

HEARING MASS

AND

OTHER CUSTOMS

CONSIDERED

BY THE

REV. A. H. HOSMER, M.A.

LONDON:

JOSEPH MASTERS, 78, NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCLXX.

ERRATA.

Page 24, line 3, for also *read* always.

„ „ 30, for phase *read* phrase.

Page 27, „ 8, for of all *read* all of.

„ „ 31, insert as that *after* gloss.

Page 48, „ 45, for conciliation *read* reconciliation.

HEARING MASS,

ETC.

We cannot but admit that opinions and practices have spread abroad among us, in regard to the Holy Eucharist, which are somewhat startling and which seem to require some consideration as to whether they are really opinions and practices sanctioned or not by the Church of England. By those who adopt and maintain them, they seem to be oftentimes regarded as tests of Catholicity, so that we read and hear, "Catholics practise this" or "believe that," and find that the "this" or "that" is not some article of the Catholic faith, but some usage which has, or has had, more or less prevalence in the Church, and which commends itself to the speaker's mind. A man may hold fully the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, so that there is not an ancient Liturgy which he could not use, and yet may find himself regarded by such persons as very unworthy the name of Catholic, because there are certain customs which he does not observe—customs, possibly, very desirable and Catholic in themselves, but the observance of which is not bound up inseparably with the Catholic faith; customs possibly, on the other hand, neither desirable nor Catholic, except to the minds of those who observe them; yet in either case often maintained with a narrow-minded uncharitableness and arrogance, which would make one the rather inclined to avoid them out of sheer disgust at the advocacy associated with them. And this all the more, because frequently it is joined with an utter disregard of other customs quite as Catholic and fundamental, or even more so. For instance, the parochial system is spoken of as antiquated and inelastic by Catholics, who find it a hindrance to their self-willed ways. Bishops, who fall short of this self-styled Catholicity, meet with sarcasms or a sneering compassion, and in their persons their office is treated with disrespect. The Church herself, I mean that part of it to which we belong, and which is to us the representative of the Church Catholic, fares but little better. Carefulness in observing her rules is stigmatised as Anglicanism; and for an English Churchman to be styled Anglo-Catholic is with

meet with laws and customs of ancient and universal observance which were observed in the Ante-Reformation period, but which, in these later centuries, have become almost, or altogether, obsolete amongst us, and concerning which the Post-Reformation Church is silent. It is easy to cut the knot either way, and to say, on the one hand, that we have nothing to do with things belonging to a system that has been discarded; or on the other hand, that ancient laws not repealed are still in force. There is truth in both remarks. Unquestionably many laws and customs have become virtually repealed or obsolete, owing to the change in our ecclesiastical system, and it would be an anachronism to restore them, however much of good we might see in them. Many, again, are clearly customs of neither local nor temporary interest, but thoroughly Catholic in their use and equally suited to all times; but against the revival of which may be urged the plea of long prescription—a plea which can never be wholly disregarded, but the full force of which must depend on the amount of importance and authority belonging to the custom.

Amongst such customs is that of receiving the Holy Communion fasting—a custom which has never wholly died out amongst us, but which for the multitude of communicants has become obsolete, and which is now being restored wherever possible by those who regard it as of grave importance. No one can deny its Catholicity or its fitness as a mark of reverence towards the Holy Mysteries; but many may answer, and answer justly, “It is more than we are equal to, it hinders our devotion through exhaustion, it unfits us for other spiritual duties, or even for temporal duties, by injuring our health and strength.” And these are real objections which cannot be overlooked; still less can they be crushed without grievous uncharitableness and injustice. They are the more difficult to meet, owing to the late hour at which Communion generally takes place and the long Service which precedes it; and I do not know of any law in our Church to which appeal can be made, later than A.D. 960, in which Communion is ordered to be made fasting. It is a question of Catholic custom rather than of law. It may be said in partial answer to the objections given above, that there may be an early Celebration for communicants; but again, it may be said that this will not meet the case, as in most places there can be no justification for two celebrations in one day; and, moreover, if the early Celebration is not the chief Celebration there may be felt a well-founded objection to communicating then. The most suitable way would be to revert to the old custom—which is, in fact, as Catholic as the custom of fasting—of having the Celebration, or the chief Celebration at an hour, neither too late nor too early. Nine o'clock is the canonical hour, says Bishop Sparrow in his *Rationale*, that is, by Catholic custom, for I know of no Canon in our Church specifying the hour. Van

Espen (*Jus Eccles. Univ.*, Pars II. Tit. V. Cap. ii. xi., &c.) mentions that it was ordered by a Synod of Mechlin that the High Mass should be at a convenient hour for the people, and at eight or nine o'clock, according to the season. And in Sec. viii. he quotes Gratian, who gives nine o'clock as the canonical hour. Renaudot, in his *Observations on the Syrian Liturgies*, says, that the hour of Celebration is about the third hour; but adds, as in explanation, "octavâ matutinâ, more nostro." Bingham (*Book XIII. chap. ix. xi.*), speaking of the ordinary prayers at the third hour, or nine o'clock, adds, "But on festivals this Service was omitted, because on Sundays the Communion Service was used, which always began at this hour." By reverting to this hour as much as possible, many who desire to communicate fasting, but are now unable to do so, would find their difficulty removed; and that, without resorting to the objectionable method of communicating at some other celebration. If, however, another celebration should be necessary for persons really unable to attend the chief, it might be made later in the day. It might even be made for them, if necessary, at an earlier hour, provided care were taken that no others were thereby drawn away from Communion at the principal celebration, and that celebrations were not unnecessarily multiplied beyond the real exigencies of the communicants. The great point to be aimed at is, to have the principal celebration at an hour when all could come to it, and when all those who desired to communicate fasting could do so. That all would be able to do so, could hardly be expected even then; whilst many would be, for a time at least, unable to see the need of a custom to which they were wholly unused, whatever might be their belief in the Blessed Sacrament and their reverence for the Presence of the LORD. They might quite feel the impropriety of eating immediately before coming to that holy Sacrament, or of indulging themselves with abundant food, or with anything likely to hinder devotion or to distract their thoughts, and yet be wholly unable to see the objection to taking what they would call necessary sustenance with a decent interval of time before participation. To some of these the celebration of the one, or the chief Service at an earlier hour, would be an assistance towards adopting a system of fasting. Many, however, under any circumstances would still prefer the later celebration; in which case, the long precedent Service is an advantage, as involving a kind of preparation for Communion.

It may be as well to say a few more words on this subject, because no Catholic-minded Christian would willingly fail in anything which could show reverence towards the Holy Eucharist, or willingly and needlessly break a law or custom of the Church. Fasting before receiving the Holy Communion is, beyond all question, a custom observed throughout the Church from the earliest times, for the special purpose of showing a greater veneration

tion for the sacred Mysteries. Amongst our own writers, Bingham says that it was the general custom of the Church. Bishop Sparrow, in the "Rationale," "Till the Service was ended men were persuaded to be fasting." Bishop Taylor ("Worthy Communicant," vii. 1), "It is the custom of the Church, of great antiquity and proportionable regard, that every Christian that is in health should receive the Blessed Sacrament fasting. It was therefore very reasonable that the Church took up this custom, and, therefore, they who causelessly do prevaricate it shall bear their own burden, and are best reprov'd in S. Paul's words, 'We have no such custom,' &c." He also speaks of the custom in the "Holy Living" (iv. v. 1, 14), and in the "Life of CHRIST." (Part II. xii. xiii.)

There is no Canon or order on the subject in our Church since the Reformation; but there was in olden time, as the 36th Canon of 960 A.D. in King Edgar's reign. Anyway, however, it was the ancient custom of the Church, so that, to use the words of the late Archdeacon Wilberforce, "The custom of rendering them this mark of respect, which had prevailed at least as early as the second century, was so universal in the time of S. Augustine, that he ascribes it to Apostolic authority." S. Augustine's words (Ep. cxviii. ad Januar.) are, "It pleased the HOLY SPIRIT that for the honour of so great a Sacrament the Body of the LORD should enter a Christian's mouth before any other food, therefore is the custom observed throughout the whole world;" and a little further on, quoting S. Paul's words, "the rest will I set in order when I come," he refers the custom of fasting to that whole order which S. Paul then established. The African Church made the custom into a law, for it was ordered by the 29th Canon of the Third Council of Carthage, that the Communion should be received only by those fasting. I specify this Canon because it became the 41st of that African Code which was afterwards received generally by the Church. The object of the custom is given in the passage quoted by S. Augustine. The same reason, and also another—viz., to avoid any profanation from sickness—are given by S. Thomas Aquinas, ("Summa Theol.," Pars III. Quæst. lxxx. Art. viii.) and by Cabassutius ("Juris Canon. Theor. et Prax." III. v. vii.) But I have nowhere seen a reason which is sometimes put forward amongst ourselves, and which seems to involve a very gross and unspiritual, not to say revolting, notion of the sacred Presence, according to which, six hours at least ought to elapse after eating before communicating, so that all previous food may be digested—a reason which would be worthy of those who forced on Berengarius his confession of faith. The great reason is that given by S. Augustine; and accordingly, throughout the Roman Church the rule is as stated by Aquinas and Cabassutius, (*loc. cit.*) to eat nothing after midnight, for food then taken would hinder

Communion for the whole day ; whereas food taken before midnight is no hindrance, however early may be the hour of reception. Aquinas gives this as the Roman rule, stating that others reckon from other times, as mid-day, evening, or sunrise. Renaudot, in his *Observations on the Syrian Liturgies* ("Lit. Orient." Vol. II. 49) says that the Syrian priests, when about to celebrate, fast from the evening before, at least abstaining from wine or anything that could try the head : and in Vol. I. 267 in his *Commentary on the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil*, he quotes various rules, by some of which abstinence is enjoined from previous sunset in case of early Communion, by others from midnight, by others in case of grave infirmity from sunrise. The custom in the ancient Church appears to have been, except when in times of persecution they were obliged to celebrate before day, to preface the Lord's Day on greater festivals with assemblies and vigils lasting through the night, and then to communicate at the celebration, which took place at nine o'clock. (Bingham, XIII. ix. 1.)

Such, then, was the authority of the custom and the object of it, and neither to be lightly regarded ; yet I think not to be made such a burden as that it must be bound on all, and not to be so strictly observed as to defeat its own object. There is, beyond all doubt, a tendency to this extreme stringency ; and with some it would appear as if they thought it the deadliest sin they could commit if they were to break through the rule. There can be little devotion gained, or little honour done to the Lord's Body, when those who come to the celebration are so wearied or exhausted that their minds wander, and they can scarcely realize what they are doing or what receiving ; or when they thereby injure their health, or unfit themselves for all other duties, spiritual or earthly, which God has given them to do. In suchlike cases the observance of the custom appears to become almost a superstition, defeating its very end, or rather putting itself into the first place, and the object for which it is instituted in the second ; and it looks like a *reductio ad absurdum* when persons, otherwise fit to receive, but unable to fast, think it better to go without the Holy Eucharist altogether, and that, even when in such a state of health that death might overtake them any day. Yet there are such cases. However, I will not rest this matter on my own unsupported opinion.

The late Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his work on the Eucharist, says, "The necessity of administering the Holy Eucharist to the sick renders it impossible to observe this rule where the consecrated Elements are not reserved ; and hence, perhaps, as well as from the length of the Morning Service, the comparative disuse of this primitive usage among ourselves."¹ Bishop Taylor in the "Worthy

¹ Even the purpose of communicating the sick is not allowed as a reason in the Roman Church for a priest to celebrate not fasting. So Cabassutius asserts

Communicant," as cited above, adds, "But sick people and the weak are as readily to be excused in this thing as the Apostles were by CHRIST in the case before mentioned. For necessity and charity are to be preferred before such ceremonies and circumstances of address." It is worth while to see the whole passage and to compare it with the "Life of CHRIST" and the "Holy Living" in the passages already referred to above. Bingham (Book XV. vii. 8) quotes passages of S. Chrysostom, in which that saint speaks of having been accused of giving the Communion to persons not fasting, and also of having baptized when not fasting. He speaks of both these things alleged against him in that strong rhetorical manner so habitual to him; but it should be observed that he speaks of both faults alleged in the same strong manner, and ends up with saying: "If he had done these things, then let him who would depose him for them, depose S. Paul, who baptized a whole family after supper;¹ nay, let them depose our LORD Himself, Who gave the first Sacrament to His disciples after supper." On which, Bingham remarks, "This shows the custom of the Church was to administer both Sacraments before eating; though, at the same time, it intimates that to do otherwise was not an unpardonable crime." Similarly, at the end of the same section, remarking on S. Cyprian's dispute with the Aquarians, he says: "He would not so easily have passed over the practice of the Aquarians, in celebrating in the evening, had there been no instances of like meaning in the Church."

There was the custom, mentioned by Socrates, of the Egyptian Churches and those in the Thebais communicating on Saturdays after eating. And again, S. Augustine speaks of the custom in the African Church of celebrating once a year, on Holy Thursday, after supper—a custom sanctioned by that 29th Canon of the Third Council of Carthage, to which I have already referred as having been confirmed by a subsequent Council and taken into the African Code, accepted by the Church. Subsequently, the Trullan Council, in its 29th Canon, refers to this African Canon and the custom which it sanctions, and forbids it for the

(*loc. cit.*), who says that a sick man *in extremis*, not fasting, may communicate, and ought to do so by the Divine command, which overrules the Church's law; but then he says also, a priest, if not fasting, may not celebrate in order that the sick man may receive, notwithstanding the Divine command; and he labours hard to show how GOD's commands are not so absolutely given in such cases but that they may yield to circumstances. His argument is hardly satisfactory, and I think that any one wishing to see what the too scrupulous observance of such a law as we are now considering may lead to in the way of casuistry, may find it in that Cap. V. of the 8rd part of Cabassutius, Sec. vii. 2—11.

¹ Mr. Bright in his History of the Church, page 243, says: "He is referring to the Paschal Baptisms, which were immediately followed by the celebration," implying, I suppose, that the objection to eating was on account of the celebration. I have not this part of S. Chrysostom's works at hand, but I do not see how this explanation is consistent with his reference to the conduct of S. Paul.

future; not, however, on the ground of such a custom being inconsistent with a due reception of the Holy Eucharist, but on the ground that the Lenten fast ought not to be broken on that day, and so the whole fast be dishonoured. The words used are those of the 50th of the Laodicean Canons, also forming part of the Church's Code, which Canon itself would appear to indicate the existence in Asia of a custom similar to that in Africa. The position of this 50th Canon in the midst of others (49, 51, 52) forbidding the oblation, the observance of martyrs' days, and marriages in Lent, gives probability to the idea that it was directed against such a custom, so that it is explained by a comparison with the African Canon. I mention all these instances as showing that, however general the custom was of communicating fasting, yet there were exceptions under one pretext or another, indicative that it was not universally considered as absolutely necessary to observe it. What, in fact, was its origin? Ecclesiastical, possibly Apostolical; certainly not Divine. It formed no part of the original institution, and there is not a word about it in Holy Scripture; but it claims obedience as an ecclesiastical law, and, if S. Augustine judges rightly, as an Apostolical ordinance.

Now, this latter claim, though by no means certain, is not altogether improbable; for it may be said, How came it to pass that the custom was so early observed over nearly the whole Church? On the other hand, it might be that the Jewish custom, of fasting until after their services were ended, was introduced into the Christian Church by the Jewish converts in various places; especially if the Apostles themselves had in some places, as S. Paul at Corinth, seen fit to order the observance. Archdeacon Wilberforce evidently hesitates to assent to S. Augustine's opinion, and to assign it Apostolical authority, only venturing to assert that it "had prevailed at least as early as the second century." But let us, for the argument's sake, take S. Augustine's account of the matter and regard it as an Apostolical institution, as part of the order which S. Paul said that he would institute at Corinth when he came. It follows, in this case, that the custom was not originally ordered by the Apostles, but only after a time when they saw it to be a safeguard against irreverence. Next, S. Paul, when writing to the Corinthians and upbraiding them for their irreverence, does not even then give this precept. He is still willing to let it wait until he comes, that is, for more than a year. What we find, then, is, that it was a custom not essential to a due reverence for the Holy Eucharist—one which Churches have thought themselves at liberty to dispense with under certain circumstances, as the African and Egyptian Churches; and one the obligation of which upon ourselves, as members of the English Church, is doubtful. No priest could be sustained in an attempt to enforce it, and no one could be repelled from the Communion

on account of it, because its obligation upon us is not that of ecclesiastical law, but of ecclesiastical custom. I say this, not as in any way desiring to hinder the growth among us of a Catholic custom and fitting reverence towards the Holy Mysteries, but to relieve the consciences of those who find themselves unable to conform to it, and to hinder the tendency which there is to bind it as a burden on the souls of all, however little some may be able to bear it. They may, at all events, rest in the words of Bishop Taylor which I quoted a little way back.

As regards the other matters about which I desire to say something, I think we shall find that the Church herself has spoken with sufficient plainness. It may be as well to state at once what these matters are, and what it is which I hope to prove. In the first place then—

1. That the Church of England allows but one Altar in a church.

2. That on this Altar (as a general rule) she allows but one celebration on the same day.

3. That where this rule is relaxed, it is solely with regard to great festivals and the exigencies of communicants.

4. That where there is a second celebration to meet the need of those who cannot come to the chief Service, it is for such alone; all others being intended to communicate at the chief Service.

5. That she recognises no separation of worship from Communion, nor is her Service a Service of adoration, (except as an accessory) or of any private devotion; but the public and common Service of the Church, in which she expects all those who are present at the celebration on any day to communicate on that day, unless they are in the position of penitents.

In the next place, that in all these points she is perfectly at one with the Ancient Church.

At the outset a difficulty meets us; because, what may be called the Reformation period was a time of unsettled opinions and continual changes, and one, regarding which it is difficult to fix upon any particular year as a starting point; for nothing can be more idle and untrue than to say that the Post-Reformation and the Ante-Reformation Church are two Churches, or that there is some one definite year in which we can say that the great change was made once for all. As, however, some point of departure must necessarily be fixed upon, I have thought it best to start from the questions debated by the bishops and doctors preparatory to the arrangements of the "Order of Communion," the first important change which took place in the Eucharistic Service. A careful consideration of the questions proposed and considered by the bishops, with the answers given, will throw much light on many things that were done and phrases that were used subsequently; and it must be borne in mind that these things

were said and done, not only by bishops who were of the Protestantising party in the Church, but by those whose Catholic views concerning the Holy Eucharist are undoubted. The questions and answers are far too long to be given in full, but they may be read in Collier's *Eccles. Hist.*, Part II. Book iv. 243—6.

Question 3 is, "What is the Oblation and the Sacrifice of CHRIST in the Mass?" To which Cranmer's answer is, It "is not so called because CHRIST, indeed, is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and people, for that was done but once by Himself upon the Cross; but it is so called because it is a memory and representation of that very true Sacrifice and Immolation which before was made upon the Cross."

The answer is remarkable, because it is strictly in accordance with the answer given by S. Thomas Aquinas (III. lxxxiii. i.), and by the oratorian canonist, Cabassutius (III. iv.); and still more closely by Peter Lombard (lib. iv. dist. xii. 7), "That which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called the Sacrifice and Oblation, because it is the memory and representation of the true Sacrifice and sacred immolation made on the Altar of the Cross. CHRIST once died, and was immolated on the Cross in Himself; but He is daily immolated in the Sacrament, because in the Sacrament is made a remembrance of that which was done once." Cabassutius also quotes Vasquez with approval, to show how the Blessed Eucharist is the only true representation, commemoration, or memory; because, to be truly commemorative there must be one and the *same* offering in the memory and in the Sacrifice commemorated. In the Institution, the memory was by anticipation; in the Eucharist, it is by retrospection; the one continual and perpetual memory of the one Sacrifice on the Cross. Some bishops declare themselves much as Cranmer, others express themselves in different language; Doctors Cox and Taylor alone lower the Oblation to prayer, thanksgiving, and the remembrance of our SAVIOUR'S PASSION.

Question 4 is, "Wherein consists the Mass by CHRIST'S institution?" The answer being, in those things mentioned in S. Matth. xxvi., S. Mark xiv., S. Luke xxii., 1 Cor. x. 11, Acts ii., to which the Archbishop of York adds S. John vi.; but Cox and Taylor answer, "in the *distribution* of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in memory of His Passion," which is, I suppose, an explanation of that part of their previous answer, "the remembrance of our SAVIOUR'S PASSION," and is, of course, only part of the truth. So again, Peter Lombard (*loc. cit.* v. 6), "'Hoc facite,' &c., that is, in memory of My Passion and Death. For as Ambrose saith, 'Because we are freed by the Death of CHRIST we ought to make remembrance of this in eating and drinking His Body and Blood.'" This is very similar to a passage of S. Basil, quoted hereafter, and in Appendix, note E.

I will now go back to the 1st Question, "Whether the Sacrament of the Altar was instituted to be received of one man for another, or of every man for himself?" Where they all agree in affirming the latter half and denying the former.

The 2nd Question is, "Whether the receiving of one man does avail and profit any other?" To which Cranmer, Ferrars (Bishop of S. David's), Cox, and Taylor say, "No." Most agree that it only profits another, as all good works done by one profit the whole body in virtue of unity. Bush (Bishop of Bristol) holds the celebration profitable to receivers and the whole Church. The Bishop of Carlisle appears to think that the act of the receiver concerns only himself, but that the *offering and distribution* of the Holy Sacrament by the common minister of the Church is beneficial to present and absent, living and dead; another remarkable view which must be borne in mind, especially as coming from a Bishop whose doctrine appears to have been the highest possible concerning the Holy Eucharist, and the growth of which may explain the new arrangement of the Liturgy a few years later, when the consecration and Communion were so closely associated together, with the Prayer of Oblation placed after them both, as though it were meant to make the memorial by offering the Sacrifice and by feasting upon it before God; and together with this whole act of worship to offer up prayers and intercessions and thanksgivings. We may compare with this view a collect, *post Nomina*, in one of the ancient Gallican liturgies ("Missale Gallicanum," Missa xxvi.), "The names of the offerers having been heard, beloved brethren, let us supplicate Almighty God that He would pour His heavenly grace of Divine odour on this oblation, which we offer in commemoration of our Lord's Resurrection; that the reception of the Blessed Body and the communion of the sacred cup may help the dead for rest, and profit the living for salvation." The latter part of this prayer, of course, is that to our present purpose; but I give the prayer entire, as an example of two things which will come into consideration presently—1, the manner in which, in the Gallican liturgies as in our own, the intercession is joined with the first oblation of Bread and Wine; 2, the close connection that there is between this offering and the more solemn oblation when the same Bread and Wine have been consecrated. There is a curious paragraph in the third of the Constitutions of Othobon, A.D. 1268, in which he speaks of a church being dedicated, "That there may be in it a Table at which the living Bread, which came down from Heaven, is eaten by way of intercession for the quick and dead."

Now, if this view, as put forth by the Bishop of Carlisle, were taken, we can easily see why the prayer for acceptance of the "sacrifice of praise," together with the intercession for the whole Church, would follow after Consecration and Communion; and it might appeal for support, with some plausibility, to some other

ancient liturgies, where there seems to be an indiscriminate use of the phrases, "tremendous and unbloody *Sacrifice*," as in S. James's Liturgy; or "reasonable and unbloody *Service*," (*λατρειαν*), as in S. Mark's and S. Chrysostom's; or both combined, "reasonable sacrifice and unbloody *Service*," (*Ministerium, Renaudot*), as in the Coptic Liturgy of S. Cyril, in which the phrase, "Service" or "Ministry" might be meant to include the whole, and not the Oblation only, and is coupled with, and followed by, prayer and intercession; as in S. Mark's, where it is instantly followed by the great Intercessory Prayer: and S. Chrysostom's, where it is followed first by the Invocation, then by the Intercession.

Questions 5 and 6 are, "What time the accustomed order first began in the Church, that the priest alone should receive the Sacrament?" and "Whether it be convenient that the same custom should continue in this realm?" There is a difference of opinion as to the time, Cranmer thinking "it began not within six or seven hundred years after CHRIST;" Ridley giving it an earlier date; the general opinion being that it came from the decay of fervour and devotion in the people—Tunstal, of Durham, explaining, that at first the people communicated every day, then thrice a week, then only on Sundays, and at more distant intervals as devotion grew languid. Cranmer and Ridley are for reviving the primitive usage as founded on Scripture, and declare against solitary Communion, (which, by the bye, must not be confounded with solitary Masses,) the other bishops, and even Dr. Cox, determine the other way, wishing that some should always communicate with the priest; but thinking it better, if they will not, that he should communicate alone, which was the rule established and wish expressed a few years afterwards by the Council of Trent, or rather the Council of Trent spoke much more strongly regarding Communion; for in the very chapter (VI. Sess. xxii.) in which it defends the communion of the priest only, when none will communicate with him, it also expresses its wish "that at each Mass the faithful present at it would communicate not only spiritually, but by sacramental participation, that so they may obtain the fuller fruits of this most holy Sacrifice."

Question 7 is on Masses satisfactory, whether it is convenient they should continue, that is, "priests hired to sing Mass for souls departed." These priests were especially called "mass-priests," sometimes "chantry-priests," and the Masses had various names, according to how they were to be sung—such as "Trentals," which were sung for thirty days. These "Masses satisfactory" are the "Sacrifices of Masses" spoken of in our 31st Article, "In the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer CHRIST for the quick and dead to have remission of pain or guilt;" and which are there objected to, on the ground that they are inconsistent with the perfection of the Offering of CHRIST once made upon

the Cross. Even Gardiner, in his sermon preached in 1548, approves of the taking away of that number of Masses satisfactory. Some of the answers given by the bishops throw a certain light on the nature of these Masses, and why they objected to them. They appear to have been associated with gross popular errors; with material notions of our LORD'S Presence and repetitions, as it were, of the Sacrifice; with objectionable notions of purgatory and of the possibility of fully satisfying for sins, through these Masses and through the payment of money equivalent for them.

We find the Statute, on the dissolution of Chantries, saying, "A great part of superstition has been brought in by devising and phantasing vain opinions of purgatory, and Masses satisfactory to be done for the departed," &c. And these notions of purgatory were of such a kind, that we find Cranmer answering the Devonshire rebels, "That purgatory implies a diminution of our SAVIOUR'S satisfaction on the Cross." The same objection was made against the Masses satisfactory, as their name implies; besides, they were profaned by being sold. Hence, we find in Cranmer's Visitation Articles, (1547,) "Whether they take any Trentals, or other Masses satisfactory, to say or sing for the quick or the dead;" and in King Edward's Injunctions, 1549, (Cardwell, Doc. An. xv.) "That none buy or sell the Holy Communion as in Trentals and such other;" and in Ridley's Visitation Injunctions, (1560,) "That none make a mart of the Holy Communion by buying and selling the receipt thereof for money;" not that this was any new injunction, for it had been forbidden in former times, as by No. 8 of Archbishop Edmund's Constitutions, A.D. 1236. In the thirteenth century also, S. Francis wished the brethren of the Order to celebrate only one Mass a day, that they might not turn Masses into a gain. This is mentioned by Van Espen, (*Jus Eccles. Univ.*, II. V. vi. xix.) who quotes Bellarmine; and himself writes strongly on the profanation which has arisen from the money paid for saying Masses, and from their multiplication. To what extent the abuse still exists, we learn from a trial, lately reported in France, before the Tribunal of Commerce.

For an example of certain gross notions prevalent as to the Presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, those who desire to do so may see some mentioned in King Edward's "Proclamation (1547) concerning the irreverent talkers of the Sacrament." When Bonner, before the Commissioners, insisted strongly on the true Presence, Cranmer asked him what presence he meant, and whether he thought CHRIST was in the Sacrament with face, nose, mouth, and other lineaments of His Body, which was only another way of asking whether he meant "the corporal Presence of CHRIST'S natural Body." (See Collier, II. iv. 279.) Such things as these show what the popular notion was, what was "commonly

said." We may also consider the answer of King Henry VIII. to the ambassadors of the German Protestant princes, (Coll. II. ii. 145,) drawn up by Tunstal, in which he speaks of "the natural and real Blood," and "the real and natural Flesh of our LORD'S Body," as contained in the Eucharist.

The language of I. and II. of the Six Articles was very similar; and at Lambert's trial the whole question seems to have turned on the point, whether our LORD'S natural Body could be in more places than one at the same time: the bishops maintaining that it could. Even all this sounds moderate when compared with the declaration that was forced upon Berengarius under Pope Nicholas II., "That the very Body and Blood of CHRIST are touched and broken by the hands of the priests and ground by the teeth of the faithful, not sacramentally only, but in truth and sensibly."¹ It is against such statements, and these popular notions, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation,² that the *Declaration* at the end of the Communion Service was put forth; not, however, I may add, originally with any sanction of the Church, but only by Royal proclamation, after the Liturgy had been in use; accordingly, after King Edward's time it was rejected, and only restored in its present form in 1662. Even in its original form, it seems clear that the phrase emphatically protested against is, "*natural* Body." It was founded on the 29th of the Forty-two Articles, in which, however, there is an important difference in wording from the Royal Proclamation, the Article denying "the real and *bodily* Presence (as they term it) of CHRIST'S Flesh and Blood;" but on the same grounds as the *Declaration*, and with the same meaning, "*bodily*," "*corporal*," &c., being equal to "*organic*."

Now, the bishops draw a clear distinction between the Sacrifice of the Mass and the intercessions there offered up for the whole Church, and these Masses satisfactory; also between the Mass thus said by the priest as the Church's public Service, and these Masses said by way of bargain. And again, between the benefit derived to the living and the dead by the intercessions of the Mass, and any "full satisfaction of sins, venial or mortal," obtained through "any thing or action of the priest." "The perfect and plenary satisfaction for all sins being only attributed to our SAVIOUR'S Passion." These quotations are taken from the opinion of the Bishop of Carlisle. The Bishop of Lincoln says, "that the keeping up satisfactory Masses, in the *notion received*, (cf., "in the which it was commonly said,") seems to import a deficiency in the Redemption upon the Cross, and that the Apostles wanted either learning or benevolence in their instructions." Cranmer, with seven other bishops and Dr. Cox, "think it not convenient

¹ Peter Lombard endeavours to explain this (lib. iv. dis. xii. 5.) but not satisfactorily: it is rather a modification than an explanation.

² See Appendix, Note A.

that satisfactory Masses should continue;" though they have no doubt concerning prayers in the Mass for quick and dead, or the lawfulness of the priest, so praying and officiating in other circumstances of the Sacrament, receiving a maintenance.

Question 10 is, "When the reservation of the Sacrament and hanging up of the same first began?" To which, two answers only are given, by Cranmer and the Bishop of Lincoln. Cranmer attributing the reservation to six or seven hundred years after CHRIST, and the hanging up of the Sacrament to a later date; (later, in answer to the Devonshire rebels, he says, "That reserving the Host in a pyx was but a modern usage;") the Bishop of Lincoln, citing a decree of Pope Innocent III. for reservation for the sick, confirmed by Honorius III., who ordered the Sacrament to be kept in a special clean and noted place, and wished a low reverence to be made at the elevation and at the carrying to the sick. As for the hanging it up, he affirms it a custom of a later time and not yet universally received.

These discussions prepared the way for the compiling and setting forth of the *Order of Communion*. In the 9th Question and answer it had been debated whether the Service of the Mass should be in a language understood by the people; and the prevailing opinion was, that the more mysterious part of the Service should remain in Latin, but that some prayers might be well translated for informing the understanding and exciting the devotion of the people. The order, therefore, was drawn up in Latin to the end of the Canon. There was a warning in English to be read the next Sunday or Holy Day, &c. before, exhorting the people to prepare themselves, and to come to the Sacrament "to be taken of them in the remembrance of His most fruitful and glorious Passion," the warning being much the same as the first in our Book. Then there was a Rubric forbidding "the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass until other order should be provided," and enjoining the priest to consecrate Bread and Wine sufficient for the people, and after his own Communion to leave the Wine upon the Altar, and commence the exhortation, "Dearly beloved in the LORD," &c., very much as in our own Book. In this exhortation again there is a passage, teaching the people that Communion is part of the Remembrance, "To the end we should alway remember. . . . He hath left in these Holy Mysteries a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His Own Blessed Body and Precious Blood for us spiritually to feed upon," &c. Then came another short exhortation, enjoining any who was an open blasphemer, &c., or that did not trust himself to be reconciled to God, to stay away. After which, was a pause to see if any would withdraw. And then "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent," &c. very much as in our present Book. The changes in this Book, beyond the use of English, were the leaving confession to every

man's discretion, the Communion in both kinds, and the disuse of elevation after consecration. The Form was published on "the 8th day of March, in the second year of our Sovereign Lord King Edward VI., and the year of our LORD MDXLVIII." But the authority of this "Order of Communion" was called in question, as only issued on authority of the Privy Council and without authority of Parliament, wherefore it was decided to draw up a new Service Book and to send it forth with full authority. Then "other order" was "provided," and we must bear in mind that it was not a mere revision of the existing books and a reissue; but they were called in; a new Service Book was framed and set forth in their place, with newly arranged Offices, and with its own ritual and ceremonial system; some ceremonies being given up as undesirable in themselves, others as undesirable through abuse. The old Books, thenceforward, lost their authority, and could be of use only in case they could throw light on any part of the new Ritual, in the event of directions being insufficiently or obscurely given in the new Book.

Now, this Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, commonly called the First Book of Edward VI., was first approved by Convocation, then ratified by the Lords and Commons in January, 1549, and came out with all authority of Church and State, and was well received; and though it was in turn supplanted by the Second Book of 1552, yet it is still of some importance to us, as it has been decided that reference has been made to this Book in the "Ornaments Rubric." Moreover, when it was revised, the Parliament itself, when ratifying the Second Book, bore witness that there was nothing in the first but what was agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation; and that such doubts as had been raised in the use and exercise thereof, proceeded rather from the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than from any other worthy cause. It is, moreover, emphatically the Church's own Book, sent out from the beginning with her full authority, which was not the case with the Second Book, sent forth at first only by civil authority and already in use before any sanction was given to it by the Church. The sanction at last given was only a short approval and authorisation in general terms, in one, the 35th, of the Forty-two Articles set forth in the end of the year 1552. It may be seen in Cardwell's "Synodalia," where the question is discussed of the authority belonging to these Articles. It is plain, then, that the Church had not changed her doctrine; and that she assented to this Second Book much in the same spirit as the Parliament had done, because she considered it, notwithstanding the changes it contained, as still consistent with the doctrine of the First Book. The First Book, therefore, is of importance as an interpreter of the Second.

In this Book we see the gradual progress made in certain directions. For one thing, the whole Service was in English; the ancient vestments were retained, but much of the former ceremonial was laid aside; the duty of communicating was strongly put forward; if the people were not exhorted concerning the Holy Communion in the sermon, there was an exhortation to be read, the same which was also in the Order of Communion, "Dearly beloved in the LORD;" and if upon the Sunday or Holy Day the people were negligent to come to the Communion, then the priest was to earnestly exhort his parishioners to dispose themselves to the receiving of the Holy Communion more diligently, using the exhortation which also was at the beginning of the Order of Communion, or words like it. An intimation appears also to be given that the participation is part of the worship or whole Service, when, after Consecration and the Oblation, the LORD'S Prayer is followed by the sentence, "CHRIST our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all wherefore let us keep a holy and joyful feast with the LORD," in which there seems plainly to be an association of the Holy Eucharist with the Passover, as its especial type, and as a consequence a feasting on the Sacrifice before God.

Another point to be observed is, that all solitary Communion on the part of the priest was done away with, the rubrics at the end ordering that there should be no celebration unless there were some to communicate with the priest; but why so objectionable a Service as the *Missa sicca* should have been retained, it is hard to say. One ancient custom was kept, which has since been lost, in the Rubrics which speak of the parishioners offering every Sunday the cost of the holy loaf, by means of the houses in the parish taking the duty upon them in rotation. And from that house, whose turn it was, one at least was required to communicate with the priest; and with him, or them, all others who were godly disposed thereunto. "By this means the minister, having always some to communicate with him, may accordingly solemnise so high and holy Mysteries with all the suffrages in due order appointed for the same." These Rubrics also imply but one celebration on the same day, as the priest is not to celebrate without communicants; and these are appointed to communicate with him, who represents the house, by which for that day the charges are defrayed. But at Christmas and Easter a double Communion was appointed, when there were two Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels. Even this was at first objected to by Bucer; but he afterwards changed his opinion, in deference to the custom mentioned by Pope Leo in his letter to the Bishop of Alexandria. Not that Bucer had anything to do with the ordering of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., but his remarks have their value, as showing what he had been told, and what he understood to be the rule of the English Church, viz., *ordinarily* one Communion, with

double Communion at Christmas and Easter. Accordingly, in King Edward's Injunctions, A.D. 1549, drawn up after the Act of Uniformity, the 10th orders, "that within any church or chapel be not used more than one Communion on any day, except Christmas Day and Easter Day." A similar Injunction, founded on the Act of Uniformity, was sent to Bishop Bonner, who neither liked the new Service Book, nor was willing to give up the celebration of certain Masses in his cathedral in Latin, although disguising them under English names. Hearing this, the Council wrote a letter to him on the subject, which will be found in Cardwell's "Documentary Annals." In this it will be seen that liberty for another celebration was given under special circumstances, but only then. "Having very credible notice that within your Cathedral Church there be as yet the Apostles' Mass, and our Lady's Mass, and other Masses of such peculiar names, under the defence and commination of our Lady's Communion and the Apostles' Communion, used in private chapels and other remote places of the same, and not in the chancel . . . we have thought good to will and command you, that from henceforth no such Masses in this manner be in your church any longer used; but that the Holy Blessed Communion, according to the Act of Parliament, be ministered at the High Altar of the Church, and in no other place of the same and only at such time as your High Masses were wont to be used; except some number of people desire (for their necessary business) to have a Communion in the morning, yet the same to be executed at the chancel at the High Altar, as it is appointed in the Book of the Public Service without cautele or digression from the common order." This letter gives plain evidence of what was intended in the New Book, which it professes to be enforcing, with an appeal also to the Act of Uniformity. Nor did Bonner object to anything that was written in it as unauthorized; but he put it in the hands of the Dean and Chapter, and referred the execution of it to them. The Council, however, found it necessary to write him another letter before he could be induced to insist in his diocese upon conformity to the new Service, which he disliked. After that, Collier says, he made no scruple to execute the order. This same restriction to one celebration in a day seems implied in the next century, A.D. 1636, in Bishop Wren's orders in the Diocese of Norwich, the 17th of which shows how, even in great parishes, when there were communicants to the number of three or four hundred at one time, there would still be but one celebration.

To proceed with the Liturgy. In the last Rubric but one it was ordered, "Furthermore, every man and woman to be bound to hear and be at the Divine Service in the parish church where they be resident; . . . and, whosoever willingly and upon no just cause doth absent themselves, or doth ungodly in the parish church occupy themselves, upon proof thereof by the ecclesiastical laws of

the realm to be excommunicate, or suffer other punishment, &c.” A rule strictly in accordance with all ancient canons, which forbade attendance at Mass in any chapel or oratory, in any place, or in any way to the prejudice of attendance at the chief Mass in the parish church. There is scarcely anything about which more stringent Canons have been enacted, or more universally, than on this matter; and priests were forbidden to say the Private Mass¹ at an hour or in a manner which might induce people to absent themselves from the Parochial Mass. This Rubric was, in fact, no new law, but only the re-enactment of one which had always existed. In like manner, the 19th Title of the projected “*Befor-matio legum Eccles.*” (Collier, ii. iv. 330) enjoined Sacraments not to be administered in private chapels, &c., without great necessity, “It being most fit the people should frequent their parish church and the flock keep close to their pastor.” “*Suffi* separate meetings weakened that union and charity the Holy Eucharist was designed to promote.” It will be seen that in this Rubric already partly considered, people are still allowed and enjoined to *hear* Mass in the parish church, “and these with devout prayer or godly silence and meditation to occupy themselves.”

There is also another Rubric, immediately following the Offertory, which orders, that “So many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire all other (that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire,” which is another sanction for staying to “hear Mass.” The injunction for the non-communicants to depart out of the quire was, perhaps, for the greater convenience of communicants; though there may also have been intended a marked distinction between the two, and an intimation that non-communicants should take a lower place, as less worthy and a kind of penitents. This would have been fully in accordance with the principles of the Primitive Church, and her practice in regard to one class of penitents. There is this warning in almost the same place of the Armenian Liturgy, “Salute one another with a holy kiss, and let those who are unable to communicate go outside the doors and pray there.” The notice in King Edward’s Liturgy, which makes this distinction, comes, like that in the Armenian, just before the commencement of the solemn part of the Liturgy, as though a token that such lost their part in the holy Service, partaking, as the early Canons would have expressed it, only in the prayers without the Oblation. I do not assert that such was the intention, it only seems to me very probable in the case of a Church avowedly going back to primitive practice. These non-communicants were bidden to behave themselves in a godly manner, and “to occupy themselves with devout prayer or godly

¹ *Missæ privata* not the same as *Missæ solitaria*. At the latter, the priest celebrated alone, an abuse forbidden by many Canons.

silence and meditation;" not, be it observed, as taking their full part in the Service, but, as it were, in some other devout way, so that they might reap some benefit from the prayers, eating of the crumbs that fell from the children's Table.

Two other things remain to be noticed, and I take them together because it was on the same principle that they rested. One was the continuance of the order not to elevate or show the Sacrament to the people; the other, that reservation was allowed only when there were any sick persons to receive it, and that on the same day: the reason in both cases being a fear of superstitious adoration; not that the Church had changed her doctrine in regard to the sacred Presence of her LORD'S Body and Blood. This elevation had been forbidden we must remember, not in this Book only, but in the Order of Communion, which was, for the most part, the old Service unchanged. But it was a principle greatly acted on at that time, where a custom had been abused, to put it as much as possible out of sight, in order to turn the people from their regard for it. Later, we find even the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, although not denied, yet put into the background, in order that people might think less exclusively of it and more of the Communion. Dr. Pusey in his book, "The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," speaking of the elevation, says, "The object of the removal of this rite may have been the same which pervades the Liturgy, viz., to concentrate the whole soul on the reception and Communion itself, doing away with all rites which had had distinct objects. People had commonly stopped short in the Sacrifice and Adoration. The elevation was removed, yet it is remarkable that the Homily on the Sacrament, while excepting against private Masses and the Communion in one kind, says nothing about the elevation or the adoration connected with it." Moreover, the elevation was not a primitive rite, and the Church may also have considered that it was perverted from its original intention; for to quote again Dr. Pusey's words, "It is thought that when in the eleventh or twelfth century the custom began of holding up the Host to the people immediately after its consecration, it was not held up for worship." And he cites a passage from S. Bonaventura, in which are given nine reasons for the elevation, without mention of adoration. When, then, the English Church, avowedly returning to primitive practice as well as doing away with abuses, forbade elevation and reservation, it was not that she objected to the reverence due to the LORD'S Body and Blood in the Eucharistic Service. I say emphatically *in the Eucharistic Service*, because it does not follow that she would therefore approve of the prevalent adoration of the Sacrament. It is one thing to consecrate the Sacrament and use it for its intended purpose with all veneration, paying due worship in its proper place, another to reserve It for worship and to make a Service of adora-

tion. The Church regarded the one as agreeable to our LORD'S Institution, Primitive and Catholic; the other as without warrant of CHRIST'S ordinance, modern and (as we should say) Roman. This is what she means, in her 25th and 28th Articles, when she says, "The Sacraments were not ordained of CHRIST to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them." "The Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper was not by CHRIST'S ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." As to reservation, it was unknown to the ancient Church, except in order to send the Sacrament to the sick or for such like purposes; neither was there any elevation after consecration. Even Bona cannot tell when the custom arose in the Latin Church, and in the Eastern it has never had place. Renaudot, however, argues in-favour of elevation in the Eastern rites at *Sancta Sanctis*.

As to open exposition of the Holy Sacrament for adoration—such as in processions, in the exposition of the forty hours, or at other times—it is admitted by Van Espen (*Jus Eccles. Univ.*, II. iv. v.) that processions and prayers with the Holy Eucharist were almost unknown in the first ten centuries, and that they came into use (in the Latin Church) in the fourteenth; but that, even then, the Holy Eucharist was not exposed for adoration; all such expositions, except during the solemnities of the Mass, being modern, and arising about the fifteenth century. The English Church, therefore, knowing the abuses which had taken place, and fearing for the future, thought it best to do away with both elevation and reservation. It is tolerably clear, I think, even from this First Book of King Edward, that she would give no countenance to Services of adoration, still less to their substitution for the appointed Eucharistic Service. Even in the case of non-communicants she recommends nothing of the kind, but only "devout prayer and godly silence and meditation." Of course, for us, as dutiful children, there is nothing but submission; nor are we called upon to judge any other Church in the matter, if she thinks it best to provide what our own thinks it best to withhold. We shall not be gainers either by want of charity or by self-will. The Church's own words were, "In these our doings we condemn no other nation, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only."¹

The period of the First Book of King Edward's reign leaves us with the permission still existing for non-communicants to hear Mass. We also gather from the letter of the Council to Bonner, that other Altars than the High Altar still existed. Now, it may be thought wholly superfluous to discuss this latter question, on the ground that the universal custom of centuries is sufficient to prove the rule of the English Church in regard to the unity of the Altar. Yet there are some points which I think worth observing;

¹ See Appendix, Note B.

and I shall therefore enter upon some short consideration of the matter, and it may be as well to do this at once and get it out of the way.

Although then other Altars remained, practically there was but one. When all peculiar Masses and Masses satisfactory were abolished, there was little use left for lesser Altars in a church; and when celebrations were restricted ordinarily to one in a day, with permission to have more than one only on high festivals and on urgent occasions, and these to be made at the High Altar, Side-Altars could then only be taken away, or remain to become antiquarian evidences of what had been. Even had there remained some prospective use for them, it was taken away when it was judged most convenient to change Altars into Tables, and to make the Holy Table moveable. A multitude of immoveable Altars, each erected with a special intention, would be an intelligible system; but no one could imagine a system, by which there should be in the same church several Holy Tables, each one moveable from its place as occasion required. The very confusion that ensued after the change was made from the Altar to the Holy Table, and the diversity of opinion and usage as to its position, show clearly how the rule of one Altar or one Holy Table in a church was recognised and acted upon. Every Royal Injunction, every Visitation Article, every Canon, which speaks on the subject implies the same, and takes it for granted. But previously to this change to a moveable Table and while the First Book was still in authority, Bishop Ridley, in 1550, issued some Injunctions, in one of which he orders "the LORD's Board" to be set up after the form of a Table; and in the same year also came a similar order from the Council to every Bishop, "To give substantial order throughout all his Diocese, that with all diligence all the Altars in every church or chapel, as well in places exempted as not exempted, be taken down, and instead of them a Table to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel, within every such church or chapel, to serve for the ministration of the Blessed Communion." Ridley had also enjoined the taking down and abolishing of all other by-Altars or Tables. Then came the Book of 1552 with its Rubrics concerning the Holy Table, the same as those in our present Book.¹

The next important documents are the Injunctions (1559) and Advertisements (1564) of Queen Elizabeth, from which again and from the "Interpretations of y^e Injunctions," we see the fact of one Holy Table ordered to stand in the place of the High Altar, except when for convenience of the communicants it needed to be moved owing to the quire being too small. L'Estrange in "Alliance of Divine Offices" adds an order, that "if in any church the steps (i.e. altar-steps) be transposed, they be not erected again, but that the place be decently paved where the Communion Table

¹ See Appendix, Note C.

shall stand out of the time of receiving the Holy Communion." The second of Archbishop Parker's Visitation Articles implies still the same; and this brings us down to the year 1569. These documents, however, it may be said, are not the Church's own voice; but they are very plain and decided testimonies of what the Church's voice was understood to be, and follow very directly from the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer (1552). But they do not stand alone. In the Constitutions and Canons of 1571, (Cardwell's "Synodalia,") that entitled, "*Æditui Ecclesiarum,*" &c., amongst manifold other things to be done and attended to by them, orders, "*Curabunt mensam ex asseribus composite junctam, quæ administrationi sacrosanctæ communionis inserviat; et mundum tapetem, qui illam contegat.*" Then there is the well known 82nd Canon of 1604, headed "A decent Communion Table in every Church." And again, the 7th Canon of the Synod under Archbishop Laud in 1640, wherein especial reference is made to Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions and Advertisements, that the Holy Table should stand in the place where the Altar stood; and wherein this position is again enjoined, and rails are ordered to screen the Holy Table from profanation. In all these there is the same manner of speaking, taking it for granted that in each church there is one Holy Table, and only one.

We have, by this last Canon, passed over two or three documents of some interest, which bear the same testimony, but which also have a peculiar interest of their own. There is, first, the letter of Archbishop Abbot, in 1623, who was supposed to lean to the Puritans, about the ministering and receiving the Sacrament in Crayford Church—a letter which plainly implies the one Holy Table, placed in the position of the former High Altar, with foot-paces in front to which the communicants are to go up, in successive companies, to receive. Next, an Order in Council, the same year, concerning the position of the Holy Table in S. Gregory's Church, in which it is declared that the Table in the parish church shall stand at the upper end of the church, after the pattern of the cathedral. Dr. Cardwell's note upon this judgment will repay the trouble of reading. In 1636, there are Bishop Wren's Orders, &c., in the Diocese of Norwich, the 3rd ordering, "That the Communion Table in every church do always stand close under the east wall of the chancel, the ends thereof north and south, unless the Ordinary give especial particular directions otherwise; and that the rail be made before it according to the Archbishop's late Injunctions." Collier (Part II., ix. 762) also mentions, without giving any date, a like decision of Bishop Davenant's concerning the position of the Holy Table; and, lastly, Archbishop Laud, in his defence, June 16th, 1637, declares that the Table had been placed in this situation in his Majesty's Chapel and in several cathedrals since the Reformation.

Now, the present point of importance to us in all this long sequence of documents is this, that in every case, whatever may be the determination as to the position of the Holy Table, it is also the one Holy Table—one, and no other—concerning which directions are given; and that, in a manner implying that one Holy Table only is the rule of the English Church. In fact, it is so plain that I fear I may be thought to have merely wasted time in proving what no one would dream of calling in question.

To go back again once more and consider the Book of 1552. There is nothing in it more observable than the strange dislocation of the prayers of Consecration, Intercession, and Thanksgiving, and the manner in which the formal Oblation after Consecration is left out. The Sacrifice is altogether put in the background. All that is essential is indeed there; it is enough that the words of Institution are spoken, and that the Holy Sacrifice is on the altar before God. Bellarmine (lib. i. de Sac. Missæ, cap. ult.) even places the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the act of Consecration. In our Liturgy the prayer of Oblation is disjoined from the Consecration, and the Communion is inserted between. I have already suggested a reason for this arrangement; it may also have been intended to bring more thoroughly home to the minds of the people the connection between the Sacrifice and the Communion, how one implied the other; but whatsoever the cause, there is no reason to suppose any change in the Church's doctrine. She still begs God to accept her "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" she still continues to make before Him the "memory" which her LORD instituted, a phrase to the force of which I have already called attention; and there is the change of a word, which is not without significance. The First Book had "*celebrate* the memory," the Second uses the word "continue," as much as to say that all other memories are united to and continue, as in one prolonged act, that one memory which our LORD Himself first made, on the night when He began the solemn Oblation, which He perfected on the Cross, and when He commanded the continuance of that which He had done unto the world's end. Since the time when the Second Book was issued, the Church has added another important phase and rite to her Liturgy—the offering of the bread and wine, and the petition to God to accept the "oblations;" and any one at all conversant with liturgies will know how intimately that first oblation of the gifts is connected with the great Oblation after Consecration. Intercessions are offered together with this oblation of the gifts as in our own Liturgy. In the Eastern rites they receive by anticipation the veneration which belongs to them after consecration. They are called by the titles properly belonging to the consecrated gifts. By way of example, in the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* (375, Mabillon), in a dominical Mass the prayer "post Nomina" is: "Offering to God, beloved brethren, spiritual gifts, let us beseech

the Divine Clemency, that He would receive with the full condescension of His Love these Oblations, which we offer in commemoration of the saints and for the salvation of all believers, and that He would hear our prayers." And again, in the Nestorian Liturgy of the Apostles, when the paten and chalice are placed on the altar the priest says; "These holy quickening glorious Mysteries are placed upon the Altar of the LORD Almighty until His coming." Perhaps nowhere is the close connection between the two oblations more indicated than in the Liturgy of S. James, in the prayer preceding the LORD's Prayer: "Thou hast received in Thy Goodness the gifts, presents, fruits, that have been offered before Thee for a sweet-smelling savour, and hast been pleased to sanctify and perfect them by the grace of Thy CHRIST, and the visitation of Thy most HOLY SPIRIT."

But not to digress further on this head, let us return to the changes made in the Book of 1552. The Sacrifice was put so much out of sight, probably in order to make the people dwell less exclusively on it and more on the Communion, to lead their aim away from the idea that assisting at the Sacrifice was their chief duty, and communicating only secondary. The Church's one great aim was to make people communicants, and to make them understand the duty and privilege of communicating when they had no sufficient cause for abstaining. Hitherto the Sacrifice had overshadowed the Communion, and the latter had become, with most, practically forgotten, except as a duty to be fulfilled once a year; the object desired was to remedy this, and to put the Communion in its proper place as a primary object, as a privilege to be desired and enjoyed with all possible frequency, and as an integral part of the memorial and of the service offered to God. Something of this had been already attempted in the *Order of Communion*, and in the First Book, but not with such urgency as in the second. The titles used for the service had been, "The Order for the Communion," "The LORD's Supper and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." There had been exhortations to communion; and intimations that the Communion is a part of the Memory; but in the Second Book all this is intensified. How far the Church would have herself initiated some of the changes made, we cannot tell, or how far she would have given her approval to everything had the Book been submitted to Convocation before its issue; but we know that it was not considered to be at variance with her own Book; that she did give it a general sanction, and that it was in use, with some variations from time to time, until the last revision in 1662. Take as an instance the words of delivery; those in the First Book were left out, and others substituted in their stead; the Church, it may be, would not have changed the former words, but the new words were in no way inconsistent with them, and she very probably would have done what was done afterwards, joined the two

forms of delivery into one, as we have them now. In the new Book the title is the first change; the word Mass is altogether dropped, and the title remains, "The Administration of the LORD'S Supper, or Holy Communion." The words of delivery, "Take and eat this in *remembrance* . . . and feed . . . with thanksgiving;" "Drink this in remembrance . . . and be thankful." In the Consecration Prayer itself is said; "Grant that we *receiving* these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy SON our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST'S holy Institution, *in remembrance* of His Death and Passion." In this Book was first inserted the Exhortation, which is now the second notice in our Book, beginning, "Dearly beloved brethren, I intend," &c., but which then began, "We be come together at this time, dearly beloved brethren, to feed at the LORD'S Supper; unto the which in GOD'S behalf," &c., in which it will be seen that to *feed* on the Holy Mysteries is put forward as the chief object. The whole exhortation very strongly was worded against refusing to communicate, as we may see in our present Book. But there was also a paragraph very like what is found in the Homily of worthy receiving of the Sacrament, in which those who did not mean to communicate were bidden to depart, on the ground that bad as it is to go away, it is worse to stand by and not communicate.

In considering not the paragraph alone, but the whole exhortation from which it is taken, we must bear one thing in mind—that it was not, as it is now in our present Book, Notice of Celebration for some future day to which those present are exhorted to come, but an Exhortation during the Service to those already present, bidding them to remain and communicate; a consideration which increases greatly the urgency of its language. The priest calls upon them for the sake of CHRIST not to refuse, and warns them against the validity of any excuses they may make; "I for my part am here present, and according unto my office I bid you in the Name of GOD, I exhort you as you love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this Holy Communion." Then he proceeds, in a passage which again points out that the communion is a part of the "*remembrance*;" "And as the SON of GOD did vouchsafe to yield up His Soul by death upon the Cross for your health, even so it is your duty to *receive* the Communion together in the *Remembrance* of His Death," (or, as it is in our present Book, "*in remembrance* of the Sacrifice of His Death,") "as He Himself hath commanded. Now if you will in no wise thus do, consider with yourselves how great injury you do unto GOD, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same." After this it proceeds: "And whereas ye offend GOD so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate

and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else than a further contempt and unkindness to God? Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay, when ye be called; but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this Holy Communion with other. I pray you what can this be else but even to have the Mysteries of CHRIST in derision? It is said unto all, Take ye and eat; Take and drink ye of all this: Do this in remembrance of Me. With what face then or what countenance shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising, and mocking of the Testament of CHRIST? Wherefore, rather than you should do so, depart you hence and give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart I beseech you ponder with yourselves from whom you depart. Ye depart from the LORD's Table, ye depart from your brethren and from the banquet of most heavenly food." This paragraph remained in the Service Book until the last revision of 1662. Now I do not see how its force can be evaded, or its meaning explained away. A correspondent of the *Guardian* newspaper some while ago suggested, "that being worshippers and discerners of CHRIST's Body and Blood in the Blessed Sacrament is very different from being 'gazers and lookers on them that do communicate.'" The difference is in the phraseology and in the way of putting the case, not in the thing itself. These "gazers and lookers on" are not bidden to mend their ways by behaving themselves in a godly way, in devout prayer and godly silence and meditation, but simply to depart. Besides, in the sentences following, their fault is characterised, "that they stand by, and yet will neither eat nor ~~drink~~ this Holy Communion with other," or as it was said before, "be no partakers of the same themselves." The whole paragraph, and the whole scope of the Exhortation, forbid any such gloss suggested. Besides, there is the additional proof that simultaneously with the insertion of this exhortation the Rubrics which recognized the presence of non-communicants were left out. As to the alternative suggested of "worshipping and discerning of CHRIST's Body and Blood in the Blessed Sacrament," I can only say as I have said before, that without condemning in the least such "worshipping," &c., as a part of the Eucharistic Service by those duly taking part therein, I think the Church would have utterly forbidden turning that Service into a service of adoration, or making that which is the public Service of the one body, a private one by individual worshippers. But this is not our present question.

Bishop Cosin clearly regards the paragraph in the same sense with myself, for his comment is (Notes, 1st Series,) that it is "a religious invective added here against the lewd and irreligious custom of the people, then nursed up in popery, to be present at the Communion, and to let the priest communicate for them all;"

and he goes on to quote the 10th Apostolical Canon, and two or three sentences from S. Chrysostom's third Homily on the Ephesians. He says also of the Exhortation in his 3rd Series of Notes; "This was added, 5 Edward, upon Bucer's special instance in his Censure, cap. 27, where he saith, *Modis omnibus instandum, ut qui presentes sunt, communicent.*" In our own day the late Archdeacon Wilberforce admitted that by this paragraph the presence of non-communicants was forbidden. But he contends that it was repealed at the last review, and that therefore their presence is forbidden no longer. And this I think is the only question to be considered; nor can I regard it in the same light as the Archdeacon.

The word "repealed" misleads us at once. The paragraph in question was not a canon or a rubric, which would have been repealed, if the Church changed her mind, or perhaps let alone if through circumstances it became obsolete. But this was an exhortation to be read constantly to the people, and the reading of which would become absurd when the circumstances which originally called for it had changed. In such a case the only thing to be done would be to cancel it, or at least to cancel the order for reading it. But this would by no means imply that the Church had changed her mind, only that there was no further occasion for the Exhortation.¹ And this was precisely the case in 1662. The Exhortation or the whole system established had done its work so completely, that apparently there was no thought with any one of staying through the Eucharistic Service, except in the cases of those who communicated. This first Exhortation was to be read "at certain times when the Curate should see the people negligent to come to the Holy Communion;" the second, corresponding to our first Notice of Communion, was to be said some time at the discretion of the curate. On these Bishop Cosin says, in *Particulars to be considered*, "These are more fit to be read some days before Communion, than at the very same time when the people are come to receive it. For, first, they that tarry for that purpose are not negligent; and they that are negligent be gone and hear it not." That is to say, none remained to whom it applied, none but communicants; all non-communicants were gone. Accordingly, in the revision of 1662, these suggestions of Bishop Cosin were carried out. These two exhortations were turned into Notices of Communion, to be said some days before, instead of being exhortations at the very time of Celebration. This involved the alteration of certain

¹ Will any one argue that the Church's mind was altered because at the last revision, in separating the Catechism from the Confirmation Service, and remodelling the latter Service, she made use of the first part of the rubric to form a preface, but left out the second and third reasons, "wherefore this order is most convenient to be observed;" or again, that she has prohibited two Communion services at Christmas and Easter, because in the second Book she did away with the two Introits, Collects, &c.?

phrases and the adapting them to their new purpose and to the change of circumstances. Amongst other parts this paragraph in question would have had to be adapted to its changed position ; but there being no persons to whom it would apply, if read, the only reasonable course was to leave it out. That the Church, however, had not changed her mind on the subject seems clear from the Conference at the Savoy. The ministers quoting these exhortations make the remark, " If it be intended that these exhortations should be read at the Communion, they seem to us to be unseasonable." To which the Bishops replied, " The first and third exhortations are very seasonable before the Communion, to put men in mind how they ought to be prepared, and in what danger they are to come unprepared, that if they be not duly qualified they may *depart* and be better prepared at another time." Neither did the Church, at the revision, in any way modify her language in regard to the primary importance of Communion, or in regard to its being a part of the Memorial which they met to celebrate ; nor did she in any form restore the repealed rubrics of the First Book concerning non-communicants hearing Divine Service. It was not a case in which the Church had, owing to circumstances, set aside a custom of which in the abstract she approved, and which she might again wish to restore. She had done away with the custom on the ground that it was in itself wrong ; and she gives no indication whatever that she had altered her opinion. Neither was it a case in which there were those desirous of restoring and practising the custom, and at whose instance and petition the removal of the prohibition might seem to be a permission. We have seen that the custom had passed away and become forgotten. If the Church wished it restored, it would have been necessary to give some intimation of the kind, and some instruction or rubric, such as the rubrics of the First Book. There was abundant reason to account for the removal of an exhortation which had become perfectly useless and unmeaning ; but none for the supposition that the removal of it involved a sanction to the restoration of the custom which had died out. Unless the Church had gone out of her way to provide against any future possibility of the restoration of an obsolete custom by some prospective declaration or canon, I do not see how her mind could have been more clearly shown on the subject than it is. And in that case I do not see how we can with any dutifulness practise or sanction a custom of which she has shown her disapproval ; for dutifulness is surely not bounded by express commands.

As for any general restoration of the practice of " hearing Mass," I can heartily say that I should feel it to be a disastrous thing. It arose from coldness, and indevotion, and relaxed discipline, and in turn intensified and established its own causes, and made Communion a secondary matter in the ordinary Christian's life, a duty to be done at certain rare intervals. What it has done it will surely

do again after a while, if it should succeed in taking its place amongst us. But does the Church allow of any exceptions? I mean, are there any which would not be at variance with her principles, and which we might think that she would sanction? It is very difficult to say, because she would probably be very jealous of the beginnings, and might disapprove on practical grounds what she might not disapprove theoretically. I can only conceive one principle, on which persons might be permitted by her to "hear Mass" without communicating, viz., when those so hearing *could* not communicate, such as children, who might enter into the service according to their ability, or persons who from some graver cause deemed themselves unfit for reception on that particular day, and who might as penitents communicate in the prayers, or those communicating at another Celebration, and who might join this one and its devotions with that at which they communicate, as though one continued act. It is held by Roman Catholic writers that any one attending part of one Mass—as by arriving too late, being interrupted during the Celebration, &c.,—may complete the service by attending the other part of another Mass. I only mention this in illustration of what I have suggested in regard to joining one Celebration to the other, as though all one act. Both proceed on one principle,—the unity of all Celebrations, as the perpetual continuance of the First, there being the same Priest and the same Offering in all. Even these exceptions, which I have suggested as possibly allowable, at any rate the two latter instances, appear doubtful; and it might be best to refer such cases to the decision of the Bishop.¹

There is another question which may be fitly considered here, and which may be dismissed in a few words. I should never have thought of discussing it, indeed, I may say, I should never have thought about it, had I not heard it mentioned by an estimable English priest, and read something concerning it in one of the religious prints. It was both said and written with reference to Churches belonging to our Communion abroad; and the point urged was that it should be made known in some manner, such as by a notice, at what hour a priest wishing to celebrate could have the use of the Altar. Now such a notice would be an intelligible thing, if the Church of England had a rule such as the Roman regarding the duty of a priest to celebrate Mass daily; and I have some indistinct recollection of having heard or seen this rule al-

¹ The custom of presence without communion at the Coronation of the Sovereign is sometimes alleged in proof of the Church's sanction being given to the presence of non-communicants; although for a time I was willing to accept it as a proof, yet I never could feel it to be satisfactory: the Service is so thoroughly exceptional and instituted for a special purpose. I cannot understand how any service of so special and exceptional a character can be appealed to as a proof of the Church's ordinary rule, and of what she requires of her people in the celebration of the ordinary public Liturgy.

leged. But it is not our rule; and in the absence of such a rule, what could be the ground for the notice? There is nothing particularly Catholic in the Roman rule. It was about the eleventh century that it came into force in the west;¹ the east has never known it; nor was it the rule of the Early Church.² In fact, it would be impossible, when there was but one Celebration in a church, with many priests. In the *Ordo Communis* of the Syriac Liturgy, there is the rubric, "When he communicates a priest with the spoon, he says;" in the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil, "Then the priest communicates and distributes to the assistant priest." But there can be no need of evidence to prove so plain a thing, as there must be and must have been many priests who did not celebrate. Why! we know that in some places there was not even a rule of daily celebration. So that if there is any latent desire of adopting the Roman rule, it has nothing very Catholic to recommend it. Again, I remember having seen it stated as a reason, that "Catholics" do not like being reduced to lay-communion. But this "lay-communion," as it is called, must be the lot of many, even in London, and it cannot become a greater hardship by being undergone abroad. But is this said seriously? Do those who use the phrase, seriously mean, that a priest having accidentally to mix with the laity, and not communicate with the officiating clergy, is in a position resembling being reduced to lay-communion. It is simply playing with language. To be reduced to lay-communion was for a priest to be forbidden any more to exercise any priestly functions or to be treated as a cleric; a formal punishment inflicted upon him for some serious fault. Such an one losing all his clerical privileges was, as a consequence, compelled to communicate as a layman.³ Is there any resemblance to this in the pass-

¹ Van Espen (*Jus Eccles. Univ.*, II. V. vii. xiii.) who says that in the first ages no such injunction is found either in Episcopal Synods or Monastic Rules. The first occurs in a Council of Compostella (1056,) and the first foundation-Mass to be said daily, at a Collegiate church in Flanders, in the time of Pope Alexander III., who, in his sanction, modifies "daily" by the words "assidue" and "quanto frequentius potest, salva honestate sua et debita devotione."

² See Van Espen on Canon xiii. of the Trullan Council, and Mr. Bright's note, n, *History of the Church*, p. 187.

³ It is this reduction to lay-communion (in other words "degradation" or "deposition") which certain clergymen are now-a-days petitioning for as a boon. If it should be thought fit for the Church to accede to such a petition; the word "Excommunication" in the seventy-sixth Canon, might be changed to "degradation" or "deposition;" without sacrificing the principle of the Canon, a principle enforced under pain of deposition from the earliest times. (*Apos. Can. vi., lxxi. Beveridge, Codex Can. i., ii., iv. Van Espen, Com. ad ii. part. Grat. causa xxi. Q. iii.*) But the proposed permission to resume Holy Orders ought not to be granted. It is shown by Bingham (xvii. ii. 5, 4,) that those once deposed were never restored except for some very pressing reason. Van Espen also (*de Inst. ad Offic. Can. p. ii. c. ii.*) shows that by the ancient discipline those deposed from their office were not restored; but that later, about the ninth century, owing to certain spurious letters in the Decree of Gratian, a laxer discipline came in, whereby those deposed for secret faults might after proportionate penitence be restored. But this present is a case of men deposed by their own will, whose

ing accidental position of a clergyman, who, through circumstances, cannot unite with the officiating clergy; or anything so intolerable, that he must needs have a separate celebration of his own to deliver him from it. But after all, what right could he put forward? The English Church has plainly enough set forth her rule; not a rule for celebrating, but a rule for communicating. In Cathedral or Collegiate churches all priests and deacons are to receive the Communion every Sunday at the least; but in places where there is not a sufficient number of communicants offering themselves, there is to be no celebration at all. In fact, to carry out this suggestion would violate most of the Church's rules; there would be needless multiplication of Celebrations in one day, and at the same Altar; Celebrations, not in order to meet the need of *communicants*, which would have some sort of pretext, but in order to satisfy some private desire or imaginary obligation of the priest. How could there be an assurance that at such a Celebration there would be a sufficient number of communicants; or that the communicants would not be taken away from their own proper Celebration on that day? I cannot see on what principle the priest in charge of a Church would be justified in giving licence to celebrate which is thus desired. Besides, by the plainest canonical rules he would have no right, no justification for admitting another priest to officiate, who was not thoroughly well known to him, or concerning whom he was not thoroughly satisfied, not only as to his Orders, but also as to his character and his entire freedom from all Ecclesiastical censure. Van Eepen points this out at considerable length in his ninth chapter "de Celebratione Missarum." But I will not discuss the matter further.

And now I will pass on to the second part of my inquiry, in which I hope to show that in these points which we have considered the English Church is fully supported by the character of the Holy Eucharist as set before us in Holy Scripture, and by the customs and authority of the Primitive Church. Let it be well understood that this is my object; and that I am not concerning myself with the customs of another Communion, or pretending to decide whether or not the Mediæval Church had justification sufficient for her departure from primitive rules. Thus as to "hearing Mass," we know that it was the recognised rule of the Mediæval Church, and as I hope to show unknown to the Early Church, and at variance with the original Institution; but I have no intention of entering into any inquiry as to whether or no there was justification for it notwithstanding, and whether or no the Church in any way exceeded her powers or injured her children. It is a case very

Holy Orders are despised and publicly cast aside. To restore such would be trifling with sacred things. S. Luke ix. 62.

cognate to that of Communion in one kind. By our LORD's Institution and, according to primitive practice, as I hope to prove, the "showing forth the LORD's Death," included "eating the Bread" and "drinking the Cup;" and, as I believe, communion meant communion in both kinds.¹ But as the Mediæval Church decided on the sufficiency and propriety of Communion in one kind, so she sanctioned the separation of the Sacrifice from the Communion, and decided that to take part in the former alone was a sufficient observance of the memory of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST. Both of these decisions have met with the disapproval of our own Church, and in both instances she has returned to primitive practice.

The first thing which strikes us, on considering the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, is the occasion on which it was instituted. Our Blessed LORD had come up to keep the Passover for the last time; and when Supper was ended, knowing that His hour was come, He took into His Hands the Bread and the Cup, and consecrated them to be a Memorial of His Death, saying, "Take eat, this is My Body," "Drink ye all of this, for this is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." Nothing could be more marked and suggestive. Taking the bread and the cup of the Paschal Feast, and varying one of the formulas used at the Paschal Supper, He plainly substituted His Memorial for that of the Passover, declaring Himself to be the true Paschal Lamb, "our Passover sacrificed for us." The great Christian Memorial and Feast instituted in such a manner, at such a time, could not fail to be regarded as the Antitype and successor to the Jewish Passover. Accordingly S. Chrysostom, on S. Matthew xxvi. 28, says, referring to the words of S. Luke, *He saith, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover*, that is, to deliver you the new rites and to give a Passover, by which I am to make you spiritual. Yet more, when we consider the circumstances under which each Memorial was instituted; how God's chosen people were in bondage and groaning for deliverance, and how when the hour was come, a sudden and overwhelming destruction came from God upon their oppressors, whilst themselves were saved and delivered by the Blood of the Lamb, which God Himself ordained for them; how that first Passover of the Israelites was the counterpart of the great Christian deliverance, when by the Blood of the SON of GOD, man who was in bondage to sin and death was set free and the power of his enemies broken; and how at the very moment, when this Israelitish deliverance was ordered, the memorial and representation of that deliverance was ordained to be observed, as our Blessed LORD, when about to die, ordained the Memorial and Representation of His Passion to all generations; we cannot

¹ See Appendix, note D.

fail to see, how if any Jewish rites can be patterns for the celebration of Christian rites, this Paschal service must hold a pre-eminent place, as a pattern of the Eucharistic Service. Whatever other sacrifices or rites may be included and summed up in the Holy Eucharist, it must surely be the case, that the Passover holds a special and prominent position. If any of them can be a guide to a right celebration of it, the Passover must be so emphatically. What the first Passover was to our LORD'S Passion, that must each Paschal celebration, the memorial of one, be to the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, the memorial of the other. Each was emphatically ordained by God Himself to be a Memorial and Representation; one of the type, the other of the antitype. Let it be granted that all Jewish sacrifices were types of the one Sacrifice of CHRIST, and have each one their representative in the Holy Eucharist; yet there remains this distinctive feature, belonging to the Passover in common with the Eucharist, that it is also a commemoration. Every other sacrifice was truly a type, but each sacrifice was a separate act beginning and ending in itself; the sacrifice of the LORD'S Passover depended on the first Paschal sacrifice, and was a commemoration and representation of the offering of the lamb slain on the night when Israel was set free; just as the holy Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon and commemorates and represents, but in a far more real and excellent manner, the one Sacrifice of our Redemption, a continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST. S. Thomas Aquinas (iii. lxxiii. 1) calls the Celebration "a kind of representative image of the Passion of CHRIST;" quoting S. Ambrose, that "in CHRIST the Victim was once offered . . . We offer in remembrance of His death;" also a dominical prayer, "Quoties hujus hostiæ commemoratio celebratur," &c. Cabassutius (iii., iv., 1.—iii.) speaks in the same manner, calling the Eucharistic Sacrifice "the Unbloody Sacrifice commemorative of the bloody Death of CHRIST," and says, that so the Fathers regarded it.

What then was the Passover? and how was it observed? It was a sacrifice and a feast combined, in its larger sense kept up for seven days with sacrifices of burnt-offerings day by day in honour of God's Majesty, but in the narrower sense, with which we are now especially concerned, observed on the first evening of the feast, when the paschal lamb was sacrificed and eaten at the sanctuary according to God's command by all the males of the children of Israel. It has been remarked that women and children were not required to eat of the Passover, apparently as an argument by analogy that all are not required to communicate when present at the Eucharistic Celebration. But an essential difference in the institution is thus overlooked. By God's command males only were commanded to keep the Passover, women might let it alone throughout their lives. But in the institution of the Holy Eucharist there

is no such exception, no such partial command of observance. It is binding equally on all that are admitted into the Church of CHRIST. The paschal lamb was a sacrifice, for so it is called at the institution, in Exod. xii. 27, and again in xxiii. 18, and xxxiv. 25; also in Deut. xvi. 46. It is called also an "offering," "Corban," and "a gift;" and the word is used for presenting it, which is used of sacrifices; "brought not the offering," (Numb. ix. 13;) with which may be compared 2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11, and Bp. Patrick's notes upon these passages. I call attention to this, because the sacrificial character of the memorial seems almost lost sight of in our regard of it as a feast. It was a feast upon a sacrifice, the two together making up the memorial, and each an act, or rather both forming one act of thanksgiving and worship to Almighty God. No one could keep the memorial who did not take part in the whole act. We should then expect to find the same rule with regard to the Christian Passover, and I cannot understand how our LORD's words can be otherwise interpreted: "Take and eat this;" "Drink ye all of this;" "Do this in remembrance of Me." In that first Eucharist He was the Celebrant, His Apostles the Communicants, to all of whom He gave that which He had consecrated, commanding the same observance to be kept in remembrance of Him. The command is, "Do this" which I have done; consecrate the bread and wine to be My Body and Blood; and distribute them to all those who are present at the Holy Table. Or if the rendering "Offer this," be adopted instead of "Do this," the result is the same;¹ for thereby our LORD commands His Apostles to offer that which He had offered, and as He had offered; a Sacrifice of praise and of commemoration, to be distributed in participation to those who, like the Apostles, were present at the Celebration. In either case the analogy of the Passover is preserved, and the Memorial is kept before GOD not by the holy oblation only, but by the participation thereof also before GOD with praise and thanksgiving. S. Paul (1 Cor. x. 16,) pointedly associates the Eucharist with the Passover, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of CHRIST?" But what is more to my present purpose, in 1 Cor. xi. 26, where he is speaking not of the benefit to ourselves, but of the memorial which we make before GOD, our act of worship, he says: "As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do show the LORD's Death till He come;" words which in Ancient Liturgies are often recited together with the words of Institution as given in the Gospels, as e.g., to take one instance of several, the Liturgy of S. James, "Do this in remembrance of Me, for as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye set forth the Death of the Son of Man and confess His Resurrection, until He come," after which the deacon immediately says, "We believe and confess," and the

¹ Appendix, note E.

people add, "We show forth Thy Death, O LORD, and confess Thy Resurrection." S. Augustine (Cont. Faust. xx. xviii.) says, "Christians celebrate the Memory of that same perfected Sacrifice by the most holy Oblation, and by participation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST;" and again (lib. de Trin. 3, 4,) "We call that the Body of CHRIST, which received from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by the mystical prayer, we receive in memory of our LORD's Passion." S. Chrysostom, on Ephes. i. 15—20, speaking of communicating says, "With this (i.e., purity of soul,) approach at all times; without it never; for as often, saith He, as ye do this, ye do show the LORD's Death, that is, ye make a remembrance of the salvation wrought for you and of the benefits which I have bestowed." S. Basil (*Catena Aurea* on S. Luke xx. 19,) says, "Learn then in what manner you ought to eat the Body of CHRIST, viz., in remembrance of CHRIST's obedience to death." I cannot then understand how we can dissociate communion from the other part of the Celebration, or imagine that without it we are at any time making the memorial, which our LORD commanded us to make, according to His commandment.

But there is yet another consideration to be drawn from the analogy of the Jewish law. The special name, which, throughout the whole Church, has belonged to this holy Memorial is the Eucharist—that is, the sacrifice of praise. This is the name and character which, beyond all others, it has obtained. S. Paul so calls it in 1 Cor. xiv. 16, where moreover he is especially referring to the Prayer of Consecration. S. Chrysostom, speaking of the Liturgical Service in reference to S. Paul's phrase, "the cup of blessing," shows plainly the Eucharistic character of that Service, and how the Offering and the Communion were the two parts of the Eucharistic whole. "When I say 'blessing,' I unfold the whole treasury of God's goodness and commemorate those great gifts; for we also, recounting over the Cup the unspeakable mercies of God and all that we have enjoyed, thus offer and communicate, giving thanks that He has delivered from error the whole race of men; that, being afar off, He hath brought us near; that when without hope and without God in the world, He has made us His Own brethren and fellow-heirs. Giving thanks for these and all the like things, thus we approach."

If we turn to the oldest Liturgies of the Church we find that they begin their most solemn part, almost without exception, as we do at this present time. "Lift up your hearts. We lift them up unto the LORD. Let us give thanks unto our LORD God"—that is, let us offer Eucharist. "It is meet and right so to do." And then, as in our own Liturgy, the priest goes on to sing the praises of God and to give Him thanks. But we can hardly imagine the length and fulness to which this thanksgiving is carried. Praise is given to God for His holiness and glory: then

His power and love are recounted from the beginning of creation, His making of man, the mercy shown to him, the promise given to him when he fell, the fulfilment of the promise in the Incarnation, until this recounting of God's mercies and this thanksgiving culminate in that supreme work of infinite love, the Incarnate SON surrendering Himself up to die for us. Then comes the Commemoration of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, and the recitation of our LORD's own words of Consecration, together generally with the words of S. Paul, as in the ancient Syriac Liturgy, "This do ye for My Memorial, when ye communicate in this Mystery commemorate My Death and Resurrection till I come." After which, again follows a commemoration of our LORD's Death, and Resurrection, and Ascension, and of all to the day of His Second Coming, ending with the solemn Oblation, the offering of the great tremendous unbloody Sacrifice; and this Oblation is made with praise and thanksgiving. Thus, in the Liturgy of Nestorius, immediately after the consecration, the people exclaim, "And we will return praise, honour, thanksgiving, and adoration to Thee, O invisible FATHER, and to Thy glorious SON, and to Thy living holy and life-giving SPIRIT, now, henceforth, and for evermore." And in the Syriac Liturgy of S. James a sentence similar to this follows the Invocation also, and even every one of the paragraphs into which the great Intercessory Prayer is broken up. The Oblation itself is called, "this Sacrifice of Praise," as in the old Liturgy of Sarum and the Roman. So again in the Liturgy of S. Basil, in the first prayer of the faithful, "That we may offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise." Another phrase we find, which is worth marking. In the Liturgies we find prayers that GOD would receive "the hallowed tremendous Divine gifts, for the odour of a sweet-smelling Sacrifice"—a phrase belonging to burnt-offerings and peace-offerings; but never to sin-offerings or trespass-offerings, except in one case, (Levit. iv. 31,) where it is supposed to be said in order to encourage the poor man to hope for the acceptance of his offering. (See Bishop Patrick's note.) And—not to multiply quotations to prove what must be well known to all liturgical students—in the Liturgy of S. James in the Prayer of the Veil, just before the commencement of the Anaphora, the priest prays, "that we may offer the mercy of peace, the sacrifice of praise;" and the deacon exhorts the people to stand with fear to offer a peace-offering to GOD; to which they answer, "the mercy of peace, the sacrifice of praise."

In conformity with this liturgical language is that verse already referred to, "If thou shalt *bless* (i.e. the Bread and Wine) with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy *giving of thanks*, or Eucharist, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" And that text, (Heb. xiii. 15,) "Through Him, then, let us offer to GOD always the sacrifice of praise, that is,

the fruit of our lips giving praise to His Name;" and also in the same chapter, verse 10, "We have an Altar of which they have no right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle." It is in the Alexandrine form, perhaps, that this character of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is more especially brought out. The Liturgy of S. Mark begins its solemn part with the usual ascription of glory and praise to GOD, recounting His majesty, His works, and His mercy and love to man, concluding the first part thus, "Thou hast made all things through Thy wisdom, the true Light, Thy Only-begotten SON, our LORD, and GOD, and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST; by Whom, with Him and the HOLY GHOST giving thanks to Thee, we offer this reasonable and unbloody Service, which all nations offer to Thee, O LORD, from the rising to the setting of the sun, from the North and from the South, because great is Thy Name among all nations, and in every place incense is offered to Thy Name and sacrifice and offering." Then follows the long Intercessory Prayer for living and dead; (in which we may observe that the offerings are called the thank-offerings, *εὐχαριστήρια*, of those who brought them;) after which, the ascription of glory to GOD is again begun, ending with the "Holy, Holy, Holy," thus passing on to the commemoration of the Institution and the recital of our LORD's words; after which comes the showing forth of the LORD's Death, Resurrection, &c., and the formal Oblation in these words, "O LORD, our GOD, we have set before Thee Thine Own of Thine Own Gifts." Surely nothing can mark more clearly than does this, how the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a Sacrifice of thanksgiving. I may add here a curious parallel drawn by Hesychius between the Holy Eucharist and the peace-offerings, when he states, that as GOD commanded all that remained of the latter to be burnt with fire, so they immediately burned with fire whatever remained unconsumed in the Holy Eucharist. (Bingham, XV. vii. 5.)

Now, I have no purpose in all these remarks of denying that the offering is also spoken of as a propitiation for sins and for the forgiveness of transgressions and ignorances, so as to partake also of the nature of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, as it does also of the burnt-offering. Even then we must bear in mind how in all Liturgies, both in the Prayer of Invocation and in the prayers and thanksgivings before and after Communion, the *participation* is always spoken of as for the remission of sins. In the Mozarabic, it is prayed, "Give me so to take the Body and Blood that by It I may merit to receive the remission of all my sins; in the Armenian still more strongly, "Cleanse me, O Almighty, by Them from all my mortal sins;" and in Syriac, S. James, "A propitiatory particle of the Body and Blood of CHRIST is given to a sinner for the pardon of transgressions and forgiveness of sins in both worlds for ever and ever." The aged Serapion, mentioned by Eusebius (vi. 44) as excommunicate,

appears to have been absolved at the point of death solely by participation of the Eucharist sent to him. But if we begin to distinguish these analogies, and to separate the Sacrifice from the Feast, as though the former might be regarded alone, it cannot be looked upon as analogous to the burnt-offering, for of that not even the priest partook. And what sin-offering or trespass-offering can we imagine offered with such words as occur throughout the most solemn portion of the Holy Eucharist? Are we to set all these aside, and choose such portions as we please of the Church's Service? For let us remember it is the actual consecration and offering of the Sacrifice which is accompanied with praise and thanksgiving, and which S. Paul calls "Eucharist." Is there not something to be learnt from the use of the Mass of the Presanctified, used in the Latin Church on Good Friday, in the Eastern throughout Lenten days of humiliation? If it was regarded as possible to separate the different ideas of Sacrifice combined in the Holy Eucharist, and for *individual* Christians to be present, as it were, at only a sin-offering, why could not the Church do the same, and change the character of her sacrifice of praise instead of having recourse to a Liturgy of the Presanctified? Instead of that, the Consecration with the praise and thanksgiving is omitted, because, as Leo Allatius explains, (Bingham, XV. iv. 12,) it was unsuited to such a season;¹ or as Balsamon, quoted by Van Espen (*Tractatus Historico-Canonicus*, P. II.) on the 49th Canon of *Laodicea*, with other Greek commentators, gives the reason for not celebrating in Lent, "because the Sacrifice is an act of joy and festive celebration." In the Liturgy of the Presanctified, therefore, there is no Sacrifice; but only the Presanctified Gifts are placed on the Altar, with a Service suited to the day. But there is a Communion, of which more presently. The 49th Canon of *Laodicea*, just mentioned, forbade, according to Beveridge about A.D. 365, "any

¹ Some contend that the English Church sanctions celebration on Good Friday. We ought to have some plain positive proof before believing that she has so far departed from herself and from ancient Catholic custom. The usual appeal is to the Collects, Epistle, and Gospel, with the Introit in the First Book, appointed for the day. These are sufficiently accounted for by the 1st Eubrio at the end of the Communion Service in all the Books, on the supposition that the Church substituted the *Missæ Sicca* on Good Friday for the *Missæ Presanctificatorum*. The latter could not be retained when reservation was done away; and the former appears less objectionable on Good Friday than on any other day, the only day on which it is not a sham Office. The Eastern Church, I believe, has not even the Liturgy of the Presanctified on that day, but only certain readings suited to the day; and it is stated that in many parts of the West, before the introduction of the Mass of the Presanctified, the churches were closed on Good Friday. But the celebration is especially inappropriate, as too Eucharistic and festive for a day of such intense humiliation, when also the Church is commemorating a season of sorrow when her LORD was taken away from her; and when also she throws herself back into the past and regards the Passion as actually in progress. This is strongly brought out in the Roman rite, which is very dramatic and very sorrowful and penitential. I may remark that the Roman custom of the priest alone communicating is a corruption, as is shown by Martene.

Oblation of Bread during Lent, except on the Sabbath and Lord's Day only;" a Canon reinforced in later times by the 52nd of the Trullan Council, which makes a special mention of the "Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts." Dr. Neale, in his Introduction to the "History of the Eastern Church," remarks, that "The intention with which the Presanctified Gifts are laid on the Altar is not their Oblation, but simply that they may be distributed to the communicants."

What, then, I desire to make clear by these remarks is, that the Holy Eucharist, by its very name, by the very character of the Service, and by the very expressions used, is so marked out as a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" that if any analogy between it and the Jewish sacrifices is to be instituted, it must be compared with the sacrifices of peace-offerings of thankgivings. Otherwise much of the Service is utterly without meaning. But, then, if it follows the analogy of these sacrifices the consequence must be that all who join in offering the Oblation must also partake of the Sacrifice and be communicants. It is an essential part of the Service.

It has long ago been remarked by Roman ritualists and canonists, how the language of the Eucharistic Service not only implies the presence of others with the priest, but also that much of it is only suited for communicants and has reference to them alone. Micrologus, quoted by both Bona and Van Espen, "We must know that according to the ancient Fathers, those only who communicated were accustomed to be present at the Divine Mysteries . . . and this is shown by the very consecration of the Sacraments." Bona, (Book I. c. xiii. n. 2,) "The tenour itself of the Mass and the custom of the ancient Church prove that the Sacrifice was from the beginning principally so instituted, that it should be celebrated publicly and solemnly, the clergy and people being present, offering and communicating." Again, he quotes words at Consecration and after Communion, which refer to the Communion of those present, adding, "Nearly all the prayers are of the same tenour which are recited after the Communion is finished, because, in fact, those only were present who could offer and participate of the Sacrament." Again, "Cyprian and Pope Leo mention the people communicating. And by the 10th Apostolic Canon and 2nd of Antioch, it is decreed, that all the faithful who assemble at church should communicate; those refusing, to be cast out of the church and excommunicated." Then he goes on to quote the words of Micrologus given above. Van Espen says, (Jus Eccles. Univ., II. V. iii.) "That Mass was called rightly done (*legitima*) at which people were present and communicated." Then he quotes Walafrid Strabo, "It must be admitted that that Mass is legitimate at which are present the priest, and he who answers, offers and communicates, as the very composition of the prayers plainly shows." Then Van

Espen proceeds, "It is certain that the Mass was originally so appointed, and that all the prayers were so ordered that not only the priest, but also those present were supposed to communicate. Indeed, anciently only those communicating were allowed to be present." Then he quotes Micrologus and Bona as above, adding from the latter, "it is plain that this custom long prevailed." A little further on he says, "It should be explained to the people, that Communion itself, or participation of the Sacrament, in a manner constitutes a part of the Sacrifice, and that, therefore, it is extremely proper, that whilst they with the priest offer the Sacrifice, they should also with him partake of the Sacrifice by Sacramental Communion." To which may be added what he says, (Observat. ad iii. part. Gratiani dia. ii.,) "This, moreover, is well known, that in the first ages it was the rule or custom (*praxim*) that those who were present at Mass should also communicate sacramentally."

I have put these passages together in this place because they appear to belong to each other. The special point in them to which at this moment I wish to draw attention is this, that the language and form of the Liturgies imply that those who take part in them do so as communicants. It is not easy to fully show this in a small compass or indeed without studying a whole Liturgy, for the Liturgies are constructed on the theory that the Eucharistic Service is one continuous unbroken action, progressing by regular steps, and only concluded when the completion of all, the Communion, is reached—an action in which all present take their part throughout, so that if they fail to communicate some part of it, an important part of their act of worship, is left undone. To non-communicants all the latter part of the Service is without meaning; nay is it not the case, that the very Invocation whereby the HOLY GHOST is besought to consecrate the Bread and Wine to be the Body and Blood of CHRIST implies that it is for communicants that this transformation is made? And this Invocation it must be remembered is no unimportant part of the Consecration in Eastern Liturgies. Whether it ever had place in the Roman Liturgy is unknown, (though to the present day there are supplications equivalent to it in the Canon,) but it had in all others. In the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, which are mostly composed of variable collects, we find it sometimes absent, sometimes present; probably in the earliest ages it was always present, but it is spoken of in them as in the Eastern rites as completing and perfecting the Consecration. As in S. Basil's Liturgy the descent of the HOLY GHOST is prayed for, that He may "bless, sanctify, and *perfect* the Gifts," or in S. Mark's, that "He may sanctify and perfect them;" so in the Reichenau Missal (Miss. IV.) it is prayed that He may descend on this Bread and this Cup, "et fiat nobis legitima Eucharistia in transformatione Corporis et Sanguinis Domini," or (Miss.

V.) "Ut accipientibus universis sit Eucharistia pura vera legitima ;" just as S. Isidore of Seville calls the Invocation "Confirmatio Sacramenti." And the way in which the Sacrament is thus confirmed, or perfected, or legitimated by the coming of the HOLY GHOST is expressed in all the Liturgies in the same way, "that He may make this bread the Body of Thy SON, CHRIST our GOD, and this Cup the Blood of Thy CHRIST." But it is just here that begins the part which belongs to communicants alone, as above, "Ut sit accipientibus universis," or as in the Liturgy of Nestorius, "That the partaking of these Holy Mysteries may be to all who receive them," or as in the Liturgy of S. James, "That all who are partakers thereof may obtain, &c.," (Greek version,) and "So that they may sanctify the souls . . . that partake of them," (Syriac version,) or, once more, as in the Liturgy of S. Mark, "That they may be to us who partake of them, &c." After this point then for non-communicants there seems to be no longer place. In the Antiochene family of Liturgies, where the great Intercessory Prayer follows the Invocation, they can still take their part for a time, but in the Nestorian or Eastern family, where the Intercessory Prayer precedes the Invocation, or still more in the Alexandrine, where it precedes the words of Institution, and the Ephesine, where it occupies the same place as our prayer for the Church Militant, their part in the service is at an end when the Invocation is begun. And all this, by the very form and wording of the Liturgies, simply because they were constructed without any idea of the Service being divided, or of a participation in the sacrifice apart from a participation in the Communion. Such a division would not have been consistent with the primitive idea of the Eucharist, either as an act of worship towards God or as a token and means of Christian unity.

To illustrate what I have said, I will give extracts from the Liturgy of S. Mark. Having recited our Blessed LORD's words, and made the Oblation in the manner already cited, the Liturgy proceeds with the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST to change the Bread and Cup to the Body and Blood of CHRIST, and with the prayer, "that they may be to us all who partake of them for faith, &c., that in this as in all things Thy Holy Name may be glorified." Then follows the prayer before the LORD's Prayer to the effect that this HOLY SPIRIT may make them worthy "to receive without condemnation this immortal and heavenly Food," and also that they may be sanctified to say the LORD's Prayer which then follows together with the embolismus. Then comes the prayer of bowing down and humiliation, in which again it is prayed, "that we may worthily partake of the good things set forth, the spotless Body and precious Blood of Thine Only-begotten SON, κ. τ. λ." Then comes the "Holy Things for holy persons," with its introduction and response; after which the breaking of the Bread, (which in

other Liturgies is a much more elaborate ceremony than in S. Mark's, and accompanied with prayer and praise, in which again there is prayer for the Communicants, as in the Mozarabic, "May the conjunction of the Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST be to us, who take and drink, for pardon, and to the faithful dead for rest;" and in S. James, "The LORD will bless us and keep us without condemnation in the participation of His immaculate Gifts," with much more to the same purpose;) then follows the Communion, then the thanksgiving and prayer that the participation may be full of all blessings, then another prayer for blessing, and strength, and purification, and enlightenment through the participation of the Sacred Mysteries, after which the dismissal and blessing. Then it is that all is ended, the Service perfected, "*solemnia completa sunt in Nomine*" is the language of the Mozarabic, whilst one name for the last prayer in the Gothic Missal is, "*Consummatio Missæ*," (e. g. *Missæ lxxv.—lxxx.*.) being a prayer for strength against all temptations through the Eucharist received, or somewhat to that effect. The final prayer also in the Liturgy of S. Basil, in which the priest says that the mystery of the dispensation has been accomplished and perfected to the best of our power, sums it up in making the memory of CHRIST'S Death, in beholding the image of His Resurrection, in being filled with His everlasting Life, and in having enjoyed His unexhausted delights. Now in all this what part can there be for those who are not partakers of the Holy Eucharist? They must feel that in such a service they are out of place.

The whole system of the Church has always been founded on unity. I have no purpose of entering into proof of matters, which ought to be known to all, and which are beside my immediate purpose. Those who need the proofs must look for themselves into such books for instance as Bingham (Book IX.) or Van Espen, or any other great writer on the Constitution of the Church. The ancient system, dating from Apostolic times, clearly was the establishment of one Episcopate in a city, the Bishop having within his jurisdiction such villages and outlying parts as constituted the suburbs of the city, the principle being that enunciated by the Roman people in the time of Liberius and Felix, when refusing to accept them as joint Bishops, "One GOD, one CHRIST, one Bishop"—the principle in fact of S. Ignatius and all writers after him, who have written concerning Bishops, accordant with the principles of S. Paul himself, (Eph. iv. 5; Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 13, &c.) And throughout all the necessary changes, or rather modifications of the original system, this principle has been strictly observed. When Churches were multiplied in the City the presbyters serving them acted only as the agents and representatives of the Bishop; the country Churches, as they became necessary, were provided for in like manner, although those serving them appear to have been

placed there more permanently. Even the Chorepiscopi, true Bishops though they were, were accountable to the one Bishop of the Diocese, whose representatives they were, and were restrained from all but minor episcopal acts. All, whether in the city or the country, received their stipends not independently but through the Bishop's Church. It was only after some length of time, at the end of the fifth or sixth century, or even later, that they were placed in an immoveable position, instituted as we should call it, and paid independently from the endowment settled on their Church. Then commenced the system which we call parochial, and which was founded and modelled on the diocesan, the Church carefully guarding the idea and principle which she had received from the beginning. What the Bishop was in his Diocese the parish priest became in his parish, the head and centre of unity, however many others there might be to assist him. In like manner in regard to Churches also. It has been argued that anciently there was only one Church in a city, and that even all the faithful in the country districts were originally required to come to the City Church for the services on Sunday and the great Festivals, and that when Churches were multiplied they were only for special purposes and with no altar, bearing the same relation to the Bishop's Church which the synagogues bore to the Temple, or that they had altars without the full privileges belonging to the Bishop's Altar. (Bingham, Book VIII. vi. 16, 17.) But whatever may have been the case at first, the same rule could hardly have held good in all places and for the same length of time. The distance of some country villages and the increasing number of the faithful would necessitate the multiplication of Churches, but they were not independent, or served by priests permanently appointed, as was the case later when the parochial system was instituted, and any oblations offered at them still belonged to the central Church of the Diocese. Under all circumstances that Church retained its position and rights as the centre of unity, so that even the Bishop was forbidden (Con. Carth. V. can. 5) to leave it for any other in the Diocese. When at length the parochial system came into existence then the parish Church became in its sphere, as the Cathedral, a centre of unity, and possessed of rights and privileges similar to those which the central Church had enjoyed, any other oratories or chapels bearing the same relation to it which itself had previously borne to the great Church of the City. This, the parochial system, which has come down to our own time, and which in every age the Church has carefully and jealously guarded, is no chance invention or system formed to suit the passing necessities of the time, but a system founded on a principle, an idea, given to the Church from the beginning, the symbol and the means of unity, a very part of her constitution.

But it is equally a part of this system that in each Church there

was but one altar, according to the saying of S. Ignatius, "one Eucharist, one Flesh of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, one Cup into the unity of His Blood, one Altar, one Bishop." It would have appeared as much a breach of the idea of unity to multiply altars in a Church as to multiply Bishops in a Diocese, and at this altar there was one celebration of the Holy Eucharist, celebrated with all the splendour of which the Church was capable. Van Espen, (*Observat. ad iii. part. Grat. dis. ii. fin.*) treating of a decree passed at the end of the sixth century, which was headed, "It is unlawful to celebrate two Masses on one altar on the same day," remarks that "the decree was founded on keeping the unity of the sacrifice on one altar, or that on the same day several sacrifices could not be offered on the same altar." Similarly Pagi, (*Crit. in Baron., an. 818, n. xv.*) "Lupus, in his answers to the calumnies of Michael Cerularius, observes that in the first ages of the Church on account of the small number of the faithful there was in each city only one Church, in a Church there was one altar and no more, and at that altar one sacrifice only was offered on the same day." With regard to the number of celebrations in one day there is a fragment of a letter of S. Leo to the Bishop of Alexandria, treated of by Van Espen, (*ad iii. part. Grat. de Consec., dis. 1*) which shows that this custom of one celebration only was so far broken through at Rome that on certain Festivals, when more people came together than the Basilica could hold, the celebrations were multiplied to meet the exigencies of the people, and this infraction of the ordinary rule S. Leo commends to the Bishop of Alexandria as a pious and reasonable course under the circumstances. But it is plain from his letter that the ancient rule of one altar in a Church and one celebration was still observed at Alexandria, and except on these special occasions at Rome also. This rule is still adhered to in the Eastern Church. In the Western we know that in the same Church there are many altars and many celebrations. But even in the West the same principle is kept in view; there is the one altar, which is emphatically that of the Church itself, at which the High Mass, *Missa publica* or *parochialis*, is celebrated,¹ whereas the others are, as it were, altars in distinct Chapels within instead of without the Church.

This High Altar and the public Mass celebrated at it have always been fortified in their exclusive privileges by manifold canons in all parts of the Church. Canon after canon has been passed forbidding celebration at side altars, oratories, &c., at a time or in a manner which would tend to lead the people away from the *Missa publica*, and requiring all the faithful of the parish, even though they had been to one of these private Masses, to be present at the public Mass celebrated by the Parish priest at the High Altar. This the

¹Compare the Council's letter to Bishop Bonner, already quoted.

Church's Unity requires, and nothing else can be substituted for it. Thus the 45th of Theodulf's Capitula, A.D. 994, "We command all Mass priests, who are willing to sing Mass before High Mass on Sundays or other Mass days, that they do it secretly, so as that they may draw no part of the people from High Mass, . . . and that all women as well as men assemble themselves to High Mass and to the holy ghostly Church, and there hear High Mass and the preaching of God's Word. And let not Mass priests in the Oratories (i. e. side-chancels or chapels, *Johnson*,) sing at all, except they do it so secretly as to draw no man from the High Mass. And we charge men of every rank to frequent the High Mass, except the holy maidens only, &c." Again, in the 5th of Winchelsey's Constitutions, A.D. 1305, concerning stipendiary priests, "Let the said priests on LORD's days, Festivals, or when a dead body is there present, begin their Masses after the Gospel¹ at High Mass is ended, not before unless they have first obtained leave of the Rector, &c." Van Espen (*Jus Eccles. Univ.*, II. V. ii. and in other chapters) treats largely of this question, quoting in Sec. vi. Pope Sixtus IV. in a Constitution against certain Orders, in which he declares the ancient law to be attendance at Parochial Mass on Sundays and Festivals, and in Sec. viii. from the Decree of Gratian, stating the hour for the public Mass to be nine o'clock, and ordering other Masses, said by priests on solemn days, to be done so privately that the people might not be drawn away from public Mass. In Sec. xvi. he says that the parochial Mass was originally instituted that in it the people of one particular Church, united together with their pastor, with one mind and one spirit might pray God and offer the sacrifice, and that the parish priest might specially offer up prayers and sacrifice to God for the people. In Sec. iii. he quotes S. Gregory and the Sardican and other canons to show how this public Mass is associated with the unity of the Church, and how those who did not attend it were considered to break unity. The "blest bread," (Cap. iv. Sec. iv.—ix.) "Eulogium," taken from the offerings for the Eucharist and given at the end of Mass to the people as a sign of communion and brotherly love, which ought to exist amongst the people of one parish, forming as it were one Church, is on that account only to be given at the public or parochial Mass. In every way then this principle is brought forward and insisted upon by the Church of all times and places, because her system is founded on unity, and this unity is betokened and effected through the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, the *Missa publica* being its expression.

But when we thus speak of the celebration of the Holy Eucharist as understood in the primitive ages of the Church, we mean something more than the Celebration referred to by the later

¹ That is, the Second Gospel.

canons and by Roman Catholic writers. They refer of course to the Sacrifice alone, whilst the Early Church meant the whole Eucharistic Service completed and perfected by the participation of the Holy Communion. The Early Christian Church signified its unity, and cemented the unity of its members by the perfect and entire Celebration; but if by one part as distinct from another, then by participation of the Holy Communion. Not that she would have permitted her children to come to the reception alone any more than to have taken part in the Sacrifice alone. Van Espen (II. V. iii. xi.) says it was after the twelfth century that those in health were allowed to communicate *after* the solemnities of Mass; and quotes Morinus, who says that it was introduced by the Mendicant Friars, and that the Sacrament was reserved only for the communion of the sick. But she did permit such as were really unable to come to the Celebration to have their part in the service by sending the Blessed Sacrament to their homes. This S. Justin Martyr tells us in so many words. Then again it was the custom for Bishops to send to distant Bishops a portion of the Eucharist as a token of communion. And there is one remarkable account in the writings of Innocent I., in which he says that he was wont to send the Eucharist (*fermentum*) from his own Church to the presbyters of the city churches on the Lord's Day, that they might not especially on that day fancy themselves separated from his communion. Bona (lib. i. xxiii. ix.) considers that they added this to the Eucharist consecrated by themselves, and that they and others communicated of both. In the Cæsarean Liturgy of S. Basil, the Invocation being made for the change of the sacred elements the priest continues, "Unite all of us who partake of this one Bread and one Cup in the communion of one HOLY SPIRIT;" so again in the Liturgy of Nestorius, "That the partaking of these holy Mysteries may be to all who receive them that we may be mutually joined together in love by one band of charity and peace; and that we may be one body and one spirit, as we are called in one hope of our calling." There is similar language in the Coptic Liturgy of S. Basil and in the Ethiopian. S. Augustine says in one of his sermons, (vii. 7, *Lib. of Fathers*), "So then the Eucharist is our daily bread; but let us in such wise receive it, that we be not refreshed in our bodies only, but in our souls. For the virtue which is apprehended there is unity, that gathered into His Body and made His members, we may be what we receive, then will it be indeed our daily bread." Unity and communion then were signified and maintained, ordinarily by participating together in the whole Eucharistic Service, under certain special circumstances by only partaking in common of the Holy Communion, but by joining together in the Sacrifice only, never. And this accords with the idea set forth by S. Paul, whose whole argument in respect to unity through the Altar and to the communion of the

faithful with each other, is founded (1 Cor. x. 16—21) not on offering but on participation.

An argument to the contrary may be and has been attempted, founded on the fact of the *consistentes* in the Early Church, who were allowed to be present but not to partake; the argument being, that this shows the Early Church to have considered the Sacrifice and the Communion separable. But what is the fact? These *consistentes* were an order of penitents; those who having gone through certain stages of penitence had arrived at this last, in which they were kept for a year, three years, or whatever time the Canon prescribed, and in which they were allowed to be present with the faithful at the Celebration, but still in penance and unreconciled and not counted amongst the faithful. How is this any argument for what might be done by the faithful, or of the separableness of the Sacrifice and the Communion in their case? What might be granted to persons completing their term of penance, and still excommunicate as a kind of imperfect worship could be no rule for the faithful, and was in reality no sign that the Sacrifice was something, in which part could be taken separately from Communion. In truth were these *Consistentes*, though present, considered to be partakers in the Sacrifice, all unreconciled as they were? They were partakers in the prayers, but no more. Thus the eleventh Canon of Nicæa orders, "Let them communicate with the people in the prayers, without the oblation;" similarly the Ancyran Canons, e.g., "To partake of prayers only, and so come to perfection," (τὸ τίλειον, i.e. Communion.) Renaudot (Lit. Orient. Vol. ii. p. 71.) speaks of the unbaptized and all penitents, as *qui jus oblationis et communionis non habebant*; but as though all were equally excluded from the *Missæ Fidelium*, forgetting the *Consistentes*, who were allowed to remain, but nevertheless were without the *jus oblationis et Communionis*. They were not even allowed to join in making the offerings; how could they join in offering the holy Sacrifice? The one was correlative to the other. Any ancient Liturgy will show this, by the manner of offering them to God, by the prayers for the offerers both then and at the solemn oblation, in which intercessions are made for those who offered and for those for whom they offered; by the similarity of phraseology used in both oblations of the gifts. For they were offered with a view to the great Eucharistic Oblation, that the Sacrifice should be taken out of them. Van Espen (Tractatus de jure Parochorum, Cap. ii. viii.) arguing that notorious offenders should not be allowed to make their oblations, says, "Who knows not that the offering made at the Altar is a kind of participation in the Sacrifice with the faithful and with the priest himself; the very admission to making the oblation, a kind of public token of peace and conciliation? And the Church has never admitted to the offering at the Altar during the solemnities of Mass any but those whom she be-

lied to be partakers of peace and reconciliation with God. Whence the custom, that the priest on receiving the offerings says, *Pax tecum.*" He has more on the subject in the *Jus Eccles. Univ.* (II. V. iv. xii., &c.) Bingham also in Book xv. ii. 2. The Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305,) acting on the same principle, but according to primitive practice associating the oblations not only with the Sacrifice but also with the Communion, orders the oblations of those not communicating to be refused. The *Consistentes* then were not partakers in the Sacrifice, although allowed to remain, but only in the prayers. The Service may be divided into three parts: 1. The Consecration and holy Oblation. 2. The participation. 3. The prayers accompanying these two; and it was in these latter only that the *Consistentes* had their part; in that which was no essential of the Service. S. Chrysostom himself draws this distinction in the third Homily on the Ephesians, where he speaks of persons neither worthy of the Sacrifice, nor of the participation, nor of the prayer that accompanies them, saying, that in these last there is a certain benefit. But to partake of these is a very different thing from partaking in the Sacrifice; and it is precisely in the prayers that the *Consistentes* were allowed to have their part by the express words of the Canons; the prayers from which all other classes of penitents were excluded, whilst the final privilege to follow upon their reconciliation was, to become communicants. But what was a boon, a first step toward Communion, a kind of imperfect communion, granted to penitents whose term of penitence was drawing to a close, could be no kind of proof, that the Church regarded the Sacrifice and the Communion as separate in any such manner, as that one might be attended by the faithful without their taking part in the other.

Then again we are met with another objection, that the Church did in fact separate them, for she allowed people to receive the Communion without being present at the Sacrifice; that is to say, she sent the Communion to the sick, those who travelled or were in the desert were allowed to have it with them, and devout people who could not come daily to the church were allowed to take the Sacrament home, and reserve It and communicate themselves daily. And therefore it is argued, that she may allow them to assist at the Sacrifice without partaking of the Communion. But after all what are these examples to the purpose? We are talking of the ordinary public Service of the Church, and what was required of those who attended it in order duly to take part in it; and we are met with instances of what was done in private, and with extraordinary cases and cases of necessity. The question is this; putting aside all consideration of benefits to be derived by the receiver, and regarding the act merely as a fulfilment of our Lord's Institution, and as the offering of worship to Almighty God, we say that the Communion, the feasting before God on the Sacrifice of-

ferred, is a part of the appointed worship; that without it the worship is incomplete and mutilated, the Institution not fully observed. It is idle in such a case to bring instances which have reference to the Communion as the Christian's spiritual food and sustenance. There is this distinction. In the Holy Eucharist our Blessed Lord is present on the Altar as the Sacrifice to be offered and feasted upon before God, but also as the Sacrifice of which the Flesh is meat indeed and the Blood drink indeed, Which whoso eateth and drinketh hath eternal life, the bread from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die. And this distinct character is realized by those who speak of attending one Celebration for communion and another for worship; their fault is that they do not see, that for the worship to be perfect there must be communion as its completion, and that in the Church's public Service the Communion must be accompanied by the worship, of which in fact it is a part. It must be remembered always that the Holy Eucharist is a celebration before God both of a Sacrifice and a Feast; the Communion itself also having a twofold aspect, both of which are united in that Celebration; under one of which it is the complement of the Sacrifice, a high and solemn act of worship paid to God with praise and thanksgiving, under the other of which it is a means of grace and, like Baptism, an extension of the Incarnation, just as in the Communion of infants, of the sick and dying. The latter of these only is considered by those who communicate at one time and "worship" at another. Their "communion" is rather a private act, and their worship mutilated.

The Church herself appears in a manner to mark this distinction in regard to the twofold character of the Communion, in her Mass of the Presanctified; when she changes her Eucharistic Service for one more suited to the time, omitting the consecration as too festive but still retaining the Communion. In the Latin Church indeed the priest alone now communicates, but it was not always so. "Martene has shown from authorities dating from the seventh to the tenth century that Communion took place on the part of the people as well as the priest. All the congregation communicated after the priest, a custom long retained in Monasteries." Thus, though there was no Consecration, there was participation of the "Holy things presanctified for holy persons." After the Eucharistic Service has been ended the Holy Sacrament still remains, what it had been made, the Body and Blood of CHRIST, the channel of that Life and those gifts treasured up for His members in our Lord's Divine Humanity, the means of union with Him. Hence it was given to infants, who could take no part in the Service and pay no worship, and who could only receive it as they had received their Baptism; and for this reason those who were hindered from attending the public Service gladly reserved the Bread of Life to be taken as a daily Fountain of Grace and of

closer communion with their LORD. We may well suppose that at such a time they joined in spirit with the Church in that worship in which they could not take part, and that they offered their own solemn service and praise to GOD as they were able; but still the object which they had in view was, that through that Communion CHRIST might dwell in them and they in Him. This reservation of the Holy Eucharist by private persons in their own houses was not anything done by stealth. The Church sanctioned it, and it is supposed to have lasted till about the eighth century. But this and all these other customs only show how pre-eminent was the value set upon Communion in those days. They might be debarred from the Holy Sacrifice, and doubtless it was a sore trial to them; but they were careful that every day they should be able to partake of their daily bread. For daily communion was the rule in the early days; and it was in this sense that they understood that petition of the LORD's Prayer, not in the sense of daily presence at the Sacrifice only but of daily participation. When they could they took part in both; when hindered from the Sacrifice they partook of the Communion reserved in their own homes, or wheresoever they might be. This was the great object; not to come to the Church for worship at the Sacrifice and to Communicate spiritually, but whether they could come to the Church or not, always to Communicate. It was not only the Church's rule that all present should communicate; but it was the one thought and desire of the faithful themselves, even to the extent of keeping the Holy Eucharist at home for daily Communion. It was only when love grew cold and faith less keen that this appreciation of Communion beyond all things became fainter; and then it is that we find the Church interposing with Canons, and endeavouring to stop the falling away. For awhile no Canons were needed. It was well known what the holy Institution required, and love had no need to be urged to fulfil its duty. When the duty began to be neglected, then we find the Church endeavouring to enforce it. And we can trace from time to time how devotion grew weaker and discipline became relaxed, until at last we find attendance at the Sacrifice the rule, and Communion the exception. It appears that the custom of daily or very frequent Communion lasted longer in the West than in the East. We know how S. Chrysostom complains, "In vain is the daily Sacrifice, in vain do we stand before the Altar, there is no one to partake;" and how S. Ambrose contrasts the daily Communion in the West with the infrequent Communion of Christians in the East. Although the accusation of S. Ambrose (or the writer *de Sacramentis*) against the Eastern Christians seems to be too unqualified, yet we learn that their Communion was less frequent than in the West. In the West some received daily, some three or four times a week, others every LORD's Day and Festival. But the name of the Eu-

charistic food is the "daily Bread," and S. Ambrose argues from the name to the duty of daily Communion. S. Augustine, with others, calls the Eucharist our daily Bread, but nevertheless respects the scruples of those who think it better to communicate at intervals of a few days. S. Cyprian again speaks as though daily Communion were a matter of course. The passages which refer to these customs may be found in Bingham (xv. ix.) but they are too numerous and too long for quotation here. There is a Canon in the Decree of Gratian (de Cons. dis. ii. c. x.) attributed, though falsely, to Pope Anacletus, which shows the custom of the Roman Church: "The Consecration being completed let all communicate, who would not be cast out of the Church, (ecclesiasticis carere liminibus,) for so the Apostles ordered and the holy Roman Church holds." This Canon Van Espen (Obscr. ad iii. part. Grat. dis. i. 60, and dis. ii. 10.) considers to refer not only to the priests but also to all the faithful present at Mass. We may compare with it what S. Jerome says: "I know that at Rome this is the custom, for the faithful always to receive the Body of CHRIST;" and again, writing, "Concerning whether the Eucharist should be taken daily, which, he says, is the custom of the Roman and Spanish Churches." These testimonies show the great value which was attached to Communion; and how long a time the custom of very frequent and even daily Communion remained in the Western Church; whilst the Canon quoted from Gratian shows, according to Van Espen's interpretation of it, that the rule of the Roman Church was for all to communicate, a rule, which I trust to prove the rule of the Church at large in the first few centuries. Bishop Beveridge, whose great work Van Espen characterises as "truly full of a most learned explanation of the Canons and exposition of the whole ecclesiastical discipline and well worthy of being read," says, (Codex Can. lib. ii. cap. iii. de frequenti Communione,) "These oblations, when consecrated, were distributed to all present and by them partaken of. No one went out before he had fed on that spiritual food." "There can be no doubt but that the primitive Christians as often as they assembled for the public prayers of the Church, also celebrated the Eucharist, which they made of so great importance, that they believed it to be thoroughly necessary to all Christians; so that not only all those that were present at the prayers and assembly partook of it, but those also who by illness or necessity were hindered from being present."

S. Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, written about the middle of the second century, in the sections 85—7, gives an account of the celebration of Holy Eucharist; "Prayers being over, (that is, the first part of the service,) we salute each other with a kiss. After this bread and a cup of wine mixed with water are brought to the president, which he takes, and offers up praise and glory to the FATHER of all things, through the Name of His Son

and the HOLY SPIRIT, giving thanks at great length for that God hath vouchsafed to us these things. When he has finished his praises and thanksgivings, all the people present assent with an audible voice, saying Amen. The thanksgiving having been thus offered by the president, and the assent of all the people having been given, the deacons distribute to every one present a portion of this Bread that has been blessed and of the mixed Wine, and carry some also to the absent. This food we call the Eucharist." "In every Eucharistic Sacrifice we bless the Maker of all things through His SON JESUS CHRIST, and through the HOLY SPIRIT. And upon the day called Sunday, all that live either in city or country, meet together in the same place," when he says the Apostles and Prophets are read, and there is a sermon and then prayers, after which "Bread and Wine mixed with water are offered, and the president offers up prayers and thanksgivings with all his power; the people ending all with a joyful assent of Amen. Then the Consecrated Elements are distributed and partaken of by all that are present, and sent to the absent by the deacons." Then there is the witness of Tertullian in the beginning of the third century, whose words (de Orat. XIX.) show how thoroughly unknown was any custom of coming to the celebration without receiving the Communion, any idea of separating the Sacrifice from participation. The rule would appear to have been, judging from his words, that those who did not think right to communicate stayed away altogether. "In like manner very many think that on station days *they ought not to attend the prayers* at the Sacrifices, because when the Body of the LORD has been received, the station must be broken up. Doth then the Eucharist break up a service devoted 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, the partaking of the Sacrifice and the fulfilment of the service." Where would have been the difficulty, or what the need of *reserving*, if there were any custom of being present without receiving? The age of Tertullian is also the age at which the great Liturgies of the Church probably were committed to writing. And whatever changes or additions may have been made in them, still it is beyond all controversy clear how entirely they are drawn up without the recognition of any being present but those who were about to communicate, when the Catechumens and others had departed. About the same period, that is the close of the second and beginning of the third century, is the age of those called the Apostolical Canons. What these canons originally were is not known; but probably they were the canons of various provincial synods, which the Church adopted as her own. However local in their origin, they became of authority in the Church. They are referred to by Synods of the Church

in such terms as, "According to the Canon." "The Canon allows or forbids." Thus they are referred to in the 14th Canon of the Council of Ancyra, (A.D. 315,) again at the Council of Nicæa. They were appealed to at the Council of Ephesus by the Bishops of Cyprus, and referred to in the 8th Canon of the Council; and the Canons of the Council of Antioch, (A.D. 341,) themselves forming part of the Code of the Universal Church, were almost entirely formed upon them, using their phrases, expanding them, and as it were explaining them. This is a point to be borne in mind, as it is of some moment in determining the meaning of one of the Apostolical Canons which we shall have to consider. Bishop Beveridge in his *Codex Canonum*, (lib. i. cap. iv.,) learnedly discusses the whole question of the authority and age of these Canons, and their relation to the Antiochene. And Van Espen in his introduction to them, (Tract. Historico-Can. III. iii. 3.) quotes Beveridge as well as Albaspinæus, Dupin, and Hincmar, in proof of their great antiquity and authority. At the end of the Fifth Century, these, with the other Canons of the Church Code, were translated into Latin by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian by birth, a Roman by education. Van Espen brings forward testimony to prove how highly he was esteemed and how learned he was "in utràque linguâ," and in the Scriptures. Then he mentions how his Codex was received at Rome and in time over all the Latin Church, with however the same qualification as in the case of the African Code, that of course this did not imply being committed to everything in it. It was even called absolutely *Codex Canonum* by Popes; and he remarks that it is evident from his letter to S. Cæsarius of Arles in the beginning of the sixth century, that Pope John II. so received it.

Of these Apostolical Canons the 9th, or as some call it the 10th, shows that some disorder was creeping into the Church, and excommunicates any who attend the service without staying to communicate. Its words are, "All the faithful who enter into the Church of God and hear the sacred Scriptures, but do not wait for the prayers and the holy Participation, ought to be excommunicated as causing disorder in the Church." This Canon is appealed to by Bingham, Bishop Cosin, Beveridge, and others amongst our own divines, and by the Roman Ritualist Cardinal Bona, as evidence that the Church allowed none to be present without communicating. Amongst the Greeks Balsamon also puts the same interpretation upon it. Dionysius Exiguus also plainly had no doubt about it, for he translates, "Nec sanctam Communionem percipiant," (*and do not receive the Holy Communion.*) But Van Espen amongst Roman writers and amongst ourselves the late Archdeacon Wilberforce interpret the Canon to mean, "do not stay in the Church until the service is ended;" or to that effect. Archdeacon Wilberforce says further, that two Greek scho-

liasts, Zonaras and Aristenus, took the same view; and he also appeals to a scholiast mentioned by Beveridge, who gives a similar interpretation. It is therefore necessary to take this view into consideration. The mere wording of the Canon will admit of either sense; and it is natural that those who have written upon it should have seen the Canon in the light to which they were accustomed; that divines who were accustomed to a system which allowed people to remain without communicating should read the Canon in that sense, whilst those who disliked such a system should see in it the opposite meaning. And this is what we find, except as I have said, that the Greek Balsamon interprets it in the same sense as our divines, and the Roman Ritualist Bona seems to have no doubt of that being the meaning. In order, however, to fully enter into the question, the previous Canon must be taken with it. The 8th Canon is, "If any Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, or any one on the sacerdotal list when the offering is made, does not partake of it, let him declare the cause, and if it be a reasonable one, let him be excused. But if he does not declare any let him be excommunicated, as being a cause of offence to the people and occasioning a suspicion against the offerer, as if he had not made the offering properly." The argument then, on the part of those who take the meaning of the scholiast, is; that all the Clergy were always bound to communicate, that therefore if any of these did not receive they were to be proceeded with as the Canon directs; but that the Laity were not bound to receive always, only to remain; and that this is all the Canon requires in their case. Van Espen draws attention also to the fact, that the Canon concerning the Laity does not require them to give a reason as in the other Canon, which he concludes that it would do, if it were directed against the same fault. Archdeacon Wilberforce further argues that the Apostolical and Antiochene Canons are connected together by all commentators; that the Antiochene was directed against special and local sectarists, who troubled the Church, in proof of which he refers to the Canons of Gangra in Paphlagonia, passed between A.D. 325 and 341; and that therefore if the Apostolical Canon has such a meaning as is contended for, it must be merely of local and special interest. He further argues on general grounds that the interpretation, which would make it punish all who refused to communicate, is inconsistent with the fact, that the Church did allow the presence of some as the *Consistentes*, who were not allowed to communicate.

Now this last argument I have already considered, and it seems to me as I have said, simply nothing to the purpose. The Canon itself has reference only to the "faithful" by its very wording. The Church had her own separate system for penitents. The other argument concerning the Canons of Antioch has this much of truth, that the Canons are connected together; but it seems

the strangest of arguments to say, because the Antiochene Canon, a century later, happened to be directed against a peculiar sect, that therefore the earlier on which it was founded also had a special and local aim; and this, too, when not this one only, but nearly all the Antiochene Canons are founded on the Apostolical; and the Apostolical had long been considered as of authority in the Church at large, as laying down general principles. Then again he assumes, but brings no proof, beyond the reference to the Canons of Gangra, that the Antiochene Canon was of only local interest, founded on the prevalence of a particular heresy, and not the expression of a general principle. This is simply begging the question. Let it for argument's sake be admitted that the Eustathians were aimed at by the Antiochene Canon; this does not exclude the assertion of a general principle by the Canon. The 11th, 12th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th Canons had a special object against Athanasius and Paul of Constantinople; but they aimed at their object through the assertion of general principles; and as such the Canons were approved and taken into the Code of the Church. I see no reason whatever for asserting that the 2nd Canon of Antioch was "not the expression of a general principle." It certainly must have been in that character that both it and the Apostolical Canon were received into the Code of the Church, whatever local object they may have had, (if so it was,) at the beginning. But after all, strangely enough, the Archdeacon contends that the Apostolical Canon must have this special object, only if it has the meaning to which he objects; if it may be interpreted in the sense for which he contends, then he appears to be willing that its aim should be the assertion of a general principle. But there is an objection to this special object for which he contends at the outset. He supposes the 9th Apostolical and 2nd Antiochene Canons to have been aimed at the followers of Eustathius. The Canons of Gangra, which are undoubtedly aimed at them, mention their object distinctly; but there is no such object alluded to in this Apostolical Canon, unless as he suggests it is intimated in the phrase, "as bringing disorder into the Church." Eustathius and his views were not condemned until between 325 and 341 by the small local Synod of Gangra, which itself referred to the Apostolical Canons as the "Ecclesiastical Canons;" (Beveridge, Codex, i. v. 1;) whereas these Apostolical Canons were of authority long before the Synod of Ancyra, A.D. 315; and the Antiochene phraseology is plainly founded on the "Apostolical." I think we may safely dismiss this hypothesis. There remains still Van Espen's objection; but this also need not I think cause any great difficulty; for it is clearly a very different matter for some of the Laity to do a thing and for any of the Clergy to do it. Any of the Laity might go out without communicating and be liable to censure for acting in a disorderly

manner, but there it would end. But if one of the Clergy for instance, who would still be remaining in his place, should though present refuse to communicate, it would clearly be a more marked and scandalous thing, liable to such misinterpretation as is mentioned, and therefore requiring explanation or punishment. There is surely not much difficulty in seeing why an explanation should be demanded in one case, which would not be needed in the other. But Van Espen has created a difficulty for himself, more difficult of explanation. Here is a Canon of the beginning of the third century, taken early into the Code of the Church, which he so interprets as to implicitly sanction the presence at the Eucharistic Service of those who do not communicate, only censuring them if they go away before the end. Yet again and again, as I have already shown by quotations, he asserts and brings witnesses, such as Micrologus, Bona, &c., to assert with him, that in the primitive times none but those communicating were allowed to be present at mass; and that this lasted in the Church for a long time. I may appeal to himself against his own interpretation of the Canon, an interpretation which, I think we may see from the sentence following, only commended itself to him as a defence of the Roman practice against the "heretics." And in the same way he has been betrayed into a false interpretation of the 2nd Antiochene Canon. That is too plain to be translated in any other way than as an excommunication of those who refuse to *communicate*; but he remarks upon it, "This Canon shows that formerly the faithful present at the Sacrifice were accustomed to communicate Sacramentally, and that it was thought a serious thing to turn away from Communion, *non quidem ex humilitate sed ex quâdam insolentia vel intemperantia*; which would imply that if it were done out of humility it would not matter. Now there is not a word of the kind or anything to justify such an implication in the Canon; neither is "insolentia" an equivalent translation. The word is in fact exactly the same as in the Apostolical Canon, ἀταξία (disorder or irregularity;) and those are censured in the one Canon as bringing disorder into the Church, who are censured in the other as in a disorderly way turning away from the Communion. It is the same word which is used in the 15th and 16th Apostolical Canons concerning a presbyter or deacon who leaves his proper diocese, and concerning any bishop who receives such an one when put into lay-Communion as a cleric. The one is guilty of ἀταξία, the other is διδάσκαλος ἀταξίας. The phrase in the Antiochene Canon is translated by Martin, Archbishop of Braga, in his Collection of Canons, *pro luxurid sua*. Zonaras, quoted by Archdeacon Wilberforce, translates "irregularly;" but meaning thereby "without a sufficient excuse." But there is this objection to the Scholiast's interpretation, that he makes the two Canons, instead of one amplifying and explaining the other, refer to two different things; that is,

he makes the Apostolical denounce those who do not stay to the end of the service and so bring in disorder; but the Antiochene denounce those who refuse in an irregular way to communicate, that is, "without sufficient reason." This objection appears to me very serious, because the relation of the Antiochene to the Apostolical Canons is very close, the one being re-enactments, amplifications and paraphrases of the other, rather than anything else. This 2nd Canon of Antioch for instance is made up of several Apostolical from the 9th to the 18th; the 3rd Canon again of the 15th and 16th Apostolical; and any one carefully examining them will see the manner in which the Synod of Antioch used the Apostolical Canons. Or better still, let him read Bishop Beveridge's *Codex Canonum*, (lib. i. cap. iv.) Beveridge remarks upon this and the other Canons; "It is evident that the first part of this Antiochene Canon is nothing else than a paraphrase and explanation of the Apostolical . . . and the same can be seen in most of the other Antiochene Canons, in which the Apostolic are not recited only, but clearly explained."

Another equally serious objection lies against the interpretation in question—that it inverts the order of abuses and remedies which Church history gives us. The Antiochene, the later, canon condemns those who in an irregular manner do not communicate, whereas the Apostolical, older by about a century, is thus made to implicitly sanction the presence of persons without communicating, and only to condemn those who do not stay to the end of the service, as though people had become more devout a century later and Church discipline severer, whereas we know that the stream ran in exactly the opposite direction, and that the course of events would be very well expressed if the Apostolical Canon were regarded as directed against an abuse then entering into the Church, and the Antiochene against the same abuse persisted in. As to any argument founded on the use in the 8th Canon of a different phrase from that in the 9th, it involves a curious piece of hypercriticism. In the first place it is very obvious why the form which is used in the 8th is used. The Canon speaks not merely about the duty of communicating, but has reference to the offerer and to the offering being rightly made, and to the people having cause of offence, as though it were not rightly offered; therefore it says, "If any . . . when the offering is made does not partake of it." In the 9th the question is only of the duty of communicating, therefore it simply says, "do not stay for the prayers and the holy participation;" and in an age in which a custom of staying and not partaking was unknown, neither those who made the Canon nor those who heard it would imagine that any further explanation was wanting. In such a case "to stay" and "to partake" would be convertible terms.

But again, how comes it to pass that Dionysius Exiguus trans-

lated it, "Nec Sanctam Communionem percipient?" He was one well skilled both in Latin and Greek, and as his contemporary Cassiodorus tells us, was as highly regarded for his learning as for his character. There can be, I think, but one answer, either that he knew that such had been the rule of the Church or that such was still the rule in his own time; at any rate that the rule so far remained as that to his mind this was the meaning most obviously suggested. If the Church had never had such a rule as that all present should participate, it seems amazing, not to say impossible, that he should so have translated the Greek. And I think we arrive at the same result if we consider the date assigned to this code of Apostolical Canons, viz. the end of the second or beginning of the third century; about half a century since Justin Martyr told us how all the faithful partook of the Holy Eucharist. If we take the view against which I have been contending we have to conclude that, in days when the fire of primitive fervour was not gone out, in this space of time the faithful had not only adopted the custom of being present without communicating, but that some were even failing in this, whilst the Church had acquiesced in this change and only interposed when this last abuse began to creep in. Surely it is very improbable that so great a change should have taken place in so short a time, or even in a longer time, and that the Church should have so passively acquiesced in it. But, moreover, this date assigned to the Canons is the age of Tertullian, who shows that he knew of no such custom; of Clement of Alexandria, who says, "Having broken the Eucharist, according to custom, they allow each one of the people to take his portion of it;" of S. Cyprian, who, writing of that petition in the LORD'S Prayer, says, "This bread we pray that it may be given us day by day, lest we who are in CHRIST, and who daily receive the Eucharist for food of salvation, should by the admission of any grievous crime, and our being therefore shut out from communion and forbidden the heavenly Bread, be separated from the Body of CHRIST." "Hence then we pray that our Bread, which is CHRIST, may be given to us day by day; that we who abide in CHRIST and live in Him may not draw back from His sanctification and His Body." Whence we may remark that S. Cyprian takes the daily Communion of the faithful for granted, and only draws a distinction between them and those who for some grievous crime are excommunicated. Is it credible that a Canon belonging to such an age could have any other meaning than to censure those who did not remain to communicate? But one thing we do see, the beginning of a falling off, the first cooling of devotion, when some did not care to communicate whenever they were present, but breaking through the Church's rule brought disorder into the Church by not staying for the prayers and the holy Communion. And this disorder continued notwithstanding the Canon, so that the Council

of Antioch renewed the censure passed upon those guilty of it. S. Chrysostom complains of the same disorderly practice which these two Canons denounce. He says (Hom. III. de incompr. Dei Nat.) that multitudes flock together to hear the sermon, but that when the time comes for celebrating the Mysteries the Church is nearly empty, by which neglect they lose all the praise due to their diligence in hearing. Then he goes on to say that if they laid his words up in their hearts they would stay in the Church and receive the Holy Mysteries with piety and veneration. Where we may notice that he speaks of the reception as though it were the natural consequence and object of their remaining. Similarly Dionysius, giving an account of the Holy Mysteries, says, after mentioning the expulsion of the penitents, &c., "Then the ministers and devout people, reverently beholding the holy Signs, not yet consecrated but blest and offered up to GOD on the table of prothesis, praise and bless the *ΠΑΤΗΡ* of light (from Whom, as all good gifts, so this great blessing of the Communion comes) with the Catholic hymn of praise, which some call the Creed. . . . When this hymn is finished the deacons with the priest set the holy Bread and Cup of blessing on the Altar." (Plummer on "Book of Common Prayer," 118.) Here we find the Communion the leading idea, and giving its name to the Service. "The word 'Communion,' according to Cardinal Bona, (I. 3.) was one of the most ancient names of the Liturgy, and was 'used not only for the Eucharist but also for the Sacrifice in which it is effected, and from which communion is inseparable.'" And though in saying this he may mean communion by the priest alone, yet such was not the ancient meaning, the meaning of S. Chrysostom or of these canons.

It has been asked, if this was the Church's rule, what became of those who for a temporary cause deemed themselves on any particular day unfit for communion, as there must have been such sometimes. Yet in their estimation it was no light thing which ought to keep men from the Communion. They called it the medicine for sins, and on that ground S. Ambrose urges daily Communion; and S. Augustine tells us of those in his time who held that no Christian ought to separate himself from the daily medicine of the LORD'S Body, unless guilty of such great sins as to be considered excommunicate—which is language similar to that already quoted from S. Cyprian. Dionysius also, in the passage quoted, speaks in a like manner, for he says, "The Catechumens, &c., are dismissed, and they only allowed to stay who are deemed worthy to receive the Holy Sacrament." Still if there were those who judged themselves on any day unfit to communicate, what became of them? They may have taken the place of the *Consistentes*, or they may probably have stayed away altogether. I have already remarked on the passage from Tertullian (de Oratione, xix.)

that the persons mentioned by him appear to have stayed away altogether from the Service as the only way of not communicating; whilst he, not thinking of any such method as "hearing Mass," advised them if so scrupulous to go and take the Sacrament, but reserve it until the hour when they were ready to receive it. On the other hand I have already mentioned the rubric in the Armenian Liturgy, which orders those who do not communicate to go outside the doors and pray there. There is a sentence also which seems to the purpose in the 20th Homily on the Statues, (Ox. trans.) S. Chrysostom having told those who had kept the Lenten Fast, in preparation for Easter Communion, to see what spiritual food they had gained, says, "Should he discover that in this good traffic he has made any gain by the fast, and be conscious in himself of much care taken of his wounds, let him draw near. But if he hath remained in neglect, having nothing to show but mere fasting, and hath done nothing which is right besides, *let him remain without*, and then let him enter when he hath purged out all these offences." Again there are canons of the Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305) which seem to bear on this case both ways—one already cited which forbids the oblations of those to be received who do not communicate, and which implies the presence of such in the Church in the temporary position of penitents; another which orders any one resident in the city, if absent from Church for three Sundays, to be excluded from Communion for the same time, implying that persons absenting themselves for some cause for a short time would be excused, only not for too long a time, for then they would incur censure either as guilty of absence for no good cause or as having sinned too gravely and deserving something more than their self-imposed excommunication. The same rule is mentioned in the 14th Canon of Sardica (A.D. 347).¹

This Antiochene Canon has brought us into a new era, when persecution was ended and the Church was flourishing—but an era when, as the consequence, devotion began to grow cold. In the earlier ages we find all present communicating and the Sacrament sent to the absent, many or most communicating daily, (so that S. Cyprian speaks of it as though a matter of course,) but not compelled to do so, the Church only requiring it on Sundays and great days; others unable to come to the Service and communicating at home on the Sacrament which they had reserved; and doubtless others less devout coming to Church occasionally or only on the LORD'S Day. But even in these times the devotion of some grew fainter, and they went away from the Church without staying for the prayers and the Holy Communion, so that the Church inter-

¹ On which Van Espen remarks, that both Canonists and Theologians have observed from this Canon how strict from ancient times was the obligation of attending the parochial Mass, and that absence for three Sundays was interpreted as "contempt of the Parish Church."

fered and forbade any such disorderly custom. But the forbidden custom continued and we find the Canon re-enacted by the Council of Antioch. The same Canon¹ was copied by Martin, Archbishop of Braga, into his collection, who translates *κατὰ ἀταξίαν* by *pro luxurid sud*, and after "turns himself away from the communion of the Sacrament," inserts, "and in the observation of the Mysteries refuses the constituted rule of discipline."

It is not to be supposed that in all Churches the falling off began equally early, or that it increased with equal rapidity, though we may be certain that as years went on, and especially when persecution ended, the numbers would increase of those who came to Church less frequently and who disregarded the rule of the Church. S. Jerome speaks of those in the Roman and Spanish Churches always communicating; yet there were clearly some disorderly practices in Spain, as we learn from the Canons just now quoted of the Council of Eliberis. S. Jerome is a witness that in his day daily communion was still the custom at Rome; S. Augustine, of a frequency varying in different places, but still a frequent participation—some communicating every day, some on certain days, in one place daily, in another only on the Sabbath and Sunday, in another on Sundays only. He says also, as we have seen, that whilst some thought it better to put a few days between their Communions, others considered it to be the duty of every Christian not under sentence of penance to communicate every day, to receive daily the medicine of the Lord's Body. He says himself to the newly baptized, (Serm. 227, ad infantēs,) "You ought to know what you have received, (i. e. in Baptism,) what you are going to receive, what you ought to receive daily." And he seems to speak with blame of the Easterns, who did not receive daily that which is called "our daily Bread." (See note *b* on S. Aug., S. John vi. 54, Library of the Fathers.)

All this implies that the rule of daily Communion had not died out in the West. S. Ambrose also, whilst speaking with the strongest censure of those who communicated once a year, urges the duty of daily Communion; for instance, "If as often as the Blood is poured forth it is poured forth for the remission of sins, I ought daily to receive it, that my sins may be always forgiven. I who am always sinning ought always to have the medicine." (De Sacram. iv. vi.)

On the other hand we learn from S. Chrysostom how grievous was the falling off and the relaxation of discipline in his part of the Church. He tells us that the Sacrifice was daily offered, but that there was no one to partake of it, even though prepared; whilst some came only on the great Festivals, and then not fitly prepared; some who came to the Communion went out immediately

¹ It was even revived in the ninth century by the Council of Aix la Chapelle. (Bingham, XV. ix. v.)

after receiving, without waiting for the end of the Service or the Communion of their brethren; (Hom. 24 de Bapt. Christi; see Bingham, XV. vi. v; also on S. Matth. xxvi. 30;) others stayed without communicating; many came merely for his sermon, and left when the Mysterics began. These and many other passages from different Fathers may be seen in Beveridge's 'Codex Canonum' (lib. ii. cap. iii. de frequenti communione) and in Bingham (Book XV. cap. iv. and ix.) Two passages, one from S. Ambrose, the other from S. Chrysostom, I will presently transcribe, but first I wish to end up with a short summary of the history of Christian Communion. Plainly matters went on from worse to worse, and the Church found herself unable to enforce her rules, until after a while we begin to find Canons in various places requiring Communion at less frequent intervals, and sanctioning the presence of those who did not communicate by requiring them to stay to hear Mass, and not to depart until a certain time in the Service. Thus the Council of Agde (A.D. 506) orders Communion three times a year, and requires all secular people to hear Mass on Sundays, and not to go out before the benediction. The third Council of Orleans and the fourth of Toledo (633) are to the same purpose, the latter ordering that the benediction should follow the Lord's Prayer and the "Conjunction" and precede Communion. Then came the still further corruption, which Van Espen reprobates, when the Communion was given to persons in health out of the proper time and not during the solemnities of Mass, thus further disjoining the Sacrifice and Communion. And lastly the Western Church contented herself with a rule, that the faithful should communicate once a year, viz. at Easter. To this the Christian's "daily Bread" had come—it was no longer the great privilege and joy of the Christian world and the centre of Christian life; to gaze upon It and adore It had taken the place of receiving It, and of desiring that through It CHRIST might dwell in His and they in Him. Meanwhile private and peculiar Masses had been increasing in number; frequent Communions had given place to multiplied Masses, the very reverse of the rule and practice of the primitive Church; and it was the complaint of many Roman Theologians that "as Masses were multiplied Communions diminished." And what shall hinder our going back to this again if we encourage a system of "hearing Mass?" Whilst we are rejoicing in increased Communions we are thus deliberately preparing the way for returning to a system which sprang out of and fostered rare Communions, and the indifference and indevotion which accompany them. What the Church struggled against as a disorderly abuse and kept off as long as she could, many are thus welcoming back as a devout and spiritual practice, a part of our "Catholic" inheritance.

The passage from S. Ambrose, of which I spoke, I quote from

Beveridge, (de frequenti Communione, sec. viii.) who introduces it saying that S. Ambrose thus addresses every Christian—"If it is daily Bread why do you take it after the interval of a year as the Greeks in the East are accustomed to do? Take daily what may daily profit you; so live that you may be worthy to receive daily. He who is not worthy to receive daily is not worthy to receive at the interval of a year. Behold, holy Job daily offered sacrifice for his sons lest by chance they should have been guilty of some sin in their hearts or their words. Do you then hear that as often as the Sacrifice is offered there is signified the Death of the LORD, the Resurrection of the LORD, the Ascension of the LORD, and the remission of sins, and yet do not take that Bread of life daily? He who has a wound requires a remedy. There is a wound, because we are under sin. The remedy is the celestial and venerable Sacrament. 'Give us this day our daily Bread.'" I have transcribed this passage partly because it puts strongly forward the view of the writer *de Sacramentis*, (for it is his,) concerning the duty of daily Communion and the remission of sins thereby obtained; and partly because it sets forth in an unexpected way the Communion as the final end of offering the Sacrifice and the means of obtaining its benefits. For having mentioned how Job offered for his sons, and how when the Sacrifice is offered such and such things are signified, he does not go on to urge the duty of offering, as one might expect, but of communicating, as though that were the one recognised way of making the Sacrifice available.

The passage from S. Chrysostom, with which I purpose to end the evidence in this matter, is one well known, but the meaning of which some have called in question, as though he had no purpose of saying what he appears to say. I can hardly imagine that they could have found much room for question had they not been somewhat blinded by an unwillingness to see his meaning. It is true that his main object was not to speak of persons remaining yet not communicating, but to warn his people of the duty of receiving worthily. From this, however, he passes on to the other subject, or rather subjects. For he complains of the manner in which Communion at the daily Sacrifice is neglected even by those worthy to receive; then, on the other hand, of the way in which some who communicate only rarely and formally at stated times, at great feasts, come to the Communion, however unworthy they may be. After which, he speaks again of those who do not communicate, and warns them in the strongest language against hearing and not partaking. He alternately warns the unworthy against persevering to come, and the worthy against not communicating. He distinctly makes them to be only of two classes; if unworthy then amongst the penitents who ought to withdraw; if not amongst the penitents, then worthy and bound to partake; if unworthy of the Sacrifice and participation, then also unworthy of the prayers. In

this last clause a kind of difficulty may be started, on the ground that the *Consistentes* were admitted to the prayers, though not worthy of the Sacrifice or the Communion; and that certain monks of Nitria, who, being accused by Theophilus of Alexandria of Origenism, had fled to Constantinople and besought the help of S. Chrysostom, were put into the same position by him. Their case not having been judicially decided, he would not give them communion in the Mysteries, but only in the prayers. But such cases, it must be repeated, are widely different from that of the faithful. Excommunicate persons, to whom a certain privilege is granted, might certainly hope for a benefit even from prayers designed exclusively for the faithful, when the faithful themselves could hope for nothing of the kind if they chose to despise their own higher privileges and to act in a disorderly way. The cases are so different that it is not easy to argue from one to the other. S. Chrysostom's argument with which we are concerned is, that those persons who did not communicate, if really unworthy, ought to withdraw as persons deserving excommunication.

Here again, Archdeacon Wilberforce endeavours to explain S. Chrysostom's words in a wholly inadequate sense. He says, "He is reasoning against those who were contented to come once or twice a year to the Holy Eucharist. Such persons, he says, cannot be living such lives as fit them to take part in the Church's prayers. So that it by no means follows that he would have spoken so severely of those who were commonly communicants, if some temporary circumstances had rendered them unfit for daily participation." Let it be that he is primarily addressing these careless persons, still his words cannot be confined to them or their particular fault, but are far too general in their application for this. Again, it is said, "If this (viz., to exclude those negligent to communicate, from the Sacrifice) had been his intention, he would surely have observed that the one of these duties could not be performed without the simultaneous performance of the other. For this would have been the legitimate argument to employ against those who attempted to separate them. But on this point he says not a syllable, his whole argument is addressed merely to the duty of receiving if men were in a state of grace." But it is not so; for he argues strongly against the "shameless effrontery" of staying and not communicating, and this in regard to "one and all of us."

I confess that I can scarcely see the drift of the Archdeacon's reasoning on S. Chrysostom's concluding remarks. Plainly he is urging them not to give up coming, but to come prepared. There is a passage very like it near the end of the 24th Homily on 1st Corinthians. "These things I say, not to keep us from approaching, but to keep us from approaching without consideration; for as the approaching at random is dangerous, so the not communi-

cating in those Mystical Suppers is famine and death." But if urging all to communicate, why could he not be at the same time warning those who did not, against being present at the Sacrifice? "Did he only tell them that they ought all to communicate, or did he exclude those from the Sacrifice who excluded themselves from the Sacrament?" Why not both? His aim was threefold—to warn those who approached unprepared; to warn those who approached rarely; and to warn those who, without approaching, dared to be present at the celebration.

Once more, it is said in reference to the remedy suggested by S. Chrysostom when he complained of the abuse, "Though he could not have wished all the Christians of Antioch or Constantinople to communicate daily in their existing state, he doubtless wished and urged them to qualify themselves for such a blessing. But what did he propose in the meantime, &c.?" But what has *daily* Communion to do with the question? S. Chrysostom is speaking of those who, when remaining, on any day do not communicate. But how many would remain, or be present, on week-days at all in S. Chrysostom's time? Some not even every Sunday. He complains, indeed, that none partake of the daily Sacrifice; but he says nothing of all the people, or even many, being daily present and not communicating. He only argues against their not communicating when they are present and do remain; and he does suggest a remedy to them if unworthy, *viz.*, to depart with the penitents. He even says in one of his illustrations, "Were it not better for such an one never to have come at all? better that is than to remain. In a note at the bottom of page 460 ("Holy Eucharist") the Archdeacon refers to the 9th Homily on the statues, and says, "He there speaks to persons as present at the Sacrifice who could not be designing to communicate, inasmuch as they were not fasting." Even if this note were correct, the extraordinary and terrible circumstances under which these Homilies were delivered might account for many irregularities. But there is no need of this explanation, for the note is not correct. S. Chrysostom expressly says he is speaking to the *absent*, those who had absented themselves because they had broken their fast, thinking it wrong to come then to hear the Holy Scriptures. But this is immaterial: what is important is this, that he is speaking of persons who ought to be present *not at the Sacrifice*, but to hear the Divine Oracles read and explained. There was, in fact, no Sacrifice at which they could be present; for these Homilies were delivered in Lent, during which time, except on the Sabbath and Lord's Day, there was no Oblation, only the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified. That those present, however, received the Holy Communion seems clear from the 6th Homily, sec. vii., "Our very meeting together daily as we do, and enjoying the hearing of the Divine Scriptures, and beholding each other, and weeping with

each other, and praying and receiving benedictions, (*εὐλογίας*, i.e. portions of the Eucharist,¹) and so departing home, takes off the chief part of our distress." (Oxford Trans., see note.) When the 9th Homily was delivered about five days later, some appear to have broken their fast, and in consequence to have considered themselves not only unfit for Communion, but also for hearing the Holy Scriptures and their explanation. Hence they did not even come to hear. This they might have done, and have remained as penitents or gone out with the penitents; for the sermon preceded the prayer for the Catechumens, as we may see, for instance, by the 15th Laodicean Canon, or by the Clementine Liturgy; and many of those who heard S. Chrysostom's sermons may have often gone out in the manner mentioned by the 9th Apostolical and 2nd Antiochene Canons. S. Chrysostom himself complains how the church is crowded to hear him preach, but empty when the Lord Himself appears in the Holy Mysteries. In the present case, those so going out or remaining would have had a good reason, being unable to communicate. This case, then, bears in no way upon the question we are discussing, as it refers to a totally different state of things. How the state of things, of which S. Chrysostom speaks in this 3rd Homily on the Ephesians gradually grew up and increased, and how the Church by degrees felt it necessary to recognise and regulate it, I trust I have already indicated. It now only remains to subjoin such extracts from the Homily as appear to me to have the meaning for which I contend.

"Art thou not worthy of the Sacrifice, nor of the participation? If so, then neither art thou of the prayer. Thou hearest the herald standing and saying, 'As many as are in penitence all depart.' As many as do not partake are in penitence. If thou art one of those that are in penitence, thou oughtest not to partake, for he that partakes not is one of those that are in penitence. Why, then, does he say, 'Depart ye that are not qualified to pray,' whilst thou hast the effrontery to stand still. But no; thou art not of that number, thou art of the number of those who are qualified to partake, and yet art indifferent about it, and regardest the matter as nothing. Look, I entreat; a royal Table is set before you, angels minister at that Table, the King Himself is there, dost thou stand still and gape?" Then returning to the parable of the Wedding Garment and the Lord coming in to see the guests, "He said not, Why didst thou sit down? No; before he sat down He declared him to be unworthy so much as to come in. He saith not, Why didst thou sit down to meat? but Why camest thou in? And these are the words that He is at this very moment addressing to one and all of us that stand here with such shameless effrontery. For every one that partaketh not of the

¹ Later the word had a different meaning, the "blest Bread" given to non-communicants.

Mysteries is standing here in shameless effrontery." Once more, "Tell me, suppose any one were invited to a feast, and were to wash his hands, and sit down, and be all ready at the Table, and after all refuse to partake, is he not insulting the man who invited him? Were it not better for such an one never to come at all? Now, it is just in the same way that thou hast come here. Thou hast sung the Hymn with the rest; thou hast declared thyself to be of the number of them that are worthy by not departing with them that are unworthy. Why stay and yet not partake of the Table? I am unworthy, thou wilt say. Then art thou also as unfit for that communion thou hast had in the prayers."

Before concluding I would again do my utmost to press the desirableness of having the chief Celebration at nine o'clock, or at some early hour, so that those who desire it may observe both the Church's rules by communicating fasting and by communicating at the chief or parochial Celebration, honouring the LORD's Body and keeping the Unity of the Church, as is meet. The present system of an early low Celebration, followed later by the chief Celebration, has many objections; one, that those who attend the former only, disregard the Unity of the Church and can never be said to celebrate the Eucharist as it ought to be celebrated; another, that those who attend both, as they say, one for Communion the other for worship, also disregard the Church's Unity by not communicating at the principal Celebration, and, further, divide what ought not to be divided. The worship is mutilated for want of its completing act in Communion; the Communion is wrested from its proper place as a part of GOD's worship, and is made to have respect only to the communicant. Every Celebration is *throughout* an act of worship offered to GOD, and it is our part to go out of ourselves, to forget ourselves, and to offer up our Sacrifice and Service to GOD; whereas in this separation of communion and worship there is the danger of making the Communion Service, in the one case an act of private devotion, a religious exercise, selfish, individual, and subjective, instead of the public and objective worship of the one Body; in the other, an act of meditation and adoration wrongly addressed instead of an act of worship offered to GOD according to the form and manner appointed by the Church.¹ There is yet a further danger. By many the true character of the Eucharistic Service and of GOD's worship therein will never be realized

¹ There is in Van Espen (*De Celebrat. Missa*, ix. xxiii., &c.) a reference to the Canons and decrees of several Synods, requiring the priests to explain to the people frequently what is done in the Mass, that they may the better follow and attend to all that is done by the celebrant, and instead of other devotions contemplate the celebration of the Mysteries with all their heart and mind. For, as he adds, beyond doubt it is more useful for the people, and more in conformity with the mind of the Church, and more becoming the Sacrifice itself, to attend to what is done in the Mass than to use any other devotions.

as an act of laud and adoration, praise, and thanksgiving, to be offered up, not only with one mind and one mouth, but with all the glory and grandeur attainable. There is all the more danger in a Service such as ours, which is not only plain in its ritual, but meagre in its praise to an extent unknown in any other Liturgy. Ordinarily the preface before the Sanctus is a long ascription of praise and adoration, though not nearly so long in the Western as in other Liturgies; and it is difficult to understand why, in the Books of King Edward the ordinary preface of the Sarum Liturgy was so curtailed. But in our present book we have also lost all the praise and thanksgiving accompanying the Consecration, when God's Love was celebrated, and the Commemoration was made before Him of what His SON had done for us, and "the Sacrifice of praise" was offered. The Church herself puts forward this praise and thanksgiving as the chief part of our Service, "Above all things ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to GOD the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, for the Redemption of the world by the Death and Passion of our SAVIOUR CHRIST, both GOD and Man." Yet she has strangely left out the expression of it. There is, therefore, all the more reason why we should make the most of that which we have, and offer it up with all possible solemnity and grandeur, and that all our people should be accustomed to this, and realise it as the true and right way of celebrating the Holy Eucharist. Probably this would not have been so forgotten, as it has been amongst us, had not all our Celebrations for so long a time been low Celebrations.

In saying this and in speaking of the meagreness of praise in our Liturgy, I have no thought of suggesting the doing of anything in the Service which is not allowed us in our own Service Books. I have already, in the beginning of this dissertation, protested against our attempting any such irregularity; though there may be many things which, if allowed us, would be gladly welcomed, yet I cannot understand by what authority we can adopt them of our own will. And in speaking of the plainness of our ritual, I by no means would be understood thereby as wishing to see the elaborate ceremonial and minute ritual of the old Sarum Liturgy restored; only that we should use, so far as circumstances allow, whatever is lawfully ours, whatever we lawfully can use to give full expression to our praise and to bring out to the utmost the dignity of the Eucharistic Service. Two things have to be considered. On the one hand, "care should be taken to allow of no ceremonies inconsistent with the rubrics, as well as to avoid overloading the Service with unauthorized observances;" on the other, all available means should be used to give dignity to our lawful ceremonial. Even though circumstances should compel us to have a Celebration without singing or any great dignity, yet still such majesty should be in the Celebration, as is within our power. At all events, every-

thing like a mere perfunctory discharge of a duty, the mere performance of a ceremony, gestures made with irreverent haste, a low hurried indistinct utterance, and such like should be avoided, as neither edifying to the Church, nor becoming towards God, nor worthy of the awful mysteries celebrated. "The rule of the Missal (not always adhered to) is, for the priest to use a distinct utterance, and avoid saying the prayers and other parts of the Liturgy too quickly, in order that he may attend seriously to what he utters, and on the other hand not too slowly, so as to produce tedium in the hearers." Above all, the words of Consecration should be pronounced solemnly, and so that all may hear and say, Amen; yet at the same time with all simplicity, without attempt at any special emphasis, and (as the Sarum Liturgy enjoins) in one breath. And this I say, because sometimes it would seem as though the celebrant imagined that there was something especially correct and Catholic in haste and indistinctness and lowness of voice, whereas it is probably the result, partly of Canons enjoining private Masses to be said in such a manner as that people might not be induced to attend them to the prejudice of the public Mass, and partly of the priest proceeding with the Canon whilst the choir was still singing the Sanctus, in which case it would be useless to attempt to make himself heard. This, and the use of Latin, when it ceased to be understood, are given by De Vert as the probable origin of saying the Canon in a low voice, which custom Bona asserts to have first taken place in the tenth century, (to which so many abuses are attributed,) as he finds no mention made of consecrating with a loud voice by any writers after the ninth century; up to that time, he says, the Western Church pronounced the holy and most efficacious words with a loud voice, as the Easterns do still. (Bingham, xv. iii. 84, also Notes on Bishop Wilson.¹) For ourselves, although the old Service Books of the English Church may be an assistance in doubtful points of ritual, we are not now bound by them or tied to their system; not so tied to them as that our ritual is false, if at variance with them. There can be such a thing as a High Celebration without the assistance of deacon and subdeacon. In the East, except at a Pontifical Celebration, there is only a deacon with the priest, as may be seen by any one who examines the rubrics of an ancient Liturgy. It is mentioned also by Renaudot in his "Observations on the Syriac Liturgies;" and it is said by the ritualist who wrote the "additional notes" to Bishop Wilson on the Lord's Supper: "There is no rule in the Missal for performing solemn Service in the absence of a subdeacon; it is customary in this case for the deacon, if there be one, to do the subdeacon's part as well as his own, the celebrant confining himself to his own part of the Service. The Rites of this Service, which

¹ Published by Oleaver, 1851. I here acknowledge my indebtedness to these notes, from which I have sometimes quoted passages, with quotation marks only.

is much in use in some Monastic Orders, are found in the Paris Ceremonial, 8, 9. It allows of but one acolyth." If this be thought too unusual or irregular for a precedent, or if any consider, as I think they may, that the English Church recognizes no distinction of "High" and "Low" Celebration, but that her ritual is always the same, except so far as varied by necessity, still there is nothing to hinder the Service from being a sung Service, sung and performed on Sundays and greater Festivals with as much grandeur and solemnity as circumstances allow; and at all times it may be celebrated, as it ought to be, however plainly, yet with due solemnity and reverence on the part both of priest and people, joining together in celebrating before God their Sacrifice of praise. For it is not the priest only who should observe the Church's rules; the people also should remember that they must take their full part in giving due dignity to the Holy Celebration according to the Church's directions, remembering also that their Service is not more fitly or reverently rendered by adopting some unauthorized ceremonialism of their own: a ceremonialism sometimes not conforming itself to the Church's own directions and so wanting in obedience and unity, sometimes ostentatious and distracting to others, (or even needlessly offensive,) and so wanting in charity, oftentimes also exaggerated and eccentric rather than Catholic. "Let all things be done decently and in order."

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

THE older meaning of Transubstantiation is different from that adopted by the Council of Trent. One arbitrary definition of "substance" was then substituted for another. Until the time when the Catechism of the Council of Trent was published the accepted definition of "substance" was that of the schoolmen, and the common belief concerning it was that definition qualified by the gross notions of the Real Presence which prevailed. We know what kind of Presence Berengarius was compelled to confess by Pope Nicholas II., and what was confessed in the time of Henry VIII. by the Six Articles; but the Council of Trent in its thirteenth Session and the Catechism of the Council give such an account of the manner of our LORD'S Presence in the Holy Eucharist as might have been given (Transubstantiation excepted) by the writers of our Catechism and Articles. The point of difference is as to whether the substance of the Bread and Wine remains after Consecration or not. Clearly by "substance" the Roman Church means particular substance, such that it can be converted into other particular substance, the substance in each case being that which makes the thing to be what it is. In this way the Catechism of Trent (Part II. cap. iv. Quest. 42) illustrates its meaning by speaking of "the substance and whole nature of air" and "the whole nature of water." But the Catechism of Trent includes in the "Accidents" which remain not only the *appearance* of bread but the quality which is supporting and nourishing, which is natural to bread; so that it is difficult to know what is meant by "substance." "It is not too much to ask the Roman Church," says Dr. Pusey, "what that substance is which they believe to be changed." And he also says in reference to the Tridentine explanation of Transubstantiation as distinguished from the scholastic, "This being granted I know not what can be included in our term 'substance' which the English Church affirms to remain, which is not also included in the Roman term 'accidents,' which they also affirm to remain." And what is the difference between the Churches is still more difficult to comprehend, if we may accept as true Roman doctrine De Marco's teaching, given by Dr. Pusey in page 230 of the 'Eirenicon,' "It may be asked how these symbols are changed and *yet remain in their own nature*. They are changed according to the invisible substance into the invisible Body of CHRIST, yet so that that invisible substance *does not cease to be*, but is attracted by the Body of CHRIST. But according to the visible body, which is seen and touched, *they are not changed*." Still I cannot help considering that there is a real difference between the Churches; for though the Articles and the Declaration were both published before the Catechism of the Council of Trent, yet it must be remembered that the Articles after many revisions and alterations were again revised and finally sanctioned in 1571, some five years subsequent to the promulgation of the Catechism; and it is scarcely probable that the Tridentine definitions were then unknown. Yet the 28th Article remained the same, and when the Declaration was restored in its altered form at the

end of the Communion Service the Church still declared that the Bread and Wine "remain in their very natural substances."

This is I think the difference, and a real difference, viz. that the English Church, without any attempt to define "substance" or "accidents," wisely keeping clear of all such physical distinctions and definitions, maintains that the substance, whatsoever it be, of the Bread and Wine remains, that not in appearance only but in reality it is bread and wine still in the perfection of their own nature; whilst the Roman maintains that it is only an unsubstantial appearance. Either theory of the Presence, the Roman or Anglican, is above nature and beyond human thought, and implies a miracle. In the one "accidents" exist without a proper subject; in the other under the same "accidents" is veiled a twofold substance. But in this question the Anglican theory has a double advantage, that it has the definite support of ancient Catholic writers, and can appeal to the highest analogy; for it is the counterpart of the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Body and Blood of CHRIST are veiled, (to use the phrase of the Homilies,) "under the form of bread and wine." There is no need of entering into any discussion to show that in this latter phrase no unsubstantial "form" was meant; that has long since been proved at length by Dr. Pusey in his book on "The Real Presence . . . the Doctrine of the English Church;" so that in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine are two whole and perfect natures, that of the bread and wine, and that of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, like as under the Form of Flesh are the two whole and perfect Natures, the Godhead and the Manhood in the Person of JESUS CHRIST. The argument, in an inverted form, is as old as the fourth century. Now we argue from the acknowledged truth of the Incarnation to the doctrine of the Sacrament; then they argued from the acknowledged truth of the Sacrament to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Pope Gelasius in the West, S. Chrysostom and Theodoret in the East, are noted examples of Catholic writers foiling Apollinarian and Eutychian heretics, by illustrating the union of the two Natures in our LORD, and Their distinct and perfect existence through the distinct and perfect existence of the two natures joined together in the Holy Eucharist. Both S. Gelasius and Theodoret use the very word *substance* in reference to the nature of the bread and wine remaining after Consecration. Now there is no language of ancient writers which can be used against the Anglican teaching with such precision as this can be against the Roman. Roman writers allege passages in which the nature of the bread and wine is said to be changed, and again in which words are used which speak of the Body and Blood only. But things may be changed and yet be substantially the same. S. Paul says, "We shall all be changed," and that the body before the resurrection is a natural body, afterwards a spiritual body, yet it is substantially the same body. S. Cyril of Jerusalem compares the effect of the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST in the Eucharist with the effect of the invocation on the holy Chrism, (Cat. xxi. 3,) but no one would pretend that the Chrism is substantially changed. Again, (xxiii. 7,) speaking of the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST to make the bread the Body and the wine the Blood of CHRIST, he adds, "For *whatsoever* the HOLY GHOST has touched is sanctified and changed," but certainly not changed from its own true nature; and thus he helps to explain what he means by "changed" in the Mysteries. Who indeed can deny that there is a wonderful change in the bread and wine when joined with the LORD'S Body and Blood? But who will deny a wonderful change in the Human Nature which the SON of GOD assumed and united with the Divine? When the Church prays, "Make this bread to become the Body and this cup the Blood, changing them by Thy HOLY GHOST," might not similar language be used concerning the Human Nature in our Blessed LORD? Is it stronger than such a phrase as "the Blood of GOD," or that used by our LORD Himself on earth, "He Which came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man Which is in Heaven?" As

to phrases which seem to speak of the Body and Blood only, they might be met by others which seem to speak of the bread and wine only, as though there were but symbols present; but each can be explained on the same principle. None of them are stronger than our LORD'S OWN WORDS, "This is My Body," which beyond all doubt it is; but not on that account necessarily ceasing to be bread. S. Chrysostom in the letter to Cæsarins appeals to this very phrase as illustrating the Incarnation, that as the bread after Consecration is freed from the name of bread and thought worthy to be called the "Body of the LORD," though the nature of bread remains in it, so CHRIST'S Human Nature being united to the Divine became worthy of the appellation of the SON of GOD. When the Centurion said, "Truly This was the SON of GOD," he spoke the truth, but it was equally true that This was "the Son of Man." That Body which he beheld was not an appearance merely without the substance of human nature. And this argument is used effectively by Tertullian, (*de Anima*, xvii., quoted by Bingham.) "We are not to call in question these senses lest we doubt of their trustworthiness in regard to CHRIST, whether He really beheld Satan fall from heaven, or falsely heard the testimony of His FATHER'S voice, or was deceived when He touched Peter's mother-in-law . . . or in the taste of the wine which He consecrated to be the Memorial of His Blood." He points out how this is like the belief of Marcion, and then adds, that neither were the Apostles deceived when they saw and heard Him on the Mount, when they tasted the water made wine, when Thomas touched Him, and when S. John appeals to "what we have seen, what we have heard, and what our hands have handled of the Word of Life." Their testimony, he says, would be false if their senses could not be relied upon. Could he have so written, if he knew that he could have been at once answered by the instance of the Holy Eucharist, and if an opponent could have replied, "This very thing which you declaim against is acknowledged to be a fact in the Mysteries?" This is in fact the great danger of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that it undermines all evidence and gives a handle to the deadliest heresy.

When I began writing this dissertation I had no purpose of discussing such a question as this, one on which it is impossible to say anything which has not been oftentimes said already. That these last few pages have been written is owing to a small book, called "The Kiss of Peace," lately shown to me by a friend, who assures me that it has had influence with some. I must say that I am sorry to have seen it, and still more, having seen it, to feel that there is any good reason for noticing it, because it is impossible to do so without some indignation. On such a subject one is unwilling to write harshly, especially concerning a person who puts forward so praiseworthy a motive as a desire to forward the union of the divided Churches of CHRIST. Nevertheless it is impossible not to feel some indignation on finding Bishop Andrewes and others whose names are held by Churchmen in veneration, and even the Church of England herself, brought before us by the writer, whilst with an air of assumed superiority and in a patronising manner he informs them all that they neither know what they mean nor the meaning of the words they use, and then proceeds to explain to them the truth, which he assumes to have been made known to himself, ejaculating with calm self-complacency, "Blessed be the LORD that He has revealed it to whom He has revealed it." One object alone appears to receive from him unqualified veneration and admiration. He does not scruple to tell the Church of England that when she speaks of Transubstantiation she does not know what she means, and to invent a word for her whereby she may express herself better;¹ and he does not hesitate to paraphrase her teaching or

¹ The word is arrived at by the following ingenious process. 1. By "very natural substances" the English Church means "very natural properties." 2. "Properties" are "accidents." Therefore 3, "very natural substances" mean

rather to make her his mouth-piece for some forty or fifty pages, but he accepts without hesitation the Roman theory of *substance* and *accidents*, and when he comes to explain a decree of the Council of Trent he approaches it with an almost superstitious awe: "If I might be allowed for a moment to paraphrase it, I should do so thus;" whilst any one who will take the trouble to look at page 103 may see the enthusiastic way in which he talks of "the exalted, the majestic, the glorious belief" of the Roman Church, and "the pure heights of faith to which that Church soars, &c." In fact his admiration blinds him, or he would hardly say that a Church, which is not content to assert "This is the LORD's Body" without adding that it is so by the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the whole Substance of His Body, abstains from defining the mode, or that in building up this doctrine on our LORD's words "no fresh assertion is made." In noticing his book I wish it understood at the outset that I have no purpose of answering it, but merely of pointing out by a few instances how utterly unfit the writer is to take up such a position as he has assumed.

For example, then; we are told that the phrase in the 28th Article, "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," has an objective meaning, that a real objective Presence is intended. Had the writer ended there all would have been well; but he unluckily sought an illustration, and found it in S. Paul's words, 1 Cor. xv. There S. Paul speaks of "a natural body" and "a spiritual body," of "the earthy man" and "the heavenly man," of "terrestrial bodies" and "bodies celestial." From the first the writer gathers that "spiritual" is opposed to "natural," and that therefore it is the same as *supernatural*; from the last two that "heavenly" and "celestial," "earthy" and "terrestrial," are respectively translations of the same word, and therefore that "celestial" may be substituted for "heavenly." Thus we arrive at the phrase, "only after a supernatural and celestial manner." It would not be easy to crowd more blunders into a small space. In the first place "earthy" and "terrestrial" are not translations of the same word; and "celestial" and "heavenly," though translations of the same word, are not (so far as this passage is concerned) convertible terms; for "heavenly" is opposed to "earthy," *χολός*, "celestial" is opposed to "terrestrial," *ἐργεια*, and has a primary reference to the sun and moon and stars. Probably for this reason our translators wisely translated *ἐρουράνια* "celestial" instead of "heavenly." Then again it may be remarked that S. Chrysostom gives to "terrestrial" and "celestial," as a secondary sense, the very meaning which this writer repudiates, viz., a subjective meaning, and refers them to a comparison "between sinners and righteous." So that to be present after a "celestial" manner would be either to be present after a righteous manner, or after the manner of the sun, moon, and stars. If the writer had taken the trouble to consider that *ἐρουράνιος* and *ἐρουράνια* are opposed to different words, he might have been saved from so ludicrous a mistake. Then with regard to "spiritual" or "supernatural;" S. Paul's argument is, that the body in this world is "natural" (*ψυχικόν*), that after the Resurrection it would be "spiritual" (*πνευματικόν*). If for "spiritual" we make this writer's substitution of "supernatural," it will follow from S. Paul's words, that bodies in this world only are natural, that bodies after the Resurrection, whether our own or our Blessed LORD's, are not natural, but supernatural; and so that Body, with which our LORD is at the Right Hand of GOD, and which the Church calls His natural Body in Heaven, is His "supernatural" Body. But of a spiritual or "supernatural" body this writer says: "It cannot be localised, it is not seen, it is not touched, it cannot be divided. All these are conditions to which a 'natural body' conforms." Or to reverse the process; the writer says, "Here we have not His natural but His supernatural Body present." If we

"very natural accidents." Hence by "Transubstantiation" the English Church means "Transaccidentation."—Q. E. D.

substitute "spiritual" for supernatural, then it will follow from S. Paul's words that it is simply our LORD's risen Body which is present, That Which is at the Right Hand of GOD in Heaven, That Which the Church calls His natural Body: and to be present "after a spiritual manner" is thus, after all, to be present after the manner of a risen Body, that is, after the manner of a natural body. Here again the writer might have been said, if he had noticed the ambiguity of the word "natural," and had known that S. Paul's word is *ψυχικόν*.

But there are two words which seem as though existing on purpose to be a confusion to this writer's mind, "natural" and "substance." He totally ignores the fact that questions of "substance" are questions of physical philosophy; and he speaks of "the language of philosophy and of the Roman formula" concerning substance, as though he thought it to be identical, and as though he did not know how different the language of modern Rome is from that of ancient philosophy and of the Christian Fathers. Apparently he assumes that the Roman account of it is true beyond all controversy, and then adds to it, as of equal authority, certain dicta of his own. We are told, "Substance is something supernatural, not natural, hyperphysical, not physical." But we may ask in passing, if substance is supernatural, what must that be which is "supersubstantial?" a term which is used sometimes by the Fathers, when instead of "daily bread" they translate "supersubstantial bread." On the other hand, apparently, nothing is natural but the sensible part of anything. "What we mean by the *natural* world is the world of sense; the world which we see and feel around us, and that is the world of *accidents*. But substance, although necessary to this natural world, this world of sense, is no part of it. *It belongs to the world beyond sense, to the supernatural world; and of its nature we know nothing.*" So that it comes to this. All the sensible and distinctive tokens of human nature, all by which we can distinguish a man to be man, are but "accidents;" and these "accidents" only are the natural part of him. On the other hand, his substance, all that makes him to be what he is, to be man, is not "natural," but something "spiritual" and "supernatural." All these assertions are drawn forth by the fact that Mr. Stuart and the Church of England have been so ignorant as to talk of "natural substance;" the Church of England having even done worse, and talked of "very natural substances." Accordingly both the Church of England and Mr. Stuart are called up to be reprov'd and instructed, and to be told how they had used the word substance "in the same loose unphilosophical manner." Mr. Maekonochie has also written in the same deplorable fashion. We may inquire how it comes to pass that Dr. Pusey is spared, who in his two works on "The Real Presence," and in the "Eirenicon," uses the phrases "natural substances" and "material substances," and quotes approvingly Thorndike's phrase "bodily substance," quite as "unconsciously" too as Mr. Stuart. Mr. Stuart is indeed told, that he is not aware of what he has done, that he has unconsciously used the word substance in two different senses, that his mistake is "so wholly unconscious." But his mistake has this advantage, that it draws out the author's theory of substance to its full extent.

Mr. Stuart had compared the co-existence of two substances in the Sacrament with the co-existence of two substances in our Incarnate LORD: upon which the writer, with reference to Mr. Stuart's unconscious use of the word substance in two different senses, proceeds: "This is clear from the comparison which he draws between it and the Hypostatic Union, which is really no parallel at all, if the word be used in its strict meaning." Either the author is "wholly unconscious" that the great Catholic writers of the fourth and fifth century employed the very same illustration; or he is prepared to treat them as he treats Mr. Stuart, and to inform them that they write in a very loose, unphilosophical manner, and need instruction from him. Amongst them Pope S. Gelasius is doubly an offender, for he not only uses

this illustration, but even falls into something very like Mr. Carter's error, using "permanentes in suis proprietate naturæ" as equivalent to "remaining in their natural substances." For whatsoever reason it may be they are wholly ignored, and the writer goes on to tell us: "In the strict sense of the word to assert that there are two substances in the Holy Eucharist would be (to adopt Mr. Stuart's own source of illustration) exactly analogous to denying the Unity of the Person in the Incarnation, or to dividing the Substance of the Blessed and undivided Trinity." And why? because "substance is to a thing what personality is to a person; the substance of the thing is the IT, just as the person of the man is the HE." Now substance being that which makes a thing to be what it is—a piece of bread, bread; a drop of wine, wine; a man, man; one would have supposed that the substance of a thing was analogous to the substance of a man; but we are told it is analogous to his personality, not to that which makes him man, but to that which distinguishes him from other men, and makes him himself, this man ("HE"). What then is left for that to be analogous to which particularizes the thing, and makes the thing, *this* thing, e.g., *this* bread, *this* wine? Had we not been instructed otherwise so confidently, we should surely have imagined it analogous to the personality of a man. But if the author, as I believe he does, considers substance to be that which makes men or things to be what they are, and at the same time the substance of a thing to be analogous to personality in a man; then it is difficult to see how he is to escape Nestorianism, and to avoid a human personality in our LORD; for without it, according to this analogy, He would not be what He is. If the author had not been so fond of those deceitful big letters it is perhaps possible that he might have instructed us otherwise. I say "perhaps," because once before he has written something similar about substance and personality: "The sign, the form, the veil of a thing is not the thing itself, cannot be the *substance* of it, any more than the ever-changing outward form of a man is the man himself, that is the *person*;" where one would have expected, *his substance*. By this time I think we may fully acknowledge with the author, that of the nature of substance we know nothing. Why, according to him, substance is different even in the same thing! or what is the meaning of the sentence, "We mean quite another thing when we say, 'the substance of wool,' and 'the substance of wood,' to what we should by 'the substance of this ball of-wool,' 'the substance of this piece of wood?'" Had the writer said that we mean a different thing when we say, "The substance of wood is changed," to what we should by "the substance of this piece of wood is changed," I could understand it; or if he had said that we mean a different thing when speaking of wood or wool in general, and when speaking of a particular ball of wool or piece of wood; but I am as wholly unconscious as Mr. Stuart could be as to what is the difference in their substances, and how it can be "quite another thing." It is somewhat like another passage in this same work, where the author gives a very strange explanation or illustration (page 70) of the phrase "whole substance." It would seem as though he thought that if wool, wood, bread, wine, or any other thing were divided into portions, each portion would have only a part of the substance of wool, wood, bread or wine, or of that thing, and so be imperfect in its nature; or as if he had been thinking of the conversion, not of the "whole substance," but of the substance of the whole bread into the substance of the Body of our LORD. It is useless to pursue this subject further; but I trust that enough has been said to make others hesitate in taking this writer for a guide. The study of a book so easily accessible as Dr. Pusey's "The Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers," and again, "The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," is quite enough to save any one from the mistakes that he has fallen into.

NOTE B.

Practices of adoration, such as the adoration of the forty hours, and in its measure any attempt at changing the Eucharistic Service into a service of adoration; practices, that is, where adoration is not merely the accessory but the principal object, become associated with erroneous notions of our LORD'S Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and lead on to a worship, which is something more than adoration. It is certainly not too much to say that the introduction of these services of adoration was the introduction of an entirely new kind of worship into the Church; and even if legitimate, still I think full of danger. But is it legitimate? It is an use of the Holy Eucharist in no way sanctioned by the Institution, or by apostolic or primitive custom, and in no way involved in the original object of the Service. Of course it will be answered that if we believe in our LORD'S Presence, and in adoration due to Him, wherever present, it is but the logical consequence of such belief to develop into these services of adoration. It is the old answer, which has been used equally in defence of the Immaculate Conception or Papal Infallibility. The western mind has been always too prone to define and systematise, and to deduce logical consequences, and then to erect these results of a rationalising process into articles of faith. But in the first place Divine Mysteries and Revelations of GOD are no fit subjects for such an exercise of our logical faculties; in the next, we too often find that the logical development is the result of too intent a regard of some secondary truth, to the exclusion of other truths which counterbalance it.

But if we for a moment admit that these services of adoration are in themselves legitimate consequences of an acknowledged truth, I still maintain that they associate themselves with erroneous notions of our LORD'S Presence in the Holy Eucharist. What I mean may perhaps best be illustrated by quoting a sentence from Dr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Pusey on the Eirenicon: "I knew a lady who on her death-bed was visited by an excellent Protestant friend. She, with great tenderness for her soul's welfare, asked her whether her prayers to the Blessed Virgin did not at that awful hour lead to forgetfulness of her SAVIOUR? 'Forget Him?' she replied with surprise, 'why, He has just been here.' She had been receiving Him in Communion." The reply was perfectly true in itself; but it did not meet the objection. It would be quite possible to realize His true Presence in Communion, and yet really to forget Him in the sense intended by the "Protestant friend." The answer is not a true answer to the objector. Doubtless it is quite legitimate to say that "He is present" in the Holy Eucharist; but then in a certain defined character. He is in fact present in a twofold character at the Altar as priest, on the Altar as the Sacrifice. Thus S. Ambrose saith, "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. And Himself indeed standeth by us as an advocate with the FATHER." "Would that to us too, burning incense at the Altars and offering Sacrifice, the Angel would stand by, yea, rather would permit himself to be seen. Thou canst not doubt that the Angel stands by when CHRIST standeth by, when CHRIST is offered." And S. Chrysostom; "It is not man who maketh what lieth there to become the Body and Blood of CHRIST, but CHRIST Himself Who was sacrificed for us. The priest standeth filling up a figure speaking those words, the power and the grace are of GOD. 'This is My Body, He saith. This word reordereth what lieth there.'" (*Real Presence*, pp. 455, 461, 555.) Again, in the Liturgy of S. James at the entrance of the Gifts, the priest says, "The King of Kings and LORD of Lords, CHRIST our GOD cometh forward to be sacrificed and to be given

for food to the faithful; he is preceded by the choirs of the Angels, &c." Again, "when he signs the Bread, He saith, Behold the Lamb of God, the SON of the FATHER, that taketh away the sin of the world, sacrificed for the life and salvation of the world." And once more, "O taste and see that the LORD is good; He that is broken and not divided, distributed to the faithful and not consumed, for the remission of their sins." These words recognise our LORD's Presence upon the Altar for a special purpose and in a certain defined character, as the Glorious Victim to be presented to the FATHER, and feasted upon by those who partake of Him, with all praise and adoration; but no otherwise. The more usual way of recognising that Presence is as the Presence of His Body and Blood; and then a marked distinction is drawn between this Presence and His Presence in Heaven. To Him as Present on the Altar, by the Presence of His Body and Blood, praise and adoration are paid, as before reception in the Mozarabic and Roman Liturgies, "Hail for ever most holy Flesh of CHRIST;" "Hail for ever heavenly Drink." But it is to Him as CHRIST the King, present in Heaven, that prayers and thankgivings are offered up, and from Him in Heaven that blessings are besought. Sometimes a marked distinction is drawn between Himself, thus abiding in Heaven, and His Body and Blood upon the Altar. He is besought to hear out of His holy dwelling-place and from the Throne of the glory of His Kingdom, and to make His people worthy to partake of His spotless Body and precious Blood, to send down His all-holy SPIRIT to sanctify and change the gifts into His Body and Blood, to behold from Heaven and His dwelling-place those who have communicated and to bless them: He is praised for having vouchsafed to make them partakers of His Body and Blood for the remission of sins and eternal life. The Holy Sacrifice is even offered to Him, e.g. in the Ancient Syriac Liturgy of S. James: "We offer unto Thee this Sacrifice, awful and unbloody, so that Thou mayest not make us guilty nor reward us according to our sins:" and in the Coptic Liturgy of S. Gregory, not the oblation only, but the whole Liturgy is offered to Him.

To change then the Eucharistic Service into a Service of adoration of our LORD present on the Altar, appears to me in itself an unauthorized and illegitimate development of the Original Institution, and one which tends to an erroneous notion of our LORD's Presence, and therewith to an erroneous form of worship, to say nothing of grosser and more serious dangers, especially with unspiritual and uneducated minds. Again let us see the result, as shown in Dr. Newman's Letter, (page 100.) We there find the very system which the Church has so jealously guarded by Canon after Canon, through long centuries, simply ignored. The unity of the Church, as symbolized in the solemn parochial Mass, the offering of a high service to GOD by all the people as with one heart and one mouth, and their participation together of the one Bread, all are disregarded as a thing out of mind. It is there spoken of as "the music and the mixed multitude, who may be lazily fulfilling their obligation," which it seems praiseworthy to leave "for the silent and the informal devotions which are offered at an image of the Blessed Virgin." We are told of those who object: "If they understood our ways they would know that we begin the day with our LORD and then go on to His Mother. It is early in the morning that religious persons go to Mass and Communion," (the very thing which by every Canon they are forbidden to do,) "the High Mass on the other hand is the festive celebration of the day, not the Special devotional Service." Though it was the Church's intention that it should be both; the festive Celebration and the devotional service combined. And plainly "the devotional service" here means, not the high and worthy worship offered to GOD, in which individual souls lose themselves in the Unity of the Body; but the Service where each soul is self-conscious and wrapt up in its own peculiar devotion. Dr. Newman then goes on to tell us how the High Mass is supplanted by another

private devotion, and what kind of devotion that is; "Nor is there any reason why those who have been at a Low Mass already, should not at that hour proceed to ask the intercession of the Blessed Virgin for themselves and all that is dear to them." No reason! when the Church by express Canons has commanded that attendance at a Low Mass shall never stand in the way of attendance at the Parochial Mass. In fact in the system here sketched out by Dr. Newman the ancient and Catholic idea seems lost. But it is to some system equally uncatholic that we shall probably come, if we adopt such practices, as these of which I have been speaking, and thrust the chief Celebration from its place.

NOTE C.

It is a pity that the question of the "North side" was left for decision in the recent judgment without argument. Through absence from England I have not seen the pamphlets which have been written on the subject; but it may fairly be said that if the Liturgy of 1552 made no change in the ancient meaning of the phrase, then the *onus probandi* lies with those who assert that such a change has been made, viz., that "North side" means North *end*. So far is the phrase itself from implying any such meaning, that in the Scottish Liturgy it was thought necessary to explain that by north side was meant North end;¹ and Wheatley, who takes this view, in writing about it substitutes one phrase for the other; whilst, on the other hand, in King Charles I.'s time Bishop Williams was so convinced that the North end could not be the North side, that he ordered the Table to be placed with the ends East and West, ignoring any but the ordinary conversational meaning of the phrase. Yet there was nothing in this, or any other Rubric of the Book as then existing, to countenance such a notion; nothing to show that the Holy Table, either when standing in the place where the Altar used to stand, or when for convenience moved from its place, was to stand in this new position. If we fall back upon common parlance, which are the sides? I suppose that the ends might be called the sides either of a Table or of an Altar, if it were placed against the wall; but the Church would hardly form a Rubric in this loose way. She had her own technical ritual language, according to which the North and South sides, or right and left sides, are the divisions in front on each side of the midst of the Altar. This was perfectly understood whilst the old Service Books were in use, and I know of nothing which marks a change in the Church's meaning. We are told that Tables were substituted for Altars and made moveable even into the body of the Church, and that the whole phraseology was altered when the Second Book of Edward came out. I do not think that even this would prove the case; but the statement itself is unfair, it passes over the intermediate steps.

The first change made brought in certain new phrases. The Service was called "the Order of Communion," and in it the word "Table" came into use. But the words "Altar" and "Mass" were retained also, as equivalent terms; whilst the old rites and ceremonies were ordered to be still observed without any change. Here, at least, North and South sides of the Table and North and South sides of the Altar would be equivalent terms, with no new meaning. Next came the First Book of King Edward, wherein the ritual was altered and simplified, the old taken away, and a new ritual substituted, preference being given to the new phraseology with the avowed design of leading people to think more of Communion, and to cast off certain erroneous notions concerning the Mass; but the meaning of the

¹ It may be remarked that this explanatory phrase, "North side, (or end,)" when suggested for our own Liturgy in 1662 was not adopted.

ritual words was unchanged. The Service is styled "the LORD's Supper and Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass:" whilst "Holy Table," "God's Board," and "Altar" are used as equivalent terms; and the old phrase, "midst of the Altar," is retained for the position of the celebrant. Here again is an indication that the Church still meant what she had always meant by her use of these liturgical terms; yet it was precisely at this time, whilst this Book had full authority, that the order was given to change Altars into Tables, in order still more effectually to bring home to the people the duty of communicating and the full nature of the Eucharistic Service. By this change the midst of the Altar would become, in fact, the midst of the Table. The order involved no change of position, but only of form in the Altar or Table. When, shortly afterwards, the Second Book appeared, the words "Altar" and "Mass" were dropped, in furtherance of the aims already mentioned; but there was nothing new, except the substitution of "North side of the Table" for the "midst of the Altar," and the order that the Table "shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel;" nothing to indicate that the Holy Table was to be placed in a new position, (as with its ends East and West,) or that any new meaning was attached to the phrase "North side." If there were those who wished so to consider it, and even acted on their wishes, that is not proof that the Church so intended. The same may be said with regard to the disputes in Queen Elizabeth's time. Into this point, however, I have no intention of entering, my object being to point out, that there is nothing to show that in the first use of the phrase "North side of the Table" any change in its ancient well-known meaning was implied, and that those who contend for such a change are bound to bring forward some clear and direct evidence as to when, at what date, the Church did change the meaning of the phrase.

It is easy to see how, amid the confusion of a lawless period, and the decline of ritual knowledge, and the prevalence of uncatholic customs, the real meaning of the phrase might be obscured, forgotten even by Catholic-minded divines; but is there any evidence to show that the Church herself has ever accepted the meaning which any such may have mistakenly attributed to the words? I know of nothing to give colour to this idea, except the words in the present Rubric before consecration, which order the priest to stand "before the Table," words which were not added until 1662, when also the suggested explanatory phrase, "or end," was not adopted. These words may imply that the priest was supposed not to be, during the former part of the Service, in any sense before the Table; but they may equally imply that he was not so in the full and proper sense, i.e. not before the middle of the Table, for this was the ancient and customary position for consecration; and this, I take it, is the position which every one, in endeavouring to obey the Rubric, would naturally adopt, wheresoever he might have been previously standing, and whether guided by a ritual or conversational interpretation of the words. The words were very probably only intended to fix by rubrical directions a position already in use. At any rate, these words being consistent with either the old or modern interpretation of the phrase "North side," there being no direction to the contrary, the ancient interpretation of the phrase ought to stand.

NOTE D.

I have met with no argument sufficient to prove that the Early Church sanctioned Communion in one kind. If any instances can be brought forward, they are only such as arise from absolute necessity; in which case, any one might be persuaded, as in the case of spiritual Communion under like circumstances, that our Blessed LORD, Who has full power over the

means which He has Himself ordained, would give the fulness of His Blessing through imperfect means. Such would be the case with infant Communion, when participation of the Cup only was given. But as to the instances usually alleged, they are not to the point. The Church reserved in both kinds, the Sacrament was taken to the sick in both kinds, those who reserved it in their own homes, reserved it in both kinds. And when the Body alone is spoken of, we must not forget the custom of moistening it with the Blood, so that Both were given and reserved under One, as is the case to this day in the East. (Bingham XV. v. 1, also Renaudot, "Lit. Orient." Vol. i. 262; Vol. ii., "*Observations: On the Mode of Communicating.*") The 49th Canon of Laodicea, which forbids the celebration in Lent, is worded thus, "There shall be no Oblation of Bread during Lent, excepting," &c. But no one would doubt for a moment that under the word "Bread" were included the Bread and the Cup. It has, however, been argued that our LORD Himself, as at Emmaus, administered to His disciples in one kind. But this would prove too much, as it would equally prove that He consecrated in one kind. And in truth, as it seems to me, this argument is legitimate; that it is as much a part of our LORD's Institution and as binding to give the Communion in both kinds, as to consecrate in both kinds. It was when He had taken, and blessed, and given the Bread and the Cup to His disciples, that He added, "Do this in remembrance of Me." The whole precedent action is contained under "Do this;" and it certainly refers as much to the Cup as to the Bread. "Whosoever ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do show the LORD's Death till He come." The principle laid down in S. Cyprian's 63rd Epistle, and on which the whole argument of the Epistle is founded, is the necessity of 'doing in our celebration what our Blessed LORD did; and the same is asserted by S. Ambrose in a passage quoted by Bishop Beveridge on the 30th Article. Not having the works of S. Ambrose by me I cannot verify the question. But the principle appears to be plainly enough laid down; so that, putting aside all question of the benefits to be obtained, the celebration itself seems to be imperfectly performed when the Cup is not partaken of equally with the Bread. The Synod of Trent, in the twenty-first Session, C. ii., claims authority for the Church to make even such a change in the celebration as this; but it is hard to see where an authority, so wide as that thus claimed, is bounded. As to the grace of the Sacrament, that again the Roman Church declares to be fully received in either kind, because in either kind "whole CHRIST" is present. The argument is, that CHRIST wherever He is is "whole and entire;" that where His Body is, there also are His Blood, His Soul, and His Divinity; and where His Blood, there also His Body, Soul, and Divinity, which is called "concomitancy;" so that, though *ex vi Sacramenti*, His Body only is under the form of Bread, and His Blood only under the form of Wine, yet *ex reali concomitantia* His Body and Blood are present under either kind, and, therefore, to partake of Either is to partake of Both: (Aquinas, P. III. Q. lxxvi. ii. :)—an argument, which would be good enough if used to explain and illustrate a doctrine founded on authority; but unfortunately it is another of those deductions, erected into a new article of faith in opposition to authority. It by no means proves that, though by our LORD's Institution the Bread and the Cup are both to be received, the whole benefit of the Sacrament may nevertheless be looked for through one kind. It may surely be argued with equal force, that whatsoever Mystical separation of the LORD's Body and Blood may be effected in the consecration, there may be the same in the Communion also. There are passages in ancient writers which attribute distinct benefits to the Body and Blood, (as is done by the prayer of humble access in our own Service,) and this Peter Lombard recognises; but then he falls back on the doctrine of concomitancy, and declares that, in consequence of it, all benefits are received under either kind. (Lib. IV. dia. xii. 6.) If, however, this doctrine was held by the

Early Church, why did she take such pains that Communion should be in both kinds? Why, when the Bread and the Cup were not given separately, did she nevertheless order the Body to be moistened with the Blood, so that both might be partaken of? And why, when the celebration was completed, did she reserve in both kinds? Cardinal Bona acknowledges that up to the twelfth century all the faithful everywhere communicated in both kinds; (Bingham, XV. v. 1;) but he reasons that it is not necessary, and that in private Communion they communicated in one kind. Of this last assertion I have already spoken. Even were it true, it would not affect what was requisite for the public celebration.

It is impossible in the limits of a note to exhaust a question of such deep importance. It must suffice now to say further that there are passages in the Fathers and Liturgies which appear to me to imply, not only that Communion in both kinds was the custom, but that it was regarded as a part of the Institution, and that participation of the LORD'S Blood and the benefits thereof were to be obtained, not by eating of the Body, but by drinking of the cup; that notwithstanding constant teaching that CHRIST was everywhere whole and entire, it was not considered that the full benefits of the Eucharist were received in one kind *ex reali concomitantia*, but only under both kinds, *ex vi Sacramenti*. I add two or three passages which are worth considering. S. Gelasius: "We find that some, content with taking a portion of the sacred Body only, abstain from the Blood of the sacred cup. Who being under the influence of some superstition or other, ought beyond doubt either to take the Sacrament entire or be kept from it altogether. Because the division of one and the same Mystery cannot take place without grievous sacrilege." This is quoted by Bingham from Gratian "de Consecratione," but passed over by Van Espen in his "Observations." S. Chrysostom (Homily xviii. on 2 Cor.): "But there are occasions in which there is no difference at all between the priest and those under him: for instance, when we are to partake of the awful mysteries; for we are all alike counted worthy of the same things: not as under the Old Testament, when the priest ate some things, and those under him others, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things whereof the priest partook: but not so now, but before all one Body is set and one Cup." S. Augustine ("Real Presence," page 509): "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?' A passage, we may remark by the bye, not very consistent with the argument by which communion of the priest only is defended through the analogy of the Holy Eucharist to the sin-offerings. Eusebius of Alexandria (ibid. page 452): "Many presbyters, being sinners, offer the gifts, and GOD turneth not away, but by the HOLY GHOST halloweth the gifts placed there; and the Bread becometh the Body, and the cup becometh the Blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST." In the Liturgies, as I have already remarked, the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST to make the bread the Body and the cup the Blood has reference to the reception, and the benefits to be received. In the Syriac Liturgy of S. James it is thus worded: "That He might make it a living Body, a saving Body, a heavenly Body for our souls and bodies, the Body of our LORD GOD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, and that they who take it may do it unto the remission of sins and life everlasting." "And this cup to be the Blood of the New Covenant, the salutary Blood, the life-giving Blood, the heavenly Blood, the Blood all-cleansing for our souls and bodies, the Blood of the LORD GOD our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST for remission of sins, and life everlasting to those who receive it." "That they may be to us, and to all who receive and participate of them," &c. The same is, I think, implied by

the exclamation found in all liturgies from the earliest times, τὰ Ἄγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. Such phrases imply that it was not merely for the Oblation, but also for the participation of the Sacrament that there was effected the mystical separation of the Body and Blood.

NOTE E.

Ποιεῖν as a sacrificial word, "to offer," "to celebrate," &c., is used many times in the Septuagint, at least as a literal translation of the Hebrew. This has been pointed out by Dr. Hickee in his *Treatise on the Priesthood*. He also quotes passages from early Christian writers in which the word is used in the same sense. Amongst others he cites S. Chrysostom's comment on the words of Institution, (S. Matth. xxvi.) where certainly in the two consecutive sentences it would be at first sight natural to refer the first ἐκείνο and τοῦτο to the same subject as the second, and this all the more as the subject of the second τοῦτο, viz. our LORD'S BLOOD, had been spoken of immediately before. Then the first ἐκείνο, referring to the blood of the Passover, and the first τοῦτο, to the Blood of our LORD, the most obvious translation of ποιεῖτε would be "offer." This translation however is too unusual, and wants authority. Dr. Hickee gives no other citation from S. Chrysostom, and only one other passage from the Fathers, (that from Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*.) in which ποιεῖν is thus absolutely "to offer." Ποιεῖν θυσιῶν or ποιεῖν προσφορῶν, phrases which are used, are no authority for the use of such a phrase as ποιεῖν ἄλυσ. In the Library of the Fathers the translation of this passage is given in the customary way, "Do this in remembrance of Me . . . for like as ye *did* that . . . so *do* this." There is another passage of S. Chrysostom, which is much to the purpose, as containing our LORD'S command to celebrate His Memorial, where τοῦτο ποιεῖτε is clearly "Do this," whilst just before it S. Chrysostom uses προσφέρειν for "offer" in connection with σῶμα and ποιεῖν in connection with θυσιῶν. The translation is Thorndike's, in "*Laws of the Church*" (Book III. v. 34). "There is one CHRIST everywhere, here full, and there full; one Body; as therefore being offered in many places there is one Body, and not many bodies, so is there one sacrifice; He is our High Priest, Who offered the Sacrifice that cleanseth us; the same we also offer that then was offered, that is invincible; this is *done* (γίνεται) in remembrance of *That* which was then done, for 'Do this,' saith He, 'in remembrance of Me.' We make (ποιούμεν) no other sacrifice, as then the high-priest, but the same always, or rather the remembrance of the Sacrifice." In the Homily on the Ephesians (i. 15—20) speaking of communicants S. Chrysostom quotes S. Paul's words, "As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do show the LORD'S Death," substituting, however, for "eating this Bread and drinking this Cup" the phrase τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, as though the two were equivalent, in which case he must have meant by it, "As often as ye do this." The passage of S. Basil, already quoted from the '*Catena Aurea*,' on S. Luke xx. 19, refers ποιεῖτε to eating, "Learn then in what manner ye ought to eat the Body of CHRIST, viz. in remembrance of CHRIST'S obedience unto death." The great difficulty of translating our LORD'S word "offer" lies in the want of authority, especially in the ancient liturgies. In them, if anywhere, we should expect to find the word taken up and repeated, when immediately after the words of Institution they proceed, "We then, according to His commandment, commemorating His Death . . . offer this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice," or whatsoever else may be the form of the oblation. We should expect to find "facimus" or ποιούμεν. The word is repeated in a few Gallican Missae; for instance, the 5th of the Reichenau Missal, "Addit etiam istud edictum, ut quotiescunque corpus ipsius sumeretur et sanguis, commemoratio fieret Do-

minice Passionis; quod nos facientes, &c.," where however "quod facientes" can hardly be anything else than "doing which," "fulfilling which." Again Missa 3 of the Gothic Missal, "Hæc facimus Domine . . . commemorantes et celebrantes, &c.," where *Hæc* may be either "these gifts" or "these things," and "facimus" would be "we offer" or "we do" accordingly. Again in the 5th Missa, "Hoc ergo facimus Domine, hæc præcepta servamus, &c.," where I think the context would lead us to translate, "This we do." Beyond these instances I know of no others. The manner in which the form of consecration stands in the Mozarabic also is adverse to the sense "offer." "Hoc est Corpus Meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Quotiescunque manducaveritis hoc facite in Meam commemorationem . . . Hic est Calix, &c. Quotiescunque biberitis hoc, facite in Meam commemorationem. Quotiescunque manducaveritis panem hunc, et calicem istum biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis, donec veniat." The Roman Liturgy (the authorized translations of which, so far as known to me, give, "As often as ye do these things, ye shall do them"¹) uses "offerimus," not "facimus," when proceeding to make the oblation. The Greek Liturgies, I think, without exception use not *ποιούμεν* but some other word, as *προθήκαμεν* or *προσφέρομεν*. The same appears also in the other Eastern Liturgies of whatever language, as the Syriac Liturgy of S. James and other Syrian Liturgies, the Nestorian, the Armenian, the Coptic, the Ethiopian. Whatever the language of the Liturgy the testimony is all the same, viz. against the interpretation of our LORD's words in the sense, "Offer this." The word *ποιεῖν* is used, and that sometimes immediately afterwards, as in the Invocation, to *make* the Bread the Body and the Cup the Blood, or to *cause* that it may become. *Facere* and *ποιεῖν* are used in the sense of to make, as to make a Celebration or Commemoration, but never, so far as I remember, in the Liturgies in the sense "to offer," certainly never in connection with our LORD's words of Institution. And this is testimony, which to my mind is insurmountable, as showing what the Church's sense of these words has been. The translation "offer" then is wanting in authority, not for the word *ποιεῖν* in general, but for these particular words *ποιεῖτε τοῦτο*, spoken by our blessed LORD; therefore I prefer to translate them in the accustomed manner, "Do this in remembrance of Me," in which indeed the other meaning is included.

¹ The Tridentine Catechism (II. iv. xix.) quoting "Hoc facite in Meam commemorationem" as the authority for using the same words of Consecration as our LORD had used, proceeds, "For what the LORD ordered to be done (faciendum) is to be referred not only to His actions, but also to what He said."