position," since it is not found in the very great majority of the passages to which we are referred in *Tract 81*, and obtains in its most definite form only in writers outside of our Communion, such as Cassander and Thalhofer, who were Romans, and Milligan, who was a Presbyterian.

It remains to trace to their

A most important and interesting task still remains : to trace, so far as we are able, these new currents in

Anglican theology to their source. We have already pointed out that, in the few writers who seem more or less favourable to the Modern view, we have to distinguish two very different currents, though in the modern school both combine and flow on together. Let us see how far we can follow up each to its fountain-head.

1. First, we have those who, like the Pseudo-Overall, Taylor, and Philpotts, relate the Holy Eucharist in its sacrificial aspect to our LORD'S present work in heaven, and yet who fully believe our LORD'S Sacrifice to have been completed on the Cross, and therefore that the merits of that Sacrifice only are now pleaded in heaven.

While this view can claim no authority from the Fathers, nor indeed directly from any writers earlier than the sixteenth century, it does not conflict with any Catholic dogma. And if it be understood in the sense in which Bishop Forbes of Brechin explains it,—as implying no more than that in heaven our LORD is in a passive sense the Sacrifice, and that, in that presentation of His Humanity before the FATHER which is His Intercession, while there is no sacrificial act, the marks of the wounds tell of the merits of the Passion,—there is nothing in this inconsistent with the Catholic view.

But what is its source? This is not a difficult question to answer, at least so far as Anglican writers are concerned, since two of them, Mede and William Forbes of Edinburgh, distinctly refer it to Cassander, and in its earliest form as found in the Pseudo-Overall we recognize the very terms used by Cassander.

George Cassander was born in 1515, and taught classical literature, canon law, and theology in the Catholic universities at Bruges and Ghent, but after-

source the two new currents in Anglican theology.

1. The view which relates the H. E. to our LORD'S Intercession, as taught by the Pseudo-Overall, Taylor, Philpotts, and others, can claim no authority from the Fathers, nor from any writer earlier than cent. XVI., but does not conflict with Catholic dogma.

Its source, so far as Anglican writers are concerned, is Cassander.

Cassander's history.

wards retired to Cologne and devoted himself exclusively to theological literature. His great object was to effect a reconciliation between the Roman Church and the Reformers. With this in view he wrote many works, e. g., his work against the Anabaptists, *De Officio Pii Viri*; and at the very end of his life, having been summoned to Vienna by Ferdinand I., he wrote what was intended to be his great eirenicon, the *Consultatio de Articulis Religionis inter Catholicos et Protestantos controversis*. This was published in 1566, the year in which he died.

Cassander effected little upon the Continent, except to offend the theologians of his own Communion, without gaining the confidence of the Protestants. His work, however, became popular in England as supplying a sort of *via media* between Romanism and Protestantism.

The passage in his "Consultatio" in which this view is stated.

In the *Consultatio* he devotes a chapter to the treatment of the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, from which we quote the following passage :

“ There remains still another controversy in regard to the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which is said to be offered in the Celebration of the Mass. For which controversy there would be no room, I think, if that ancient custom amongst the majority, of celebrating and distributing the Eucharist, had been retained ; which if it were resumed would, I believe, take away the greater part of this controversy. For Protestants admit that the ancient Church used the names ‘ sacrifice ’ and ‘ oblation, ’ but by them understood the whole action,—prayer, reception, remembrance, faith, confession, and thanksgiving. This indeed is in some measure true, for the ancients in this sacred action understood a certain unique manner of

sacrifice and oblation, which CHRIST had instituted and commanded when He said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me;' which mode of sacrificing was performed by the ministry of those alone who in the place of the Apostles presided over the Church.

"We must, therefore, admit that by the names 'oblation' and 'sacrifice' the ancients sometimes understood this whole mystical action, which consisted in the oblation of the consecrated symbols, the Consecration of the oblations, the commemoration of the LORD'S Death, the thanksgiving, the prayer for the general salvation of all men, and also in the distribution and participation of the Sacrament. All these things certainly the Greeks seem to have signified by the names *λειτουργία, ἱερουργία, θυσία ἀναιμάκτη λογική, λατρεία*.

"But the Protestants cannot tolerate this, that the Body of CHRIST is here said to be offered, and a Sacrifice indeed to be made for quick and dead and for the common salvation of the whole world, since (if the authority of the ancient Church is worth anything) that ancient Church did not always admit this. Indeed, it is evident that the ancient Church always considered that the Body and Blood of CHRIST once for all offered upon the Cross was a perpetual Victim for the salvation of the whole world, which, once offered, cannot be consumed, but remains efficacious for the remission of daily transgressions.

"So also CHRIST in heaven, having a perpetual Priesthood, daily, in a certain sense, offers this eternal Victim for us when He intercedes with the FATHER for us. So the Ministers of the Church by His own command daily offer that same Body of CHRIST through a mystical representation and commemoration of the Sacrifice once for all accomplished, the perpetual Victim of

which Sacrifice, standing at the Right Hand of the FATHER in the heavens, they have present on the sacred table ; through whom they supplicate GOD the FATHER to grant that the virtue and grace of this eternal Victim of His Church may be efficacious and saving for all the necessities of body and soul.

“ And because the virtue of this Sacrifice pertains equally to the living and the dead, the Sacrifice is said to be offered for these also, for whom we pray that the virtue of this Sacrifice may be efficacious. There is, therefore, here no new Sacrifice, for there is here the same Victim which was offered upon the Cross, and there is a commemoration in mystery of that Sacrifice accomplished upon the Cross ; and a representation in image of the uninterrupted Priesthood in heaven and of the Sacrifice of CHRIST is continued, by which no new propitiation and remission of sins is effected ; but we ask that that which once for all was fully made upon the Cross may be efficacious also for us.

“ So the ancients *related this mystical Sacrifice not so much to this Oblation once for all made upon the Cross* (of which, however, a remembrance is here made), as to the perpetual Priesthood and *continual Sacrifice* which the eternal Priest offers daily in the heavens, the image of which is here set forth by the solemn prayers of the ministers. Wherefore this Sacrifice is said to be offered for the general salvation of all men, but, as Tertullian says, an unbloody Sacrifice by prayer alone [*pura prece*].” *

If we now compare with this the extract from the Pseudo-Overall we shall see that it is clearly taken from this passage. And this is the more evident if we have the Latin before us, the phrase *juge Sacrificium*

* Opera Cassandri, *Consultatio, De Sacrificio*, pp. 998, 999.

The Pseudo-Overall's words compared with Cassander's.

(continual Sacrifice) in the Pseudo-Overall being the very expression used by Cassander. The former says:

“Therefore this is no new Sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to GOD by CHRIST in heaven, and continueth here still on earth, by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation, or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross. Neither is the Sacrifice of the Cross, as it was once offered up there, *modo cruento*, so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it be commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in heaven in His everlasting Priesthood, and thereupon was and should be still the *juge Sacrificium* observed here on earth as it is in heaven, the reason which the ancient Fathers had for their daily Sacrifice.”

Overall was born in 1560 and died in 1619. Cassander's *Consultatio*, as we have observed, was first published in 1566, and we may assume not only that Cassander is the source of this view, so far as English writers are concerned, but that he is the first theological writer in whose works this theory appears, although, as we have pointed out, the germ from which it was developed is found in the mystical writings of S. Ivo of Chartres. The statement that the Eucharist is *not so much* to be referred to the Sacrifice of the Cross as to “the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in heaven,” which the Pseudo-Overall seems to have taken from Cassander, is unwarranted, and absolutely contrary to all Catholic theology. In tracing it to Cassander we have, we believe, reached the undoubted

Cassander the undoubted source of this view, so far as Anglicans are concerned.

fountainhead of the Modern view, so far as it teaches that the Eucharist is related to the Sacrifice of the Cross only indirectly and through our LORD's action in heaven. That is, we have traced it to a theologian discredited in his own Communion, distrusted by Protestants, and taken up by certain Anglican divines because he seemed to offer, as a *via media*, a compromise between Rome and Protestantism.

Its attraction as a "via media."

Only one Anglican, however, follows Cassander in the objectionable feature of his theory; all others avoid, and therefore reject, it.

The fact, however, to which we would especially call attention is that only one Anglican writer follows Cassander in this objectionable feature of his teaching. All the others, though probably having his works before them, carefully avoid that particular statement, doubtless because they recognized that it was an unwarranted innovation. And in justice to the Pseudo-Overall (Haywood) it must be remembered that Cassander's words are merely transcribed into his note-book.

A passage in Watson's "Sermons" claims our notice at this point.

Before we pass from this first and more moderate division of the modern school, there is one who claims our attention as being apparently the earliest English writer in whom is found a special relation of the Eucharist to our LORD's Intercession in heaven; though he gives no support to Cassander's view that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is to be "related not so much to the Oblation once for all made upon the Cross as to the continual Sacrifice which the eternal Priest offers daily in the heavens."

Watson's history.

Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, was consecrated on August 15, 1557, by Archbishop Heath of York, Bishop Thirlby of Ely, and Bishop Glyn of Bangor. He was deposed by Elizabeth on June 25, 1559. In 1558 he published a volume of sermons from the press of Robert Caly, London. These sermons were republished by Burns and Oates, under the editorship of

Father Bridget, C.S.S.R., in 1876. The book was entitled *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne concerninge the Seven Sacramentes of Chrystes Church, expedient to be knowne of all men, set forth in maner of shorte Sermons to bee made to the People*; and the twelfth sermon is "Of the Sacrifice of the Newe Testament, which is called the Masse." * In Folio 71 we have the following passage :

" . . . So that CHRIST in heaven and al we Hys mysticall body in earth do both but one thing. For CHRIST being a Priest for evermore, after His Passion and Resurrection, entred into heaven, and there appeareth now to the countenance of GOD for us, offering Himselfe for us, to pacify the anger of GOD with us, and representing His Passion and all that He suffered for us, that we might be reconciled to GOD by Him : Even so the Church our mother being carefull for all us her children that have offended our FATHER in heaven, useth continually by her publike minister to praye and to offer unto GOD the Body and Bloude of her husband CHRISTE, representing and renewynge Hys Passion and Death before GOD, that wee thereby might be renewed in grace, and receive lyfe, perfection, and salvation. And after the same sorte the holye angels of GOD, in the tyme of this oure Sacrifice do assist the Priest and stand about the hoste, thynking than [i. e., then] the meetest tyme to shewe their

His view of our LORD'S Intercession and of its relation to the H. E.

* The author is indebted to Father Puller, S.S.J.E., for having the following passages transcribed from the Bodleian copy of Bishop Watson's works. They are taken from folios 70-74, and will be found in the Burns and Oates reprint on pp. 124-136. They are quoted by Dean Richard Field, of Gloucester, in his *Book of the Church*, and two of them by Scudamore in his *Notitia Eucharistica*.

charitie towards us, and therefore holding forth the Body of CHRIST pray for mankynde as saying thus : LORD, we pray for them whom Thou hast so loved, that for theyr salvation, Thou haste suffred death, and spent Thy lyfe upon the Crosse ; we make supplication for them, for whom Thou hast shed this Thy Bloode, we praye for them, for whom Thou hast offred this same Thy very Body.”*

He is the earliest writer in whom this teaching is found.

In this passage we observe, first, that the action in the Eucharist is spoken of as one with our LORD'S action in heaven, where Bishop Watson says our LORD represents His Passion “to pacify the anger of GOD with us,” and “that we might be reconciled to GOD by Him.”. Second, that in the Eucharist our LORD'S Passion and Death are represented and renewed before GOD, “that we thereby may be renewed in grace, and receive life, perfection, and salvation.”

The first statement, that our LORD pleads His Passion in heaven, is not found in the writings of any Father, though, as we have observed, it is not contrary to any Catholic dogma, if it be not so taught as to take away from the completeness of our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross. And in Bishop Watson's case there is not only no trace of this objectionable feature, but from other parts of the same Sermon we gather that he held the orthodox view that the Eucharist was essentially the memorial of the Passion. For he says :

It is, however, balanced by an accurate exposition of the S. of the Cross.

“Which thing the Churche most faythfullye and obedientlye observeth and useth, not by presumption, taking upon itself to offer that Sacrifice of our SAVIOUR, . . . that is to saye, to represent to the FATHER, the Bodye and Bloode of CHRISTE, whyche Hys omnipotent woorde hath there made present, and

* Watson, *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne*, folio 71.

thereby to renew Hys Passion, not by sufferyng of deathe againe, but after an unbloody maner, . . . that we shoulde by oure fayth, devotion, and thys representation of Hys Passion, obtayne the remyssion and grace alreadye deserved by Hys Passion, to bee nowe applyed unto oure profytte and salvation, not that the Passion of CHRYSŦE is unperfyte," etc.*

Again: "So that the Host or the thing that is offered both in the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Crosse, and in the Sacrifice of the Church upon the aultare, is all one in substance, beyng the naturall Bodye of CHRIST our Hye Priest and the price or raunsome of our redemption, but the maner and the effectes of these two offrynges be dyvers, the one is by shedding of CHRISŦE'S Bloud, extendyng to the Death of CHRISŦE the Offerer, for the redemption of all mankynde: the other is without shedding of Hys Bloude, onelye representyng Hys Deathe, whereby the faythfull and devoute people are made partakers of the merites of CHRISŦE'S Passion and divinitie." †

Again: "O LORD what earnest desyre shoulde we have to be present, and to associate our selves in the oblation of thys our Sacrifice, whyche we knowe CHRISŦE Himselfe alwayes to doo, and also Hys holy Angels and Archangels, and is so acceptable a thing to GOD the FATHER, for all our synnes and ignoraunces. For in that houre when CHRISŦE'S Death is renewed in misterye, and Hys moste fearefull and acceptable Sacrifice is represented to the syght of GOD, than [i. e., then] sitteth the King upon Hys mercye seat, inclined to geve and forgeve what so ever is demaunded and asked of Him in humble maner." ‡

* Watson, *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne*, folio 70.

† *Ibid.*, folio 70.

‡ *Ibid.*, folio 72.

Again : “ By resorting to thys Sacrifice of the Masse we evidentlye declare and protest before GOD and the holle worlde, that we put oure singular and onely trust of grace and salvation in CHRIST oure LORDE, for the merytes of His Deathe and Passion, and not for the worthynes of any good woorke that we have done or can doo. And that wee make Hys Passion oure onelye refuge.” *

Again : “ Our refuge is to CHRISTE’S Passion, than [i. e., then] we turn (as the prophet saith) to the cup of our SAVIOUR, and call upon the Name of our LORDE, that is to say, we take His Passion, and offer to GOD the FATHER in misterie, the woorke of our redemption, that by this memorie and commemoration of it, it woulde please Hys mercifull goodnesse to innovate Hys grace in us, and to replenish us with the fruyt of His SONNE’S Passion and Death.” †

Again : “ Then [i. e., there] whiles we celebrate the memorie of His Passion, we acknowledge and confesse our sinnes,” etc. . . . “ His Passion, which . . . wee renewe and represent before Him, . . . which Passion the Church now dayly to the worlde’s ende dothe renewe in misterye, and doth represent before GOD in the Holy Masse,” etc. ‡

Bishop Watson’s book antedated Cassander’s by eight years, and his teaching must be carefully distinguished from Cassander’s ; for in the passages before us there are abundant proofs that he considered the Eucharist in its sacrificial aspect as essentially related to our LORD’S Passion and Death upon the Cross. Indeed, he only associates it with our LORD’S offering in heaven in so far as he considers that, too, a pleading

* Watson, *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne*, folio 72.

† *Ibid.*, folio 72.

‡ *Ibid.*, folios 72, 73.

of the Passion. And he certainly does not give any countenance to Cassander's assertion (repeated by the Pseudo-Overall) that the Eucharist depends not so much on the offering upon the Cross as on that perpetual Sacrifice which the Eternal High Priest offers daily in heaven. So that we may still consider Cassander as the responsible authority for this latter unwarranted and uncatholic statement.

2. We have yet to trace to its source that more radical form of the Modern view which teaches that only "the initial act" "in our LORD'S Sacrifice was fulfilled when He died once for all upon the Cross," and that "He has passed into the heavens . . . to fulfil perpetually the other acts of His Sacrifice, which the slaying of the Victim made possible."*

Most of those who hold this view, in deference to Catholic tradition, teach that when this initial act, the slaying of the Victim, took place upon the Cross, our LORD was a Priest; although this is by no means universally admitted, since under the Jewish Law the victim was often slain by a layman.

Dr. Milligan says: "The question is one which since the days of Grotius has engaged the attention of not a few of the most eminent theologians and commentators. It has justly done so, for, as may afterwards appear, the answer to be given it has a vital bearing on our consideration of dogmatic theology, and particularly on our conception of the great Doctrine of the Atonement." †

We agree with Dr. Milligan that the answer to this question has a vital bearing on our conception of the Atonement. It is, however, misleading to trace this teaching only to the days of Grotius, who died in 1645.

2. The source of the radical form of the Modern view, which holds that the Cross was only the initial act of our LORD'S S.

Most of its English adherents admit that our LORD was then a Priest.

Dr. Milligan points out that this has a vital bearing on the Atonement.

He attributes the view to

* Brightman, pp. 4, 5.

† Milligan, *The Ascension*, etc., p. 72.

Grotius; we may trace it, a century earlier, to Socinus,

Its real source is found nearly a century earlier, and its author is undoubtedly Lælius Socinus, the founder of modern Unitarianism.*

who seems to be the real source of the theory, as shown by three arguments.

We have already pointed out † that the theory which, in our LORD'S offering of Himself, places the essentially sacrificial act after His Ascension and entrance into heaven, thus making the Cross only the initial act, as Mr. Brightman says, in our LORD'S Sacrifice, was an essential feature of the Socinian system. That Faustus Socinus (or more probably his uncle Lælius) was the author of this theory may be gathered from the following considerations :

(1) It is set forth in the writings of Faustus Socinus as the very essence of his Christology.

(2) He cites authorities for his interpretation of Holy Scripture, apparently wherever he can find such support (e. g., Beza); but he refers to no author as supporting this peculiar interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which in itself implies that he knew of no earlier writer who took this view.

(3) No trace of this view—that the essentially sacrificial act by which our LORD redeemed man took place, not upon the Cross, but after His Ascension into heaven,—is found, so far as we know, in any writer earlier than Socinus; and a reference of this question to several eminent theologians in France, Germany, and England has elicited from all the same reply,—that they know of no writer before the sixteenth century in whose works such an interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews appears.

As Dr. Milligan is responsible to no small extent for the erroneous views of our LORD'S heavenly Priesthood and Sacrifice which have been so widely spread in our

* See Appendix B.

† Pp. 57, 58.

own day, it may be worth while at this point to examine his reference to Grotius (in the passage which we have just quoted), in order that we may estimate the general value and accuracy of his statements. He says: "The question is one which since the days of Grotius has engaged the attention of not a few of the most eminent theologians and commentators."

This paragraph leads the reader to infer that the question was first raised in the days of Grotius (ob. 1645), and that in fact he was the author of the view which limited our LORD'S Sacrifice and Priesthood to heaven. Both these inferences, however, are entirely contrary to the facts.

From some expressions in the writings of Grotius, Bossuet accused him of Socinianism, and the popularity of Bossuet's works led to the charge being largely disseminated. But Burigny, the French historian (ob. 1785), in his *Vie de Grotius* (published in 1750), entirely clears him from this accusation, which, he points out, Grotius himself denies. Besides this, Grotius' work, *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum Senensem* (published in 1617), is an admirable refutation of the main features of the Socinian heresy, and especially of its theory of the heavenly Sacrifice.

Dr. Milligan probably knew that Grotius had been accused of Socinianism, had heard that the work, *De Satisfactione Christi*, contained a discussion of the theory of a heavenly Sacrifice based upon the opinion that our LORD'S Priesthood was limited to heaven, and therefore took it for granted that Grotius originated this theory.

He, however, had probably never verified his assumption and did not know that this work of Grotius was a masterly refutation of this very theory, as set

forth by Faustus Socinus in his treatise against Cove-
tus, *De Jesu Servatore* (published in 1594), in which
he probably only states and interprets the views of
his uncle Lælius Socinus (ob. 1562), the real founder
of Socinianism.

In order that the reader may judge how far Grotius
is to be associated with the Socinian doctrine (and also
for its own intrinsic worth), we give a translation of
the last page of the work, *De Satisfactione Christi*.
Refuting the interpretation of Heb. ix. 12 and Heb.
i. 3 given by Socinus, Grotius writes as follows: " In
which passages the words in the past tense show that
the redemption and expiation were made *before* CHRIST
entered His heavenly kingdom ; for although CHRIST is
an High Priest of an order which does not remain on
earth like the Levitical priests (Heb. viii. 4), but, enter-
ing heaven, must ascend higher than heaven itself
(Heb. iv. 14 and Heb. vii. 26), since His Priesthood is
to be eternal and perpetual (Heb. vii. 24), neverthe-
less He was a true Priest and true Victim at the time
when on earth He delivered Himself up to death.

" Therefore is He said to have come into the world
(Heb. x. 5) to do the will of GOD (vv. 7, 9) ; that is,
to offer to GOD (v. 10) for sins (vv. 8, 12) His Body
which had been prepared by GOD, that is, sanctified
(v. 5).

" In which passage we must at the same time notice
that we are said to be sanctified by His Oblation once
for all (ἐφ' ἅπασι). Since CHRIST intercedes for us as
often as we are in need, in this place we are to under-
stand not His Intercession, but His mactation. There
is on this account a twofold Oblation (both of certain
legal victims and of CHRIST), first the Oblation of
mactation, then that of presentation.

“ In the case of the legal victims the first took place in the temple, the second in the sanctuary itself. In CHRIST’S Oblation of Himself, the first was on earth, the second in heaven. *Nevertheless that first Oblation was not the preparation of the Sacrifice (sacrificii præparatio), but the Sacrifice ;* the latter not so much a sacrifice, as the commemoration of a sacrifice which had been made. Wherefore since the appearance and intercession [in heaven] are not properly priestly acts, *excepting in so far as they depend (nituntur) on the virtue of a finished (peracti) sacrifice,* he who takes away that sacrifice does not even leave CHRIST a true Priesthood, contrary to the plain teaching of the Scripture, which assigns to CHRIST the high-priestly dignity as distinct from that of the prophetic and regal offices; a term used not figuratively, but in a most real sense, for His Priesthood is contrasted with the Levitical priesthood (which was a true priesthood) as in the same genus a more perfect species is contrasted with one which is less perfect.

“ Nor can it be rightly inferred that CHRIST should have somewhat to offer (Heb. viii. 3) unless in the truth of that Priesthood in which He was established (Heb. i. 3). But indeed it is not to be wondered at that those should have taken away from CHRIST the natural glory of His true name, I mean His Deity, who also diminish His offices and refuse to acknowledge His special benefits (*beneficia*).

“ To Thee O LORD JESU as true GOD, as true Redeemer, as true Priest, as true Victim for sins, with the FATHER and SPIRIT, together with Thee one GOD, be honour and glory.” *

It is much to be desired that the Modern school

* Grotius, *De Satisfactione Christi*, Opera, tom. iv., p. 338.

would read this treatise of Grotius, instead of quoting him as the author of the Socinian theory of our LORD'S heavenly Priesthood and Sacrifice.

Reasons why the views of Cassander and Johnson should be rejected by members of the Anglican Church.

In closing this lengthy but important chapter, we remark, first, that the doctrine of Cassander, that the Eucharist is related in its sacrificial character "*not so much* to the Oblation once for all made upon the Cross . . . as to the perpetual Priesthood and continual Sacrifice which the eternal Priest offers daily in the heavens," has no Catholic or Anglican authority, in that it is only followed by the Pseudo-Overall, and is carefully avoided by all other Anglican writers.

Second, that the teaching of Johnson that our LORD'S "Soul was separated from the Body before the Sacrifice was consummated," * and "that the Ascension of CHRIST into heaven many days after was but the finishing of this one Oblation," † which was therefore not finished on the Cross, is found in no reputable Anglican divine, and should be most earnestly repudiated by all members of the Anglican Church for the following reasons:

- (1) It is perilously near to the doctrine of Socinus ;
- (2) It is inconsistent with the scriptural doctrine of the Atonement ;
- (3) It is unknown to any Catholic writer; and
- (4) It is absolutely contrary to the express declaration of the Prayer Book that upon the Cross our LORD "made . . . by His one Oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

* Tract No. 81, p. 317.

† Ibid., p. 334.

CHAPTER XI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE TRACTARIANS.

THERE still remains for our examination the evidence of one school of writers, the Tractarians, the leaders of the Catholic Revival in the Church of England.

No words can be too strong to express the debt of gratitude which the Church of England owes them ; no language too glowing to tell of the wondering admiration with which their lives and works inspire every thoughtful English Churchman.

When we take into consideration the opposition which they had to meet from those in authority in the Church itself ; the prejudices they had to overcome, not only in their own early education, but in their whole environment ; the difficulties which ensued from the entire absence, for a century past, of any English theological literature upon which they could draw ;— it fills us with amazement that they were able to grasp and teach the Catholic Faith as they did. Their great learning, their patient industry, that indomitable courage born of absolute trust in GOD and faith in His Church, which enabled them to accomplish such wonderful results, must command at once our deepest respect and our most profound gratitude.

Among the difficulties which somewhat hindered

Introductory:
The Tractarians the leaders of the Catholic Revival.
The great debt the Church owes to them.

Their wonderful lives.

Some difficulties of their task,

especially from

two assumptions, in part true but liable to bias the judgment.

1. That Roman teaching was necessarily wrong.

2. That a "via media" between Romanism and Protestantism could be found in the Fathers. The true "via media," the touchstone of truth, considered.

their early investigations of truth were two assumptions, in part true, and yet liable to warp the judgment where it most needed to be kept free from bias. The first was, that certain unpopular Roman doctrines were necessarily wrong, and, indeed, that all doctrines as stated by the Roman Church probably needed modification. The second, for which Newman was largely responsible, was that there could be found in the Fathers a certain *via media* between Romanism and Protestantism, and that this *via media* was the real teaching of the English Church.

That the true *via media*, as set forth by Aristotle in his treatment of the Virtues, is the touchstone of perfect truth must be recognized by all as incontrovertible. But this *via media* in theology will be discovered, not by finding a middle term between Romanism and Protestantism, but by testing each doctrine separately to see whether it errs by excess or defect.

This testing, as we have already indicated, can only be accomplished by fitting the doctrine in question into its place in the great body of Catholic truth. If it will fit in with all other revealed or defined dogmas we may assume that it satisfies the true *via media*. If it conflicts with any one, either by exaggeration or understatement, the excess or defect must be corrected.

It is, however, evident that such a *via media* will include truths held by the extreme parties of both sides, and, indeed, will often consist in the combination of the affirmative statements of both these parties, corrected, of course, as we have said, by comparison with the only absolute standard, the Catholic Faith.

While, therefore, these two fundamental principles with which the early Tractarians began their work contained an element of truth, which, in the light, or

rather the darkness, of the first half of this century, doubtless seemed greater than it does in our times, yet both alike had a tendency to prejudice their minds in the difficult search for truth, rather than to produce in them that judicial sense which was so much needed in their day to correct the influences of adverse education and environment.

I. In spite, however, of these and other hindrances, they seem, from the beginning, to have grasped Catholic doctrine to a very remarkable extent. There can be little doubt that this was the result of their diligent study of the Fathers, of the care with which they traced the stream of "tradition" to its fountainhead.

I. It is wonderful how fully the Tractarians grasped the Catholic Faith.

And yet a student of the movement observes distinct progress in the theological position of its leaders. Indeed, they recognize it themselves, and, to cite only one as an example, this is evident from Dr. Pusey's letter to the Rev. B. Harrison :

i. A progress may, however, be observed in the views of the leaders,

"It will be disappointing to you that I can do nothing to reassure people in the way you speak of. I am afraid lest I fight against GOD. From much reading of Roman books, I am so much impressed with the superiority of their teaching; and again, in some respects I see things in Antiquity which I did not (especially I cannot deny some purifying system in the Intermediate State, nor the lawfulness of some Invocation of Saints), that I dare not speak against things. I can only remain in a state of abeyance, holding what I see and not denying what I do not see. I should say that wherein I have changed, it has been through Antiquity."*

i. as is evidenced in a letter of Pusey to Rev. B. Harrison,

And again, in a letter to the Bishop-elect of Oxford, Dr. Wilberforce: "It is in this way that I have

ii. and in a letter to Bp. Wilberforce.

* Liddou's *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii., p. 457.

received everything which I have received. Whatever I have received, I received on the authority of the Ancient Church. I may say, too, I received some things against my will. My bias was to keep the position which those in our Church had usually held. I have mentioned the change in myself to *very* few ; because what I had at heart was simply the revival of holiness and true faith among ourselves, and I trusted that GOD in His mercy giving us this ' would provide ' for the rest. Practically, when people come to me for guidance, I endeavour to withhold them from what lies beyond our Church, although, if asked on the other side, I could not deny that such and such things seem to me admissible.

“ If I may explain my meaning, the remarkable Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, which were beyond question genuine, contains a very solemn vision, which involves the doctrine of process of purification after death by suffering, to shorten which prayer was available. I came upon it while reading the Acts for another purpose : it was great pain to me. The ground was taken from under me. I had interpreted passages (as of S. Basil), as I saw, wrongly, under a bias the other way ; solemn as it was I could not, taking all together, refuse my belief to an intermediate state of cleansing, in some cases through pain. The history was a revelation, at a very solemn time, to a martyr ; falling in with much which *might* be the meaning of Holy Scripture and very much in the Fathers, and stamping it upon my mind. I could not escape it. The effect has been that I have since been wholly silent about Purgatory (before I used to speak against it). I have not said so much as this except to two or three friends. Some of my nearest friends do not know it.

“ In like manner, I found that some Invocation of Saints was much more frequent in the early Church than I had been taught to think, that it has very high authority, and is nowhere blamed. This is wholly distinct from the whole system as to S. Mary, as what I before said is from the popular system as to Purgatory. In this way, then, and partly from the internal structure of the Article XXII., I came to think that our Article did not condemn all ‘ doctrine of Purgatory ’ or Invocation of Saints, but only a certain practical system ; and then I came afterwards to see that the actual Roman formularies did not assert more on these subjects (as apart from the popular system or ‘ Popery ’) than was in the Ancient Church.” *

We have already observed that the theological literature of the English Church for a century previous had not been of a character to help the Tractarians in their search for truth. They looked askance at the treatises of Roman theologians, and therefore fell back upon the Fathers and the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century, but chiefly upon the Fathers. As a result of this, the Tractarians endeavour to present the various doctrines which they treat, in the form in which they find them in the Fathers.

We have seen in the history of the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist, † that the Fathers, while un-
 animously teaching that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, never approach the question of the mode of that Sacrifice, and therefore set forth no definite theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They treat the Eucharist synthetically, not analytically ; they regard it as a great whole. For them the mystic action is the Church’s Sacrifice, in which our LORD’S Death is shown forth,

* Liddon’s *Life of Pusey*, vol. iii., p. 44. † Chapter VII.

2. The absence of a contemporary theological literature threw the Tractarians back on the Fathers and Anglican divines.

Hence their view of the E. S. is that of the Fathers, coloured by Anglican writers.

our LORD'S Passion renewed. The Fathers, too, associate the Holy Eucharist, as the great act of Christian worship, with the worship of heaven. As S. Gregory says, "Heaven opens at the voice of the Priest, to unite itself with the Church on earth." * It is the Church's Sacrifice, which the Church's Head and Great High Priest presents, with His mystical Body complete in all its members, to the Eternal FATHER. In it CHRIST is the Priest, the Sacrifice, and the heavenly Altar.

They formulate no definite theory in regard to it,

As we should expect, the Tractarians in their teaching concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice follow closely in the steps of the Fathers. They put forth no theory in regard to it. For them it is the Church's Sacrifice, the memorial of our LORD'S Death and Passion. It is the Church's greatest act of worship, in which she unites herself to the worship of heaven. In it our LORD is the principal Priest, the Victim, and the heavenly Altar.

and if we find traces of modern influence,

If we find in some passages that their doctrine of the Eucharist is coloured by something of the teaching of certain Anglican divines, such as Jeremy Taylor, in regard to the heavenly altar, we need not be surprised, when we consider (1) how prominent a place the Anglican divines occupied in their reading, and (2) that such teaching is no part of an attempt to formulate a theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We shall also show that such teaching is more than counterbalanced by the most explicit statements that the Eucharist in its sacrificial aspect is related to that Sacrifice of our Blessed LORD which was offered once for all and was finished upon the Cross of Calvary.

this is more than counterbalanced by their explicit recognition of its relation to the S. of the Cross.

II. This will be evident from an

II. That this view is correct is evident from an examination of *Tract 81*, the only work in which Dr.

* S. Greg. Mag., *Dialog.*, 1. iv., c. xlviiii.

Pusey treats directly of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. He gathers extracts, as we have shown in the last chapter, from the writings of sixty-three Anglican divines, all of whom speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice; twelve, however, give no hint in regard to their view of the character of the sacrifice, while the other fifty-one differ somewhat in the way in which they treat this point. Dr. Pusey in his introduction makes no allusion to this difference, although he does state what he considers to be the teaching of the Fathers; but in his great work on the Real Presence we find no treatment of the doctrine of the Sacrifice.

examination of their principal writings on the subject.

Mr. Keble, too, wrote on the Eucharist in his treatise on *Eucharistical Adoration*; in this there is only a passing reference to this question, which, however, receives somewhat fuller treatment in his *Considerations*.

And Bishop Forbes, while discussing the Eucharistic Sacrifice in his work on the Thirty-Nine Articles, is more occupied with the attempt to show that it is a Sacrifice than with the question in regard to the mode in which it is a Sacrifice. We find his views on this subject most fully expressed in his *Theological Defence*.

As it is not necessary to our purpose to go through the incidental writings of all the Tractarians, and as we believe only these three wrote anything definite on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, it will be sufficient if we confine ourselves to them. Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and Bishop Forbes were undoubtedly the most representative of their school, and, as we shall see, had occasion to treat the subject with more or less fulness.

This examination will be limited to the works of Pusey, Keble, and Forbes.

To begin with Dr. Pusey, we find the most complete statement of his view in *Tract 81*. He is endeavouring to state briefly what he understands to have been the teaching of the Fathers. He says :

i. Dr. Pusey's view stated in "Tract 81."

i. The passage
quoted.

“ The doctrine then of the early Church was this : that ‘ in the Eucharist an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to GOD, under the form of His creatures of bread and wine, according to our Blessed LORD’S holy institution, in memory of His Cross and Passion ; ’ and this they believed to be the ‘ pure offering ’ or sacrifice which the Prophet Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer ; and that it was enjoined by our LORD in the words ‘ Do this for a memorial of Me ; ’ that it was alluded to when our LORD or S. Paul spake of a Christian ‘ altar ’ (S. Matt. v. 23, Heb. xiii. 10), and was typified by the Passover, which was both a sacrifice and a feast upon a sacrifice.

“ For the first Passover had been a vicarious sacrifice, the appointed means of saving life, when the first-born of the Egyptians were slain ; and like all other vicarious sacrifices, it shadowed out that of our LORD on the Cross ; the subsequent Passovers were sacrifices commemorative of that first sacrifice, and so typical of the Eucharist, as commemorating and showing forth our LORD’S Sacrifice on the Cross. Not that they reasoned so, but they knew it to be thus, because they had been taught it, and incidentally mentioned these circumstances, which people would now call evidence or grounds and reasons.

“ This commemorative oblation or sacrifice they doubted not to be acceptable to GOD Who had appointed it ; and so to be also a means of bringing down GOD’S favour upon the whole Church. And, if we were to analyze their feelings in our way, how should it be otherwise, when they presented to the Almighty FATHER the symbols and memorials of the meritorious Death and Passion of His Only-Begotten and Well-Beloved SON, and besought Him by that

precious Sacrifice to look graciously upon the Church which He had purchased with His own Blood—offering the memorials of that same Sacrifice which He, our great High Priest, made once for all, and now being entered within the veil, unceasingly presents before the FATHER, and the representation of which He has commanded us to make ?

“ It is, then, to use our technical phraseology, ‘ a commemorative, *impetratory* sacrifice,’ which is all one with saying that it is well-pleasing to GOD ; for what is well-pleasing to Him, how should it not bring down blessings upon us ? *They* preferred to speak of it in language which, while it guarded against the errors of their days, the confusion with the sacrifices of Jew or Pagan, expressed their reverence for the memorials of their SAVIOUR’S Body and Blood, and named it ‘ the awful and unbloody Sacrifice,’ or the like, as men would, with a sense of the unfathomable mystery of GOD’S goodness connected therewith.

“ This pleading of our SAVIOUR’S merits, by a sacrifice instituted by Himself, was (they doubted not) regarded graciously by GOD, for the remission of sins ; as indeed our LORD had said, ‘ This is My Blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.’ The Eucharist, then, according to them, consisted of two parts, a ‘ commemorative Sacrifice ’ and a ‘ Communion ’ or Communication ; the former obtaining remission of sins for the Church ; the Communion ‘ the strengthening and refreshing of the soul,’ although, inasmuch as it united the believer with CHRIST, it indirectly conveyed remission of sins too.

“ The Communion was (to use a modern phrase) the feast upon the Sacrifice thus offered. They first offered to GOD His gifts in commemoration of that His

inestimable Gift, and placed them upon His altar here, to be received and presented on the heavenly altar by Him, our High Priest ; and then trusted to receive them back, conveying to them the life-giving Body and Blood.

“ As being, moreover, appointed by their LORD, they believed that the continual oblation of this Sacrifice (like the daily sacrifice appointed in the elder Church) was a benefit to the whole Church, independently and over and above the benefit to the individual communicants — that the sacrifices in each branch of the Christian Church were mutually of benefit to every other branch, each to all and all to each : and so also this common interest in the Sacrifice of the memorials of their SAVIOUR’S Passion was one visible, yea, and (since GOD for its sake diffused unseen and inestimable blessings through the whole mystical Body of His SON) an invisible spiritual bond of the Communion of Saints throughout the whole Body.” *

Tract 81 was written by Dr. Pusey in the year 1838, and therefore represents his views in the early period of his work ;— not that we have any reason to suppose that in regard to this subject they were materially changed later. In the passage which we have quoted in full Dr. Pusey with characteristic accuracy first states the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as he finds it in the Fathers, and then proceeds, as he says, to analyze it and put it into the form of a theory. Let us examine each.

In his statement he says that “ the doctrine of the early Church was this : that ‘ in the Eucharist an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to GOD, . . . according to our Blessed LORD’S holy institu-

* *Tract No. 81*, pp. 4-6.

Dr. Pusey first states the doctrine as he finds it in the Fathers, and then analyzes it.

tion, in memory of His Cross and Passion ; ' ' that this " was typified by the Passover which was both a sacrifice and a feast upon a sacrifice. For the first Passover had been a vicarious sacrifice, . . . and, like all other vicarious sacrifices, it shadowed out that of our LORD on the Cross ; the subsequent Passovers were sacrifices, commemorative of that first sacrifice, and so typical of the Eucharist, as commemorating and showing forth our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross."

Here it is evident that no theory of the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is set forth, merely the statement found in the Fathers that it is a sacrifice made in memory of our LORD'S Cross and Passion, and that, as the yearly Passover was a sacrifice in that it commemorated the first Passover, so was the Eucharist a sacrifice in that it commemorated and showed forth our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross. Nothing can be clearer or more in accordance with Catholic teaching.

Dr. Pusey then says that " if we were to analyze the feelings of the Fathers in our way," we should put it somewhat thus : " They presented to the Almighty FATHER the symbols and memorials of the meritorious Death and Passion of His Only-Begotten and Well-Beloved SON, . . . offering the memorials of that same Sacrifice which He, our great High Priest, made once for all, and now being entered within the veil, unceasingly presents before the FATHER, and the representation of which He has commanded us to make."

In this passage Dr. Pusey again makes the Sacrifice of the Eucharist to consist exclusively in the memorial of the meritorious Death and Passion of our LORD. He states that it is the memorial of the same Sacrifice which our great High Priest made once for all (i. e., upon the Cross). He also states that now, being

No theory is formulated.

The H. E. is a S. made in memory of the Cross, therefore a commemorative S.

entered within the veil, He unceasingly presents this Sacrifice before the FATHER.

The S. was completed on the Cross, its merits presented in heaven.

From other passages, which we shall quote presently, we learn that in Dr. Pusey's opinion the Sacrifice was absolutely finished upon the Cross, and that the offering which was presented in heaven was the merits or effects of the Sacrifice as exhibited in our LORD'S glorified Human Nature. While the view that our LORD in His great Intercession is pleading His Passion in heaven is not found in the Fathers, but is of later date, there is nothing in it, as we have already remarked more than once, which in any way conflicts with Catholic dogma.

His reference to a heavenly altar.

Dr. Pusey further says : " They first offered to GOD His gifts in commemoration of that His inestimable Gift, and placed them upon His altar here, to be received and presented on the heavenly altar by Him, our High Priest ; and then trusted to receive them back, conveying to them the life-giving Body and Blood." Here he probably has in mind the reference to a heavenly altar, which we find in so many of the Fathers,* and which most of them explain as our LORD'S glorified Human Nature interceding for us in heaven, through which Intercession our Sacrifice is accepted, and we in Communion are filled with all spiritual benediction and grace." There is nothing, therefore, in Dr. Pusey's statement of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is inconsistent with the Catholic view. He explicitly relates it to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and not to a sacrifice which our LORD is now supposed to be offering in heaven.

In Sermon IV. of a volume of sermons preached be-

* E. g., S. Greg. Naz., *Oratio* xxvi., n. 16 ; S. Epiph., *Hær.*, Iv., n. 4.

fore the University of Oxford between the years 1859 and 1872, and published in 1872, we have very distinctly set forth Dr. Pusey's view of the relation of our LORD'S Intercession in heaven with the Sacrifice which He offered once for all upon the Cross. The title of the sermon is "The Prophecy of CHRIST our Atoner and Intercessor in Isaiah, chapter liii.," the text, "And He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."* In the earlier part of the sermon Dr. Pusey treats of the Sacrifice upon the Cross, and then goes on to speak of its relation to our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven. He says :

"These acts also of sacrifice for sin, and the priestly office which follows, GOD has, in this prophecy, so distinguished, that the Atoning Death, which was once for all, He speaks of under those many words, almost throughout, as past ; the High Priest's office, which was to abide continually, He speaks of as future. It seems as though GOD had exhibited before the Prophet's soul the events of the Passion and taught him so to relate them, as he saw them. And so up to His Death and Burial, Isaiah speaks in the well-known prophetic past, 'seeming,' in S. Jerome's words,† 'to compose, not a prophecy but a Gospel,' so minutely does the account correspond with our LORD'S Passion.

"In two places only he intermingles futures, 'when Thou shalt make His soul a sin offering ;' 'their iniquities He shall bear ;' lest his hearers or we should think that he was speaking of a real past. Beyond it, he speaks of our LORD'S continual Mediatorial office for us with the FATHER, and from the FATHER towards us, as a continued future. What was *once for all finished on the Cross*, what our LORD embraced in His

ii. Three passages from his sermon on our LORD'S Intercession.

* Isa. liii. 12.

† S. Jerome, Ep. liii., *Ad Paulin.*, n. 7.

word, 'It is finished,'* Isaiah mostly speaks of as past: what He still continueth to do, he speaks of as future. Yet he so blends both, that he does not stop short in the Atonement, without speaking of the abiding office in which it was to issue; nor of our LORD'S present office, justifying, cleansing, interceding for us, as separate from the Atonement, by whose meritorious virtue He justifies, cleanses, availingly intercedes for us." †

Again he says: "In the same way also, in which Isaiah unites the Atonement once made and the continual Intercession at the Right Hand of GOD, 'He it was who bare the sins of many, and *shall* intercede for the transgressors,' in that same way do S. Paul and S. John. The Atonement, although ended as an *Act*, is not a mere past act. It lives on in effect in our LORD'S abiding Intercession." ‡

Again: "'We have an Advocate, JESUS CHRIST the Righteous, and He is the Propitiation for our sins.' He is our Advocate, because He is our Propitiation; He *is* our Propitiation, § in the present, and not in the past only, because that Propitiation, *although in itself perfected when He bare our sins on the Cross*, || is ever present with GOD, ever makes Him propitious to us sinners." ¶

Dr. P. distinguishes between the Atonement finished on the Cross and its effects abiding

In these three passages Dr. Pusey "distinguishes" between "the Atoning Death, which was once for all," and "the High Priest's office, which was to abide continually." He says that the Atonement "*was once for all finished on the Cross;*" that it was "ended as an

* τετέλεσται.

† Pusey, *University Sermons*, pp. 95, 96.

‡ Pusey, *Ibid.*, p. 98.

§ Ἐν αὐτῷ ἰλασμός ἐστι.

|| Italics are ours.

¶ Pusey, *Ibid.*, p. 99.

act;" that its effects live on in our LORD'S abiding Intercession. From this we may see that Dr. Pusey gives no countenance to the idea that only the initial act of our LORD'S Sacrifice was performed on the Cross, and that the essentially sacrificial act, the presentation of the Blood, took place in heaven. He says that as an act it was finished and ended on the Cross, and that it is only the effects which live on in the Intercession. While the effects may be, and are, closely related to the cause, and issue from it, they are not the cause, and, as Dr. Pusey says, are to be distinguished from it. He tells us that although CHRIST "is our Propitiation in the present;" . . . "that Propitiation" was "itself perfected when He bare our sins on the Cross."

in our LORD'S Intercession, and so gives no support to the Modern view.

If Dr. Pusey says, in speaking of our LORD'S Oblation of Himself in heaven, that "our great High Priest unceasingly presents before the FATHER that same Sacrifice which He made once for all," he uses the word "sacrifice" only in a passive sense, as the Fathers use the expression. For in the same sermon he quotes from S. Epiphanius: "He is the Victim, He, the Sacrifice; He, the Priest; He, the Altar; He, GOD; He, Man; He, King; He, High Priest; He, the Sheep; He, the Lamb; He, for our sakes, became all things in all, that in every way He might become life to us."* That this is the sense in which he regards the Sacrifice in heaven is evident not only from a consideration of the use of the term in the others, but from the explanation given by Bishop Forbes in a passage † to which we shall refer later, and which, as we learn from Dr. Pusey's *Life*, received his approval.

He uses the word "sacrifice" only in a passive sense, quoting from S. Epiphanius.

* S. Epiph., *Hær.*, lv., n. 4.

† Forbes, *XXXIX. Articles*, pp. 617, 618.

2. Mr. Keble's view :

i. It is expressed in passages from his sermon on "The Unchangeable Priesthood of CHRIST;"

We now pass to Mr. Keble. Sermon XXXIX. of his *Sermons for the Christian Year* is entitled "The Unchangeable Priesthood of CHRIST." Its text is : "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto GOD by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." * In this sermon we find many passages which set forth Mr. Keble's view on this subject, and we subjoin the following :

"We are not to think of our LORD'S Sacrifice as of a thing past and done, in such sense that we sinners may have the blessing and benefit of it, without anything done on our part, and without any more merciful interference on His. True ; He died once for all ; the day of Calvary can never come again : CHRIST hanging on the Cross was ' a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' . . . But He lives again, lives for ever, to communicate the benefits of His Death to the Church which is His Body, and to each Christian in particular." †

Again : "The Son of Man, our High Priest and SAVIOUR, obtained eternal Redemption for us by what He endured upon the Cross : but for you and me and each of us to reap finally the fruit of that Redemption, we must be partakers of that which He is now doing for us in heaven. . . . How does He apply to you and me and the whole Church the blessed infallible medicine which He provided for us by His Death and Passion ? How does He bring home His Salvation to each one of our souls ? First, you know, He is our King in heaven ; He sitteth there at the Right Hand of

* Heb. vii. 25.

† Keble, *Sermons for the Christian Year*, vol. iv., pp. 389, 390.

GOD. . . . And most especially He, as our King, sends down His royal Gift, the HOLY SPIRIT of the FATHER and the SON, to dwell in our hearts, to unite us to Him, to sanctify and prepare us for joy and glory.

“ But that is not all. . . . He is not only our King but our Priest. This is what S. Paul speaks of, ‘ He ever liveth to make intercession for us.’ To make intercession, i. e., to intercede. . . . So our LORD, not exactly as one praying, at least Holy Scripture does not say so, but as a Priest offering a sacrifice and pleading for another, appears before GOD for us. If He appears as a Priest, He must have some sacrifice to present. . . . What is the Sacrifice which our LORD offers in heaven? The very same which He once for all offered on earth: the Body which was broken, and the Blood which was shed on the Cross. That Body and Blood which He took of the Virgin Mary, which He offered once for all with pain, suffering, and death, on Good Friday, but which on Easter Day He united again, and on Ascension Day carried both Body and Soul into heaven, there to appear night and day in the Presence of the FATHER for us: not without Blood, His own Blood whereby He continually pleads for His Church and each one of His servants on earth, and is our Advocate with the FATHER, through that same love which caused Him to make Himself here a Bloody Sacrifice, a Propitiation, i. e., a reconciling gift, for our sins.

“ Thus He pleads and intercedes in heaven, standing before the FATHER as a Lamb that had been slain. . . . And as if this was not love enough, behold what He has done besides for us; according to the delight which He has in being with the

sons of men and doing them good. Though He has taken up His Blessed Body and Blood in its outward and visible form unto heaven, there to remain until His second coming, He has nevertheless in a Sacramental manner left us that same Blessed Body and Blood on earth, to be set before His FATHER, in the way you know of, by the appointed use of bread and wine, and so to be pleaded on our own altars for a memorial of His precious Death. And observe, this memorial on earth, as well as the memorial in heaven, is made by CHRIST Himself. . . . He pleads for us on earth by that bread and wine which is His Body and Blood, as surely as He pleads in heaven by His natural Body, with its visible wounds, in the very form which He has shown to a few of His saints. . . . So you see, my brethren, the offering in the Holy Communion is the same remembrance of our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross which He offers to the FATHER continually in heaven : and it is the same CHRIST Who pleads and offers it : here in an image and under a veil, there openly in His own Human Form, in the sight of the Angels." *

ii. in his treatise "On Eucharistical Adoration,"

In Mr. Keble's treatise *On Eucharistical Adoration* we find the following passage :

"This memorial CHRIST offers in heaven, night and day, to GOD the FATHER: His glorified Body, with all its wounds, His Blood which He poured out upon the Cross, but on His Resurrection took again to Himself, and with it ascended into heaven. With that Body and Blood He appears continually before the Throne, by It making intercession for us ; by It reminding GOD the FATHER of His one Oblation of Himself, once offered upon the Cross, as S. John writes, ' We

* Keble, *Sermons for the Christian Year*, vol. iv., pp. 390-394.

have an Advocate,' one to plead for us 'with the FATHER, and He is the Propitiation for our sins.' Thus He is our Aaron first, and then our Melchisedec, the virtue of His perpetual Advocacy depending on His former propitiation." *

The most important work of Mr. Keble on this subject is his *Considerations Suggested by the Pastoral Letter of the Six Scotch Bishops on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist*.† The second "Instruction" of the Pastoral Letter related to the Sacrifice of the Altar, and Keble, in answering the arguments of the letter, deals first with our LORD'S sole Priesthood, that is to say, with the fact that He is the principal Priest in every Eucharist, which the untheological language of the Bishops seemed to deny; and secondly, with the relation of the Eucharist on earth to our LORD'S continual Intercession in heaven. It is with this second point that we have to do. He quotes many of the Fathers, amongst others the passages from Thodoret and from S. Ambrose which we have cited in Chapter VIII. ‡

iii. and in his
"Considerations."

Mr. Keble then goes on to speak of the identity of each one of our Eucharists with that which our LORD Himself celebrated in the beginning. Referring to the language of S. Ambrose, who uses the words "shadow," "image," and "truth" as mystically representing the Jewish Law, the Gospel or the Church on earth, and the Church in heaven, he exemplifies these three in the matter of sacrifice, the "shadow" being taken for the Levitical Priest entering the Holy of holies; the "very image," for the commemoration

* Quoted by Sadler, *One Offering*, p. 183. Keble, *On Eucharistical Adoration*, p. 74.

† For an account of the occasion of this Pastoral, see p. 434.

‡ See pp. 261, 262, and 249-255.

of our LORD'S Passion in the Eucharist; and our LORD'S Intercession as the "truth," the "good thing to come." He then quotes the passages from Bishop Taylor which we gave in the last chapter, and says that the Holy Eucharist is the "very image" of the perpetual Sacrifice in heaven.*

It differs but slightly from Dr. Pusey's view;

In these various passages we have Mr. Keble's view set forth very fully, and it differs but little from that which we have already noticed in Dr. Pusey's works. He holds that upon the Cross our LORD made a full, perfect, and sufficient Offering once for all; that in some sense, in His great Intercession in heaven, He pleads that Offering once made; by which he means, of course, that He pleads the merits of it. He says that our LORD "on Ascension Day carried both Body and Soul into heaven, there to appear night and day in the Presence of the FATHER for us: not without Blood, His own Blood whereby He continually pleads for His Church."

it is less Patristic,

This theory, of course, is not found in the Fathers, but it is not contrary to any Catholic dogma, and of late years has gained acceptance with many theologians. It should be noticed that while Mr. Keble in his *Considerations* quotes a very large number of passages from the Fathers, not one of them bears out this statement; and we may be pardoned for again saying that no commentator on the Epistle to the Hebrews before the sixteenth century takes this view, although we have traced its germ in the mystical writings of S. Ivo of Chartres in the twelfth.

Bishop Westcott in his Commentary says: "The modern conception of CHRIST'S pleading in heaven His Passion, 'offering His Blood,' on behalf of man,

* Keble, *Considerations*, pp. 250-265.

has no foundation in the Epistle. His glorified Humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly express the thought, by His presence on the FATHER'S Throne." *

While Mr. Keble undoubtedly associates the Eucharist with our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, he does not teach that our LORD'S Offering upon the Cross was imperfect, nor that the presentation of the Blood did not take place until after the Ascension. We acknowledge that he gives too much weight to the opinion held by Jeremy Taylor and others in regard to our LORD'S Intercession, but we do not believe that his view has much real affinity with the Modern view as stated by Mr. Brightman.

By far the most important witness to the precise views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice held by the Tractarians is to be found in the writings of the Right Rev. A. P. Forbes, Bishop of Brechin. Their importance consists not only in the fulness with which the subject is discussed, but in the fact that the bishop's *Theological Defence*, in which it is most exhaustively treated, was practically the joint work of Keble, Pusey, and Bishop Forbes. Before we proceed to quote from these documents, it will be well to remind our readers of the circumstances under which they were put forth.

The Rev. A. P. Forbes, † while Vicar of S. Saviour's, Leeds, was chosen to be Bishop of the Diocese of

* Westcott, *On Hebrews*, p. 230. Bishop Westcott in a private letter also says the thought "of CHRIST'S pleading His Passion in heaven is, as far as I know, not found in the Fathers." See Appendix G.

† This account of the Brechin controversy is taken from Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, vol. iii., pp. 448-459, and Coleridge's *Life of Keble*, vol. ii., chap. xviii.

and coloured by Cassander's theory, though without its objectionable features; but it sets forth the finished S. of the Cross.

3. The most important witness to the Tractarian view is the Bp. of Brechin.

i. The "Theological Defence" the joint work of Keble, Pusey, and Bp. Forbes.

The circumstances of the trial.

Brechin. His *Primary Charge*, delivered on August 5, 1857, was devoted to an exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. At the Synod held in Edinburgh in December, 1857, it was proposed to issue a declaration on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in opposition to the statements of the Bishop of Brechin. The motion was lost, but the Bishops of Edinburgh, Argyle, and Glasgow signed a document which, if not identical with that proposed, was to the same purport. This declaration from the three bishops was followed by others from the Clergy. Keble, who had sent his book, *On Eucharistical Adoration*, then just published, to the Scottish Bishops, considered the episcopal declaration a condemnation of his own book as well as of the Bishop's Charge, and addressed to the Bishop of Edinburgh a letter on the subject.* Pusey had spent the winter of 1857-58 in the neighbourhood of Paris. During his previous illness and his absence in Paris he had heard nothing of the Scottish controversy. On his return to England, however, he entered into correspondence with some of the Scottish Bishops with whom he was acquainted, especially with Bishop Trower of Glasgow and Galloway, but with ill success, for at the Synod which met in Edinburgh six Scottish Bishops determined to issue a Pastoral Letter, which they did on May 27, 1858. In this letter the Bishop of Brechin's *Primary Charge* is considered *seriatim* and condemned.

Keble's "Considerations."

Keble, as Honorary Canon of Cumbrae, and therefore as having a recognized place among the Scottish Clergy, reviewed this Pastoral in the work to which we have already referred, his *Considerations*, etc.

* This letter is given at length by the Rev. D. J. Mackay, *Life of Bishop Forbes*, pp. 101, sqq.

The matter, however, was not allowed to rest here, for on October 3, 1859, Bishop Forbes was formally presented before the Episcopal Synod of the Scottish Church on a charge of holding, maintaining, and teaching in his *Primary Charge* doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion, the Word of God, the formularies of public worship, and the Scottish Communion Office. The Bishop's *Defence* in answer to the presentation is the work in which the mind of the Tractarians is most fully expressed in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The Bishop's presentation.

We are told* that Pusey spent much labour in helping him to prepare it. It forms an octavo volume of 230 pages, and when the Synod met on February 7, 1860, two days were occupied in hearing the Bishop read it. We may consider, then, that in the Bishop of Brechin's *Primary Charge* and in his *Theological Defence* of that *Charge* we have the fullest exposition of the mind of the Tractarians on the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

We quote from the *Charge* in its emended form, the Bishop having added some explanatory matter before his trial.

ii. Extracts from his "Primary Charge."

"Moreover, the ancient doctors teach that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the Cross. . . . The word 'Sacrifice' may be taken actively and passively: actively it is the rite, passively it is the Victim,—just as it is with the word 'Passover.' Thus the Apostle says, 'CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast.' Now in the sense that the Sacrifice is the Victim, it is evident, as a consequence of the Real Presence, that that of the Holy Eucharist and of the Cross are

* Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, vol. iii., p. 456.

substantially one. CHRIST was offered on the Cross ; the same CHRIST is commemorated and pleaded in the Holy Mysteries. . . . Our LORD said, *This is My Body* ; and no words of man can strengthen the tremendous and absolute identity of the two Sacrifices—or rather, as I should prefer to say, of the one Sacrifice in its two aspects. Unless you hold that in some transcendental sense the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar are identical, you contradict the Apostle, who says there is no more sacrifice for sin. You must admit a true, proper Eucharistic Sacrifice, compelled to do so by the unanimous testimony of antiquity ; but *if it be a true and proper Sacrifice, it must be either one with the Cross or supplementary to it.**

“ I believe that the non-recognition of this identity has been the main cause of the non-acceptance of the doctrine of an Eucharistic Sacrifice by many earnest minds. Say as you will, if you disjoin the Sacrifice of the Cross from the Sacrifice of the Altar, you make the former incomplete. Either there is no such thing as the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, in which case the Church has erred from the very beginning, or in some mysterious way it is, in a sense, one with the offering on Calvary.” †

Again: “ On the other hand, taking the word ‘ sacrifice ’ actively, you come to find a sense in which it is not the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross. It is the *αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκὼν*—the very image, not only of that, but of the everlasting Eucharist, which is ever going on in heaven. It is the commemoration of all the divine acts of the SON of GOD wrought for the redemption of

* That it is supplementary is denied, therefore here its identity is affirmed.

† Bishop Forbes, *Primary Charge*, pp. 40, 41.

the human race. . . . So that, to conclude, passively the Holy Eucharist is the *θυσία*; actively it is the *ανάμνησις τῆς θυσίας.*" *

Again: "In the first place we must inquire what is the One Sacrifice of CHRIST? Is it confined to the few hours during which that Holy Victim hung upon the Tree of Shame upon Mount Calvary, or was it extended beyond that? In one sense, it was 'finished' then. 'Finished' was His work of obedience; 'finished' were His atoning sufferings; 'finished' was the transgression, and 'an end made for sin.' That mysterious act stands alone throughout all time in all eternity. Not the Godhead, but GOD died. He Who was, and is GOD, and, as GOD, lives unchangeably—He, as Man, died. And as that act of GOD'S mercy was one and alone, so the effects of that act stand alone. CHRIST Himself, our LORD GOD, in His Human Nature, 'ever liveth to make intercession for us.' GOD Himself intercedes with GOD. Yet He hath pleased so to limit Himself, that He Himself doth not *merit* anything more for us now. There, on that Cross of Shame, 'He made that full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' That Sacrifice to which all faith looked on, representing and pleading it to GOD, before CHRIST came; which our LORD pleads now; to which all Eucharists and all prayers to GOD now look back and plead, was, as an Atonement, complete in Itself. It alone was an Atonement; It alone was a Satisfaction for sin; It alone (we may dare to say, for it is the language of the Church) was meritorious.

"Our dear LORD, in the bright Majesty of His Mediatorial Throne, invested with all power in heaven and

* Bishop Forbes, *Primary Charge*, p. 41.

in earth, adored by the Cherubim and Seraphim and by all the company of heaven, clothed with that Body which was pierced for us, and ever exhibiting, for us sinners, to His FATHER, those wounded Hands and Feet and Side, has vouchsafed to limit Himself; He adds nothing now to that One Sacrifice which He made when He died upon the Cross, inasmuch as nothing could be added. For—It was ‘finished,’ perfect, infinite, superabundant, sufficient to redeem a thousand worlds. Yet, although the Atoning Act was one, and nothing could be added to its value (for nothing can be added to that which is infinite), still in purpose and will and representation (as at that first Eucharist that Sacrifice was presented to the FATHER before it was made), It can be and is pleaded for us to the FATHER now.

“And are not we gainers beyond all thought, in that our Great High Priest ‘ever liveth to make intercession for us?’ The Apostle speaks as though the object and end of His present Life in Glory were ‘to make intercession for us.’ And yet, although He gains everything for us by that Almighty Intercession, yet He gains all for us by the merits of that One All-sufficient Atonement on the Cross. That Sacrifice was perfected there, as an Act of Atonement, Satisfaction, Merit.

“It was applied beforehand to the forgiveness and acceptance of those who in faith (as Abraham, David, and all Prophets and holy men of old), before CHRIST came, pleaded it and were accepted: It has been, and is, and shall be applied, until CHRIST shall come again to judgment, to the pardon, grace, and acceptance of those who are His. For in another sense, the Christian Church, after S. Paul, has always held that

our LORD'S was *θυσία εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (Heb. x. 12), *juge Sacrificium*,— a continual Sacrifice,— commencing at the first moment of His Conception, continued during every day of His holy Life, offered on the night before His salutary Passion, consummated and slain upon the Altar of the Cross, and now carried by Himself, as the Melchisedecan Priest, within the veil, and perpetually pleaded and presented by Him there to the Eternal FATHER, and in image by the Church on earth in the Holy Sacrament." *

If we now turn to the *Theological Defence*, we find the following explanation of the term " sacrifice : "

" We have now to go on to consider the sense in which the word ' sacrifice ' is used in the passage which has been presented. I must beg the Court to bear very strongly in mind what I have said with reference to the word ' sacrifice ' as it is taken actively or passively—a distinction, indeed, which runs through all our language. I believe that the misunderstanding of my meaning has arisen entirely in this, that whereas I used the word ' sacrifice ' *passively* † of that which is offered, those who objected to my doctrine understood what I said ' actively,' i. e., of the act of Sacrifice or Offering. . . . For the passages from the XXXIst Article and the Liturgy, which they accuse me of having ' contradicted and depraved,' relate solely to our Blessed LORD'S *act of offering* Himself upon the Cross ; while in my teaching, which they charge with having depraved them, the word ' sacrifice ' is used ' passively ' for that which is ' offered.' " ‡

Again : " It were a grave offence to teach any error,

* Bishop Forbes, *Primary Charge*, pp. 48-50.

† Italics ours.

‡ Idem, *Theological Defence*, p. 13.

iii. Passages from his "Theological Defence."

on matters of faith ; but that I should have been supposed to contravene these simple and fundamental truths of the Gospel—on which our only hope of Salvation depends—which I have ever taught—and for which—with my last breath—I hope to bless my GOD—this is, indeed, passing strange. Need I assert, then, that I do, from the bottom of my heart, hold and believe that the offering of CHRIST once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and that there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone? I believe and confess that GOD did give His only SON JESUS CHRIST to suffer death upon the Cross for our Redemption, Who, by His own oblation of Himself once offered, made a full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memorial of that His precious Death and Sacrifice till His coming again.

“ I believe that He, by this single oblation on the Cross, consummated, or made a consummate oblation, paid a consummate and perfect price for our redemption and satisfaction, whereby, as by a boundless and inexhaustible fountain, to be effectual always, and even to the end of the world, yea, to all eternity, He should *perfect* those who are sanctified ; so that though an infinite number of men should be born, and commit an infinite number of sins, no other oblation should be needed for their redemption and sanctification, but for that end this single oblation on the Cross should suffice, by the *application* of which all should be completely justified.

“ This single Sacrifice on the Cross is universal

and all-powerful. This alone is meritorious. To it CHRIST Himself in His Eternal Intercession addeth nothing. . . . Briefly, then, I hold and confess, that the Holy Communion is *actively* the commemoration of the most precious Death and Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST; but all this is perfectly compatible with the belief that *passively* the Sacrifice, i. e., that which is offered and presented to Almighty GOD, is the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST, and therefore, in virtue of the hypostatic union, JESUS CHRIST Himself." *

In treating of our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven, in regard to which the Bishop quotes passages from Jeremy Taylor given in the last chapter, we find the following :

"The question . . . will then be, whether it is erroneous to say that the sacrifice in heaven is the same substantially with the Sacrifice of the Cross. I need not say that I here use sacrifice in the passive sense. Is there then a sacrifice in this sense at this moment in heaven?" †

The Bishop then refers to the ritual of the Day of Atonement, and says :

"Of the first of these functions [the slaying of the victim outside the Tabernacle, which is called making 'an atonement' (Lev. xvi. 6)], the sacrificial action wrought upon the Cross is confessedly the Antitype. Of the latter [the sprinkling of the blood within the Holy of holies] the Antitype is distinctly described in the Epistle to the Hebrews to be the appearing (*ἐμφανισθῆναι*) of our LORD before His FATHER in the heavenly Sanctuary. Now, if the presentation of

* Bishop Forbes, *Theological Defence*, pp. 15, 16.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 65.

the victim's blood within the Holy of holies can be called an act of oblation and sacrifice, the same term must of necessity apply to the antitypical act, viz., our LORD'S entering into heaven once for all, at once the High Priest and the Victim.

“ But it is certain that the typical act in this case is spoken of in Scripture not only as an act of offering (δ προσφέρει, Heb. ix. 7), but also as, we perceive, ‘making an atonement,’—that our Blessed LORD, *then*, does not ‘make a propitiation,’ but ‘is the Propitiation for our sins,’ that He is that Propitiation by virtue of that Body which He once offered for the sins of the whole world upon the Cross ; that that Body, wounded for our transgressions, does and ‘must,’ by its very presence, ‘plead’ with the FATHER ; its Being ‘pleads ;’ the sight of the Lamb which was slain ‘pleads.’

“ It is therefore certain even thus far that our LORD'S present Being in heaven has a sacrificial, nay, a propitiatory character, not as *making* a propitiation, but as propitiating the FATHER, in that He continually, as our High Priest, presents and pleads that active Sacrifice once made ; in other words, that He is present in heaven as the Propitiation for our sins, i. e., as the Sacrifice in the *passive* sense, in that He causes the FATHER to be at one with us severally, one by one, generation after generation, by virtue of that Sacrifice which He continually pleads. His Death upon the Cross atoned for the sins of the whole world. The sins of the whole world were laid upon Him *then*. But the merits of that One Atoning Death are applied continually, and pleaded, and made available to all who shall be saved, through His continual Intercession. Who would say that he should

have been saved by that Atoning Death, apart from the continual Presence of our LORD at the right hand of GOD to intercede for him? It were plain blasphemy. For it would be to say that that Intercession was something superfluous and unnecessary.

“It will be obvious that in Leviticus atonement is predicated of the sprinkling of blood in this sense, that it was the presentation before GOD of the *satisfactory virtue of the action performed outside the veil*;* so that then it was one work ‘under two aspects,’ which partook of a deep-mysterious ‘identity.’ The mactation of the victim was not repeated within the Holy of holies, but it was applied and made effectual for those in whose behalf it was offered. . . . In Heb. viii. 3, we are told that He, whose *present* action as High Priest has in the immediate context been set forth, must necessarily have something also to offer. I must call attention to the emphatic word ‘offer.’ If the word ‘intercede’ had stood alone in Holy Scripture, it might have been misunderstood. Our LORD’S Intercession is an act not of mere prayer, but of oblation. And what has He to offer? Surely His Body and Blood — His sacred humanity — that is, by virtue of the hypostatic union, Himself, really present under natural conditions at the FATHER’S Right Hand.” †

The Bishop also refers to a passage in a sermon of his on Manasseh, from which we cite the following extract :

“The adorable and Blessed SON of GOD and Man, . . . has entered into the heaven of heavens, there to appear in the Presence of GOD for us. There, upon

iv. A passage from his sermon on Manasseh.

* Italics ours.

† Bishop Forbes, *Theological Defence*, pp. 64-66.

the celestial altar, He is presented as the Lamb that was slain — our Propitiation ; and yet at the same moment He is presenting His Passion and our prayers to the FATHER—our Advocate. . . . A door is opened in heaven, and within the Holy of holies, by the celestial altar, JESUS, the High Priest of the New Law, and the Victim of Eternal Propitiation, pleads His Passion before the King of kings, offers the devotions of an adoring universe, and obtains eternal Redemption for us.” *

v. A review of the Bishop's teaching :

(1) That the S. of the Cross is complete ;

(2) that the E. S. is substantially the same as that of the Cross;

(3) that our LORD'S whole life has a sacrificial character ;

We have now before us the fullest exposition of the Tractarian view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And we may note :

(1) That in regard to the Sacrifice of the Cross no language can be clearer than that which the Bishop uses to express his belief that it was absolutely complete, a perfect and finished Sacrifice. Here, therefore, there is no support for Mr. Brightman's view that only the initial act of the Sacrifice took place upon the Cross.

(2) That the Eucharist, as a Sacrifice, is connected directly with the Sacrifice of the Cross, so that, as the Bishop says, it is substantially the same Sacrifice in a passive sense; actively it is the *ἀνάμνησις τῆς θυσίας*, the memorial of that Sacrifice. This, therefore, ill accords with the theory that in the Eucharist we have “ the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross, but of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven.”

(3) While insisting in the strongest language that the Sacrifice was finished and the Atonement complete in itself upon the Cross, the Bishop adds that our LORD'S whole life was “ a continual sacrifice, commencing at the first moment of His Conception, . . .

* Bishop Forbes, *Theological Defence.*, pp. 67, 68.

consummated and slain upon the altar of the Cross, and now carried by Himself, as the Melchizedecan Priest, within the veil, and perpetually pleaded and presented by Him there to the Eternal FATHER, and in image by the Church on earth in the Holy Sacrament." *

From the use of the term *juge Sacrificium*, the Bishop is evidently here quoting from the Pseudo-Overall and Cassander, and is setting forth an aspect of our LORD'S Intercession which was certainly held by the Tractarians, but which, as we have said, they drew, not from the Fathers, but from some few of the Anglican divines, and this at most can only claim mediæval authority. The Bishop, however, is most careful to point out that in speaking of this celestial sacrifice he is using the word only in the passive sense. He says: "The question . . . will then be, whether it is erroneous to say that the sacrifice of heaven is the same substantially with the Sacrifice of the Cross. I need not say that I here use sacrifice in the passive sense. Is there then a sacrifice in this sense at this moment in heaven?" †

No one ever doubted that there was a sacrifice in heaven in this sense. As the Bishop of Brechin points out, it is what S. John affirms when he says of our LORD that "He is the Propitiation for our sins." He is in heaven what He was on the Cross, the Lamb of GOD which taketh away the sins of the world, the Eternal Victim. This, however, is very different from the modern contention that our LORD in an active sense is offering sacrifice in heaven, and that the Eucharist is a sacrificial act, not because it is identical

(4) But that the expression "celestial S." is only used in a passive sense.

* Bishop Forbes, *Primary Charge*, p. 50.

† Idem, *Theological Defence*, pp. 64, 65.

with that of the Cross, but because of its reproduction of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven.*

The affinity of these views with those of Johnson;

but the Bp. in three places seems to disown Johnson's views.

The Bishop of Brechin's views on this point *seem* to have some affinity with those expressed by John Johnson in *The Unbloody Sacrifice*. We have called attention to the heretical character of some of the statements of this writer, and it should be noted that in three places in his *Defence* the Bishop of Brechin uses expressions which show that he does not desire to identify himself with Johnson's views. After quoting a passage from Johnson, in which the force of the word "memorial," or ἀνάμνησις, is discussed, he says: "Now let me be understood here to claim Johnson simply for that for which I allege him, as an exponent of the word 'memorial,' or ἀνάμνησις." † Again, after saying that he finds some statements from writers of very different schools put together ready to his hands by Johnson in *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, he adds: "I would only premise, that I here simply take the collection, as it stands, of ancient writers, *without any sanction* from Johnson's work." ‡ And, treating of the Nonjurors, the Bishop of Brechin says: "I am not the person to undervalue their testimony to truth and honesty. . . . On the contrary, every feeling of early veneration has been enlisted on their side, but it is no true kindness to their memory to place their testimony in an unduly prominent position. They are but

* In treating of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in his work on the XXXIX. Articles, issued seven years later, Bishop Forbes makes the same distinction, and this work is well known to have received the approval of Dr. Pusey. (Forbes, XXXIX. Articles, pp. 617, 618.)

† Bishop Forbes, *Theological Defence*, p. 21.

‡ Ibid., p. 57.

one school of opinion within the Anglican Church, though a school that deserves much consideration from the piety, learning, and self-sacrifice of its adherents. . . . If we consider the circumstances of the time, as well as its theological literature, we shall come to find that there were among the Nonjurors two lines of theological thought upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist ; that there existed in the school synchronistically, and sometimes even in the same minds, at the same time, two currents of belief on these most mysterious subjects.

“There was first the continuation of the school of Laud, Overall, and Andrews, which, through Sancroft, was still naturally represented in a body, that was the legitimate successor of the school of High Church divines, which had sprung up in reaction against the Calvinistic school of Abbott. This school held, with more or less distinctness, that the Holy Eucharist consisted of two parts, a *signum* and a *signatum* [*significatum*],—that the *signum* was bread, the *significatum* the Body of CHRIST, and therefore CHRIST Himself.

“The other school owed its existence to one man of great genius, John Johnson, the Vicar of Cranbrook, in Kent. His theory was that the Body of our LORD, which had been conceived by the HOLY GHOST, and born of the Virgin Mary, had ascended into heaven, there to remain till the restitution of all things ; but that, in the divine mysteries, on Consecration, the HOLY GHOST descended upon the gifts of bread and wine which had been offered in sacrifice to GOD, and, joining Himself with them, made them the Body and Blood of CHRIST in power and efficacy. Johnson’s ability immediately formed a great school, among which

he numbered Bishop Hicke. From this time we find those peculiar expressions of authoritative representatives, etc., which hitherto are, I believe, to be sought for in vain among the earlier divines." *

Bp. Forbes makes two admissions in regard to Johnson's view which are its condemnation.

In this passage Bishop Forbes makes two most important admissions : first, that the school of Johnson did not represent the teaching of the school of Laud, Overall, and Andrews, but owed its existence to the genius of one man, Johnson himself ; and, second, that its peculiar views " are to be sought in vain among the earlier divines."

And this is its condemnation, for Churchmen surely cannot accept a view which owes its existence to the genius of one man, whether he be Socinus, Johnson, or one of their more recent representatives.

Conclusion : An examination of the Tractarian writings discloses a recognition of a relation between the H. E. and our LORD'S Intercession, but the E. S. is explicitly and directly connected with that of the Cross. The Tractarians would therefore have repudiated the more extreme form of the Modern view.

As a result of our examination of the Tractarian position, we believe we are justified in saying that while there is found in their writings an undoubted recognition of a relation between the Holy Eucharist and our LORD'S Mediatorial work, which is regarded by them as in a sense sacrificial, yet the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is in no way made to depend on this. On the contrary, it is explicitly connected directly with the Offering on the Cross, and that not merely through its relation with the Intercession in heaven.

We further believe that the teaching of the modern school, implying as it does an incomplete Sacrifice on Calvary (which is virtually calling in question the Doctrine of the Atonement upon the Cross), would have been repudiated by the Tractarians as emphatically as their disciple and representative, Dr. Liddon, repudiated the teachings of a section of that school in

* Bishop Forbes, *Theological Defence*, pp. 112, 113.

regard to the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and as others* have repudiated its view of the Kenosis as impugning our LORD'S Incarnation.

* Among whom Dr. Liddon would have certainly been found had he lived a year longer.

CHAPTER XII.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

Introductory :

WE have now before us evidence gathered from all the different fields in which testimony to the Eucharistic Sacrifice is found, and we are therefore in a position to draw some conclusions from our investigations.

I. Three points established:

- (1) The E. is a S.,
- (2) whose character depends on the S. of the Cross;
- (3) no theory of the mode "de fide."

Summary of the results of our investigation

1. Of Holy Scripture,

2. of the liturgies,

I. There are three points which we may consider as established beyond doubt by the consensus of the teaching of the whole Church at all times and everywhere : (1) The fact that the Eucharist is a sacrifice; (2) that it depends for its sacrificial character on its relation to our LORD'S Sacrifice upon the Cross ; (3) and that no theory which attempts to explain the *mode* in which the Eucharist is a sacrifice can claim to be in any sense *de fide*.

For, to sum up the results of our investigation of Holy Scripture, the liturgies, the Fathers, mediæval writers, Anglican divines, and Tractarians :

1. From Holy Scripture we learn that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice in that it is the showing forth of our LORD'S Death. Moreover, there is no passage in Holy Scripture which directly or indirectly connects the Eucharistic Sacrifice with our LORD'S action in heaven.

2. The liturgies bear evidence to the sacrificial char-

acter of the Holy Eucharist, but while they speak of a heavenly altar, the adjectives they use to qualify it show that they use this term in a figurative, not in a literal sense.

3. The Fathers distinctly teach that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, but they formulate no theory in regard to the nature of the sacrificial act. They relate the Eucharist exclusively to the Passion and Death of our LORD upon the Cross, and never associate it with our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven. This work they regard not as an offering of His Passion in heaven, but as the presence of His glorified Humanity,—His Humanity itself pleading with GOD for us. They speak of our LORD in heaven as the Victim or Sacrifice in the passive sense of the word, but never of Him as offering sacrifice there. Indeed S. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Euthymius explicitly disclaim this idea. They speak of our LORD'S sacred Humanity as an altar from which rise up the prayers and offerings of the whole Church.

3. of the
Fathers,

4. The mediæval writers, while carefully relating the sacrificial act in the Holy Eucharist to the Sacrifice on the Cross, introduce the conception of our LORD'S Mediatorial work as a pleading of His Passion in heaven, and mystically interpret, *not* the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but the prayers and ceremonies of the liturgy by the ritual of the Day of Atonement, and take them as representing our LORD'S life on earth and His Intercession in heaven; they do not, however, make the sacrificial character of the Eucharist in any way to depend upon this.

4 of mediæval
writers,

5. The Anglican divines, with few exceptions, regard the Eucharistic Sacrifice as commemorating and renewing the Death of our LORD on the Cross. The

5. of Anglican
divines,

Pseudo-Overall is the first to relate the Eucharist to the Oblation in heaven, *rather* than to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the words he uses show that he is quoting almost *verbatim* from Cassander, the earliest writer in whom this conception is found, and probably its author. This view is also set forth by Jeremy Taylor, although he is more guarded in his statements. He does not in any place say that the Eucharist is to be related *rather* to the Intercession than to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and in many passages speaks of the Church on earth offering to GOD in the Eucharist the Sacrifice of the Cross.

William Johnson, the author of *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, is responsible for certain Nestorian and Socinian theories in regard to the Eucharist, which have been followed by some clergy in our own day. These Nestorian tendencies are well exposed by Keble in his *Considerations*.*

6. of Tractarian writers.

6. The Tractarian writers for the most part followed the teaching of the Fathers, and taught the identity (*quoad substantiam*) of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and of the Cross, using the term "sacrifice" in its passive sense. In this sense also, like the Fathers, they speak of our LORD as a perpetual Victim or Sacrifice in heaven.

History shows that no theory of the mode of the E. S. is "de fide."

As we have said, the historical treatment of the subject shows that no theory in regard to the mode of the Eucharistic Sacrifice can claim to be *de fide*; so that while the view so well expressed by Bossuet, that the sacrifice consists precisely in the Consecration, would be accepted by the theologians of the East, such as Cabasilas and Macarius, and in the West by Roman theologians and by most of those in the Church of England who recognize that the Eucharist is in any

* Keble, *Considerations*, pp. 222-247.

sense a sacrifice ; yet we must remember that even this is only a theological opinion, whose weight depends upon the practical consensus of every part of the Catholic world, but which cannot claim the authority of antiquity.

While fully admitting that no theory on the subject is *de fide*, we must also assert that some theories may be *contra fidem*, in that they conflict with the accepted dogmas of the Catholic Faith. Of this we have an example in the more extreme view of the modern school as set forth by Mr. Brightman, which conflicts not merely with some *theories* of the Atonement, but with the very foundation of the doctrine of the Atonement itself, namely, that upon the Cross our LORD offered the full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice by which the world was redeemed.

We must, however, recognize that there are many who, while inclining to that part of the Modern view which associates the Eucharistic Sacrifice with our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven, entirely reject the dangerous and objectionable features of the theory. Indeed we may trace no less than four different divisions of the Modern school, three of which recognize the Sacrifice of the Cross as perfect in itself.

There is the view with which Overall's name is unwarrantably associated : that the Sacrifice of the Cross is not so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it is commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in heaven in His everlasting Priesthood.* While this view in no way conflicts with the Atonement, it can claim absolutely no support either from Holy Scripture, the Fathers, or theologians, and it seems to depend solely

Some theories, however, are "contra fidem,"

for they conflict with the doctrine of the Atonement.

The modern school fall into four divisions,

three of which are entirely orthodox. The school of Cassander,

* Cf. pp. 343, 344.

on the authority of Cassander. Certainly no one before his day taught that in the Eucharist a remembrance was *not so much* made of the Sacrifice of the Cross as of our LORD'S offering in heaven. Nor can any proof be adduced for this opinion.

of Lepin,

Then there is the very beautiful theory of Dr. Lepin, who, regarding our LORD'S whole life on earth and in heaven as one perpetual sacrifice, sees in the Eucharist an *accidental* relation to our LORD'S offering in heaven, although he carefully teaches that its *essential* relation is to the Sacrifice of the Cross alone, and that on this its sacrificial character depends, and explicitly rejects the extreme Modern view of Mr. Brightman.*

of Drs.
Scheeben and
Schanz.

Again, there is the view of Dr. Scheeben and Dr. Schanz, who recognize in our LORD'S Mediatorial work a *virtual* though not an *actual* sacrifice with which they associate the Eucharist. These last two theories, while lacking antiquity, are entirely within the limits of sound theological opinion ; but they all differ not only in degree but in kind from Mr. Brightman's view, in that they all fully recognize that on the Cross our LORD offered the full and perfect Sacrifice by which man's salvation was secured, and that to that Sacrifice nothing can be added. The objection is frequently made that the Death of CHRIST has been too entirely isolated from His life, and regarded as though it alone were the Atonement ; whereas the obedience of our LORD'S whole life must be included in His Atoning work.

These differ
not only in
degree but in
kind from the
extreme Mod-
ern view.

There is doubtless much truth in this criticism, but we must beware lest it carry us too far ; for although we may admit that, from the moment of His Conception to the day of His Death our LORD'S whole life was sacrificial, in that it was the continuous offering to

* Cf. p. .

His FATHER of a perfect obedience, of an entire conformity of His human Will to GOD'S Will, and His whole life therefore being meritorious, yet we must hold that this interior sacrifice of our LORD'S Will culminated and found its full expression in the Sacrifice of the Cross, which, as a definite and external act, completed in time, was a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.

That which followed, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the life of glory, added nothing to this Sacrifice, and our LORD'S Intercession at the Right Hand of the FATHER is not meritorious but is rather the fruit of His Sacrifice, the application of His merits. So that it is quite possible to regard our LORD'S whole life and work as included in His Atonement, and summed up and finished on the Cross, without accepting the Socinian doctrine that the sacrifice was not *offered* on the Cross but in heaven after the Ascension.

II. The purpose of this work is not to put forth or to defend any theory in regard to the mode of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but rather to gather together material from which each for himself may be able to form an opinion upon three points :

1. What views must be denied as conflicting with dogmas which form an essential part of that great body of truth which we call the Catholic Faith.

2. What views may be held, which, while lacking antiquity, are not inconsistent with Catholic truth, and have the authority of many names of great weight.

3. What views must be affirmed as necessarily comprised in the Catholic Faith and clearly set forth in the formularies of the Church of England.

It will perhaps facilitate the use of this chapter for

II. There are three points on which we shall express an opinion :

1. What views must be denied as "contra fidem;"

2. what may be held as not "contra fidem;"

3. what must be affirmed as "de fide"

purposes of reference if we express these points in a series of concise theological propositions under the three heads which we have indicated, and then add some remarks upon the general subject.

i. Propositions
"contra
fidem :"

i. That the S.
of the Cross
was imperfect
or unfinished;

1. Propositions which must be denied as conflicting with some doctrine of the Catholic Faith :

i. It must be denied that in any sense the Sacrifice of the Cross was imperfect or unfinished, or that by anything our LORD does now in His Mediatorial office He adds anything to the fulness and sufficiency of the Sacrifice which He offered once for all and finished upon the Cross.

ii. that the S. of
the Altar con-
sists in aught
else than doing
what our
LORD did, i. e.,
consecrating
bread into His
Body and wine
into His Blood;
and that in our
LORD'S Inter-
cession there is
any counter-
part to this
Consecration;

ii. It must be denied that the Sacrifice of the Altar consists in aught else than the "doing" of that which our LORD Himself did, and commanded His Apostles to continue, namely, the taking of bread, and the consecrating it into His Body, the taking of wine in the cup, and the consecrating it into His Blood. Hence it must be denied that this Consecration of the Body and Blood of the LORD under diverse species, as severed by death, has any counterpart in our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven; and it likewise must be denied that it finds its counterpart anywhere save in His Sacrifice on the Cross.

iii. that the
mere presence
of a once sac-
rificed Victim
is a "proper"
S;

iii. It must be denied that the mere presence of a once sacrificed Victim is a *proper* sacrifice,—that is, in the active sense of the word. Our LORD'S glorified Humanity, sitting at the Right Hand of the FATHER and now appearing in the Presence of GOD for us, is analogous to His Presence in the Reserved Sacrament, but not to the act of Consecration, which is the act of sacrifice.

iv. that our
LORD

iv. It must therefore be denied that in the proper sense our LORD *offers* any sacrifice in heaven, or that

He there exercises *that* function of His Priesthood.* For revelation assures us that He has committed to the priesthood on earth the ministry of reconciliation,† through which priesthood, in the Church on earth alone, He actively offers sacrifice. ‡

"offers" any
S. in heaven.

2. Propositions which may be admitted as entirely consistent with the Catholic Faith :

2. Propositions
not "contra
fidem :"

i. It may be admitted that in a mystical and very true sense there is an altar in heaven, from which rise up before the Almighty TRINITY all the prayers, alms, and sacrifices of the whole Church, Militant, Expectant, and Triumphant. Most of the Fathers consider this altar to be our LORD'S Sacred Humanity.

i. That there is
an altar in
heaven on
which are
offered the
oblations of
the Church ;

ii. It may be admitted that, since the presence of the Sacred Humanity always pleads for us with the Divine Majesty, our LORD may be properly in mystery styled a perpetual Oblation, and that in this sense there is in heaven now a perpetual Oblation.

ii. that our
LORD may be
in mystery
styled a "per-
petual Obla-
tion" in
heaven ;

iii. It may be admitted, too, that our LORD is a Sacrifice in heaven, since He is the Lamb which was once offered in sacrifice for us. And in this sense, using the word "sacrifice" as the equivalent of "victim," it must be admitted that there is now, and that there will be to all eternity, a Sacrifice in heaven.

iii. that our
LORD "is"
a Sacrifice in
heaven.

3. Propositions which must be affirmed as necessarily comprised in the Catholic Faith and clearly set forth in the formularies of the Church of England :

3. Propositions
necessarily
"de fide :"

i. It must be affirmed that on the Cross our LORD offered, once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient

i. That our
LORD offered

* S. Chrys., *In Heb.*, hom. xiii., 3 ; Euthym. Zig., *In Heb.*, c. vii., v. 27. For these passages, see pp. 261, 262.

† 2 Cor. v. 18-20.

‡ Theodoret, *In Psalm.*, cix., 4 ; for the passage see pp. 261, 262.

upon the Cross a full, perfect, and sufficient S.;

ii. that the E. S. though a true is not an absolute S., but depends for efficacy on the S. of the Cross ;

iii. that the remembrance of the mysteries of our LORD'S life, and the oblations and intercessions, are not essential parts of the E. S., which consists only in doing what our LORD did and commanded us to do.

These statements are not peculiar to any school, but belong alike to the teaching of every part of the Church.

An explanation of the pur-

Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, and that to this Sacrifice nothing can ever be added, by Him or by anyone else. And further, that this Sacrifice was sufficient and superabundant as a satisfaction for all the sins of men, both original and actual.

ii. It must be affirmed that the Sacrifice of the Altar is a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, not absolute, nor possessing any power in itself alone, but deriving all its efficacy from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, of which it is the perpetual memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*) and application.

iii. It must be affirmed that while in connection with the offering of this Sacrifice a grateful memory is made of all the mysteries of the LORD'S life ; and, in a symbolical way, gifts like those of Abel and Melchisedec are offered and presented, and intercessions are made in union with our LORD'S great Mediatorial work ; yet all these are mere accidental accompaniments of the Divine Sacrifice, and not its essential part, which consists, as we have said, only in doing that which the LORD did, and which He commanded us to do when He instituted this Sacrament.

In making these affirmations and denials, we believe that we are not following any particular school, nor accepting the opinions of any individual teachers, whether ancient or modern ; but that we are simply following the express words of Divine revelation as interpreted by the Church in all ages, alike by its liturgies, its Fathers, and its theologians. And therefore we affirm that this is the only doctrine which can be held by us with loyalty to the principles of the Church of England.

In the ten foregoing propositions we have summed up in a concise form the dogmatic conclusions which

seem warranted by the evidence collected in the various fields of investigation which we have explored in this work. At the risk, however, of some repetition, and to avoid misunderstanding, it seems expedient again to go over these propositions, with a view to explaining their purport more fully.

port of the foregoing propositions in their relation to modern theories.

The first four are purely negative, and are intended to meet certain modern views which involve a virtual denial of the doctrine of the Atonement as the Catholic Church has always received the same. We refer, of course, to that theory of our LORD'S Sacrifice which sees in His Death upon the Cross "*only the initial act of the Sacrifice* the other acts of which our LORD is perpetually fulfilling in heaven."

This theory, as we have many times shown, is based upon an interpretation of the typical acts of the Jewish high priest on the Day of Atonement, absolutely unknown to the Fathers and mediæval theologians, and invented by Socinus as the keystone of his system of Christology. Certain modern theologians, mostly belonging to schismatical communions, probably quite ignorant of the true authorship of this theory, and in one instance apparently assigning it to Grotius,* have elaborated it and presented it in an attractive form, in which it has been unwittingly adopted by some members of our own Communion.

This theory, tested by the appeal to antiquity, falls at once. Tested by the doctrine of the Atonement, as taught in Holy Scripture, by the theologians of the Catholic Church, in the Articles of Religion, and in the Consecration Prayer of our own Church, it must be condemned as absolutely inconsistent with the Catholic Faith. Traced to its source, it is associated with the

* Milligan, *The Ascension*, etc., p. 72.

most dangerous heresy which has attacked the Church since the Reformation.

If it be urged as against this, that the supporters of this theory think they find it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, surely it is sufficient to reply that it is found in no commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews before the sixteenth century, in no interpretation of it by any Father or writer, and that it is explicitly rejected by the best commentators of the present day. The only noteworthy exception is Alford, who adopts the novel opinion of Bengel, a novelty so startling as to be generally repudiated even by the most advanced exponents of the Modern view.

1. If the first four negative propositions be read in the light of this explanation, their purport and importance will be evident.

i. We must deny that in any sense the Sacrifice of the Cross was imperfect or unfinished ; for if our LORD did not there perform the essentially sacrificial act, which was typified in the Jewish Law by the presentation of the blood,* the Death upon the Cross was not only an incomplete and unfinished Sacrifice, but, as Socinus justly points out, was no sacrifice at all.

ii. We must deny that the Sacrifice of the Altar consists in aught else than the doing of that which our LORD Himself did and commanded His Apostles to continue, namely, the Consecration of bread and wine into His Body and Blood. This Consecration of the Body and Blood of the LORD (under separate species, and therefore as severed by death), which is the essentially sacrificial act, certainly has no counterpart in any-

* This must not be confounded with the application of the blood of a finished sacrifice to certain things and places. Cf. Exod. xxix. 36, 37 ; Levit. xvi. 33 ; Heb. ix. 21, 22.

thing which revelation teaches us that our LORD is doing in His Mediatorial work in heaven. It finds its counterpart, as S. Paul tells us, and as the Fathers and the Church have always testified, solely in that which our LORD did, when He shed His Blood for us upon the Cross.

Those followers of the modern school, therefore, who teach that the Eucharist is a sacrifice because it reproduces on earth, "not the moment of the Cross, but our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven," are contradicting the teaching of every part of the Church, and can cite no earlier authority than Cassander, a discredited Roman divine.

iii. We must deny that the mere presence of a once sacrificed victim is a proper sacrifice,—that is, in the active sense of the word. For if we seek an analogy between our LORD'S glorified Humanity, sitting at the Right Hand of the FATHER and now appearing in the Presence of GOD for us, and His Sacramental Presence in the Holy Eucharist, we shall certainly find that analogy, not in the sacrificial act of Consecration, but in His Presence in the Reserved Sacrament. Hence, for those who hold this extraordinary view, that the presence of a once-sacrificed victim is a sacrifice, there can be no necessity for frequent celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, since the Reserved Sacrament would supply all their needs, not only for Communion, but, according to their theory, for Sacrifice.

iv. We must deny that our LORD in any proper sense, that is, in any active sense, offers sacrifice in heaven, or that He *there* exercises that particular function of His Priesthood. This function, the Fathers tell us, He exercises through His Church on earth in offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and in reconciling

sinnerS to GOD in the Sacraments of Baptism and Pen-
ance.

We have already pointed out* that on the Day of Atonement the purpose for which the high priest entered the Holy of holies was not to offer sacrifice, for sacrifices were offered outside, in the tabernacle of the congregation, the blood being sprinkled, in the Holy place, before the veil of the Sanctuary, some of it put upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense, which was also in the tabernacle of the congregation, and then all the blood poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering, which was at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. †

The normal place, therefore, for the offering of sacrifice was the tabernacle of the congregation, which represented, not heaven, but the Church on earth. When the high priest went into the Holy of holies once a year, he offered the sacrifice as usual without the Sanctuary, even putting the blood of the bullock and of the goat upon the horns of the altar round about, and as usual sprinkling the blood with his finger seven times. ‡ It is true that in addition to this he carried some of the blood into the Holy of holies and sprinkled it before the Mercy-Seat, as the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, thereby signifying that it was only through blood that access could be had to GOD. But the purpose of his entering the Holy of holies was not to offer sacrifice, but to appear in the presence of GOD for the people, to typify our LORD'S Mediatorial work, which was not an offering of blood, but an intercession. And this intercession was typified by the breastplate of the high priest, on which were engraved the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel. For his

* Pp. 124, 125.

† Lev. iv. 5-8.

‡ Lev. xvi. 18, 19.

presence in the Holy of holies with the names of the people upon his heart (not the sprinkling of the blood) was the type of our LORD'S Intercession.

2. The next three propositions deal with doctrines which are admittedly and entirely consistent with the Catholic Faith.

i. We do not deny that in a mystical and very true sense there is an altar in heaven, from which rise up before the Almighty TRINITY all the prayers, alms, and sacrifices of the whole Church, Militant, Expectant, and Triumphant. But we, with the Fathers, theologians, and Tractarians,* consider this altar to be our LORD'S Sacred Humanity. He is the Head of the Church ; in Him is summed up and offered all that the Church offers. This does not imply any literal altar in heaven ; any other altar, indeed, than our LORD'S Humanity. As the Fathers so often say, He is the Priest, He is the Victim, He is the Altar. The distinction is only in thought. It is simply our LORD Himself regarded from three different points of view.

ii. We do not deny that, since the Presence of the Sacred Humanity always pleads for us with the Divine Majesty, our LORD may be properly in mystery styled a perpetual Oblation, and that in this sense there is in heaven now a perpetual Oblation. This pleading, or intercession, as the Fathers so often point out, is not so much an utterance of words as the presence of our LORD'S glorified Human Nature. Once again, to quote Euthymius, " His very Humanity pleads with the FATHER for us." But this does not imply a pleading of His Passion in any sense of representing His wounds. Such a thought is entirely unknown to the Fathers.†

* P. 427.

† See Bishop Westcott's statement, p. 552.

It appears in some Anglican writers, and even in Mr. Keble's *Sermons*,* but in the many passages from the Fathers referring to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, adduced by Mr. Keble in his *Considerations*, and by the Bishop of Brechin in his *Theological Defence*, not one contains any such statement, and we may be sure that if such a passage had been known to them it would have been quoted.

iii. We do not deny that our LORD *is* a Sacrifice in heaven, since He is the Lamb which was once offered in Sacrifice for us, and in this sense, using the word "sacrifice" as the equivalent of "victim," we admit that there is now, and *that there will be to all eternity*, a Sacrifice in heaven. This was the teaching of the Fathers and the Tractarians, but it does not seem to be the doctrine of the modern school, for they seek to find some sacrificial *act*, by which our LORD actively offers sacrifice, and generally claim to find it in the marks of the wounds in His glorified Body.†

The fallacy of this we have already exposed. ‡ For our LORD is the Sacrifice, the Victim, only in the same sense in which He will be the Victim to all eternity. When time is no more, and all things have been brought into subjection unto GOD, our LORD will still be "the Lamb as it had been slain," whereas there will be no more occasion for Him to plead for those who are reigning with Him.

3. The last three propositions are affirmations, all of which seem to us required by the clear teaching of the Church Catholic.

i. We must affirm that on the Cross our LORD offered, once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, and that to this Sacrifice

* See p. 430. † See pp. 142, 143. ‡ See pp. 143, 144.

nothing can ever be added. And further, that this Sacrifice was sufficient and superabundant for all the sins of men, both original and actual.

This may seem to be merely identical (though put in the affirmative) with the first negative proposition. It is intended, however, to include more, and to meet in a positive form the modern teaching that our LORD is now offering a propitiatory Sacrifice for us in heaven, in the sense that "He is fulfilling perpetually the other acts of His Sacrifice, which were made possible by the initial act of slaying the Victim."

We must repeat that there is no middle view possible between the alternatives that our LORD offered a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice and Propitiation upon the Cross, and that His Sacrifice and Propitiation there were *insufficient*. The first is, of course, the Catholic view, and is clearly expressed in our Prayer Book.

The view that our LORD after His Ascension into heaven fulfils perpetually the other acts of His Sacrifice, which were made possible by the initial act of slaying the Victim must mean, if it means anything, that those acts were not fulfilled upon the Cross.

And inasmuch as we have seen that those acts included the essentially sacrificial action typified by the presentation of the blood, and that the slaying of the victim was not even a necessarily priestly act, there seems no escape from the conclusion that the Modern view, as stated by Mr. Brightman, takes from our LORD'S work on the Cross and adds to His work in heaven, not merely the fulfilment of an unimportant detail, but the essentially sacrificial action, the presentation of the Blood, by which man was redeemed.

S. John tells us that our LORD *is* the Propitiation for our sins. We understand by this that He made that

Propitiation once for all upon the Cross, and therefore, in a passive sense, is now the Propitiation for our sins, the application of this Propitiation to the individual being ordinarily made through the ministries of His Church on earth.

ii. We must affirm that the Sacrifice of the Altar is a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, not absolute nor possessing any power in itself alone, but deriving all its efficacy from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, of which it is the perpetual memorial and application. Here again, in positive form, we refute the doctrines (1) that the Sacrifice of the Altar is in any sense an absolute Sacrifice ;* (2) that it derives its efficacy from its relation to our LORD'S work in heaven ; † and (3) that it is not so much a commemoration of our LORD'S Death as that it rather suggests the thought of His whole work. ‡

iii. We must affirm that, while in connection with the offering of this Sacrifice a grateful memory is made of all the mysteries of the LORD'S Life, and, in a symbolical way, gifts like those of Abel and Melchisedec are offered and presented, and intercessions are made in union with our LORD'S great Mediatorial work, yet all these are mere accidental accompaniments of the Divine Sacrifice, and not its essential part, which consists, as we have said, only in doing that which the LORD did, and which He commanded us to do, when He instituted this Sacrament.

This last proposition merely affirms that while mystical language may be used of the accidental relation between the Eucharistic Sacrifice and our LORD'S Intercession, we have no authority either in revelation or in the teaching of the Church for placing the sacrificial

* See pp. 89-91. † Brightmau, pp. 12, 13. ‡ Ibid., p. 5.

character of the Eucharist in anything but in that which our LORD commanded us to do, consecrating bread and wine into His Body and Blood, by which we "shew the LORD'S Death till He come."

III. As we began this book by pointing out the tendency of human thought to swing from one extreme to another, and the danger of exaggerated reaction in theology as in all other departments of truth, so we end with a warning to learn by the experience of the past, and with an appeal to hold fast *all* truth.

It was a favourite maxim of an ancient writer that in any dogma Catholic truth was to be found in the opposite extremes. This is paradoxical, but, like many paradoxes, it is quite compatible with fact. The very term "Catholic" implies this, for we do not reach Catholic truth by developing a doctrine to its extreme on one side, and then abandoning that and swinging to the opposite pole, but by holding fast *what is true* on both sides.

At the Reformation the doctrine of the Atonement was so exaggerated that it overshadowed other doctrines, and indeed one might say that the whole system of Christianity was rearranged around this doctrine as a centre, so that almost every dogma was more or less coloured or modified by its supposed relation to our LORD'S work of Redemption.

The Catholic revival was a recognition that this was a great mistake, and that not the Atonement but the Incarnation was the foundation doctrine on which the Christian faith was based ; although the great leaders of that revival in developing the dogmas of the Incarnation never for one moment lost their hold on the importance of the Atonement. In teaching the Incarnation as the foundation of Christianity they recognized

III. Catholic dogma embraces all sides of truth.

The exaggeration at the Reformation, of the doctrine of the Atonement, which was then made the foundation and centre of all theology.

In correcting this, and supplying what was lacking, we must not abandon what was true ;

the Tractarians acted on this principle.

In our day a danger of giving up truth in response to a popular clamour, which represents the "irreligious conscience."

The attack not limited to the Atonement; the Incarnation also assailed.

that the Atonement had its place, and while supplying what was lacking they did not abandon what was true. Indeed they saw underlying all the exaggerated teaching of the Reformation a great and saving truth, and with real wisdom and justice they preserved the true balance between these two doctrines.

In our own day, alas! the Atonement has been obscured; given up by many on the plea that it conflicts with man's moral sense, with his sense of justice. The answer to this of course is that it is not the Atonement, but certain Protestant theories of the Atonement, which are contrary to man's sense of justice. But this answer is often overlooked, and the trend of religious thought now is to make little of what was once regarded as the most important doctrine of Christianity.

And with the doctrine of the Atonement goes all that severer side of Christianity which is so unpopular in our own luxurious age, and the belief in eternal punishment. For indeed a belief in any real punishment of sin offends what might be called the irreligious conscience; "the moral sense," that is, of those whose standard of morality is not GOD'S revelation, but their own inclinations and desires.

It is not, however, only the dogmas of the Atonement and of sin and its punishment which we find are unpalatable to the world of to-day, but we see that the Incarnation, while proclaimed as the basis of a reorganized Christianity, is emptied of its true meaning, and for it is substituted a humanitarianism which, in insisting on our LORD'S perfect Manhood, robs Him of any real Godhead. For the theory that at the Incarnation our LORD, in order to become true man, parted with certain attributes of His Godhead which were supposed to be inconsistent with His Manhood (such as

Omnipotence and Omniscience) gives us an Incarnation which is not a taking of the Manhood into GOD, but the taking of part of the Godhead into man.

Alongside of this theological tendency is another — to develop, as the antithesis of the exaggerated doctrine of the Atonement, a view of our LORD'S life in glory, which in its turn is made the centre of a theological system, in relation to which the other dogmas of the faith are readjusted. In place of *Christus patiens*, it is *Christus regnans*! Yet here, instead of an antithesis, we should see rather the complement, the fulfilment, the perfection, of the entire CHRIST.

At the same time is seen a tendency to develop a view of our LORD'S life in glory, which is made the centre of a new theology.

There is little doubt that the great truth, the life of glory, has been obscured; that in the early Church Christians lived more in the realization of that heavenly citizenship which is not a mere future reward, but a present possession. It is very evident that such a grasp of our communion and fellowship with the Church Triumphant in the mystical Body of CHRIST must be of immense help to us not only in bearing the toil and sorrow of our exile here, but in imparting to our prayers, devotions, and especially to our acts of public worship, an intense reality and uplifting power.

Much that is helpful in this if it be not allowed to conflict with other truths.

It is also certain that the true doctrine of the Eucharist implies this; as S. Gregory says, "What faithful soul can have a doubt but that at the very moment of the immolation, at the voice of the priest, the heavens are opened, in that mystery of JESUS CHRIST the choirs of angels are present, the lowest are united with the highest, earthly things are joined with heavenly, and things visible and invisible become one"?

Let us, then, join with our brethren of the modern school in teaching the helpfulness of the realization

The value of a realization of

our privileges
as fellow-citi-
zens with the
Saints,

but this is not
the centre of
Christian
theology.

The Incarna-
tion the centre;
its relation to
the Atonement
and to the
H. E.
The attraction
of the life of
glory,

but first must
come the life of
suffering.

(especially in our Eucharistic worship) of our privileges as members of the mystical Body of CHRIST ; as fellow-citizens of the Saints ; as partakers of a heavenly altar.

But in this teaching it is not necessary to readjust the dogmas of the Christian faith to the demands of nineteenth-century thought. While heaven is the goal, and is in a sense our present possession, it is not the centre around which the teachings of Christianity are arranged. This centre is the Incarnation, of which the Eucharist is an extension, and the Atonement a fact rendered necessary by man's sin.

And again, let us recollect that our hearts are drawn not only heavenward but that they are also drawn to the Cross. When we say with the Psalmist, " I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help," we raise our eyes to the hill of Sion, to the throne of glory, where our great High Priest ever liveth to make intercession for us ; and ever applies the fruits of His one Sacrifice as the propitiation for our sins. But we need to remember that there is another hill to which we must also lift up our eyes ; not the lofty hill of Sion, but the little hill of Calvary. Not to the throne of glory only, but to our LORD, King and Priest, reigning from the Tree, reigning from the throne of shame.

We must lift our eyes to Calvary and learn what it cost to redeem us, we must gaze upon the Sacrifice offered once for all there, in which our LORD gave Himself for us.

He said, " If I be lifted up out of the earth I will draw all men unto Me." The words may be mystically applied to the Ascension, but our LORD spoke them literally of the Passion. In our Eucharists, therefore, as we lift up our hearts to heaven, we need to remember

that the Sacrifice of the Altar is not the commemoration of our LORD'S Intercession, however closely it may be associated with Him in glory, but that it is the re-presentation and renewal of His Sacrifice upon the Cross; for when He instituted the Eucharist He said, "Do this in remembrance of Me," and the inspired words of Holy Scripture explain this act of remembrance by adding, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the LORD'S Death till He come." In praying our Heavenly FATHER to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, we beseech Him to grant that we and all the whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.

What has that Passion been to the struggling sinner? It is not the thought of our LORD'S life of glory which draws the sinner to penitence. It is the thought of the arms outstretched upon the Tree of shame, the act of love by which He laid down His life for us; for "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

The remembrance of the Passion as a force in our lives,

The Saints on earth lived in the contemplation of the life of glory, yet they never forgot the life of suffering; they lived in the fellowship of the Saints around the throne, and yet lived in the very presence of CHRIST upon the Cross. What does the Crucifix mean to the Christian Saint? It is the mirror in which he sees what his life on earth should be, the life of crucifixion; it is the narrow gate through which alone he can pass into the wide realms of the kingdom beyond. What was it that S. Paul declared he would preach and preach alone? CHRIST crucified. To what did he determine to confine his knowledge among the Corinthians? To JESUS CHRIST and Him crucified.

and in the lives of the Saints.

Conclusion:
To be Catholic
we must hold
all sides of the
truth.

Let us, then, be Catholic in holding all sides of the truth, and while not allowing the doctrine of the Atonement to obscure that of the Incarnation, or of the life in glory, let us not keep changing from one to the other, but let us hold the fulness of the faith ; for if, like S. Paul, we glory only in the Cross of CHRIST, we shall pass to the glory which is revealed through the Cross of CHRIST.

The Incarnation is the *foundation* doctrine of Christianity, the Atonement its *consequence* in the work of redeeming fallen humanity in time, the life of glory its *consequence* in the work of manifesting the possibilities of redeemed humanity in eternity.

All are necessary articles of the Catholic faith, and all are summed up in the Holy Eucharist, which is the extension of the Incarnation, the memorial of the Passion, and the means by which we are united with the whole mystical Body of CHRIST in the heavenly worship of the Church Triumphant.

APPENDIX A.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE SACRIFICIAL TERMS USED IN LATIN, GREEK, AND HEBREW.

IN Latin the more common sacrificial terms are : Latin sacrificial terms :
“sacrificare,” “sacrificium facere,” “rem divinam facere,” “rem sacram facere,” “victimas immolare,” “hostias immolare,” “cædere,” and “immolare quid” (Cic.); “hostiis rem divinam facere” and “hostiis sacrificare” (Liv.); “mactare” (Suet.); “sacra curare,” “sacris operari,” “res divinas peragere,” “litare,” “offerre.” Of these the only words which need examination are “sacrificare,” “mactare,” “litare,” and “immolare.”

“Sacrificare,” of course, explains itself : “aliquid “Sacrificare.”
sacrum facere offerendo.”

“Mactare,” which we have come to use so freely, in “Mactare.”
the term “mactation,” for the slaughtering of victims, has originally no such meaning. It is generally derived from “magis augere,” as if “magis auctare,” and its signification is, to magnify, extol, glorify, honour, a deity with sacrifices ; to worship him. Later it came to be employed as an euphemism for “occidere,” and hence our use of “mactation” for “slaughter.” As Pitisco says : “Olim enim hostiæ immolatæ dicebantur mola salsa tactæ : cum vero ictæ, et aliquid ex illis in aram datum, mactatæ dicebantur per

laudationem, per ominis bonæ significationem. Mactare est proprie magis augere. Prisca superstitione scæva proferre verba, ne vitiarentur facta, nefas erat. Et hinc mactare pro occidere."*

"Litare,"

The derivation of "litare" (which, of course has no connection with *lis*, *litis*, in Latin, or with *λειτουργός* in Greek) becomes evident in its old spelling, "lutare," found in Plautus (*Pæn.*, ii., 42):

"Tum me Juppiter
Faciât, ut semper sacrificem, nec umquam lutem ;"

and in Varro (*Non.*, ii., 482): "Habes qui, et cujus rei causa, facerem hecatombam ; in quo ego, ut puto, quoniam est luere, solvere, lutavi." "Lutare" is considered a frequentative form of "luere," and signifies, to pay a debt due to the gods. It differs from "sacrificare" in that "sacrificare" is to seek for pardon; "lutare" is to propitiate and perform a vow.†

"Immolare,"

"Immolare," as its derivation signifies, is, to sprinkle the victim with sacrificial meal. It is not used of the "papa" or "victimarius," the inferior priest who brought the victim to the altar and felled it with an axe, but only of the priest who really offered the sacrifice.

Hence we see that, so far as Latin sacrificial terms are concerned, none of them have in their intrinsic signification any reference to slaughter, with the single exception of "victimas cædere," which, however, is not a common sacrificial expression, and conveys its own meaning.

* Pitisco, *Lexicon Antiquit. Rom.*, tom. ii., p. 510.

† "Sacrificare est veniam petere ; lutare est propitiare et votum impetrare."—Pitisco, *ibid.*, tom. ii., p. 470 ; also Vergil: "Tu modo posce deos veniam, sacrisque litatis [i. e., impetratis]."—Vergil, *Æn.*, iv., 50.

The principal words which we have to consider in Greek are, *θυσία*, *σφάζειν*, *ποιεῖν* and *ἔρδειν*, *προσφέρειν* and *ἀναφέρειν*, *λειτουργεῖν*, and *λατρεύειν*.

Greek sacrificial terms:

Θυσία is, literally, the act of sacrificing or offering, and, hence, the sacrifice itself. Its root, *θύειν*, has as its primary meaning, to sacrifice by burning. Aristarchus observes that in Homer the word is only used in the sense of offering or burning, and never of sacrificing.* In classical Greek a sacrifice is a tribute due to the gods, in most cases something paid for gifts received or prayed for, compensation or amends for crimes committed or duties neglected. Even the sin-offering is, with the Greek writers, generally a simple act of homage on man's part, which, like every other *δῶρον* or *γέρας*, he accompanies with a prayer, or prayerful statement of what he wishes to obtain from the divinity in return for his gift. *Θυσία*, however, later comes to represent the victim or offering itself,† and to be used of the act of slaying a victim,‡ and so of slaughter. §

"*Θυσία*."

Σφάζειν. Here the meaning is distinctly "slaughter," properly, to slay by cutting the throat (Lat. *jugulare*), used from Homer downwards, especially to slaughter victims for sacrifice.

"*Σφάζειν*."

Ποίειν and *ἔρδειν*, like *facere* in Latin, are simply general terms for "sacrifice."

"*Ποίειν*,
ἔρδειν."

Προσφέρειν and *ἀναφέρειν*. These two words (like the Latin *offerre*) have, of course, as their root meaning, simply the idea of offering, though applied to sacrifices of all kinds. Their difference would seem

"*Προσφέρειν*,
ἀναφέρειν."

* Homer, *Iliad*, l. ix., 219; *Odyss.*, l. xiv., 446.

† Luc., *Sacrif.*, xii.; Plut., *Vitæ Parall.*, ii., 184 E.

‡ Herodot., l. i., 216; Pindar. *Od. xiii.*, 96.

§ Herodot., l. i., 126.

to be that in *ἀναφέρειν* we have mainly the idea of an offering made to GOD and placed upon His altar ; in *προσφέρειν*, that of an offering brought to GOD. In the former, the thought of the destination of the offering prevails; in the latter, that of the offerer in his relation to GOD. *Ἀναφέρειν*, therefore, properly describes the ministerial action of the priest, and *προσφέρειν* the action of the offerer, although the distinction is not observed universally.*

“ Λειτουργεῖν.”

Λειτουργεῖν has as its underlying conception “ a public work,” from *ἔργω* and the unused *λεῖτος*. At Athens it signified, to serve an expensive public office at one’s own cost, and generally, to perform public duties ; sometimes, to serve a master ; and in late ecclesiastical Greek, to minister as a priest, though in the New Testament use of the word it is applied to services rendered to GOD and to man, and that in the widest relations of social life. Thus, the officers of civil government are spoken of as *λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ* (Rom. xiii. 6). S. Paul describes himself as *λειτουργὸς Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* (Rom. xv. 16), in the discharge of his debt to mankind and by virtue of his commission to proclaim the Gospel (Rom. i. 5, 14). The priestly office of Zacharias was a *λειτουργία* (S. Luke i. 23). Prophets and teachers performed a public service of the Church to the LORD : *λειτουργούντων αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ* (Acts xiii. 2). In the widest sense, the whole life of a Christian society becomes a sacrifice and ministry of faith : *εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν* (Phil. ii. 17) ; to which the life-blood of their teacher is as the accompanying libation ; and in a narrower sense, the vessels of the Tabernacle were “ vessels of the ministry : ” *τὰ σκεύη τῆς λει-*

* Cf. Westcott, *Heb.*, vii., 27.

τουργίας (Heb. ix. 21). The Levitical priests "served:" λειτουργεῖν (Heb. x. 11); and CHRIST has obtained a more excellent ministry: διαφορωτέρας τέτυχεν λειτουργίας (Heb. viii. 6), being a Minister of the Sanctuary and of the true Tabernacle: τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς (Heb. viii. 2). The λειτουργία strictly rendered to man has an equally broad character. The wealthy have a ministry to fulfil towards the poor: ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς (Rom. xv. 27), the due accomplishment of which brings wider blessings to the society: ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης . . . ἐστὶν . . . περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ Θεῷ (2 Cor. ix. 12). In the closer relations of the Christian life a corresponding ministry has its place: λειτουργός τῆς χρείας μου (Phil. ii. 25); ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας (Phil. ii. 30). In ecclesiastical usage the word λειτουργία was used especially of the stated services of public worship: of the Evening Service, of the Service of Baptism, and especially of the Service of the Holy Communion.*

Hence the λειτουργός did not necessarily exercise his office by offering sacrifice. The term is of a far wider signification, although in later ecclesiastical usage λειτουργία became the recognized title of the Holy Eucharist.

Λατρεύειν also describes a Divine service, a service to GOD or to gods, and the underlying idea implies complete devotion of powers to a master, which lies in the root of the word, λάτρις, *latro*, a hired servant. In classical writers the word λατρεία is used of an absolute service, personal or moral. In the New Testament,

"Λατρεύειν."

* Cf. Westcott, *On Hebrews*, p. 231

as in the Septuagint, *λατρεία* uniformly expresses a Divine service, and in ecclesiastical usage expresses that worship which can be offered to God alone.*

From an examination, therefore, of these sacrificial words, we may observe that only one in its original meaning, *σφάζειν*, contains any notion of slaughter. We must bear this carefully in mind when we come to define the term "sacrifice."

Hebrew sacrificial terms:

"Minchah."

If we now turn to the words used in reference to sacrifice in the Old Testament, the most general appear to be:

(1) מִנְחָה (Minchah), from the obsolete root † מָנַח, "to give;" used in Gen. xxxii. 14, 19, 21, of a gift from Jacob to Esau; in 2 Sam. viii. 2, 6; in 1 Kings v. 1; in 2 Kings xvii. 4, of a tribute from a vassal king; in Gen. iv. 3, 5, of a sacrifice generally; and in Lev. ii. 1, 4, 5, 6, joined with the word "Korbân," of an unbloody sacrifice, or "meat-offering."

"Korbân."

(2) קָרְבָּן (Korbân), from the root קָרַב, "to approach;" used with "minchah" in Lev. ii. 1, 4, 5; generally rendered in Greek by δῶρον (cf. S. Mark vii. 11: κορβάν, ὃ ἐστὶ δῶρον), or προσφορά. The idea of a gift is not prominent in the root. It is rather that which is brought near or offered, corresponding to our use of "oblation."

"Zebach."

(3) זָבַח (Zebach), derived from the root זָבַח, "to slaughter animals," especially, "to slay in sacrifice," refers especially to a bloody sacrifice, one in which the shedding of blood is the essential idea. It is thus contrasted with "minchah" in Ps. xl. 7 (LXX. *θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν*), and with "ôlah" (the "whole

* Cf. Westcott, *Hebrews*, note on viii. 22.

† The root does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew, but its use in Arabic, in this sense, shows that it forms part of the common Semitic vocabulary.

burnt offering") in Ex. x. 25, xviii. 12, etc. While the expiatory idea of sacrifice would seem conspicuous, the class **זִבְחֵי** is wider than that of expiatory offerings, and includes thank-offerings or peace-offerings (Lev. iii. 1, iv. 10), **זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים**.

Distinct from these general terms, and yet often appended to them, are the words denoting special kinds of sacrifices :

(4) **עֹלָה** (*Ôlah*), from the root **עלה**, "to ascend." It "Ôlah." symbolizes perfect consecration, and is the term for the burnt-offering, which was wholly consumed by fire on the altar, and the whole of which thus ascended in the smoke to GOD.

(5) **שְׁלָמִים** (*Shelem*), from the root of the same form "to be in health, to be whole," is used to denote a "peace-offering," or "thank-offering," which indicated that the offerer was already reconciled to, and in covenant with, GOD. Its ceremonial is described in Lev. iii. "Shelem."

(6) **חַטָּאת** (*Chattâth*), from **חט**, which signifies "to miss," or "to fail," "to err from a way," "to sin." This root has the sense of "to sin" in the parent Assyrian tongue. "Chattâth."

(7) **אֲשָׁם** (*Âshâm*), "guilt or trespass offering," from the root **אשם**, which is properly "to be guilty," having for its primary idea "obligation contracted through wrong-doing." "Âshâm."

Here again, in Hebrew, we find only one term the primary idea of which is "slaughter," namely **זָבַח**. And further, the slaying of the victim in itself was necessarily a priestly act. It seems to have been normally performed by the offerer (Lev. i. 5, iii. 2, 8, iv. 4, 24, 29, 33, etc.). When the priest stood in a representative position toward the congregation or offered for himself or his order, he of course slew the victim.

APPENDIX B.

FAUSTUS SOCINUS:

“DISPUTATION ON JESUS CHRIST OUR SAVIOUR.”

PART II., CHAPTER XV.

IN connection with the explanation of the passage Hebrews ix. 13, 14, it is taught that the expiatory offering of CHRIST was completed in heaven: from the same passage the explanation is concluded of the manner in which we are for ever freed from the punishment for our sins through the Death of CHRIST.

“Moreover, we must note that these words, ‘He offered Himself without spot to GOD,’ are not to be referred to the Death on the Cross alone, but also to the entrance into the Holy of holies, i. e., into heaven itself, where CHRIST now stands for us in GOD’S Presence for ever. For in this whole Epistle, the author, as we have mentioned above, understands, by the offering of CHRIST, nothing but the presentation (so to speak) of CHRIST Himself made to GOD in heaven for us by means of the shedding of His own Blood. Therefore, just as the author does not hold that He had truly attained to His Priesthood until He had been brought into heaven after His death, that He might appear for us before GOD, so he states that He did not offer Himself perfectly to GOD until He had presented Himself to GOD in heaven.

“ For priest and offering are relative terms. And so, where there is not yet a true priest, there can be no true offering. But where there is a true priest, there is also of necessity a true offering. It is clear enough to anyone who has read the Epistle even once, that CHRIST is not called truly a priest by the writer of it until after His Ascension into heaven ; and, GOD willing, this shall we prove later on, when we treat of CHRIST Himself as foreshadowed in the person of the high priest. But what the author of the Epistle understands by the expression, ‘ the offering of CHRIST,’ he explains so clearly that there is no room left for doubt. For he writes thus in the same chapter ix. verse 25: ‘ Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the Holy place every year with blood of others.’ Very aptly does he compare the offering of CHRIST, which He once made of Himself, with the yearly entrance of the high priest into the Holy place with blood of others. For the word ‘ offer ’ corresponds to the ‘ entering into the Holy place.’ ‘ The words ‘ nor yet often,’ with proper antithesis, are contrasted with the words ‘ every year ; ’ the words ‘ He Himself ’ with the words ‘ with blood of others.’ In this passage, other points of antithesis are passed over, and only this comparison made and this difference shown, that the high priest used to offer every year — while CHRIST offered only once.

“ Who, therefore, does not in these words clearly grasp the idea that CHRIST offered Himself to GOD in no other way than through the shedding of His own blood ; or, as the same writer says, that by the shedding of his own Blood He entered into the true Holy place, i. e., into heaven itself, and stands there in GOD’S

Presence for us? The following words make this clear enough. For first the writer says: 'Otherwise He must often have suffered from the beginning (or rather from the foundation) of the world.' There would be no point, nor any force either in those words, if to offer Himself were the same as to suffer—and if the offering did not definitely mean something different from death. For what point or force could the words of the author have, if he had said that there was no need that CHRIST should suffer often; for that otherwise He must have suffered often from the foundation of the world? For even if there be any meaning in these words, 'from the foundation of the world' (as I believe that there is), nevertheless it is not likely that he would have spoken in that manner, or would have repeated without point the same words, that is, words meaning the same things; but that he would have written thus: 'Otherwise it would have been necessary that He should have determined to do that, even from the foundation of the world.' But if *to offer Himself* principally means *to present Himself* to GOD in heaven, the Apostle concludes with great force and point that there is no need that CHRIST should often offer Himself, for otherwise He must also often have suffered. CHRIST did not and could not present Himself to GOD in heaven except by death and the shedding of His own Blood.

“Moreover the words which the inspired author adds by way of antithesis make the whole matter clear as day. For he says: 'But now once in the end of the world hath He appeared, to put away sin by His offering, or by the immolation of Himself.' Now the word 'appear,' which I think that few have noticed, seems to mean in this place nothing else than to

appear before GOD. For the same author in chapter x. 11, used the single word 'stand,' for 'stand at the altar,' as Theodorus Beza aptly and learnedly notes in that place. But a little before, this had been said of CHRIST, 'that He might now appear before the face of GOD for us.' Although in the latter passage, the expression, 'before the face of GOD,' or 'in GOD's presence,' is not added: nevertheless, one is apparently forced to admit that the Apostle was speaking about the same act of 'appearing.'

"Now the words that follow, i. e., 'by the immolation of Himself,' make this clear. For no other appearing of CHRIST (which might be in question here) resulted from the immolation of Himself, except the presentation of the same CHRIST by Himself in heaven before GOD, after the example of the high priest of old, who through the immolation of victims appeared before GOD in the sanctuary. Although * these words, 'by the immolation of Himself,' might be joined with the preceding words, i. e., 'to put away sin;' yet in all the texts that I have had an opportunity of seeing, whether Greek or Latin, texts not of the Vulgate only but of other versions too (with the exception of one of Seb. Castellio), a mark of punctuation is put between the two phrases, and 'by the immolation of Himself' is joined with 'appeared.' And this punctuation can hardly be defended unless one explains 'appeared' as I have done.

"By this interpretation of mine, as we see, a very fitting meaning is obtained. For if we would have these words so interpreted as to mean that CHRIST by the immolation of Himself has been revealed to us, then there will be in these words no relation to the foregoing that thought and no force at all; not to speak of the fact

in whatever sense you take it, the expression will appear clumsy and obscure. Castellio, as I imagine, perceiving this, although perhaps he did not grasp the true meaning of *φανερόω*, rejected the punctuation, though it existed, but without doing violence to the Greek codices. For when the meaning is not otherwise plain, the punctuation of the words may be boldly changed, if only the words themselves are not changed or moved from their positions in any way. These things, therefore,³ I have said as to the meaning of this passage, should we be unwilling to depart at all from the commonly received punctuation.

“ In other respects, I do not think that Castellio’s interpretation is to be rejected. And, following him, this passage will then be like that other in 1 S. John iii. 5: ‘And ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins.’ And yet I should not deny that even if the usual punctuation were retained, the word *πεφανέρωται* might be taken, in this passage from the Hebrews, in the same sense as that in which it was used by S. John, if by the word *διά* or *through* we understand *with*, a meaning which is found in other places of the New Testament, as in the same epistle of the same S. John (v. 6): ‘This is He that came by water and blood, even JESUS CHRIST.’ *

“ What I first affirmed and have now proved, namely that the writer to the Hebrews means by the oblation of CHRIST, His presentation made to GOD in

* It may be observed that Socinus is quite in error in regard to the force of *διά* in the passage, “This is He that came by (*διά*) water and blood.” It cannot possibly mean “with.” The passage may be rendered, “This is He that came [or was shown to be the CHRIST] by water and blood,” that is, through His Baptism and Death upon the Cross.

heaven for us, was perceived before my time by that man, whoever he was (and surely it is clear that he was a scholar), who wrote the marginal notes for the New Testament, edited by Robert Stephens in the year 1545 at Paris. For in explaining the words of this Epistle, viii. 5, 'Who serve unto the shadow and example of heavenly things,' he writes thus: 'Who indeed serve unto the shadow and example of those things, which at a future time had to be done in heaven by CHRIST. For in heaven, CHRIST offers Himself to GOD.' Thus far he. Here one must note, by the way, that this scholar held the same view as we do, namely that the oblation of CHRIST is still being made as a perpetual act. The word 'offer,' which he uses in the present tense, makes this perfectly clear. Nor is it very remarkable that he should have noticed this, since the Apostle had distinctly said a few verses before, that CHRIST in heaven had been made a minister of the true sanctuary, and that therefore, as all priests have something which they offer, it is necessary that He should have something to offer too, i. e., in the same place [the true sanctuary], heaven.

"But CHRIST offers and offered nothing to GOD except Himself (I am speaking of that offering, which our writer understands in this place), therefore He continues in heaven the offering of Himself. And so, although it may be conceded that the words, *ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὁ προσενέγκη*, ought to be translated by a past tense, thus, 'Wherefore it *was* necessary that this man too should have somewhat to offer' (a rendering approved by some scholars), yet by no explanation can these words be taken as referring to the oblation made here on earth upon the Cross before His entrance into heaven, because in this passage there is

question of the oblation, which either is being made, or shall be made by CHRIST, *after* He has sat down at the Right Hand of the Majesty on high, as is stated with sufficient clearness in the same passage.

“Nor, as perhaps someone may think, do those words of Paul’s at the beginning of chapter v. of the Ephesians oppose my view of the oblation of CHRIST for us: ‘Walk in love, as CHRIST also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a sweet-smelling savour.’ When the love of CHRIST is here mentioned, the writer is apparently speaking of the death of the Cross itself, or rather of CHRIST Himself in so far as He suffered the death of the Cross, which was an offering most pleasing to GOD. In the first place, my view does not separate the Death of CHRIST from the offering of the same CHRIST for us. Nay, I hold that it was only through death, through death as a medial cause, that He was able to offer Himself at all, although the offering was not perfected until His Resurrection and Ascension into heaven.

“For also in that yearly sacrifice, instituted under the Law, in which we have said that the sacrifice of CHRIST was most clearly foreshadowed, it was absolutely necessary, for the completion of the offering, that the blood of the victims should be carried within the Holy of holies. For it is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 7, that the blood was offered by the high priest for his own offences and those of the people, after he had entered with it into the Holy of holies. Moreover, what I have advanced concerning the offering of CHRIST, as is plain from my words, refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews alone, in which I maintain that the oblation of CHRIST is used only in

that sense, which I have above expounded; and not to the writings of the other inspired authors as a whole.

"Moreover Paul does not say that CHRIST has offered Himself to GOD for us, although many (e. g., Beza) have believed that he does so say, especially those who, changing the passage, sometimes add to Paul's words the preposition *εις*, reading thus, 'Who gave Himself for us for an oblation.' If, indeed, the word 'gave,' which in Greek is *παρέδωκε*, ought not to be joined with the word *συμφορά*, i. e., offering; as Tigurini and Castellio have properly noted, who have urged the distinction between the two expressions.

"Both the word *παρέδωκε* itself, which you will never find used of offering victims, bears out this point, and also the thought of the Apostle, who wished to express the very great love of CHRIST, and to say plainly, that CHRIST had given Himself to death for us. (Giving Himself to death, he expresses by the single word 'gave' [*tradere*], as he often does when speaking of this very thing. For in this same chapter, v. 25, he says : 'Husbands love your wives, even as CHRIST also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it.' And in Galatians ii. 20, 'I live by the faith of the SON of GOD, who loved me and gave Himself for me.' And of GOD, Who so loved us that He gave Him [CHRIST] to death, he says in Romans viii. 32, 'Who spared not His own SON but delivered Him up for us all.' And CHRIST Himself also used the word 'gave' in the same sense, or, to please some sticklers, the evangelist John uses it in these words, chap. iii. 16 : 'GOD so loved the world that He gave His only begotten SON.' Paul himself used the same expressions in Gal. i. 4 and Titus ii. 14.

"He would not thus have expressed this idea, if he had said that CHRIST offered Himself to GOD for us.

For this latter expression does not bring before our minds as the former does, the Death of CHRIST. Since a man might offer himself to GOD and yet not die. For the same Apostle at the beginning of chap. xii. to the Romans writes that they should present their bodies as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to GOD. Therefore the meaning of the passage from the Ephesians, under consideration, is that CHRIST so loved us that He gave Himself to death for us. And then, that the Ephesians may be the more stirred up to imitate this wonderful deed of CHRIST, the Apostle adds, as a parallel truth, that this marvellous love of CHRIST, this His pre-eminent work, was an offering and sacrifice most pleasing to GOD.

“So the question turns, not on the offering of His body, but on the offering of a transcendently great act. For that an act by itself may be called a sacrifice is evident from what is written in Hebrews xiii. 16: ‘But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices GOD is well pleased.’

“Moreover, you have a like mode of expression, with the same very common use of apposition, at the end of the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 18), where it is written, ‘But I have all and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing to GOD.’ See also in the same Epistle, ii. 17. From this passage, it also appears that these words, ‘an odour of a sweet smell,’ to which the LXX. restored the meaning that it has in Hebrew, ‘an odour of rest,’ do not contain any idea of expiation, as we have said in commenting on them, much less of the pacification of wrath.

“And therefor, in these words to the Ephesians,

there is no question of any expiatory victim, as Jerome also in his explanation of the place seems clearly to have recognized, although he has not grasped entirely the meaning of the word ‘gave.’ For on this passage, he left the following note : ‘ For as He [CHRIST] gave Himself for us, so also he [the Christian] willingly dying for those for whom he can die, will imitate Him [CHRIST] Who gave Himself to the FATHER an offering and sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour, and so himself becomes an offering and sacrifice to GOD for a sweet-smelling savour.’

“ But finally, to return to the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which I have now especially singled out for explanation, I say that the words ‘ He offered Himself to GOD ’ *must* be explained in this manner, that He presented Himself to GOD in heaven through His own blood. I say that they *must* be so explained, and on another line of argument I have proved that so explained they ought to be. For this is the explanation given of what had been said before. It had been said that CHRIST by His own Blood had entered into the Holy of holies and had obtained eternal redemption. Therefore, in this passage, the reason is given, why CHRIST, when He had entered into heaven through His own Blood, obtained this eternal redemption. And so mention is made not of the shedding of His Blood only, but also of His entrance into heaven.

“ Through the Eternal Spirit, moreover, CHRIST is said to have offered Himself to GOD, because now He lives for ever, and therefore will appear for us for ever in the Presence of GOD; and not, as many foolishly interpret, because the expiatory act of CHRIST’S Sacrifice is made eternal. For in this latter case, the author of the Epistles would have assumed exactly that which he

had intended to prove. See 2 Corinthians iii. 6. In this passage also the *spirit* is understood as opposed to the *letter*, which was neither eternal, nor provided priests that continued for ever. And in these few words the same idea is contained, which had been explained in fuller form at the end of chapter vii., where it is written : ' For the Law maketh men high priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which was sworn since the Law, maketh the SON, Who is perfected (or consecrated) for evermore.'

" The fact that He offered Himself without spot is added, in order that, while the writer is making an apt passing allusion to the victims which were offered in the legal sacrifices and which had to be without spot, it might be inferred that GOD would never deny Him anything, and that therefore we, who are His, should be, by His aid, for ever freed from the punishment of our sins. Yet I do believe that another idea also underlies the words ' without spot,' which I shall explain later on in another place.

" A conscience purged from dead works, i. e., from sin, is the same thing as having no more consciousness of sin; a mode of expression which the same Apostle uses in the beginning of the next chapter (Heb. x. 2). This means, as I shall show later on, that we have now and for ever a conscience free not only from sin itself, but also from the guilt and punishment of sin ; or from the sense of guilt and the fear of punishment therefor. As I have said, it is stated in these words, that through the death of CHRIST, both these things are ours. And since we have now seen how all these expressions imply an everlasting freedom from the punishment of sin, let us next prove that they may also justly imply a freedom from the sins themselves."

In reading the above chapter of Socinus no one can fail to observe that the position taken throughout is precisely that taken by Mr. Brightman,* and that the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which Socinus puts forth, as the basis of his teaching, is so exactly similar to that of the modern school that in reading the chapter one might suppose that it had been written by Dr. Milligan or some representative of that school. And yet this view is the very kernel of the Socinian system, and in tracing it to Socinus we believe we have found its *fons et origo*.

* Cf. pp. 84, 89, and 408.

APPENDIX C.

TERTULLIANUS "ADVERSUS JUDÆOS," CHAPTER XIV.

“ **L** EARN now (over and above the immediate question) the clue to your error. We affirm *two* characters of the CHRIST demonstrated by the prophets, and as many *advents* of His forenoted : one, in humility (of course the first), when He had to be led ‘ as a sheep for a victim ; and, as a lamb voiceless before the shearer, so He opened not His mouth,’ not even in His aspect comely. For ‘ we have announced,’ says [the prophet], ‘ concerning Him, [He is] as a little child, as a root in a thirsty land ; and there was not in Him attractiveness or glory. And we saw Him, and He had not attractiveness or grace ; but His mien was unhonoured, deficient in comparison of the sons of men,’ ‘ a man [set] in the plague, and knowing how to bear infirmity : ’ to wit, as having been set by the FATHER ‘ for a stone of offence,’ and ‘ made a little lower ’ by Him ‘ than angels,’ He pronounces Himself ‘ a worm, and not a man, an ignominy of man, and [the] refuse of [the] People.’ Which evidences of ignobility suit the FIRST ADVENT, just as those of sublimity do the SECOND ; when He shall be made no longer ‘ a stone of offence nor a rock of scandal,’ but ‘ the highest corner-stone,’ after reprobation [on earth] taken up [into heaven] and raised sublime for the

purpose of consummation, and that 'rock'—so we must admit—which is read of in Daniel as forecut from a mount, which shall crush and crumble the image of secular kingdoms. Of which SECOND ADVENT of the same [CHRIST] Daniel has said: 'And, behold, as it were a SON of man, coming with the clouds of the heaven, came unto the Ancient of days, and was present in His sight; and they who were standing by led Him unto Him. And there was given Him royal power; and all nations of the earth, according to their race, and all glory, shall serve Him: and His power [is] eternal, which shall not be taken away, and His kingdom one which shall not be corrupted.' Then, assuredly, is He to have an honourable mien, and a grace not 'deficient more than the sons of men;' for [He will then be] 'blooming in beauty in comparison with the sons of men.' 'Grace,' says [the Psalmist], 'hath been outpoured in Thy lips: wherefore GOD hath blessed Thee unto eternity. Gird Thee Thy sword around Thy thigh, most potent in Thy bloom and beauty!' while the FATHER withal afterwards, after making Him somewhat lower than angels, 'crowned Him with glory and honour, and subjected all [things] beneath His feet.' And then shall they 'learn to know Him Whom they pierced, and shall beat their breasts tribe by tribe;' of course because in days bygone they did *not* know Him when conditioned in the humility of human estate. Jeremiah says: 'He is a human being, and who will learn to know Him?' because, 'His nativity,' says Isaiah, 'who shall declare?' So, too, in Zechariah, in His own Person, nay, in the very mystery of His Name withal, the most true Priest of the FATHER, His own CHRIST, is delineated in a twofold garb with reference to the TWO

ADVENTS. First, He was clad in 'sordid attire,' that is, in the indignity of passible and mortal flesh, when the devil, withal, was opposing himself to Him—the instigator, to wit, of Judas the traitor—who even after His baptism had tempted Him. In the next place, He was stripped of His former sordid raiment, and adorned with a garment down to the foot, and with a turban and a clean mitre, that is [with the garb] of the SECOND ADVENT; since He is demonstrated as having attained 'glory and honour.' Nor will you be able to say that the man [there depicted] is 'the son of Jozadak,' who was never at all clad in a sordid garment, but was always adorned with the sacerdotal garment, nor ever deprived of the sacerdotal function. But the 'JESUS' there alluded to is CHRIST, the Priest of GOD the Most High FATHER; Who at His FIRST ADVENT came in humility, in human form, and passible, even up to the period of His [actual] Passion; being Himself likewise made, through all [stages of suffering], a Victim for us all; Who after His resurrection was 'clad with a garment down to the foot,' and named the Priest of GOD the FATHER unto eternity." *

* This translation is that given in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

APPENDIX D.

A CATENA * OF PASSAGES FROM THE FATHERS WHICH
BEAR WITNESS TO THE FACT THAT THEY REGARDED
THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRIFICE.

S. IRENÆUS (ob. 202), *Adv. Hær.*, l. iv., c. xvii., n. 5.

Patristic Ca-
tena:
1. S. Irenæus

“ Instructing His disciples to offer to GOD first-fruits from His creatures, not as though He needed aught, but that they themselves might not be unfruitful nor ungrateful, He took that which of the creation is bread, and gave thanks, saying, ‘ This is My Body.’ And likewise the Cup, which is of that our creation, He confessed to be His Blood, and taught that it is the new Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the whole world to GOD, Who giveth us sustenance, of which first-fruits of His gifts in the New Testament, of which among the twelve Prophets, Malachi thus presignified, etc. : ‘ I have no pleasure in you, saith the LORD of Hosts, neither will I receive an offering at your hands. For from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof, My Name shall be great among the heathen,

* This catena of seventy passages might be greatly enlarged. Most of those here given will be found in Pusey’s *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, Keble’s *Considerations*, and the Bishop of Brechin’s *Theological Defence*.

Every passage has been compared with the original, and, where needed, the translation has been revised ; the references have also been verified and in many cases changed to more modern editions.

and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering ; for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts : ' most clearly signifying by these words, that the former people indeed shall cease to offer to GOD ; but in every place sacrifice shall be offered to Him, and that pure ; and His Name shall be glorified among the heathen. ' "

2. S. Irenæus. S. IRENÆUS, *Cont. Hær.*, l. iv., c. xviii., n. 2.

" Not Oblations as a whole were rejected ; for there were Oblations then [among the Jews], there are Oblations now too ; sacrifices in the Jewish people, sacrifices also in the Church, but the kind only has been changed (*species immutata est tantum*), seeing that it is offered, not by bondsmen but by the free.] This Oblation the Church alone offers pure to the Creator, offering it with thanksgiving from His creation. But the Jews do not offer ; for their hands are full of Blood ; for they do not receive the Word *which is offered* to GOD. But neither do all the synagogues of the heretics. "

l. 'per quod'

3. S. Hippolytus.

S. HIPPOLYTUS (fl. circa 178-236), *Fragmenta in Prov.*, ix. i., Migne, P. G., tom. x., col. 628.

" She [Divine Wisdom] mingled her wine in the cup, i. e., the SAVIOUR uniting His Own Godhead with the flesh, as pure wine, in the Virgin, was born of her without confusion, GOD and Man. ' And she prepared her Table ; ' the Knowledge of the HOLY TRINITY promised, and *His precious and pure Body and Blood, which daily at the Mystical and Divine Table are consecrated, being Sacrifices in remembrance of that ever-to-be-remembered and first Table of the Divine and Mystical Supper.* "

unde?
not in Acheis

4. Tertullian.

TERTULLIAN (ob. 245), *De Oratione*, c. xix., Migne, P. L., tom. i., col. 1287.

" In like manner, also, most think that on the days of stations they ought not to attend the prayers at the sacrifices, because, when the Body of the LORD hath

been received, the station must be broken up. Doth, then, the Eucharist break up a service devoted to GOD? Doth it not the more bind to GOD? Will not thy station be the more solemn, if thou standest also at the altar of GOD? When the Body of the LORD hath been *received and reserved*, both are saved, both the partaking of the Sacrifice and the fulfilment of the service."

*is carried away
by the Communion
the consumed in*

S. CYPRIAN (ob. 258), *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

5. S. Cyprian.

"Some, either through ignorance or simplicity in consecrating and administering to the people the Cup of the LORD, do not the same as JESUS CHRIST our LORD and GOD, *the Teacher of this Sacrifice*, did and taught."

author +

S. CYPRIAN, *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

6. S. Cyprian.

"You should know that we have been admonished that, in offering the Cup, the tradition of the LORD be observed, nor aught else be done by us, than what the LORD has first done for us, that the Cup *which is offered in commemoration of Him* should be offered, mixed with wine."

S. CYPRIAN, *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

7. S. Cyprian.

"Who is more a Priest of the Most High GOD than our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Who offered a Sacrifice to GOD the FATHER, and *offered that same which Melchisedec had offered*, that is, *bread and wine*, namely, *His own Body and Blood*?"

S. CYPRIAN, *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

8. S. Cyprian.

"Whence it is apparent that *the Blood of CHRIST is not offered*, if there is no wine in the Cup; nor *the Sacrifice of the LORD celebrated by a legitimate Consecration*, unless our Oblation and Sacrifice corresponds with His Passion. But how shall we drink new wine of the fruit of the vine with CHRIST in the Kingdom of the FATHER, if, in *the Sacrifice of GOD the FATHER and of CHRIST*, we do not offer wine, nor mingle the Cup of the LORD according to the LORD'S Institution?"

9. S. Cyprian. S. CYPRIAN, *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

“ If in the Sacrifice which CHRIST offered, CHRIST only is to be followed, then we ought to obey, and do that which CHRIST did, and which He commanded should be done.”

10. S. Cyprian. S. CYPRIAN, *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

“ If it is unlawful to break even the least of the LORD’S commandments, how much more to infringe those so great, so weighty, so concerning the very Sacrament of the LORD’S Passion and our redemption, or by human tradition to change it into something else than was divinely appointed. For, if JESUS CHRIST, our LORD and GOD, is Himself the great High Priest of GOD the FATHER, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the FATHER, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, surely that priest truly acts in CHRIST’S stead who imitates that which CHRIST did ; and he then offers a true and full Sacrifice in the Church to GOD the FATHER, when he begins to offer ~~it~~ according as he sees CHRIST Himself offered ~~it~~.”

μυστηριον

a mixed Chalice
the Oblation of
Elements.

11. S. Cyprian. S. CYPRIAN, *Epist. lxxiii., ad Cæcil.*

“ And because we make mention of His Passion in all Sacrifices (*for the Passion of the LORD is the Sacrifice which we offer*), we ought to do nothing else than what He did. For the Scripture says, [‘ For as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew the LORD’S Death till He come.’] As often then as we offer the Cup in commemoration of the LORD and His Passion, do we what it is known the LORD did.”

Some M.S.S. omit

12. S. Laurence.

S. LAURENCE (ob. 258), S. Ambrose, *De Offic.*, l. i., c.

41, n. 214.

“ Whither goest thou forth, father, without thy son ? whither hastenest thou, holy priest, without thy deacon ? Never wert thou wont to offer sacrifice without thy minister. How then have I displeased thee ? Hast thou found me wanting ? Surely thou desirest to

try whether I am a fitting minister. To whom thou hast committed the consecrated Blood of CHRIST, the fellowship in the completion of the sacraments, dost thou refuse to him the fellowship of thy blood ? ”

Council of Nicæa (325), Canon 18.

13. Council of
Nicæa.

It has come to the knowledge of the holy and great Synod that in certain places and cities deacons administer the Eucharist to priests, although it is contrary to the canons and to custom to have the Body of CHRIST distributed to those who offer the Sacrifice by those who cannot offer it.”

S. EPHREM SYRUS (ob. circa 373), *Parænes.*, 74, Opera Omnia Syriace et Latine, tom. iii., p. 555, Romæ, 1743.

14. S. Ephrem
Syrus.

“ Having obtained eternal Redemption Thou dost daily renew Thy Sacrifice on the altar and thou dost bestow the Chalice of salvation for our lips to taste.”

S. OPTATUS (ob. circa 384), *De Schism. Donatist.*, l. vi., c. 1, Bibl. Mag. Vet. Pat., tom. iv., p. 289, Coloniae Agripp., 1618.

15. S. Optatus.

“ What is the altar but the Throne of the Body and Blood of CHRIST ? . . . They [the Jews] lay their hands on CHRIST on the Cross : by you He was smitten on the altar.”

S. CYRIL of Jerusalem (ob. circa 386), *Catechesis*, xxiii., Mystag. v., n. 7, et. 8, p. 327. Paris, 1720.

16. S. Cyril of
Jerusalem.

“ Then having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns, we call upon the merciful GOD to send forth His HOLY SPIRIT upon the gifts lying before Him ; that He may make the bread the Body of CHRIST, and the wine the Blood of CHRIST ; for whatsoever the HOLY GHOST has touched, is sanctified and changed. Then after *the Spiritual Sacrifice is perfected*, the Bloodless Service, upon *that Sacrifice of Propitiation*, we entreat GOD for the common peace of the Church,” etc.

Original - 1466 f

17. S. Macarius of Egypt. S. MACARIUS of Egypt (fl. cent. IV.), *De Charitate*, § 29, Migne, P. G., tom. 34, col. 932.
 “Consider that these visible things are types and shadows of the things hidden ; the visible temple, of the temple of the heart ; the priest, of the true priest of the grace of GOD ; and so on. As, then, in this visible Church, unless first the readings of psalmody, and the rest of the prescribed order, were to precede, it would not be in order, that the priest should celebrate the *Divine Mystery itself of the Body and Blood of CHRIST* ; or, again, although even the whole ecclesiastical canon were added, but the mystic *Eucharist of the Oblation by the priest* and the communion of the Body of CHRIST did not take place, the ecclesiastical ordinances would not be fulfilled, and the Divine service of the Mystery would be defective ; so think thou as to the state of the Christian,” etc.
18. S. Gregory of Nyssa. S. GREGORY of Nyssa (ob. circa 395), *In Christ Resurrect.* Ratio i., Migne, P. G., tom. 46, col. 611.
 “In a hidden kind of sacrifice which could not be seen of men [the Holy Eucharist], He offers Himself as a Sacrifice and immolates a Victim, being, at the same time the Priest and the Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sins of the world.”
19. S. Ambrose. S. AMBROSE (ob. 397), *Epist. xxii., Dominæ sorori*, n. 13.
 “Let the triumphant victims [the martyrs] enter the place *where CHRIST is the Sacrifice*. But *He upon the altar*, Who suffered for all ; they under the altar, who were redeemed by His Passion. This place I had destined for myself. For it is meet that a priest should rest *there where he was wont to offer*. But I yield up the right side to the holy victims ; that place was due to martyrs.”
20. S. Ambrose. S. AMBROSE, *Expositio in Lucam*, l. i., n. 28.
 “For thou canst not doubt that the Angel stands by, when CHRIST standeth by, *when CHRIST is immolated*. For *CHRIST our Passover is immolated*.”

S. AMBROSE, *De Virginitibus*, l. i., c. xii., n. 66.

21. S. Ambrose.

“The altar . . . on which CHRIST the Head of all is daily consecrated.”

S. AMBROSE, *Exhortatio Virginitatis*, c. xiv., n. 94.

22. S. Ambrose.

“Thee, now, O LORD, I entreat, that upon this Thine house, upon these altars which this day are dedicated, upon these spiritual stones, in each of which a spiritual temple is consecrated to Thee, daily Thou wouldest in Thy Divine mercy look down, and receive the prayers of Thy servants, which are poured forth in this place. *Be every sacrifice* for a sweet-smelling savour unto Thee, *which in this temple is offered to Thee*, with pure faith, with pious zeal. *And when Thou lookest on that saving Sacrifice, whereby the sin of this world is blotted out*, look also on these sacrifices of pious chastity, and defend them by Thy daily help, that they may be to Thee sacrifices acceptable, for an odour of sweetness, pleasing CHRIST the LORD, and vouchsafe to ‘preserve their whole spirit and soul and body unblamable,’ unto the day of Thy SON our LORD JESUS CHRIST.”

S. AMBROSE, *Enarrat. in Ps. xxxviii.*, n. 25.

23. S. Ambrose.

“We have seen the High Priest coming to us, we have seen and heard Him offering for us His Blood : we priests follow, as we can, that we may offer sacrifice for the people : although weak in deserts, yet honourable in sacrifice : since though *CHRIST is not now seen to offer, yet Himself is offered on earth, when the Body of CHRIST is offered : yea Himself is plainly seen to offer in us, Whose Word sanctifieth the Sacrifice which is offered.*”

S. AMBROSE, *De Offic.*, l. i., c. xlviiii., n. 248.

24. S. Ambrose.

“Before, a lamb was offered ; a calf too was offered ; now CHRIST is offered. But He is offered as Man, as renewing His Passion ; and He offers Himself as Priest, to forgive our sins ; here in image, there in verity,

where He intercedeth for us as an Advocate with the FATHER.”

25. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM (ob. 407), *De Sacerdot.*, l. iii., n. 4, Gaume, tom. i., p. 467.

“For when thou *seest the LORD sacrificed*, and lying, and the priest standing over *the sacrifice*, and praying over it, and all present reddened by that precious Blood, dost thou still think that thou art among men, and standing upon earth, and wilt thou not be at once translated to heaven, and casting forth from thy soul every carnal thought, gaze around thee on the things that are in heaven with a naked soul and pure mind? Oh, the wonder! Oh, the love of GOD to man! He that sitteth on high *is held in that hour in the hands of all*, and He gives Himself to those that desire to embrace and receive Him. But all do this through the eyes of faith.”

26. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *De Sacerdot.*, l. vi., n. 4., Gaume, tom. i., p. 519.

“When he also invokes the HOLY SPIRIT, and consummates the most awful sacrifice, and *touches incessantly the common LORD of all.*”

27. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *Ad popul. Antioch.*, hom. xv., n. 5, Gaume, tom. ii., p. 187.

“What dost thou, O man? At the sacred table thou exactest an oath, and where CHRIST lieth sacrificed, there thou sacrificest thine own brother.”

28. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *De Cœm. et de Cruce*, n. 3, Gaume, tom. ii., p. 473.

“Since then we too shall this evening [Easter Eve] see Him Who was nailed on the Cross, *as it were a Lamb slain and sacrificed*, let us approach with trembling, I beseech you, and much reverence and godly fear.”

S. CHRYSOSTOM, *De Cœm. et de Cruce*, n. 3, Gaume, tom. ii., p. 474. 29. S. Chrysostom.

“*When thou seest the Lamb sacrificed and made ready,*” — “*thou beholdest the Lamb slain? If, the whole night through, thou couldest look on this Sacrifice, tell me, shouldest thou have too much of it? . . . Consider What it is that lieth before thee, and what caused it. He was slain for thy sake and thou neglectest to see Him sacrificed. . . . It is blood, the very Blood which blotted out the handwriting of our sins, the Blood which cleansed thy soul, which washed away the stain, which triumphed over principalities and powers.*”

S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Matt.*, hom. i., n. 3, Gaume, tom. vii., p. 582. 30. S. Chrysostom.

“*Of His own holy Flesh He hath granted us our fill; He hath set before us Himself sacrificed.*”

S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Act.*, hom. xxi., Gaume, tom. ix., p. 188. 31. S. Chrysostom.

“*The Sacrifice is in hand, and all things are prepared and set forth. Angels are present, and Archangels; the SON of GOD is present.*”

S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Rom.*, hom. viii., n. 8, Gaume, tom. ix., p. 558. 32. S. Chrysostom.

“*Let us reverence then, let us reverence the table of which we all partake, the CHRIST Who has been slain for us, the Sacrifice that is laid upon it.*”

S. CHRYSOSTOM, *De Bapt. Christi*, n. 4, Gaume, tom. ii., p. 441. 33. S. Chrysostom.

“*When one would communicate, one should not watch for feasts, but cleanse the conscience, and so touch that holy Sacrifice.*”

34. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In 1 Cor.*, hom. xxiv., n. 2, Gaume, tom. x., p. 249.
 "CHRIST even herein [in giving us His Blood] exhibited His care and fervent love for us. And in the old covenant, because they were in an imperfect state, the blood which they used to offer to idols, He Himself submitted to receive, that He might separate them from those idols : which very thing again was a proof of His unspeakable affection ; but here He hath transferred the sacred office to that which is far more awful and glorious, changing the very sacrifice itself, and instead of the slaughter of irrational creatures, commanding to offer up Himself."
35. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Eph.*, hom. iii., n. 5, Gaume, tom. xi., p. 26.
 "It is for this reason, that they which are in sin are first of all put forth. For just as when a master is present at his table, it is not right that those servants who have offended him should be present, but they are sent out of the way, just so also here when the Sacrifice is brought forth, and CHRIST, the LORD'S Sheep, is sacrificed."
36. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Diem Nat. Jesu Christi*, n. 7, Gaume, tom. ii., p. 430.
 "Think with thyself, O man, *what Sacrifice* thou art about *to touch*, what Table to approach ! Lay to heart that, being earth and ashes, thou partakest of *the Body and Blood of CHRIST*.—GOD invites thee to His own Table, and *setteth before thee His Own SON*."
37. S. Chrysostom. S. CHRYSOSTOM, *In Psalm.*, cxl., n. 4, Gaume, tom. v., p. 522.
 "This [the tongue] is the member through which we receive the awful Sacrifice (the faithful know what I mean)."
38. S. Jerome. S. JEROME (ob. 420), *Ad Damasum, Epistle* xxi. (alias cxl.), n. 26, tom. iv., col. 155.
 "The fatted Calf Who is sacrificed for the salvation

of the penitent, is the SAVIOUR Himself, by Whose Flesh we are daily fed, Whose Blood we drink. This feast is daily celebrated: daily does the FATHER receive the SON; always is CHRIST sacrificed for believers (*semper Christus credentibus immolatur*)."

S. JEROME, *Dial. adv. Pelag.*, l. iii., n. 15, tom. iv., col. 543. 39. S. Jerome.

"He so taught His Apostles, that believers should, ~~at the Sacrifice~~ of that Body, venture to say, 'Our FATHER.'"

*in capon's illi
Sacramento*

S. JEROME, *Quæst. Heb. in Gen.*, xiv., 18, tom. iii., col. 329. 40. S. Jerome.

"In that he says, 'Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec,' our Mystery is signified under the word 'order,' not in sacrificing irrational animals through [the order of] Aaron, but by the offering bread and wine, that is, the Body and Blood of the LORD JESUS."

S. JEROME, *Comm. in Matt.*, l. iv. (c. xxvi., 26), tom. iv., col. 128. 41. S. Jerome.

"After that the typical Passover was finished, and He had eaten the flesh of the Lamb with the Apostles, He takes bread, which strengtheneth the heart of man, and passes to the true Paschal Sacrament; that as Melchisedec, Priest of the Most High GOD, offering bread and wine, had done in prefiguration of Him, *He Himself might re-present* [to the FATHER] *in the VERITY* of His own Body and Blood."

S. JEROME, *Comm. in Ezech.*, l. xiii. (c. xlv., 2), tom. iii., col. 1023. 42. S. Jerome.

"Himself is the Prince, and 'High-Priest after the order of Melchisedec,' and Sacrifice, and Priest."

S. JEROME, *Comm. in Ezech.*, l. xiv. (c. xlvi., 13), tom. iii., col. 1049, 1050. 43. S. Jerome.

"*He shall sacrifice* a burnt-offering unto the LORD, a Lamb 'of the first year,' and not on certain days, but

'daily,' nor at any hour, but 'in the morning,' shall he sacrifice it. Who that Lamb without spot is, Isaiah will say more fully (lv. 7) and Jeremiah (xi. 19) and John Baptist (John i. 29). And let not the reader wonder that the same is Prince and Priest, and Calf and Ram and Lamb, since in Holy Scripture we read of Him as LORD and GOD, and Man and Prophet, and Stem and Root, etc., as the case requires. In the whole burnt-offering, then, of that *Lamb* of the first year, without blemish, *which is always offered in the morning*, the Prince Himself will make the Sacrifice or Minchah. And a third part of a hin of oil is offered, that it may be mingled or sprinkled on the fine flour, a sacrifice to GOD, continual, by a perpetual ordinance, which is no day intermitted, but is *always offered, at all times*, at the rising of the sun, that that may be fulfilled which is put at the close of this section—'He shall offer a Lamb for a sacrifice, and oil every morning for a continual burnt-offering.'"

44. S. Jerome. S. JEROME, *Comm. in Osee*, l. ii. (c. viii., 13), tom. iii., col. 1290.

"These [heretics] sacrifice many sacrifices and eat them, *forsaking the one Sacrifice of CHRIST*, and not eating *His* Flesh, Whose Flesh is the food of believers. Whatever they do, simulating the order and rites of the Sacrifice, or whether they give alms, GOD will accept none of such sacrifices."

45. S. Gaudentius. S. GAUDENTIUS of Brescia (ob. circa 420), *De Exodi. Lect.*, Serm. ii., Migne, P. L., tom. 20, col. 854, 855.

"In the shadow of that legal Passover not one lamb was slain, but many. For one was slain in every house, since one was not sufficient for all. But a figure is not the reality (*proprietas*) of the LORD'S Passion. For a figure is not the verity, but an imitation of the verity. . . . In this verity, then, in which we are, One died for all; and *the Same* in each house of the Church, in the mystery of bread and wine, *being*

sacrificed (immolatus), refresheth ; believed on, quickeneth ; consecrated, sanctifieth the consecrators. This is the Flesh of the Lamb : this His Blood.”

S. AUGUSTINE (ob. 430), *Ep. liv. ad Januar.*, c. vii., n. 9, Migne, P. L., tom. 33, col. 204. 46. S. Augustine.

“ But some have thought good, and that with show of reason, that on one fixed day in the year, on which the LORD gave the actual supper, it is lawful that *the Body and Blood of the LORD should*, as though for a more marked commemoration, *be offered* and received after eating.”

S. AUGUSTINE, *Quæst. in Lev.*, qu. lvii., Migne, P. L., tom. 34, col. 704. 47. S. Augustine.

“ But whereas the LORD says, ‘ Except ye eat My Flesh and drink My Blood, ye have no life in you ; ’ why were the people so strictly forbidden the blood of the sacrifices which were offered for sins, if by those sacrifices this one Sacrifice was signified, wherein is the true remission of sins ; while yet the *Blood of that Sacrifice* itself, not only is no one forbidden to receive for nourishment, but rather all, who wish to have life, are exhorted to drink.”

S. AUGUSTINE, *Enarrat. in Psalm.*, xxi. (Enar. i.), n. 28, Migne, P. L., tom. 36, col. 178. 48. S. Augustine.

“ ‘ I will offer my vows unto the LORD, in the sight of them that fear Him.’ The Sacrifice of peace, the Sacrifice of love, the Sacrifice of His Body the faithful know.”

S. AUGUSTINE, *In Psalm.*, xxxiii., n. 5 et 6, Migne, P. L., tom. 36, col. 302, 303. 49. S. Augustine.

“ The Sacrifice of the Jews was, as ye know, according to the order of Aaron, in animal victims, and this is a mystery ; for not as yet was *the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST*, which the faithful know and they who have read the Gospel, which Sacrifice is now diffused throughout the whole world. . . . The Sac-

rifice of Aaron then was taken away, and the Sacrifice after the order of Melchisedec began. Our LORD JESUS CHRIST willed our salvation to be in His Body and Blood. But whereby commended He His Body and Blood? By His humility. For were He not humble, it could not be eaten or drunk. By Him are the Angels filled. 'But He made Himself of no reputation,' that man might eat Angels' food, and 'took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men : and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross ;' *that so from His Cross might be commended unto us the Body and the Blood of the LORD, for a new Sacrifice.*"

50. S. Augustine.

S. AUGUSTINE, *In Psalm.*, xxxix., n. 12, Migne, P. L., tom. 36, col. 441.

" ' Sacrifice and burnt-offering Thou wouldest not,' said the Psalmist to GOD. For the ancients, when as yet *that true Sacrifice which the faithful know* was fore-announced in figures, celebrated the figures of the substance (*rei*) which was to be. . . . Why did He not will them? Why did He first will them? Because all those things were as words of one promising ; and promissory words, when what they promise is come, are spoken no more. Those sacrifices then, as promissory words, have been taken away. What has been given in fulfilment? That Body which ye know ; which ye do not all of you know ; which of you who know It not, I pray GOD none may know It to your condemnation."

51. S. Augustine.

S. AUGUSTINE, *De Civitate Dei*, l. x., c. 20, Migne, P. L., tom. 41, col. 298.

" He is a Priest (as well as a Sacrifice). Himself offering, Himself also the Oblation. Of which thing He willed the daily Sacrifice of the Church to be a Sacrament. The Church, being that body whereof CHRIST Himself is the Head, learns to offer herself through Him. Of this true Sacrifice the ancient sacrifices of holy men were tokens manifold and various. "

S. AUGUSTINE, *De Civitate Dei*, l. xvii., c. 20, n. 2, Migne, P. L., tom. 41, col. 536. 52. S. Augustine.

“To be made a partaker of that table is to begin to have life ; for in Ecclesiastes, ‘it is not good for a man save that he should eat and drink,’ what can he be more probably thought to mean, than what appertains to the participation of this table, which the Priest Himself, the Mediator of the New Testament, exhibits after the order of Melchisedec, *of His own Body and Blood*. For *this Sacrifice* succeeded all those sacrifices of the Old Testament, which were immolated as a shadow of That to come, of which we understand that Voice of the same Mediator speaking, through the prophecy in the 39th Psalm, ‘Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a Body hast Thou prepared for Me ;’ because *for all those sacrifices and oblations His Body is offered*, and is ministered to the communicants.”

S. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Faust.*, l. xx., c. 18, Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 382, 383. 53. S. Augustine.

“The Hebrews in the sacrifices from their flocks, which they offered to GOD, in many and various ways (as was worthy of so great thing), solemnized the prediction of that future Sacrifice, which CHRIST hath offered. Whence Christians now solemnize the *memory of that completed Sacrifice*, in the sacred *Oblation* and *Communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST*.”

S. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Faust.*, l. xx., c. 21, Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 385. 54. S. Augustine.

“Of this sacrifice the flesh and blood before the Advent of CHRIST was promised in the typical victims, was rendered in actual truth in CHRIST’S Passion ; after CHRIST’S Ascension * it is celebrated by means of a sacrament of commemoration.”

* In Migne’s edition the clause, “*per ipsam veritatem reddebatur post Ascensionem Christi*,” is omitted ; it is found in Gaume’s edition, tom. viii., col. 546, and in the Basle edition of 1542, tom. vi., col. 376.

55. S. Augustine.

S. AUGUSTINE, *Contr. adv. Leg. et Proph.*, l. i., c. xviii., n. 37, Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 624, 625.

“The whole of which the Faithful know, in the Sacrifice of the Church : whereof all the kinds of previous sacrifices were shadows. . . . That which David offered that the people might be spared was a shadow of that which was to come, whereby it was signified that through one Sacrifice, of which that was a figure, the salvation of the people is spiritually granted. *For it is CHRIST JESUS Himself, Who was delivered*, as the Apostle says, *for our offences*. Wherefore he also says, ‘*CHRIST our Passover is Sacrificed.*’ ”

56. S. Augustine.

S. AUGUSTINE, *Contr. adv. Leg. et Proph.*, l. i., c. xx., n. 39, Migne, P. L., tom. 42, col. 626.

“The Church immolates to GOD in the Body of CHRIST the Sacrifice of Praise. . . . for this Church is Israel after the spirit, from which is distinguished that Israel after the flesh, which used to serve in shadowy sacrifices, whereby the One only Sacrifice is signified, which is now offered by Israel after the spirit.”

57. S. Cyril of Alexandria.

S. CYRIL of Alexandria (ob. 444), *In Zeph.*, iii., 10, Migne, P. G., tom. 71, col. 1008.

“The word of the prophecy has its issue in truth. Not in the Roman world alone has the Gospel been preached. It traverses even the barbarous nations. And moreover, everywhere are churches, pastors and teachers, guides and teachers of the Mysteries, and Divine altars. Spiritually the Lamb is sacrificed by the holy priests even among the Indians and Æthiopians.”

58. S. Cyril.

S. CYRIL, *Explicatio xii. Capitum*, Declar. xi., Migne, P. G., tom. 76, col. 311.

“We celebrate in the Churches the holy and life-giving and unbloody Sacrifice, not believing that that Body which lies to open view is the body of one of the

men among us, and of a common man; and in like manner also the precious Blood, but rather receiving it as having become the *proper* Body and also Blood of the all-vivifying Word."

S. CYRIL, *Homil. Div. in Mysticam Cœnam*, n. 10, 59. S. Cyril.
Migne, P. G., tom. 77, col. 1017.

"CHRIST to-day receives us to a feast; CHRIST to-day ministers to us. CHRIST Himself, the Lover of men, warms us back into life again. What is said is wonderful, what is done is awe-inspiring. The fatted Calf Himself is sacrificed. The Lamb of GOD, Which taketh away the sin of the world, is sacrificed. The FATHER rejoices; the SON is willingly immolated."

S. PROCLUS (ob. 446), *Tract. de Tradit.*, Migne, P. G., 60. S. Proclus.
tom. 65, col. 849.

"After our SAVIOUR'S Ascension into heaven, the Apostles, before they were dispersed through the whole world, being assembled with one accord, gave themselves all day to prayer; and finding the mystical Sacrifice of the LORD'S Body a comfort to them, they sang it at very great length. For this, and the office of teaching, they considered the most important of all things. Much more with gladness of heart and greatest joy did they continue steadfastly in so divine a Sacrifice, ever mindful of the word of the LORD, 'This is My Body,' and 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' and 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him.'"

S. PROCLUS, *Orat. 14 in Sanct. Pasch.*, n. 2, Migne, 61. S. Proclus.
P. G., tom. 65, col. 796, 797.

"And indeed, of old, my beloved, the mystery of the Passover was by the law mystically celebrated in Egypt, but symbolically it was signified by means of the immolation of the lamb. But now by the Gospel we spiritually celebrate the resurrection festival of the Passover. There, indeed, a sheep from the flock was sacrificed according to the law, but *here*, CHRIST Himself, the Lamb

of GOD, is offered up. There is a sheep from the fold, but here, instead of a sheep, the Good Shepherd Who laid down His own life for the sheep. There a sign of the sprinkled blood of an irrational creature was the safeguard of a whole people, but here CHRIST'S precious Blood is poured out for the salvation of the world, that we may receive remission of our sins."

62. Theodoret. THEODORET (ob. circa 457), *In Psalm.*, lxii., 3, Migne, P. G., tom. 80, col. 1337.

"The people which, from the Gentiles, hath believed on Thee will ever say, 'Thus have I appeared before Thee in Thy Sanctuary,' that is, in Thy Temple, where Thou art sacrificed unsacrificed, and art divided undivided, and art expended remaining unspent."

63. Theodoret. THEODORET, *In Psalm.*, cix., 4, Migne, P. G., tom. 80, col. 1773.

"Now also CHRIST sacrifices, not offering anything Himself, but being the Head of those who offer, for He calls the Church His Body, and through it He, as Man, sacrifices,—as GOD, receives the things that are offered. But the Church offereth the symbols of His Body and Blood, hallowing the whole lump through the first-fruits."

64. Theodoret. THEODORET, *Qu. 27 in Exod.*, Migne, P. G., tom. 80, col. 252.

"He bade them take a bunch of hyssop, and, having dipped it in the blood of the Lamb that was sacrificed, to anoint the lintel and door-posts, that when the destroyer came in to smite the first-born of Egypt, he, seeing the blood, might pass over the dwellings of the Hebrews. Not that the Incorporeal Nature required such signs, but that through the signs, they might learn the care of GOD'S Providence, and that we, *who sacrifice the spotless Lamb*, might know that the type had been described beforehand."

S. LEO (ob. 461), *Ep. lxxx. ad Anatol.*, c. ii., Migne, 65. S. Leo.
P. L., tom. 54, col. 914.

“ In the Church of GOD, which is the Body of CHRIST, neither are the priestly offices valid, nor the Sacrifices true, except the true High Priest in our own proper nature (*in nostræ proprietate naturæ*) reconcile us, the true Blood of the Immaculate LAMB cleanse us. Who, though He is set at the Right Hand of the FATHER, yet in the same Flesh which He took of the Virgin, doth He complete the Sacrament of Propitiation (*in eadem carne quam sumpsit ex Virgine, Sacramentum propitiationis exequitur*), as saith the Apostle, ‘ CHRIST JESUS, Who died, yea rather, Who is risen, Who is set on the Right Hand of GOD, Who also maketh intercession for us.’ ”

S. LEO, *Serm. v., De Natali Ipsius*, c. iii. 66. S. Leo.

“ For Himself is the true and eternal Bishop, Whose office can have neither change nor end. Himself it is, Whose likeness Melchisedec set forth, offering to GOD not Jewish sacrifices, but immolating the Sacrifice of that Sacrament, which our Redeemer consecrated in His Body and Blood.”

S. LEO, *Serm. lviii., De Passione*, c. i., Migne, P. L., 67. S. Leo.
tom. 54, col. 332.

“ That the shadows then might give place to the Body, and images cease under the presence of the truth, the old observance is taken away by the new Sacrament, sacrifice passes into Sacrifice, blood is taken away by Blood, and the legal festivity is at once changed and completed.”

S. LEO, *Serm. lviii., De Passione*, c. iii., Migne, P. L., 68. S. Leo.
tom. 54, col. 333.

“ JESUS, steadfast in His design, and unshaken in the work appointed by the FATHER, consummated the Old Testament, and founded the new Passover. For when His disciples sat down with Him to eat the Mystic

Passover, while those in the hall of Caiaphas were debating how CHRIST might be put to death, He, ordaining the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, was teaching what sort of Sacrifice should be offered to GOD."

69. S. Leo.

S. LEO, *Serm. lix.*, c. vii., Migne, P. L., tom. 54, col. 341.

"Now also, the variety of carnal sacrifices ceasing, *the one oblation of Thy Body and Blood supplies the place of all the different kinds of victims, because Thou art the true LAMB of GOD, that takest away the sins of the world; and Thou dost in Thyself perfect all the mysteries, that as there is one Sacrifice instead of every victim, so there may be one kingdom formed out of every nation.*"

70. S. Gregory
the Great.

S. GREGORY the Great (ob. 604), *Hom. in Evang.*, l. ii., Hom. xxxvii., n. 7, Migne, P. L., tom. 76, col. 1279.

"From this, therefore, let us consider what kind of a sacrifice for us this is, which for our salvation continually re-presents the Passion of the Only Begotten Son."

APPENDIX E.

THE REPORTS OF THE OXFORD CONFERENCE ON PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE AND OF THE FUL- HAM "ROUND TABLE" CONFERENCE.

A CONFERENCE was held at Oxford, December 13 and 14, 1899, at the invitation of the Rev. Dr. Sanday, to discuss different conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice. Dr. Sanday, in his preface to the *Report of the Conference*, tells us that he aimed at bringing together three groups: a group of high churchmen, a group of nonconformists, and an intermediate group of churchmen who could not be called high; that in filling up a vacant place at the last moment, this condition was not strictly observed, but that, roughly speaking, the conference fell into three equal groups of five.

Conference held at Oxford, Dec. 13, 14, 1899.

There were present Father Puller, Dr. Moberly, Canon Gore, Canon Scott Holland, Rev. C. G. Lang, Archdeacon Wilson, Dr. Ryle, Canon E. R. Bernard, Rev. A. C. Headlam, and Dr. Sanday. The nonconformists were Dr. Fairbairn, Mr. Arnold Thomas, and Dr. Forsyth (Congregationalists), Dr. Salmond (Presbyterian), and Dr. Davison (Wesleyan).

It consisted of ten churchmen and five nonconformists.

A preliminary paper was circulated among the members some time before the conference, asking each to answer certain questions bearing upon the general sub-

ject; and there were besides three meetings for discussion. A stenographic report of the speeches and conversations (corrected by the speakers) has been published under the editorship of Dr. Sanday. It is scarcely necessary to say that it will be found of great interest to all who are studying the questions of priesthood and sacrifice.

The question of the E. S. only incidentally touched upon. Father Puller's view similar to Mr. Brightman's. This view supported by no other member, but condemned by several in "obiter dicta."

In this conference the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was only incidentally touched upon, but one speaker, the Rev. Father Puller, put forth a view almost precisely similar to that expressed in Mr. Brightman's pamphlet, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*.

While this theory was not definitely discussed, the grounds on which it was based were condemned by certain *obiter dicta* of various speakers. The majority, however, passed it over in silence, and the only one who expressed any sympathy with it was Mr. Lang; but his endorsement was limited to a statement which was really inconsistent with Father Puller's theory, namely, that while the act of death was the completion of the Sacrifice in time, its significance and efficacy were to be eternal. No Catholic of course doubts either that the Sacrifice was completed in time or that the significance and efficacy of it are eternal, since the significance and efficacy of a completed sacrifice can not be the sacrifice itself; the basis, however, of Father Puller's and Mr. Brightman's view is, that the Sacrifice was not confined to the act of death or to the Cross, and therefore was not completed in time, and that it is not the significance and efficacy, but the *act of sacrifice* which is eternal.

We shall, however, give in this Appendix Father Puller's speeches in full and those portions of the other speeches which show agreement or disagreement with

Father Puller's views, and then we shall conclude with some remarks upon them.

FATHER PULLER.—“ The point on which I wish to lay stress is the fact that in the Old Testament sacrifices are represented to us as processes consisting of various acts. A sacrifice is not simply the killing of a victim, but a process of a complex nature. The victim was first brought and presented alive by the offerer ; then the offerer laid his hands on the head of the victim, and in some sense constituted it as his representative. The victim was next killed by the offerer ; and it was not until the death had taken place, as I understand it, that the priest's part commenced. It was his duty to catch the blood which flowed from the victim, and then to offer the blood on the altar, or round the base of the altar, and in some cases on the horns of the altar; while on the Day of Atonement the High Priest took it within the innermost veil and sprinkled it before the Shekinah enthroned over the Mercy-seat.

Father Puller's
speech at the
first discussion.

It was in that blood-sprinkling that the priestly action in the sacrifice commenced. Then the priest had to take either the whole body of the victim as in the case of the burnt-offering, or, as in the case of some other forms of sacrifice, choice portions of the victim, and lay them upon the great altar of burnt-offering, where they were burned in the holy fire which had come out from GOD. To use the remarkable language of the Old Testament, the victim became the bread or the food of GOD. Finally, there came the feasting on the sacrifice.

In the whole burnt-offering there could be nothing of the victim eaten, because the peculiarity of that kind of sacrifice consisted in the fact that the whole victim was burnt ; but there was always offered with the burnt-offering a meal-offering, part of which was eaten by the priest. In the case of the peace-offering the eating was much more emphasized. The priest had his share, and the offerer and his family had their share. Altogether, there seem to have been six different acts which went

to make up the great complex process of sacrifice. The presentation alive, the laying on of hands, and the killing—these three may be described as non-sacerdotal acts, because they were ordinarily performed by the offerer, who was generally a layman. When the priest took part in these acts, he was acting, not as a priest, but rather as an offerer, or as the representative of the offerers. The priestly part in the work of sacrifice consisted in the manipulation of the blood, and in placing the body or part of it on the altar to be burned. Now this may all seem at first sight unfruitful; but I think that it has a great bearing on the way in which we should regard the Sacrifice of our LORD, and sacrifice generally under the Gospel dispensation. The question is a very vital one, and it has been answered in various ways—the question, I mean, whether the Sacrifice of our LORD simply consists in His Death on the Cross; whether His priestly action is confined to His death, or whether His sacrificial action goes on after His death and in His life of glory.”—Pp. 69-70.

In the next discussion Father Puller said :

Father Puller's
second speech.

“ I will take up the line I suggested this morning in regard to the complex character of the sacrificial act as set forth in the Old Testament, and apply it to that which we are now prepared to discuss—the New Testament doctrine of sacrifice and of priesthood. I would lay great stress on the thought that while our Blessed LORD'S death on the Cross is a most essential and fundamental element in His sacrifice, His priestly work is especially to be connected with His life in glory. I have pointed out that the killing of the sacrifice was not in the typical dispensation a sacerdotal act, and that it was only accidentally that a priest ever took any part in it, and that when on any occasion the priest did kill the victim, he was not acting as a priest, but rather as the offerer. Similarly I am accustomed to regard our LORD, when He was dying on the Cross, rather as the Victim than as the Priest. This, I think, is the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The

author of that Epistle seems always to connect our LORD'S Priesthood with His life in the state of glory. I would refer especially to Heb. ii. 17, v. 5-10, vi. 20, vii. 28, viii. 2, 3; and I would lay stress on the fact that Dr. A. B. Davidson, of Edinburgh, in his remarkable *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, to a great extent bears me out. Dr. Davidson, on p. 151, says: 'It is doubtful if the Epistle anywhere regards the SON'S Death considered merely in itself as a priestly act. . . . The Epistle seems to confine the high-priestly ministry to the acts done in the sanctuary, and to refrain from including under the priesthood, when it is spoken of distinctively, any acts not done there.' I would call special attention to what is said about our LORD'S becoming a High Priest in Heb. v. 5-10. The holy writer says: 'So CHRIST also glorified not Himself to be made a High Priest, but He that spake unto Him, "Thou art My SON, this day have I begotten Thee."' Here I note in passing that our LORD'S elevation to the High Priesthood is by implication described as a *glorification* of Him by the FATHER; and it is also implied that the FATHER was glorifying the Incarnate SON to be High Priest, when in the words of the Second Psalm He said, 'Thou art My SON, this day have I begotten Thee.' But those words are interpreted by S. Paul of our LORD'S Resurrection (see Acts xiii. 33 and Rom. i. 4). The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews goes on to say: 'As He saith also in another place, "Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek."' And these words are taken from Psalm cx., a psalm of our LORD'S life in glory, a psalm which begins with the words, 'The LORD said unto my LORD, Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.' Thus our LORD'S glorification to be High Priest is connected with His Resurrection and His session in the heavenly places. The rest of the passage, Heb. v. 7-10, will be found to corroborate this result. Thus, it would appear that, when our LORD entered the heavenly sanctuary and was about to present Himself to the FATHER, He *became* a High Priest, and in some mysterious

way He fulfilled what the high priest did on the Day of Atonement, when he went within the veil and offered the blood. Again, our LORD no doubt also fulfilled the other priestly act of presenting His Holy Body as a sacrifice. S. John, in the Book of the Revelation, looking up into heaven, saw 'in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing as though it had been slain.' There was the sacrifice in heaven. The lamb was the sacrificial animal *par excellence*, and our LORD is described not simply as the Lamb, but as the *ἀρνίον ὡς ἐσφαγμένον*, which last word is the usual word in Leviticus for the mactation of sacrifices. Yet the LORD is not now dead. He is *standing*, for He is alive for evermore. Thus He is represented as a *living Sacrifice*, Who has passed through death. The Jewish sacrifices had to be offered in death with no resurrection life in them; while the Christian Sacrifice has passed through death and 'is alive for evermore.'—Pp. 100-102.

In the third discussion Father Puller said :

Father Puller's
third speech.

" I think that we shall all agree that our LORD is a 'priest for ever,' however much we may differ in our views as to the functions of His priesthood; but I am afraid that we shall not all be agreed that His *sacrifice* continues for ever, that it is a perpetual sacrifice. To my mind, however, the perpetuity of our LORD'S sacrifice is brought out with very special clearness by St. John in the Apocalypse. In his vision he sees our LORD in glory as the 'Lamb standing, as though it had been slain.'

" It certainly seems probable to me that that particular symbol was used with the object of expressing the idea that our LORD continues to be a sacrifice, and that, whatever there may or may not be on earth, there exist at any rate in heaven not only a High Priest but also a sacrifice. But in fact I believe that Holy Scripture teaches that the oblation of the Sacrifice of CHRIST is not limited to heaven, but that it takes place also on earth in the celebration of the Eucharist. The whole

account of our LORD's institution of the Eucharist implies the sacrificial character of that rite. Every detail is sacrificial. I notice first that our LORD taught us to use at the eucharist *bread* and *wine*. It may be admitted that to an ordinary Englishman of the nineteenth century these elements may not suggest sacrificial ideas. But it was surely otherwise with those who were gathered around our LORD in the upper room. The meal-offerings consisted of preparations of fine flour. The drink-offerings consisted of wine. Bread and wine were also largely used in the heathen sacrifices. The very word 'immolation' is derived from 'mola,' the sacrificial meal that was sprinkled on the victims. Thus the bread and the wine, which formed the basis of the eucharistic rite, were sacrificial things. These sacrificial things our LORD blessed and consecrated; and having consecrated them, He identified them with His own precious Body and Blood. He said: 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood.' But His Body and Blood are the sacrificial things which He perpetually presents in heaven. He has, as our High Priest, brought His 'Blood of sprinkling' within the veil, that it may 'speak better things than that of Abel.' He appears openly before the face of GOD on our behalf, clothed with His glorified Body, the Body of the 'Lamb standing, as though it had been slain.' Moreover, by the institution of the Eucharist our LORD was inaugurating a *new covenant*. He said: 'This cup is the new covenant in My Blood, which is being poured out for you.' And according to the teaching of Holy Scripture covenants are made and ratified by sacrifice. Once more, our LORD, after instituting the Eucharist, gave an injunction to His Church, saying: 'Do this for My memorial' (*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*). The word *ἀνάμνησις* corresponds in the LXX. to the Hebrew *זִכְרוֹן*, which is also rendered in some passages of the LXX. by the word *μνημόσυρον*. It normally signified a sacrificial offering burnt on the altar. Thus in Lev. xxiv. 7, it is written: 'Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row [of the shew-bread], that

it may be on the bread *for a memorial* (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*), even an offering made by fire unto the LORD.' In the case of the meal-offerings the *זֶבַח* was that part of the offering which was burnt on the altar, the rest being eaten by the priest. From what has been said it seems clear that the principal words used by our LORD at the institution of the Eucharist, and also the elements which He appointed to be used in that rite, point in the same direction, and indicate the sacrificial character of the ordinance; and it would require very explicit and authoritative statements in the opposite direction to induce me to give up my belief that the Holy Eucharist was instituted by our LORD as a sacrifice, the earthly counterpart of the sacrificial oblation which is being carried on in the heavenly tabernacle. Had there been time I should have gone on to point out how from the Apostolic age onwards the Eucharist has always been understood in the Church to be a sacrifice."—Pp. 134-136.

In the "Statements and Definitions" Father Puller wrote :

Father Puller's
"Statement."

"CHRIST exercises His Priesthood in heaven in His own Person. He exercises it on earth in and through His Church. To use Dr. Milligan's words: 'The Church of CHRIST is a sacerdotal or priestly institution. Sacerdotalism, priestliness, is the prime element of her being.'"—P. 15.

DR. RYLE, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, in the second discussion said :

Dr. Ryle's
views.

"The work of our LORD as a Priest will include, of course, His function of intercession, benediction, and absolution. These belong to His eternal Priesthood. So far as His historic work is concerned, there is no teaching in the New Testament which would imply either that His mediatorial office and sacrifice for sin were otherwise than completely finished in Himself and in His own person; or that the duties of service are not to be performed by all alike who were His disciples.

The Priesthood and Sacrifice of CHRIST 'in the heavens,' in the Presence of the FATHER, seem to me matters quite beyond the range of our conception."—P. 108.

And in the third discussion Dr. Ryle said :

"It is important that there should be no misapprehension here. I should be very sorry if any words I had used could be thought to derogate from the supreme importance of the doctrine of the atoning sacrifice. From the physical point of view the death of CHRIST was a dying ; from the Roman point of view it was an execution ; from the Jewish point of view we may say it was a murder. From the Christian point of view it was a sacrifice, and it becomes sacrificial by the description of the historical fact under metaphorical terms."—P. 144.

In the first discussion CANON SCOTT HOLLAND said :

"And, then, about the contrast that has been so frequently made between 'outward' and 'inward' in sacrifice. It has been implied that the moralizing of sacrifice lies in dropping the 'outward' expression and in accentuating solely the 'inward' act of will : so that CHRIST'S perfect sacrifice is wholly inward, 'of the heart.' But is it not essential to sacrifice that it should be the outward act by which the inward intention is realized, is pledged, is sealed? The inward self-dedication only becomes sacrificial when it has discovered the appropriate offering by which it can verify itself. Only through attaining this expression, in outward realization, does the language of sacrifice apply to it. It has somewhat to offer, by which it can pledge its loyalty of self-surrender : there is its relief, its reality. The process by which the sacrifice is moralized is, not by dropping the external offering, but by raising the moral quality of that which it expresses. This can, for ever, be rising higher and higher ; but always, as it rises, it will need to make its external offering ; and CHRIST completes all sacrifice because He gives perfect outward expression to the inner motive. He recovers for it its true realization by the offering of His

Canon Scott
Holland's.

Body, by which act, once done, all man's capacity of self-dedication is sealed and crowned. He can take up in His hands, and bring before GOD, that in which His oblation of Himself is verified and eternalized."—Pp. 85, 86.

And in the third discussion Canon Scott Holland said:

"As to the sacrifice of CHRIST, I want still to plead what I have said before, that the inward motive is not, in itself, sacrificial until it has obtained an outward realization—until it can succeed in *making* an offering. The 'Lo! I come to do Thy will' becomes sacrificial when it has completed its intention in the offering of the *Body* prepared for it. The will that is to be done is that He should have a *Body* to present in sacrifice. And so it is that our own offerings of spiritual thanks and praises only gain the right to use sacrificial language through the sacrifice, present in their midst, of the *Body* and *Blood*. It is this that constitutes them sacrifices."—Pp. 152, 153.

DR. MOBERLY in the first discussion said :

Dr. Moberly's.

"As to the bearing of the Old Testament upon the true meaning of sacrifice and priesthood, I would urge that it is limited. The Old Testament itself is only really understood retrospectively. Of course all that is in the Old Testament is relevant. The New Testament will interpret it all. But the Old Testament is not determinative of the meaning of the New. What things mean in the New Testament, is their true meaning. It is only from *that* that you can go back and find out how all the Old Testament had been (however blindly) leading up to the different elements of the fulness of the truth."—P. 74.

In the second discussion CANON BERNARD said :

Canon
Bernard's.

"I will only remark that I think that the teaching which has been drawn from Hebrews as to our LORD'S

High-Priestly work in heaven has been obtained by using the Old Testament to interpret the New, which I do not look upon as legitimate. It has been well said that the Old Testament explains the New Testament, while the New Testament interprets the Old Testament. The distinction between explaining and interpreting is a very important one. But in remarks made at the beginning of our discussion the maxim was practically inverted."—Pp. 113, 114.

And in "Statements and Definitions," page 25, Canon Bernard writes :

"That that Sacrifice was made once for all, and that it was followed not by continuous presentation of the Sacrifice, but by session at the Right Hand of GOD (Heb. x. 12). There is, of course, much other teaching, but this is the point which appears relevant to the present discussion.

"That it is a Priesthood of intercession ; and also a mediation, in regard of our whole life towards GOD."—P. 25.

In the second discussion CANON GORE said :

"I suppose that as one studies the New Testament documents more closely, nothing gets hold of one more in regard to them than the central place held in the earliest Church by the ideas derived from Isaiah liii. These ideas underlie the early speeches of the Acts in such a way as forces one to realize that from the first beginning of the Church the conception was dominant that CHRIST'S death was the realization of the ideal suggested by Isaiah. And our LORD Himself, in all that central spiritual labour of His life, which consisted in habituating His disciples to the idea of glory through death, was but recalling them to the lost conception. 'Ought not the CHRIST to have suffered?' was an appeal more especially to Isaiah liii.

Canon Gore's.

"The forerunner, according to S. John, had already prepared the way for this recall by pointing to CHRIST as 'the Lamb of GOD Who taketh up and expiateth the

sin of the world.' Surely the idea of CHRIST the Sacrifice is at the very centre and kernel of the New Testament. These general considerations give distinction and emphasis to the one or two special utterances of our LORD about the sacrificial character of His own life and death. The words, 'This is My Blood which is being shed' (or 'poured out') 'for you,' characterize His Death as the spiritual counterpart of the sacrifice which inaugurated the first covenant. There is also the passage, 'For their sakes I consecrate Myself that they also may be consecrated in truth'—a phrase which identifies priesthood and sacrifice in CHRIST, i. e., brings out the fact that the sacrifice is essentially *of the person*, which means, of course, that priest and sacrifice are identified. . . . There is also S. Matthew xvi., where Peter rebukes our LORD for His anticipation of His Death, and where our LORD refers to the Cross which is to be the instrument of His own death, adding, 'Whosoever will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it,' etc. Here again He implies that the Cross, the instrument of His own Sacrifice, is to belong to the disciples as well.

"I should have thought, however, that the New Testament as a whole required us to draw a distinction between the spiritual meaning and efficacy of our LORD'S dying or our LORD'S Sacrifice, and anything which we, through Him, can share."—Pp. 111-113.

In the second discussion MR. LANG said :

"As to the very profound subject of the nature of our LORD'S Sacrifice, surely it is necessary from His own language to feel that there was more in the sacrifice than the mere dedication and sacrifice of His own will—that He looked forward to the death on the Cross as the great deed that was to work some great achievement ; that that achievement was to be done once ; and that once done it was to have eternal significance and efficacy. Whatever the act of death meant, it was at least the completion of the sacrifice in time, but its

significance and efficacy were to be eternal. I agree with Father Puller that in thinking of the Sacrifice of CHRIST—of the Eternal SON—it is impossible to think of it merely as an event past in time—something that has come to an end.”—P. 121.

And in the third discussion Mr. Lang said :

“ It is impossible to dissociate that conception of the office of the living and eternal CHRIST from the Sacrifice which He has achieved once and for all. With Father Puller I am still feeling that that Sacrifice is not a thing completed in the sense of being past in time, and therefore ended. It is completed in the sense that it is perfect—there is nothing to be added to it—it is eternal. That is why I cannot quite agree with Professor Ryle’s words ; because I feel that in some deep, mysterious sense—a sense which it is hardly possible to express in language, for language is of things in space and time—the function, so to say, of that Sacrifice is not ended, but is eternal as itself. I can imagine nothing that speaks to one’s life’s need more than the conception of being associated with the perpetual pleading of the eternal Sacrifice ; it is there that the importance of the Eucharist comes in. In the Eucharist, we have the assurance of the Divinely appointed pledge and symbol of being identified with the eternal Sacrifice of the Lamb of GOD. And so I cannot conceive it as being a mere commemorative rite. It is in some mysterious sense a real sharing of the Body and Blood of a living CHRIST, who *is* the eternally perfect Sacrifice. The symbolic act is not *in itself* expiatory. It is nothing in itself apart from CHRIST, through Whom it is offered. It is not, therefore, to my mind, expiatory, but it associates us with the eternal presentment by our LORD—our eternal High Priest—of His Sacrifice for the sins of the world. It is an act by which we are permitted, by Divine condescension, in some degree to share in what CHRIST is doing.”—Pp. 159, 160.

In “ Statements and Definitions ” DR. SANDAY says :

Dr. Sanday's.

"Our LORD undoubtedly regarded His own Death as sacrificial.

"The central passage is Mark xiv. 22-24 (Matt. xxvi. 26-28 [Luke xxii. 19 f.]). Compare Mark x. 45 (Matt. xx. 28); John i. 29, 36, vi. 51.

"If His Death is sacrificial, He is Himself the High Priest by whom it is offered (John xvii.). The fuller teaching of the Epistles appears to have its root in sayings of CHRIST Himself."—P. 22.

And again: "The Sacrifice of CHRIST is offered once for all (Rom. vi. 10; Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, 26-28, x. 10, 12, 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18).

"Its effect and the Intercession of CHRIST following upon it are eternal (Heb. vii. 15, 25, ix. 12, 14, x. 12-14, 18; Rom. viii. 34).

"The 'feast upon the Sacrifice' is intended to be perpetually repeated (1 Cor. xi. 25 f.)."—P. 26.

In the second discussion MR. HEADLAM said:

Rev. A. C.
Headlam's.

"The general topic has been discussed very amply, and up to a certain point there has been a remarkable and unanimous agreement. We all agree that the propitiatory character of our LORD'S Death is something unique, and the point at issue is, how far and in what way the effects are shared in by us."—P. 122.

And again: "Now if we refer to the Passover we can distinguish the following parts of the rite: the slaying of the victim, the sprinkling of the blood, and then, afterwards, the sacrificial meal; there was also the offering of first-fruits. It seems to me that the analogy runs thus: instead of the paschal lamb the sacrifice to be once offered was that of our LORD on the Cross. The effects of that Sacrifice were to be continued. Therefore, though the death is accomplished, the communion in the sacrificial rite and the effect of it in the new covenant live on; and in that sense the Eucharist is a Sacrifice."—Pp. 122, 123.

Dr. Fair-
bairn's.

In "Statements and Definitions" DR. FAIRBAIRN writes:

"Thus, while there is complete agreement as to the

death of CHRIST being a Sacrifice for sin, this Sacrifice is by no means regarded by all, equally, as sacerdotal in its character. . . . The explicit references to CHRIST'S death as a Sacrifice bear out this view; 'CHRIST is our Passover' (1 Cor. v. 7), the rite where the father was the priest and the official priesthood had no function. And Eph. v. 2 is too purely ethical to permit a strictly sacerdotal inference.

"In Hebrews, the Sacrifice is conceived under sacerdotal forms, but these are expressly designed to bring out the uniqueness of both the Priesthood and the Sacrifice. He was a priest without sin and without successor, and His Sacrifice was spiritual, made by His obedience and offered once for all, leaving no other possible or necessary (Heb. ix. 26, x. 5-7, 12)." — Pp. 27, 28.

In the second discussion Dr. Fairbairn said :

"That brings us to the root of the whole matter. What do we conceive CHRIST accomplished by His death? What was its purpose, its *terminus ad quem*, as it were? Is its influence exhausted in what it enables man to do or to become? Or does it so concern GOD that because of it and through it He has new relations to man?" — P. 129.

In the second discussion DR. DAVISON said :

"McLeod Campbell dwelt unduly upon our LORD'S confession of man's sin as atoning, but he did not use the term 'penitence,' which does not properly describe CHRIST'S Sacrifice at all. In that Sacrifice we cannot share. Whatever it was, it was perfect, offered once for all." — P. 115.

Dr. Davison's.

We have now before us Father Puller's three speeches in full, and all the passages from the speeches of the other members of the conference which seem to bear directly upon Father Puller's theories. In each discussion Father Puller was the first speaker, and in

each of his speeches he confined himself to what we have called the Modern view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the grounds upon which it is based.

Father Puller divides the process of S. into six acts, three sacerdotal and three not sacerdotal.

In his first speech he divides the process of sacrifice into six different acts, three of which—"The Presentation Alive," "The Laying on of Hands," and "The Killing"—he describes as non-sacerdotal acts. He considers that the priestly part in the work of sacrifice consisted in the manipulation of the blood and in placing the body or part of it on the altar to be burned. The sixth act in the process he regards as the feast upon the sacrifice, and he asks (and recognizes the question as a vital one) whether the Sacrifice of our LORD simply consists in His Death upon the Cross; whether His priestly action is confined to His Death, or whether His sacrificial action goes on after His Death and in His life of glory. He has, however, already implicitly answered the first question, for in saying that the killing is a non-sacerdotal act, he implies not only that our LORD's priestly act is not confined to His Death, but that it has nothing to do with His Death.

He considers the priestly acts to be confined to heaven and to the H. E.;

In his second speech he says: "I would lay great stress on the thought that while our Blessed LORD's Death on the Cross is a most essential and fundamental element in His Sacrifice, His Priestly work is to be especially connected with His life in glory. I have pointed out that the killing of the sacrifice was not in the typical dispensation a sacerdotal act. . . . Similarly I am accustomed to regard our LORD, when He was dying on the Cross, rather as the Victim than as the Priest."

and that the Death on the Cross, not being a priestly act, cannot be a strictly sacrificial act.

He also considers that when our LORD entered the heavenly sanctuary and was about to present Himself to the FATHER, He *became* a High Priest, and

no doubt also fulfilled the other priestly act of presenting His Body as a sacrifice. Here Father Puller is entirely in accord with Socinus in confining our LORD'S Priesthood to heaven, and in placing the act of sacrifice, the presentation of His Body as a sacrifice, after His Ascension.*

In support of the view that a sacrifice is offered in heaven, he quotes Rev. v. 6 : " In the midst of the throne . . . a Lamb standing as though it had been slain " (*ἀρνίον ὡς ἐσφαγμένον*). †

In his third speech he expresses his " belief that the Holy Eucharist was instituted by our LORD as a sacrifice ; the earthly counterpart of the sacrificial oblation which is being carried on in the heavenly tabernacle."

He, however, nowhere alludes to the Catholic view that the sacrificial character of the Eucharist depends on its showing forth of the LORD'S Death upon the Cross. He speaks of the words, " Do this for My memorial," but refers this to a sacrificial offering burned on the altar which he apparently considers finds its counterpart in our LORD'S action now in heaven. Throughout his treatment there is no reference whatever to the Eucharist as related to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Father Puller nowhere relates the E. S. to the Death on the Cross.

There are two things in connection with Father Puller's speeches which are very noticeable : First, that he quotes only two authorities, the Rev. Dr. Milligan † and the Rev. Dr. Davidson of Edinburgh § — both

He quotes only two authorities, Dr. Milligan and Dr. Davidson, both Presbyterians.

* Cf. Appendix B, pp. 480.

† We have already pointed out (page 142) that *ὡς ἐσφαγμένον* excludes the idea of a sacrifice in an active sense, since the tense of the participle shows that the condition of the Lamb was the result of an act which had taken place in the past, the effects of which remained ; but the effects of a sacrifice cannot be the sacrificial act.

‡ See p. 522.

§ See p. 519.

of them estimable men, no doubt, but as Presbyterian ministers they are not precisely the authorities which would carry much weight with churchmen. We may be sure that Father Puller would have quoted Patristic authorities for his view if there had been any; he might have quoted Socinus as its source, but those he cites indicate how modern and unchurchly his theory is.

Mr. Lang's
reference to
Father Puller's
view.

Second, that with the solitary exception of Mr. Lang, no member of the conference made any reference directly to Father Puller's speeches; although he was the first speaker and his speech was evidently most carefully prepared, yet, with the exception mentioned, it was entirely ignored by all the other speakers. And Mr. Lang, in expressing sympathy with one aspect of Father Puller's view, uses expressions which, as we have shown, are entirely inconsistent with the grounds on which that view is based.

Several of the other speakers, however, incidentally condemn either the grounds on which his theory is based or the principles of interpretation by which it is supported. To point out a few of these instances:

Dr. Ryle's
"obiter dicta"
inconsistent
with Father
Puller's
theory.

Dr. Ryle: "The work of our LORD as a Priest [i. e., in heaven] will include of course His function of intercession, benediction, and absolution. These belong to His eternal Priesthood. . . . The Priesthood and Sacrifice of CHRIST 'in the heavenlies,' in the Presence of the FATHER, seem to me matters quite beyond the range of our conception." And again: "The Death of CHRIST . . . from the Christian point of view, was a sacrifice." *

Canon Scott
Holland's.

Canon Scott Holland: "The inward self-dedication only becomes sacrificial when it has discovered the appropriate offering by which it can verify itself." And again: "The inward motive is not, in itself, sacrificial

* See p. 522.

until it has obtained an outward realization—until it can succeed in *making* an offering. But the ‘Lo! I come to do Thy will’ becomes sacrificial when it has completed its intention in the offering of the *body* prepared for it. . . . And so it is that our own offerings of spiritual thanks and praises only gain the right to use sacrificial language through the Sacrifice, *present in their midst, of the Body and Blood.** It is this that constitutes them sacrifices.” †

Canon Bernard : “ That that sacrifice was made once for all, and that it was followed not by continuous presentation of the sacrifice, but by session at the Right Hand of GOD.” †

Canon
Bernard's.

Canon Gore speaks of “ our LORD's ” dying or “ our LORD's Sacrifice ” as identical. §

Canon Gore's.

Dr. Sanday : “ Our LORD undoubtedly regarded His own Death as sacrificial. . . . If His Death is sacrificial He is Himself the High Priest by whom it is offered.” And again : “ The Sacrifice of CHRIST is offered once for all. Its effects and the Intercession of CHRIST following upon it are eternal.” ||

Dr. Sanday's.

Mr. Headlam : “ It seems to me that the analogy runs thus : Instead of the paschal lamb the sacrifice to be once offered was that of our LORD on the Cross. The effects of that Sacrifice were to be continued. Therefore, though the death is accomplished, the communion in the sacrificial rite and the effect of it in the new covenant live on ; and in that sense the Eucharist is a sacrifice.” ¶

Mr. Head-
lam's.

Dr. Fairbairn : “ Thus . . . there is complete agreement as to the death of CHRIST being a Sacrifice for sin.” Again, “ the explicit references to CHRIST's Death as a Sacrifice bear out this view.” And again : “ What do we conceive CHRIST accomplished by His death ? What was its purpose, its *terminus ad quem* ? ” **

Dr. Fair-
bairn's.

Dr. Davison : “ In that Sacrifice [CHRIST's] we cannot share. Whatever it was it was perfect, offered once for all.” † †

Dr. Davison's.

* Italics ours. † See p. 525. || See p. 528. ** See p. 529.

† See p. 524. § See p. 526. ¶ See p. 528. †† See p. 529.

Dr. Moberly's. Dr. Moberly : " As to the bearing of the Old Testament upon the true meaning of sacrifice and priesthood, I would urge that it is limited. The Old Testament itself is only really understood retrospectively. Of course all that is in the Old Testament is relevant. The New Testament will interpret it all. But the Old Testament is not determinative of the meaning of the New [therefore the rite of the Day of Atonement is not interpretive of our LORD'S action in heaven, but is to be interpreted by it]."*

Canon Bernard's. Canon Bernard: " I will only remark that I think the teaching which has been drawn from Hebrews as to our LORD'S high-priestly work in heaven has been obtained by using the Old Testament to interpret the New, which I do not look upon as legitimate. It has been well said that the Old Testament explains the New Testament, while the New Testament interprets the Old Testament. The distinction between explaining and interpreting is a very important one. But in remarks made at the beginning of our discussion, the maxim was practically inverted." †

Conclusion to be drawn from the Oxford Conference. These passages seem quite inconsistent with Father Puller's view that our LORD'S Priestly action is limited to heaven (or to the Eucharist on earth), and therefore that while the Death upon the Cross might be an essential and fundamental element in His Sacrifice (just as the preliminary rites performed by the layman under the Jewish law, when he brought the victim to the door of the tabernacle, placed his hands upon its head, and killed it, were essential and fundamental elements in the sacrifice offered by the Jewish priest), yet they were not the Sacrifice itself. Besides, Father Puller's view is quite irreconcilable with the words of the English Canon, that upon the Cross our LORD made a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice.

* See p. 524.

† See p. 525.

The Fathers are never tired of teaching that on the Cross our LORD was both Priest and Victim, Offerer and That which was offered ; and that there He comprehended and fulfilled every sacrificial act. This, too, we have shown in our treatment of the Sacrifice of the Cross. *

We may conclude, then, that of the fifteen representative members of the Conference, Father Puller was the only advocate of the Modern view, and that his opinions were not endorsed by any of the other members, and were explicitly rejected by several.

FULHAM CONFERENCE

A resolution was passed at the London Diocesan Conference on May 16, 1900, requesting the Bishop of London to appoint a Round Table conference, consisting of members of the Church of England, on ritual and the doctrines involved therein. In accordance with this resolution the Bishop appointed the following Churchmen as representing divergent schools of thought in the Church of England : Rev. Dr. Barlow, Rev. H. E. J. Bevan, Rev. Dr. Bigg, Mr. W. J. Birbeck, Rev. N. Dimock, Rev. Canon Gore, Viscount Halifax, Rev. Prof. Moule, Rev. Canon Newbolt, Rev. Dr. Robertson, Rev. Canon Robinson, Rev. Prof. Sanday, Mr. P. V. Smith, the Earl of Stamford, Rev. Dr. Wace.

Round Table
Conference at
Fulham, Octo-
ber 10, 1900.

Its constitu-
tion.

At the invitation of the Bishop the Conference assembled at Fulham Palace on Wednesday, October 10, 1900, and continued its sessions until Saturday morning the 13th.

The subjects discussed were : (1) The nature of the

The subject
discussed was

* See pp. 49-54.

the Holy Eucharist.

A written statement invited in preparation for the Conference.

That of the Rev. N. Dimock taken as the starting-point for discussion. One entire session devoted to the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The Modern view conspicuous by its absence.

Divine Gift in the Holy Communion ; (2) the relation between the Divine Gift and the consecrated Elements ; (3) the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion ; (4) the expression in Ritual of the doctrine of the Holy Communion. As at the Oxford Conference, the members were invited to send beforehand a written statement of their views,—in this case on the subject of the Divine Gift in Holy Communion.

It will be observed that two of the members (Dr. Sanday and Canon Gore) took part also in the Oxford Conference.

Of the written statements sent at the Bishop's request, that of the Rev. N. Dimock was taken as the starting-point for discussion. As one entire session was devoted to the consideration of the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion, and as the members of the Conference were representative of the various schools of opinion in the English Church, we shall turn to this discussion with special interest.

Mr. Brightman in his pamphlet on *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* assures us that " what is more characteristic among our theologians is the theory which is remarkable by its general absence in the Roman writers, the interpretation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the reproduction on earth, not of the moment of the Cross, but of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven as the minister of the true tabernacle." * We should therefore expect to find this the basis of, or at least occupying a prominent place in, a discussion of the Eucharistic Sacrifice at a conference of Anglican Churchmen. It is not a little remarkable, therefore, that no such view is put forth by any member of the Conference ; that there seems to have been practical agreement that the

* Brightman, p. 2.

sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion depends on its reproduction (or commemoration) on earth of our LORD'S Death upon the Cross ; that is, to reverse Mr. Brightman's language, " of the moment of the Cross," not " of our LORD'S perpetual action in heaven." The only possible exception to this was a statement by Canon Gore of what he considered to be S. Irenæus' view of the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist. As in the case of the Oxford Conference,—to enable the reader to judge for himself,—we shall proceed to give extracts from the statements and speeches in so far as they seem to bear upon the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

A practical agreement that the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist depends solely on its relation to our LORD'S Sacrifice on the Cross ; the only possible exception Canon Gore's theory about S. Irenæus. Extracts will be given of all passages bearing on the E. S.

I. FROM THE STATEMENTS.

1. Rev. N. Dimock : " That, though not *the* purpose of the Ordinance, there may be truly said to be an offering, i. e., to the Divine view, of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST, or of CHRIST Himself, in representation, not *re*-presentation, symbolically, not hypostatically, offered to view—not as making, but as having made once for all the perfect propitiation for the sins of the world."—P. 11.*

Extracts from the written statements.

1. Rev. N. Dimock.

2. Rev. H. E. J. Bevan : " I believe that the Eucharist has a two-fold sacrificial aspect, in that it (1) ' shews forth ' the benefits of the SAVIOUR'S atonement ' until He come ; ' and (2) symbolizes ' the reasonable, holy, and lively ' sacrifice of ' ourselves, our souls, and bodies.' "—P. 14

2. Rev. H. E. J. Bevan.

3. Lord Halifax : " I believe that each Eucharist is a repetition of what our Blessed LORD did in the Last Supper. That CHRIST, mystically represented under the aspect of death by the separate consecration of His Body and His Blood, offers Himself, presents Himself,

3. Lord Halifax.

* The paging in the text refers to the Report of the Conference,—that in the footnotes to this work.

is offered, is presented to the FATHER in commemoration of all He did or suffered for us throughout His whole life and upon the Cross. That each Eucharist is the showing forth of the one Sacrifice which is the complete and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. . . .

“Further, as CHRIST, the second Adam and the Head of the human race, by the sacrifice of Himself which He offered throughout His whole life and on the Cross, was discharging all the obligations due from mankind collectively and individually to GOD, every member of CHRIST’S Body in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, which is the commemoration of that Sacrifice, is bound to take, so far as he can, his personal share in that Sacrifice, and to tread in the steps of his SAVIOUR CHRIST by offering himself, body, soul, and spirit, in union with CHRIST’S offering of Himself, as a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto GOD.”—Pp. 22, 23.

4. Rev. Dr.
Moule.

4. Rev. Dr. Moule : “The Ordinance is ‘a sacrament of our Redemption by CHRIST’S Death.’ And this distinctively and supremely.

“For the occasion, the action, and the full words of the Institution, all define the sacred Body in our LORD’S thought to be the Body as in death, and the sacred Blood to be the Blood as in death. That is, as in the act and process of the one Sacrifice which is our Redemption.”—P. 29.

5. Rev. Canon
Newbolt.

5. Rev. Canon Newbolt : “I believe that the Holy Communion was ordained ‘for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST, and of the benefits which we receive thereby;’ and that this ‘remembrance’ is in the first place a memorial before GOD, because ‘CHRIST instituted not only a remembrance of the Sacrifice to ourselves, but also a special mode of pleading it before GOD’ whereby we offer the same Body once for all sacrificed for us, and the same Blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, to the FATHER.”—Pp. 30, 31.

6. Rev. Dr.
Robertson.

6. Rev. Dr. Robertson : “Like Baptism, the Eucharist has a special reference to the Death of CHRIST.

In both sacraments we are so united with CHRIST that His Death becomes our death, His merits our righteousness,—the forgiveness wrought by Him is applied to us. In the Eucharist especially we make CHRIST'S Sacrifice our own."—P. 33.

7. Rev. Canon Robinson: "The Johannine and Pauline conceptions find a meeting-point, when we go on to consider the food offered to us in the Eucharist as Sacrificial Food. Whether or not we supply the word 'given' or 'broken' to the phrase 'My Body which is on your behalf,' a reference is clearly intended to the Crucifixion; and the sacrificial aspect is yet more plainly indicated in the words 'My Blood of the Covenant, which is being poured forth on behalf of many.'"—P. 35.

7. Rev. Canon Robinson.

8. Rev. Dr. Wace: "I believe that, at the Institution of the Holy Communion, our LORD appointed the Bread which He broke to take the place of the Paschal Lamb, and the Wine to take the place of the blood of the Covenant, and that He thus established the Christian Passover in place of the Jewish, as a Covenant between GOD and believers. . . . The Holy Communion is a commemoration, as well on the part of GOD by Whom it was instituted, as on the part of man, of the one sufficient Sacrifice offered by our LORD on the Cross, and a visible means for assuring and conveying to us the benefits of that Sacrifice; while on the part of man it is a Eucharistic Sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies."—P. 38.

8. Rev. Dr. Wace.

II. FROM THE DISCUSSION.

At the third session, held on Friday morning, the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion was considered, starting from the consideration of Mr. Dimock's statement already quoted.*

Extracts from the discussion.

"Canon Gore intimated that he felt much hesitation in accepting the opening words of this statement, that

1. Canon Gore.

* P. 537.

the offering to the Divine view of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST was not *the* purpose of the Ordinance. He thought that the commemoration of that Sacrifice before GOD as well as man must be recognized as at least one of its purposes."—P. 59.

2. Dr. Wace.

"The Chairman (Dr. Wace) intimated a similar difficulty, as he was disposed to regard such a commemoration, before both GOD and man, as the primary purpose of the Ordinance. . . ."—P. 59.

3. Lord Halifax.

"Lord Halifax said that what he intended to express in his statement on this point was that the bread and wine, sacramentally identified with our LORD'S Body and Blood, are offered in commemoration of all our LORD suffered. The Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon a valid Consecration, by means of which the Body and Blood of CHRIST, mystically represented under the aspect of death, are sacramentally offered to the FATHER. . . ."—P. 60.

4. Canon Gore.

"Canon Gore desired to urge two points: A. That it may be emphatically stated that down to the time of S. Thomas Aquinas inclusive, the memorial of our LORD'S Death made in the Holy Communion is regarded as commemorative only, and is not connected with any idea of actual immolation; B. That it would be generally agreed that that which differentiates our relation to the Sacrifice of CHRIST as commemorated in the Holy Communion from our relation to that Sacrifice on any other occasion, when we might agree to commemorate His Death, is the fact that this sacrament is the ordained occasion on which our LORD gives us His Body and Blood, sacramentally identified with the bread and wine. . . ."—P. 60.

5. Mr. Dimock.

"In reply to a question from Dr. Barlow, Mr. Dimock explained his meaning by referring to Waterland's distinction between sacrifice actively and passively considered. 'CHRIST'S Sacrifice is *our sacrifice*, but in the *passive* sense; for us to *partake* of, not to *give* unto GOD.' . . ."—P. 61.

"It was then agreed as an amendment to Mr. Dimock's statement, to omit the words 'though not the purpose,' and to substitute the words 'as one aspect.'"

“The discussion then turned to the nature of the offering made in the Holy Communion.”

“Dr. Robertson drew attention to the early use of sacrificial terms in the primitive Church, which he thought arose inevitably from the connection of the Eucharist with the Passover, which was a sacrificial meal, the expression *θύειν τὸ πάσχα* being used by S. Mark (xiv. 12) and S. Luke (xxii. 7), and *θυεῖν* being a sacrificial word. But he thought that if we got to the real meaning of early Christian writers in the use of such language, their idea is always that of a retrospective reference to the Sacrifice on the Cross, and he quoted passages from S. Chrysostom (*Hom. in Hebr.*, xvii.) and S. Augustine (*Cont. Faust.*, xx. 18) in which this view is expressed in almost identical terms.”—P. 62.

6. Dr. Robertson.

“Canon Gore then said that there was no subject on which similarity of phrase had covered more difference of meaning than that of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The supposition that there is any re-sacrificing of CHRIST might at once be excluded; but when we proceed beyond that point, there have been and still are great differences as to the sense in which the Eucharist is regarded as a sacrifice. More particularly:

7 Canon Gore

“A. He agreed with Mr. Dimock that in the sense in which the early Christians used the word, as, for example, in Irenæus, the main stress was laid on the material elements. The Sacrifices of the Church are regarded as offered for the acceptance of GOD. The thought in the mind of Irenæus is that they were offered for acceptance at the heavenly altar. Then in response to the invocation of the HOLY SPIRIT they were consecrated to be our LORD'S Body and Blood; and the Consecration was regarded as the acceptance of the Church's Sacrifice at the heavenly altar, in virtue of which the elements were returned to the Church as the Body and Blood of our LORD. This he thought was the view primarily represented in the liturgies—our gifts go up to heaven and receive an identification with CHRIST'S priestly offering.

“B. There is a view characteristic of Eastern teaching and represented by Cyril of Jerusalem, accord-

ing to which the Consecration is specially regarded as a consecration of the bread and wine to be on the altar the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which makes a special presence of CHRIST'S everlasting Sacrifice, bringing it, as it were, into the midst of the Church. . . .

"C. There is the view that by means of Communion the real connection of the Church with the Sacrifice of CHRIST is substantiated or maintained. In S. Augustine this view became dominant. Though he speaks also of the offering of CHRIST or of the Passion of CHRIST, yet he lays the main stress on the offering of the Church in CHRIST."—Pp. 65, 66.

8. Lord Halifax.

Lord Halifax then presented a statement which he had drawn up, from which the following is extracted :

"That expressed devotionally, in the words of Prof. Moule, 'I see in the Holy Eucharist, which is primarily and before all things the memorial of the LORD'S Death, CHRIST my LORD at the Holy table, coming to me and saying : 'This is My Body which was broken for you, this is My Blood which was shed for you,'—or, as was expressed by Canon Gore, Canon Newbolt, and Lord Halifax, 'That in every Eucharist CHRIST is the real Consecrator' Who in the service which He has instituted for the perpetual memory of His Death gives to His faithful people His Body as broken, His Blood as poured out, mystically represented and exhibited under the act of death by the separate Consecration of the bread and wine.'—P. 69.

Summary.

We believe we have now given every statement in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice which in any way bears upon the nature or character of that Sacrifice, with the result that in this representative gathering of Anglican Churchmen not one puts forth the view which Mr. Brightman tells us is "characteristic of Anglican writers."* All alike seem to see the sacrificial character solely in the reproduction of the moment of the Cross, which is what Mr. Brightman explicitly tells us Anglican writers do not hold. The only statement

No one puts forth the Modern view. All trace the E. S. solely to the Death upon the Cross.

* Brightman, p. 15.

which can possibly be considered as a recognition of the unobjectionable part of the Modern view (what M. Lepin calls the accidental relation existing between the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the heavenly Offering) is found in Canon Gore's description of what he considers to have been the theory of S. Irenæus on this subject. We have already pointed out that in the passage of S. Irenæus from which Canon Gore deduces this view ("There is therefore an altar in the heavens, for thither our prayers and oblations are directed"*) it is very doubtful from the context whether S. Irenæus in speaking of oblations is referring to the Eucharist at all. The oblations of which he is treating are good works, i. e., the corporal works of mercy inculcated in S. Matt. xxv.† If, however, this refers to the Eucharist we would only remark that Canon Gore has here constructed for us from very slender materials the theory which S. Irenæus held.‡

Canon Gore's interpretation of S. Irenæus considered.

* S. Iren., *Adv. Hæres.*, l. iv., c. xviii., n. 6.

† Cf. pp. 172, 173.

‡ Canon Gore tells us (p. 65) that "this was the view primarily represented in the liturgies—our gifts go up to heaven, and receive an identification with CHRIST'S priestly offering." What precisely are we to understand by these words? "*Our gifts*" are the material elements of bread and wine. Are we to suppose that these material elements, while remaining physically present on the altar, are really carried up to heaven? This undoubtedly is what Canon Gore says, and Mr. Brightman in his pamphlet (pp. 13, 14) attributes a very similar opinion to Paschasius Radbertus, and to the mediæval liturgical writers.

As regards S. Irenæus, the only passage which supplies any grounds for constructing such a theory is the one we have quoted above, and as we have pointed out it is doubtful whether it refers to the Eucharist at all, but if so, it certainly does not contain any such view as this. It will be both interesting and useful to place side by side with what Canon Gore and Mr.

No reference of H. E. to the ritual of the Day of Atonement. Drs. Wace and Robertson connect it with the Passover.

Lord Halifax gives the Catholic view;

There is no reference whatever in the discussion at the Conference to the action of the Jewish high priest in the Holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. On the other hand, both Dr. Wace* and Dr. Robertson † say that the Eucharist as a sacrifice takes the place of the Passover, which is exactly our contention; ‡ while Lord Halifax, who would represent the Catholic view, states that (1) "CHRIST, mystically represented under the aspect of death . . . offers Himself, presents Himself, is offered, is presented to the FATHER in commemoration of all He did or suffered for us throughout His whole life and upon the Cross." § Here the Sacrifice upon the Cross is certainly the climax and end, since there is no reference to anything which our LORD did after His death upon the Cross. (2) And again: "I see in the Holy Eucharist, which is primarily and before all things the memorial of the LORD'S Death," . . . "In every Eucharist CHRIST is the real Consecrator, Who in the service which He has instituted for the perpetual memory of His Death, gives to His faithful people," || etc. While Mr. Dimock,

Brightman tell us is the view of the liturgies and mediæval liturgical commentators, the explicit treatment of this subject by one of the best-known mediæval liturgical writers. Odo of Cambrai (ob. 1116), commenting on the *Supplices Te*, says: "Here the Sacrifice is offered, there it is accepted, not by change of place nor by succession of time; not that the translation as a movement begun in this place is afterwards completed in another place, but in the same place that which was bread becomes the Flesh of the Word. There is no translation of place that from bread it may become Flesh, but it is translated from the altar to heaven, because it is translated from bread to GOD."—Odo Cam., *Expos. in Can. Miss.*, div. liii. Cf. also p. 281 sqq.

* See p. 539.

‡ Cf. p. 139.

† See p. 541.

§ P. 538.

|| P. 542.

who seems to have been the representative of the opposite or Evangelical School, says : " That, though not *the* purpose of the Ordinance, there may be truly said to be an offering, i. e., to the Divine view, of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST." And Canon Gore and Dr. Wace, objecting to the words " though not *the* purpose of the Ordinance," intimate* that the primary purpose of the Ordinance was the offering to the Divine view of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST (not of His Mediatorial work in heaven).

No speaker or writer traces any connection between the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven, unless possibly Mr. Gore's description of what he thinks was S. Irenæus' theory may be considered to refer to that.

We may therefore with much satisfaction assert that in these two Conferences of representative Churchmen the Modern view was not entertained as in any way representing the views of the Church. Although it was pressed in the Oxford Conference throughout with great persistency and skill by Father Puller, yet it found no adherents there, and some opponents, and it is conspicuous for its absence in the Conference held at Fulham.

and even Mr. Dimock, so far as he sees any sacrificial action, traces it to the Death upon the Cross.

No one refers it to our LORD'S Mediatorial work in heaven.

Conclusion.

APPENDIX F.

SADLER'S "THE ONE OFFERING."

The One Offering, by the Rev. M. F. Sadler, Rector of Honiton, Prebendary of Wells, appeared in 1875. It was a small duodecimo of one hundred and ninety-two pages, and was entitled *The One Offering : A Treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist*. The main purpose of this little book was to show that the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is recognized by the early Christian Fathers, by the liturgies, by all schools of Catholic writers, including the Anglo-Catholic writers of the seventeenth century, the Tractarians, Romanists, and even many Protestants. Incidentally Mr. Sadler discusses the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and in his treatment of this point proposes a theory which is based (although he probably did not know it) upon the Socinian interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The One Offering was the first definite treatise on the Eucharistic Sacrifice which the Catholic revival produced. This fact, together with the popular style in which it was written, and the author's reputation as the writer of several very useful and practical works on theological subjects, gave to the book a wide circulation, and there is little doubt that in this way erroneous views of the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice were widely spread. It is a thankless task to criticise one

to whom the Church owes much ; and Prebendary Sadler's *Church Doctrine Bible Truth, The Second Adam, The Sacrament of Responsibility, The Catechist's Manual*, in their day were the means of winning many to the Church who were prejudiced against her teachings.

While recognizing our indebtedness to Mr. Sadler, we must, however, point out not only that the book we are now discussing is responsible for much of the erroneous teaching in regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is prevalent in our own times, but that the writer's knowledge of the subject was not only inadequate, but seems to have been mostly second-hand. If there is one authority to which Mr. Sadler appeals as of supreme importance, it is the authority of the Fathers of the early Church. But we notice that his quotations and other writings are mostly taken at second-hand from the works of Keble, Pusey, Neale, and others ; and what shakes our faith in Mr. Sadler's authority is his examination in chapter vi. of the words " We have an Altar " (Heb. xiii. 10). After stating that he considers the altar to mean the altar or holy table on which the Eucharist is offered, he observes that some say this altar is the actual Cross upon Mount Calvary, and while he admits that, in a certain sense, the Cross is the one Christian altar, we find the following passage: " Others, seeing the danger to their opinions of thus interpreting this altar as the actual Cross, affirm that it is CHRIST Himself, Who they say is at once our Priest, our Sacrifice, and also our Altar; but such an opinion, however pious it may sound, is simply an absurdity ; although CHRIST was at once the Priest and Victim He was not His own altar, i. e., His own Cross. . . . I am ashamed to take up the

reader's time with showing the absurdity of such an opinion." In a foot-note he adds: "I am aware that the name of Waterland can be pleaded for the interpretation that CHRIST is our Altar as well as Priest and Sacrifice." *

It would have been quite impossible for anyone with even a moderate acquaintance with the Fathers to have written these words—that is, if he had the reverence for the Fathers which Mr. Sadler manifests in other places; since readers of the Fathers would know that a great many of them speak of our LORD as Himself the Altar. To quote but one example, S. Epiphanius says, "He is the Victim, He the Priest, He the Altar." † Many commentators on Hebrews also take the altar to mean our LORD'S Humanity, the Altar in heaven on which the sacrifices of the Church are offered to GOD. This view is found also in many mediæval writers on the liturgy. It is therefore quite inconceivable that Mr. Sadler would have characterized it as an opinion so absurd that he apologizes for taking up the reader's time with showing its absurdity, if he had been aware that it was the Patristic view. The way, too, in which he quotes Waterland, as though he thought that he was the author of this opinion, is another indication that he was quite unaware that it was Patristic in its origin. Indeed I fear that those who have read Waterland's treatise *On the Eucharistic Sacrifice* will feel that, Protestant as he was, he knew a great deal more about the Fathers, at first hand, than Mr. Sadler did.

We have drawn attention in Chapter IV. to Mr. Sadler's apparent adoption of the "appalling view" of Bengel and Alford, who teach that our LORD'S

* Sadler, *The One Offering*, pp. 31, 32.

† S. Eph., *Hær.*, lv., n. 4.

Resurrection-Body was bloodless, and that the precious Blood which He shed upon the Cross exists in heaven separated from His Body, and is offered sacrificially somewhat as the Jewish priest offered the blood of the victim.

It is not necessary to make any further examination of Mr. Sadler's book. What we have pointed out is sufficient to show how little weight can be attached to his opinion on any question which rests on Patristic authority.

APPENDIX G.

CORRESPONDENCE.

I N the preparation of *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* the author had occasion to write to many theologians in England, France, and Germany, whose works are among the standard authorities on this subject, to ask for explanations of passages which were not clear ; but especially to find out their opinion on questions which had not been treated in their works. From all he received most courteous replies,—from several most helpful and suggestive letters. Out of this correspondence he has selected the following letters as of special value and interest, since they are all from writers of great eminence and, with the exception of the Bishop of Durham, from those who are somewhat in sympathy with the Modern school.

Of five German theologians to whom he wrote, he gives a letter from Dr. Paul Schanz, so well known from his work, *Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sacramenten der Katholischen Kirche*.

Of the three French writers he prints in full a most interesting correspondence with Dr. Lepin, Director of the Grand Seminary of S. Irenæus at Lyons.

Of the many English theologians he has obtained permission to use letters from the Bishop of Durham and from the Rev. F. A. Brightman. Bishop Westcott's letter will carry great weight as the opinion of the greatest living authority on the interpretation of the

Epistle to the Hebrews. Mr. Brightman's letter is of special interest as setting forth with great clearness the distinctive features of the more extreme form of the Modern view.

The author wished to add letters from several other representatives of this school, but found that they were unwilling that their letters should appear.*

Of each of the French and German theologians the author asked whether they knew of any writer earlier than Socinus who interpreted the Epistle to the Hebrews on the Socinian theory that our LORD is therein represented as offering a sacrifice in heaven after His Ascension, for which His Death upon the Cross was only the preparation. Not one of them, however, knew of any writer earlier than Socinus who held this view.

With this introduction we shall proceed to the letters themselves.

The first we give is from the Rt. Rev. Dr. Westcott, Bishop of Durham. The author had written to ask :

1. For references to certain passages in S. Chrysostom and S. Euthymius Zigadenus.
2. Whether the Bishop knew of any passages in the Fathers in any way favorable to the Modern view.
3. Whether his lordship knew of any writer earlier than Socinus in which the modern interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews was to be found. Bishop Westcott's answer is very definite and convincing.

AUCKLAND CASTLE,
BISHOP AUCKLAND,
June 19, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR:

Allow me to thank you for your most interesting letter. I am sorry that you should have found any

* In the Preface p., x., will be found some account of these letters.

difficulty about the quotations. Unless a special reference is given, the quotations are, I think, uniformly taken from the part of the Commentary which deals with the special passage. Thus the passage of Chrysostom is taken from Hom. xiii., § 8, in which he deals with Heb. vii. 27. The words of Euthymius are taken from his comment on the same verse. The whole note runs: *ἐκεῖνοι* (the Levitical priests) *μὲν δι' ὅλης τῆς ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς καθ' ἡμέραν ἱεράτευον, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ ἱεράτευσεν*. The notes of Euthymius on the Epistle were first published at Athens by Abp. Calogeras in 1887, and the book is not, I think, well known. On verse 25 Euthymius expresses the true conception of the LORD'S Intercession with singular terseness and force: *αὐτῇ οὖν ἡ ἐπανθρώπησις αὐτοῦ παρακαλεῖ τὸν Πατέρα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*.

Of the history of the "modern conception of CHRIST pleading His Passion in heaven" I cannot say anything. I have not worked it out. When I feel satisfied that an opinion is wrong, I generally dismiss it. The pathology of interpretation, if I may use the phrase, has no attraction for me. I greatly regret, therefore, that I cannot add anything to what you have collected. The thought is, as far as I know, not found in the Fathers.

Believe me to be, yours most faithfully,

(Signed) B. F. DUNELM.

THE REVEREND DR. MORTIMER.

AYSGARTH, YORKS, P. S. O.,

September 4, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR :

Let me thank you for your letter. Pray make any use you think right of what I wrote to you. To me more and more Holy Scripture is the standard of faith and I hardly look beyond it as I study the words in the full light of our present experience. Your work, I cannot but hope, will do valuable service to Biblical truth.*

* This must not be referred to the book as a whole, but only to what his lordship knew of its contents, namely, to the in-

Forgive a very short note. Just now I am overwhelmed with work and years tell.

Yours most faithfully,

(Signed) B. F. DUNELM.

THE REVEREND DR. MORTIMER.

The next letter is from the Rev. F. E. Brightman, Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford, to whom the author had written asking for titles of works on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, for passages of the Fathers in support of the Modern view, and for an explanation of some statements in Mr. Brightman's pamphlet, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*; and, further, to seek his opinion in regard to the view of Bengel and Alford, that our LORD'S Blood was offered in heaven separated from His Body.

PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD,
June 11, 1900.

DEAR DR. MORTIMER :

I scarcely know how to apologize to you for leaving your letter so long unanswered.

I do not think I can very satisfactorily answer your questions.

i. I cannot suggest anything beyond the authors you quote.

ii. In speaking of the "other acts" one is necessarily, of course, referring to the "type" rather than to the "antitype." In speaking of His life now as "acts," I conceive one is only speaking symbolically. His eternal Sacrifice is not an act or succession of acts, but a relation. In speaking of Him as presenting His Blood, I conceive one means that He is doing, or rather He is, what was symbolized by the presentation of the

terpretation of the passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to the tracing back of the modern interpretation to Socinus, and the attempt to show that it is inconsistent with the teaching of the Fathers.

Blood. In fact, His Blood is merely Himself in a certain relation, resulting from His historical acts. Accordingly, I do not wish to find myself within measurable distance of the appalling view of Alford and Bengel.

iii. I have no catena of Fathers, etc., beyond what you have, I expect. I may have noted somewhere one or two things which seemed to bear on the subject, but I do not think I have anything of importance.

iv. I have not looked at the Anglican Catena for a very long time now. But when I did, it seemed to me that, of those who tried to define more exactly what they meant, comparatively a good many tended towards this view ; and in the explicitness of its statement it seemed, and seems, to me to be characteristic of the Anglican divines. I do not mean more than this, that so far as they have a characteristic view, or theory, or statement, it is this.

I should like to say in general two things :

i. That, whatever may seem to be the scantiness of authority for this view put explicitly, the same may be said about any other view. There is plenty of authority for the Eucharist being a Sacrifice, or the memorial of a Sacrifice ; but there is exceedingly little, if any, for any particular explicit view of how it comes to be so, or what exactly you mean when you say it is so. Any particular view, therefore, is only offered as an attempt to articulate the meaning of the thing, and ought not to make any claim to adequacy or exhaustiveness. To me it seems that the sort of view I followed in my tract — not said there — best harmonizes the many things that have been said about it.

ii. That the most explicit view or views have been founded on an *a priori* definition of sacrifice which does not seem to me even worth discussion. I should now say what I have said on this point in that tract, much more strongly. Whatever a sacrifice is, at least it seems to me one may say confidently that it is not the destruction of a thing in honour of God.

It certainly seems to me that the results of Comparative Religion, so far as any are reached, and whatever

modifications they may require in the future, are quite illuminating for this subject. So far, they mean that the Eucharist requires no discussion as to the fact of its being obviously, absolutely, and primarily a Sacrifice : it simply satisfies the definition and embodies the idea ; and this becomes the fundamental fact from which we start, not the result at which we arrive, in all theorizing and speculation upon it. And in fact it seems to be implied that we ought to have begun with the Eucharist as the Sacrifice, and derived our conception of Sacrifice from it, and interpreted the Atonement by it. And I am not sure that this whole position was not much more that of the Fathers than we commonly imagine. The conception of Sacrifice was still more or less living, and the Eucharist spoke directly to what was in their minds. Whereas our minds are filled with all sorts of arbitrary and perverted imaginings, so that we have to argue, even to ourselves, that the Sacrifice is a sacrifice at all ; while utterances on the sacrificial side of the Atonement are apt to be simply unintelligible or irrelevant.

I am sending you the tract. I should like to alter some of it in detail.

Yours very faithfully,
(Signed) F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

The third letter is from Dr. Schanz, so well known for his profound treatment of the whole question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. To understand Dr. Schanz's reply it is necessary to prefix a copy of the author's letter to him. It will be observed that Dr. Schanz points out that the author was in error in attributing to Dr. Thalhoffer the view held by Mr. Brightman, that the essentially sacrificial act, our LORD'S oblation of Himself to the FATHER, took place not upon the Cross, but after our LORD'S Ascension into heaven. This error arose from the difficulty of obtaining copies of Thalhoffer's works. The author had twice sent to

Germany for them and received the answer that they were out of print. His knowledge of Dr. Thalhofer's views was therefore obtained from references to his writings in Stentrup, Vacant, and others. A few days before Dr. Schanz's reply was received, the author succeeded in obtaining copies of Dr. Thalhofer's books, *Das Opfer des Alten und des Neuen Bundes* and *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, through a second-hand German bookseller, and found, of course, as Dr. Schanz shows, that Dr. Thalhofer was entirely orthodox in regard to our LORD'S Sacrifice upon the Cross.

*Clariss^o ac Rev^o Paulo Schanz,
 Doctori et Professori SS. Theologiæ,
 Aluredus G. Mortimer, SS.T.P., Salutem.*

VIR DOCTISSIME :

Jam diutius studio " Quomodo Missa sacrificium sit " deditus, nunc autem evulgando opere de ea re adlaborans, mirum non est me summam operam contulisse ut mentem tuam respectu doctrinæ istius perspectam haberem.

Quum votis meis potitus essem, libet tibi significare opiniones tuas mihi admodum arrisisse.

Unicum tamen obstabat quominus Germanice legendo ipse perfruerer mea ejus linguæ imperitia, quapropter ut voto meo potirer partim interpretis auxilio mihi utendum erat, partim autem librorum Anglicorum et Latinorum in quibus placita tua allegata reperiri poterant, veluti *Manuale Theologiæ Catholicæ*, auctoribus Wilhelm et Scannell.

Consilium proinde cepi ut tibi scriberem et præsertim circa unum quæstionis punctum te consulere, utpote qui tutius consilium mihi præstare possis, quam quicumque quem sciam.

Cornu quæstionis hujus spectat ad obtutum Clⁱ Thalhofer, qui a Cl^o Stentrup (in *Soteriologia*, Parte II.) acriter oppugnatus est. Placitum Thalhoferianum de *Sacrificio Cælesti* interpretatione quadam Epistolæ ad

Hebræos nititur, scilicet, actionem essentialiter sacrificalem oblationis semel a CHRISTO factæ non in Cruce sed in Cælo post ejus ingressum quærendam esse.

Doctrina hæc, quæ in sæculo XVII^o in scriptis Anglicanis aliquando invenitur, auctori plerumque attribuitur Georgio Cassandro, Belgæ Catholico, qui anno 1566 erat mortuus.

Attamen interpretatio eadem Epistolæ ad Hebræos in operibus Fausti Socini exhibetur. Hic autem creditur a plurimis e scriptis posthumis patrum, Lælii Socini, interpretationem hanc hausisse. Lælius vero vita functus est anno 1564.

Ex hoc clare intelligimus Lælium Socinum binis annis, antequam opus Cassandri (quod opinionem hanc complectitur), lucem viderat, mortuum fuisse.

Ad fontem anteriorem L. Socino regredi non poteram.

Persuasum mihi est eam sententiam a patribus ac theologis veteribus depromi non posse.

Suntne ulla vestigia obtutus hujus in operibus scriptorum quorumcumque sæculo XV^o vel dimidio priore sæculi XVIⁱ tibi cognita?

Quæstionem hanc jam variis theologis proposueram a quibus cunctis humanissima responsa tuli, nemo tamen scriptorem Socino anteriorem suggerere poterat.

Indulge, quæso, eapropter ut idem a te percontari possim quum te humanitate summa esse intelligam. Quum Cl^{os} et Rev^{dos} Thalhoffer atque Stentrup jam e vivis migrasse compertum habeam, nec ad quem recursus pateat præter te sciam, officium præstabis eximium, nec memoria abolendum, si quæsito, quoad ejus possis, responsum dederis.

Cum summo ac perpetuo tui studio,

ALUREDUS G. MORTIMER.

PHILADELPHIÆ, xiii^o Julii.

TUBINGEN, 24^o Aug., 1900.

*Clarissimo ac Rev^o Aluredo G. Mortimer, SS. T. D.
Salutem!*

VIR DOCTISSIME :

Litteras tuas accepi et quæstionem de vi ac natura Sacrificii CHRISTI quantum possim solvere conabor.

Inter placitum Thalsoferianum de *Sacrificio Cœlesti* et dogma Socinianorum de eodem magni interest. Thalsofer ex epistola ad Hebræos neutiquam concludit actionem essentialiter sacrificalem oblationis semel a CHRISTO factæ non in Cruce sed in cœlo post ejus ingressum quærendam esse, sed characterem sacrificii cruenti omnino destructionem vitæ esse contendit, quare per sanguinis effusionem CHRISTUM semel in ara Crucis mundum reconciliasse credit.

At sacrificium cœleste nihilominus vere esse Sacrificium opinatur, non nudam interpellationem seu repræsentationem. Auctores antiquos, quos enumerat, invenies apud Stentrup, nec minus apud Thomassin., *De Incarn.*, cc. x., xi., sqq.

Quod vero attinet ad Socinianos, hi negant divinitatem CHRISTI et pretium sacrificii in Cruce oblatis pro redemptione hominum. Solus CHRISTUS a mortuis resuscitatus et in cœlum ingressus offert tanquam vicarius Patris sacrificium quoddam cœleste, ex quo gratiæ in homines influunt.

Atque hæc doctrina non tantum Cassandri est sed etiam Socinii Fausti et Lælii, ex epistola ad Hebræos hausta. Eadem est in catechismo Socinianorum Racovensi (anno 1609) posita. Qui non solum secundum citatam epistolam perenne sacerdotium CHRISTI commemorat, sed etiam addit: "JESUS in cœlis expiationem peccatorum nostrorum peragit, dum a peccatorum pœnis nos liberat virtute mortis suæ, quam pro peccatis nostris ex DEI voluntate subiit. Victima enim tam preciosa, tantaque CHRISTI obedientia, perpetuam coram DEO vim habet, nos qui in CHRISTUM credimus, et CHRISTO commortui sumus, ne peccatis vivamus, a peccatorum pœnis defendendi; porro dum potestate sua, quam a Patre plenam et absolutam consecutus est, perpetuo nos tuetur et iram DEI, quam in impios effundere consuevit, intercessione sua a nobis arcet, quod scriptura interpellationem pro nobis appellat; deinde ab ipsorum peccatorum servitute nos liberat, dum nos sibi mancipat, partim morte itidem illa sua quam pro nobis perpessus est, partim in sua ipsius persona nobis ostendendo, quid consequatur is qui a peccando destitit,"

etc. (Sectio de munere CHRISTI). CHRISTUM demum resuscitatione a mortuis Sacerdotem cœlestem constitutum esse expressis verbis enuntiatur.

Antecessores sensu stricto Sociniani non habent, nisi Nominalistas et Scotistas tales habueris, quippe qui omnia in libero arbitrio DEI et in obedientia CHRISTI ponant.

At hi semper sacrificium Crucis defendunt, et efficaciam Sacramentorum ex opere operato tenent.

Denique addo, notionem Sacrificii, quam Scheeben, Schanz, et alii statuunt, a plerisque oppugnari. Singuli quidem nuperrime eam suam fecerunt, ex. gr. Lepin, *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne*, principalement après le P. de Condren et M. Olier, Lyon, 1897. Fixeront (*L'Université Cathol.*, 1897, 15 Mai, p. 550) citat Berulle, Thomassinum et Bossuet tanquam antecessores huic notioni consentientes.

Hæc sunt quæ quæstioni tuæ respondere possum. Quæ si labori tuo prosint, pergratum mihi est.

Cum summo tui studio,

DR. SCHANZ.

The last letters given are from M. l'Abbé Lepin, to whose work, *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne*, we have so often referred. These letters most eloquently and ably present all that is attractive in the Modern view, but without its unorthodox basis, the transference of the act of our LORD'S Sacrifice upon the Cross to heaven.

As M. Lepin is often quoted as favouring the Modern view in its entirety, the author wrote to ask him how far he accepted certain statements of Mr. Brightman and others. The whole correspondence is given, since it is only fair that, as M. Lepin had not Mr. Brightman's work before him, the very words in which the author described that view should be given. And besides, the author's last letter points out where he considers M. Lepin's argument to be wanting in cogency.

*Clarissimo ac Reverendo M. Lepin, SS.T.D., Viro
Doctissimo,*

Aluredus G. Mortimer, Salutem!

VIR SPECTATISSIME :

Binis annis abhinc amicus meus Rev^{us} F. Puller, S.S.J.E., Oxoniensis, tractatum *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne* a te scriptum fuisse me edocuit, quem ego, quamprimum per otium poteram, summa cura ac studio, nec sine uberrimo fructu, perlegi.

Quum et ipse quæstionum a te propositarum sim studiosus, plurimum mea interesse arbitrabar ut in doctrina tanti momenti mentem tuam plane perspicerem. Hoc autem eo magis quod inter eruditos Angliæ opinionum schola viget, quæ auctoritate tui nominis ad fulcienda sua placita utendum putat.

Dubio quodam tentus, anceps sum utrum proposita tua de Sacrificio Eucharistiæ reapse innuant, quod schola suprafata iis significari contendat. Hinc veniam tuam impetrare spero, si in tanto dubio ad fontem doctrinæ, auctorem nimirum doctissimum ipsum, recurrere ausus sim.

Quamquam peritus Gallice legendi, impar tamen scribendo, ut lingua scholæ uteretur satius ducebam.

Cornu igitur quæstionum in medio istud est : De Sacrificio Missæ tractans Schola, cujus Clarissimi Brightman et Puller, Oxoniæ, sunt interpretes, actionem sacrificalem e reproductione vult constare non temporis momenti mortis JESU CHRISTI in Cruce, sed momenti temporis actionis Domini nostri in cælo perpetuæ, qua Ministri tabernaculi veri, Sacerdotis secundum ordinem Melchisedec.

Placet ei in Eucharistia "Agnum tanquam occisum" attamen "stantem in medio Throni" potius quam se in Cruce offerentem deprehendere.

Ut alium scriptorem quendam scholæ allegem, "Modus quo sacrificium comprehendere debeat," inquit Doctor Mason, "est hic : CHRISTUS adest nobis in altari eodem modo quo in cælo. Idem nos Ipsi in altari facere sinit quod Ipse in cælo facit."

Hinc manifestum est Eucharistiam ad mortem in Cruce *indirecte* tantum referri, id est, mediante functione CHRISTI, qua Mediatoris, in cœlo.

Estne hoc tua mens? Schola præfata asseverat *hoc* tuam mentem esse. Ego dubito, atque hoc propter rationes subsequentes :

1. Propter usum vocabuli " Sacrificii " æquivocum in Litteris Sacris atque in scriptis sanctorum Patrum ; quandoquidem in utrisque sacrificium adhibitum deprehendimus, partim *improprie* (recte tamen) ad actus internos veluti ad preces, laudes, gratiarum actiones, pœnitentiam, e. g., " Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus " (Ps. li. 17), partim autem *proprie* ad actum externum quo res quædam Deo offertur.

2. Quod in Patribus ac theologis duas assertorum series invenimus (1) Alteram Eucharistiam cum functione CHRISTI, qua Mediatoris, in cœlo *mystice* conjungentem ; (2) Alteram Eucharistiam cum morte CHRISTI in Cruce *dogmatice* nectentem.

(1) Series prior precibus quibusdam vetustis nititur in liturgia adhibitis, quarum oratio, *Supplices Te rogamus*, in liturgia Romana est exemplum.

Forma antiquissima precum hujusmodi, quantum sciam, in libro octavo *Constitutionum Apostolicarum* occurrit. Scriptores vetustissimi forsitan qui ad preces has alludunt, sunt : S. Gregorius Nazianzenus, S. Ambrosius, atque minus directe S. Irenæus, uti, " Est ergo altare in cœlis (illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur) " (*Adv. Hæres.*, l. v., c. 18, n. 6).

Missis vetustioribus, recentiores theologi, a te allegati, Olier, de Condren, et Bossuetus magnus, iisdem prope verbis utuntur. Scripta tamen, quæ has sententias comprehendunt, plerumque indolem admodum *mysticam* exhibent, atque ambages verborum mysticorum præ se ferunt, suntque opera maxima ex parte ad pietatem facientia.

(2) Huic adversatur series posterior, quæ ex operibus sæpe eorundem Scriptorum *dogmaticis* erui potest, in quibus essentiam sacrificii Eucharistici in relatione sua ad sacrificium Crucis sitam esse *semper* docent, atque hoc sine ulla mentione relationis ad ea quæ

Dominus noster in cœlo nunc agit. Quin etiam non desunt Patres perinde ac theologi, qui negare non dubitent Dominum nostrum in cœlo sacrificium verum et proprium nunc offerre, quamquam scriptores hoc genus oblationem, seu immolationem, mysticam in cœlo sine dubio agnoscunt; e. g., ut manifestum fit e sequentibus Theodoreti verbis, "Sacerdos autem *nunc* est CHRISTUS, ex Iuda secundum carnem ortus, *non ipse aliquid offerens*, sed Caput existens eorum qui offerunt. Corpus enim suum Ecclesiam vocat, et per eam sacerdotio fungitur ut homo, recipit autem ea quæ offeruntur ut Deus. Offert vero Ecclesia corporis et sanguinis symbola, totam massam per primitias sanctificans" (*In Psal.*, cix., 4, Migne, P. G., tom. 80, col. 1774).

Quandoquidem iidem scriptores in diversis suis operibus ambobus placitis favent, manifestum est ea sibi non repugnare se arbitratos fuisse.

His præmissis, indulge, amabo, ut velut explicationem, quid ego hac de re sentiam, paucis ostendam.

Ex mea identidem sententia de rebus *mysticis* scribentes auctores hi multum aberant quominus sacrificium Missæ definire voluissent, nec nisi relationem veram, spiritalem, ad vitam Domini nostri in cœlo glorificam exprimere gestiebant.

Ne copiosus sim, me ad citandum Bossuetum solum restringam, quippe quem tu pagina 184 in medium protuleras. Citatum tuum est ex operibus suis mysticis, nempe, *Explication de quelques difficultés sur les prières de la Messe à un nouveau catholique*.

At ex adversa parte in sua definitione sollicita cura elaborata de sacrificio Missæ, quam in litteris atque explicationibus ad Cl. ac Rev. Ferry, Ministrum Protestanticum, Mettensem, invenimus, mentionem prorsus nullam facit sacrificii Missæ quasi id ullo modo nexum sit cum functione JESU CHRISTI in cœlo. Verba sunt hæc :

[Here followed the passages from Bossuet (a translation of which we have given in Chapter IV., pages 74-76), *Œuvres*, tom. vi., pp. 116-118.]

In his verbis, oblationis, quam JESUS CHRISTUS in cœlo facit, nulla mentio invenitur.

Si tibi dogmaticè definiendum foret ex quibus elementis sacrificium Eucharisticum consistat, potiusne definitionem scholæ Anglicanæ, Mason et Brightman, cujus verba memoravi, an vero definitionem Bossueti, in sua propositione ad Cl. ac Rev. Ferry, Ministrum Protestanticum, Mettensem, datam, adoptare eligeres?

Quanquam Bossuetus, ut supra videbamus, definitionem hanc conceptui, Eucharistiam cum functione CHRISTI, qua Mediatoris, in cœlo conjungenti, repugnare arbitratus non sit, attamen mihi, causam ejus rei, quod Eucharistia est sacrificium verum ac proprium, in relatione Eucharistiæ ad functionem suprafatam Domini nostri in cœlo inveniri, pugnare videtur.

Veritatem tuo incommodo indaganti, veniamque tuam bonam flagitanti indultum a te iri spero.

Quodcunque responsum mihi benigne dederis, exitium erga me beneficium a te collatum, me consideraturum scito. Vale quam plurimum.

Cum tui studio persevero,

ALUREDUS G. MORTIMER.

S. MARK'S CLERGY HOUSE,
PHILADELPHIÆ, ii^o April., 1900.

SÉMINAIRE ST. SULPICE, ISSY, PRÈS PARIS.

MONSIEUR :

Il a fallu toutes les occupations d'une fin d'année scolaire pour me faire retarder aussi longtemps la réponse que j'avais promise à votre honorée lettre du 5 août dernier. Je profite d'un peu de répit, à la veille de nos examens pour satisfaire de mon mieux aux questions que vous voulez bien me proposer. Puisque vous connaissez la langue française, et que moi-même, tout en lisant couramment l'anglais, ne saurais l'écrire assez correctement, c'est en français que je prends la liberté de venir m'entretenir avec vous.

I. Tout d'abord, Monsieur, les RR. Brightman, Puller et Mason, me paraissent bien dans le vrai lorsqu'ils établissent une relation entre le Sacrifice de la

Messe et l'Offrande que JÉSUS CHRIST fait de Lui-même dans le Ciel. Le Sacrifice de la Messe, en effet, contient JÉSUS CHRIST, réellement présent, dans sa vie ressuscitée et glorieuse sur nos autels. Il Le contient donc avec cette oblation incessante qu'Il fait de Lui-même à son PÈRE, c'est à dire avec le Sacrifice du Ciel, désormais inséparable de sa personne. En sorte que, par l'Eucharistie, nous avons sur nos autels terrestres, l'équivalent exact du Sacrifice qu'offre Notre SEIGNEUR JÉSUS CHRIST sur l'autel du Ciel.

C'est cette relation du Sacrifice de la Messe au Sacrifice du Ciel que j'ai essayé d'exposer moi-même dans mon ouvrage, en montrant (p. 201) comment "le Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie *contient* le Sacrifice du Ciel," et (p. 225) comment notre Sacrifice est sur la terre le *parallèle*, le *correspondant* du Sacrifice Céleste.

Sur ce point donc, je suis heureux d'être en parfait accord avec les R.R. Brightman, Puller et Mason.

Mais où je me séparerais de ces RR. DD., c'est sur la question de définir si cette relation avec le Sacrifice du Ciel constitue véritablement *l'essence* du Sacrifice de la Messe, ou bien lui est seulement en quelque sorte *accidentelle*. Ces RR. DD., me dites-vous (car malheureusement j'ignore leurs écrits auxquels vous faites allusion), veulent faire consister l'essence du Sacrifice de la Messe dans sa relation au Sacrifice du Ciel, plutôt que dans sa relation au Sacrifice de la Croix, de telle sorte que le Sacrifice Eucharistique ne se rapporterait au Sacrifice de la Croix qu'*indirectement* et *par l'intermédiaire* du Sacrifice Céleste.

Je ne voudrais pas souscrire à une proposition ainsi formulée, et vous avez tout à fait raison, Monsieur, de penser que cette conception ne répond pas exactement à ma propre manière de voir.

En effet, la relation du Sacrifice Eucharistique au Sacrifice Céleste, tout en me paraissant très véritable et très réelle (sur ce point je suis pleinement d'accord avec les RR. DD.), ne me semble pas constituer *essentiellement* le Sacrifice de la Messe, mais lui être plutôt une relation *accidentelle* (et c'est là où je me séparerais de ces Messieurs).

Le Sacrifice de la Messe, en effet, étant un sacrifice *d'application*, à l'Église de la terre, des mérites du Sacrifice premier accompli sur la Croix, doit *essentiellement* avoir une relation sensible à ce Sacrifice de la Croix. Sans doute dans l'Eucharistie nous avons le Sacrifice du Ciel, et ce Sacrifice est Lui-même directement relatif au Sacrifice du Calvaire, dont il est l'éternelle commémoration et application. Mais cette relation, très réelle, au Sacrifice du Calvaire est invisible pour nous. Or le Sacrifice propre de l'Église militante doit être un Sacrifice sensible. Il est donc essentiel à notre Sacrifice Eucharistique d'avoir avec le Sacrifice de la Croix une relation *visible* et *directe*, indépendante de cette relation indirecte et invisible qu'il a déjà avec lui par le Sacrifice du Ciel qu'il contient. Cette relation directe et visible se fait par la mise du SAUVEUR sous les espèces séparées du pain et du vin, qui nous représentent sensiblement son Corps et son Sang séparés par l'Immolation du Calvaire.

Le Sacrifice de la Messe est donc bien la reproduction de l'Offrande sacrificale de Notre Seigneur dans le Ciel, *mais* faite dans conditions appropriées à l'état de l'Église militante, pour qui il est particulièrement offert. Ce qui le constitue essentiellement, c'est bien l'offrande que N. S. fait de Lui-même à son Père. *Mais avec une spéciale et directe relation sensible au Sacrifice de la Croix*, par la consécration sous les espèces du pain et du vin séparées.

C'est bien là, si je ne me trompe, la notion essentielle que j'ai donnée du Sacrifice Eucharistique dans mon ouvrage. En effet, après avoir exposé la relation entre le Sacrifice de la Messe et le Sacrifice du Ciel, j'ai eu soin de remarquer (p. 209) : "*Nous ne pouvons dire simplement que la Messe est le Sacrifice du Ciel, rendu présent avec la personne de JÉSUS CHRIST sur l'autel.* Le SAUVEUR, en effet, continue dans le tabernacle sa présence sous l'espèce du pain avec son Sacrifice Céleste, et nous savons cependant qu' à la communion au moins est terminé le Sacrifice proprement dit."

D'autre part lorsqu'il s'est agi de déterminer l'essence du Sacrifice de la Messe, après avoir noté (p. 219)

que, "absolu par ailleurs, le Sacrifice de la Messe est aussi *essentiellement relatif au Sacrifice du Calvaire* qu'il renouvelle par une mystique représentation," j'en suis venu à le définir (p. 224) : "l'offrande que Notre Seigneur JÉSUS CHRIST par le ministère extérieur du prêtre visible, y fait de son Humanité Sainte, anéantie sous les espèces mais *aussi revêtue des marques sensibles de sa Passion et de sa Mort.*"

Cette définition, vous l'avez très bien vu, Monsieur, ne concorde pas avec celle des RR. DD. Elle ne fait pas mention de la relation au Sacrifice du Ciel, parce que, dans ma pensée, cette relation, tout en étant très véritable et très réelle, n'est pas cependant *essentiellement constitutive* du Sacrifice de la Messe, mais lui est plutôt *accidentelle*, simple relation *d'analogie* ou de parallélisme, comme j'ai eu soin de le faire remarquer (p. 225) : "AINSI, dans le Ciel, JÉSUS CHRIST perpétue son Sacrifice et en renouvelle éternellement les effets. . . ."

II. Cette manière de concevoir le Sacrifice de la Messe est entièrement conforme, me semble-t-il, à celle que fait valoir (sans parler du P. de Condren et de M. Olier), Bossuet lui-même, dans tous ses ouvrages, soit de piété, soit de controverse. Et ce n'est pas un des traits les moins remarquables de la doctrine du grand théologien que sa parfaite et constante unité de vue sur ce point.

Toujours, lorsqu'il veut déterminer l'essence de notre Sacrifice, il la place dans *l'oblation* que fait Notre Seigneur de Lui-même présent sous les espèces *avec relation sensible au Sacrifice de la Croix* par la séparation de ces espèces.

Ainsi, dans son *Explication de quelques Difficultés sur les Prières de la Messe, à un nouveau catholique* (citée dans mon ouvrage, pp. 184, 185), il mentionne (1) que "l'essence de l'oblation est dans la présence même de JÉSUS CHRIST en personne, *sous cette figure de mort* (par la séparation mystique de son corps d'avec son sang); (2) que ce Sacrifice est analogue et parallèle à ce qui a lieu dans le Ciel : "C'était *imiter* sur la terre ce que JÉSUS CHRIST fait dans le Ciel ;" " Cette

présence emporte avec elle une intercession *aussi efficace* que celle que fait JÉSUS CHRIST dans le Ciel même, en offrant à DIEU les cicatrices de ses plaies.”

Cette *Explication* . . . est-elle à qualifier d'écrit mystique plutôt que dogmatique? Je me permettrai d'en douter, car Bossuet s'y adresse “à un nouveau catholique,” et s'y propose de répondre à des difficultés *sur le dogme*, bien qu'à propos des prières de la Messe. C'est, me semble-t-il, un véritable écrit de controverse, et dont les termes sont mûrement pesés. Quoiqu'il en soit, Bossuet, sur le point qui nous occupe, l'exprime absolument de même façon dans ses ouvrages les plus étudiés, de controverse dogmatique, en particulier dans son *Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Église catholique sur les Matières de Controverse*, ouvrage dont il assurait avoir pesé toutes les syllabes, et dans son *Explication de différents Points de Controverse*, adressée au Ministre Ferry, et à laquelle vous voulez bien me référer.

Dans son *Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Église catholique* . . . (citée dans mon ouvrage, pp. 183, 184), (1) Bossuet, cherchant la raison pour laquelle nous avons dans la Messe un véritable sacrifice, la trouve en ce que “JÉSUS CHRIST, présent sur la sainte table *en cette figure de mort* (par la consécration), intercède pour nous, et représente continuellement à son Père la mort qu'il a soufferte pour son Église.” (2) Il note l'analogie ou le parallélisme de notre Sacrifice avec le Sacrifice du Ciel, et semble même arguer de la réalité du Sacrifice Céleste à la réalité du Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie, à cause de l'analogie des conditions : “L'Église . . . ne craint point de dire que JÉSUS CHRIST s'offre à DIEU partout où il paraît pour nous à sa face, et qu'il s'y offre *par conséquent* dans l'Eucharistie, suivant les expressions des Saints Pères.”

Enfin, dans son *Explication* au Ministre Ferry *de différents points de controverse*, et en particulier, “de l'Eucharistie et du Sacrifice,” Bossuet s'exprime en termes identiques : (1) Il fait “consister principalement l'action du Sacrifice que nous reconnaissons dans l'Eucharistie,” en la consécration, “en tant que la

mort de JÉSUS CHRIST y est représentée, et que son corps et son sang y sont mystiquement séparés par ces divines paroles: Ceci est mon corps, ceci est mon sang.” (2) Il remarque un peu après, comme dans ses autres ouvrages, l’analogie entre notre Sacrifice Eucharistique et le Sacrifice du Ciel : “ C’est pour cela que nous disons que JÉSUS CHRIST s’offre encore dans l’Eucharistie : car s’étant une fois dévoué pour être notre victime, *il ne cesse de se présenter pour nous à son Père, selon ce que dit l’Apôtre, qu’Il paraît pour nous devant la face de DIEU.*” “ Tout cela n’empêche donc pas qu’il ne soit très véritable que JÉSUS CHRIST n’est offert qu’une fois ; parcequ’encore qu’Il se soit offert en entrant au monde pour être notre victime, ainsi que l’Apôtre le remarque, encore que nous croyions qu’*il ne cesse de se présenter pour nous à DIEU, non seulement dans le Ciel, mais encore sur la sainte table, néanmoins tout se rapporte à cette grande oblation par laquelle il s’est offert une fois à la Croix.*”

C’est donc bien, me semble-t-il, l’idée même de Bossuet que j’ai rendue dans mon ouvrage, en notant (1) (pp. 201 et 225) que le Sacrifice de l’Eucharistie *contient* le Sacrifice du Ciel, et en est, en quelque sorte *l’analogie, le correspondant, le parallèle*, sur nos autels terrestres, JÉSUS CHRIST y faisant à la Messe la même oblation qu’il fait de Lui-même devant le trône de Son Père ; mais en précisant aussi (2) (pp. 209, 214, 223 et 224) qu’il est *essentiel* au Sacrifice de la Messe d’avoir, par la mise du SAUVEUR sous les espèces séparées, *une relation sensible avec le Sacrifice de la Croix*, dont il doit être la commémoration et l’application pour l’Église de la terre, et que, ce qui constitue *essentiellement* ce Sacrifice Eucharistique c’est (p. 224) “ l’offrande qu’y fait Notre Seigneur (offrande d’ailleurs analogue et parallèle à celle qu’il fait au Ciel) de son Humanité Sainte, anéantie sous les espèces, mais aussi *revêtue des marques sensibles de sa Passion et de sa Mort.*”

III. Pour ce qui est de la vérité du Sacrifice du Ciel, je me permettrai d’ajouter simplement quelques mots. Sur ce sujet, et sur la manière générale d’envisager le Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur, on peut distinguer comme

un double courant dans la Tradition patristique et théologique.

Les uns plus rigoureux se plaçant à un point de vue plus essentiellement pratique ne conçoivent le Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur que sous une double forme : (1) comme Sacrifice de la Croix, c'est à dire comme Sacrifice d'expiation, restreint au moment de l'immolation sur le Calvaire ; (2) comme Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie, c'est à dire comme Sacrifice d'application pour l'Église militante, borné à la consécration sous les espèces sacramentelles représentant l'immolation du Calvaire et nous en appliquant les fruits. Cette conception est parfaitement juste, dans toute sa partie *positive*, et elle restera toujours peut-être la plus simple, la plus accessible à l'esprit des fidèles, la plus capable de faire impression sur eux.

D'autres, plus larges dans leurs vues, plus méditatifs, plus mystiques si l'on veut, se sont demandé si sans contredire à la théorie précédente et sans rien diminuer de ce qu'elle affirme touchant le Sacrifice expiateur de la Croix et le Sacrifice applicateur de l'Eucharistie, on ne pouvait pas l'élargir, l'agrandir, en étendant le Sacrifice expiateur de Notre Seigneur à toute sa vie mortelle, et son Sacrifice applicateur à toute sa vie glorieuse. L'analogie, et le langage de l'Épître aux Hébreux paraissent bien justifier cette manière de voir.

Dans toute la vie mortelle du SAUVEUR, en effet, on trouve ce qui constitue essentiellement son Sacrifice de la Croix : l'offrande de son Humanité Sainte humiliée et souffrante, pour tous les devoirs de la religion, et particulièrement celui de la réparation. Le Sacrifice expiateur de JÉSUS CHRIST embrasse donc tout l'ensemble de sa vie mortelle. Mais comme l'humiliation et la souffrance de l'Humanité Sainte ont atteint leur summum à l'immolation du Calvaire, et que c'est à ce moment du Sacrifice de son FILS qu'il a plû à DIEU le PÈRE d'attacher tous les mérites de notre Rédemption, c'est aussi pour cela que le Sacrifice premier de JÉSUS CHRIST sur la terre est généralement identifié avec le Sacrifice de la Croix, qui est bien, en effet, le couronnement auquel toute la partie antérieure n'était pour

ainsi dire, qu'une préparation, le point culminant devant lequel peut s'effacer tout le reste.

De même, trouve-t-on dans la vie glorieuse de Notre Seigneur au Ciel tout ce qui constitue essentiellement notre Sacrifice commémorateur et applicateur de l'Eucharistie : l'offrande de son Humanité Sainte, ressuscitée et glorieuse, mais portant encore les marques de l'immolation du Calvaire, afin de rappeler éternellement à DIEU et d'appliquer aux hommes les mérites attachés au Sacrifice de la Croix.

Que si l'on a souvent laissé dans l'ombre ce Sacrifice du Ciel, parallèle au Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie c'est que, en somme, il nous importe moins, il n'est pour ainsi dire pas directement pour nous, mais pour les bienheureux : notre Sacrifice à nous, mémorial et application, du Sacrifice de la Croix étant le Sacrifice Eucharistique.

Que si, d'autre part, quelques-uns ont paru nier la vérité du Sacrifice Céleste, le plus souvent ils ont seulement voulu écarter de l'esprit des fidèles la pensée qu'il y aurait au Ciel un Sacrifice d'humiliation et d'expiation, comme s'il n'avait pas suffi du Sacrifice du Calvaire. Et, entendue ainsi, leur manière de parler est parfaitement juste (cf. l'explication de quelques textes de St. Jean Chrysostome, et de St. Grégoire de Nazianze dans mon ouvrage, p. 178, notes).

Mais si l'on prend le Sacrifice dans le sens moins restreint que suggère l'Épître aux Hébreux et que nécessite la vérité du Sacrifice Eucharistique enseignée par l'Église et toute la tradition, on ne peut, me semble-t-il, refuser de voir un vrai Sacrifice dans cette offrande que Notre Seigneur fait au Ciel de son Humanité Sainte toujours marquée des signes de sa Passion et de sa Mort.

Niée la vérité du Sacrifice du Ciel, je ne vois pas comment on peut se tirer du langage très formel de Saint Paul dans son Épître aux Hébreux. D'autre part il sera toujours, me semble-t-il, fort difficile de donner du Sacrifice très véritable de la Messe, une notion qui ne convienne pas parallèlement à l'offrande que fait Notre Seigneur de Lui-même dans le Ciel.

C'est ce qu'a bien compris Bossuet, qui, dans toutes

ses argumentations suit constamment ce procédé très remarquable : (1) apporter le témoignage de l'Épître aux Hébreux pour prouver l'existence d'un Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur au Ciel ; (2) conclure par analogie rigoureuse, de la vérité du Sacrifice Céleste à la vérité du Sacrifice de nos autels, où Notre Seigneur s'offre de même en rappelant son Sacrifice de la Croix par des marques sensibles, appropriées à notre condition présente, indépendantes de celles que porte invisiblement pour nous son Humanité glorieuse, et qui font de son offrande sur nos autels un Sacrifice distinct du Sacrifice Céleste, le Sacrifice propre de l'Église militante destiné à lui appliquer particulièrement les fruits du Sacrifice de la Croix.

Ces quelques explications, très honoré Monsieur, répondent-elles bien aux questions que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de me poser ? Je le désire de tout mon cœur ; et je l'espère car je crois que vous aviez déjà bien saisi ma pensée, et que nos esprits étaient parfaitement d'accord au moins sur les points principaux de cette conception du Sacrifice adorable de Notre Seigneur JÉSUS CHRIST.

Il me reste, Monsieur, à vous remercier de nouveau de l'intérêt si bienveillant que vous avez bien voulu témoigner à ma thèse. Soyez persuadé que ce sera toujours pour moi un plaisir de m'entretenir de ces belles questions avec quelqu'un que les comprend et les goûte si bien.

Je vous prie, très honoré Monsieur, d'agréer l'hommage de ma respectueuse et bien sympathique considération.

M. LEPIN,

p. s. s.

Ce 4 Juin, 1900.

Directeur au
Séminaire Saint Sulpice
à Issy près Paris.

VIR HUMANISSIME :

Antiquius mihi nihil habeo quam ut tibi plurimas refundam gratias pro tua humanitate, qua causa mei tantum incommodum suscipere non dubitabas, ut

quæstionibus meis tam disertam tamque accuratam responsionem elaboravisses.

Conscius non sum te edocuisse me operi de Sacrificio Eucharistico scribendo intentum esse, nec profecto mentem meam tibi aperuisse quid de re sentirem.

Quapropter multo gratius mihi est obtutum ad quem perveneram in essentia concordare cum opinionibus quas tu in litteris tuis tam clare tamque dilucide explicas et evolvis.

Fundamentum, cui ego insisto, est combinatio duarum sententiarum extremarum; altera ad Crucem solam refert, altera ad Sacrificium cœleste solum, Sacrificium Eucharistiæ.

Doctrinam propono Sacrificium Missæ *directe* atque *essentialiter* ad Sacrificium Crucis solum referre, attamen Eucharistiam, qua sacrificium, veram, imo verissimam relationem habere ad oblationem Domini nostri in cœlo, nempe ad magnam Ipsius interpellationem. Ex litteris tuis colligo mentem tuam hanc esse.

Ex parte mea destructionem victimæ elementum necessarium sacrificii esse ego non censeo, inter nos hic quoque convenitur.

Quæstio unica, de qua mihi certo non constat, est utrum in sacrificio cœlesti actio proprie sacrificialis reperiri possit. Cum Cl^o Scheeben mihi videtur sacrificium cœleste sacrificium *virtualiter* esse, sed non *actualiter*, siquidem cicatrices in corpore suo gloriosæ tantum actus sacrificialis *præteriti* indicio sint.

Dubitandum non censeo opera hac de re in Germania triginta postremis his annis evulgata tibi cognita esse. Primum horum, quantum mihi constat, ab auctore Thalhofer, *Das Opfer des alten und des neuen Bundes*, anno 1870 editum erat. Post hoc secuta sunt opera Schmid, Franz, et aliorum ejusdem scholæ, atque tractatus alter a Thalhofer, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik* (tom. ii., 1887 et 1893). Ex adversa parte edebatur magnum opus Stentrup, S. J., quo acriter oppugnantur argumenta Thalhoferiana. Inter has duas scholas collocanda sunt opera Scheeben atque Schanz de re eadem, auctores hos a te non nimium differre mihi videtur. Novistine hæc opera?

Ex quo tibi nuper scripseram plures literæ de hac re haud exigui momenti ad me pervenerunt. Quorum unæ a Cl^o Brightman eum imo abruptius quam tibi indicaveram recedere demonstrant, siquidem Eucharistiam Sacrificium absolutum censendum esse asseverat, atque eapropter doctrinam Propitiationis in Cruce e Sacrificio Eucharistico interpretari debere, potiusquam doctrinam Sacrificii Eucharistici e Sacrificio Crucis arbitratur. Doctrinam hanc, te mecum una, ex toto corde repudiaturum fore certo scio.

Aliæ litteræ ab Illustrissimo ac Reverendissimo B. F. Westcott, Episcopo Dunelmiensi, heri tantum acceptæ, quibus respondet quæstionibus meis de historia interpretationis modernæ Epistolæ ad Hebræos respectu sacrificii cœlestis. Obtutum hunc indagando ad dimidium posterius sæculi XVIⁱ usque recessi, quocirca interrogabam eum utrum quisquam auctorum anterior sæculo XVI^o sibi notus esset in scriptis cujus doctrina hæc reperiri posset. Episcopus Westcott, ut tibi sine dubio notum, auctoritate in interpretando Litteras Sacras, atque præcipue Epistolam ad Hebræos, saltem apud Anglicanos, certe summa pollet. Responsio sua est doctrinam hanc nusquam apud Patres reperiri, nec, quantum sibi notum, apud ullos auctores ante sæculum XVI^m.

Estne tibi fortasse quisquam auctor cognitus, qui sacrificium cœleste, ut in ea Epistola docetur, clare ac distincte profiteatur?

Has quæstiones a te interrogare ausus sum, quoniam in litteris tuis tam humanis mihi hanc facultatem largiri videbaris.

Tandem indulge ut haud pauca quæ in litteris tuis ad rem a me tractatam tam apprime faciunt, quum visum fuerit, argumento adhibere possim.

Ex intimis meis gratias summas tibi habeo atque refero pro omni qua in me es humanitate, quibus cum omni studio ac fide tibi persevero.

S. MARK'S CLERGY HOUSE, ALUREDUS G. MORTIMER.
1625 LOCUST STREET,
PHILADELPHIÆ, U. S. A.
IV^o Julii, 1900.

SÉMINAIRE SAINT IRÉNÉE, LYON.

12 Septembre, 1900.

MONSIEUR :

Vous êtes bien en droit de vous étonner de mon long retard à répondre à votre honorée lettre du mois de Juillet dernier. Mais votre lettre ne m'a pas trouvé à Issy : j'étais à la campagne, malade et condamné au repos. D'autre part, ces derniers temps, j'ai reçu de mes Supérieurs une destination nouvelle : Du Séminaire d'Issy, j'ai été nommé, comme professeur et directeur, au Séminaire S^t Irénée de Lyon. Vous voyez, Monsieur, que mon retard à vous écrire a été tout à fait indépendant de ma volonté. J'espère que vous voudrez bien m'en excuser, car ça a été une vraie peine pour moi de ne pouvoir vous répondre plus tôt.

C'est avec le plus vif intérêt que j'apprends, Monsieur, votre intention de publier un ouvrage sur le grand sujet du Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie. Permettez-moi de vous en adresser mes sincères félicitations. Ce sera pour moi une raison de persévérer, avec une nouvelle ferveur, dans l'habitude déjà prise de porter chaque jour votre souvenir au Saint Sacrifice de la Messe, demandant à Notre Seigneur qu'Il vous donne de comprendre et de goûter de plus en plus son divin Sacrifice, afin que vous-même le fassiez mieux comprendre et mieux aimer.

Vous avez bien raison, Monsieur, de penser que je suis avec vous pour rejeter la théorie du Rev. Brightman. Sans doute, le Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie est *absolu*, comme le Sacrifice de la Croix, en tant qu'il contient le même JESUS CHRIST, s'offrant à son Père pour tous les devoirs de la religion. Mais, d'une part, on ne peut dire que le Sacrifice de la Croix soit *relatif* au Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie, car c'est un sacrifice complet par lui-même et indépendant ; d'autre part, au contraire, le Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie est essentiellement *relatif*, comme Sacrifice propre de l'Église militante, au Sacrifice de la Croix, qu'il est destiné à rappeler et à appliquer par un acte extérieur et sensible, approprié à la condition présente du CHRIST

qui est offert et à celle de l'Église pour qui Il est offert.

Vous pensez, Monsieur, avec le Dr Scheeben, que, dans l'offrande de Notre Seigneur JESUS CHRIST au Ciel, nous n'avons pas un sacrifice *actuel* proprement dit, mais seulement un sacrifice *virtuel*, en tant que les cicatrices glorieuses du Sauveur y sont un simple signe de son sacrifice *actuel passé*, à savoir de son Sacrifice de la Croix. Je me permettrai, Monsieur, de vous présenter quelques courtes observations sur ce sujet, en me contentant de mettre simplement en relief la conception un peu différente que j'ai développée dans mon ouvrage.

Vous êtes d'accord avec moi, dites-vous, pour penser que la destruction de la victime n'est pas un élément essentiel au sacrifice. Dès lors, si l'oblation de Notre Seigneur sur l'autel Eucharistique, sans destruction nouvelle de la Victime, mais avec simple représentation sensible de son immolation passée, vous paraît néanmoins être un sacrifice *actuel* proprement dit, distinct du Sacrifice passé de la Croix, pourquoi ne pas voir aussi un sacrifice *actuel* et proprement dit dans l'oblation que Notre Seigneur fait de Lui-même dans le Ciel en présentant incessamment à Dieu son corps marqué des signes de l'immolation antérieure ? Sur l'autel du Ciel, comme sur l'autel de la terre, nous avons un même Prêtre, une même Victime, une même Oblation infiniment efficace, appuyée sur une même représentation (quoique appropriée, ici aux conditions des Bienheureux, là aux conditions des fidèles mortels), de l'immolation accomplie sur la Croix. Ou bien il faut dire que le Sacrifice de la Messe n'est qu'un sacrifice *virtuel* ; ou bien, à mon avis, il faut dire que le Sacrifice du Ciel, tout comme le Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie, est un sacrifice *véritable et actuel*.

Comme j'ai eu soin de le faire remarquer dans mon ouvrage [le Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur JESUS CHRIST a un élément invariable, persévérant à travers ses diverses phases extérieures, et qui en fait l'unité : c'est l'offrande que Notre Seigneur fait incessamment de Lui-même à son Père, depuis le premier instant de son

existence jusque dans l'éternité, offrande qui comprend tous les devoirs de la religion et a une infinie efficacité sur le Cœur de Dieu. Cette offrande, toujours actuelle, constitue le Sacrifice toujours actuel de Notre Seigneur JESUS CHRIST. Elle se trouve au Calvaire, elle se trouve au Ciel, elle se trouve dans l'Eucharistie : au Calvaire, au Ciel, dans l'Eucharistie, nous retrouvons, de ce chef, le même acte, en diverses phases, de l'unique et véritable Sacrifice. Cependant, si cette Oblation toujours actuelle suffit à constituer l'acte incessant du sacrifice général de Notre Seigneur JESUS CHRIST, inséparable de sa personne, elle ne suffit point à constituer spécifiquement telle ou telle partie spéciale du Sacrifice du Sauveur, que nous appelons le Sacrifice propre de la Croix, le Sacrifice propre du Ciel, le Sacrifice propre de la Messe. Il est essentiel au Sacrifice de la Croix que Notre Seigneur s'y offre *humilié et immolé* afin d'expier réellement nos fautes ; il est essentiel au Sacrifice du Ciel que Notre Seigneur s'y offre *avec une représentation de l'immolation du Calvaire* (à laquelle il a plû à DIEU d'attacher les mérites de notre Rédemption), représentation appropriée à la condition du CHRIST glorieux et à celle des Bienheureux du Ciel ; il est enfin essentiel au Sacrifice de l'Eucharistie que Notre Seigneur s'y offre *avec une représentation de la même immolation du Calvaire*, appropriée elle aussi à la condition glorieuse du CHRIST et à celle des fidèles de la terre pour qui Il est particulièrement offert.

Dès lors, à la Croix nous avons un Sacrifice *actuel* et proprement dit de Notre Seigneur, parce que nous y avons, (1) l'acte incessant de son oblation à son Père, (2) l'acte de son immolation sanglante, terme de la longue immolation qui a commencé avec sa vie, et qui sert en quelque sort de support à son offrande pour l'expiation des péchés des hommes.

Dans l'Eucharistie, nous avons un sacrifice *actuel* et *propre* de Notre Seigneur, parceque nous y avons, (1) l'acte incessant de son oblation à son Père, (2) l'acte de sa mise sous les espèces séparées, en signe de son immolation antérieure, acte continu qui persévère aussi longtemps que les espèces paraissent séparées sur

l'autel. Enfin, dans le Ciel nous avons un Sacrifice *actuel* et proprement dit de Notre Seigneur, parceque nous y avons, (1) l'acte incessant de son oblation à son Père, (2) l'acte continu, éternel, de la conservation des cicatrices glorieuses qui rappellent également à leur manière l'immolation passée.] Sur la question de l'interprétation traditionnelle de l'Épître aux Hébreux, l'éminent Dr. Westcott est certainement bien capable de vous fournir des renseignements autorisés. Pour mon propre compte, je ne connais pas de textes patristiques plus formels que ceux cités dans ma thèse à propos du sacrifice du Ciel. Je crois seulement que les textes où les Pères interprètent l'Épître aux Hébreux se prêtent très bien dans leur ensemble à la théorie d'un véritable sacrifice Céleste, et que souvent même leur manière de décrire, d'après l'Apôtre, l'interpellation du Sauveur auprès du trône de Dieu, va sinon jusqu'à formuler explicitement, du moins jusqu'à insinuer et suggérer la doctrine mise depuis en lumière par des hommes tels que Bossuet, le P. de Condren, M. Olier, et bien d'autres après eux.

Je suis heureux, Monsieur, de pouvoir vous autoriser à faire de mes chétives explications l'usage qui vous semblera bon. Ce sera un grand honneur pour moi si elles méritent votre considération bienveillante, et un grand bonheur aussi si elles peuvent, pour leur petite part, contribuer à faire mieux connaître et mieux aimer Notre Seigneur JÉSUS CHRIST dans son adorable Sacrifice.

Je me permets, Monsieur, de vous adresser en même temps, une petite brochure, dont j'ignore l'auteur, mais qui vous intéressera peut-être en vous renseignant sur le mouvement qui porte actuellement bon nombre de saintes âmes, soit dans le monde, soit dans le cloître, à étudier le Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur JÉSUS CHRIST, et à s'y unir, par leurs aspirations et leurs immolations, afin de donner à ce divin Sacrifice ce qui, dans les intentions ineffables de Dieu, doit s'y ajouter de la part de pauvres créatures pour en assurer de plus en plus l'effet rédempteur et sanctificateur.

Veillez encore une fois, très honoré Monsieur, agréer

mes sincères excuses pour mon long retard à vous répondre, et l'expression de ma respectueuse et bien sympathique considération en N. S.

M. LEPIN,

p. s. s.

Prêtre de S^t Sulpice,

Directeur au Grand Séminaire de Lyon.

VIR SPECTATISSIME :

Voluptati, quam e litteris tuis humanissimis hauseram, fructus tantum, quos mihi ex iis carpere licuit, fuerunt pares.

Attamen quum vix ulla gaudia humana amaritudinis immunia habeantur, aculeum doloris nec ego effugere poteram, quum te corporis ægritudine oppressum ac gravatum intelligerem. Responsum tuum eam ob causam remoratum quis miretur?

Cæterum nec mihi datum erat ut proprio meo arbitrio parerem, quandoquidem procul a sedibus, laborum, qui moræ patientes non erant, mole obrutus, dies æstivos in anfractibus umbrosis montium dissitorum, quasi sub jugum actus, degebam.

Nunc tamen aliquando ad aras focosque redux, ad officia expedienda ex sententia me accinxi, quum antiquius nihil habebam quam ut tibi, vir amicissime, ob eximios honores, quibus præpositi tui te ad altius dignitatis fastigium evexerant, gratulabundus mea vota suffragarer. Simul etiam certiore me fieri volo, humanitatem tuam, qua exiguitatis meæ in sacro Missæ Sacrificio memorem fuisse nuntias, me non modo summi fecisse, nec gratissimum erga te animum meum devinxisse scito ; sed et vicem vice pari a me repensam, atque Numen Æternum eodem sacro ritu a me supplici precatum fuisse, ut tibi dignitate nova honestato, tam in celso munere tuo obeundo, quam in novo opere in eundo, et feliciter explicando, gratiæ cœlestes nunquam deessent, atque ut manus illa divina, quæ te hactenus in hac vitæ semita tanto bono gregis Christiani rexerat ac gubernaverat, ad suam gloriam te ultro quoque sospitem ac vegetem servari et vigere juberet.

Gratiis demum tibi obstrictum me sentio pro eo erga

me beneficio, quo facultatem mihi feceras, ut litteris tuis doctissimis in opella mea ad arbitrium meum uti liceret, quæ facultas mihi certe gratissima est, nec ea me abusurum spondeo.

Mirus profecto afflatus ille divinus existimandus est, cujus sub alis tu posthac functurus es, quique te ad nova orsa singulari virtute excitat. Sub tutela enim constitutus es summi illius Sancti, Irenæi nimirum, martyrii corona inclyti, qui patronus vestræ urbis vestrique seminarii existit. Illa enim nunc tibi est patria, illæ sedes, ille locus, quem Ipse Sanctus, sui que socii, cæteri amici Dei singulares, sua vita, suis rebus gestis suoque sacro sanguine in perpetuum purpura collustrarunt ac bearunt.

Quum hoc animi sensu essem, haud mediocri cura legebam quæ ad fulciendum obtutum in cælo sacrificium actuale potiusquam virtuale perfici memoras. Tuam itaque indulgentiam imploro ut quid discriminis inter opiniones nostras intercedat, hic paucis ostendere patiaris.

Tua verba sunt :

[Here followed that part of M. Lepin's letter which on pages 575-577 is enclosed in brackets.]

Convenit inter nos de actu, quem tu actum invariabilem appellas, ego autem actum *interiorem*, atque actum istum *sacrificium verum* constituere; sed ad sacrificium verum et *proprium* efficiendum, actu quoque exteriori definito opus est.

Actus interior atque invariabilis in ea voluntate invenitur qua Dominus noster Patri Suo, per totam vitam in terris se offerebat, tum in cælis et in Eucharistia sese perpetuo offert.

Actus, contra, exterior, atque essentialiter sacrificialis, quem tu actum specificum nominas, in sacrificio Crucis in effusione sanguinis, in Eucharistia autem in consecratione panis ac vini gemina invenitur. Hactenus inter nos convenitur.

In oblatione cœlesti actum istum, exteriorem, spe-

cificum, atque essentialiter sacrificalem, cicatricibus continuatis tu consistere autumas.

Ab hoc puncto viæ nostræ divergunt, quandoquidem continuatio cicatricum cum reliquis duobus actibus, nempe sanguinis effusione atque panis viniq̄ue consecratione, ut mihi videtur, nulla analogia gaudet.

Effusio sanguinis in Cruce est actus, exterior, definitus, specificus, atque essentialiter sacrificialis; consecratio quoque panis in Corpus Christi, et vini in sanguinem CHRISTI, ex institutione Salvatoris nostri, est actus, exterior, definitus, specificus, atque essentialiter sacrificialis. At, contra, continuatio cicatricum actus ejusmodi non est. Enimvero continuatio cicatricum est status, seu conditio, non vero actus, nec est nisi repræsentatio actus præteriti, seu effectus sacrificii præteriti, non tamen ipsum sacrificium proprium.

Liceat mihi illustratione hac uti;—Confessor, qui voluntate, sed non facto, martyrium perpressus fuerit, cicatrices quotidie gerit, velut symbola martyrii hujus quod pati voluerat, nec tamen eum martyrium quotidie pati dici potest.

Actum sacrificalem, invariabilem in vita Domini nostri, ab Incarnatione sua ad Mortem suam usque in Cruce, in effusione sanguinis culmen attingere atque effectui datum esse, sententia mea est. Ita ut sacrificium hac effusione sanguinis in Cruce factum, quod antea (juxta definitionem S. Augustini notissimam) sacrificium *verum* fuisset, in sacrificium quoque *proprium* elevatum esset.

Simili modo oblatio in cœlis perpetua effectus seu fructus, hujus sacrificii veri ac proprii in Cruce semel facti esse censenda est. Oblationem igitur hanc cœlestem cum S. Augustino sacrificium *verum*, cum Scheeben et Schanz sacrificium virtuale vocare quidem possumus; attamen, me judice, non sacrificium *proprium* nec *actuale*.

Ratio est, quod oblatio hæc cœlestis quolibet actu sacrificiali definito caret. Nam, ut a S. Isidoro Hispalensi et a S. Thoma ostenditur, etymon vocabuli ipsius suadet sacrificium vocari “ex hoc quod homo

facit aliquid sacrum ;” at continuatio in Corpore CHRISTI in cœlis definitioni huic nullo pacto respondet.

Èo tamen non obstante in Eucharistia consecratio gemina est actus, qui definitioni ex omni parte congruit, quoniam in ea actum essentialiter sacrificalem cernimus, nempe hanc consecrationem geminam a Domino nostro Ipso demandatam.

Verum ea, quæ inter nos intersunt, verba potius quam res esse videntur, quandoquidem utriusque nostrum effusio sanguinis in Cruce actum essentialiter sacrificalem valet, ad quem sacrificium Salvatoris, sive in terris, sive in cœlis, sive vero in Eucharistia referendum est.

Libellus, quem de Sacrificio Eucharistiæ scripseram, circa initium anni secuturi ex prelo prodibit, quum librariis, ut tibi exemplar honorarium mittant, jubebo.

Verendum mihi arbitror ne tam prolixè de his rebus disserens tibi tædium attulerim, quod si invitus fecissem veniam ab humanitate tua impetrare non diffido.

Opto te semper bene valere, sumque, qui fui, omni obsequentia tibi deditus,

ALUREDUS G. MORTIMER.

ST. MARK'S CLERGY HOUSE,
PHILADELPHIÆ, U. S. A.,
XX^o Nov., 1900.

GRAND SÉMINAIRE ST. IRÉNÉE, LYON.
20 Xbre, 1900.

TRÈS HONORÉ MONSIEUR :

Vous n'avez pas à craindre de m'importuner le moins du monde par vos lettres. Je puis au contraire vous assurer qu'elles me font et me feront toujours le plus grand plaisir.

J'ai lu avec beaucoup d'intérêt les remarques que vous avez bien voulu me communiquer touchant l'explication du Sacrifice Céleste. Le sentiment que vous exprimez est, en effet, celui de très illustres théologiens, et je le crois parfaitement fondé en raison. Néanmoins, je persiste à croire que l'autre conception est également soutenable, et, pour ma part, je tends à lui donner ma préférence.

Il est très vrai que l'on ne trouve pas, dans l'offrande de Notre Seigneur au Ciel, un *acte extérieur* proprement dit (acte transitoire et pour ainsi dire instantané), qui corresponde à l'*acte* d'immolation sanglante que nous trouvons dans le Sacrifice du Calvaire, ou à l'*acte* d'immolation mystique que nous trouvons dans le Sacrifice de la Messe, opéré par le double consécration.

Mais est-il bien essentiel au Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur que son oblation intérieure soit appuyée sur un *acte extérieur*, transitoire et instantané, et non pas sur un acte continu, ou, si vous aimez mieux, sur un *état* ou une *condition extérieure* de son Humanité Sainte, parfaitement apte à agir sur le cœur de DIEU ?

I. Si l'on consulte le langage, il est bon d'interroger en premier lieu nos langues sacrées. En hébreu, à côté de *zêbach* (immolation) qui désigne plus spécialement les sacrifices sanglants, nous trouvons *minchâh*, qui sert à désigner les sacrifices non sanglants, et a le sens d'*offrande*, de *donation* ; *qorban*, qui a le même sens d'*offrande*, de *donation*, est même le terme générique employé pour désigner le sacrifice. Il semble bien, d'après ces expressions, que le sacrifice consiste proprement dans un *présent offert* à DIEU ; d'autant plus que les verbes, employés pour marquer l'action sacrificale, présentent la même idée d'*offrande* et de *donation* : *hiqrîb* (*faire approcher* de DIEU, faire passer en DIEU), *hêrîm* ou *hé' élâh* (*faire monter vers* DIEU).

À cette idée peuvent se ramener également les expressions grecques : *θυσια* (offrande d'agréable odeur ; de la racine *θυω*, qui signifie proprement *faire brûler un parfum*) ; *προσφέρειν* (présenter, offrir). De même, les expressions latines : *offerre* (offrir) ; *sacrificium* (consécration et donation à DIEU d'une chose qu'on tire de l'ordre profane pour la faire passer dans le domaine de DIEU).

À en juger par le langage, le sacrifice est donc proprement un acte d'*offrande* ou de *donation* à DIEU. Et c'est également l'idée que nous en donne l'analyse attentive des sacrifices de l'Ancienne Loi. Or, dans le Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur, l'*acte* d'offrande ou de donation, qui doit le constituer, ne doit-il pas être

considéré du côté du *Prêtre Souverain* ? Et n'est-il pas avant tout un *acte intérieur* d'oblation, ayant pour terme, ou pour objet offert, son Humanité Sainte ? Et cette Humanité Sainte, ne suffit-il pas qu'elle soit constituée dans tel ou tel *état* où elle soit apte à plaire à son PÈRE ? Par exemple, durant sa vie mortelle Notre Seigneur offre son Humanité humiliée, souffrante, immolée finalement sur la Croix ; dans l'Eucharistie Il offre son Humanité immolée mystiquement sous les espèces séparées ; au Ciel, Il l'offre encore à l'état de victime immolée et portant encore les marques de son immolation. À travers toutes ces phases, dans tous ces *états*, le *Souverain Prêtre* ne continue-t-Il pas à faire de son Humanité Sainte un *acte d'oblation* infiniment agréable à DIEU son PÈRE ? Par conséquent, n'y a-t-il pas un véritable sacrifice au Ciel, tout comme dans l'Eucharistie, tout comme sur le Calvaire ? C'est ce qu'il me semble permis de croire, à s'en tenir à la notion essentielle du sacrifice fournie par le langage.

II. Si maintenant nous consultons l'Écriture, nous voyons que : (1) Le sacrifice de la Loi Ancienne n'était pas tout entier dans l'*acte* d'immolation de la victime offerte, mais s'étendait jusqu'à la *consommation*, par laquelle DIEU entraît symboliquement en jouissance de son offrande, et durait autant que cette consommation. Or, au Calvaire s'est accomplie seulement l'Immolation sanglante de la divine Victime, c'est à dire seulement une importante partie de son Sacrifice ; la consommation de la Victime, son passage définitif dans le domaine et la jouissance de DIEU, se fait à la Résurrection, pour ne point cesser, car, à la différence des hosties anciennes, l'Humanité Sainte n'est point détruite par sa consommation en DIEU, ou plutôt cette consommation même durera éternellement, et DIEU ne cessera de prendre éternellement en elle ses complaisances. L'analogie conduit donc à admettre une réelle continuation du Sacrifice de JÉSUS CHRIST au Ciel (voir mon ouvrage, pp. 151, 190).

(2) De fait, d'après l'Épître aux Hébreux, comparée avec l'Apocalypse, il semble bien que le Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur n'a pas été tout entier exclusivement

dans l'acte de Son Immolation sanglante, mais qu'il se continue à jamais dans le Ciel. L'Humanité de Notre Seigneur n'est pas immolée actuellement au Ciel ; mais elle est à l'état de victime immolée et portant encore les marques de son Immolation : dans cet état, Notre Seigneur l'offre encore à son PÈRE ; et, à voir les expressions de l'Apôtre, il semble bien qu'il veuille désigner par là une vraie oblation sacrificale, un véritable et réel sacrifice. (Hébr. viii. 1-3, etc.): "Omnis enim pontifex *ad offerendum* munera et hostias constituitur ; unde necesse est et hunc habere aliquid *quod offerat.*"

(3) On ne trouve rien dans l'Écriture qui établisse formellement et avec précision la nature exacte du Sacrifice Eucharistique. La meilleure manière de l'appuyer sur l'Écriture paraît bien encore être celle de Bossuet, qui suppose la réalité du Sacrifice Céleste témoignée par l'Épître aux Hébreux, et de ce Sacrifice Céleste conclut, par analogie, à la réalité du Sacrifice de la Messe: Au Ciel, JÉSUS CHRIST offre son Humanité dans l'état de victime immolée, et cet acte d'offrande est un vrai et actuel sacrifice ; un vrai et actuel sacrifice doit se trouver également sur nos autels, où JÉSUS CHRIST s'offre pareillement dans un état semblable de victime immolée.

III. Enfin, si nous consultons la tradition patristique et théologique : (1) Ou ne peut pas dire que les Pères enseignent positivement la réalité du Sacrifice Céleste. Mais aucun n'y contredit formellement. Bien plus, on peut citer un certain nombre de témoignages patristiques qui lui sont plutôt favorables et l'insinuent (voir mon ouvrage, pp. 172, 180).

(2) Les théologiens se sont également peu occupés du Sacrifice du Ciel ; beaucoup au contraire, du Sacrifice de la Messe. Or, la façon dont un bon nombre conçoivent le Sacrifice de la Messe justifie, selon moi, la réalité du Sacrifice du Ciel. En effet, alors que les uns, comme St. Thomas, se contentent de dire, d'une manière générale, à la suite des Prées, que le Sacrifice Eucharistique consiste dans une représentation de la Passion du SAUVEUR, sans affirmer positivement que

cette représentation, et par conséquent la réalité du Sacrifice, soit restreinte au seul instant de la consécration, et ne continue pas suffisamment tant que les espèces paraissent séparées sur l'autel : d'autres, en assez grand nombre, sont très formels à ne pas restreindre la réalité du Sacrifice de la Messe au seul instant de la consécration, et l'étendent jusqu'à la communion (voir mon ouvrage, p. 227, note 1). Le célèbre Cardinal de Lugo enseigne même formellement que "*reverà sacrificium durat in ratione sacrificii usque ad consumptionem*" (ibid., p. 228, note 2). Il paraît bien aussi que c'est l'opinion de Bossuet (ibid., p. 226, note 2). D'après ces théologiens, ce qui constitue la réalité du Sacrifice de la Messe, ce ne serait donc pas exclusivement *l'acte d'immolation* mystique produit au moment de la double consécration, mais tout aussi bien *l'état* de victime immolée dans lequel Notre Seigneur continue de s'offrir à son PÈRE jusqu'à la communion. Dès lors, pourquoi ne pas voir également un sacrifice réel et actuel dans le Ciel, où Notre Seigneur offre pareillement à son PÈRE son Humanité Sainte dans un état semblable de victime immolée, "*agnum tanquam occisum*" ?

À vrai dire, cet acte d'immolation mystique a, dans le Sacrifice de la Messe, une signification spéciale ; il a pour but de rappeler sensiblement *l'acte* d'immolation sanglante accompli sur la Croix ; et, pour cela, je crois que le fruit principal du Sacrifice de la Messe doit être attaché au moment de la double consécration (voir mon ouvrage, p. 228). Mais s'ensuit-il que *l'état* de position sous les espèces séparées, qui en résulte, ne suffise pas à *l'actualité continuée* du sacrifice, et que Notre Seigneur, continuant de s'offrir à son PÈRE Victime immolée pour notre salut, ne continue pas la réalité de son Offrande sacrificale pour une efficace application des mérites de sa Rédemption ? Et, dès lors, pourquoi ne pas admettre la réalité du Sacrifice Céleste, dont les conditions sont analogues ?

En résumé, je conviens qu'au Ciel nous ne trouvons pas un *acte* proprement dit d'immolation mystique correspondant précisément à *l'acte* d'immolation mystique

que nous trouvons à la sainte Messe, au moment de la consécration. Il me semble néanmoins que l'on peut voir un véritable et toujours actuel sacrifice dans l'acte incessant par lequel Notre Seigneur offre à son PÈRE son Humanité Sainte, revêtue des marques de Son Immolation et lui rappelant très efficacement cette mort sanglante à laquelle sont attachés tous les mérites de notre Rédemption : " ut appareat nunc vultui DEI pro nobis " (Hébr. ix. 24), " semper vivens ad interpellandum pro nobis " (vii. 25). Encore une fois, très honoré Monsieur, je présente cette idée, non comme une théorie qui s'impose, mais comme une manière de voir qui me paraît avoir sa raison d'être et ses avantages, tout en reconnaissant que votre façon de concevoir les choses, qui est celle de nombreux et très illustres théologiens, est parfaitement justifiée.

C'est vous dire, cher Monsieur, que je suis heureux de vous sentir pleinement d'accord sur ce qu'il y a de véritablement fondamental dans la doctrine du Sacrifice de Notre Seigneur.

Je vous suis par avance bien reconnaissant de l'hommage, que vous voulez bien me promettre, d'un exemplaire de votre ouvrage. Ce sera pour moi une jouissance de le lire et d'entrer ainsi plus intimement dans votre pensée. Si même vous me le permettez, je serai heureux, aussitôt que j'eu aurai le loisir, d'en donner un compte-rendu dans quelque Revue française dont les lecteurs ne manqueront pas de s'intéresser à votre travail.

Et puisque nous sommes aux approches de la nouvelle année, veuillez me permettre, cher Monsieur, de vous offrir mes meilleurs souhaits. Daigne Notre Seigneur répandre de plus en plus sur vous les lumières de son Saint Esprit et les grâces de son Sacré Cœur ! C'est ce que je Lui demande et Lui demanderai chaque jour, particulièrement aux grands jours de fête qui s'approchent.

Veuillez agréer, très honoré Monsieur, avec mes souhaits de cœur, l'hommage de ma profonde et bien respectueuse sympathie.

M. LEPIN,

p. s. s.

INDEX.

A.

Abbott, 447.
Albert the Great, 198, 201, 203, 209.
Albertino, Edmond, 250, 251.
Alexander II., 191.
Alexander of Hales, 41, 198.
Alford, Dean, 54, 58, 96, 97, 132, 136, 137, 361, 460.
Algerus of Liège, 196, 197, 227, 269, 310-316.
Altar, treatment of, by S. Ignatius, 180, 181; use of term, by S. Ignatius, 233; Hermas, 233; S. Clement of Alexandria, 233; S. Methodius, 233; S. Chrysostom, 233; S. Cyril of Alexandria, 233.
Amalarius, Bp., 166, 191, 192, 196.
Ambrose, S., 48, 158, 185, 224, 225, 249-255, 431, 500-502.
Andrewes, Launcelot, Bp. of Winchester, 214, 215, 342, 346, 367-369, 395, 447, 448.
Anglican theology, two new currents traced to their source, 397-402; Cassander the source so far as Anglican writers are concerned, 401; reasons why they should be rejected by Anglicans, 412.
Anglicans recognize two principles, 10.

Anglican view, term misleading, 82.
Anselm, S., 88.
Anspach, Peter, 208.
Antiquity appealed to, 10.
Antoninus Pius, 182.
Apostolic succession, question of Reformation and Oxford Movement, 13.
Aristotle, 3.
Articles, works on, by Bp. Burnet, 79, 80; Bp. Forbes, 93, 94, 96; Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, 94, 95; Rev. B. J. Kidd, 94.
Athanasius, S., 88.
Atonement, isolated from Incarnation, 4; our LORD man's Representative in, 50; doctrine of, made the foundation of theology at the Reformation, 467.
Augustine, S., 25, 29-31, 38-41, 43, 48, 50, 82, 185, 186, 211, 225-227, 255-259, 265, 266, 271, 278, 297, 323, 325, 326, 364, 365, 368-370, 507-510.
Austin, S., 364.
Auxerre, Remi d', 194.

B.

Barlow, Bp., 342.
Baronius (Raynaldus), 306.
Barrow, Dr., 345.
Basil, S., 158, 159, 416.

- Bede, Venerable, 190.
 Bellarmine, Card., 78, 208, 214, 370.
 Benedict XIV., S., 331.
 Bengel, 58, 97, 122, 132, 136, 137, 361, 460.
 Bennett, W. J. E., 342.
 Berengarius, 196, 278, 310.
 Bernard, Canon E. R., 515, 524, 525, 533, 534.
 Beron, 12.
 Berulle, Card. de, 316, 317.
 Bessarion, Card., 306.
 Bevan, Rev. H. E. J., 537.
 Beveridge, William, Bp. of S. Asaph, 342, 395, 397.
 Beza, Theodorus, 408, 483, 487.
 Biel, Gabriel, 43, 205, 211.
 Bilson, Thomas, Bp. of Winchester, 342, 363-366, 395.
 Bonaventura, S., 198.
 Bossuet, Bp. of Meaux, 74, 78, 151, 213, 215, 331, 332, 384, 409, 452.
 Bramhall, John, Abp. of Armagh, 342, 371, 372.
 Brett, Thomas, Nonjuror, 342, 387-389.
 Brevint, Daniel, Dean of Lincoln, 342, 375, 376, 395.
 Bridget, Father, 403.
 Brightman, F. E., 19, 83-92, 96, 108-110, 112, 113, 132, 142, 149, 150, 152-154, 156, 164, 183, 215, 229-231, 249-253, 269, 276, 277, 286-288, 299, 301, 302, 304, 306, 307, 332, 333, 335-337, 339, 340, 407, 408, 433, 444, 453, 454, 465, 466, 491, 516.
 Buckridge, John, Bp. of Rochester and Ely, 366.
 Bull, George, Bp. of S. David's, 342, 378, 395.
 Burigny, J. L., 409.
 Burnet, Bp., 79, 80.
 C.
 Cabasilas, Nicholas, Bp. of Thessalonica, 216, 332-337, 452.
 Cajetan, 205.
 Caly, Robert, 402.
 Campbell, McLeod, 529.
 Cassander, 344, 346, 354, 355, 396-402, 408, 412, 445, 452-454.
 Castellio, Seb., 483, 484, 487.
 Castro, Alphonsus de, 43.
 Catechism of Peter Mogila, 216.
 Catena of passages from the Fathers bearing witness to the fact that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, 495-514.
 Catharinus, 81, 206.
 Catholic Church, interpreter of truth, 11; teaches that upon the Cross our LORD offered His perfect Sacrifice, 71; Socinian theory contrary to teaching of, 71, 72.
 Catholic revival, Tractarians leaders of, 413.
 Catholic view, destruction of Victim not a necessary element of, 79; connects words of Institution with our LORD'S Death, 107, 108; witness to, by Greek Fathers, 220-224; by Latin Fathers, 224-228; summary of passages from the Fathers in support of, 228; of forty-two Anglican writers, 363-396; only two representative Anglican divines hold Modern view, 396.
 Cawley, Rev. Thomas, 346.
 Channing, W. E., 56.
 Chrysostom, S., 11, 120, 135, 147, 160, 161, 179, 187, 188, 202, 222-224, 230, 232, 233, 261, 262, 267, 268, 306, 312, 315, 321, 370, 451, 457, 502-504.
 Cienfuegos, Card., 214.
 Clement of Alexandria, S., 115, 233.

- Clement of Rome, S., 77, 177, 180.
 Clementine liturgy, 165.
 Clichtovée, 205.
 Cochläus, John, 208.
 Coleridge, 433.
 Collier, Bp., 342.
 Comber, Thomas, Dean of Durham, 381, 382.
 Condren, Charles de, 213, 270, 316, 317, 324, 329, 330, 332.
 Conference at Fulham (Round table), Oct. 10, 1900; its constitution, 535; subject, 536; Canon Gore's interpretation of S. Irenæus, 543; Dr. Wace and Robertson connect Eucharist with the Passover, 544; no one at this Conference refers Eucharist to our LORD's Mediatorial work, 545.
 Conference at Oxford, Dec. 13, 14, 1899: report of, 515-532; Eucharistic Sacrifice incidentally touched upon, 516; conclusion to be drawn from, 534.
 Consecration, the, essence of Eucharistic Sacrifice, 77.
Considerations, by Rev. John Keble, 431, 434, 452.
 Contarini, Card., 211.
 Cornelius à Lapide, 159.
 Corrionero, Bp. of Almeria, 210.
 Cosin, John, Bp. of Durham, 345, 372, 373.
 Council of Nicæa, 499.
 Council of Trent, diversity of opinion in regard to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 209, 210; stated that the Eucharist was a Sacrifice, 210; does not define mode, 210.
 Cyprian, S., 115, 184, 185, 224, 364, 369, 371, 497, 498.
 Cyril of Alexandria, S., 19, 158, 187, 221, 222, 230, 233, 263, 510, 511.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, S., 220, 499.
 D.
 Damascus, John of, S., 11, 202, 264, 333.
 Daubeny, Charles, 392.
 Davidson, Rev. A. B., 519.
 Davison, Dr., 515, 529, 531, 533.
 Day of Atonement, typifies CHRIST'S High-Priesthood, 123-126; typifies our LORD'S Intercession, 139.
 De Castro, Alphonsus, 43, 205, 211.
De Expositione Missæ, by Florus, most important contribution of century IX., 195.
 Definition, of the "genus" of Sacrifice by S. Augustine, 29; of "heavenly" by S. Chrysostom, 132, 160; of Sacrifice, Dr. Schanz, 36, 37; by S. Augustine, 37-41; Alexander of Hales, 41; S. Thomas Aquinas, 41; S. Isidore of Seville, 42, 189, 190; Vasquez, 42-44; Gabriel Biel, 43; Alphonsus de Castro, 43; Suarez, 45; Dr. Scheeben, 45; William of Auvergne, 199; S. Thomas Aquinas, which changed the current of theological thought, 203, 204.
 Delitzsch, Dr., 54.
 De Lugo, Card., 42, 78, 204, 212-214.
De Sacramentis Corporis, by Algerus of Liège, 310-315; only heavenly Sacrifice known to Algerus the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 312.
De Sacrificio Missæ, by Algerus of Liège, 314.
De Sacrificio Missæ, by Benedict XIV., 331.
 Destruction of Victim, not an essential idea of Sacrifice shown by Latin, Greek, and

- Dest'n of Victim—*Continued*.
 Hebrew terms, 34, 35; in Eucharistic Sacrifice only mystical, 76, 77; Roman schools, 77-79; view of, by S. Thomas Aquinas, 77; Vasquez, 77; Perrone, 78; De Lugo, 78; Salmeron, 78; Bossuet, 78; Melchior Canus, 78; Card. Bellarmine, 78; Suarez, 78; Card. Franzelin, 78; Dr. Scheeben, 78; Dr. Schanz, 78; Dr. Lepin, 78; Tyrrell, 78; not a necessary element of Catholic view, 79.
 "Didache," the, 181.
 Dimock, Rev. N., 537, 540.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, S., 202.
 "Disputation on JESUS CHRIST our SAVIOUR," by Faustus Socinus (chap. xv.), 480.
 Dodwell, 342.
 Dowden, Dr., Bp. of Edinburgh, 434.
 Duchesne, M. l'Abbé, 169, 194, 305.
 Dummermuth, Père, 209.
 Duns Scotus, 204.
 Du Perron, Card., 316.
 Duppa, Bp., 342.

E.

- Early ages examined, 180-188.
 Eastern writers: Nicholas Cabasilas, Bp. of Thessalonica, 216, 332-337, 452; Macarius, Bp. of Vinnitza, 217, 337, 338, 452.
 Eck, J., 205.
Eirenicon, by Dr. Pusey, 74.
 Elizabeth, Queen, 402.
 Ephrem Syrus, S., 499.
 "Epiklesis," the Greek, 305.
 Epiphanius, S., 424, 427.
 Eucharist, doctrine of, question of Reformation and Oxford Movement, 13; mer-

its of the Cross applied in, 76; asserted to be no Sacrifice by Protestants, 82; difference between Catholic teaching and Modern view held by Brightman, 88-92; sense in which some Romans have taught that it is an absolute Sacrifice, 90; Dr. Scheeben's view of, as a relative Sacrifice, 90; in Institution, Brightman sees no special reference to our LORD'S Death, 91; peculiar view of our LORD'S Presence by Dr. Mason, 95, 96; examination as to whether it can be proved from Scripture to be a Sacrifice, 100-106; examination as to whether its sacrificial character depends on its relation to the Cross, or to our LORD'S work in heaven, 100, 106-109; witness of Old Testament to its being a Sacrifice, 101-103; evidence of New Testament to its being a Sacrifice, 103-106; conclusion as to the fact that it is a Sacrifice, 106; testimony of Scripture as to the manner in which it is a Sacrifice, 106; Catholic teaching, 106, 107; difference between Catholic and Modern view; same passages of Scripture quoted on each side, 107; typified by the Passion, 139; Old and New Testaments both prove it to be a Sacrifice, 145; a relative Sacrifice in which we make a memorial of our LORD'S Death, 145; a Sacrifice because essentially identical with Sacrifice of Cross, 146; accidentally related to our LORD'S Mediatorial work, 146; extension of Incarna-

Eucharist—Continued.

tion, 151; treatment in three periods of Church history, 177, 178; the Church's Sacrifice, 180; best writer in century XII. Algerus of Liège, 197; Luther denied sacrificial character of, 205; defined as a Sacrifice by Council of Trent, 210; mode not defined, 210; accidental relation between it and our LORD'S Mediatorial work shown by Gallican theologians, in century XVII., 213; strange theory suggested by Cienfuegos, century XVIII., 214; Bp. Macarius teaches that it is a Sacrifice, 337, 338; three points established by our investigations, 450; summary of their result, 450; witness of Scripture, 450; of liturgies, 450, 451; of the Fathers, 451; of mediæval writers, 451; of Anglican divines, 451, 452; of Tractarian writers, 452; catena of passages from the Fathers bearing witness to the fact of its being a Sacrifice, 495-514; at Fulham Conference, Oct. 10, 1900, Canon Gore's interpretation of S. Irenæus given, 543; Drs. Wace and Robertson connect the Sacrifice with the Passover, 544; no one at the Conference refers it to our LORD'S Mediatorial work, 545.

Eucharistic Adoration, by Rev. John Keble, 419, 430, 431.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, 187, 263, 264.

Euthymius Zigadenus, 120, 128, 135, 147, 175, 179, 202, 262, 265, 268, 451, 457.

Ewald, Dr., 108.

F.

Fairbairn, Dr., 515, 528, 529, 533.

Fathers, the, neglect of, by Milligan, 5; summary of passages from, in support of Catholic view of words of Institution, 228; teaching as to our LORD'S Intercession in heaven, by Greek Fathers: S. Chrysostom, 261, 262; Theodoret, 261; Euthymius Zigadenus, 262, 265; S. Cyril of Alexandria, 263; Eusebius of Cæsarea, 263, 264; S. John of Damascus, 264; by Latin Fathers: Primasius, 265; S. Augustine, 265, 266; S. Gregory the Great, 266, 267; summary of Patristic testimony, 267; catena of passages bearing witness to the fact that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, 495-514.

Felicitas, S., 416.

Fell, John, Bp. of Oxford, 342, 360, 361, 396.

Ferdinand I., 398.

Ferne, Henry, Bp. of Chester, 375.

Ferry, M., 74.

Field, Richard, Dean of Gloucester, 365, 366, 403.

Florus, 166, 191, 194-196, 198.

Forbes, A. P., Bp. of Brechin, 93, 94, 96, 112, 113, 145, 419, 427, 433, 435, 439, 448, 464.

Forbes, William, Bp. of Edinburgh, 342, 371, 397.

Forsyth, Dr., 515.

Franz, Dr., 215.

Franzelin, Card., 42, 78, 104, 105, 213, 214.

French school, Lepin, 16, Vacant, 17.

Fulham Conference (Roman

- Fulham Conf.—*Continued.*
table), Oct. 10, 1900: its constitution, 535; subject, 536; Canon Gore's interpretation of S. Irenæus, 543; Drs. Wace and Robertson connect Eucharist with the Passover, 544; no one at this Conference refers Eucharist to our LORD'S Mediatorial work, 545.
- G.
- Gallican writers in century XVII.: Charles de Condren, 270, 316, 317, 324, 329, 330, 332; Jean Jacques Olier, 270, 317, 318, 329-332; Card. de Berulle, 316, 317; Card. du Perron, 316; Thomassin, 317, 318, 320, 321-328, 331.
Gaudentius, S., 506, 507.
Genebradus, 243.
"Genus" of Sacrifice, definition of, by S. Augustine, 29.
German schools, three, 15, 231.
Gibson, Rev. E. C. S., 94, 95.
Glyn, Bp. of Bangor, 402.
GOD the only Authority for Sacrifice, in revealed religion, 33.
Godet, Dr., 12, 108, 109.
Gore, Canon, 515, 525, 526, 533, 539-541.
Grabe, John Ernest, 342, 386, 387, 395.
Grancolas, M. J., 166.
Greek sacrificial terms, 475, 477.
Gregory the Great, S., 178, 180, 188, 189, 228, 230, 248, 249, 259, 266-268, 323, 418, 469, 514.
Gregory Nazianzen, S., 198, 424.
Gregory of Nyssa, S., 187, 221, 224, 500.
Grotius, Hugo, 497, 409-412.
- Guilmundus Aversanus, 269, 277-279.
- H.
- Haldane, Dr. A. Chinnery, Bp. of Argyle, 434.
Halifax, Lord, 537, 540, 542.
Hall, Joseph, Bp. of Norwich, 370.
Hammond, Henry, 165, 168, 342, 356, 357.
Harrison, Rev. B., 415.
Haywood (Pseudo-Overall), 345, 346, 402.
Headlam, Rev. A. C., 515, 528, 533.
Heath, Abp. of York, 402.
Heavenly altar, Thalhoffer's argument considered; examination of Isa. vi. 6, and Rev. viii. 3, quoted by Thalhoffer, 157-159; taken for our LORD Himself, 160; often spoken of by the Fathers, 162; discussion of, summed up, 173, 174; frequently spoken of by mediæval writers, from which Thalhoffer infers heavenly Sacrifice, 270; his authorities examined, 270-286, 307-316; views of Charles de Condren, 329, 330; Jean Jacques Olier, 330, 331; Bossuet, 331, 332; referred to by Dr. Pusey, 424.
"Heavenly," defined by S. Chrysostom, 160; passages in the New Testament as to the use of the word, 162-164.
Hebrews, Modern interpretation of, 12; battle-ground of Catholic and Modern views, 110; sketch of purpose and argument of, 111, 112; ruling thought, CHRIST'S High-Priesthood, 113; examination of passages bearing on Sacrifice of Cross, 114-119,

Hebrews—*Continued.*
 122-126; examination of, as to our LORD'S work, as typified by Day of Atonement, 126-134; chap. xii., 24, by Bengel and Alford, 136, 137; in no Catholic commentary nor before century XVI. nor in any of the Fathers, are found any traces of Modern view, 147.

Hebrew sacrificial terms, 478, 479.

Hefele, Bp., 190.

Hermas, 233.

Herodotus, 475.

Hickes, Dr. George, Titular Bp. of Thetford, 82, 379, 381, 448.

Hildebert of le Mans (or Tours), 196, 269, 286, 303, 307-309.

Hippolytus, S., 496.

Histoire de la Conception, by Dr. Vacant, 17.

Hofmann, Dr., 108.

Holland, Canon Scott, 515, 523, 524, 532.

Holy Orders, form of, 14.

Homer, 475.

Hooker, R., 342.

Hooper, Bp., 342.

Horsley, Bp., 342.

Hughes, John, 390.

Hugo of S. Victor, 269, 309, 310.

I.

Ignatius, S., 19, 180, 181, 229, 232, 233.

Incarnation, humanitarian distortion of, 4; Eucharist extension of, 151; assailed, 468; centre of Christian theology, 470; its relation to the Eucharist, 470.

Innocent III., 166, 191, 194, 198.

Institution, words of, Catholic view connects with our

LORD'S Death, 107, 108; interpretation by Brightman in support of Modern view, 108-110.

Intercession, our LORD'S, in Heaven, teaching of the Fathers regarding 260-267.

Irenæus, S., 19, 36, 164, 170, 172, 173, 182, 183, 185, 220, 229, 234, 235, 495, 496.

Isidore of Seville, S., 42, 189, 190.

Isidore Pelus., 187.

Ivo of Chartres, S., 196, 269, 286-307, 432.

J.

Jackson, Dean, 58, 97, 361.

Jerome, S., 116, 158, 425, 504-506.

Jewell, John, Bp. of Salisbury, 363.

Johuson, John, Vicar of Cranbrook, 342, 349-353, 393, 395, 396, 412, 446-448.

Johnson, William, 452.

Jolly, Alexander, Bp. of Moray, 392, 393.

Jones, 342.

Justin Martyr, S., 19, 103, 156, 182, 229.

K.

Keble, Rev. John, 419, 428-434, 452, 464.

"Kenosis," 12; Lutheran sources of, 12, 449.

Kidd, Rev. B. J., 18, 190, 207, 213.

L.

Lang, Rev. C. G., 515, 516, 526, 527, 532.

Latin sacrificial terms, 473, 474.

Laud, William, Abp. of Canterbury, 342, 369, 370, 395, 447.

- Laurence, Richard, Abp. of Cashel, 390.
 Laurence, S., 498, 499.
 Law, William, 342, 391.
 Le Brun, M., 166, 167.
 Leo the Great, S., 60, 186, 513, 514.
 Lepin, Dr., 16, 78, 146, 332, 363, 454.
 Leslie, Charles, 382, 383.
 Lessius, 212.
 Letter, of Dr. Pusey to Rev. B. Harrison, 415; to Bp. Wilberforce, 415-417; of Bp. Westcott to Rev. Dr. Mortimer, first, 551; second, 552; of Rev. F. E. Brightman to Dr. Mortimer, 553; of Dr. Mortimer to Rev. Dr. Schanz, 556; of Dr. Schanz to Dr. Mortimer, 557; of Dr. Mortimer to Rev. Dr. Lepin, first, 560; second, 571; third, 578; of Dr. Lepin to Dr. Mortimer, first, 563; second, 574; third, 581.
 Liddon, Canon, 415, 417, 433, 435, 448, 449.
L'Idée du Sacrifice, by Dr. Lepin, 16.
 Lightfoot, Bp., 162.
 Liguori, S., 212.
 Liturgies, quoted by Brightman in support of Modern view, 109; witness to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 148; Roman, Scotch, Anglican, and American, quoted by Brightman, 150-152; significance of passages must be determined by the Fathers, 156.
 Liturgy, the, attempt in century IX. to find image of the Passion in, 191; exposition of by Bp. Amalarius, 192-196; exposition written by Bp. Nicholas Cabasilas in century XIV., 216; mystical works on, in century XII.: by S. Ivo of Chartres, 269; treatment of in his sermon *Opusculum*, 286-307; B. Odo of Cambrai, 269, 279-285; V. Hildebert of le Maus (or Tours), 269, 286, 303, 307-309; V. Peter of Cluny, 269; Algerus of Liège, 269, 310-316; Hugo of S. Victor, 269, 309, 310; Guitmundus Aversanus, 269, 278, 279.
 Luther, Martin, 205.
- M.
- Macarius of Egypt, S., 500.
 Macarius, Bp. of Vinnitza, 217, 337, 338, 452.
 Mackay, Rev. D. J., 434.
 Man, as an individual and as a society, must worship GOD, 28.
 Mansi, G. D., 306.
 Marcion, 12.
 Martyrdom, illustration of sacrificial act, 40; difference between it and sacrifice examined, 65-68.
 Mary, B. V., 417.
 Mason, Dr., 19, 95, 96.
 Mason, Francis, Archdeacon of Norfolk, 369.
 Massarello, 210.
 Mede, Joseph, 342, 354-356, 397.
 Melanchthon, P., 208.
 Melchior Canus, 78, 207, 210, 211.
 Methodius, S., 233.
 Meyer, Dr., 108, 122.
 Meyrick, Canon, 346.
 Milligan, Dr., 5-10, 12, 20, 59, 97, 108, 109, 215, 328, 396, 407-409, 459, 491, 522, 531.
Ministerial Priesthood, by Dr. Moberly, 18.
 Moberly, Dr., 18, 515, 524, 534.
 Modern view, term used in this book, 82; principal accretion, stated by Alford, 96, 97; words of Institution, 1 Cor.

Modern view—*Continued.*

xi. 26, interpreted by Brightman in support of, 108-110; several theories in regard to Sacrifice of Cross, 112, 113; Rev. v. 6, 140, 141; Thalhofer's argument on this verse, 142-145; no basis for, found in any commentary, nor in any of the Fathers, on Hebrews, before century XVI., 147; question as to whether the liturgies support this view, 148; true and valuable element in, 153, 174; result of examination of Thalhofer's authorities, 260; only passages in support of this view considered in Chapter IX., 270; no support found in Mediæval writers, 316; re-statement of characteristics, 318-321; finds no support in Thomassin, 328; no notice of, in Eastern Church, nor among any writers of the Middle Ages, nor of century XVII., 338; Brightman claims that Anglican divines held this view, 340; writers who favour this view in *Tract 81* by Dr. Pusey, 342-362.

Mogila, Peter, 216.
 Montague, Richard, Bp. of Norwich, 370, 371.
 Mortimer, Rev. Dr., Letters, 551-581.
 Morton, Thomas, Bp. of Durham, 355, 367.
 Moule, Dr., 538.

N.

Nelson, Robert, 383, 384.
 Newbolt, Canon, 538.
 Newman, Rev. J. H., 96, 414.
 New Testament, passages which refer man's redemption to the Cross, 69-71;

recognizes only one absolute Sacrifice, 145; passages as to use of the word "heavenly," 162-164.
 Nicholson, Bp., 342.

O.

Odo of Cambrai, B., 167, 196, 269, 279-285.
 Œcumenius, 120, 202.
 Olier, Jean Jacques, 270, 317, 318, 329-332.
One Offering, The, by Sadler, 18, 546.
 Optatus, S., 499.
Opusculum, sermon by S. Ivo of Chartres: his treatment of the liturgy, 286-307; no support found for Modern view, 299; teaching of S. Ivo summed up, 307.
 "Opusc. de Ven. Sac. Altaris," ascribed to S. Thomas Aquinas, 208; author and source cannot be determined, 209.
 Oratory, the, founded by Card. de Berulle, 316.
 Origen cited by Thalhofer, 235-246.
 Overall, John, Bp. of Norwich, 215.
 Overall (Pseudo-), 342-345, 393, 395-397, 400-402, 407, 445, 447, 448, 452, 453.
 Oxford Conference, Dec. 13 and 14, 1899; report of, 515-532; Eucharistic Sacrifice incidentally touched upon, 516; conclusion to be drawn from, 534.

P.

Papal Bull, 13.
 Paschasius Radbertus, 169, 179, 191, 195, 269-276.
 Passion, the, typifies the Eucharist 139; evidence of Gospels to importance of,

- Passion, the—*Continued*.
 155; remembrance of, a force
 in our lives, 471.
 Patrick, Simon, Bp. of Ely,
 377, 378.
 Paulus, Dr., 209.
 Pearson, Bp., 63.
 Perpetua, S., 416.
 Perrone, Rev. J., S. J., 78.
 Petavius, 63, 103.
 Peter of Cluny, V., 196, 197,
 269.
 Peter Damian, S., 62, 179.
 Peter Lombard, S., 194, 196-
 198, 202, 364, 375.
 Peter of Prussia, 309.
 Philastrius, 158.
 Philo Judæus, 36.
 Philpotts, 342, 353, 393-395,
 397.
 Pighius, 205, 211.
 Pitisco, 473.
 Plautus, 474.
 Plutarch, 475.
 Polycarp, S., 233.
 Potter, John, Abp. of Canter-
 bury, 389, 390.
 Priesthood, High-, Christ's,
 ruling thought of Hebrews,
 113; as typified by Day of
 Atonement, 123-126.
 Priesthood, Christ's, on earth,
 questioned by Milligan, 7, 8;
 theory as to when it began,
 by Socinus, 61-63; theo-
 logians agree it began at
 the Incarnation, 62; theory
 of Socinus finds no support
 in Scripture, and is contrary
 to the teaching of the Catho-
 lic Church, 71, 72.
 Priesthood, necessity of, in
 sacrificial act, 46.
 Priests ministers of Christ, 75.
Primary Charge, by Dr.
 Forbes, Bp. of Brechin, 435-
 439.
 Primasius, 120, 162, 232, 265,
 268.
 Proclus, S., 511, 512.
 Propositions in regard to Eu-
 charistic Sacrifice *contra*
 fidem, 456, 457; not *contra*
 fidem, 457; explanation of
 propositions in their relation
 to modern theories, 459-467.
 Protestant view of Eucharistic
 Sacrifice expressed by Bp.
 Burnet, 79, 80.
 Puller, Father, S.S. J. E., 403,
 515-522, 527, 529-532.
 Pulleyne, Robert, 196, 197.
 Pusey, Rev. Dr., 74, 96, 340,
 345, 395, 415, 419-427, 432,
 434, 435, 446.
 R.
 Rabanus Maurus, 169, 191,
 194, 196.
 Ratramnus of Corbey, 179, 191,
 195.
 Reaction exemplified by age
 of Councils, and Reforma-
 tion, 1, 2.
 Real Presence, Eucharistic
 Sacrifice a consequence of,
 75; rejected by Protestants,
 82; discussed from century
 IX. to XVI., 178, 179; at-
 tacked by Berengarius, 196.
 Redemption, man's, passages
 in New Testament which
 refer it to the Cross, 69-71.
Reductio ad absurdum, im-
 portance of, 2.
Reductio ad impossibile, 253.
 Reformation, theology of, ob-
 scures the Incarnation and
 our LORD'S Intercession,
 154; doctrine of the Atonement
 made the foundation
 of theology at time of, 470.
 Reichenau, Bernon de, 196.
 Religion, distinguishes man
 from other creatures, 24;
 demands external worship,
 27.
 Resurrection, theologian of,
 Charles de Condren, 316-
 318.

Revelation v. 6, views of Modern school, 140, 141; Thalhoffer's argument, 142-145.
 Ridley, Gloucester, 391, 392.
 Robertson, Dr., 538, 541.
 Robinson, Canon, 539.
 Ryle, Dr., 515, 522, 523, 527, 532.

S.

Sacrifice, equivocal use of term, 22, 23; nature of, not determined before century XVI., 22; absence of modern English works on, 23; universal characteristic of religion, 24; origin primæval, 24; institution not necessarily divine, 24; meaning primarily love, 25, in mediæval theology a sense of sin, 25; purpose of, practical religion, 27; expresses man's relation to God, 27; demands external worship, 27; chief act of public or external worship, 28; S. Augustine's definition of the "genus" of, 29; his treatment of, 29-31; S. Thomas' treatment of, 31, 32; its character and Authority, 32; God the only Authority in revealed religion, 33; demands external form, 33; propositions in regard to, by Dr. Schanz, 33, 34; idea of destruction not essential, shown by Latin, Greek, and Hebrew terms, 34, 35; S. Irenæus on, 36; definition of, by Dr. Schanz, 36, 37; S. Augustine, 37-41; Alexander of Hales, 41; S. Thomas Aquinas, 41; S. Isidore of Seville, 42, 189, 190; De Lugo, 42; Vasquez, 42-44; Gabriel Biel, 43; Alphonsus de Castro, 43; Suarez, 45; Dr. Scheeben, 45; recapitulation of ele-

ments, 46; how the Cross fulfils definition of, 47; terms used in Scripture describing our LORD'S Death as a Sacrifice, 48, 49; elements of, found in the Cross, 64; New Testament recognizes only one absolute Sacrifice, 145; definition of, by William of Auvergne, 199; by S. Thomas Aquinas, which changed the current of theological thought, 203, 204; this definition became true basis of treatment of Eucharistic Sacrifice, 203; different senses in which it is used 233.

Sacrifice of Cross, Milligan's treatment of, 6; only absolute Sacrifice, 47; five actions corresponding to those of Jewish Law, 49-54; every rite of Jewish Law fulfilled, 54; our LORD Priest and Victim in His Human Nature only, in His Divine Nature He receives the Sacrifice, 54-56; Socinus' theory as to its being a martyrdom discussed, 56-72; man's redemption accomplished by it, 68; passages in New Testament which refer man's redemption to the Cross, 69-71; Catholic Church teaches that upon the Cross our LORD offered His perfect Sacrifice, 71; recognized by both Protestants and Catholics as the only absolute Sacrifice, 80; Catholic teaching, 112; several theories of Modern school, 112, 113; examination of passages in Hebrews, 114-126; only absolute Sacrifice, as shown by Hebrews x., 134-136; all the sacrifices of the Law foreshadowed different aspects of, 138, 139; Scripture offers no support

Sacrifice of Cross—*Continued.*

for view that it is not a completed Sacrifice, 146; Thalhoffer's view orthodox, 231; his innovation, 231, 232; his authorities examined, 232-260.

Sacrifice, Eucharistic, difficulties in treatment of, 21; many departments of theology touch on, 23; method of treating the subject, 73; three views given by writers to be traced to century XVI., 73; support for each view, 74; Bossuet on essence of, 74; CHRIST both consecrates and offers, 74; consequence of the Real Presence, 75; Sacrifice of Cross renewed in, 75; does not take away from sufficiency of Sacrifice of Cross but depends entirely upon it, 75, 76; Consecration, essence of, 77; Protestant view of, as taught by Luther, and held by most Protestant bodies, 79, 80; Protestant view a reaction, modified in century XVII., 81; Mede's theory, 81; Dr. Hickeys', 82; Waterland's, 82; name discussed, 82; term "Anglican view" misleading, 82; term "Modern view" used in this book, 82; Brightman as exponent of Modern view, 83-88; his view very like that of Socinus, 89; difference between Catholic teaching and Modern view, 88-92; essential difference between Catholic and Modern views, 98, 99; Hebrews the battleground of Catholic and Modern views, 110; sketch of purpose and argument of Hebrews, III, 112; sum-

mary of Scripture teaching, 145; witness of liturgies, 148; no attempt to define it until century XVI., 178, 179; celebration of, restricted to bishops and priests, 180; treatment during middle period of the Church, 188; efficacy of, for souls in Purgatory taught by S. Gregory the Great, 189; frequency of, limited in century VI., increased century IX., 190; consecration of species, strange theory, 198; definition of, by William of Auvergne, 199; by Albert the Great, 199-201; S. Thomas' definition of, became basis of treatment of, 203; view taken by Duns Scotus directly opposed to that of S. Thomas, 204; theory popularly held in century XVI., 206; attributed to Catharinus, 206; he was not its author, 207; diversity of opinion at Council of Trent, 209, 210; in centuries XVI. and XVII., theologians who treated of this fall into three groups, 210; has received little attention in England since Reformation, 214; question as to whether the Fathers relate it to Sacrifice of Cross, 219; witness to Catholic view of, by Greek Fathers, 220: S. Irenæus, 220; S. Cyril of Jerusalem, 220; S. Gregory of Nyssa, 221, 224; S. Cyril of Alexandria, 221, 222; S. Chrysostom, 222-224; Thomassin, 223, 224; witness to Catholic view of, by Latin Fathers, 224: S. Cyprian, 224; S. Ambrose, 224, 225; S. Augustine, 225-227; Algerus of Liège, 227;

Sacrifice, Eucharistic—Cont.

S. Gregory the Great, 228; summary of passages from the Fathers in support of Catholic view, 228; only heavenly Sacrifice known to Algerus of Liège, 312; treated by Nicholas Cabasilas, century XIV., 332-337; Brightman claims that Anglican divines hold Modern view of, 339-340; view of Tractarians, 417, 418; writings on the subject confined to Pusey, Keble, and Forbes, 419; in *Tract 81*, Pusey's view stated, 419-424; in Sermon IV., 424-427; Keble's view, 428-434; his sermon No. XXXIX. of *Sermons for the Christian Year*, 428; Bp. Forbes' view in his *Primary Charge*, 435-439; in his *Theological Defence*, 419, 439-443; a passage in his sermon on Manasseh, 443, 444; review of his teaching, 444-448; result of examination of Tractarian position, 448, 449; no theory of mode is *de fide*, 452; some theories are *contra fidem* 453; four divisions of Modern view, three entirely orthodox, 453; theory of Cassander, 453; of Dr. Lepin, 454; of Dr. Scheeben, 454; of Dr. Schanz, 454; these differ from extreme Modern view, 454; opinion expressed on three points, 455; propositions *contra fidem* 456, 457; propositions not *contra fidem*, 457; explanation of propositions in their relation to Modern theories, 459-467; incidentally touched upon in Conference at Oxford, 1899, 516.

Sacrifices, Jewish, 35.
Sacrificial terms, Latin, 473, 474; Greek, 475-477; Hebrew, 478, 479.
Sadler, Rev. M. F., 18, 59, 97, 132, 361, 431.
"S. Sulpice," founded by Jean Jacques Olier, 317.
Salmanticenses, 212.
Salmeron, 78, 211.
Salmond, Dr., 515.
Sancroft, Alex., 342, 345.
Sanday, Dr., 515, 516, 527, 528, 533.
Scandret, J., 342, 361, 362.
Scannell, Wilhelm and, 16, 33, 50, 90.
Schanz, Dr., 16, 33, 34, 36, 37, 78, 214, 215, 454.
Scheeben, Dr., 16, 45, 78, 90, 214, 215, 454.
Schismatics, place of their writings, 12.
Scrivener, Matthew, 377.
Scudamore, Rev. W. E., 403.
Sergius, Pope, 194.
Sharp, John, Abp. of York, 381.
Sherlock, William, 385, 386.
Smith, 342
Socinus, Faustus, 12, 54, 56-72, 89, 111, 112, 245, 408-410, 412, 448, 459, 460, 480-491, 531, 532.
Socinus, Lælius, 408, 410.
Sparrow, Anthony, Bp. of Exeter, 374, 375.
"Sprinkling of the FATHER," expression attributed to S. Ivo of Chartres, 303.
Stentrup, Rev. F. A., 15, 64, 285.
Stephens, Robert, ed., 485.
"Stercorianism," 193.
Stillingfleet, Edward, Bp. of Worcester, 378, 379.
Strabo, Walafrid, 190-194, 196.
Suarez, 44, 45, 78, 204, 206, 207, 212, 214, 215.

- Supplices Te*, of Roman rite, referred to by Brightman, 156, 164; three points in this prayer, 166-168; peculiar interpretation of, in century IX., 169; Duchesne's view of, 169; theological difficulties of Modern interpretation, 170, 171; quotation from S. Irenæus, associated with this prayer, 171-174, 273, 280, 286, 295, 305, 306; B. Odo of Cambrai discusses this prayer, 280-285; verses by Hildebert of le Mans (or Tours), 307; treated by Hugo of S. Victor, 309, 310; treated by Algerus of Liège, 315, 316.
- T.
- Taylor, Jeremy, Bp. of Down and Connor, 215, 342, 346-349, 393, 395-397, 418, 433, 441, 452.
- Te Igitur*, exposition of this prayer by Hildebert of le Mans (or Tours), 308; comment of Algerus of Liège, 314.
- Tertullian, 184, 496.
- Tertullianus' *Adversus Judæos* (chap. xiv.), 492.
- Thalhofer, Dr., 15, 20, 119, 122, 142, 143-145, 156-159, 164, 172, 215, 230, 231, 234, 235, 245, 248-250, 255, 269-273, 275-282, 286, 307, 308, 311, 312, 315, 316, 329, 396.
- Theodoret, II, 55, 120, 147, 179, 188, 202, 261, 268, 451, 457, 512.
- Theological Defence*, by A. P. Forbes, Bp. of Brechin, 419, 439-443, 464.
- Theophylact, 120, 162, 202, 232.
- Thirlby, Bp. of Ely, 402.
- Thomas Aquinas, S., 31, 32, 41, 77, 178, 188, 194, 199, 202-204, 208, 209, 211.
- Thomas, Arnold, 515.
- Thomassin, 19, 184, 187, 223-224, 270, 317, 318, 320, 321-328, 331.
- Thorndyke, Herbert, 342, 357, 360, 378.
- Tigurini, 487.
- Tournely, G., 212.
- Towerson, Gabriel, 378.
- Tractarian school, quotations from various prominent writers of, repudiating Modern view, 93-96; men of, leaders of Catholic revival, 413; authority for views taken from the Fathers and Anglican divines of century XVII., 417; examination of the subject confined to Rev. Dr. Pusey, Rev. John Keble, and Bp. Forbes, 419; in *Tract 81* Pusey's view stated, 419-424; in Sermon IV., 424-427; Keble's view, 428-434; his sermon No. XXXIX., of *Sermons for the Christian Year*, 428; Bp. Forbes' view in his *Primary Charge*, 435-439; in his *Theological Defence*, 419, 439-443; a passage in his sermon on Manasseh, 443, 444; review of his teaching, 444-448; result of examination of Tractarian position, 448, 449.
- Tract 81 of Tracts for the Times*, by Dr. Pusey, examination of, 340-396; proves that there are no grounds for claiming that the Modern view is the Anglican position, 396; Pusey's view stated, 419-424; this Tract written by Pusey in 1838, 422.
- Transubstantiation, author of term probably S. Peter Damian, 179.

Trower, Bp. of Glasgow and Galloway, 434.
Tyrrell, Rev. G., S. J., 78.

U.

Unbloody Sacrifice, by John Johnson, 446.

V.

Vacant, Dr., 16, 17, 176, 184, 190, 209.
Varro, 474.
Vasquez, 42-44, 77, 81, 205-207, 211, 214.
Vergil, 474.
Via Media of Aristotle, 3, 414, of Cassander, a compromise between Rome and Protestantism, 402; between Romanism and Protestantism, not the teaching of the English Church, 414.

W.

Wace, Dr., 539, 540.

Wake, William, Abp. of Canterbury, 342, 384, 395.
Waterland, Archdeacon, 82, 357.
Watson, Thomas, Bp. of Lincoln, 402-406.
Wesaliensis, Arnold, 208.
Westcott, B. F., Bp. of Durham, 20, 21, 54, 97, 106, 113, 116, 119, 121, 122, 126, 135, 138, 147, 164, 265, 432, 433, 463, 476-478.
Wheatly, Charles, 342, 391.
White, Francis, Bp. of Ely, 369.
Wilberforce, S., Bp. of Oxford, 415.
Wilhelm and Scannell, 16, 33, 50, 90.
William of Auvergne, 198, 199, 203.
William of S. Thierry, 196.
Wilson, Archdeacon, 515.
Wilson, Thomas, Bp. of Sodor and Man, 342, 385, 395.
Winer, 129.
Wordsworth, 230, 247.
Worship, external, why needed, 27; religion demands, 27.

INDEX OF LATIN, GREEK, AND HEBREW WORDS.

LATIN.

Ad rem, 219.
Agnus Dei, 194.
Altare sublime, 173.
Anaphora, 299.
Ascensus, 291.
Aspergit, 293.
Beneficia, 411.
Christus patiens, 469.
Christus regnans, 469.
Communicantes, 201.
Confectio rei, 42.
Conficere rem, 44.
Contra fidem, 453.
De fide, 453.

Demutatio, 42.
Destructio, 42.
Disciplina arcani, 181.
Fecit, 293.
Hæc dona, 291.
Hæc munera, 291.
Hæc sancta sacrificio, 291.
Hanc aspersionem, 294.
Hic in imagine ibi in veritate, 250.
Humano modo, 213.
Imago, 251.
Immolandi, 301.
Immolare, 474.

Immolati, 293.
 Immolatio, 42.
 Immolatus, 367.
 Interveniens, 259.
 Juge sacrificium, 344.
 Lacuna, 252.
 Latria, 35.
 Litare, 474.
 Mactare, 473.
 Mactati, 301.
 Memento etiam Domine, 201,
 306.
 Missa Catechumenorum, 287.
 Missa Fidelium, 287.
 Modo cruento, 343.
 Nobis quoque peccatoribus,
 192.
 Obiter dictum, 42.
 Oblatio, 34.
 Offerrimus enim ei non quasi
 indigenti, 172.
 Passibile, 368.
 Peracti, 411.
 Per quem hæc omnia, 202.
 Per quem hæc omnia creas,
 298.
 Popa, or victimarius, 67.
 Pro-Anaphora, 299.
 Pro mactatione et occisione
 victimæ, 344.

Pura prece, 400.
 Quam oblationem, 169, 294.
 Qui pridie, 169.
 Quoad substantiam, 97.
 Reductio ad absurdum, 2.
 Reductio ad impossibile, 253.
 Sacrificare, 473.
 Sacrificator, 119.
 Sacrificii præparatio, 411.
 Sacrificium quo, 354.
 Sacrificium quod, 354.
 Sacrum facere, 33.
 Sanctus, 300.
 Status declivior, 212.
 Supplices Te, 160, 164.
 Suppressio veri, 92.
 Supra quæ, 169.
 Sursum corda, 300.
 Te Igitur, 300.
 Terminus ad quem, 529.
 Toto cælo, 96.
 Tradere, 487.
 Unde et memores, 169.
 Verum ac proprium sacri-
 ficium, 39.
 Veteres enim in hoc mystico
 Sacrificio, 354.
 Via media, 3.

GREEK.

ἀθθινή, 120.
 ἄμωμον, 54, 133.
 ἀναγκαῖον, 121.
 ἀναιμάκτη, 399.
 ἀνάμνησις, 152, 437, 444, 458.
 ἀναφέρειν, 475.
 ἄπαξ, 122, 129.
 ἄπαξ γὰρ ιερᾶσατο, 248.
 ἀρνίον ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, 520.
 γάρ, 108.
 διὰ, 123.
 διδόμενον, 349.
 εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, 105,
 521.

εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν, 117.
 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 116.
 ἐμφανισθῆναι, 441.
 ἐν, 129.
 ἐπουράνιος, 162, 173, 174.
 ἔρδειν, 475.
 ἐσφαγμένος, 160.
 ἐφάπαξ, 116, 129, 134, 410.
 ἔχομεν, 105.
 ἦν οἱ ἐστὶ, 121.
 θυσία, 399, 437, 475.
 θυσία εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, 439.
 θυσιαστήριον, 105, 173, 234.
 ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεωγμένη, 142.

ἱεραῖοι, 248.
ἱεροουργία, 399.
λατρεία, 399.
λατρεύειν, 477.
λειτουργεῖν, 476.
λειτουργία, 119, 399.
λειτουργός, 119.
λογική, 50.
μετά, 123.
μετὰ αἵματος, 128.
νοερόν, 159, 234.
οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, 128.
παρέδωκεν, 48, 487.
πεφανέρωται, 484.
πνευματικῆ, 50, 159.

ποιεῖν, 475.
πολίτευμα, 163.
προσενέγκη, 122, 133.
προσφέρειν, 122, 475.
προσφορά, 48.
συμφορά, 487.
σφάζειν, 35, 475.
τελείωσις, 36.
τί ἐστὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάμνησις, 334.
τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, 105.
ὑπερουράνιον, 159.
ψυχῆ, 36.
ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, 140.

HEBREW.

Âshâm, 48.
Azkârâh, 521.
Hizzâh, 127.
Minchâh, 102.
Muggâsh, 102.
Muqtâr, 102.

Nagâsh, 102.
Nâthan, 127.
Niggas, 48.
Qâtar, 102.
Zârak, 127.
Zebâch, 35.

INDEX OF TEXTS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

2 Chronicles, VII, 1, 53.
 Deuteronomy, IV, 24, 53.
 Exodus, III, 2, 53; X, 25, 479; XII, 3, 6, 8, 14, 101;
 XVIII, 12, 512; XXVIII, 29, 376; XXIX, 36, 37, 460;
 XXX, 10, 126.
 Ezekiel, I, 2, 34, 323.
 Genesis, I, 1, 283; IV, 3, 5, 478; XIV, 8, 505; XXXII, 14, 19,
 21, 478.
 Isaiah, VI, 6, 157; LIII, 12, 48, 425.
 Jeremiah, IX, 1, 298.
 I. Kings, V, 1, 478.
 II. Kings, XVII, 4, 478.

- Leviticus, I, 3, 4, 19, 49; 5, 127, 479; 9, 127; II, 1, 4, 5, 6, 478; III, 1, 101, 479; 2, 127; 2, 8, 479; 3-6, 8-11, 127; IV, 5-7, 51; 5-8, 462; 6, 127; 7, 9, 127; 10, 479; 24, 29, 33, etc., 479; 30, 127; VII, 2, 127; 15, 101; IX, 24, 53; XVI, 133; 4, 125; 6, 441; 13, 14, 242; 16, 20, 126; 18, 19, 462; 33, 460; XVII, 11, 35; XXIV, 7, 521.
- Malachi, I, 2, 102.
- Numbers, XIX, 133.
- Proverbs, IX, 1, 496.
- Psalms, XXI, 507; XXXIII, 6, 283, 507; XXXIX, 508; XL, 7, 478; LXII, 3, 512; LXV, 13, 323; CIV, 4, 262; 24, 283; CIX, 4, 512; CX, 519; 4, 114; CXL, 504.
- I. Samuel, XIII, 12, 356.
- II. Samuel, VIII, 2, 6, 478.
- Zephaniah, III, 10, 510.
- Acts, II, 3, 53; III, 15, 55; XIII, 2, 476; 33, 519; XX, 28, 55.
- Colossians, I, 15, 183; 19, 20, 125, 294; 21, 22, 71; III, 1, 163.
- I. Corinthians, II, 8, 55; V, 7, 48, 101, 529; XI, 24-26, 91, 104, 105, 108, 145, 528; XIII, 12, 253; XV, 53, 331.
- II. Corinthians, III, 6, 490; V, 14, 15, 69; 18, 20, 457; 21, 48; IX, 12, 477.
- Ephesians, II, 6, 163; 16, 70; V, 2, 48, 53, 181, 529; 2, 25, 69, 70; 7, 181; XX, 2, 181.
- Galatians, I, 4, 487; II, 20, 69, 487; V, 21, 257.
- Hebrews, I, 3, 113, 410; 14, 36; II, 14, 15, 71; 17, 519; III, 1, 163; IV, 14, 410; V, 7, 82; 7-10, 519; 5-10, 519; VI, 4, 163; 20, 324, 519; VII, 15, 25, 528; 24, 410; 25, 428; 26, 410; 27, 123, 129, 528; 28, 519; VIII, 2, 477; 2, 3, 519; 3, 121, 411; 4, 410; 5, 160; 6, 477; IX, 7, 442, 486; 8, 51; 9, 10, 36; 10, 123; 12, 129, 410; 12, 14, 528; 12, 24, 125; 12, 26-28, 528; 13, 14, 480; 14, 54, 321; 14, 25, 123; 20, 373; 21, 477; 21, 22, 460; 22, 131; 24, 240; 26, 129, 336, 529; 28, 122, 336; X, 1, 111; 2, 490; 4-9, 61, 62; 5, 141, 410; 5-7, 65; 5, 7, 9, 10, 410; 10, 129; 11, 477; 11, 14, 134; 12, 142, 525, 529; 12, 14, 528; 12, 14, 18, 528; 19, 123; XII, 2, 9; 22-24, 58, 96; 29, 321; XIII, 10, 105, 420; 12, 71; 15, 82.
- John, S., I, 4, 283; 29, 36, 528; II, 1, 2, 238; III, 14, 15, 69; 16, 53; 24, 262; 34, 293; IV, 34, 60; V, 6, 484; VI, 27, 65, 141; 51, 104, 528; 53, 297; 56, 200; VIII, 5, 485;

- X, 9, 52; II, 15, 18, 70; 17, 18, 66; XI, 25, 278; XII, 26, 297; 32, 8; XIV, 6, 52; XV, 1, 39; 13, 70, 107; XVI, 13, 8; XVII, 528; 1, 291; 2, 292; 19, 331; 24, 297; XIX, 30, 60; XX, 19, 60; 22, 23, 61.
- I. John, S., I, 2, 125; 7, 125; II, 1, 2, 49; III, 5, 484; 16, 70; IV, 10, 49.
- Luke, S., I, 23, 476; II, 34, 278; XI, 30, 278; XII, 49, 53, 239; XXII, 19, 528; 19, 20, 104, 105; XXIII, 45, 52; XXIV, 51, 118.
- Mark, S., VII, 11, 478; X, 45, 528; XIV, 22, 24, 104; 22-24, 528; XV, 38, 52.
- Matthew, S., I, 4, 505; V, 23, 420; VII, 6, 181; IX, 13, 38; XVI, 526; XVIII, 10, 167, 282; XX, 28, 36, 70, 528; XXII, 41, 116; XXVI, 26, 116; 26, 28, 104; 26-28, 528; 29, 183, 243; 39, 49; XXVII, 20, 296; 25, 296; 51, 52; XXVIII, 18, 61, 136.
- I. Peter, S., I, 19, 50; II, 5, 82, 382; 9, 240, 258; 24, 70; III, 18, 70, 528; 18, 19, 60.
- Philippians, II, 8, 9, 9, 71; 17, 476, 488; 25, 477; 30, 477; III, 20, 163; IV, 18, 488.
- Revelation, V, 6, 140, 531; VI, 10, 245; VIII, 3, 157.
- Romans, I, 4, 519; 5, 14, 476; III, 25, 49, 238; V, 6, 8, 70; 10, 70; VI, 4, 330; 10, 528; VIII, 32, 70, 487; 34, 267, 373, 528; XIII, 6, 476; XV, 16, 476; 27, 477.

Catholic Faith and Practice

A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY

Part I.

BY THE REV. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. MARK'S, PHILADELPHIA

Author of "Helps to Meditation," "The Seven Last Words of Our Most Holy Redeemer," etc.

Small 8vo, cloth, pp. XLVI-340, 7s. 6d.

CONTENTS: Chap. I.—God. II.—The Creation and Fall of the Angels. III.—The Creation and Fall of Man. IV.—The Incarnation. V.—The Atonement. VI.—The Church. VII.—The Origin of the Church's Doctrine. VIII.—Grace and the Sacraments in General. IX.—Baptism. X.—Confirmation. XI.—The Sacrament of Penance. XII.—Sin and Self-Examination. XIII.—Conditions required for Penitence. XIV.—The Holy Eucharist.—As a Sacrament. XV.—The Holy Eucharist.—The Real Presence. XVI.—The Holy Eucharist.—The Sacrifice. XVII.—The Holy Eucharist.—The Communion. XVIII.—The Liturgy. XIX.—Prayer. XX.—The Rule of Life. Index.

Opinions of the Press

"Any work from the pen of Dr. Mortimer is sure of a cordial welcome. . . . He has already laid us under many obligations, but we do not think that any of his works, not excepting the valuable *Meditations*, will prove of greater or more permanent value than the one now under notice. . . . It is a systematic outline of dogmatic theology, based upon, by no means blindly following, Western theology as formulated by St. Thomas Aquinas; scholarly, concise, and written in a clear and luminous style. . . . the manual, as a whole, seems to us of the highest value. It pursues no phantoms of modern speculation, but appeals throughout to conservative theologians of repute. It will supply the need of those intelligent lay folk who desire some manual more detailed than *The Catholic Religion*; and we can imagine no work more useful to the student who desires to have before him at the beginning of his theological course an accurate outline of which his after-reading will fill in and complete the details."—*The Church Times*.

"We can highly commend it for parish libraries as a little encyclopædia of the main points of Catholic doctrine. . . . The chapter on the origin of the Church's doctrine is quite a little compendium of Christian philosophy, and is certainly very excellent. We want in England, as well as in America, to give some reasons for the faith that is in us. Thoughtful men often ask the clergy for the basis of their doctrine: "Why is it so?" This is not merely cavilling, but a search for an intellectual basis of belief. In this book certainly (although very briefly), we have this basis cleverly stated. . . . The chapter on Baptism is interesting and full, but not nearly so long as those dealing with the Holy Eucharist. Between Baptism and the Eucharistic chapters there are thoughtful chapters on Confirmation and Penance, as preparations for a worthy reception. The information given as to the forms of Confirmation in divers churches and on the seven-fold gifts of the Spirit is very valuable. . . . The chapter on the Liturgy is full of valuable information lucidly expressed. . . . This is a most valuable book, lucid, Catholic, simple, and thoughtful, and is one of the most important recent contributions to theology that we have had from the other side of the Atlantic."—*The Church Review*.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

Works by the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. MARK'S, PHILADELPHIA

- Catholic Faith and Practice: A Manual of Theology.**
In two parts. Crown 8vo. Part I., pp. xlvi-340, 7*s.* 6*d.*
Part II., pp. lxi-519 9*s.*
- The Seven Last Words of Our Most Holy Redeemer,**
with Meditations on some Scenes in His Passion. Crown
8vo 5*s.*
- Jesus and the Resurrection.** Thirty Addresses for Good
Friday and Easter. Crown 8vo 5*s.*
- Helps to Meditation: Sketches for Every Day in the Year.**
Vol. I. Advent to Trinity. 8vo 7*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. II. Trinity to Advent. 8vo 7*s.* 6*d.*
- Sermons in Miniature for Extempore Preachers:**
Sketches for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian
Year. Crown 8vo 6*s.*
- Notes on the Seven Penitential Psalms, Chiefly from**
Patristic Sources. Small 8vo 3*s.* 6*d.*
- Learn of Jesus Christ to Die:** Addresses on the Words of
Our Lord from the Cross, taken as Teaching the Way of
Preparation for Death. 16mo 2*s.*
- The Laws of Happiness; or, The Beatitudes as Teaching**
Our Duty to God, Self, and Our Neighbour. 18mo, 2*s.*
- The Laws of Penitence:** Addresses on the Words of Our
Lord from the Cross. 18mo 1*s.* 6*d.*
- Stories from Genesis:** Sermons for Children. Crown
8vo 4*s.*
- The Way of Progress:** 32mo, sewed, 2*d.*; or 8*s.* 4*d.*
per 100.
- The Way of Penitence.** 32mo, sewed, 2*d.*; or 8*s.* 4*d.*
per 100.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

Symbols 630 462

BV

Mortimer

825

The eucharistic

.M67

sacrifice

110475

BV

825

.M67

