

EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

WE publish in another column a letter from "D. H." on this subject. The first exclamation that rises to one's lips on reading that communication is the old adage, "A little learning is a dangerous thing." Our young friend, who is an honest-hearted and in other respects a clear-headed man, is to be compassionated for having fallen under the influence of those blind guides who have beguiled him into the thick of the Zwinglian fog which is so bewildering him now. Had he ever had an opportunity of studying theology in a scientific way, it would not have been possible for him to fall into the superficial conceptions of the great mystery which his letter everywhere betrays. Against the rationalistic view of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper which D. H. seems to hold, even the most eminent of English dissenters, Dr. Dale, indignantly protests. Dr. Dale points out that "*If the Lord's Supper be only a ceremony to express faith in Christ and love for each other, there are a thousand other modes in which this faith and love may be expressed as emphatically as by eating Bread together and drinking wine.*" Dr. Dale asks if the Sacrament is only a commemorative rite, "why should we not have new Sacraments?" He declares that if the Lord's Supper is merely "subjective," if, he says, "it is only an expression of religious thought and feeling it can be expressed as effectively in other ways." He goes on to declare that the Sacrament is merely commemorative is a very imperfect and ineffective method of instruction or impression. (see Ecclesia p.p. 374, 390).

Perhaps a brief statement of what is meant by the Eucharistic sacrifice will be the best confutation of the mistakes of D. H. And the best means of helping him, if he will be helped, to a worthier conception of his own office and work as a priest in the Church.

It is not meant then by any who use this language that the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ is reiterated or supplemented or assisted in any way whatever. But only this that the sacrifice of the Cross is represented in the outward acts of the Holy Eucharist, and presented and preached afresh. The sacrifice of calvary, not another is held up between the sinner and God, as His plea for pardon and acceptance. The Eucharistic sacrifice is not as D. H. so confidently assumes the offering of our praises or of ourselves, neither of which would be a very "spiritual sacrifice." But the commemorating before God and men the one only acceptable all prevailing sacrifice of Christ. "We believe not," says a thoughtful writer of our day, the Bread and Wine to be made figures, and thus reduce the blessed sacrament to a Jewish rite. Nor do we believe that Christ is present after the natural laws of material substances, so that He can be sacrificed again as He was sacrificed upon the Cross. But we believe that His Body and His Blood to be really present after a spiritual and heavenly manner, and so identified with the consecrated symbols that these are properly called by their names. And, therefore, when we offer them, we offer His Body and His Blood truly, though in a mystery. It is not a repetition of the sacrifice of the Cross, but a representation of His continual offering of Himself now in Heaven, and

by it we point to and plead before the Father the one perfected sacrifice of the Cross; through the merits of which alone we can approach and make our offering. This has been held by the Church from the beginning, to be the meaning of our Lord's words when He had consecrated the symbols of the first sacrament calling them His Body and His Blood, He said *touto poieite eis ten emen anamnesin*. Words which could not have conveyed to the minds of His hearers the modern explanation. Do this to shew your faith in me, or, do this, i.e., eat this bread and drink this wine, and think about me or my death. The word *poieite*, far more frequently translated by the word "offer," than by the word "do" in the Bible, though the word "do" here would mean perform or make this memorial. For the word *anamnesis* is never used in scripture except with express reference to a memorial before God. And so the words literally mean "Do or offer this my memorial," that is, make a solemn commemoration before God and your brethren of what I have done and suffered for you. This is the sacrifice view of the Eucharist. To say that this view is neglected by the Church of England is to accuse her of having rejected the faith of the Church from the beginning, and to accuse the great stream of her great divines of ignorance or fraud.

The Holy Eucharist is described as a sacrifice in liturgies that certainly date back to the second century, and in all probability to Apostolic times. Thus the liturgy of St. James' used in Jerusalem, Palestine, and Syria. The priest says during the celebration, "We offer to thee this fearful unbloody sacrifice." The liturgy of St. Chrysostom, "We offer to thee this seasonable and unbloody sacrifice." Again in the liturgy of St. Basil, "We offer thee this seasonable and unbloody sacrifice." And so in the liturgy of St. Clement which some think the earliest of the surviving liturgies. In the prayer for the consecration of a Bishop it is said, "Grant O God that he may appease thee by offering constantly and without blame or accusation the pure unbloody sacrifice." This language is taken up and repeated again and again by the early Christian writers, as we could abundantly show did space permit. It will hardly do for D. H. to try to escape the force of this as fixing the interpretation of our Lord's words by his flippant accusation of Romanism. And so we will merely ask D. H.'s attention to the statements of a few of our leading English Divines. Bishop Oswald wrote the sacramental part of the Church Catechism. He may be presumed to know as well as "D. H." what the language there employed means and what it excludes. He says if we compare the Eucharist with Christ's sacrifice made once upon the Cross as concerning the effect of it, we say that that was a sufficient sacrifice, but withal that this is a *true real and efficient* sacrifice, and both of them propitiatory for the sins of the whole world. Neither do we call *this sacrifice of the Eucharist*, an efficient sacrifice, as if that upon the Cross wanted efficacy, but because the force and virtue of that sacrifice would not be profitable unto us unless it were applied and brought into effect first by this Eucharistical sacrifice." Bishop Cosin, who bore a prominent part in the last revision of the Prayer Book, says in the celebration of the Eucharist, God's Son and His Son's death, (which is the most true sacrifice) is represented by us to God the Father, and by the same representation commemoration and attestation is offered. And that for the living and for the dead. "So also does the Church represent and offer Him and His death. And consequently that sacrifice which was performed on the Cross."

Bishop Ridley (Parker Society, p. 250), says: "As though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice, offered up once for all. . . . "It is called an unbloody sacrifice and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and is a representation of that unbloody sacrifice; and he doth not lie who saith Christ to be so offered." Bishop Jeremy Taylor says, "What Christ does in heaven he hath commanded us to do on earth, that is, to represent his death, to commemorate his sacrifice by humble prayer and thankful record, and by faithful manifestation, and joyful Eucharist to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly Father."

We could multiply quotations all speaking the same language, from every really great theologian of the Church of England. This will probably be accepted as a sufficient answer to D. H.'s dogmatic assertion that the Church of England expressly repudiates the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice upon the altar.

His assertion that we now have no altar, stands in flat contradiction to S. Paul's declaration, (Heb. xiii. 20), that "we have an altar whereof they have no right to eat," of which Richard Baxter says, the naming of the table as an altar related to the representative sacrifice, is no more improper than the other." Baxter's Inst. p. 304. The commemorative act must be performed on something, and that on which it is performed is called an altar, when the reference is to something offered to God. It is called a table when the reference is to the heavenly feast which God has provided for us. Both amongst Jews and Gentiles the words table and altar were interchangeable, ("consequence terms.") Thus the prophets Ezekiel and Malachi, call the altar on which Jewish sacrifices were offered the Lord's table. And, conversely, Paul calls the actual altars of the heathen gods, the tables of devils (1 Cor. x. 24). It is not the altar which makes the sacrifice, but the sacrifice which makes the altar. And so neither the shape nor name would make any difference, so long as the act to be performed on the Lord's board remains the same throughout.

The contention that the xxviii. Article by stating that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not to be worshipped, and xxxi. which says that the sacrifice of masses were blasphemous fables, expressly prohibit the idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice, shows a strange ignorance of the controversies of the time. The reformers, whether rightly or wrongly, had become persuaded that the Roman Catholics taught that the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross was not sufficient, and needed to be added to by the sacrifice of the altar, which was supposed not to represent but to repeat the sacrifice of the cross. The ever repeated masses for the dead, were supposed to merit the remission of so much debt which they owed, and to secure the remission of so much of the pain of purgatory wrath which they had to endure. It was these repeated independent sacrifices which the Article denounces, just as in the xxviii. it is the gross materialistic conception of the Eucharist as expressed in the doctrine of transubstantiation which represented the elements of bread and wine as being so turned into Christ as to be themselves the objects of worship that is there rejected.

THE ROYAL ACADEMICIAN.—W. P. Frith, whose charming reminiscences have been so widely quoted, has written two fascinating articles for the *Youth's Companion* on his experiences with "Youthful Models," including Italian bootblacks, cockney Arabs, and children of the royal family.