

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Digitized by Google

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

B. B. EDWARDS AND E. A. PARK,
Professors at Andover,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

DR. ROBINSON AND PROF. STUART.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
WILEY AND PUTNAM,
1844.

of life or death, an authoritative code of morals, a law with inflexible sanctions, a gospel to be rejected on peril of eternal damnation.

These shallow philanthropists and religionists are as ignorant of the nature of man, as they are of the revelation of God, as little versed in the more imposing features of our constitution, as in the high and solemn themes of Christianity. They have little to do with the deeper wants of our moral being. They do not understand how curious and almost contradictory a piece of workmanship is man. They seem never to have imagined, that he has the closest relations to a moral law, to an atoning Saviour, to a righteous moral Governor, and to an impartial judgment seat.

Equally ignorant are they of the bonds which hold society together. Much of the doctrine, which is industriously promulgated at the present day, tends to form a counterfeit philanthropy, to make men sympathize with the misfortunes of the criminal, rather than with injured virtue, or with public morals, to weaken the arm of the law and reduce government itself into a compact remarkable for nothing but its weakness.

ARTICLE VI.

PATRISTICAL AND EXEGETICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE QUESTION RESPECTING THE REAL BODILY PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE ELEMENTS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By M. Stuart, Professor in the Theol. Seminary, Andover.

† 1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* will probably remember, that in No. III. of that work, during the past year, I published an exegetical essay on 1 Cor. 11: 17—34,—a passage which has special relation to the subject of the Lord's Supper. In that essay I treated, in a very brief manner, of the subject named at the head of this article. I had, at that time, other objects in view besides a discussion of this topic; and, of course, the subject now before us could occupy only a subordinate place. Since the publication of that article in the *Bibliotheca*, circumstances have occurred which seemed to me to render it desirable, that the topic in question

should receive a more ample and extended discussion. In the essay already published, no attempt was made to cast any light on the *history* of the eucharist. The limits there prescribed forbade any attempt, on my part, to show how the early Christian fathers thought and reasoned with respect to the real presence of Christ in the sacramental elements. The history of *transubstantiation* and *consubstantiation* was also excluded for the same reason. The scriptural and exegetical examination of the subject was also of necessity quite compressed. No more could be done, in relation to these respective topics, than was done, without entirely changing the plan and design of the essay; and this I did not think to be expedient.

The times call loudly, at present, for more information and more discussion, in regard to the subject of the *real presence* of Christ in the eucharistic elements. No well-informed man among us can now be ignorant respecting the claims made by one class of even Protestant Christians, in our country and in England, in behalf of this doctrine. With great confidence they appeal to the ancient Fathers in support of it; and they are not reluctant to be considered as regarding those Fathers in the light of authorized expositors of the Scriptures. The subject has begun to assume a more definite and urgent shape, since the publication of Dr. Pusey's sermon concerning it. And in view of such and the like facts, some of my friends, for whose opinions I entertain much regard, have expressed a desire that I would continue and expand my investigations respecting the *real presence*. I have deemed it to be my duty, on the whole, to comply with their desire, although I feel considerable reluctance in repeating, even in a small part, a subject that I have once discussed. But the attitudes in which I have placed it in the following discussion, are so many of them diverse from the former ones, and the method in general pursued so different from that in the Bibliotheca No. III., that I would hope none of my readers will be disposed to complain of repetition.

It is time that the public at large were furnished with more ready and accessible means of forming a more extensive and well-grounded acquaintance with the subject before us, than they now possess. The time has come, when some of the fundamental doctrines of *Protestantism*, in the English and American sense of that word, are assailed, and are at least threatened by their adversaries with overthrow. In such times our armour should not only be buckled on, but be well-fitted and polished. I have aimed in the following pages, to write an article which is neither exclusive-

ly for the learned or the unlearned. The minute details of the mere technical scholar I have studiously avoided, although it would have been very easy to have gone into them. On the other hand, I have aimed at substantial facts and truths, in patristic and other history and in exegesis, on which the determination of the question before us must turn, at least in the minds of all sensible and candid men. It has been my steady aim not to pervert or discolour a single fact, or to overdo and press beyond its proper limits any argument. How far I have succeeded, the well-informed reader must judge. I have no good opinion, at least, of endeavouring to carry a point in theology or exegesis, by stratagem or misrepresentation either of facts or arguments. I hope I have avoided every such effort.

Designedly have I written in such a way, that what is said would not be inappropriate for public Lectures or Readings, before a well-informed Christian assembly. This is one use that I would hope may be made of this discussion. Proper breaks will be found in it. I have so written, because I thought it might be more adapted to produce good among the churches of our country.

I place at the head of my remarks, two leading and principal passages of the New Testament, on which dependence is placed and great stress laid, by the advocates of the *real presence*, for the maintenance of their cause. I do this, in order that I may make some remarks upon them as preparatory to the historico-patristic and exegetical investigations which are to follow. My aim is to give the inquiring Christian some particular and satisfactory account of the manner, in which the subject before us is presented to our consideration by New Testament writers in general; to remove some difficulties accompanying this matter; and then to direct his attention to the specific questions before us.

‡ 2. LEADING TEXTS IN SOME RESPECTS EXAMINED.

Luke 22 : 19, 20. *And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying : This is my body which is given for you ; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise, also, the cup after supper, saying : This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*

John 6 : 53—56. *Then Jesus said unto them : Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day.*

For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

The words which I have last in order recited from the Gospel of John, appear to have been originally interpreted in a *literal* manner, by the unbelieving Jews and by some of the professed disciples of Jesus. Even *many* of the latter, according to the narration of the evangelist (6: 60), when they heard the words of Jesus, said: "This is a *hard* saying; who can hear it?" By a *hard* saying, they meant either a saying which was unintelligible to them, or one that was disagreeable and offensive to their views and feelings. Expositors are divided in opinion, respecting which of these meanings should be here put upon the word *hard* (*σκληρός*). But the preceding context seems to me to settle this question. When Jesus said: "The bread which I will give is my flesh," and, "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever," (v. 51), "the Jews strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his *flesh* to eat?" Now the idea of eating human flesh was so shocking to the feelings of Jews, that they could attach to the words of Jesus no intelligible meaning, so long as they assigned to them a *literal* sense; of a *spiritual* meaning they had no proper conception. And like to them were the murmuring disciples of Jesus, who, after the words cited in our text were spoken, exclaimed: "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (v. 60). In other words: 'Who can understand such declarations respecting eating human flesh and drinking human blood? They are both unintelligible and offensive. We do not like to hear them.'

The answer of Jesus to this expression of incredulity and offence, is such a one as ought to have been kept in mind, pondered upon, well-understood, and thoroughly believed, in every age of the church. It runs thus: "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit* and they are *life*." (vs. 62, 63). In other words: 'Are ye now stumbled and offended with my declarations respecting eating my flesh and drinking my blood? You will see all this made plain hereafter. When the Son of Man has ascended up to heaven, where he was before his incarnation, and his *bodily* presence is wholly withdrawn from you, then will it be very plain, that my words are not to have a *literal* sense given to them. It is only the *Spirit* that quickeneth; *flesh*, as such, is of no moral profit or avail. The words that I

speak to you are designed to produce a spiritual and life-giving influence. This is the true meaning to be attached to what I have said. When I speak of *eating my flesh* and *drinking my blood*, I mean that a spiritual communion with me, and a spiritual and life-giving participation of the graces which I bestow, are absolutely necessary to future and eternal life and happiness. It is merely because you have unbelieving hearts, that you do not understand what I say, and give it the credit which is due.'

It will easily be believed, that all expositors are not united in their views and explanations of the passage now under consideration. Those who maintain the actual *bodily* presence of Christ in the elements of the Lord's Supper, refer the whole of the passage to this; and they suppose, that Jesus meant to affirm the same sentiment by it, which he has affirmed in his declarations at the holy supper, when he said: This is my body, and This is my blood. In other words; they interpret both passages so as to make them affirm the real and actual presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements of the eucharist, and also by implication to mean, that the partakers of these elements do actually and substantially participate of the real body and blood of Christ.

Whatever, now, may be true of the Saviour's declarations at the institution of the eucharist, I cannot but remark, for the present, that the passage in John vi. seems to be quite inappropriately referred to the same occasion. As yet, the disciples of Jesus did not know, at any rate did not believe, anything respecting his sufferings and violent death. They knew as yet nothing of such an institution as the Lord's Supper. How was it possible, then, if Jesus spake in reference to this, that he should be understood by them? Considered in this light, it would have truly been a hard saying to them. Nor should it be forgotten, that when Jesus speaks, in John vi., of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, he says nothing at all of his violent death, by which his body was to be broken and his blood shed, nor of their eating his flesh and drinking his blood in *remembrance* or *commemoration* of such a death. He tells his murmuring disciples, that his words are *spirit* and *life*, i. e. of a spiritual and life-giving nature. And the *life* in question does not mean temporal or physical life, but the *everlasting life* which Jesus had often said, in his preceding discourse, would be consequent upon eating the bread which came down from heaven. He had also said, that "the bread, which he would give for the life of the world, was his flesh;" in other words, he had intimated, that he would devote his body to suffering and death, in order that

everlasting life might be given to a perishing world. It is a spiritual understanding and belief of these declarations, which is life-giving. It is a spiritual reception of Christ as our passover sacrificed for us, a spiritual reception of the truth that Christ's body was broken and blood poured out, and this only, which can give us any title to everlasting life. "The flesh profiteth nothing." Even the advocates of the *literal* sense of the words under consideration concede, that there must be *faith* and *repentance* in order to make the sacrament spiritually profitable; yea, that without these an unworthy partaker only eats and drinks judgment or condemnation to himself.

It is at most, then, only to the general truth, that Christ was to give himself as an offering for the sins of men, that the declarations in John vi. can be referred. But there was, at the time when these declarations were uttered, neither *bread* nor *wine* before the Saviour and his disciples. Of course when he spoke of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, this could have had no reference to the sacramental elements of bread and wine. Much less can it with any propriety be considered as asserting, that they become his actual body and blood. The true meaning, as I have endeavoured to show, is something quite diverse from this. Of course, those who appeal to John vi, and specially (as they are wont) to that part of it which I have cited above, have no good exegetical grounds to justify such an appeal. If the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, or of *consubstantiation*, be true, it must be gathered only and merely from the declarations of Jesus at the last Supper. In fact, the more considerate among the advocates of these doctrines have been ready to acknowledge this; and indeed, some of them have frequently avowed it.

Let us come, then, after this examination of the passage in John so often cited and so much relied on, to the consideration of the declarations made by Jesus at the last Supper.

It is a remarkable, yet by no means a singular fact, that of the four sacred writers who have given us an account of these declarations, no two of them are perfectly agreed as to the *words* which were spoken. The record of Matthew runs thus: "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said: Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the remission of sins;" Matt. 26: 26—28. Mark comes the nearest to this account of what was spoken, but differs in some

minute particulars. His words are: "Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said: Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said unto them: This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many." Mark 14: 22—24.

The most considerable discrepancies between the two Evangelists here are, that Matthew inserts the words: "*Drink ye all of it,*" which Mark omits; Matthew also represents Jesus as saying, in respect to his blood: "Which is shed for many, for the remission of sins:" while Mark omits the clause, "for the remission of sins." On the other hand, Mark records the following fact: "And they all drank of it;" while Matthew repeats merely the command to drink, but omits to record the fact that they did drink. There are other discrepancies in the *diction* of the narrators; but they are too minute to be noticed here.

The account of Luke, which I have produced above, near the head of this article, is of a somewhat different tenor, as to the diction. It runs thus: "He took bread, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you: This do in remembrance of me. Likewise the cup also, after supper, saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you;" Luke 22: 19, 20. Both of the other evangelists say: "Take, eat; this is my body;" Luke says simply: "This is my body, which is given for you." Of the cup the two first evangelists say: "This is my blood of the New Testament;" while Luke says: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Both the former say: "Which is shed for *many*;" but Luke says: "Which is shed for *you*." On the other hand, Luke says of the bread: "This do in remembrance of me;" while neither Matthew nor Mark record this expression. There are other minute differences; but to dwell on these would be inappropriate.

Last of all, Paul, in 1 Cor. xi., differs in some respects from all three of the evangelists, although he comes very near to Luke. Paul inserts the words, *take, eat*, which Luke omits, but which the other two evangelists record. Paul also repeats the words: "This do in remembrance of me," both after breaking the bread and distributing the cup; while Matthew and Mark omit these words entirely, and Luke has them only after the breaking of the bread. Besides these, there are also other discrepancies in the *diction*, which are of a minuter character.

Our first question is, In what are all the sacred writers agreed?

They all agree, that Jesus said of the bread: "This is my body;" two of them add: "Which is given for you," "Which is broken for you." Substantially they all agree, that Jesus said, respecting the cup: "This is my blood of the New Testament," or, as Luke and Paul express it: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." I take both of these expressions to be essentially equivalent; for both declare the fact, that the New Testament or covenant is consecrated and sanctioned by the blood of Jesus.

Three of the witnesses also agree in relating the fact, that Jesus said concerning his blood, that "it was shed for many," (Luke, *for you*); and Matthew adds: "For the remission of sins." Paul does not record this last declaration; but the manner in which he introduces his account of the eucharist, and the connection of this with what he had before said, plainly implies it.

Now these are the substantial facts of the case, on which of course all the others rest, and around which they all cluster and concentrate. Luke is more brief than either of the others; and Matthew, who was present, at the first eucharist, is naturally more full and circumstantial. There are no discrepancies here which amount to contradictions. The state of the case is simply this, viz., that some have related attending circumstances or concomitant words, which others have omitted. I have not unfrequently met with the suggestion, that the differences in this case amount to an important discrepancy or virtual contradiction. I cannot accede to such a view of the subject. Here are four independent witnesses, and each tells the story for himself, or in his own way. Now it happens, in this case, as in all others, that four different and independent men never tell a story, or give a particular account of any matter, in the same identical words, or with a repetition of minute circumstances in all respects the same. Such testimony, if it could be found, would be regarded in no other light than as a matter of mere collusion and concert between the narrators, and would consequently lose its credibility. And so the Spirit of God has ordered it in the present case. Each of the narrators preserves his own personal characteristics, his own style, his own views; each has inserted something omitted by the others, and omitted something inserted by them; and yet there is a harmony of method, in regard to the exhibition of all the essential facts of the case, which is unusual even in the evangelists themselves, at least it is unusual on many occasions.

It is of some importance to illustrate and confirm this, in order to relieve the perplexity of scrupulous readers of the Gospels.

when they become distinctly aware of this matter, and have never exercised their minds upon such subjects. I will do it as briefly as the nature of the case and the object in view will permit, and merely for the sake of relieving their perplexity, if it be in my power.

Passing the fact, that Luke only, of all the evangelists, has given a circumstantial account of the annunciation of the birth of Christ to the virgin Mary by Gabriel, and of other interesting occurrences which were consequent upon it, we will stop for a moment at the history of the temptation in the wilderness. Mark simply adverts to it in a single verse, as a matter of fact. Matthew and Luke devote, respectively, a whole paragraph to the narration of it. Substantially these two evangelists agree; but in the *order* of events they differ. Luke presents the temptation on the pinnacle of the temple as the *last* of the three; Matthew presents it as the *second* in order.

So in respect to the Sermon on the Mount. Only two evangelists have recorded or mentioned it, viz. Matthew and Luke. But Luke has not recorded more than one third part of what Matthew exhibits; and some of this is in a different order, and is clothed with a diction quite diverse. Matthew was present when the discourse was delivered, and would naturally be more circumstantial in his narration; Luke gathered his information, as he tells us in the preface to his Gospel, from eye and ear-witnesses.

It were easy to go on through the whole of the Gospels, and find, almost every where, more or less like the discrepancies just presented. But the nature of the present occasion forbids me to do it. I will only advert to one or two minute circumstances, in respect to different modes of narration, which are of a somewhat striking nature.

After the baptism of Jesus, there came a voice from heaven, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Three evangelists tell the story; but neither of the three relates, in all respects, the same words as the others, as being spoken from heaven. The occurrence was so striking and remarkable, and the words so few, that one is moved at first to wonder how the identical expressions could ever be forgotten or in any respect changed.

More remarkable still is another narration of a similar character. I refer to the inscription which Pilate put upon the cross of Jesus. Mark says simply: "The King of the Jews;" all the others are more circumstantial, and introduce other designations

of the sufferer. Yet no one of all four gives us the inscription in exactly the same way as his associates give it.

If one were to follow the Gospels critically and minutely through, he would find on every page of them more or less of the same character, in regard to the modes of narration. With all the points of resemblance in these compositions, (and these are exceedingly numerous), the points of *diversity* in respect to diction and mode of narration, are almost of equal amount. How few readers there are, who examine into such matters, or have any accurate knowledge of them, is evident enough from the fact, that the bare mention of these things is wont to surprise and even to shock them, and they are prone to look upon the man who tells them of such facts, as loving rather to read the Gospels with prying and skeptical eyes, than to read them with a humble and believing temper. 'It is enough,' they exclaim, 'simply to believe what is said, without inquiring *how* it is said, or what difficulties may possibly arise from minute attention to matters of diction and critical comparison of them.'

I give such persons credit for meaning well. Yet I could hardly class them with those noble Bereans, who are immortalized by the sacred historian, because they searched the Scriptures daily, in order to put to the test the preaching of Paul and Silas. 'Why! one might say, could they not believe Paul at once, without a moment's investigation or inquiry? Is not ready and implicit faith the very best of all faith?' And yet it would seem that Luke thought otherwise, for he records two things of these same Bereans; the first, that they received the word with all readiness; the second, that they exhibited this readiness then, and only then, when by searching the Scriptures they had found to be true what Paul and Silas had announced.

Put now the case, that all Christians should read the Gospels merely in the manner which some contend for. Infidels and latitudinarians do, and will, also read them. The diversities in question are affirmed by them to amount to *contradictions*. Strauss's book, which has roused up all the continent of Europe, and even the isles of the sea, and set the mass of men to wondering at the Gospels, or doubting about them, is built almost exclusively and entirely on the basis of the frequently apparent disagreements of the Gospels. Happy the man, you may say, who knows nothing about such matters! And so would I say, with all my heart, if I thought the times would let such men remain peaceful in their happy ignorance of such matters. But what shall be done,

when a learned and subtle advocate of neological views assails them by producing his doubts and difficulties? Christians of this cast are, in such a case, absolutely unarmed and defenceless. If they do not fall in the contest, they will be covered with wounds that are many and deep. That they are soon to meet with attacks of this nature, is quite manifest from the spirit of the times, and the publications in English of works bearing the character to which I have alluded. May the great Head of the Church compassionate and defend them, when the day of trial comes!

Most of my readers are called by duty to know something of the difficulties to which I have been adverting. Such difficulties run through all the Gospels. Nay, the Gospel of John is so entirely different from all the others, that there is scarcely anything in it in common with the others, except the account of the death and resurrection of Christ. Not a word of the *birth* of Christ, in the record of this beloved disciple; no account even of the institution of the Lord's Supper; which is very remarkable, inasmuch as John has given altogether a more circumstantial account of Jesus' actions and words near the close of his life, than any other evangelist. How could the disciple who leaned on Jesus' bosom, omit such a deeply interesting transaction?

All these views and suggestions, as any one will easily perceive, have a bearing on the different accounts given by the other sacred writers, of what was said and done at the institution of the eucharist. We have seen the discrepancy that exists among these accounts. We have seen, or at any rate we may by examination see, that these discrepancies do not amount to any contradiction. Each writer has presented things deemed important by himself. Each one has looked with his own individual eye upon the scene, and presented us with what struck him most forcibly. In this way we have a more complete view of the original, than any one single portrait could well give. All the circumstances, as they now are, are perfectly natural, and have therefore the stamp of genuineness. But if all the accounts were run in one and the same mould, every wary and critical reader would of course suspect *collusion* and *copying* among the writers. The credit of the whole would then vanish, or be substantially injured. *Now*, the witnesses are evidently independent, and do not copy after one another. Their diversity is an ample pledge of this. So has an all-wise Providence ordered the manner of the narrations, that unbelievers cannot say with truth: Here is collusion and copying.

Let us advert for one moment to other records of interesting

persons and transactions, for the sake of satisfying our minds that we are making a proper estimate of this matter. Plato and Xenophon have both given an account of Socrates' apology or defence before his judges. Yet, while they substantially agree, how different is the costume and the back-ground of each picture! So is it also with Xenophon's picture of Socrates' teaching and doctrines, as exhibited in his *Memorabilia*, in comparison with Plato's exhibition of the same in his dialogues.

I might say of Raphael, Titian, Michael Angelo, and other painters, that they have each and all sought to give us some adequate view of the person of Jesus. But one has presented him, at his baptism; another, in the wilderness as tempted; another, on the mount of transfiguration; another, as before the tribunal of the high-priest, and at the bar of Pilate; another, as on his way to crucifixion; another, as nailed to the cross; another, as lying in the sepulchre; another, as risen triumphant from the grave; and another, as ascending to heaven. Now how could any one picture of Jesus exhibit him in all these attitudes and circumstances? That was impossible. Why then should we expect, that any one evangelist, and each one, would give all the actions and words of Jesus? John tells us that the world would not contain the books, if all were written out which Christ had said and done. What propriety or fairness is there, then, in accusing the evangelists and Paul of contradicting each other, and disagreeing with each other, in the history of the eucharist? Does the painter who draws Christ in one particular attitude, contradict another, who has thrown other and different circumstances into the back-ground of his picture, although his chief design is to exhibit the same attitude? I trow not. Paul then does not contradict Mark, nor Matthew, nor Luke, because he differs in circumstantiality from each and all of them. And when this is once fully conceded, and placed in its proper position, most of the difficulties about this matter would seem to be at a reasonable end.

One general result of minute comparisons of the gospel narrations must inevitably be this, viz., that it is not probable, that either of the evangelists have, in all cases, or perhaps in any, given us the *exact, identical* words of Christ. But the leading *sense* of his words each has given us in his own way. Now fourteen centuries ago Jerome said, that 'the Scripture is in the nut, not in the shell; it is the fruit, and not the rind; the *sense* and *meaning* is the true word of God, and the diction is nothing more than the costume.' Well understood and skilfully applied, this is not only

good sense, but truth exceedingly important. Even civil jurists have a maxim which they often appeal to and apply: *He who sticks in the letter sticks in the bark.* (*Qui haeret in litera, haeret in cortice.*)

Of the identical words employed by Jesus on any occasion we cannot be sure, unless there is a complete agreement among all the narrators. The real and substantial meaning of what he said, is quite another matter.

In the case before us, however, we have seen, that as to the words: "This is my body; this is my blood," there is an entire accord among all the narrators. The meaning of these words, then, becomes an object of great interest and importance. Our main object is to investigate it.

‡ 3. IS THE OPINION OF THE FATHERS AUTHORITATIVE ?

I never expected, until recently, to see the day, when, among English and American Protestants, there would be a contention, whether the Saviour's words at the original eucharist were to be literally or figuratively interpreted, when he said, in respect to the bread before him: "This is my body," and of the wine: "This is my blood." But I have lived to see such a day, to my undissembled astonishment. I knew well, indeed, that multitudes who have borne and bear the Christian name, had interpreted the words just quoted in a *literal* manner. But their minds had been prepared for this, by what I believe to be an extravagant reverence for antiquity, that is, for the Christian fathers of ancient days, and for the subtle reasonings of the schoolmen during the dark ages. But among Protestants of England and America, that the question should arise, and be seriously debated once more, whether *transubstantiation* or *consubstantiation* be not after all a verity of the Gospel, is more than I had ever anticipated in any measure. Yet such a time has actually come. We have not only side-long hints and glances at such doctrines, but from high places in Protestant and Christian England we have an open avowal of them. The echo has reached across the Atlantic, and, as is not unusual in many cases, is louder, or threatens to be louder, than the original sound. Indeed, in the published sermon of Dr. Pusey, in relation to the subject before us, I find but a feeble report of the matter. It is made up, in the first place, of a string of citations from the New Testament, in respect to each and all of which, the writer takes it for granted, that the *literal* sense of the passages quoted is the only sense of which they are fairly capable:

and, in the second place, it consists of a like series of quotations from the Christian fathers, on which the preacher puts the same gloss. Any and every Romish treatise on the sacrament, of any celebrity, would easily furnish the matter for such a sermon; and little more is in fact done by the writer, than to copy out what he had found already prepared and made quite ready to his hand.

As to those in our own country, who reëcho such declarations as that sermon contains, without any effort to distinguish between the *figurative* and the *literal*, I must say, at least, what I have already said of another class of persons, that they seem not very much to resemble those noble Bereans, who were wont, in the exercise of their own judgment, to put the preaching of Paul and Silas to the test of the Scriptures. It is always easier, as we all know, to believe and assert, than it is to examine and prove. And when the expediency of such a method of forming religious sentiment comes to be questioned, then a defence of this sluggishness is usually ready and near at hand. This is, that all who do not believe with such persons, are skeptical, proud of their own reason, and prone to make religion more a matter that pertains to the intellect than to the heart. So, with them it is not only a merit to believe in the literal sense of scripture-declarations and of the assertions of the fathers; but the more difficult and improbable this sense is, the greater and more meritorious, in their view, would appear to be the faith which gives credit to it. What merit, they would seem to ask, in believing where all is plain and certain? But when you believe a thing incredible or impossible, it shows that you have a strong and operative faith. It was in such a way, that Tertullian came to his famous *Credo quia impossibile est*; and it is in this way that he has come, with many, to be regarded on this very account as having a claim to be called a second *Father of the faithful*.

In a broad survey of the question before us, we are first of all cast necessarily upon the inquiry: *How much is due to the opinion of the ancient Christian fathers?* Then follows of course the question: *What was that opinion?*

It were easier, in some respects, to write a book on each of these questions, than to give such a summary as is adapted to our present purposes. I must not occupy much time with either of these questions. Yet, if I do anything to the purpose in the way of answering either, I must say so much as will enable my readers to rest their opinion on arguments and facts, rather than on any assertions that I may make.

The first question need not detain us long. It stands thus: *In forming our views of religious truth, how much is due to the opinion of the ancient Christian fathers?*

"ALL SCRIPTURE," says Paul, "IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17). Now here is a plain and unequivocal assertion, that the Scripture is sufficient for all that is needed in relation to doctrine or practice. The man of God, that is the Christian, may be *perfect* by what is revealed in Scripture; in other words, he may be raised to the highest attainments in faith and holiness, by means of the Scripture; he may, moreover, be *thoroughly furnished* unto all good works. He needs no canons of councils; no books of discipline exhibiting the commandments and inventions of men; no visionary speculations and phantasies of ascetics; to make him *thoroughly* furnished—furnished not only for this or that good work, but for all good works.

So wrote and said Paul, before any ascetic had risen up in the church, to trouble and perplex it with dreamy conceits about the means of sanctification and high Christian attainments; or at least, before there was any considerable effort made by men of this class. This apostle does indeed once recognize the existence of such men in one church, viz. that at Colosse. To those in this church who were in danger of hearkening to such ill-grounded and superstitious opinions and conceits, he says: "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not, taste not, handle not; which all are to perish with the using), after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things, indeed, have a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting the body, not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh," or, as the last two clauses should rather be translated or paraphrased: 'Neglecting the body by withholding due sustenance for it; and even this for the gratification of carnal wishes.' The apostle tells the Colossians plainly, that by a solicitous attention to such matters, they would be beguiled of their true Christian reward in heaven.

I ask now whether all or any of the so-called Christian fathers, from Clement of Rome down to the latest writer who is reckoned among them, were *inspired* men? All antiquity said *NAY*; the middle ages, even, said *NAY*; modern times and the present day

are compelled to say **NAY**. Their writings then are not **SCRIPTURE**; for all Scripture is *inspired*. They are not infallible, then. Even the most strenuous Romanist is compelled to acknowledge this. So far as they agree with the Scriptures, all is well. But when they differ from the plain and obvious meaning of the Scripture, what is then to be done?

That they do differ in some cases; that even all of them whose writings amount to any thing considerable, do sometimes differ; will not be denied by any fair-minded man of any party, who is familiar with their writings. I go further. I venture to say in the face of the world, and to challenge refutation when I say, that there is not one considerable writer among them all, who does not exhibit some weak spots, discrepancies, contradictions either of the Scriptures or of rational views of things, contradictions even of himself. There is not one of them in whom may not be found incongruities, uncomelinesses, superstitious views, occasional weak credulity, and puerilities that would now be regarded by us as very strange, even among the larger children of a Sabbath-school. Many of their gems, even, are incrustated with crude and shapeless substances; and not unfrequently, when one finds them, he is obliged to pick them out as it were from a dung-hill.

It answers no purpose to reply to these assertions by lifting up both hands, and exclaiming, with elongated visage and the assumption of holy horror, against the *impiety* of such suggestions. I repeat it, that I have told the simple truth; and that if time and place permitted, and life were long enough to complete the task, more or less of what I have said could be easily made out as a matter of fact from every considerable father, and in most cases all that I have said could be fully applied to each of the patristical works now extant. No person who is familiar with these writings, will venture to contradict me, unless he has a sinister or party purpose in view.

When I say all this, I say it with no design to dishonour or degrade the Fathers. I have no feelings towards them which could lead me to form such a design. I respect the piety of most of them. Many excellent, yea invaluable things they have said. Their testimony to *facts*, in a multitude of cases, is of indispensable and inestimable value. Some of them, also, were truly great men, considering the time and the circumstances in and under which they lived. Any man, who can treat them in mass with

ridicule and contempt, shows only that he is himself an ignorant or a slanderer.

But still, they were not only men who might err, but men who did often err. They all had more or less of superstition. Their interpretations of the Scripture, with few exceptions, are often at open war with all the sound principles of exegesis. Their knowledge of the sciences was next to nothing. Few of them were even well versed in history. Only Jerome, among them all, could read and understand the Hebrew Scriptures. Origen had, it is true, a modicum of Hebrew knowledge; yet it was worth but little for any critical purposes. Possibly Epiphanius, brought up in Palestine, might know something of Hebrew. How then could the Fathers expound to us, with any good critical certainty, the original Hebrew Scriptures? How could they judge whether any translation of them was exact, or erroneous?

These then are the *guides*, whom we are invited to place by the side of Matthew, and John, and Paul, and other inspired writers. What certainty can we attain to, by following them? When they contradict themselves, and contradict each other, (and this they sometimes do), what is the poor wanderer to do, who has chosen them for his guide?

I hesitate not to say, that these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered. I am aware, that we are called on to consider, that although no one of the Fathers is infallible, in all cases, yet there is among them a universal agreement in *some things*; and that, as to those things, there is good ground for placing them by the side of the Scriptures. The criterion is said to be: *Quod verum; quod semper; quod ubique*; i. e. what has been always and every where one and the same. But if we concede the correctness of this criterion, for the sake of argument, it will amount to nothing. Among all the controverted doctrines of Christianity, (and nearly all have been controverted), you cannot find one which has not been either called in question by some of the Fathers, or at all events viewed in a defective light, or in a different light from those in which others have viewed it. If *constant uniformity*, then, be the criterion of appeal to the authority of the Fathers, then is their cause truly desperate who make such an appeal. This uniformity cannot possibly be proved.

But we are reminded here, that the Spirit of God is promised to the Christian in every age; and therefore of necessity we must suppose him to have guided the Fathers to the knowledge of the truth; and if this cannot be specifically asserted of this in-

dividual among them, or of that, yet *it may be said of them as a whole.*

In reply to this I have to say, first, that I see no reason why we must not apply such a principle to the Christians in the dark ages, and in the present age, as well as to ancient times. The moment we admit this latter position, (and how can the objector refuse to admit it?) all preëminence of the Fathers ceases; unless indeed they are entitled to one for superior learning and ability. But this will not be seriously contended for, by any well-informed man. Then as to the assertion, that *as a whole* they must have been guided to a knowledge of the truth, while at the same time we are obliged to concede that each individual of this whole has been liable to err, and has actually erred; I know not how we shall make the whole to be of a quality altogether different from the qualities of each of its component parts. Infallible no individual was; how then could the sum of the same individuals be infallible?

Besides, the Spirit of God is not specifically promised to the individuals who compose the corps of the Fathers. It is promised to the *Church*. God always has had a true Church in the world. But even to them the Spirit is not promised, in such a sense as to make them inspired and infallible in their writings. The best of men, when uninspired, have always fallen into some errors, and cherished some notions not taught in the Bible. Did we know for certainty who the true Church are and always have been, we could not even then look to them as infallible in all matters of sentiment. The most that we can truly say, is, that all truth essential to salvation will be known and acknowledged by the true Church, whenever or wherever it exists. But after all, some chaff may be and is mingled with the wheat.

It is out of all question, then, to place any *uninspired* men by the side of *inspired* ones, and to make them of equal authority, or to regard them as entitled to implicit credit, without any further examination than what is necessary in order to decide what their meaning is. We must fall back on another position, and take our place with those who have said: "The *Law of the Lord* is perfect, converting the soul;" "the *Gospel* is the power of God unto salvation."

‡ 4. HISTORICAL VIEW OF OPINION IN THE CHURCHES AT PRESENT,
AND IN MODERN TIMES.

We come now to the second question: *What was the opinion of the ancient Fathers, in respect to the meaning of the consecrating sacramental words?*

Before I proceed, however, to the immediate discussion of this question, I must solicit the attention of my readers to some account of the present attitude of the Christian world in regard to this matter, and lay before them what causes have been in operation, since the commencement of the Reformation, to produce and continue such a state of opinion. Information in relation to these matters is not only interesting and useful in itself to an enlightened Christian, but it will deepen his interest to know what the leaders of the early churches have thought and said in relation to the eucharist.

Beginning then our historical inquiries with the present day, and with more recent times, we shall find that the great mass of nominal Christians now entertain a belief in Christ's real bodily presence in the elements of the Lord's Supper. For some time before the Reformation began, during the first quarter of the 16th century, nearly all Christendom were united in the Romish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, i. e. of the actual presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements of the eucharist, or rather, that these elements, after due consecration, are actually and verily converted into the body and blood of Christ. As Protestantism made progress, the so-called Reformed churches, modelled by Zuingli, Calvin, and their associates, called in question this doctrine, and, with some shades of difference, united in the view, that the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper are merely *symbols* of his body that was broken and of his blood that was poured out. This sentiment has been gaining ground since that period; but, as the sequel will show, it has as yet made but little progress among professed Christians.

Taking the popular estimate of the inhabitants of our world, at present, they are divided into 500,000,000 Pagans, 100,000,000 Mohammedans, and 200,000,000 Christians. Of the Christians, the Roman Catholics constitute at least one half; the Greek church numbers about 52,000,000, and the so-called Protestants nearly 50,000,000. From these we must, for our present purpose, subtract the Lutherans, amounting to about 17,000,000. The remainder,

about 33,000,000 of Protestants, of different names, are the only portion of Christendom, which does not believe in *transubstantiation* or *consubstantiation*. All the Roman Catholics and the Greek church, which together make about 152,000,000, profess to believe, that the consecrated bread and wine become the true and real body and blood of Christ; and the Lutherans, as a body, have hitherto believed in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacramental elements. Their mode of expressing it has been, that Christ's body and blood are *in, with, and under* the elements of the eucharist; while, at the same time, they do not deny that these elements still preserve unchanged their attributes as bread and wine. The Romish church deny this last proposition, and assert that the consecrated elements are no longer bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Jesus Christ.

I should not do justice to the Lutheran church of recent times, if I did not say, that many within its precincts have loudly called in question the old doctrine of Luther and his compeers and successors, in respect to consubstantiation. The battle has been fought, of late, with great power; and scarcely a doubt remains, that the more enlightened among the Lutherans, are either renouncing his views, or coming to the position that they are not worth contending for. In this country, such is clearly the case. Dr. Schmucker, the able and excellent exponent of the Lutheran theology in this country, in his work called *Popular Theology*, has told us, that they are "settled down in the happy conviction, that on this, as on all other subjects not clearly determined by the inspired volume, her sons shall be left to follow the dictates of their own conscience, having none to molest or to make them afraid." (p. 255.) The great body of Lutheran divines among us, according to the same writer, doubt or deny the corporeal or physical presence of Christ in the elements of the eucharist.

It is not difficult to predict, that ere long the great mass of well-informed Lutherans, at least in this country, will be substantially united, in regard to this subject, with the other reformed churches. The progress of discussion in Germany seems to promise the same in that country.

How different this state of things is, from that which succeeded the publication of the Augsburg Confession, Melancthon's *Apology*, the *Catechisms of Luther*, and afterwards the *Formula Concordiae*, no one can fail to perceive. Luther's points of reform did not touch the sacrament, at first, excepting merely some of the ceremonies consequent on, or concomitant with, its administration.

In all the early authentic documents of the Lutheran faith, the *real presence* of Christ in the elements is strongly and often asserted. Even graceless communicants, it is asserted, partake of the real body and blood of Christ, although it is to their harm or condemnation. As to others, Luther maintained, that communion at the Lord's table was the means of obtaining forgiveness of sin, confirmation of belief, and establishment of Christian virtue.

The idea that *forgiveness of sin* was to be obtained by coming to the table of the Lord, was wholly inconsistent with another part of Luther's creed, who held that the impenitent, i. e. the unforgiven, have no right to come to the table of the Lord, and if they do come, they only enhance their guilt.

The great mass, moreover, of enlightened Lutherans hold, so far as I can ascertain, even now, that the communicant, by coming to the Lord's table, establishes and confirms his *regeneration*; which last, as they aver, was actually commenced, when the rite of baptism was duly administered. This rite, when thus administered, does of itself, and by its own virtue, as they hold, implant the *germ of regeneration* in the soul of the child, or at all events occasion it to be implanted. Such then, even now, is the doctrine of the greater part of our Lutheran brethren on the continent of Europe. (See evidences of the above views of the older Lutherans, in Bretschneider's Dogmatik, II. p. 714 seq.)

How strenuous Luther and his followers were for a long period, in their views respecting *consubstantiation*, is well known to all attentive readers of ecclesiastical history. In vain were repeated conferences resorted to, in order to bring them and the Swiss reformers to a harmony of opinion, in relation to this subject. The breach grew wider and wider, the longer the subject was agitated. Melancthon and other Lutherans would easily have come to an agreement with Calvin and his associates; but Luther would not give way an inch; and he succeeded in inspiring a majority of his followers with the same spirit. The battle waxed still warmer after his death; and this, when both parties of the Reformed were in danger of overwhelming destruction from the advocates of the Papacy. United, the Protestants might have bid defiance to all the efforts of Rome, and the greater part of Europe would probably have become Protestant. But the strenuous leaders among the Lutherans did not scruple to declare, as the venerable Planck has shown, that they would sooner go back and unite with the Romish church, than admit the abominable doctrine, that the elements of the Lord's Supper are merely *symbols* of his body and blood.

How often is one compelled, in reading the history of the church, to wonder at the power of superstitious notions, and the zeal and obstinacy with which they are defended! When men get into this predicament, they generally try to make up by zeal and obstinacy, what is wanting in reason and argument. As this is the only way in which they can retain their position, one may expect that they will be very much in earnest. I think it would not be far from the truth if I should say, that outrageous disputes, vituperative discourse, reproachful appellations, dark suspicions, and zeal to find or make heretics, yea, and to burn them too, proceed almost entirely from those who have a weak cause to maintain, and have planted themselves on the basis of imaginary orthodoxy, or of metaphysical or superstitious conceit.

Thus have I given a brief view of the state of things, in regard to the matter before us, since the time when the Reformation commenced. Out of the 200,000,000 of nominal Christians, now and for some time past existing, it would seem that not more than one sixth part believe that the bread and wine of the eucharist are merely *symbols* of the body and blood of Christ. And even among this small number, it appears that division is commencing. There are not wanting men, as I have already said, in this country and in England, who openly or secretly advocate the doctrine of the *real presence* of Jesus in the eucharistic elements. Perhaps a majority of these men content themselves with suggesting, or significantly hinting, that to regard the bread and wine as mere symbols, is a cold and heartless and comparatively unmeaning rite; that unspeakably more interest and importance are attached to the Lord's Supper, when Christ is regarded as embodied in its elements; and consequently, on this ground, if on no other, such a mode of viewing the subject is altogether preferable. But for the most part, they do not content themselves with merely reasoning in this way. They not unfrequently more than hint, that the sacramental words of Christ are to be *literally* interpreted; and above all, that this method of interpretation has been the prevailing one, ever since the earliest periods of the Christian church. They do not scruple, on some occasions, to aver, that this is one of those matters of which it may be said: *Quod unum, quod semper, quod ubique*, i. e. it has always and everywhere been one and the same. Consequently, as they aver, we are under obligation to listen to the voice of all the earlier ages, which have thus expounded the sacramental words of Christ.

Is this declaration respecting the *uniformity* and *antiquity* of the

opinion in question true? We must pursue this inquiry still further, in the following section.

§ 5. OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

In entering upon the consideration of the question: What was the opinion of the Christian fathers respecting the elements of the Lord's Supper? I must premise, that appeal to individual declarations, in this case, excepting merely so far as illustration or special confirmation demands, is out of all question. Declarations enough might easily be exhibited, to fill several successive volumes. But that would be altogether out of place in such a plan as my present one, and in a discussion so limited. Summary views illustrated and confirmed, are all that I shall attempt, and all that ought to be aimed at, in an essay like the present.

It is natural to suppose, when we consider the peculiarly solemn nature of the Lord's Supper, that the three great parties of Christians, who appeared soon after the commencement of the Reformation, would direct their special attention to this ordinance. The Roman Catholic church had, by this time, settled down on the belief of transubstantiation; and along with this they received the idea, that the eucharist was a renewal, so often as it was celebrated, of vicarious sacrifice by the body and blood of Christ. Hence the consecrated bread was carried round publicly in processions, was distributed to the sick and infirm, and was worshipped as the actual body of Christ.

Melancthon first opened the contest on the subject of the eucharistic elements, so early as 1530, only thirteen years after the Reformation. In his treatise, the usual Lutheran views of the day were defended. He was answered by Oecolampadius, who, although a German and a Lutheran, took sides with Zuingli in the sacramentarian controversy.

An attack was soon made upon the Romish views, by De Mornei of France; and successively the contest was prolonged, by different writers, and has continued down to the present time. Among these may be reckoned some of the most distinguished writers, in each of three great divisions of Christians.

One grand question, for a long time, with most of the writers, was: What have the earlier fathers taught, in respect to the elements of the Lord's Supper? And it is a fact worthy of special note, that each of the parties found, or believed that they had found, patronage for their respective opinions among the Christian fathers.

Nor is this without some reason. It is a fact, that one may, in some of the fathers, find sentiments that correspond with transubstantiation, with consubstantiation, and with the idea of symbolic representation; and sentiments, moreover, which correspond with neither of these views.

I must now touch upon a few particulars, in the way of illustrating and justifying this declaration.

The epistles of Ignatius are so uncertain, in regard to their genuineness, that we cannot safely appeal to them as evidence. If this might be done, it were easy to show, that he held the partaking of the eucharistic elements to be 'the means of preparing our bodies for a resurrection and an immortality;' and that he regarded the eucharist as 'the flesh of Christ, who suffered for our sins, and was raised from the dead.' (Ep. ad Eph. c. 20. Ep. ad Smyr. c. 7). But whether he held to views like the Romish, or the Lutheran, it would be difficult to make out from his words, should we regard them as genuine.

Justin Martyr, who flourished about A. D. 140, is the first Christian father who has given us particular and specific views respecting the sacramental elements. There is a long paragraph in his *Larger Apology* respecting the Lord's Supper, which I cannot here repeat, but from which, as it seems to me quite plain, it is evident that he held an opinion different from either of the three great parties into which Christendom is now divided. The sum of it is, that as the Logos or higher spiritual nature of Christ once assumed a body in connection with himself, and dwelt in the same, so the same Logos is present in the eucharistic elements, and for the time being, i. e. when they are consecrated and partaken of, they are, in a like way as his former body and blood, the place or the subject of his indwelling. He who partakes of them, then, partakes of the present, not the former, body and blood of Christ; and on this ground he receives within himself the germ or element of the future resurrection and immortality of his body. (Justin Mart. *Apol. maj.* pp. 82, 83, edit. Colon.)

It will be perceived, at once, that this is different from the transmutation of the bread and wine into the actual body of Christ; different from Christ's actual body and blood being in, with, and under the bread; and different from the idea, that the elements are only symbols of Christ's broken body and of his blood that was shed. All three of these parties have appealed to Justin for support; and all without any valid reason. Each can find some-

thing that looks as if it might favour his opinion ; but in the end each is obliged, if he is a fair-minded man, to give this up.

The other passages of Justin, in his Dialogue with Trypho, (pp. 209, 210, 137, *ib.*), merely declare, that the eucharist is a *thank or praise-offering* to God ; not a sin-offering, in the sense of the Romanists. What naturally led Justin to view the eucharist in this light, was the circumstance, that the Jews and Heathen objected to Christianity, that it presents no visible offerings to God, such as their religion taught them to present, and so could not be a true religion. Justin and other fathers felt that this objection might be removed, by maintaining that the eucharist was an *oblation or thank-offering* ; and at the same time, that it brought to view the real expiatory offering, viz. the death of Christ. In addition to this, the consideration, that an analogy between the offerings of the Old Testament and of the New would appear to be kept up by such a view of this subject, seems to have been a further inducement for regarding the eucharistic elements as a *thank-offering*.

Irenaeus, who lived near the close of the second century, speaks in like manner of the sacrament of the Supper. After labouring at length, in his fourth book, to show that the eucharist is a *thank-offering* ; and after asking, how it can be supposed, that heretics, who deny the true Maker of heaven and earth, can bring such an offering, he thus proceeds : " How shall it be made evident to them, that the bread, on account of which thanks are given, is the body of the Lord, and the cup of his blood, when they will not acknowledge him as the Son of the world's Creator, that is, his Word, by whom the trees are made fruitful, the fountains flow forth, and the earth yields first the stalk, then the ear, and lastly the full grain in the ear." (Lib. iv. c. 18. § 1—4.)

In another passage, in the sequel (§ 5), he speaks of " the eucharist as consisting of two elements, the earthly and the heavenly," and from this circumstance he draws the conclusion, that our bodies partake of an element besides the perishable one, and this element is the germ of immortality by reason of the Logos being in the elements of the eucharist. In another passage he speaks of our bodies as belonging to Christ, because he nourishes them by the effects of the sun and rain, and the fruits, i. e. by bread and wine which these produce. (V. c. 2. § 2.) In yet another passage, he speaks of the Word (Logos) of God as received by the elements of the Supper, and says that " they become the body of Christ ; and that by these elements our bodies are nourished and

grow;" and he then asks, how any one can deny that the body is capable of eternal life. In the same passage, he speaks of the Logos of God as coming to the bread and wine, and of his being received by them; and he says, that thus they become the eucharist, that is, the body and blood of Christ. (Ib. † 3. See and comp. also, IV. c. 33, † 2. Fragm. p. 343.) In consequence of such a union, he deduces the certainty of the resurrection of the body.

Irenaeus, in arguing against the Gnostics, who denied that the Old Testament proceeded from the same God as the New, (because *there* are offerings everywhere, and *here* nowhere), maintains the idea of an *offering* in the eucharist; yet not a propitiatory offering, but only a *thank-offering*. As already noticed, he argues the future existence of our bodies, from the fact that we have fed on the body and blood of Christ, in the eucharistic elements, and therefore we must live forever. And lastly, like Justin Martyr, he argues that the elements of the eucharist are the body and blood of Christ, because the Logos comes to men, and is received by men, and uses them as his body and blood. This as we have seen in the case of Justin, is a view that differs from that of either of the three great parties now existing in Christendom. All have appealed to Irenaeus; all may find something, which considered merely by itself, may favour the views of each; but neither has any good reason to cite this Father as an authority. He differs from them all.

There is another consideration to be taken into view here, both in respect to Justin and Irenaeus. Very early in the Christian Church the view of baptism which began to be cherished was, that the Holy Spirit united himself with the baptismal water, in some mysterious way, and thus made it to produce a regenerating and sanctifying influence. In like manner, Justin and Irenaeus seem to have thought, did the Logos unite with the elements of the eucharist, and give to them a peculiar and imperishable virtue. It should also be remarked here, that the leading influence of the sacramental bread and wine appears, in the view of these two early writers, to have been this, viz., that our bodies, naturally perishable, became, by partaking of the eucharist, immortal like the body of Christ. How they disposed of the bodies of the *wicked* at the general resurrection, would present a question of some difficulty. But I cannot dwell upon it here.

Clement of Alexandria, early in the third century, distinguished in his day for a variety of learning, has expressed himself, in relation to the eucharist, somewhat more obscurely. Yet we may

gather some things, with sufficient definiteness. He maintains a distinction between the blood of Christ on the cross, and his blood in the eucharist; he asserts the spiritual presence or energy of the Logos in the elements; and finally he says, in so many words, that "the holy fluid of gladness [i. e. the eucharistic wine], *allegorizes* the Logos, whose [blood] was poured out for the remission of the sins of many." (Paed. II. c. 2. p. 186. For confirmation of the other assertions, see Paed. I. c. 6. II. c. 2. Opp. p. 988. Paed. II. 2. p. 184.)

Origen, whose fame both as a critic and interpreter all know, and who lived in the first half of the third century, in his commentary on Matt. 15: 11, (Nothing which goeth into the mouth, defileth a man), most explicitly declares, that the bread and wine of the eucharist are nothing without prayer and holy affections; that they remain bread and wine, and nothing more; and that merely faith is the measure of profit. (Opp. III. p. 498 seq.). In commenting on the words of Christ at the eucharist, he says: "The bread, which the God Logos (*θεὸς λόγος*) declared to be his body, is his word which nourishes souls, the word which comes from the Logos;" and so of the wine, he says: "It is his word watering and satisfying the hearts of those who drink it." And in the sequel; "He [Christ], did not call this visible bread which he held in his hands, his body; but the word, to which the bread to be broken had a mysterious reference. The visible drink he did not call his blood, but the word (or doctrine), to which the wine to be poured out had a mysterious reference." (Opp. III. 898.)

Here, then, we find in full measure and in the most unequivocal manner, the *symbolical* significance of the eucharistic elements. No follower of Zuingli or Calvin could make it plainer. Origen speaks, in another place, of those, who attribute a *physical* power to the elements of the eucharist, and names them *simpletons*. He avers, that he interprets the words of Christ *spiritually*, because the letter killeth. (See De Orat. § 17. I. p. 247. Comm. in Johan. IV. p. 444. Hom. in Lev. Opp. II. pp. 222, 225.)

That such were the sentiments of the church in Africa, appears not only from this view of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, but also from Tertullian of Carthage, at the close of the second century. This writer, in defending the reality of Christ's body and blood against Marcion, avers that the elements of the eucharist are the *symbols* (*figura*) of Christ's body and blood, and that they could not be so, if these were not real. (Cont. Marc. IV. c. 40. Comp. I. c. 14. III. c. 19. De Resurrect. Carnis, c. 37.

De Orat. c. 6.) Tertullian entertained exalted views of the sacrament; and he seems even to think, that the physical *body* of Christians receives some peculiar nutriment from it, (De Resurrect. c. 8); but he does not call it an *offering*, nor does he say any thing to favour the views of either the Romanists or the Lutherans.

Cyprian, the famous bishop of Carthage and martyr, who flourished about the middle of the third century, has a long passage in his letter to Caecilius (Ep. 63, p. 148), on the subject of the sacrament. But his main object there, is to show that *water* must of necessity be mingled with the sacramental wine, in order to give it due significancy. Nowhere does he express himself explicitly or fully respecting the presence of Christ in the elements of the eucharist; but the tenor of his reasoning, and the illustrations to which he resorts, as Muenschler well remarks, show that "Cyprian admitted no actual presence of the body and blood of Christ in those elements, but regarded them in the light of tokens or symbols of his body and blood." (II. p. 367, Muensch. Dogmengeschichte.) That Cyprian cherished even an excessive feeling in regard to the wonderful and mysterious and awful in the eucharist, is plain enough from all that he says respecting it. Among other things this may serve as a specimen. In the very gravest manner and filled with solemn awe, he relates the story of a little Christian child, who on some occasion had been allured to approach the statue of some of the heathen gods, and being too small to eat of the *meat-offering* to the idol, the by-standers gave to it some bread and wine. When brought to the eucharist, by its parents, the child rejected with outcries and struggles the elements of the Holy Supper. 'Its mouth,' says Cyprian, 'profaned by idol aliments, could not receive the sacred elements of the eucharist.' (De Lapsis, p. 132). Several other wonderful occurrences of a like tenor, the good bishop relates. The story may at least serve to show, what is an undoubted fact, that at this period baptized children, in very early childhood, were brought to the sacramental table. (For confirmation, see Ep. ad Caecil. pp. 148 seq., 153, 164, 149, 155. Ep. ad Magnes. 67, p. 182. See also Ep. 70. De Unit. Ecc. p. 116).

Thus we have come near to the close of the third century, and find not a single case, in which the doctrine of transubstantiation appears; nor indeed that of consubstantiation, in the sense of Luther. We find the earlier sentiment, as exhibited by Justin Martyr and by Irenæus, to be, that the Logos was present in the eucharistic elements, as he once was in the body which he as-

sumed. But there is no transformation of the elements; nor is the human body and blood of Christ regarded as being present. But after this, in the third century, we find that Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, all unite in regarding the eucharistic elements in the light of *symbols*, although they indulge in some variety of expression respecting the matter, and employ not a few loose and undefined expressions with regard to it. All unite, however, in considering it a kind of *thank-offering* or *oblation*, not a propitiatory offering such as the Romanists assert. Cyprian even goes so far as to compare the duty of the officiating minister, who consecrates the elements at the sacramental table, to an office like that which the priests of old were regarded by the Jews as performing, when they went through with a service under the High Priest. He says nothing, however, of *expiation* made by the eucharistic oblation; but still, he says that on which after ages, prone to seize every occasion of introducing superstitious views, erected their structure of the vicarious sacrifice of the mass.

There is another remark which I must not omit, at the close of this part of our investigation. I have already adverted to the subject; but it needs distinct mention here, on the ground of its importance. The remark is, that down to this period, it seems everywhere to be recognized by most of the Fathers, and to lie at the basis of their views respecting the eucharist, that Christ in some mysterious and indescribable way, did so unite himself with the bread and wine of the Holy Supper, that the partaker actually received something of him, in some sense or other, and incorporated it into his system in such a way, that the germ of immortality was inserted into the material body of the communicant, and so he was prepared for the resurrection of the last day. Indeed this seems to be altogether a leading view of the early Fathers, in their notions respecting the Sacrament. But this the Romanists and the Lutherans, who appeal to the Fathers, for some reason, mostly choose to pass by in silence. We can easily conjecture reasons enough for their silence; but *they* are not fond of giving them.

In the state in which we have seen the sacramental question to be, near the close of the third century, it continued to be until the latter half of the fourth century. In the first quarter of the fourth century, Constantine, the emperor of Rome, became a professed Christian, and did all in his power to propagate his new religion. Heathenism almost every where declined apace; and

during the latter half of the fourth century, there sprang up a great host of distinguished and able men among the Christians. It may suffice to mention Cyrill of Jerusalem, Ephrem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Cassian; who, however, are only a part. *How did these men view the eucharistic elements? What changes did the doctrine of the earlier Christians undergo?*

To produce specific testimonies on this subject, would occupy a volume, instead of a brief discussion. All that can be done is to present some *general views*, to which the detail of these matters seems necessarily to lead us. I say *necessarily*, on the supposition that party views are laid aside, and the investigation conducted on the simple grounds of exegetical inquiry.

It is a remarkable circumstance in the history of these times, that no disputes seem to have grown up among the churches on the subject of the eucharist. Almost everything else was doubted and disputed by some. But among the Sabellians, the Arians, the Pelagians, and other sects which troubled the church, there was no question or controversy about the elements of the Lord's Supper; unless, indeed, the small question, whether wine only, or water only, or a mixture of both, should be employed. But the Council of Nice, and other Councils that followed in large numbers, do not appear to have been occupied with any sacramentarian disputes, nor to have passed any specific or important decrees in regard to this matter.

Still, during the period in question, the elements with which the doctrine of the Romish Church were afterwards constructed, were evidently in a state of formation. The germ began in monkery, and in a multiplication of church offices and ceremonies. Everything that could add to the pomp and ceremony of religion, began to attract attention and approbation. The heathen reproached Christians for having no solemn rites, nothing attractive, but only a rude and uninteresting exhibition of their religion. Christians, in order to stop their mouths, and also to attract them towards Christianity, soon began to show, that they could even outdo the heathen themselves in many respects. Not a few of the heathen ceremonies, with a little variation, and baptized (if I may so express it) by a new name, were incorporated into the rituals of the churches. All this was naturally enough regarded as a work of piety; and the apparently good tendency of it, in attracting the heathen, scarcely permitted a doubt in regard to the expediency of adopting these new changes in rituals.

The attachment of the initiated among the heathen to their so-called mysteries, and the profound reverence which they entertained for them, made Christians desirous of presenting to them some attractive correspondencies in their own religion. *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* opened a door of easy access to mysteries. In the first, there was the presence of the Holy Spirit, with his regenerating and sanctifying influence, in the consecrated water. The signs of the cross, chrism with holy oil, sponsors, and a variety of other ceremonials were connected with this ordinance. As to the other sacrament, none but the initiated, i. e. the baptized, could be admitted to the Lord's table. The occasion was compared with the celebration of the Eleusian mysteries. To throw a sacred awe around the table of the Lord, to endow the eucharistic elements with some mysterious qualities and influence, was a natural consequence of labouring to find something attractive to the multitude, and which would compensate for the loss of their mysteries. Nothing could be better adapted to this, than to interpret the consecrating words of Christ, *This is my body, this is my blood*, in a kind of literal way. This would carry the matter even beyond the bounds of the heathen mysteries. It would fully satisfy the cravings of our nature for the mysterious and the awful.

With such views and feelings, slowly and gradually growing up from the middle of the third century to the middle of the fourth, it can be no matter of wonder that we find the numerous fathers, in the latter part of the fourth, filled with ecstasy and awe, whenever they come to treat directly of the eucharist. Two or three brief examples will afford a specimen of what I mean.

"Direct thy view," says Cyrill of Jerusalem, "to the holy body [meaning the consecrated bread], and sanctify thine eyes. Guard well against losing anything of it; for it would be like losing a member of thine own body. If any one were to commit gold dust to thee, to be conveyed anywhere, wouldest thou not guard carefully against losing any particle thereof? How much more shouldst thou guard against the smallest crumb of that which is more precious than gold or rubies! Draw near to the cup, bowed down, and with a kind of worshipful reverence.—If one drop of it should hang upon thy lips, moisten thine eyes and forehead therewith, and thus sanctify them!" (Catech. XXIII § 21, 22).

Chrysostom, after describing with what reverence we are wont to approach earthly majesty and splendour, breaks out into this exclamation: "With how much more shuddering shouldst thou approach, when thou seest him [Christ] lying before thee! Say

now to thyself: By means of this body, I am no more dust and ashes; no more a captive, but a freeman; through this I expect an eternal life in heaven, with all the blessings there reserved; and to obtain an inheritance with the angels, and intercourse with the Redeemer." (Hom. XXIV. in Ep. ad Cor. Opp. XI.) Again he says, in the sequel: "This entertainment is the nerve of the soul, the bond of the spirit, the foundation of confidence, hope, safety, light, and life. When we go away in possession of this, we find ourselves in possession of golden armour. Why should I speak of the future? This mysterious transaction transforms the earth into heaven.—All that heaven holds of the precious, will I point out to thee on earth. In a royal palace, nothing is more precious than the person of the king. This thou canst now see on earth, yea touch, eat. Purify thyself, then, in order to be made partaker of such mysteries." (Ut sup. p. 261).

One more extract, from *Cyrril of Alexandria*, must conclude this exhibition? "Christ gives us a feast to-day. Christ serves us. Christ, the friend of men, receives us. Awful is what is said, awful what is done. The fatted calf is slain; the Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the world. The Father is well pleased; the Son freely presents himself as an offering, not brought forward by the enemies of God, but by himself, to show that he freely took upon him the sorrows that render us happy.—Divine presents are offered; the mysterious entertainment is prepared; the life-giving cup is mingled. The King invites to honours; the incarnate Logos exhorts us; he imparts his body as bread; he presents his life-giving blood as wine.—O what an indescribable arrangement! What incomprehensible condescension! What unsearchable piety! The Creator gives himself to the creature to be partaken of; the source of life voluntarily presents himself to mortals as food and drink!" (Homil. in Myst. Coen. Opp. V. p. 2. pp. 371, 372).

Many passages of such a tenor may be found, in several of the fathers of this period. I envy not the man who can read them with a light or scoffing temper of mind. They manifest the deepest feeling, the most sacred awe, that we can well conceive of as pervading the human breast. I doubt not that the spirit of them was altogether acceptable to God. But whether other and different views of the eucharistic elements might not have excited in the same minds sentiments equally glowing and reverential, and even more spiritual—is a question that different persons might answer in diverse ways. I cannot hesitate to believe, that such

men as a Doddridge, a Baxter, or an Edwards, might be equally affected, yea more rationally and spiritually affected, by such views of the eucharist as they cherished.

† 6. RESULTS.

We have come down to the distinguished Fathers of the latter part of the fourth century. We have found in the writers of preceding times, that when they speak of the presence of Christ in the elements of the eucharist, they have reference to the presence of the *Logos* in them, who assumes them, for the time being, as he once did a human body; and that by virtue of feeding on the consecrated bread and wine, an immortality, or rather, the germ of immortality, becomes incorporated with the *physical* system of the faithful, and renders them capable of reanimation at the period of the general resurrection. Such was the leading idea in relation to this subject, so far as one was definitely formed and exhibited, down to the middle of the third century.

In regard to the fathers subsequent to this period, the most distinguished of which I have named in the preceding section, I can do nothing more than give mere *results*. These I must arrange under general heads.

There cannot be the least doubt, that the fathers of the period in question thought and spoke of the sacramental bread and wine as the *body* and *blood* of Christ. Some of their expressions are exceedingly strong, and even revolting at first view. "The bread," says Gregory of Nyssa, "is at first communion bread; but when it is mysteriously consecrated, it is called and becomes the body of Christ." Again: "Jesus Christ himself declares: This is my body. Who can venture to remain in uncertainty? When he assures us [of the wine]: This is my blood; who can doubt, and say: It is not his blood?" (Greg. Nyss. Orat. in Baptismum Christi, Opp. III. p. 370. See also Cyrill. Hieros. Cat. XIX. † 7. XXI. † 3. XXII. † 2.)

So says Chrysostom, in relation to the same subject: "Let us always believe God, and not contradict him, even when he says that which disagrees with our senses and our reason. His word is certain, our feelings may deceive us. When therefore the *Logos* says: This is my body; let us believe him, and regard his body with spiritual eyes.—His very self thou seest, thou touchest, thou eatest." (Chrys. Hom. 83 in Matt. Opp. VII. p. 868.)

Cyrill of Alexandria, who seems to surpass all the others in the

vehemence of his expressions, when controverting Nestorius who had defended the *symbolic* view of the Sacrament, exclaims; "Is it not then plainly an eating of the man?—We do not eat the Godhead, but the proper flesh of the Logos; which becomes life-giving, because it is the flesh of the Logos." (Cont. Nestor. IV. c. 4. Tom. VI. See also Cyrill. Hieros. Cat. XXII † 3. XXIII † 7. XXII † 9. Ambrose, De eis qui Myst. init. c. 9; comp. De Fide, IV. c. 5.)

On every side expressions of such a nature abound. At first sight, it would seem as if the doctrine of *transubstantiation* was believed and asserted by these fathers, without any question. Yet there are other passages in them, and there are modes of reasoning to which they often resort, that serve to cast much doubt on this first impression, and finally to remove it. I must illustrate and briefly confirm this remark.

First, then, the fathers frequently compare the eucharist with *baptism*, and put them both in the same class of mysteries. But in regard to baptism, they never maintain that the water becomes, when consecrated, the Holy Spirit, or that the holy oil, which was also employed, experiences any such change. They regarded this matter merely as standing on the following basis, viz., that the Holy Spirit communicated to those elements an extraordinary and supernatural energy. But this is quite a different thing from a change or transformation of the elements into the Holy Spirit.

Secondly, it is a favourite and most frequent idea of the fathers in question, that the union of the Logos with the bread and wine of the eucharist, is like his union with a human body. Now in regard to this latter union, the orthodox churches never held that the two natures of Christ were so blended, that they became merely one nature. The *person* was one, but the *natures* two. Eutychius, an abbot of Constantinople, who flourished at this period, maintained the doctrine of one nature only in Christ. But Eutychius was assailed and opposed from all quarters, with great zeal. The union of the Logos, then, with the body of Jesus, did not change or transform the proper human nature of the body. It still remained real and proper human flesh and blood. If now the same fathers who fought against Eutychius, had maintained a real transubstantiation of the sacramental elements into the body and blood of Christ, by the presence of the Logos in them, then would they have put deadly arms into the hands of Eutychius, who might well say: 'By your own concession, the eucharistic elements are transformed, and are no more bread and wine. when

the Logos is present in them; consequently, when he assumes a human body, it no longer remains such, but it is transformed into a higher nature.' The fathers were in general too wary disputants to expose themselves in this way.

In the third place, some of the fathers are occasionally so explicit, in regard to the point before us, viz. that the *substance* of the bread and wine still remains even after consecration, that no doubt can be left of their meaning. So Chrysostom in his epistle to Caesarius: "As we call the bread, before the consecration, *bread*, but after consecration it loses this name and is called the *body of the Lord*, ALTHOUGH THE NATURE OF THE BREAD STILL REMAINS," etc.¹ (Ep. ad Caesar. in Canisii Thesaur. I. p. 235.) Theodoret, in writing against the Monophysites, asserts, that "the body of Christ retains its proper nature when united with the Godhead; even," he adds, "as the bread and wine, after the consecration, lose nothing of their sensible substance." (Dial. II. Opp. IV. p. 125. seq. Dial. I. p. 25. Comp. Ephrem. Syr. in Phot. Biblioth. c. 229.)

Gelasius, made bishop of Rome in A. D. 492, who lived a century later than most of the fathers of whom I have been speaking, when writing against the Eutychians and Nestorius, says, in the most explicit manner: "Certainly the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receive, are a divine matter; and on this account, we are by them made partakers of a divine nature; but still *the substance or nature of the bread and wine does not cease to exist*.—Although, through the energy of the Holy Spirit, they pass over into a divine substance, yet *their own proper nature remains*." (Gelas. in Bib. Max. Pat. viii. p. 703.) If now the pope of Rome is infallible, why should the doctrine of Gelasius be expressly contradicted by the Council of Trent?

There cannot be the least doubt, that among the fathers of the last half of the fourth century, innumerable expressions may be found, which, when merely considered by themselves would speak strongly in favour of transubstantiation. But whoever will take the pains to go into a more thorough study of the views of these writers, he will find, that now and then they unbend from the vehemence of their expressions, and bring us of necessity to adopt the opinion, that they regarded the change made by the presence of the Logos in the bread and wine, only as one which con-

¹ The genuineness of this epistle is doubted by some; by Muenscher among others (Dogm. Geschichte, IV. p. 389). Yet the reasons given by him are not satisfactory. Eutychius began to spread his errors in A. D. 248. It may well be supposed that Chrysostom opposed him.

sisted in the accession or addition of preternatural or supernatural influences communicated to these elements, without changing the physical nature of the elements themselves. Thus Cyrill of Jerusalem, the most strenuous of them all, says expressly in his Catechism (xxi. § 3), that "the body of Christ is presented by the symbol (*ἐν τύπῳ*) of the bread; and the blood of Christ, by the symbol of the wine." And he adds, respecting the declaration of Jesus to the Jews, viz. that they must eat his flesh and drink his blood, that "they did not understand him in a *spiritual* manner, and so they took offence and went away, because they thought he exhorted them to the literal eating of flesh." (Ib. § 4. Comp. also Greg. Nyss. Orat. catechet. c. 37. Tom. III.)

Besides all this, there were distinguished authors during the fourth century, who continued to regard the Lord's Supper as only a *memorial* of his sufferings and death. Such were Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Augustine. Yet they all of them seem to have admitted, that there was some mysterious virtue in the elements of the eucharist. (See Euseb. Dem. Evangel. I. p. 38, 39. IV. p. 223. Greg. Naz. Orat. xvii. p. 273. Aug. Ep. 98. § 9. Cont. Faust. XX. c. 18, 21. Cont. Adimant. c. 12. § 3. Doct. Christ. III. c. 16. In Ps. III. § 1. Opp. Tom. IV. p. 7. Also in an extract in Bib. Max. Pat. IX. p. 177, 178. Comp. also Athan. Ep. IV. ad Serap. § 19. Tom. I. p. 710. Theod. Dial. II. Opp. Tom. IV. p. 125—127. Facundi Defens. IX. c. 5.)

Finally, we meet everywhere, in these fathers, with the intimation now and then, that the *bodies* of believers do, by use of the eucharistic elements, attain to a *physical* unity with Christ; so that Christians have both a *spiritual* and a *physical* union with him. This doctrine we have already met with, in the second century, in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus. Cyrill of Jerusalem, Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyrill of Alexandria, Ambrose, Theodoret, and Leo the Great, all speak of this point in terms not to be misunderstood.

(Cyr. Hieros. Cat. XXII. § 3. Hilar. De Trinit. VIII. § 13—16. Greg. Nyss. Orat. Cat. c. 37. Chrysos. Hom. 45 in Johan. Tom. VIII. p. 292. Hom. 83 in Matt. Vol. VII. p. 869. Cyrill. Alex. in Evang. Johan. III. Tom. IV. p. 324. IV. p. 361, 376. X. p. 863. Contr. Nestor. IV. Opp. Tom. VI. p. 109 seq. Ambros. De eis qui Mysteriis, etc. c. 8. Theod. in Ep. ad Ephes. Opp. III. p. 434. Leo, Ep. 46. c. 2, 4. p. 260, 261.)

We must halt for a moment, to make some comparisons here between the sentiments of the fathers and the views of the three

Christian parties. The basis of patristical opinion and representation, down to the fifth century, appears plainly to be this, viz. that by a mysterious and invisible union of the Logos with the elements of the eucharist, or by his supernatural presence and influence upon them, they were to be considered in the light of a body and blood, for the time being; so that those who partake of them, did thus become *physically* united to Christ, as well as spiritually one with him. The elements themselves did not change their proper nature, but superadded powers and virtues were connected with them. Nor did the proper body and blood of Christ become present in, with, and under the bread and wine of the sacrament; but the Logos himself, pervading and uniting with these elements, used them as his body and blood, for the time being. The sacramental bread and wine they seem to have regarded as becoming wholly incorporated with the *physical* systems of believers, and thus to make them capable of an eternal existence after the general resurrection.

Now this is not *transubstantiation*, that is, it is not the transformation of eucharistic elements into the proper human body and blood of Jesus, so as to change their nature entirely as elements of bread and wine. Nor was it *consubstantiation*, which assumes the actual human body and blood of Christ as present in, with, and under the elements; for it is the *Logos* who forms a union with them, and not Christ's human body. Finally, the views of most of the fathers are not in accordance with those, who hold only to the symbolic or mnemonic significancy of the eucharistic elements. All parties have appealed to the fathers; all can find passages in them, which may easily be made to favour their views, if no comparison with other passages be made; and all appeal in vain, when they expect to find either union or consistency among them. The *quod unum, quod ubique, quod semper*, is quite out of all reasonable question, in regard to this matter.

What remains of doctrinal history in regard to our subject, must be very briefly exhibited.

The first exhibition of the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, which can now be fairly traced, was made by a monk of Picardy in France, about A. D. 831. His name was *Paschasius*, surname *Ratbertus*. He wrote a treatise on the body and blood of Christ, which is still held in high esteem by the Romanists. In this he maintains, that after consecration, the eucharistic elements no longer remain bread and wine, but are absolutely and substantially the body and blood of Christ. But instead of meeting, as one

would expect from the views of the Romish church in respect to this matter soon after this period, with universal or even general approbation, Paschasius was speedily opposed by formidable antagonists. Rabanus Maurus (a. 847), Johannes Scotus or Erigena, and Bertramus or Ratramus, who all flourished about the middle of the ninth century, and were highly distinguished for their literature and their talents, and along with these others in the Romish church, wrote against the views of Paschasius, and in favour of the *symbolic* exegesis of the passages respecting the eucharist. Yet the general inclination of the age to superstitious views, and to mysterious rites and forms, predominated at last over the reasonings of these learned men. In A. D. 1063, we find that a small Council at Rouen, (Concilium Rotomagense), confirmed the views of Paschasius, and cast away or condemned the doctrine of consubstantiation, or, as it was then called, *impanatio*, i. e. the doctrine that Christ's body and blood were contained in and concealed under the bread and wine of the eucharist. It was not until the twelfth century, that the word *transubstantiation* came to be employed. It was introduced by the famous Hildebert of Tours (1134): and the corresponding verb *transubstantiate*, was first used by Stephen, bishop of Autun, about the same period, who was somewhat distinguished for his attainments. Still, the doctrine of transubstantiation was not received and sanctioned by the Pope of Rome, until Innocent III, and the fourth Council of Lateran, composed of 418 bishops, and held in A. D. 1215, declared it to be essential to the belief of a catholic Christian. This was the pope, whose administration gave birth to various orders of monks; who spread wide in Italy his temporal dominions; who first claimed a right to appoint or depose all the kings or emperors of Europe and even of Asia; who, in his contest with John, king of England, about the election of an archbishop of Canterbury, not only carried the day, but gave away the dominions of John to the king of France, and finally brought John, in the sight of all England, to kneel in the dust, at the foot of the Romish legate, resign his crown, and after five days receive it again from the legate merely as a gift of the pope's grace, whose vassal he professed himself to be. To crown all, this was the pope that first introduced *auricular confession*; a thing which put the whole mass of the community entirely under the control and at the mercy of the priests. To sanction the doctrine of transubstantiation, was worthy of such a man as the pope in question.

But let the serious inquirer after truth note well, that for the

first 600 years after the commencement of the Christian era, there never was any noticeable dispute on the subject of transubstantiation, or Christ's physical presence in the elements of the eucharist. We have already seen, that in the ninth century, such men as Rabanus Maurus, Johannes Scotus, Bertram, and others, highly distinguished in the church, set themselves openly to oppose any other views of this matter, than those which regard the elements as symbols of Christ's spiritual presence, and memorials of his death. About the middle of the eleventh century, there was a vehement dispute on the same subject, when the celebrated Berenger, who maintained the like views with Zuingli, was condemned by one pope, and virtually absolved by another. Previous to the fourth Council of Lateran, in A. D. 1215, there never had been any predominant, or at any rate uniform, opinion among Christians, about the transformation of the eucharistic elements; although from the beginning of the ninth century, there was a growing persuasion in favour of this doctrine. There was no superstition so absurd that it could not find some advocates, at such a period as this.

Even after the fourth Council of Lateran, the persuasion was not universal in the church, in favour of transubstantiation. The question continued now and then to be agitated, until finally the famous Council of Trent, about the middle of the sixteenth century, decreed, that if any one should deny the conversion of the whole substance of the sacramental bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, leaving nothing more than the mere appearance of those elements, he should be accursed, (*anathema sit*). In the like manner, they anathematize all who do not believe, that, when once the eucharistic elements are transformed, they always remain and are the true body and blood of Christ. (Sess. XIII. Can. 2. 4.) This, of course has ever since been, and still continues to be, the doctrine of the Romish church. The Greek church also, although not subject to the Council of Trent, had, at an earlier period, borrowed the same doctrine from the writings of Paschasius and other monks, and among them it was generally received, and they substantially retain it down to the present hour; so that three quarters of nominal Christians may be regarded as being believers in *transubstantiation*. If now *majorities* must rule in the church, the question as to what we must believe, in this case, might be very easily decided. When to all this we add some seventeen or eighteen millions of Lutherans, believing in *consubstantiation*, we find the odds greatly against the Protestant party

who hold to the symbolic interpretation of Christ's words at the last Supper. For, we must call to mind, that *transubstantiation* converts the eucharistic elements into the body and blood of Christ; while *consubstantiation* maintains, that the real body and blood of Christ are in, with, and under, the bread and wine, although the substance of these elements remains unchanged. In regard to the *reasonableness* of the matter, I must confess that I can see no important advantage here on the side of the Lutherans. The Romanists evidently come nearer the *literal* sense of Christ's words, "This is my body; this is my blood:" while the Lutheran view agrees neither with the literal nor tropical sense of the words in question. What that sense may be, which is neither literal nor tropical, would somewhat perplex a simple-minded interpreter to determine.

Thus have we taken a survey of the Christian world, at the present period and in past ages. We have seen that in the present state, three quarters agree in maintaining the doctrine of transubstantiation; and that of the remaining quarter, who are Protestants, one third hold, at least their formulas of doctrine oblige them to hold, that the real body and blood of Christ are in, with, and under, the sacramental elements. Only some thirty or thirty-three millions profess to reject both of these doctrines, and to regard the eucharistic elements as symbols of Christ's sufferings, death, and atoning blood. Even among these must be counted large numbers, who may be truly said to have no belief about this matter, having never examined it, and feeling no interest to make an examination into it.

If now any argument could be drawn from the *number* of advocates for any particular creed or point of doctrine, it would, at the present day and for five centuries past, be quite probable, if not altogether certain, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is true. But where shall we stop, if we begin to make such an appeal? In the time of Christ, an immense and overwhelming majority of the Jews, embracing at first nearly every one of their learned men, their priests, and their magistrates, rejected Jesus of Nazareth and spurned at his Gospel. From the third century onward down to the Reformation, the great majority of Christians, learned and unlearned, believed not only that apostate spirits held carnal intercourse with seduced women, but that witchcraft and magic were realities, and were grounded on a league or covenant solemnly entered into between evil spirits and human beings, who were led astray by them. When Luther lifted up the voice of *reform*, in

respect to selling indulgencies to commit sin, and with regard to many Roman Catholic superstitions, and particularly excessive reverence for the Pope and submission to him, an immense majority of Christendom were against him; and so they always have been, and still are. When Zuingle and Calvin sounded the trumpet of alarm in Switzerland, and John Knox in Scotland, the great majority said: 'It is a false alarm; the public are disquieted without cause. These men are schismatics, revolutionists, and bent upon turning the world upside down, that they may obtain a better or a more elevated place for themselves.' So it has been, moreover, even in matters of science. When Copernicus and Kepler and Galileo and Newton proclaimed to the European nations that the world moved round the sun, and not the sun round the world, the decrees of the Vatican were issued, anathematizing the doctrine, and calling for the punishment of so many of its authors as were within its reach. Protestants remonstrated against it also, as well as the Romanists. The same reasoning that is now employed in respect to the sacrament, was then employed as to the movement of the sun: 'The Bible says, that the sun *rises* and *sets* and *circles round* the earth; and he who teaches a different doctrine is an unbeliever and a heretic; *anathema sit*.' In other words: The literal sense of the Scriptures, and no other, is to be admitted, on pain of excommunication and infamy, if not of death. Yet even here, if one examines for a moment into the opinions of the very men so ready to launch the thunderbolts of ecclesiastical anathema, he will find a total inconsistency in them. They did not hold, that God is material, and of human form, because the Bible says, more than once and very emphatically too, that *God made man in his own image*, and that *man is the image and glory of God*. They did not believe or maintain, that God has material eyes, nostrils, mouth, ears, hands, feet, and other parts of the human body, although the Bible speaks of these, times without number. They did not believe, that when God is displeased with men, he arms himself against them with bow, arrows, sword, spear, buckler, helmet, and breast-plate; and yet the Bible says this. They did not believe that God literally repents, takes revenge, is grieved at the heart, or shouts for joy like a mighty man that is filled with wine; and yet the Bible says all this. They did not believe that the Maker of heaven and earth indulges the carnal passion of love; that he *married* Israel in the wilderness, and became reconciled to this unfaithful wife, after she had estranged and divorced herself. They did not believe, that Christ is, in reality, a way, or a

vine, or a door, or the rock that followed Israel in the wilderness, or the literal light of the world, or literal bread that came down from heaven. Nothing of all this, and ten thousand things of the like nature. No; they felt constrained to interpret reasonably, in these cases. They would have even anathematized the man who did not interpret reasonably with them; but the moment a point of *superstition* comes up, the rules of exegesis have nothing to do with the matter. We must simply believe what God has said in respect to that matter, believe it in the exact *literal* sense, or else be a heretic and exposed to condemnation here and hereafter. Hear, once more, what Gregory of Nyssa says, to one who seems to doubt, or hesitate, as to what he ought to believe respecting the matter before us: "When the bread is mysteriously consecrated, it is called, and becomes, the body of Christ." (Orat. in Bapt. Chr. Opp. p. 370.) And again; "Jesus Christ himself declares: This is my body. Who will venture to remain in uncertainty? When he assures us: This is my blood; who can doubt, and say, It is not his blood?" (Ubi sup.) So even Luther and his adherents: 'En mysterium magnum!' they say. 'Who can doubt the power of God? All things are possible with him.' The Lutheran Formula Concordiae acknowledges, that the supernatural partaking of the elements of the eucharist, "cannot be comprehended either by reason, or by the senses; whence, in this matter," as it goes on to say, "as in other matters pertaining to faith, it behooves us to bring our understanding into *captivity* to obedience unto Christ." (VII. Epit. p. 604.) *Anathema sit*, say the Council of Trent, to every one who will not submit to a *captivity* still more humiliating. We must not only receive the doctrine, in spite of reason and the senses, but we must receive it on the authority of the infallible church who has decided that it is true.

Here, then, if we listen to any or all of these parties, here is an end of the matter. We are to believe in the *literal* sense only of the consecrating words at the eucharist; and any attempt even, to show that another interpretation ought to be given, is itself a heresy and a crime.

Still, as we are PROTESTANTS, and this, I would hope, in something more than in name, it is consistent and proper for us, to do as the Bereans did, that is, to search the Scriptures, in order to see whether these things are so. We know of no good reason why the *tropical* sense of words should be admitted so extensively as I have shown it to be by all parties, and that we should then stop short of applying it to the consecrating words of the eucharist.

Whatever declaration there may be, which, if *literally* interpreted, would give an absurd, contradictory, inept, unmeaning, frigid sense, it is plainly to be *tropically* interpreted. And on this same ground do the Romanists, the Greek church, and the Lutherans stand, in all cases where their prejudices are not concerned in respect to some favourite doctrine which they have adopted. But why should others be compelled to exempt such cases from the common laws of interpretation?

We have now brought to a conclusion our historical investigations in regard to the doctrine of the eucharist. But by far the most important part of our labour remains to be accomplished, viz. our *exegetical inquiries* respecting the true and scriptural meaning of the Saviour's words, at the original institution of the Lord's Supper.

ARTICLE VII.

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST.

By Gottfried Kinkel of the University of Bonn. Translated from the German by B. B. Edwards, Professor in the Theol. Seminary, Andover.

[The following essay relates to a subject of deep interest, and which is not unattended with serious difficulty. The different accounts of the Evangelists are said by neologists to involve irreconcilable contradictions. The reader will be pleased with the spirit of the writer of the ensuing observations, and with the light which he casts upon many passages of the Word of God, though he should not feel at liberty to accord with all which is advanced. The author is a *privatim docens* in the evangelical faculty at Bonn. The article may be found in the "Theologische Studien u. Kritiken," edited by Drs. Ullmann and Umbreit of Heidelberg, Vol. XIV. 1841. It is introduced by the following note from Dr. Nitzsch, the well-known theologian of Bonn. "The ensuing investigation, on account of the striking nature of its results, will certainly experience opposition from the two parties that occupy the hostile positions of our times; still it is conducted in a theological spirit and contains many observations on the meaning of the biblical narratives which must win the respect of the dissentient, and tend