

in which no aid is needed. 2 Cor. ix. 8, a sufficiency of the necessities of life. Subjectively, a mind contented with its lot, *contentment*, 1 Tim. vi. 6. It is found only in these two places.

In Phil. iv. 11, *αὐτάρκεις* (Vulgate: *sufficiens*), subjectively, *contented with one's means*. Found only here.

Review.

The Holy Communion. Four Visitation Addresses A.D. 1891. By JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury. Oxford and London. Parker and Co. 1891.

IN the Diocese of Salisbury there seems no likelihood of the Church dying of caution. We admire the outspoken boldness of the recent occupants of this see, even as we admire the courage of an ancient Bishop of the same diocese, whose learning and zeal did so much for the Reformed Church of England—"the worthiest divine" (in the estimation of the great Richard Hooker) "that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years," the author of the "*Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*"—not only the Apology of a Jewel, but a very jewel of an Apology, our "*Apologia vere gemmea*," as Bishop Andrewes justly designated it ("*Opuscula*," p. 91, A.C.L.). No doubt, in these difficult days, it must be very difficult for a bishop, with a desire to be fair to all parties, and with a demand upon him to be impartial all round, to be thoroughly true to his own convictions—his most sacred convictions—on matters which concern the highest interests of his flock and the spiritual welfare of his diocese, and to use to the utmost the influence and authority of his high position for the purpose of banishing and driving away erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to the truth of God's Word.

Certainly, on one of the burning questions of our day Bishop John Wordsworth has not left his clergy in doubt as to his opinions, and on a very solemn occasion has not shrunk from throwing the weight of his utterances into the controversial scale.

And we gladly acknowledge that his utterances *are* weighty—evidently the result not only of careful inquiry and matured thought, but also of learned and laborious investigation. We trace in them, moreover, a wise and circumspect discrimination, as well as much independence of judgment. Some of his statements must, we should think, be very unsatisfactory to most of those who call themselves High Churchmen, and many must be distinctly repugnant to the feelings of the advanced party of Ritualism. There is not a little in this Charge for which the Bishop deserves the thanks of Churchmen.

Moreover, there is a tone of brotherly sympathy with his clergy running throughout his addresses which is much to be appreciated—a candour, too, in inviting criticism (p. 118) which indicates a mind still open to conviction.

In reliance on this evident readiness to give an attentive hearing to what may be said from another point of view, we shall venture briefly to touch on only one or two isolated points in the Charge, and we shall even venture to hope that further consideration may lead to the qualification of certain statements, even if not to the modification of certain doctrinal views which are here propounded.

We are glad indeed to see that the Bishop does not build an argument for the sacrificial character of the Eucharist on the sacrificial sense of *ποιεῖτε*. We wish we could think that this argument had now been withdrawn, to reappear no more in popular treatises and widely-read manuals. It is an argument which, having first (we believe) made its infant voice to be heard in the sixteenth century (though it may have had an obscure birth somewhat earlier), then having been ignored by the Tridentine Catechism (De Euch. xx., nota), then ably refuted by Picherellus (Opuscula, p. 146, *sqq.*, Lugd. Bat., 1629), then declined by Bellarmine (though rightly contending that *ποιεῖν* often does signify *sacrifice*, "De Missâ," lib. i., cap. xii., c. 991. Ingol. 1701), and rejected by Estius and other Roman Catholic theologians, ought hardly to have been revived by Bishop Hamilton, without acknowledging that the Greek Fathers and Greek Liturgies give no evidence in its favour, and that Syriac Liturgies, rendering "Do thus," are dead against it. The Bishop might have called to mind the challenge of his great predecessor: "What father or doctor ever taught that *hoc facite* was *hoc sacrificate*?" (Jewel's "Works," P.S. ii. 990). It is true that Mr. Scudamore, conceding other Fathers, claims the authority of Justin Martyr in support of this argument. And he supposes that he alone of the Fathers had the key to the true meaning of *ποιεῖτε* ("Not. Euch.," p. 625, 2nd edit.). And Bishop Wordsworth goes so far with him as to believe that in Justin's use of *ποιεῖν* it *must* have the sense of "offer." He says that in chap. xli. Justin makes it "clear that he interpreted *ποιεῖν* in the Hebrew and LXX. sense of 'offer.' . . . He further uses *ποιεῖν* twice, exactly in the same sense, both of the bread and the cup, in chap. lxx." (p. 12).

The Greek of chap. xli. is as follows: *τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους . . . ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν*. In chap. lxx., after quoting from Isa. xxxiii., including "bread shall be given him," verse 16 (a passage with no sacrificial reference), he interprets the prophet's language: *περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν κ.τ.λ.*

Here it is that we must join issue with the Bishop. No doubt such a rendering of the passages referred to will make very good sense, and a sense which we have no reason to suppose that Justin would have been anxious to repudiate. But it is a sense which we believe to be altogether a novelty. It is not that of the learned Benedictine editor (see Præf., Par. ii., c. x.). Casaubon's interpretation, "Benedictione et gratiarum actione consecrare in sacramentum Corporis Christi" (Ad B.A. xvi. 33), deserves, at least, respectful consideration. But, in truth, the wide sense of *ποιεῖν* gives scope to a variety of interpretation. Governing an accusative, it would seem almost (like the Hebrew *ásâh*) to admit the meaning of doing almost anything that has to be done or usually is done to almost anything. Thus, for example, we have *οὐδὲ ἐποίησε τὸν μύστακα* for "nor trimmed his beard" (2 Sam. xix. 24; "Intonsa barba," Vulg.). So *ποιήσει τὸν μύσχον, ὃν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸν μύσχον τὸν τῆς ἀμαρτίας* (Lev. iv. 20) does not mean "he shall sacrifice," but "he shall do to the one as he did to the other." Compare xvi. 15: *ποιήσει τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ὃν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸ αἷμα τοῦ μύσχου*, with the same meaning. So also *ποιεῖν τὸ χρυσίον*, to work in gold (Exod. xxxv. 30). Compare also *πεποίηκε πᾶσαν τὴν δόξαν ταύτην*. Gen. xxxi. 1, "bath gotten all this glory," A.V.; "factus est inclytus," Vulg. But it signifies also

the sacred observance, or commemoration, of an event or of a day. Not only is ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα to keep (not to sacrifice) the passover, but ποιήσετε τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην (Exod. xii. 17) is "custodietis diem istum" (Vulg.). See the Hebrew. Compare ἡ ἡμέρα ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος in Ps. cxviii. 24. So we have frequently ποιεῖν τὴν ἑορτήν, to keep the feast. A cognate sense to this would not be altogether unsuitable to the language of Justin, especially as regarded in connection with the Paschal occasion, when the words would be sounding in all ears: *πᾶσα συναγωγὴ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ποιήσει αὐτό*, Exod. xii. 47. *τότε προσελύσεται ποιῆσαι αὐτό*, verse 48. Compare Num. ix. 11, *πρὸς ἑσπέραν ποιήσουσιν αὐτό*: Verse 12, *κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ πάσχα ποιήσουσιν αὐτό*: Verse 14, *κατὰ τὸν νόμον . . . ποιήσει αὐτό*. But it is also not seldom applied to the making provision for, or doing what has to be done for making ready for any "doing" or for any purpose.

Thus, e.g.: (1) *πλὴν ὅσα ποιηθήσεται πάσῃ ψυχῇ* (Exod. xii. 16) is "exceptis his quæ ad vescendum pertinent" (Vulg.). See the Hebrew.

(2) *πᾶσα θυσία ἣτις ποιηθήσεται ἐν τῷ κλιβάνῳ, καὶ πᾶσα ἣτις ποιηθήσεται ἐπ' ἐσχάρας ἢ ἐπὶ τηγάνου* (Lev. vi. 39, or vii. 9) is "Omne sacrificium similia, quod coquitur in clibano, et quidquid in craticula, vel in sartagine preparatur" (Vulg.): "Every meal-offering that is baked in the oven, and all that is dressed in the frying-pan, and on the baking-pan" (R.V.).

(3) In Ezek. xlv. and xlvi. ποιεῖν is constantly rendered both by the Revisers and by our Authorised Version "to prepare." And though this may be scarcely an adequate translation (see Bishop Wordsworth on xlv. 17) as applied to the offerings of the prince, yet, as accepted in preference of "to offer," it seems justified by the fact that there are priests (xlvi. 2) to do the strictly sacrificial offering. But we would not make too much of this. Compare, however, Ps. lxxv. (lxxvi.) verse 15, *ποιήσω σοὶ βόας*, and see Kay's note there.

(4) In Hosea ii. 8 the LXX. have *αὐτὴ γὰρ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησε τῇ Βαάλ*. The Authorised Version has "prepared for Baal." The Revised Version renders "used for Baal." Both have an alternative meaning in the margin. The Hebrew probably signifies "made into Baal." But (though Jerome renders "offered unto Baal") there need be no doubt that the "prepared" of the A.V. represents truly the ἐποίησε of the LXX. (see Huxtable in Speaker's Commentary).

(5) In Malachi iii. 17 we have *ἔσονται μοι εἰς ἡμέραν ἣν Ἐγὼ ποιῶ*, where the Revised Version has "in the day that I do make" with the same meaning, no doubt, as is expressed in the "Speaker's Commentary" by the translation, "in the day that I am preparing."

(6) Compare Gen. xxx. 30—*Πότε ποιήσω καγὼ ἐμαντῶ οἶκον*; "When shall I provide for mine own house also?"

(7) And in this or a similar sense it is applied to the preparatory work not only of offering sacrifice to God (see 1 Kings xviii. 23, *καὶ ἐξὼς ποιήσω τὸν βοῦν τὸν ἄλλον*, where we render "will dress;" meaning, no doubt, the cutting in pieces and laying on the wood, see verse 33), but also and equally to the work of making ready for the use and service of man; as, e.g., ποιεῖν πότον, ποιεῖν ἑορτήν, ποιεῖν δοχὴν, ποιεῖν γάμον, ποιεῖν ἐδέσματα ποιεῖν ἐπισιτισμὸν.

It seems scarcely necessary to observe how, in such a sense as this, it very naturally fits into the saying of Justin.

But we must go further, and say that we believe there is no example to be found of such an isolated expression as ποιεῖν ἄτρον, ποιεῖν ποιήριον in a sacrificial sense. Mr. Scudamore alleges Num. xv. 5, *δινον εἰς σπονδὴν . . . ποιήσετε* (where the R.V. follows the A.V. in rendering "prepare," and the words following, *ἐπι τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως*, sufficiently indicate the sort of doing) and 1 Kings viii. 64, *ἐποίησε . . . τὰ στέγατα*. And this last is probably the nearest approach to the language of the Martyr. But it must

be observed that here τὰ στέατα does not stand alone, like the ἄρτον and ποτήριον of Justin, but follows close on two other words, which naturally require the sense of *offer*. Surely this fact tends to vitiate the force of the comparison.

This will be obvious, we think, to all who look at the sentence as a whole : ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν ὀλοκαύτωσιν καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰ στέατα τῶν εἰρηνηκῶν.

The direction concerning the wave-loaves is προσοίσετε ἄρτους (Lev. xxiii. 17). So for the thank-offering προσοίσει . . . ἄρτους (Lev. vii. 2 or 12). The command concerning the loaves of the shew-bread is ἐπιθήσετε αὐτούς . . . ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν (Lev. xxiv. 6). We submit that it is a fact of very high and important significance, if (as we believe) it can be established, that whereas the Old Testament had what may be called its sacrificial ἄρτοι, the LXX. never in respect of these uses the word ποιεῖν to express the sense of *offering*, or of any *sacrificial doing*.

On the other hand, there are unquestionable examples of the use not only of similar language, but of the very words ἄρτον ποιεῖν or ἄρτους ποιεῖν, in which a sacrificial signification is altogether out of the question. See Ezek. iv. 9, ποιήσεις αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ εἰς ἄρτους, and verse 15, ποιήσεις τοὺς ἄρτους σου ἐπ' αὐτῶν; but especially Gen. xxvii. 17, ἔδωκε τὰ ἐδέσματα καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους οὓς ἐποίησε; and Eccles. x. 19, εἰς γέλωτα ποιοῦσαν ἄρτον, καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι ζῶντας. See also Lev. xxiv. 5, Καὶ λήψεθε σμιθάλω καὶ ποιήσατε αὐτὴν δώδεκα ἄρτους; and compare 1 Kings xvii. 12, 13, ποιήσω αὐτὸ ἐμαυτῇ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις μου . . . ποιήσόν μοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐγκρυσίαν . . . αὐτῇ δὲ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις σοῦ ποιήσεις ἐπ' ἰσχύατφ.

We need not, indeed, question the fact that Justin does in one place speak (like Irenæus) of the bread and the cup as a sacrifice. And he regards the Jewish minchah of flour, offered by the cleansed leper, as a type of the eucharistic bread ("Dial. Try.," chap. xli.). In this Justin appears to be forgetful of the fact that no part of the *minchah* was given as food for the offerer, and that the sacrifice which we do feed upon in the Eucharist is certainly not a *minchah*, but a sacrifice of propitiation—of blood shed for the remission of sins. But this language should be read beside another passage, in which he speaks of the sacrifice prescribed by Christ, and everywhere offered by Christians as being (not the bread and cup, but) in the Eucharist of the bread and cup (ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, chap. cxvii.). And he goes on to teach expressly that prayers and thanksgivings are the *only* perfect and acceptable sacrifices, and the *only* sacrifices which Christians have learnt to offer ("Try.," c. cxvii.). And it is material to observe that this is said with distinct reference to the Eucharistic Liturgy. He adds, in view of the prophecy of Malachi, that there is no race of men with whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered through the name of the crucified Jesus.

It would seem, perhaps, as if, in Justin's idea the eucharistic elements¹ were regarded as, in some sense, the centre (shall we say, like the coal in the flame?) of the prayers and praises which constituted the pure offering of the Gentiles, being sometimes looked upon, in connection with these,

¹ *I.e.*, viewed, no doubt, as tokens of homage, and incentives to thanksgiving and praise. Justin's inconsistency can hardly, we think, be held to justify those divines who refuse to see that Justin does, in some sense, include in the sacrifice the material elements of the Eucharist. Such inconsistency is not peculiar to Justin.

The offerings were originally made by the people for the purposes of the sacred rite, a custom which is said to have its survival now only in the Church of Milan. See Neale's "Essays on Liturgiology," pp. 148, 193.

Bellarmino regards the unconsecrated elements when offered as *sacrifices*, "quia sunt materia sacrificii, et jam dedicata, et parata, ut ex iis fiat sacrificium" ("De Missâ," lib. i., cap. xxi., c. 1128. Ingolst. 1701).

as a subsidiary part of the offering, and sometimes being altogether out of view.¹

So Irenæus also, referring to the same prophecy of Malachi, speaks of it as God's will that we should offer a gift at the altar, frequently and without intermission. And then he adds: "The altar is in heaven, for towards that place our prayers and oblations are directed" ("Adv. Hær.," L. iv., c. xviii., § 6).

And so Tertullian, in view of the same prophecy, says: "Gloriæ scilicet relatio et benedictio, et laus, et hymni" ("Adv. Judæos," § 5), apparently (as Bishop Wordsworth justly observes, p. 12) "thinking rather of the eucharistic praises than of the oblation of bread and wine."

We submit that not only is there a lack of evidence to substantiate the opinion that Justin's *ποιεῖν* must needs mean *offer*, but that it would be nearer the truth to say that it hardly can in fairness be made to bear such a sense.

We must turn for a moment to another point. It has too often been alleged that, in using the word *ἀνάμνησις*, our Lord was using the technical language to express the sacrificial memorial of the Levitical service—whereas the truth is that for this signification the word *μνημόσυνον* is used in the Old Testament (not including the Apocrypha) nine times, that is *always*—the word *ἀνάμνησις* never. Moreover, no part of the sacrificial *μνημόσυνον* was ever given to be food for man. Avoiding this mistake, but desiring, apparently, to lead up to the same result, Bishop Hamilton had asserted that *ἀνάμνησις* "signifies the offering of a *μνημόσυνον*" (Charge, p. 52). It is an assertion which, we think, never ought to have been made. Is it too much to say that it is quite unwarranted? We are sure the Bishop did not wish to mislead, but he must, we think, have been strangely misled. Bishop Wordsworth, of course, knows better than to follow such a mistaken leading; yet we observe with regret that he seems to aim at guiding his clergy in somewhat the same direction by apparently attaching to *ἀνάμνησις* the sense of a memorial *before God*. We refer to his language in p. 135, where he reads into an answer of the Catechism a meaning which, we are persuaded, no one would naturally read out of it, and says that it "leads us to think of the memorial of Christ made before God, and especially to think of it as a thank-offering, a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.'" Far preferable, we think, is the interpretation of Bishop Sanderson: "This Sacrament was ordained by our Saviour Jesus Christ Himself for this end especially, that the remembrance of His death, wherein He offered up Himself a sacrifice for our sins (and the innumerable benefits that we receive thereby), might be better remembered in the Christian Church to all succeeding generations" (Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," pp. 23, 24. Comp. Nowel's Catechism, pp. 90, 92, 93, P.S.).

Bishop Wordsworth, indeed, is not the first who has thus understood the language of our Lord in the words of institution. And none will deny that *ἀνάμνησις* can very well be used with such an application, and, in an interpreting connexion, is sometimes so used by some of the Fathers. Yet we must venture to express quite a decided opinion that any argument, based on the assumption that the word here *must* have such a force is nothing less than a great mistake. It is true indeed that on both occasions where (besides the titles of two Psalms) the word is used in the Septuagint it has a Godward reference. This is made unmistakably clear by the

¹ On the language of Justin Martyr see Canon Heurtley's "Sermons on Recent Controversy," pp. 50, 51. The whole sermon may be strongly recommended as most valuable. It has, to our knowledge, been of great service to some (and, we doubt not, to many others) whose minds have been exercised and their thoughts perplexed on the subject of "The Eucharistic Sacrifice."

addition of the words following *ἐναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* in Num. x. 10, and *ἐναντι Κυρίου* in Lev. xxiv. 7, 8 (where it represents the Hebrew *azkarah*). But the fact of its receiving this addition to give it this application tends rather to lead to the inference that without such an addition the word does not avail to convey such a meaning of itself. Wherever the word *μνημόσυνον*, the technical term for the Sacrificial memorial, is used of *that memorial*, it never, we believe, has any such addition. Wherever the word *μνημόσυνον* has such an addition, as in Eccles. i. 19; Exod. xxviii. 23, xxx. 16, it is used in another sense, in which another application would be admissible. The word *ἀνάμνησις* is used by Symmachus for "this is My memorial" in Exod. iii. 15, and for the "no remembrance of Thee" in Ps. vi. 5, where the LXX. render *ὁ μνημονέων σου*.

Mr. Scudamore, indeed, in favour of a Sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις*, says "The Lexicons tell us that *azkarah* is a 'sacrificial term'" ("Not. Euch.," p. 626, 2nd edit.). But in the LXX., *μνημόσυνον*, and not *ἀνάμνησις*, is used to represent the Hebrew *azkarah*. The single exception, we believe, is Lev. xxiv. 7, where it is applied to the frankincense put on the shew-bread (see "Speaker's Com.," *in loc.*), not to the sacrificial memorial laid on the altar, and where the addition of the words *προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίῳ*, and in v. 8, *ἐναντι Κυρίου*, sufficiently indicate, as already stated, the Godward relation. The texts which Mr. Scudamore refers to—Exod. xii. 14, xiii. 9, xvii. 14; Num. v. 15 (compared with Num. x. 10)—do not show at all "how completely equivalent *ἀνάμνησις* is" to *μνημόσυνον*. They only show what none can doubt, that *μνημόσυνον* admits also a wider sense than its technical signification.

It cannot be shown that *ἀνάμνησις* is ever used in the New Testament with a distinctly Godward reference. And we question whether of itself, and apart from any verb of offering, or interpreting context, it ever conveys such a meaning. Moreover, it does not appear to have been so understood by the ancients. Philo, we are assured, "finds no 'memorial' in *ἀνάμνησις*" (Malan, "Two Holy Sacraments," p. 173).

The Liturgies express the obedience to our Lord's word by *μνημημένοι*, and the Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil has the words "Quotiescumque manducabitis . . . *meique memores* eritis donec veniam" (Renaudot, tom. i., p. 15). So in the Syriac Liturgy of St. James, as in many others, the "Memoriam agimus" has relation not only to Christ's sacrifice, but to His ascension and second advent, which admit no Godward sacrificial memorial (see Hammond, p. 70). So the Ambrosian Liturgy has "In mem commorationem facietes," etc. (Hammond, p. 334), followed (as in the case of several other Liturgies) by the "Unde et memores."

Chrysostom compares this *ἀνάμνησις* of Christ with the keeping a commemoration of a deceased relative (Op., tom. x., p. 246, edit. Montfaucon), and regards it as parallel with the command concerning the Passover, that "this day" should be "for a memorial." In each case he says, *τῆς ἐνεργείας ἐγκατέθεσε τὸ μνημόσυνον τῷ μυστηρίῳ* (*Ibid.*, tom. vii., pp. 782, 783). Theodoret clearly understands our Lord's words as pointing to a memorial whose aim and purpose it is that *we* may be reminded, and *our* minds affected by the contemplation of the sufferings thus represented ("In Ep. Heb.," cap. viii., Op. tom. iii., pp. 594, 595. Edit. Schulze).

So the author of the treatise "De Baptismo," which has been attributed to St. Basil the Great, thus regards the object of the institution: *ἵνα . . . αἰὲ μνημονεύωμεν τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος*, adding, *ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, δηλονότι εἰς ἀνεξάλειπτον μνήμην τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος* (Lib. i., cap. iii. § 2, Op., edit. Garnier, tom. ii., Append., pp. 650, 651).

So Sedulius Scotus compares *this* memorial to the *pignus*, left by a parting friend, "ut quotiescunque illud viderit, possit ejus beneficia et amicitias recordari" (In 1 Cor. xi. ; in Bibl. Max., tom. vi., p. 545).

And another commentary, sometimes attributed to Remigius of Auxerre, compares our Blessed Lord's words to those of a dying man, who commits some *munus pretiosum* to a friend, saying, "Accipite hoc munus . . . et tene illud . . . in memoriam mei, ut quotiescunque illud videris, recorderis Mei" (*Ibid.*, tom. viii., p. 971).

In like manner Christian Druthmar likens our Lord's dealing with us to that of one who, going on a journey, leaves to those who loved him a *vinculum dilectionis*, and says of the consecrated symbols, "ut per hæc duo memoremus quæ fecit pro nobis de corpore et sanguine suo, et non simus ingrati tam amatissimæ charitati" ("In Mat. Evang.," fol. lxxxiv., edit. 1514).

So also Nicholas, of Methone, says: 'Αιτία δὲ τῆς παραδοσῆς ἢ τῆς μεγάλης ταύτης εὐεργετίας ἀνάμνησις ("De Corpore et Sanguine Dom.") In Migne's "Patrol. Græc.," tom. cxxxv., c. 512), where none will maintain that ἀνάμνησις means anything else than *our* remembering.¹

We must, therefore, respectfully decline to accept the teaching that in the words of Institution there is any idea of sacrificial offering or presentation to God of a sacrificial memorial conveyed in the use of the term ἀνάμνησις. We must even urge that, on the contrary, if our blessed Lord had intended to convey this idea, we should almost certainly have had His meaning conveyed to us by the Greek word *μνημόσυνον*. And yet, as connected with the command "Eat this," "Drink this," this word would have involved a strange—may we not say, to Jewish minds, an impossible?—combination of ideas, seeing that the sacrificial *μνημόσυνον* was never to be eaten, neither by the offerer nor by the priest (see Waterland, vol. v., p. 144).

It may be permitted to add the statement of a historical fact which ought to carry some weight with ministers of the Church of England.

The first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. spoke of "making here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make." Why were these words omitted from the second book? They implied no belief in transubstantiation. They conveyed no doctrine of the Mass. All that could be said to belong to the Romish and Mediæval Mass doctrine had already been carefully eliminated from the first book. And it has recently been maintained by a very able writer, whose Protestantism is above suspicion, that

¹ So also the commentary—perhaps the work of Pelagius—among the works of Jerome (tom. xi., par. 3, c. 259, 260. Edit. Vallarsius). "Quemadmodum si quis peregre proficiscens aliquod pignus, ei, quem diligit, derelinquat. . . . Ideo hoc Salvator tradidet Sacramentum, ut per hoc semper commemoremus, quia pro nobis est mortuus . . . ut beneficiis Ejus non existamus ingrati."

So also Florus Magister: "Hoc Sacramentum ultimum discipulis tradidit, ut memorium tantæ charitatis, per quam solam salvamur, arctius eorum mentibus infingeret" ("De Exp. Missæ," § 63, Op., Edit. Migne, c. 55).

And the same words are found also in Hincmar (Op., tom. ii., p. 92. Paris, 1645).

So also Primasius: "Salvator Deus exemplum dedit ut quotiescunque hoc facimus, in mente habeamus, quod Christus pro nobis omnibus mortuus est . . . quemadmodum si quis moriens relinquat ei quem diligit aliquod pignus" (In I Cor. xi. In "Bibl. Max.," tom. x., p. 189).

It is scarcely necessary to add that many other testimonies might be added to the same effect—all witnessing to this: that (though doubtless, in some sense, the "memory" was said to be offered to God in token that in our approach to the throne of grace we had no sacrifice to offer but the remembrance of that which had been once offered for our remission, in which alone—i.e., in the Blood of Christ—we had boldness to enter into the holiest) the primary purpose of the command, the object of the ἀνάμνησις was that *we* might have a continual remembrance, whereby *our own* hearts might be continually reminded of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

the omission of these words made no doctrinal change. There was a memorial while they were retained, and there remained a memorial when they were omitted. This is doubtless quite true. But there is a difference between memorial and memorial. And it is inconceivable that such an omission could have been made carelessly without a purpose, wantonly without a design. What, then, can have been its design and purpose? We cannot doubt that this change—like other changes of the same date—indicates the wise (even if sometimes perhaps excessive) caution of our Reformers—not only to lop off branches on which had grown the blasphemous fables of the Mass, but also to pull up the dangerous roots out of which might grow less noxious, but still dangerous errors. They saw the distinction between the memorial of the *μνημόσυνον*—the sacrificial memorial—and the unsacrificial memorial of *ἀνάμνησις*. They would leave, indeed, the memorial—the sacred and blessed remembrance for the ransomed of the Lord—their remembrance of the precious death of Him who loved them and gave Himself for them—their *ἀνάμνησις* (as the Fathers understood it), to remind *them* of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which they receive thereby.

But they would carefully avoid the use of language which might, even by mistake, seem to imply the making of a *μνημόσυνον*—by some acting or making of the priest upon an altar—that is, of a sacrificial memorial to be offered to God, to be accepted on our behalf.¹

And because we admire the wisdom of our Reformers, and are satisfied that the circumstances of our times are vindicating their caution, we must be allowed, with all due respect, to dissent from the desire of the Bishop that the words "and this" might be substituted for "or this" in the rubric between the two Post-Communion Collects. It may seem a very small matter, but there is a witness in that little "or" which we should be sorry to lose. We can have no possible objection to the use of both prayers, but we do feel a decided objection to any loss or impairing of this witness. If our Church had intended in the words "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" to signify a sacerdotal offering of a sacrifice on the altar, it is impossible that she could have left the use of this prayer to the option of the minister. That "or," therefore, testifies that our eucharistic sacrifice is the sacrifice of praise, not (if we may so express it) of the Eucharist, but *for* the Eucharist. And we submit that in these days this distinction is one which we are called upon faithfully to uphold. We must, therefore, regret what the Bishop has said in p. 142 about the Prayer of Oblation as recognising the Sacrament as a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." It seems to us to be suggestive of that of which our Liturgy has no suggestion, and which derives no support, we believe, from the words of Bishop Ridley referred to ("Works," *p.s.*, pp. 211, 216, 217). See his "Works," pp. 208, 209, 322, 323.

It will little avail, in our judgment, to plead as against this that at the date of the last review a reactionary current had set in, and made its influence felt in the revision. The doctrinal views of the reaction have been, we believe, much misunderstood, notwithstanding the eccentric opinions of one or two individuals, and its influence, we are sure, has been greatly exaggerated. In the matter of the eucharistic sacrifice, Laudian divines (departing, as they did, from the language of Hooker) were as far from the doctrines of the Mass as Cranmer and Ridley and Jewel.

¹ We are not, of course, questioning that the ancients offered (or pleaded) to Godward the commemoration which they made of the Sacrifice of Christ. Chrysostom expresses the truth—*προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ* ("Ep. Heb.," c. x., Hom. xvii.).

The teaching of Laud himself was no more sacrificial than that of Beza, the Calvinist, abroad, and of Perkins, the Puritan, at home. His followers were perhaps over-anxious to make the language and practice of the Reformed Church conform to that of the third and fourth and fifth centuries of our era. But they knew well that that language meant nothing like the corrupt doctrines which, as parasites, had grown upon it in after ages of darkness and superstition.

As a matter of fact, however, it should be noted that the efforts of the reactionary party were (as a whole) defeated all along the line. The revision was governed, indeed, by a decided—perhaps we ought to add by an intemperate and unconciliatory—anti-Puritan bias, which doubtless was willing to make concessions to the reactionary party in matters of indifference or of little apparent moment; but not the less did it give clear evidence of an animus which looked suspiciously on Laudian innovations, and would have nothing of that which might seem to shake the doctrinal settlement of the Reformation.

Thus, for example, wisely and well, instead of putting “into the poor man’s box,” the churchwardens are now directed reverently to bring the basin with the alms and devotions of the people “to the priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy table” (though there seems to be no evidence of *money* alms being so placed in early times; see what the Bishop says, pp. 84, 85); and then the priest is directed to “place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.”

This direction concerning the bread and wine was, in fact, only carrying out the suggestion contained in Baxter’s Prayer-Book. The suggestion, however, came from another quarter, that the rubric should run thus, “the priest shall then *offer up* and place upon the table,” etc., and the words “offer up” (possibly from an excess of caution) were struck out.

So also as regards the whole body of change which distinguished the second book of Edward VI. from the first—the Revision did not interfere with it as a whole. It is needless to say that it included many particulars evincing an unmistakable design to suffer nothing to remain in our formularies which even by ambiguity could seem to shelter the doctrine of the real corporal presence or countenance the idea of an offering for sin of any sort in the Eucharist.

Not only were the words which spoke of making a memorial with the holy gifts before the Divine Majesty not restored, but Wren’s proposal (if pressed) was rejected, to alter the words of institution with the view of making them receptive or suggestive of this memorial sense (see Jacobson’s “Fragmentary Illustrations,” p. 81), and the witness of all the other most significant changes remains unimpaired.

Mr. Maskell regards three rites as *essential*. “These three rites are: the recital of the words of Institution, the oblation of the elements afterwards, and a prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit, to make them in effect the body and blood of Christ” (“Ancient Lit.,” Pref., p. xlix.). Certainly, as regards the two last, this could not have been the view of our Reformers in 1552 nor of our Revisers in 1662.

The reactionary party, indeed, would fain, as we know, have done away with what is now sometimes spoken of as the mutilation and dislocation of our Communion Service. And but for the value and importance of the testimony to the reformed character of our Liturgy, there might have been something considerable to be said in favour of the change. But the knowledge which we have of the efforts made in this direction is now valuable evidence of the checkmate of the Laudian influence in the Revision. We have the note in Sancroft’s handwriting: “My Lords the Bishops at Ely House ordered all in the old method.”

Possibly the innovators themselves became sensible of their error. At all events, we know—and it is all we want to know—that wiser counsels

prevailed. The Bishop says (p. 134): "We must remember that our Prayer-Book was modified not a little after Hooker's time." But the particular modifications which he mentions (pp. 134, 135), and of which he makes much, when weighed against the changes of 1552, which gave to our Liturgy its distinctly Reformed character, and which still remain unchanged, will be found to be very light indeed. Moreover, they all (including the addition to the Catechism) came of following out Puritan suggestions.

But while we thus speak thankfully of the check which was given to the reactionary tendencies of the Restoration, we must not be supposed to be accusing any of an attempt to bring back Romanizing doctrines, nor to be condemning as unfaithful to the English Reformation those divines who maintained a commemorative sacrifice (*i.e.*, the commemoration of a sacrifice—see Waterland, vol. v., pp. 292, *sqq.*) in the service of the Eucharist. We can see no possible objection to the offering of God's earthly gifts—the unconsecrated elements—for the service of the Sacrament, for the sacred purposes of the Eucharist. We do not even condemn the word "offer" as applied to the sacrifice commemorated in the sense of simply "offer symbolically to view." It is, doubtless, very commonly so used by the ancients. See Waterland, vol. v., pp. 129, 269, 275, 286, 294. Only we think it a misfortune that this word—so innocent as explained in this sense—should have even the semblance of contravening the inspired Word—"no more offering for sin." We should be more careful not to seem to contradict the Word of God than not to seem to differ from the language of old Catholic doctors, whose words (however soundly meant) have given occasion to misunderstanding. It was truly said by Bishop Bilson: "This hath been not the least of Satan's sleights in conveying your [*i.e.*, the Romish] religion from step to step, and from point to point, to keep the speech and change the sense of the learned and ancient Fathers" ("True Diff.," p. 688; edit. 1585).

Between "offering" in the sense of the Fathers and real sacrificial offering there is the same sort of difference as there is between paying a debt and showing the receipt. We shrink, indeed, from using such a comparison between things sacred and profane. And we are conscious that the analogy is very imperfect. But it may help to mark clearly a distinction which is too important to be overlooked—a distinction between things which need to be very clearly distinguished. What we have to do with in this service, regarded in its Godward relation, is a pleading the merits of the sacrifice once offered on the cross (and we fully acknowledge that such a pleading is inseparable from a worthy receiving of the Eucharist); it is (if we may so speak) the sacrifice of nothing but a remembrance—the *μνημὴν ἀντὶ θανάτου* of Eusebius ("Dem. Ev.," i., c. 10)—and not the sacerdotal doing of anything or the sacrificial offering of anything as a real sacrificial memorial before God. This truth is involved, as we think, in the saying of Cyprian: "Passio Christi est sacrificium quod offerimus" (Ep. lxiii.). See Waterland, vol. v., p. 269.

If we speak of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist we must (with the Roman Catholics Ferus and Barnes) take *sacrificium* "passive pro *sacrificato*." *Actively* considered, it was (as Waterland says) "one transient act." In the Holy Communion "Christ's sacrifice is our sacrifice, but in the *passive* sense—for us to partake of, not to give to God" ("Works," vol. v., p. 235).

Every feast upon a sacrifice postulates the idea of the sacrifice itself as a thing of the past—a thing already finished. And the date of the finished sacrifice which we feast upon ought not to be doubtful. Herein the object of our faith is not any memorializing act of a priest, but the commemorated sacrifice of the cross. And the purpose of the institution

is not that we may have a memorial to offer on an altar, but that we may have a continual thankful remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, when He was once for all offered to bear the sins of many. This distinction is not too fine to be apprehended by the simple. And it needs in our days to be clearly stated and strongly insisted on. Let faith be taught to rest on a sacerdotal act—the offering of a *μνημόσυνον* as a sacrifice—and this act will naturally assume in faith's view a prominence which will naturally attract to itself superstitious ideas—ideas which again will naturally develop into much more than superstition. (We may refer here to what the Bishop says, pp. 87, 143.) Has it not been so in the past? And with the history of the growth of the Mass-sacrifice before us, can we be too cautious as to the restoration of that which at the Reformation we cast away? That which may have had its first beginnings in piety, it may be impious now to bring back. What was once a "holy excess of language" has become a fruitful parent of erroneous doctrines and dangerous deceptions.

The idea of a sacrificial offering of a victim now going on in heaven, and needing a continuous counterpart by the hands of sacrificing priests on the altars of our churches on earth (see Bishop Hamilton's "Charge," p. 51) is one which is condemned alike (as we are persuaded) by the doctrine of Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. The inspired Word—*οὐκ ἐστὶ προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (Heb. x. 18)—lays the axe to the root of all such conceptions. And the language of Chrysostom—*ἡπάξ ἱεράσατο, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκάθισεν* ("Ep. Heb.," c. vii., Hom. xiii.)—which could never have lived in such surroundings, is good witness against these views having ever been incorporated into the faith of the early Church. It is not merely sacrifice, but all sacrificial offering of sacrifice which is thus excluded. On this matter we must venture to think that Bishop Wordsworth (pp. 138, 139) might have expressed himself more clearly or more cautiously.

And indeed, concerning the Charge as a whole—considering that it obviously aims at bringing into greater prominence the sacrificial character of the Eucharist—we think it right to say that it might well have been, in our judgment, much more distinct in pointing out the lamentable errors which our Reformers so diligently laboured to banish from the Church of England. We could certainly wish that the Bishop had been more careful to warn his hearers against the revival of those blasphemous doctrines, for the denial of which our Reformers were willing to lay down their lives.

Is there not a cause?

The impetus given of late to the study of the ancient Liturgies may doubtless account, in some measure, for the general spread of a desire to make our own Communion Service more like them in form and in sound. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that this desire has been too commonly associated with a diseased hankering after the restoration of doctrines which belong not to the English Church, nor to the Fathers, but to the dark ages. And surely this craving calls loudly for a word of solemn warning from our rulers—an echo of the word of warning in our Homilies, "lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice."

Still, we do not doubt that the Bishop would join with us in deprecating the extremes to which some have allowed themselves to be carried. There are some passages in his book which need, we think, to be read with caution, and some suggestions which we cannot but think very questionable. But we can heartily thank him for many of his statements, which ought to carry much weight, and which, if allowed to have their full force, ought to do much in the way of restraining the hasty, and correcting their errors.

We may take, for example, his mention of "Gregory the Great's

strongly-expressed assertion" that the Apostles by the Lord's prayer alone "were accustomed to consecrate the oblation"—which, though stumbled at by Bona ("Rev. I.it," lib. ii, cxv., § 1), and doubted by Muratori, and denied by the Jesuit Zaccaria (who considers that the words unexplained would argue the Pope to have been in heresy, "Bib. Rit." tom. i., Diss. i., p. xvi.), and cruelly racked by other Romish divines, and questioned by Maskell (who seems inclined to follow the lead of those who consider the passage to be corrupt, "Anc. Lit. of Ch. of E.," Pref., p. xxii.), had been repeated by Durandus ("Rat." iv., c. 1), and accepted by Cassander (Op., p. 37), and not rejected by Bellarmine (the "verba consecrationis" apparently being presupposed, "De Missa," i., c. xxvii., c. 1036, 1038). It is a tradition which comes from an authority which is not easily to be set aside. Pope Gregory, as the Bishop says, p. 105, "was a student of liturgies, and had personal acquaintance with the Greek Church, and had access to materials no longer in our possession." And it is one which, whether true or false, and however explained, could hardly have had its birth in the atmosphere of mediæval or modern Romish doctrine concerning the Sacrament.

Bishop Wordsworth supposes that it is the Lord's prayer which is probably meant by Justin Martyr when he speaks of the "word of prayer which is from Him, by which our ordinary food becomes eucharist" (pp. 107, 108). And he considers the position of the "institution," sometimes before and sometimes after the invocation, to be, "in all probability, an evidence that it was of more recent introduction" (pp. 104, 105); and he alleges other evidence (p. 104) to the same effect.

We are thankful also to read such words as these: "By blessing they [early writers] clearly mean not so much an act of consecration as blessing God for His gift of this spiritual food" (p. 96). Cardinal Cajetan had taught the same, alleging "that Jesus's blessing of the bread was a blessing of praise, and not a blessing of consecration" (see Canon Jenkins, "Pretridentine Doctrine," p. 40). And this sense may be found in the writings of some of our Reformers (see Ridley, "Works," p.s., pp. 16, 26; Calhill, p.s., p. 231; Becon, Prayers, etc., p.s., vol. iii., p. 269). Gasquet observes that in the Prayer-Book of 1552 the words "Blessed and" are left out, and have not since been restored (Edw. VI., p. 207).

The Bishop adds: "The words 'sanctification' or 'consecration' are, I think, hardly found in the first two centuries as descriptive of the eucharistic action. I do not in the least mean to imply that there was not a thought of this consecration or that there was not a prayer for it in the Liturgy, but I feel sure that it was not the prominent thought in that age. The main thought was the thanksgiving for what God had done for us in Christ, and the bringing it home to the receivers by a solemn distribution of the elements, over which thanks had been given. The words *εὐχαριστηθεῖσα τροφή, εὐχαριστηθεῖς ἄρτος*, etc. . . . are of themselves enough to prove this" (pp. 96, 97).

He says also (p. 76): "The *ὅσα θέλουσιν* [of the "teaching"] is like Justin's *ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ* of the president's prayers, chap. lxvii., and implies the absence of a fixed form of consecration on the part of the minister." He considers the "Recital of the Institution" to have been introduced early, but not universally (p. 103), and thinks that the evidence shows "that it was considered at first as descriptive rather than effective" (p. 103; see also p. 105).

In like manner Bishop Wordsworth separates himself clearly from the teaching of Bishop Hamilton (Charge, pp. 49, 51) when he writes: "By a kind of prophetic instinct of reserve and caution, she [the Church] made no attempt to treasure up our Lord's own words of blessing or invocation, and, for several centuries at least, had no doctrine as to a necessary

'form' of consecration. . . . When the consecrated bread and cup is delivered to the communicants, the Body and Blood of the Lord is proclaimed aloud to the faithful. But the actual moment of the mysterious union of Christ with the elements is not known to man. To seek to fix it is to be wise above the teaching and example of Christ—wise above the doctrine of the Apostles, wise above the early Liturgies. It leads to a dangerous and curious materialism and carnality, from which I trust you will all keep yourselves, and the flocks committed to you, free" (p. 110).

The Bishop might very suitably have added here that the real presence in the Eucharist is not simply the presence of the Saviour's humanity, but the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ as in the condition of death. "The Eucharist," to quote the words of Archbishop Laud ("Conf. with F.," Oxford, pp. 255, 256), "is a sacrament *sanguinis effusi* (of blood shed and poured out); and blood poured out, and so severed from the body, goes not along with the body *per concomitantiam*." It is needless to quote the well-known words of Bishop Andrewes, and of other English Divines, to the same effect. If this truth were more commonly insisted upon, it would tend effectually to exclude the materialistic notions which Bishop Wordsworth is condemning by making it evident that the presence can only be spiritual—that is, not the presence of a body, after the manner of a Spirit, which Cosin pronounces impossible (Works, vol. iv., p. 169. A.C.L.), but presence "to our spirits only," as Bishop Jeremy Taylor so well expresses it ("Real Presence," sec. i., § 8).

In conclusion, we should like to be allowed to supplement this Charge of the present Bishop of Salisbury with the weighty words of the late Archbishop Longley, who, in his posthumous charge, wrote: "The Romish doctrine of a true, real, and substantial sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as it is called in the Council of Trent, entailed the use of the word altar. But this term appears nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer, and was, no doubt, omitted lest any countenance should be given to the sacrificial view. The notion, therefore, of making in the material elements a perpetual offering of the Body and Blood of Christ is as foreign to the spirit and the letter of our service, as I hold it to be to the doctrine of the Early Fathers, as well as of the leading Divines of our Church" (p. 26).¹

And we will be bold to add further the following from the conclusion of the great sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross by Bishop Wordsworth's great predecessor in the year 1560: "If there be any here that have had or yet have any good opinion of the Mass, I beseech you for God's sake, even as ye tender your own salvation, suffer not yourselves wilfully to be led away, run not blindly to your own confusion. Think with yourselves, it was not for nought that so many of your brethren rather suffered themselves to die, and to abide all manner extremity and cruelty than they would be partakers of that thing that you reckon to be so holy. Let their death, let their ashes, let their blood, that was so abundantly shed before your eyes, somewhat prevail with you and move you. . . . Ye have a good zeal and mind towards God—have it according to the knowledge of God. The Jews had a zeal of God, and yet they crucified the Son of God. . . . If ever it happen you to be present again at the Mass, think but thus with yourselves: What make I here? . . . Christ bade me take: I take nothing; Christ bade me eat: I eat nothing; Christ bade me drink: I drink nothing. Is this the insti-

tution of Christ? Is this the Lord's Supper? Is this the right use of the holy mysteries? Is this it that Paul delivered unto me? Is this it that Paul received of the Lord? Let us say but thus unto ourselves, and no doubt God of His mercy will open our hearts. We shall see our errors, and content ourselves to be ordered by the wisdom of God—to do that God would have us do, to believe that God will have us to believe, to worship that God will have us worship. So shall we have great comfort of the holy mysteries; so shall we receive the fruits of Christ's death; so shall we be partakers of Christ's body and blood; so shall Christ truly dwell in us, and we in Him; so shall all error be taken from us; so shall we join all together in God's truth; so shall we be able with one heart and one spirit, to know and to glorify the only, the true, the living God, and His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; to whom, both with the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

The *Quarterly Review* contains articles on Oxford before the Reformation, Horace and Hafiz, the History of Bookselling in England, and a Teaching University for London. There are two ably-written reviews of Memoirs, viz., Baron de Marbot, and Duke of Livia, son of the Duke of Berwick. From the *Quarterly* article on the Election, forcible and suggestive, we take the following, specially interesting to the rural clergy:

"The chief hopes of the Gladstonians are centred in the agricultural labourers. There does not appear to be much chance of capturing many of the boroughs now in the hands of Conservatives, although we should not advise over-confidence even in that direction. Where a change of candidate is impending, it is highly desirable to find the strongest man to lead the fight without regard to 'prior claims.' A very mischievous candidate having once been sent to a certain constituency, the persons who sent him were asked why in the world their choice had fallen upon him. The reply was, 'He has spent a good deal of money in contesting other seats, and we thought he ought to be recompensed.' That system will never win elections in these days. We look upon most of the Conservative boroughs as fairly secure, unless where the sitting member has fallen out of favour or is weak. There, of course, anything may happen. The rural counties are likely to be more easily moved against the Conservative party. The Radicals are issuing promises to pay with the utmost profusion under the guidance of Mr. Gladstone himself. There is nothing which the agricultural labourer may not hope to get if he will help to put Mr. Gladstone into office. All the resources of the party are to be brought to bear upon this section of the community. The 'Conference' which was so skillfully got up in December last is but an indication of what is going on. Everywhere the labourers are being taught that their worst enemies are the 'parson and the squire,' and their best friends the Radical agitators."
