NOTES AND STUDIES

SANCTORUM COMMUNIO AS AN ARTICLE IN THE CREED.

THE phrase *Sanctorum Communio* occurs in early formulae solely in places which lie on the great road from Asia Minor and the East, across the Bosphorus, through Pannonia to Aquileia, Milan, the Riviera, the South of France, to Spain, and in its northern fork over the Brenner, by the Lake of Constance to Northern France, Britain, and Ireland. Starting at the western end it is found in the Bangor Antiphonary of the seventh century; in the Book of Deer, and in the *dicta* Abbatis Priminii, probably an Irish monk, in the eighth century; and in an Anglo-Saxon Creed of the ninth century; in the Mozarabic Liturgy; in the Canons of the Council of Nîmes in 394; the Creeds of Faustus of Riez (Bp 449–482) and Caesarius of Arles (Bp 503–543), both of which probably sprang from Lérins; in a Gallican sermon attributed to St Augustine (*Serm.* Ap. 242); and in various forms in the Gallican Sacramentaries; in the missal of Bobbio—a monastery founded by Columban the Irishman after leaving Bregenz—and the Creed of Niceta of Remesiana (370–375). It occurs also in the Creed of Jerome, possibly that which he mentions in 378 as sent to Cyril of Jerusalem. This may be his native creed at Strymon, or he may have picked it up in the course of his travels down this road eastwards from the Balkans, or in his peregrinations in Asia Minor. And it occurs also in an Armenian Creed [1] which, though in its present form it cannot be earlier than the fifth century, contains a nucleus of high antiquity.

The Lower Rhone Valley was largely dominated by Greek influence. Pothinus and Irenaeus were bishops of Lyons, and the Marcosian heresy passed from Asia Minor to this region; and the Council of Nîmes speaks of presbyters and deacons coming from the east. Not merely the Gallican liturgies, but the whole *consuetudo ecclesiae* [2] abound in Oriental features. Dr Sanday [3] has traced the phrase *descendit in inferna* from Palestine to Constantinople, Nike, and Sirmium, and so to Aquileia; and the word *catholica* is obviously a Greek importation. Niceta [4] was indebted for his theology to Gregory Thaumaturgus of Pontus, Basil of Cappadocia, and Cyril of Jerusalem; among Latin writers he quotes only Cyprian; and his list of scriptural canticles is eastern rather than western in origin. [5] The word *communio* is rare in Latin writers, though it occurs with some frequency in Cicero, whose education was largely conducted by Greeks. When it is followed by

[1] Hahn *Bibliothek* p. 155.
[3] *J.T.S.* vol. iii p. 17.
[2] Duchesne *Christian Worship* p. 95 n.
[4] Burn *Niceta of Remesiana* p. cxxxix.
[5] *Ibid.* p. xciv.

a substantive in the genitive, the case is almost invariably either possessive or descriptive, a genitive of material or contents. The nearest approach to *sanctorum communio* is in Cyprian *Ep.* lxviii. 9 *nisi se a communione malorum separaverint*, with which cp. Aug. *Ep.* cxli 5 (Migne, vol. ii, p. 579) *Hoc nos ostendimus . . . quia communio malorum non maculat aliquem participatione sacramentorum sed consensione factorum.* Here the phrase means 'their sect' as opposed to *communio nostra*, Aug. *Ps.* lvii 15 *imperatores nostrae communionis, Ep.* xliii 2 *nostrae communionis non estis.* In this sense *sanctorum communio* would be equivalent to the holy Catholic Church. *Communio*, meaning 'communion with', is followed by *cum. Non ineundam cum his communionem*, Sulp. Sev. ii 45. *Et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum communionem habeatis cum sanctis martyribus, et per illos cum Domino Iesu Christo*, Praef. Pass. S. Perpetuae. *Cum illis sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt, societate et spei communione teneamur*, Ps. Aug. *Serm. de Tempore* clxxxi cap. 13. Similarly *sancti* rapidly took on in Latin the popular meaning of specially holy beings, as we find it in Tertullian,[1] and it was so used by the Donatists of their sect ; while ἅγιος retained more firmly its sense of 'consecrated'. And these indications of Eastern influence are supported by the absence of the phrase from the creeds of Africa and Rome. We may then be assured that *sanctorum communio* was in origin eastern, that is, in language originally Greek.

And if we seek a common seed plot whence it could spread along the north-west road on the one side, and into Armenia on the other, we shall naturally look for it in Asia Minor ; and though we cannot find it here in a Greek creed, yet we do find that the Marcosians, who imitated the Christian ceremonies, had in their baptismal creed κοινωνία τῶν δυνάμεων,[2] which points to a contemporary Christian Creed containing κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων.

Let us now examine this evidence in greater detail with special reference to the interpretation to be put upon it.

(i) *The Council of Nîmes.*

Starting then with the earliest occurrence to which we can assign a definite date, the first Canon of Nîmes in 394[3] runs: 'In primis quia multi, de ultimis Orientis partibus venientes (*sc.* Manichaeans), presbyteros et diaconos se esse confingunt . . . (qui) sanctorum communione speciae (speciem ?) simulatae religionis (*add* sibi) impraemunt (imprimunt) : placuit nobis (*add* ut) si qui fuerint eiusmodi, si tamen communis ecclesiae causa non fuerit, ad ministerium altari (altaris) non admittantur.' Here there can be no doubt that what the presbyters

---

[1] *De Baptismo* c. xii. [2] Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* I xiv 2.

[3] Héfélé ii p. 403.

and deacons were trying to obtain was the right to administer Holy Communion. That is, *sanctorum communio* is the communion of or in holy things.

(ii) *The Sermon* Simbolum graeca lingua est.

Next in date we put a Gallican sermon, *Simbolum graeca lingua est*; for though the sermon belongs in all probability to the sixth or seventh century it is based on earlier sources, which cannot well be later than the fourth, and may be a century earlier. The sermon occurs in Codex Sessorianus 52, in the Victor Emmanuel Library at Rome, a MS of the eleventh or twelfth century, based on a collection formed in the ninth century at Nonantula, in the south of Italy. It is also found, without the introduction on the meaning of the word *symbolum*, in Cod. Sangallensis 732 of the ninth century, and in a fuller shape in Cod. 73 of the eleventh century at Vésoul. Of these Cod. Sangallensis is certainly the most primitive.

Now in the article on the forgiveness of sins which follows that on the *sanctorum communio* the sermon mentions seven ways in which forgiveness may be obtained : (1) *in baptismo*; (2) *per paenitentiam*; (3) *per martyrium*; (4) *per indulgentiam inimicorum*; (5) *per veram contritionem* (i. e. *per opera misericordiae*); (6) *per eleemosinam*; (7) *per praedicationem* (i. e. by converting a sinner from the error of his ways).

This is the list as given in Cod. 73 of Vésoul. In Cod. Sangall. and Cod. Sessor. the list is the same in regard to six items, but has a variant, *doloribus multis*, for the seventh. The occurrence of *per martyrium* points back to a date for the source of the list not later than the first half of the fourth century, and therefore probably to a Greek source, and this is rendered all but certain by the occurrence of this list in Origen [1]: 'Est ista prima, qua baptizamur in remissionem peccatorum. Secunda remissio est in passione martyrii. Tertia est quae pro eleemosyna datur. . . . Quarta nobis fit remissio peccatorum per hoc quod et nos remittimus peccata fratribus nostris. . . . Quinta peccatorum remissio est cum converterit quis peccatorem ab errore viae suae. . . . Sexta quoque fit remissio per abundantiam charitatis. . . . Est adhuc et septima, licet dura et laboriosa, per paenitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum, et fiunt ei lacrymae suae panes die et nocte, et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quaerere medicinam.'

The number seven in connexion with the methods of obtaining remission of sins is by no means common. It occurs in Cod. Ambros. M. 79 of the eleventh century, and in the Norwegian [2] formula of the thirteenth century; but in this latter the list is not composed of the

---

[1] *Hom. II in Levit.* § 4 opp., ed. 1840, Berlin, t. ix pp. 192, 193.

[2] Hahn, p. 125.

same items. Pseudo-Alcuin *De div. offic.* names four ways, and Leidrad, in the *Ep. de sacr. bapt. ad Carol.*, three ways. Thus it cannot be said that there was a widespread tradition of seven. But the Cod. Ambros. exactly corresponds with Origen and has: (1) *per baptismum*; (2) *per martyrium*; (3) *per eleemosinam*; (4) *si remittit quis peccanti in se peccata sua*; (5) *si per praedicationem suam aliquis et per bonorum operum ministerium alios ab errore suo convertit*; (6) *per caritatem*; (7) *per paenitentiam*. Here there can be little doubt that the writer of the Codex had Origen in front of him, either in the original text or in a translation. But this suggests that while the connexion of the paragraph in Cod. Sangall. with Origen is hardly doubtful, it is not so direct. The alteration in order and the substitution of *doloribus multis* for *per paenitentiam* is only to be accounted for if the author of the sermon was sufficiently acquainted with Origen to be aware of the number of his items and their general purport, but had not the text under his eye. That is to say, we are dealing with some one familiar with his teaching and thought, in a wide sense of the word a member of his school, rather than with a mere copyist.

But the explanation of the *sanctorum communio* given in this sermon is: 'Ibi est communicatio sancta (per invocationem) Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, ubi omnes fideles diebus dominicis communicare debent.'

On this Dom Morin writes,[1] 'A propos de l'article *Sanctorum Communionem* on appelle l'obligation imposée à chaque fidèle de communier tous les dimanches ; ce qui oblige d'assigner à la pièce une assez haute antiquité.' Certainly there is a probability on this side. When Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire many flocked into the Church who were but half-converted pagans. The effect of this in the relaxation of the standard of Christian faith can be seen in Arianism, while in practice it largely contributed to a relaxation of the earlier rule of weekly communion such as we find in Justin Martyr.[2] Thus the twenty-first Canon of the Council of Elvira (*c.* 320) confines itself to attempting to enforce merely attendance at church, while the Council of Agde in 506 only laid upon the layman the obligation of communicating three times a year. Similarly Chrysostom insists on the moral dispositions necessary before communicating, and the evil of leaving before the close of the service, while he says that individuals communicated as infrequently as once a year, or even once in two years. Dom Morin has in his favour a considerable body of circumstantial evidence.

Thus the occurrence of martyrdom among the methods of obtaining remission of sin, the adoption of the views of Origen, and the reference to weekly communion, all contribute to suggest for the source from which the matter of this sermon is drawn an early date and the Greek

[1] *Revue Bénédictine* xiv, 1897, p. 481.   [2] *Ap.* i 67.

language; and Greek would find its way to those parts of the western world, where it was not already established, along this great highway of intercourse near which in later times was the monastery of St Gall, whence, through Bâle and Belfort, there would be an easy connexion with Vésoul.

(iii) *Niceta of Remesiana.*

Coming next to Niceta's exposition, it will be necessary to give careful attention to the whole passage, which runs as follows[1]:

'Post confessionem beatae Trinitatis iam profiteris te credere sanctae ecclesiae catholicae (*al.* sanctam ecclesiam catholicam). Ecclesia quid est aliud quam sanctorum omnium congregatio? Ab exordio enim saeculi sive patriarchae, Abraham et Isaac et Iacob, sive prophetae, sive apostoli, sive martyres, sive ceteri iusti, qui fuerunt, qui sunt, qui erunt, una ecclesia sunt, quia una fide et conversatione sanctificati, uno Spiritu signati, unum corpus effecti sunt; cuius corporis caput Christus esse perhibetur et scriptum est. Adhuc amplius dico. Etiam angeli, etiam virtutes et potestates supernae in hac una confoederantur ecclesia, apostolo nos docente, quia *in Christo reconciliata sunt omnia, non solum quae in terra sunt, verum etiam quae in caelo.* Ergo in hac una ecclesia credis te communionem consecuturum esse sanctorum. Scito unam hanc esse ecclesiam catholicam in omni orbe terrae constitutam, cuius communionem debes firmiter retinere. Sunt quidem et aliae pseudoecclesiae, sed nihil tibi commune cum illis, ut puta Manichaeorum, Cataphrigarum, Marcionistarum, vel ceterorum haereticorum sive schismaticorum, quia iam desinunt esse ecclesiae istae sanctae, siquidem daemoniacis deceptae doctrinis aliter credunt, aliter agunt, quam Christus Dominus mandavit, quam apostoli tradiderunt. Credis deinde Remissionem Peccatorum. Haec est enim ratio gratiae quia credentes, Deum et Christum confitentes, consequuntur per baptisma remissionem suorum omnium peccatorum. Unde et regeneratio dicitur, quia plus homo innocens et purus redditur, quam cum de matris suae utero generatur. Consequenter credis et Carnis tuae Resurrectionem et Vitam Aeternam. Revera enim, si hoc non credis, frustra in Deum credis. Totum enim, quod credimus, propter nostram credimus resurrectionem. Alioquin, *si in hac vita tantum speramus in Christo, sumus* vere, ut ait apostolus, *miserabiliores omnibus hominibus,* quando utique ad hoc Christus carnem suscepit humanam, ut communionem vitae perpetuae mortali nostrae substantiae impertiret.'

We notice first of all *Sancta ecclesia catholica* is expounded as *sanctorum omnium congregatio,* that is Niceta is translating; he has found two Greek words in the Creed, and for the benefit of his hearers he puts them into Latin. *Ecclesia* is *congregatio,* a word which might well pass as equivalent except for the fact that *ecclesia* suggests a divine act of summons which *congregatio* does not. Then, avoiding *universalis,* he represents *catholica* by *omnium.* Here the equivalence is lost. *Ecclesia catholica* is no more a Church consisting of all men than

[1] *De Symbolo* c. 10.

a universal truth is a truth which is recognized by every one; indeed *catholica* came to be used in a sense exclusive of heretics, schismatics, and heathen, or as what would now be called a 'sectarian' title. Having thus employed a term which has too wide an application, he proceeds to limit it by changing *sancta* into *sanctorum*, and by *sancti* he means persons of exceptional holiness. That is, whereas Christians are *sancti* as members of a *sancta ecclesia*, he makes the Church *sancta* because it consists of *sancti*. Instead of saying that they are ἄγιοι by a divine consecration, he says the Church is ἄγια by a human correspondence with grace. In St Paul and in the Apocalypse ἄγιοι is used regularly as a synonym for Christians. In Ignatius and Polycarp this use is already being supplanted by that of ἀδελφοί, which occurs roughly in the proportion of three to one and in some cases where, if we come straight from the Pauline epistles, the alteration strikes our attention with a sudden jar, thus ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἐν Τρωάδι (Ign. *ad Phil.* xi ; *Smyrn.* xii), so that we are inclined to regard the use of ἄγιοι as a local Asian survival. By the time of Lucian so common and regular had ἀδελφοί become that he could seize upon it as a term of reproach well known to his heathen readers (see Oehler's note *u* on Tertullian *Apol.* xxxix vol. i p. 260), and it seems that just as the charge of cannibalism rested at least in part on a perversion of the language used about the Eucharist, so that of 'Oedipodoean connexions' was supported by this use of 'brother and sister'. In Latin it is hardly an exaggeration to say that except in direct quotation or indirect allusion *sancti* is never equivalent to Christians, its place being supplied by *fratres, Christiani, fideles,* or, more rarely, *fidentes,* but that it almost always implies personal holiness and most commonly has reference to the departed. Thus Niceta's translation has in fact altered the mental context and value of the terms he employs, and this Latinization or popularization leads him more astray as he proceeds.

Having in his mind *omnes sancti,* he cannot well exclude Old Testament saints, especially as they were very possibly commemorated in the Eucharistic thanksgiving which he employed. Nevertheless their inclusion in the Christian Church needed some justification, a justification which, when it appears, is quite clearly forced. He could well maintain that they held implicitly the Christian faith and lived accordingly; but he could not help being vividly conscious at a baptismal service that a right faith and a good life did not of themselves confer membership in the Church. Accordingly he introduced *uno Spiritu signati,* where the *signati* is a definitely sacramental term probably referring to the marking with the cross which we know was in use in baptism at Aquileia in the time of Rufinus. The phrase itself seems to have a Pauline flavour ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι . . . τῷ ἁγίῳ Eph. i 13 ;

ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε iv 30 ; ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος 2 Cor. i 22 ; ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι . . . ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες . . . καὶ πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν 1 Cor. xii 13 ; ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα . . . ἓν βάπτισμα Eph. iv 4, 5 ; but it is certain St Paul would not have recognized that an unbaptized Jew, however pious, was a Christian. Proceeding on this line Niceta could hardly exclude the angels, who are pre-eminently *sancti*, but probably St Paul and certainly the author of the epistle to the Hebrews would not have reckoned as members of the Body of Christ those who are ministers to the members of the Body,[1] who themselves have no bodies, and whose nature Christ did not take. Niceta himself seems to have felt the difficulty, and to overcome it falls back either on a corrupt text of St Paul or more probably alters and adapts him. St Paul had said[2] εὐδόκησεν . . . δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, but he can hardly be thought to have imagined that the holy angels, which left not their first estate, needed an ἀποκατάλλαξις, and in any case the statement of the divine purpose is not the same as the statement that it has already been fulfilled.

The truth appears to be that Niceta has started off with a non-sacramental explanation of a sacramental body—a body which has an outward and visible expression in men and women, and an inward and invisible life, the life of the exalted Christ. In the course of his explanation he diverges further and further away, but endeavours to recall himself by stating that the patriarchs and others had the *sigillum* of the Spirit (which he was shortly going to impart to the neophytes) and by twisting the language of St Paul ; the origin of his divergence being the translation of *sancta ecclesia* into *sanctorum congregatio*, followed by his choosing the more obvious though less correct interpretation of this ambiguous phrase.

But when he comes to the next article no choice of language is possible. *Sanctorum communio* stands as part of the creed that he is expounding. We cannot, therefore, infer that he is using *sanctorum* in the same sense in this passage as it has already borne previously. A little consideration will make this clear. If *omnium sanctorum congregatio* had followed *sanctorum communio*, it would be a legitimate inference that Niceta was pursuing the same line of thought, and in consequence that the unambiguous sense of *sanctorum* in the second instance determined the sense of it in Niceta's mind in the quotation from the creed. But as it stands, even if he felt the ambiguity and would have preferred to say *communio sacramentorum* as St Augustine[3]

---

[1] Heb. i 14.   [2] Col. i 20.

[3] 'Ecclesia Dei vivi . . . : quae malos in fine separandos, a quibus interim discedit disparilitate morum, tolerat in communione sacramentorum' s. ccxiv 11 'In redditione symboli'.

does say, he has no option, and his meaning can therefore only be learnt from his subsequent words. Passing on, therefore, to the next two sentences, we find there is a *communio ecclesiae*, and this *communio* means the possession of a *commune aliquid*, which the heretics are without. This *commune* has two sides to it, that of creed, *aliter credunt*, and that of action, *aliter agunt*. That the heretics differed in creed from the teaching of our Lord and the tradition of the apostles is obvious, or they would not be heretics, but how do they differ in action? Niceta is not, speaking of the private life of Christians as individuals but of the corporate action of the Church, as the creed was the common or corporate profession, and this *actio* is a *mandatum Domini*. What corporate actions did Christ prescribe? The obvious answer is, first, baptism. Niceta is speaking at a baptismal service; he was not ignorant of the gospels; he would have no critical doubts as to the authenticity of the last verses of St Matthew; the neophytes would naturally imagine him to be referring to the sacrament he was administering and they receiving. But if he referred to one great sacrament of the gospel, it is probable also that he referred to the other. And now look at the precise terms of reference *quam Christus Dominus mandavit, quam apostoli tradiderunt*. Has he any apostle specially in mind? Certainly if he has, St Paul would be the most likely. He had preached round about as far as Illyricum,[1] his collection of epistles were often called '*the* apostle', he is quoted in the neighbouring context *apostolo nos docente, ut ait apostolus*, and seems to be tacitly referred to even when not explicitly mentioned, so that it does not appear unfair to translate *apostoli* St Paul and the other apostles. And now what else besides baptism is involved in the *mandatum Domini* Παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς . . . ἔλαβεν ἄρτον κτλ.,[2] with which we may compare οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι . . . οὕτως παρέδωκαν, ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον κτλ.[3] and *Eucharistiae sacramentum et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a Domino sumimus*.[4] In the next sentence we have *consequuntur per baptisma remissionem peccatorum*, which reminds us of the previous use of *consequor*, *communionem consecuturum esse sanctorum*. Finally we come to *Christus suscepit carnem ut communionem vitae perpetuae mortali nostrae substantiae impertiret*. The phrase is not so strong as Rufinus's *huius carnis resurrectionem*,[5] but reminds us of οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτά, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα[6] and πῶς δεκτικὴν μὴ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ θεοῦ

---

[1] Rom. xv 19.
[2] 1 Cor. xi 23–25.
[3] Justin Mart. *Ap.* i 66.
[4] Tertull. *de Cor. Mil.* 3.
[5] See *Symb. App.* 36. · · ·
[6] Iren. *c. Haer.* IV xxxi 3.

ἥτις ἐστὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος [1]; and especially of ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα . . . ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἶμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.[2] Certainly if Niceta's flock had been asked how does our Lord impart the *communio vitae perpetuae* there could be little doubt of their answer. And then compare the construction of *communionem vitae perpetuae* with that of *communionem sanctorum*.

The allusions to Holy Communion are covert and suggestive rather than explicit, but that is precisely what we should expect. Niceta's discourse betrays more than one point of similarity with the catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, and on comparing them with the lectures 'On the Mysteries' which followed after baptism we see that while in the former there is little or no reference to the Eucharist, in the latter his treatment on the point is full and explicit, and indeed he states this himself : οὐδὲ τῶν μυστηρίων ἐπὶ κατηχουμένων λευκῶς λαλοῦμεν. ἀλλὰ πολλὰ πολλάκις λέγομεν ἐπικεκαλυμμένως, ἵνα οἱ εἰδότες πιστοὶ νοήσωσι, καὶ οἱ μὴ εἰδότες μὴ βλαβῶσι.[3]

In conclusion put together these phrases : ' In ecclesia credis te communionem consecuturum esse sanctorum . . . cuius communionem debes retinere . . . Sunt pseudo-ecclesiae sed nihil tibi commune cum illis, aliter credunt, aliter agunt, quam Dominus mandavit, quam apostoli tradiderunt. Consequuntur per baptisma remissionem peccatorum. Consequenter credis et Carnis tuae Resurrectionem et Vitam Aeternam. Ad hoc Christus carnem suscepit humanam ut communionem vitae perpetuae mortali nostrae substantiae impertiret.'

It is impossible not to feel a sacramental reference running right through and starting from *communio sanctorum*. Or we may ask by what public acts the *communio ecclesiae* was to be maintained except by baptism, by the confession of the creed which was never used except in connexion with baptism, and by communion. Is not the reference in *Ergo* not only to the faith and conversation which precede, but also to the baptism and communion which follow ? And if this is granted, does not the main reason for taking *sanctorum* as masculine in *communionem sanctorum* fall to the ground ? But even if we allow that to Niceta *sanctorum communio* meant 'communion of ' or ' with the saints ', it does not follow that κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων would bear the same signification. We have already observed the looseness of Niceta's translation, and both West of him, as we have seen, and East of him on the road along which it passed, κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων meant the participation of Christians in something, or more probably participation in holy things.

---

[1] Iren. c. Haer. V ii 3.　　　[2] John vi 51, 54.

[3] Lect. Catech. vi 39 ; cp. Tertull. Apol. vii ; Basil. de Spir. S. xxvii ; Lact. Inst. vii, xxv.

(iv) *Faustus of Riez* et al.

This perversion of the meaning of *sancti* as a translation of οἱ ἅγιοι from divine consecration, and consequently human obligation, to the success of human effort in correspondence with grace, comes to its full stature in Faustus of Riez, who justifies the veneration of saints by an appeal to the Creed. In his homily on the Creed[1] he contrasts the 'communion of saints' with the 'Catholic Church', a singularly unpauline and unbiblical usage. 'The Catholic Church is the Church diffused by the light of grace throughout the world. Let us believe *also* in the communion of saints; but let us venerate the saints . . . for God's honour and glory. Let us reverence in the saints their fear and love of God, the merits which are not of their own but which they have merited to receive for devotion. They deserve such veneration, since their contempt of death teaches us to serve God and to long for the life to come.' Here it is clear that the original meaning of the clause has been completely forgotten, and it is being employed for a controversial purpose in favour of the growing cultus of the martyrs, which the Aquitanian priest Vigilantius had vainly sought to check.

In another Gallican sermon on the Creed[2] the defence degenerates into intemperate censure of the Vigilantian party: 'This clause in the Creed confounds those who blasphemously deny that the ashes of the saints are to be had in honour. . . . Such persons have sinned against the Creed and lied to Christ in the font.'

Somewhat similar in the restricted sense of the word 'saint' is a Gallican sermon falsely attributed to St Augustine[3]: 'The Communion of saints, that is the fellowship and hope of communion by which we are joined to those saints who have departed in the faith that we have received.' While another old commentator remarks that 'whereas in this life the gifts of the Holy Spirit appear to be unequally divided, in eternity they will be shared in common, so that each will find his deficiences supplied by the virtues of others',[4] where the fellowship contemplated is altogether removed to the sphere of the future life.

In another sermon, also falsely ascribed to St Augustine,[5] we seem to get back to the meaning of *sanctorum* given by the Council of Nîmes, and the sermon *Simbolum graeca lingua est*: 'Credentes ergo sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum habentes communionem, quia ubi fides sancta, ibi est sancta communio, credere vos quoque in corporum resurrectionem et remissionem peccatorum oportet. Omne sacramentum

---

[1] Caspari *Anecdota* i 338.   [2] Caspari *Alte und neue Quellen* p. 273.
[3] *Sermo* 242.   [4] *Sermo* 402.
                    [5] *Sermo* 241.

baptismi in hoc constat, ut resurrectionem corporum et remissionem peccatorum nobis a Deo praestanda credamus.'

Here *sanctorum communionem* is clearly communion in holy things, that is in sacraments, and it is so taken by Kattenbusch[1] and Zahn. This sermon is generally supposed to be Gallican in origin, but Kattenbusch[2] thinks it was known to Pirminius, and may possibly be Irish. There seems also to be a connexion between the creed of Pirminius and that on the last page of the Book of Deer, and this, as we have seen, contains *sanctorum communionem*. Finally *sanctorum communionem* occurs in the Bangor Antiphonary.

It is noteworthy that in all formularies, as distinct from expositions, the order *sanctorum communionem* is invariable. And it is difficult to find any other explanation of this phenomenon except that all came from a single source. If we allow that the phrase existed in popular speech before it became formularized, its occurrence in the Canon of the Council of Nîmes compels us to look for it not later than 350. The comparative rarity of the word *communio* as compared with such equivalent terms as *communicatio, societas,* or *consortium,* and the rapid tendency to limit *sancti* to persons of exceptional holiness, and especially to departed saints, suggest that the phrase arose in a Greek- rather than a Latin-speaking country. Moreover the fact that all the early instances lie on the great road from the east to Ireland on the north and Spain on the south, and that a wave of eastern influence passed along it at about this period conveying with it other phrases of the Creed, and the oriental features of the Gallican Church and Liturgy, suggests that our search should be directed towards eastern lands ; while the occurrence of the phrase in an Armenian Creed defines Asia Minor as the seat of origin, as being the district whence the formula could spread both west and south.

And this view is strongly confirmed by the fact that the earliest known use of κοινωνία in the Creed is in a formula of the Marcosians, (εἰς) κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων, given in Irenaeus.[3]   Here the meaning of 'participation in' or 'communication of' is supported not only by Biblical usage, but by the fact that Marcus[4] himself claimed to possess δυνάμεις, and proved it by pretending to work miracles ; and also by the context c. xiv I Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι τοῖς τὴν τελείαν γνῶσιν εἰληφόσιν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμιν ὦσιν ἀναγεγεννημένοι. Ἄλλως γὰρ ἀδύνατον ἐντὸς πληρώματος εἰσελθεῖν.   And so it was understood by the translator, who interprets it as *communionem virtutum.* Irenaeus accuses these gnostics, and probably rightly, of imitating the

[1] *Das apost. Symbol* ii 945.   [2] *Ibid.* 769 ff.
[3] *adv. Haer.* I, c. xiv 2, ed. Harvey, vol. i p. 183.   [4] *Ibid.* c. vii.

Christian mysteries, among which was baptism; and he gives the baptismal formula used by a certain sect of them.

οἱ δὲ ἄγουσιν ἐφ' ὕδωρ, καὶ βαπτίζοντες οὕτως ἐπιλέγουσιν·

εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων,

εἰς Ἀλήθειαν μητέρα πάντων,

εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς Ἰησοῦν,

εἰς ἕνωσιν,

καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν,

καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων.

Knowing the intimate connexion between the Christian baptismal formula and the baptismal creed it is impossible not to regard this as a parody of the latter.

Ἄγνωστος is, of course, a regular Gnostic word ; thus we have in c. xii περὶ τοῦ προπάτορος αὐτῶν, ὃς ἄγνωστος ἦν . . ., and in c. xiii περὶ τοῦ ἀγνώστου τοῖς πᾶσι πατρός. πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων has its analogy in Justin Martyr *Ap.* i 61 ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ . . . τὸ . . . λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται.

Ἀλήθεια seems to be identified with the heavenly Adam of 1 Cor. xv 45–47 ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ (ἐγένετο) εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν . . . ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, with which cp. θέλω δέ σοι καὶ αὐτὴν ἐπιδεῖξαι τὴν Ἀλήθειαν. κατήγαγον γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν ὕπερθεν δωμάτων . . . Ὅρα οὖν κεφαλὴν ἄνω τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ω . . . Καὶ καλεῖ τὸ στοιχεῖον τοῦτο Ἄνθρωπον. . . . Καὶ ἀνοίξασαν τὸ στόμα λαλῆσαι λόγον. τὸν δὲ λόγον ὄνομα γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα γένεσθαι τοῦτο, ὃ γινώσκομεν καὶ λαλοῦμεν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν *adv. Haer.* viii 4, 5, and Ps. xlv 1 ἐξηρεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν, Jn. i 14 ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο and xiv 6 Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια. And moreover Ἀλήθεια was the offspring of the supreme Father, xii 2, xiii 2.

The third clause refers to the Holy Spirit, *qui in eo descenderit spiritus* xiv 1 (the Greek here appears to be defective).

Ἑνότης, Ἕνωσις, Ἑνοῦσθαι are frequent in Ignatius in connexion with the Church. And Zahn (*Das apost. Symbol*, 1893, p. 32) thinks that the words 'A holy Church' were contained in Marcion's baptismal confession.

Finally Ἀπολύτρωσις recalls Col. i 14 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτίων.

There should then be some clause in the Christian baptismal Creed corresponding to κοινωνία τῶν δυνάμεων, a clause which follows the expression of belief in Holy Church, and this can hardly be other than κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων, a participation in or communication of holy things.

The Meaning of the Phrase.

We have now to examine the meaning of the phrase, and the evidence for this is threefold : Greek grammatical usage, early exposition, and the

fact that we are dealing with an article of the Creed in which 'I believe' implies assent not only to the existence but also to the value of the several items, and reliance upon them.   As regards the first of these our field of enquiry is limited.   κοινωνία occurs frequently in the New Testament; three times in Irenaeus, besides the instance in the Marcosian Creed; and (though Dr Swete[1] could say that it seemed to have no place in the sub-apostolic fathers, or in the apologists of the second century) it occurs twice in the *Apology* of Justin Martyr.   But as we have said, the earliest occurrence of the full phrase seems to be in the Canon of the Council of Nîmes.

New Testament: What is the κοινόν τι?

If there is a κοινωνία, there are κοινωνοί who are many and a κοινόν τι which is one.   What are the common possessions of Christians, or to what things in the New Testament is given the predicate 'one'? The answer works out into a curious resemblance of the Apostles' Creed.

There is One Faith which we all believe,

    One God
    The Father of all   .
    One Lord Jesus Christ
    One Spirit
    One Church
    One Baptism
    One Bread
    One Hope of our calling, i. e. of Everlasting Life.

Usage of the Word κοινωνία (A) in the New Testament.

In the New Testament though the phrase κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων does not occur, the single word κοινωνία in varying constructions occurs frequently.

A. Absolutely, 'the right hand of fellowship' Gal. ii 9, and 'forget not well-doing and fellowship' Heb. xiii 16.

B. With the genitive, subdivided into two classes :

(1) adjectival or possessive, 'your fellowship in furtherance of the gospel' Phil. i 5 ; 'if there be in Christ, comfort, loving consolation, spiritual fellowship' ii 1 ; 'fellowship of thy faith' Philem. 6, and

(2) partitive, 'communion in His Son' 1 Cor. i 9, with which compare 'partakers of Christ' Heb. iii 14 ; 'communion in the blood and in the body' 1 Cor. x 16 ; 'fellowship in ministration' 2 Cor. viii 4 ; 'communion of the Holy Ghost' 2 Cor. xiii 13 : cp. 'partakers of the

---

[1] *The Holy Catholic Church* p. 152.

Holy Ghost' Heb. vi 4 and 'partakers of the divine nature' 2 Pet. i 4; 'fellowship in His sufferings' Phil. iii 10.

C. With prepositions meaning 'fellowship with':

(1) μετά with genitive, 1 John i 3 'fellowship with us ... our fellowship with the Father'; 6 'with Him; 7 'with one another'.

(2) πρός with acc., 2 Cor. vi 14 'What fellowship has light with darkness?'

Accordingly, if Biblical analogy be followed, οἱ ἅγιοι must of course mean all Christians, and the phrase κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων would mean 'communion in holy things' or 'the fellowship which all Christians have' —in something undefined. But of such a personal and absolute use the New Testament seems to furnish no instance, for in Phil. i 5, the nearest parallel, the κοινωνία is defined as εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, while κοινωνία meaning 'communion with' is always followed by μετά, as in St John, or πρός, as in 2 Cor. vi 16. On the other hand, a noun in the genitive following κοινωνία is always either descriptive or partitive.

There remains Acts ii 42:

ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ,
‑ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου,   καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

But here τῇ κοινωνίᾳ is used absolutely, for (1) Precedents would seem to shew that communion with the apostles should be expressed by μετά or πρός. (2) It is commonly thought that each of these words is used technically, as is certainly the case with τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, and κοινωνία in a technical sense means not communion with, but contribution to, or community of goods. (3) The Greek would more naturally require τῇ διδαχῇ καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων or τῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχῇ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ. (4) The rhythm or sound of the sentence is against joining τῇ κοινωνίᾳ with τῶν ἀποστόλων. (5) This argument is strengthened by the analogy of the succeeding clause where it is impossible to translate 'in the breaking and the prayers of the bread'. (6) The next verses are a comment on this. The teaching of the apostles was enforced by the working of signs and wonders, the breaking of the bread was κατ' οἶκον and αἱ προσευχαί included the θυσία αἰνέσεως, and similarly therefore the κοινωνία meant that they had all things κοινά because they made a κοινωνία of them, that is διεμέριζον. (7) The Vulgate has *perseverantes in doctrina Apostolorum, et communicatione fractionis panis et orationibus.*

(B) *In the Early Fathers.*

Justin Martyr's *Apology* follows the lines of Biblical usage. The only instance of κοινωνία followed by a genitive is καὶ ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω, εἰ μὴ ἀνηνέχθησαν ὑμῖν αἱ κοινωνίαι τῶν λόγων, ἕτοιμος καὶ ἐφ' ὑμῖν κοινωνεῖν τῶν ἐρωτήσεων *Apol.* II viii 5, where τῶν λόγων is clearly a genitive of

material or contents, 'interchange of arguments'. Cp. LXX Sap. viii
18 εὔκλεια ἐν κοινωνίᾳ λόγων αὐτῆς. Of the verb there are three other
instances in the First Apology: I xiv 2 ἃ ἔχομεν εἰς κοινὸν φέροντες καὶ
παντὶ δεομένῳ κοινωνοῦντες; I xv 10 εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις;
I xxvi 6 οἱ οὐ κοινωνοῦντες τῶν αὐτῶν δογμάτων; a similar genitive to that
with the substantive κοινωνία, the things in common being δόγματα, and
such a genitive in the regular construction with the adjective κοινωνός.

Of the three passages in Irenaeus the first suffers under a difficulty
of reading. Πῶς . . . τὴν σάρκα λέγουσιν εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν
τῆς ζωῆς, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφο-
μένην; ἢ τὴν γνώμην ἀλλαξάτωσαν, ἢ τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα παραι-
τείσθωσαν. ἡμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία
βεβαιοῖ τὴν γνώμην. προσφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια, ἐμμελῶς κοινωνίαν καὶ
ἕνωσιν ἀπαγγέλλοντες [καὶ ὁμολογοῦντες] σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος [ἔγερσιν].
ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκέτι
κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου
τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας,
μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτά, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα, adv.
Haer. IV xxxi 4. The bracketed words are rejected as an interpolation
by Grabe and Harvey, but defended by Massuet. The translation has
communicationem et unitatem praedicantes carnis et spiritus.

If the bracketed words are omitted, either σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος forms
a single expression and both genitives are qualitative, 'a fleshly and
spiritual communion', or σαρκός is a possessive and πνεύματος an
objective genitive, 'our flesh participates in spirit', μετέχει πνεύματος, as
it is said μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς.

The sense of κοινωνία is elucidated by the second passage ὅσα
τὴν πρὸς θεὸν τηρεῖ φιλίαν, τούτοις τὴν ἰδίαν παρέχει κοινωνίαν (κοινωνία
in Himself). κοινωνία δὲ θεοῦ,[1] ζωή, καὶ φῶς, καὶ ἀπόλαυσις τῶν παρ'
αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν V xxvii 2. 'Quicunque erga eum custodiunt dilectionem,
suam his praestat communionem. Communio autem Dei, vita, et
lumen, et fruitio eorum quae sunt apud Eum bonorum.' Here the
construction is indubitable and the meaning parallel to 2 Pet. i 4 ἵνα
γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. And a genitive of material or contents
follows also in the remaining passage I i 18 τὴν τῆς συζυγίας κοινωνίαν.
On the other hand when κοινωνία means 'communion with' it is followed
by πρός as is shewn by the Latin translation of IV xxxi 2 'si quis . . .
non recte dividat eam quae est ad proximum communionem', repre-
senting an original Greek ἐὰν μὴ ὀρθῶς διέλῃ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πλησίον
κοινωνίαν, that which is common to both parties, their common property
or possession; cp. 2 Cor. vi 14 referred to above.

---

[1] Cp. III xix 6 εἰ μὴ συνηνώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ Θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἠδυνήθη μετασχεῖν
ἀφθαρσίας . . . Qua enim ratione filium adoptionis eius participes esse possemus,
nisi per Filium eam quae est ad ipsum recepissemus ab eo communionem!

These instances make it clear that κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων cannot mean communion with the saints; it might mean *either* that communion which the saints enjoy, the genitive being a possessive genitive, *or* communion in the holy things; and if the mere preponderance of instances were a sufficient ground for decision, in all probability it would be the latter.

But if we take the former meaning we must examine it rather more closely.

Do we then believe in the intercommunion of the saints? Certainly it is a fact; it flows from the unity of the Church, and the Church is a body instinct with a divine life, is a divine creation. But it is not so much that it flows from the unity of the Church, but rather that the two are interdependent, the unity of the Church depending in its turn on the intercommunion of its members, and were there no such communion there would not be one Church. In short, the unity of the Church and the communion of its members are two different modes of expressing the same thing, and to indulge in repetitions is not only contrary to the analogy of the structure of the Christian Creed, but also to the analogy of the Marcosian formula, where the two articles are clearly distinguished, since εἰς ἕνωσιν cannot be identified with εἰς κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων. Moreover, do we believe in the unity of the Church? In the sense in which 'believe' is used in the Creed the answer must be No. For such belief is not a mere assent to the truth of a proposition, but of reliance, and we do not rely on some quality or attribute of the Church but on the Church itself, as a divinely ordered means of salvation, and even if the Christian Creed of Asia Minor in the time of Irenaeus had not εἰς μίαν ἐκκλησίαν, &c., but only εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, the same idea would be expressed with sufficient precision.

Whatever may be the modern view, in the early ages of Christianity both catholics and heretics agreed that outside the Church salvation was insecure, and in their more passionate moments they might declare that it was impossible; but each party claimed to constitute the true Church. Similarly both asserted the need of sacraments as the means by which eternal life was imparted, but each denied that the other had any real sacraments.[1] That is, each relied on God and on His acts; the Church was a God-created society, sacraments were divinely-appointed ordinances, and both were for salvation; but neither catholics nor heretics would have said that without the intercession or influence or example of the saints there was no salvation; the intercession they relied on was Christ's intercession, the example they valued His example, and the influence by which they were moved His Spirit.

Niceta was right in what he meant when he said 'Totum quod credi-

[1] Cp. Tert. *de Bapt.* xv.

mus, propter nostram credimus resurrectionem '. As God alone can give resurrection and eternal life, it is on Him alone and His acts that we rely. And Faustus was so far right when, like the *Quicumque*, he conjoined faith and worship. To believe is to ascribe worth, and we believe in Him Whom we worship. It is true that we rely on something which the saints possess in common, a *commune aliquid* or κοινόν τι, but that is not on their feelings or their activities, but on a divine gift which God gives both to them and to us.

What then is this divine gift? Is it the Church itself? Such a supposition, though possible as a meaning of the Greek words, is negatived not only by the structure of the Creed, but by the fact that the collocation of 'the Church' and 'the Communion of Saints' is by no means universal, and that when it does occur the two articles are sometimes separated in other ways. Thus in the Creed attached to the Antiphonary of Bangor *abremissa peccatorum* is placed before *sanctorum communionem*, separating it from *ecclesiam catholicam*, and a later Armenian Creed[1] has the same arrangement. In Miss. Gall. i the interpunctuation assigns to Article 9 *sanctum Spiritum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*, and places *sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum* in Article 10. Similarly where separate articles are assigned to individual apostles, Pirminius gives *sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum* to St Jude, the brother of James, as Article 11; pseudo-Augustine S. 241, to Simon Zelotes as Article 10; while the Book of Deer joins *sanctam ecclesiam* by *que* to *Spiritum sanctum*; and a Gallican form of Creed of the tenth or eleventh century[2] joins *sanctorum communionem* with *remissionem peccatorum* by *et*, where the second form of the Gallican missal has *ac*, unless this be a mistake for *ab*-remissionem.

But if κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων is neither the unity of the Church or intercommunion of the saints as an abstract quality, nor their mutual influence, nor a synonym for the Church as a concrete body, but some other gift of God in which all Christians take a share, what then is it?

Theologically it might be a reiteration of any of the articles of the Creed, including faith itself, for all these are gifts of God whose purpose is eternal life. Yet not only is the general character of the Creed against this view, but it is impossible to imagine that such a summary statement should be placed in the midst of it. If we suppose that the articles of the Creed are arranged not merely in a historic, but in a logical order, κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων must be on the one side closely connected with the Church and on the other with remission of sins. This is so far independent of the question whether τῶν ἁγίων be masculine or neuter; in any case the κοινωνία is a μετοχὴ τῶν ἁγίων in

---

[1] Catergian *de fidei symbolo quo Armenii utuntur*, Vienna, 1893, p. 39.

[2] Hahn, p. 82

something, and the things must be ἅγια as being divine gifts, so that the full phrase would be ἡ τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων, the communion of the holy ones in the holy things. At this point, consequently, we must enquire what occupies this position in other eastern Creeds, what would be suggested to the minds of early Christians by κοινωνία, whether there was anything which was specifically known as τὰ ἅγια, and finally how far does our conclusion fill an obvious gap.

The answer to our first question is not doubtful. The place of κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων is all but universally filled in eastern Creeds by βάπτισμα. This is true not only of our present 'Nicene' Creed, which in all probability is derived through Constantinople from Antioch, but also of the Creeds of Cyril of Jerusalem, the Nestorian Creed, the longer Armenian Creed, and the Ethiopian Creed. Nor in the mind of the early Church could the intercommunion of Christians be separated from the rite in which they first received as a common possession the life of which that intercommunion is a manifestation. But it is no less clear that neither could it be separated from the other sacrament by which that life is sustained. Participation in the Eucharist was regarded not only as a sign of union, but as the means of it. And, on the other hand, to be excluded from it was to be excluded from the Church as a body, though not so excluded as to be incapable of restoration.

If we consider together as a single group the words κοινωνεῖν, κοινωνία, κοινωνικὰ γράμματα, ἀκοινώνητος, ἀκοινωνησία there is no mistaking their suggestion. The first of them occurs in the letter of Irenaeus to Victor. καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων, ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν Πολυκάρπῳ. No doubt these words had other meanings and synonyms; εὐχαριστία was a more common term for the service; μετάληψις equally with κοινωνία meant the act of communicating; and ἀφωρισμένος could be used instead of ἀκοινώνητος. The meaning even among Christians was not, apart from the context, more clearly defined than 'communion', 'communicate', 'excommunicate', among ourselves; but if in English we add to communion the word *holy* the total phrase becomes definite at once. And something of this kind is true of the phrase κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων. τῶν ἁγίων might indeed suggest 'of Christians', 'Christian communion', or 'of the consecrated', 'sanctified', or 'sacred', the 'consecrated communion'; it would hardly at this date mean 'saints' in our popular sense. But it would tend also to suggest 'consecrated or sacred things'. The double usage meets us in the phrase τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις which, as being a common feature in the early liturgies, must go back to a remote antiquity, in all probability far earlier than Cyril of Jerusalem, in whose exposition of the Eucharistic rites it occurs. But τὰ ἅγια is also a synonym of εὐλογία in the sense of the consecrated Host. Previous

to the Council of Laodicea (343-381) (of which the fourteenth Canon runs, περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὰ ἄγια εἰς λόγον εὐλογιῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα εἰς ἑτέρας παροικίας διαπέμπεσθαι) the Host was sent from one diocese to another in token of amity, and this custom as we learn from the letter mentioned above was older than Irenaeus (ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν), while within the rite itself τὰ ἄγια bears a similar technical meaning in the Byzantine liturgy and in the liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites; while in the liturgies of St Basil and St James ἁγίασμα is employed in the same sense, and so also in the canonical epistle of Gregory of Nyssa. But while the meaning of τὰ ἄγια in the liturgies is fixed, the meaning of οἱ ἄγιοι has in some cases undergone a change. No doubt it originally referred to the Christian communicants as St Cyril [1] explains it, and at this time the elevation in connexion with which it occurs was simply a shewing to the people as an invitation to communion; but in the earliest liturgy to which we can get back, probably about A. D. 350,[2] as well as in the liturgies of the Syrian Jacobites, St Mark, the Coptic and Abyssinian Jacobites, and the Nestorians it is followed by the response: 'One is the holy Father, one is the holy Son, one is the holy Spirit', shewing that οἱ ἄγιοι was losing its meaning of 'Christians' and a new interpretation was being found for it.

In this connexion it is interesting to note that St Basil [3] has τολμᾶν εἰς κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων παρέρχεσθαι for 'daring to make one's communion', though St Basil is too late for his evidence to have much weight in the argument.

When we remember that the attendance of Christians at the weekly Eucharist was a regular practice and that it was the specifically Christian service, it is difficult not to think that such language had a real influence on the formation of the phrase.

But if we try to go behind this evidence and enquire how τὰ ἄγια came to bear this meaning, we can find a probable answer without great difficulty. τὰ ἄγια bears all the marks of a popular abbreviation which could be but half stated because it would be incapable of being misunderstood [4]: sanctum Domini is often used by Cyprian with omission of corpus in reference to Matt. vii 6, as in the Didache ix 5, and I think we may say with confidence that the full phrase from which it was derived is τὰ ἄγια μυστήρια.

---

[1] Lect. V on The Mysteries, § 19; cp. St Chrys. in Heb. xvii 4, 5 (xii 170 B).
[2] Cp. W. C. Bishop, 'Early Persian Liturgy', Ch. Qtrly. Rev. Jan. 1919, pp. 317 and 327.   [3] Regulae brevius tractatae, Interrog. cccix.
[4] Possibly made all the easier by the use of τὰ ἄγια in the LXX, e. g. Exod. xxviii 38, Lev. v 15, xxii 2.

Thus we find in Cyril of Jerusalem χωρητικοὶ τῶν θειοτέρων μυστηρίων, θείου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀξιωθέντες,[1] and τῆς κοινωνίας ἑαυτοὺς μὴ ἀπορρήξητε, and μὴ διὰ μολυσμὸν ἁμαρτιῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τούτων καὶ πνευματικῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστερήσητε μυστηρίων[2]; in the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions μεταλαβεῖν τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ μυστηρίων; and similar phrases in the liturgies of St Basil, St Chrysostom, and the Syrian liturgy; and so in the liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites 'as the Mysteries are being covered'[3]; and though these liturgies are later in date, they are evidence of the survival of an old rather than of an introduction of a new usage. But the phrase τὰ μυστήρια even in its narrow sense covered not only the Eucharist but also Baptism. And we may go further. Those who were ἀκοινώνητοί, not for moral offences but for heresy, were at this early stage thought to have neither a real Baptism nor a real Eucharist. The distinction between irregularity and invalidity was at this time in the Eastern Church practically unknown. Of this fact Firmilian's letter to Cyprian on the Baptismal question is sufficient evidence. Or we may put the matter another way. The κοινόν τι of Christians was twofold, faith and sacraments; and faith for the most part regarded objectively as a summary of facts having for Christians a value and meaning which was only to be appreciated or enjoyed within the Christian society. And admission to that society was by the one great sacrament, while life within it was maintained by the other. Moreover, though the possibility of salvation outside the Church might not be denied, yet the only *revealed* possibility was within. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus est* might be too strong; but no early Christian would doubt that *extra ecclesiam nulla salus revelata est.*

Thus the interpretation of κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων as meaning 'the communion of Christians in the holy things', and 'the holy things' as meaning the two great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, is entirely in line with the other articles of the Creed, as mentioning things necessary in the idea of the early Church to salvation, and therefore things to which assent could be demanded. But it is more than this. Other Eastern Creeds mention Baptism exactly at this point, and without some mention of sacraments we are left with a logical hiatus. There is nothing to shew us by what means sonship towards the Eternal Father is either given or maintained, how the benefits of our Lord's work on earth and in heaven are communicated to believers, or how the Holy Spirit comes to them, how they enter upon membership in the Holy Church, or how that membership is at once signified and continued. It would be natural that τὰ ἅγια should have a special meaning in regard to the Eucharist, because this was perpetually kept

[1] Lect. I § 1. [2] Lect. V § 23.
[3] Brightman *Eastern Liturgies* pp. 411, 378, 398, 103, 65.

in the minds of the people by their weekly communion, of which we read in Justin Martyr ; but it would be no less natural that Baptism by which these benefits are conferred should have a specific mention. Nor can we separate either Baptism or Communion in the blood shed for man's forgiveness, from the remission of sins which is enumerated in the next article. Finally, whatever evidence there is in favour of an early date for the phrase ' Communion of Saints ' is evidence also of Greek language, and this will tell both against ' saints ' meaning ' specially holy persons ' or ' departed Christians ' and in favour of κοινωνία followed by a genitive being ' communion in ' or ' participation in ' rather than ' communion with '. We have seen that this phrase occurs only in formulae or expositions which shew eastern influence : Nîmes and Lerins in the South, Ireland in the North, lie on the road from Asia Minor which passed through Pannonia by way of Milan to the former pair, and along the shore of the Lake of Constance to the latter. A southern offshoot from this road at the eastern terminus would lead to Armenia, while in Asia Minor itself we find the Marcosian Creed with its corresponding article. Allowing the phrase to be origi-nally Greek, usage and the Marcosian phrase would point to τῶν ἁγίων being an objective rather than a possessive genitive, though the latter is not excluded. We have seen that τὰ ἅγια as well as κοινωνία had a special reference to the Eucharist, and this is the interpretation put on the phrase in all the earliest authorities, in the Council of Nîmes, the sermon *Simbolum graeca lingua est*, and sermon 241 of pseudo-Augustine, and it underlies the exposition of Niceta, though both words still maintained a wider signification ; while on the other hand the analogy of the Eastern Creeds would lead us to look at this point for some mention of Baptism. But if τὰ ἅγια means τὰ ἅγια μυστήρια we shall commemorate both the great sacraments of the Gospel, and some such mention is necessary to the logical sequence of the Creed and satisfies at once our standard of dogma, as a judgement both of truth and of value.

F. J. BADCOCK.