

THE HISTORY OF THE MASS AND INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUPS

[Unknown]

The mass is the celebration of the sacrament of Holy Communion as observed particularly in the Roman Catholic and in the Episcopalian churches. In the various branches of the Christian Church and at various periods of its history this sacrament has been known by a variety of names. One of the earliest of these is the Eucharist (Grk. *Εὐχαρισταί*). This is regarded as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *ברכה*, the Jewish “blessing” addressed to God at meals for and over the food and drink, and is applied to the sacrament because in instituting the sacrament the Lord “gave thanks” (Gr. *Εὐχαριστήσας*) before breaking the bread and giving his disciples the bread and the wine. Other names are: the Lord’s Supper (Grk. *Κυριανκόν δεῖπνον*, Lat. *coena Domini*, 1 Cor. 11,20); Communion (Grk. *Κοινωνία*, 1 Cor. 10,16; and Holy Communion from the fellowship with Jesus and with Christian believers of which the observation is both the expression and the means; Mass, (Lat. *missa* or *missio*) a word derived from the “dismissal” with which Christian services of worship concluded, and eventually used of any complete service, eucharistic or otherwise, its restriction to the Eucharist dating from the close of the 4th century. In the Greek and Russian churches the rite is known as The Divine Liturgy, (Grk. *ἡ θεία λειτουργία*) as being preeminently the public service rendered to God by the Christians. In the Syriac-speaking Coptic and Armenian Churches it is designated by words meaning “oblation” or “present” (Syr. *Qurbana*; Copt. *Prosfora*; Arm. *Patarag*; mod. *Badarak*). The Abyssinian Church terms it “the consecration” (Eth. *Qedasse*).

It shall be the purpose of this paper to trace the development of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper from its earliest beginnings in Apostolic times to the time when it reached the form it now has in the Mass of the Roman Catholic Church.

I. The Institution of the Lord’s Supper.

From the account of St. Luke (22,7) “And the Day of Unleavened Bread came, on which the Passover must be sacrificed” it is clear that he wishes us to understand that Jesus was about to celebrate the ordinary Jewish Paschal Supper. The designation of the day is exactly that of the commencement of the Pascha¹ which is the 14th Nisan, and the description that of the slaying of the Paschal Lamb. Luke continues, “And He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the Pascha, that we may eat it..... And they made ready the Pascha. And when the hour was come, He reclined (as usual at the Paschal Supper), and the Apostles with Him: And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Pascha with you.” This fully agrees with the language of the other two Synoptists, St. Matt, 26,17-20, and St. Mark 14,12-17. No ingenuity can explain away these facts. The suggestion, that in that year the Sanhedrin had postponed the Paschal Supper from Thursday evening (the 14th-15th Nisan) to Friday evening (15th-16th, Nisan), so as to avoid the Sabbath following on the first day of the feast—and that the Paschal Lamb was therefore in that year eaten on Friday, the evening of the day on which Jesus was crucified, is an assumption void of all support in history or Jewish tradition. Equally untenable

¹ As this is an exceedingly important point it is well to quote the precise language of the Jerusalem Talmud: “What means: On the Pesach? On the 14th (Nisan).” The Passover began on the 14th Nisan, that is from the appearance of the first three stars on Wednesday evening (the evening of what had been the 13th), and ended with the first three stars on Thursday evening (the evening of what had been the 14th day of Nisan).

is it, that Christ had-held the Paschal supper a day in advance of that observed by the rest of the Jewish world—impossible, since the Paschal Lamb could not have been offered in the Temple, and, therefore, no Paschal supper was held, out of regular time. It was, therefore, with the view of preparing the ordinary Paschal Supper that the Lord sent Peter and John.

The preparations which John and Peter were to make were simplified by the Lord's instructions to follow a servant to a certain house, the owner of which would let them use a large upper room fully furnished. All they needed to do was to take the lamb (which Judas had presumably bought the Previous day) to the temple to have it killed, roast it, and perhaps prepare the first Chagigah, or festive Sacrifice, which, if the Paschal Lamb itself would not suffice for Supper, was added to it. As the room was furnished, they would doubtless find a table, the necessary couches as well as the Wine for the four Cups, the cakes of unleavened Bread, and probably also 'the bitter herbs.' Of the latter five kinds are mentioned, which were to be dipped once in salt water, or vinegar, and another time in a mixture called Charoseth (a compound made of nuts, raisins, apples, almonds, etc.) -- although this Charoseth was not obligatory. The wine was the ordinary one of the country, only red; it was mixed with water, generally in the proportion of one part to two of water.² The quantity for each of the four cups is stated by one authority as five-sixteenths of a log, which may be roughly computed at half a tumbler—of course mixed with water.³ The Paschal Cup is described (according to the rubrical measure, which of course would not always be observed) as two fingers long by two fingers broad, and its height as a finger, half a finger, and one third of a finger.

The period designated as "between the two evenings" in Ex. 12,6 and Num. 9,3.5 **בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם**, when the Paschal Lamb was to be slain was past. The Lord was about to offer the only sacrifice he had ever brought, for at previous Passovers He had attended, He had always been a guest. It was very fitting indeed that on this occasion He was offering the Pascha and partaking of its commemorative Supper, and connecting with it His own Institution of Holy Communion. This joining of the Old with the New, the one symbolic Sacrifice which He offered with the One Real Sacrifice seems to cast light on the words with which he followed the expression of His longing to eat that one Pascha with them: "I say unto you, I will not eat any more thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God." Thus His last Pascha is connected with that other Feast in which He is ever present with His Church, not only as its Food but as its Host, as both the Pascha and He who dispenses it. His ministry had begun with a Sacrament—Baptism. With a second Sacrament He closed His ministry, the Lord's Supper.

As the disciples arranged themselves at the table there arose a dispute among them which should be accounted the greatest, that is who should have the position of honor at the table. Jesus corrected them by giving them a real lesson in humility, washing their feet.

The Paschal Supper began by the Head of the Company taking the first cup, and speaking over it the "thanksgiving." This consisted of a double benediction, the first over the wine, "Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, Who hast created the fruit of the Vine;" the second was a benediction "over the day, which was varied, but usually included the thoughts that they had been "preserved alive, sustained, and brought to this season." The cup, in which wine had been mixed with water before it was blessed, was then passed around the circle of his disciples.

The next part of the ceremonial was for the Head of the Company to rise (alone) and "wash hands." This part of the ritual the Lord deliberately changed into the foot-washing in order to impress the disciples with true humility.

Next the Head of the Company would dip some of the bitter herbs into the salt-water or vinegar, speak a blessing, and partake of them then hand them to each in the company. Then he would break one of the unleavened cakes, of which half was put aside for the supper. This is called the Aphiqomon, or after-dish, and

² The contention that it was unfermented wine is not worth serious discussion, although in modern practice (for reasons needless to mention) its use is allowed.

³ The whole rubric is found in Jer. Pes. 37c. The log = the contents of six eggs. Herzfeld (Handelsgesch. p. 184) makes 1/32 of a log = a dessert spoon. 12 log = 1 hin.

as we believe that the “bread” of the Holy Eucharist was the Aphiqomon, some particulars may be of interest. The dish in which the broken cake lies (not the Aphiqomon), is elevated, and these words are spoken: “This is the bread of misery which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt. All that are hungry, come and eat; all that are needy, come, keep the Pascha.” In the modern ritual the words are added: “This year here, next year in the land of Israel; this year bondsmen, next year free!”

Thereupon the second cup is filled, and the youngest in the company makes formal inquiry as to the meaning of all the observances of that night. The liturgy proceeds to give him answers as regards the festival, its occasion, and its ritual. After this the cup is elevated, the service proceeds somewhat lengthily, the cup is raised a second time, prayers are spoken, and this part of the service concludes with the two first Psalms in the series called “the Hallel” (Ps. 113-118). The cup is raised a third time, and a prayer is spoken. Then the cup is drunk. This ends the first part of the service. It must have been during this part of the service that the heaviness of spirit came upon the Lord and the discussion ensued regarding the identity of the Betrayer.

The Supper itself began with the “sop” which the Lord dipped and handed first to him who occupied the position of honor at His left (Judas). This sop consisted of flesh of the Paschal lamb, a piece of unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, wrapped together and dipped into Charoseth. At this point Judas, assured by the Lord that he was indeed to betray His Master, and being admonished to do speedily what he would do, rushed out into the dark night. The meal continued after Judas’ departure to its end. At the close of the Supper the third Cup was filled. This was called “the Cup of Blessing” (cf. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10,16) because a special blessing was spoken over it.

We can have little doubt that the Institution of the Cup was in connection with this third “Cup of Blessing.” The Breaking of the Bread in the Holy Eucharist must have taken place at this point also, use being made of the Aphiqomon which had been broken and put aside at the beginning of the Supper. As to the words of Institution, they were doubtless spoken in Aramaic, and our Gospels give us only the Greek translation of the Lord’s actual words which were never recorded. The copula “is” (This is my Body, This is my Blood) Was certainly not spoken in Aramaic. The words “Given”, “broken”, “shed” are more correctly rendered “Being given,” “being broken”, “being shed.”

After the Institution of the Sacrament the Jewish ritual continued. The cup was filled the fourth time, and the remaining part of the Hallel repeated. Then followed Psalm 136, several prayers and hymns. Then the concluding Psalms of the Hallel were sung, after which the Master left the upper chamber with His disciples.

II. The Lord’s Supper in Apostolic Times.

Besides the triple record of the institution of the Lord’s Supper in the Synoptic gospels (Matt. 26,26-29; Mark 14,22-25; Luke 22,14-20) the New Testament contains several passages which indicate clearly that the celebration of Holy Communion was firmly established at a very early date as one of the principal rites of the church. Immediately after the Day of Pentecost on which there were added to the church about three thousand souls, we read Acts 2,42: “And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.”

St. Paul also refers to the celebration of Holy Communion as a well-known ceremony among the Corinthian Christians in his first epistle to them (ch.10,15-17): “I speak as to wise men: judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.” The Corinthian Christians evidently celebrated Holy Communion regularly and did so because the Lord had instructed them to do so, and thus to enter into closer communion with their Lord.

But here at Corinth we also hear of the first abuse of the Lord’s Supper. In the Corinthian congregation as in many others at that time the Lord’s Supper was often celebrated in connection with the so-called Love-feasts or Agapes, which themselves were feasts commemorating the last supper of the Lord with his disciples. These festivals were held in the assembly, or church, towards evening, after prayers and worship were over. The faithful ate together, with great simplicity and union, what each had brought; so that rich and poor

were in no way distinguished. After a supper marked by much frugality and modesty they partook of the sacramental signs of the Lord's body and blood, and gave each other the kiss of peace.

This fine means of cultivating mutual affection among the members of the early Christian congregations⁴ seems to have fallen into serious abuse in Corinth. St. Paul complains to them in the 11th chapter of his first epistle to them (verses 17-22):

17 Now in this that I declare unto you I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse.

18 For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it,

19 For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.

20 When ye come together therefore into one place, this⁵ is not to eat the Lord's supper.

21 For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken.

22 What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What Shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.

Hereupon St. Paul proceeds to call their attention to the essentials in Holy Communion by referring, to the Words of institution, which he reminds them, he has received from the Lord and delivered unto them.

For various reasons⁶ the celebration of Holy Communion was separated from the Love-feasts in the earlier half of the second century and attached to the regular Sunday services and to the services on special festivals and holidays (Saints' Days).

From the early association with the Agapes one custom seems to have persisted into later times, namely the custom that the food the bread and wine used in the Lord's supper, was brought by the members of the congregation as a free-will offering. Acceptance of these offerings on the part of the clergy was considered tacit and formal recognition of church membership. The names of those who brought these offerings were often read publicly in the service and included in the prayer. The offerings were called oblationes, προφοραί, and thus the first step was already taken toward the idea which asserted itself more and more strongly in later centuries that the Lord's Supper was a sacrifice in which the body and blood of Christ were offered, as well as partaken of by the communicants.

The bread⁷ was therefore common bread (κοινὸς ἄρτος) or leavened bread. Only the judaizing sects demanded unleavened bread. The wine was mingled with water, as was customary at ordinary meals. This

⁴ Tertullian (Apol. cap. 39) speaks of the Agapes thus: "Nothing low or unseemly is committed in them; nor is it till after having prayed to God that they sit down to table. Food is taken in moderation, as wanted; and no more is drunk than it becomes discreet persons to drink. Each takes such refreshment as is suitable, in connection with the recollection that he is to be engaged, in the course of the night, in adoration to God; and the conversation is conducted as becometh those who know that the Lord heareth them. After water has been brought for the hands, and fresh lights, everyone is invited to sing, and to glorify God, whether by passages from the sacred Scriptures, or of his own composition. This discovers whether proper moderation has been observed at the table. In short, the repast concludes as it began; that is to say, with prayer."

⁵ Grk. 20 Συνερχομένων οὐκ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ το αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεπιπνον φαγεῖν. "It is impossible to eat" "you cannot eat"

⁶ Increasing size of the congregations, calumny on the part of the heathen (who accused the Christians of eating human flesh), abuses, selfishness, pride, lack of love and consideration, voluptuousness, gluttony.

⁷ The Communion Elements; That common, and therefore leavened, bread was used is clear from the fact that it was brought by the members of the congregation. The contrast with the Jewish custom of using unleavened bread in the Passover was deliberate and significant. The mixing of the wine with water is considered symbolical of the union of Christ with the church (ep. 63): Si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis; si vero aqua sit sola, tunc sacramentum spiritale et coeleste perficitur.

departure from the customs of the Jews in the celebration of the Passover, where unleavened bread was required, is not without purpose and significance.

III. The Lord's Supper in the Sub-Apostolic and Patristic Periods ca.100 – 323

Already in this early period of the history of the Christian church the Lord's Supper had become the most important part of the regular service, the doctrine of this sacrament had, however, not as yet been fully developed. At this time the church seemed to be satisfied with knowing that in the Lord's Supper there was a divine mystery, and that in a mysterious manner the believer received in the sacrament an essential food for his soul. The church fathers of this period agree in general on this point that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ enters in a supernatural manner into a mystic union with the elements of bread and wine, and that by partaking of these the believer enters into an intimate communion with Christ. This view is apparent from the liturgical form of the sacrament in this period, which we shall examine a little farther on in this paper.

In *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*⁸, the earliest document in which the term "Eucharist" is used in its technical sense referring to the Lord's Supper, there are forms of thanksgiving over bread and wine, the later being placed first, and a eucharistic prayer which is to be said "after being filled". The blessings over bread and wine are reminiscent of the corresponding Jewish blessings. Thanksgiving is offered to God over the cup "for the holy vine of David Thy servant," and over the bread "for the life and knowledge" which with the holy vine are made known "through Jesus thy servant." The vine is suggestive of Psalm 80,8-19, and signifies the true, the spiritual Israel, the church, for the "gathering together" of which "into Thy Kingdom" prayer is made after the thanksgiving over the bread. The Eucharist of the Didache is still associated with the common meal, as the words "after being filled" indicate. The uppermost thought in the prayers is that of the community, blessed by God through Jesus, and of its unity. The one eucharistic loaf is taken as symbolical of that unity (cf. 1. Cor. 10,17), and participation is restricted to authentic members of the community, the baptized. The Lord's Day is to be the occasion of the eucharistic celebration, It is note-worthy that in none of its forms of prayer is there any reference to the body and blood of Jesus or to His crucifixion.

In the central Graeco-Roman Church, the Eucharist had become an established "rite" by the middle of the 2nd century. It was not yet a "liturgy", but had a fixed order, the matter of its prayers was settled, and its celebrant was duly authorized. In his *Epistle to the Corinthians* Clement of Rome (c. 96 A.D.) had stated that Christ had fixed the worship to be performed, and the persons who should perform it. Likewise Ignatius of Antioch in his *Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna* (c. 108 A.D.) insists that the Eucharist, to be genuine (βεβαία) must "be celebrated by the bishop or by one whom he appoints" (Smyrn 8,1). This is in the interest of unity, which is stressed no less by Ignatius than by the *Didache*. The normal celebrant of the eucharistic service, the bishop, is the local focus of Christian unity, as the Eucharist itself is at once the symbol, the safeguard, and the means of that unity, as being (Philadel: 4,1) "one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union with His blood."

That the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper was commonly believed by the Christians in the 2nd and 3rd centuries is apparent already from the libelous defamations of the Christians during the Roman persecutions, accusing them of butchering children and eating human flesh.⁹ Only the partaking of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper could possibly provoke calumny of this type.'

⁸ The Didache, Ἡ διδαχὴ τῶν δωδεκά ἀποστόλων, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, is an ancient Christian document (? 100 A.D.) written in Greek, dealing with the organization, belief, and worship in the early church. It was found in 1873 by Bryennios, in an 11th century manuscript in the Monastery of the Holy Sepulchre in Istanbul, and published by him ten years later. It contains a description of the Two Ways, one of life, the other of death, in the form of rules for Christian conduct, used in catechetical instruction to prepare converts for baptism. The second portion sets forth the rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and defines the office and duties of the Christian Leaders.

⁹ Minucius Felix (200 A.D.), a Christian writer, reports that a heathen named Octavius enumerated among the crimes of which the Christians were commonly accused the following: 'Jam de initiandis tirunculis fabula tam detestanda quam nota est. Infans farre coniectus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur ei, qui sacris imbuitur. Is infans a tirunculo, farris superficie quasi ad innoxios ictus

This view of the presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament is also presupposed by everything we know about the liturgy of the Lord's Supper during the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The writings of the early church fathers, e.g. Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus. Thus Ignatius¹⁰ in his Epistle to the Ephesians (c. 20) writes of the Lord's Supper: "...breaking one bread, which is a medicine of immortality; a remedy for not dying, but rather for living in Jesus Christ forever;" and in his Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna he warns against the Docetae¹¹ "who abstain from the Eucharist and prayers because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh (body) of our Savior Jesus Christ."

Justin Martyr¹² is somewhat more explicit in his I. Apology c. 66: "For we receive it (the Eucharist) not as common bread or common drink, but even as Jesus Christ our Savior made flesh by the word of 'God possessed both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that the food blessed by the word of Him through prayer by which our blood and flesh are nourished according to the change (or transformation) is the flesh and blood of that same incarnate Jesus. The word rendered "change" or "transformation" in this quotation is μεταβολή which later became the terminus technicus for transubstantiation, but is here merely employed to designate the assimilation of the food by the body of him who partakes of it.

Irenaeus¹³ expresses himself even more clearly on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in his treatise *Against Heresies* (4,18. 5) "In what manner the bread, which is of the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist are no longer corruptible having the hope of resurrection."

Tertullian¹⁴ also speaks in his treatise *On Resurrection* of eating the Lord's body and blood in the sacrament in the words: "He eats the precious body and blood of Christ, in order that his soul may also be nourished by God."

Notice must here be taken of another important eucharistic conception and terminology, the symbolical, which is most clearly found in the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine, though it is not restricted to Africa and the West. The bread and wine are said to be figures, symbols, likenesses, or antitypes (figurae, imagines, σύμβολα, ὁμοιωματα, ἀντίτυπα) of the body and blood. They "represent" (repraesentant) them, i.e., make them present. The symbol is not the sign of an absent reality, but is in such a way associated with its reality that it is in some sense what it symbolizes and possesses the effect of the reality. A similar idea is applied to the liturgical action. This is a copy or analogue both of the supper and of the passion in such a way "that as often as the memorial of the victim pleasing to Thee is celebrated, so often is the work of our redemption set in operation" (Leonian Secret in Muratori, *Liturgia romana vetus*, i. 303-304). Clemens of Alexandria¹⁵ and Origen¹⁶ declare the real purpose of the Lord's Supper to be the nourishment of the soul with the divine word (ἀληθινὴ βρωσις τοῦ λόγου) and distinguish clearly and definitely between the earthly bread and the bread of life

provocato, caecis occultisque vulneribus occiditur; hujus (proh nefas!) sitienter sanguinem lambunt, hujus certatim membra, hac foederantur hostia."

¹⁰ Ignatius of Antioch, ep. ad Ephes. c. 20: ...ἓνα ἄρτον κλῶητες, ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας ἀντιδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰ. Χρ. διὰ παντός. ep. ad Smyrn. c. 7: εὐχαριστίας καὶ προζευχῆς ἀπέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χρ.

¹¹ Docetae – An early heretical sect, which held that Christ's body was merely a phantom or appearance, or if real its substance was celestial and not human or material. How do you deal with international websites or international educational programs?

¹² Justin Martyr (c.100-165) one of the earliest apologists of the Christian church. He wrote two Apologies for the Christians, one addressed to Antoninus Pius, the other to the Roman senate.

¹³ Irenaeus (c. 120-200) adv. Haer. 4,18. 5: Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, iam non communis panis est., sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et coelesti; sic et corpora nostra, percipientia eucharistiam, iam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia.

¹⁴ Tertullian (c. 160-220) de resurr. c. 8: Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur.

¹⁵ Titus Flavius Clemens of Alexandria (c. 150 – c. 215)

¹⁶ Origenes Adamantius of Alexandria (c. 185-253) a voluminous writer and biblical scholar.

which it symbolizes. Through the giving of thanks (*εὐχαριστία*) the divine power is transferred to the earthly elements and brings to the worthy partaker life and salvation, to the unworthy, death and damnation.

Besides this symbolic theory and the simpler realism of Justin and Irenaeus a third development is to be noted in this period, which in later centuries became the dominant one. It is the gradual development of the sacrificial theory of the Eucharist. In the ancient world the concepts of sacrifice and worship were so closely associated with each other that in spite of the clarity of the New Testament and of the Epistle of the Hebrews in particular, in which the one great sacrifice on Calvary is emphasized as making entirely unnecessary any further sacrifices for the atonement of sins, yet the concept of a sacrifice though at first merely in figurative and allegorical expressions, gradually crept into the Christian worship. After the concept of the priesthood had become firmly rooted in the church the related concept of a sacrifice followed naturally. It was especially the Lord's Supper that offered opportunities for such a development. First of all there was the prayer, which played so important a part in the celebration of the Eucharist that it derived its name therefrom. This prayer gradually began to be looked upon as a spiritual sacrifice. Then there were the gifts that were brought for a celebration of the Lord's Supper, the bread and the wine, which were called *oblaciones* or *προσφοραί*, expressions borrowed from the language of sacrificial worship. These oblations were often compared with the firstfruits and tithes of the Old Testament.¹⁷ And as the congregation brought its gifts for the Lord's Supper, so the priest brought them again in the celebration of the Eucharist, for which the expressions *προσφέρειν* and *ἀναφέρειν* were used. Then a further step was taken, and the prayer as well as the Eucharist were designated as a *θύσια* or *sacrificium*. Of course, at first this was done only in a figurative way. For example we find Justin Martyr¹⁸ speaking of it thus: "The prayers and the thanksgivings (Eucharist) made by those who are worthy are alone effective and God pleasing sacrifices." From this figurative sacrificial concept the idea grew in later centuries that the Lord's Supper is an actual bloodless sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. This thought does not appear to have entered into the minds of the early church fathers. Yet the tendency to transfer the figurative concept to that of an actual sacrifice is evident from the words of Cyprian¹⁹: "If we are not permitted to relax the least of the commandments of the Lord, how much less is it permitted to weaken that which pertains to the sacrament of the passion of our Lord and to our salvation, or by human tradition to change it into something other than that as which God instituted it;" For, if Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, himself is the high priest of God the Father, and offered himself as a sacrifice to His Father, and commanded that this be done in remembrance of him, then certainly, the priest who imitates that which Christ himself has done and brings a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father in the congregation is discharging the office of Christ."

The privilege to partake of Holy Communion was limited to baptized Christians, who were actual members of the congregation in good standing. Catechumens, penitents and those mentally afflicted (*ἐνεργουμένοι*) were excluded. Justin Martyr in his first Apology, ch. 66 says: "This food is called Eucharist among us. To partake of it is permitted only to him who believes that our teaching is true and who has been washed clean in the washing of regeneration and forgiveness of sins, and who lives as Christ has taught us." In the African Church and in the East even children, naturally only baptized children, were admitted to the Lord's Supper because of John 6,53: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

From simple beginnings there evolved in the 3rd century a well-articulated Communion Liturgy which formed the basis for all subsequent ones. At the time of Justin Martyr it was still rather simple. After a general prayer which concluded the regular service followed the brotherly or holy kiss (*φίλημα ἁγίων, εἰρήνη osculum pacis*); then the elements, bread and wine (mixed with water) were brought to the bishop, who consecrated them

¹⁷ Irenaeus 4,18: Oportet nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus gratos inveniri fabricatori Deo, primitias eorum, quae sunt ejus creaturarum offerentes. Et hanc oblationem ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura eius.

¹⁸ Just. M. dial. c. Tryph.: εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαρισταὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων γινόμεναι τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐαρεστοὶ εἰσι τῷ θυσίαι.

¹⁹ Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus, great leader of the early African Church (c. 200-258).

with the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία). The congregation responded with “Amen.” Then the presbyters and deacons brought the consecrated elements to all present.

The Apostolic Constitutions²⁰ describe the Communion Liturgy as it was in the third century thus: After the dismissal of the catechumen, penitents, and unbelievers at the end of the *missa catechumenorum* the *missa fidelium* began with a silent prayer by those who remained. Then followed the general prayer by the deacon containing special intercessions for the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons, the lectors, maidens, married couples, ascetics, the “offerentes”, neophytes, the sick, those on a journey, captives, exiles, those suffering persecution, enemies and non-Christians, Christian children, and finally for every Christian soul. The congregation interrupted this prayer after each paragraph with Κύριε ἐλέησον. After another collect by the bishop the deacons went out into the congregation to gather the bread and wine brought for the celebration, and these were now set aside for that specific use. Then followed:

Deacon: Προς σχῶμεν
Bishop: Ἡ εἰρήνη θεοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.
Congregation: Καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου.
Deacon: Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ

The clergy kissed the bishop, the men the men, and women the women. The sub-deacon brought water; the bishop, the presbyters and deacons washed their hands. Another warning was sounded that no unbelievers, catechumens or penitents may be present, and that none should partake unworthily of the sacrament. The oblations were then placed upon the altar. The bishop clad in a special vestment surrounded by the higher clergy approached the altar, made the sign of the cross (τὸ τρίπτυχον σου σταυροῦ τῆ χειρὶ ποιησάμενος) and spoke the blessing from 2. Cor.13,14 “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.”

Congregation: Καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου
Bishop: Ἄνω τὸν νοῦν ὀν τὰς καρδίας (Sursum corda!)
Congregation: Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸς Κύριον (Habemus ad Dominum!)

Here began the εὐχαριστία or the prayer of consecration.

Bishop: Ἐυχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ (Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro!).
Congregation: Καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου (Dignum et iustum est!).
Bishop: It is truly meet, right, and salutary that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, etc.
Congr. & clergy: “Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Sabbath.” Now the bishop elevated and consecrated the gifts set aside (ἀγιασμός) by reciting the words of institution (cf. Ambrose de sacr. 4,4: Sermo Christi conficit hoc sacramentum), and elevated the consecrated elements showing them to the congregation as body and blood of Christ. Before the distribution another general prayer was spoken by the bishop

²⁰ The *Apostolic Constitutions* ascribed by tradition to Clemens Romanus, are notes of ecclesiastical customs held to be apostolical written in the form of apostolic precepts. The *Constitutiones Apostolicae*, consisting of eight books, contain a comprehensive rule for the whole Christian life. The first six books were written about the end of the 3rd century; while the seventh and eighth are ascribed to the 4th century.

	with special intercessions for all walks of life and all members of the church, as well as for the dead as for the living, often with the mention of their names.
Congregation:	Amen!
Bishop:	Ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παντων ὑμῶν
Congregation.:	Καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνευματός σου
Bishop:	Our Father, who art in heaven, etc.
Deacon:	Προς σχῶμεν
Bishop:	Ἄγια ἄγιοις
Congregation:	Εἷς ἄγος, εἷς Κύριος, εἷς Ἰησ. Χρ., εἷς δοξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς, εὐλογητὸς εἰς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

Then followed the great doxology and thereupon during constant singing of psalms by the congregation the distribution. First the clergy partook of the sacrament in the order of their hierarchical rank, then the ascetics, deaconesses, maiden, children, men, and women in order. The bishop broke the bread and gave it to the communicants with the words: *Σῶμα Χριστοῦ*. Then the deacon offered them the cup with the words: *Αἶμα Χριστοῦ ποτήριον ζωῆς*. The communicant replied to both with: *Ἀμήν*. At the close followed hymns and prayers of thanksgiving. The deacon asked the congregation to receive the blessing kneeling, which the bishop spoke, whereupon the deacon dismissed the congregation with the words: *Ἀπολυεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ*. The Christians of this period forbade the attendance at and the participation in the celebration of the Lord's Supper to all who were not baptized, because this would have disturbed them in their joy and thus the *missa fidelium* was a mystery to others. Yet they had no interest in concealing their activities at this second half of their services, but wrote freely about them in writings which were intended for the eyes of heathen readers, as did for instance, Justin Martyr.

After the close of the service the deacons brought the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper to the sick and captives in the congregation in order that they too might have an opportunity to share the communion with those who were able to attend the service. They received both elements as did those at the service proper. This custom of house communion or post-communion is known to have been observed especially in northern Africa, but in the 4th century was also common in Egypt, Spain, and Italy. In some places a part of the consecrated bread was taken home by members of the congregation to be eaten at the morning devotion on the following day. Thus Tertullian in *de orat.* c. 19 speaks of a Christian matron "Accepto corpore Domini et reservato arca sua." Cyprian too speak of (*de laps.*) such an "arca, in qua Domini sanctum fuit." Here only the bread could be used, and this is the only example of a "communio sub una" in the entire ancient church. Only the Manichaeans partook of the sacrament without wine. The Enkratites and Ebionites used water.

The absence of a confessional service or of a confession at all is noteworthy. This seems to have been deemed unnecessary because of the strict discipline which was constantly maintained in the early church

IV. The Lord's Supper in the Period of the Establishment of the Christian Church as State Church (323-692)

In this period as in the preceding period the three theories of the Eucharist, the symbolical or spiritual, the realistic, and the sacrificial continued to be taught by the church fathers. No one of these theories was universally adopted to the exclusion of the others, but it is possible to see how the symbolical or spiritual theory was losing ground over against the increasing popularity and universality of the other two, which in the period after this one were elevated to the position of dogma and officially adopted by the Church of Rome. From the fourth to the seventh centuries these theories were in a state of flux. No doctrine of the Lord's Supper was formulated. The thought of the various church fathers on the subject had not yet crystallized into a dogma. This

is the more surprising because this period of the church's history abounds in dogmatic controversies on many theological and Christological subjects, some of which, esp. the Monophysite controversy touched the Lord's Supper very closely. Throughout this period divergent opinions on the important doctrine of the Eucharist existed peaceably side by side, and the question never became the subject of controversy in the church. The chief reason for this situation is no doubt the vagueness and lack of clarity in the expressions of the church fathers on this important subject, because of which none could take offense at the expressions of the others. As a result the various parties to the subsequent disputes on the Lord's Supper were often able to support both sides of the dispute with utterances of the church fathers, yes even with utterances of the same church father:

All the church fathers of this period seem to be aware of the fact that in Holy Communion there is a sacred mystery which they often designate as "dreadful" or "fearful" (*φικτόν*, *tremendum*), and all of them indicate a strong conviction that the Bread and Wine of the sacrament stand in a definite and effectual relationship to the Body and Blood of Christ in some supernatural manner. This relationship is variously regarded as spiritual, according to which glorified Body of the Lord has a dynamic influence upon the visible elements which represent it; and as realistic, according to which the Body and Blood of the Lord is thought to be imparted in a full and actual manner to the Bread and Wine. This latter attitude (which gained acceptance by a majority of the members of the church during this period) calls the miraculous act of divine omnipotence in the sacrament, *μεταβολή*, *transfiguratio*. This term is not intended to suggest that the Bread and Wine are changed or transformed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, but merely that a change took place as regards the contents of the substance of the elements: Before consecration the elements were merely bread and wine, by virtue of the consecration bread and wine are permeated very intimately with the Body and Blood of Christ. The bread does not cease to be bread, but the substance of the Body of Christ has been united very intimately with it; and "a potiori fit denominatio"—hence it is now called Body and Blood. Indeed the church fathers of the fourth century employ expressions, illustrations and comparisons (e.g. the changing of water into wine at the marriage at Cana, or the assimilation of food by the human body), which appear to designate an actual transmutation. This, however, is not their true intent, for they employ the same terminology *μεταβάλλεσθαι*, *μεταστοιχειῦσθαι* etc. in speaking of baptism and the Chrism, which was considered a sacrament by the Eastern church at this time already. Certainly they did not mean to say that the water used in baptism or the anointing oil were changed into the substance of the Holy Spirit. Besides they speak of bread and wine as being actually present still in the sacrament. All they meant to convey by the use of these terms is to make it very clear that in the consecration of the bread and wine a marvelous mystery was involved.

The Christological controversies of the fifth century tended to bring about a sharper and unequivocal conception of the *μεταβολή*. Even before this some had seen in union of the celestial with the terrestrial in Holy Communion a corresponding illustration of the union of the "Logos" with the human nature of Christ. In the fifth century the relationships between the earthly and heavenly elements in Holy Communion was explained in the same manner as the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ. Thus the victory of the Dyophysites over the Monophysites was also in effect a victory of the doctrine of consubstantiation over that of transubstantiation. However, the doctrine of Holy Communion had never become the subject of synodical action or ecclesiastical decrees. After the council of Chalcedon²¹ there was an unmistakable trend toward the more literal conception of *μεταβολή* occasioned by the growing preference for the immediateness of the miraculous. The result of this was that the connection of the imparting of spiritual and heavenly food through the agency of the earthly bread and wine began to be cowed into the background again. The common people had long since gained the impression from the term *μεταβολή* of an actual transmutation, and thus at the end of the period under consideration, the idea of a transubstantiation is doubtless the dominant one in the church.

²¹ The Council of Chalcedon, the fourth ecumenical council, was assembled (451 A.D.) by the Emperor Marcian for the purpose of drawing up a form of doctrine in regard to the nature of Christ, designed to avoid the errors of the Nestorians and Monophysites.

In a period such as this, characterized by lack of clarity and the simultaneously tolerated variety of opinions concerning Holy Communion, it is difficult to group the church fathers on one or the other of the conceptions of Holy Communion then current. In general we may say that the spiritual conception was predominant to the Eastern church, esp. among the followers of Origen. Thus Eusebius of Caesarea²² shares the spiritual attitude of his master Origen. Bread and Wine are the symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, but *σύμβολα ἀληθείας μετέχοντα* (Demonstr. evang. 1, 10). The true food of the soul is the Words of Christ, which are full of Spirit and Life, and these He Himself calls (John 6) His flesh and blood (theol, Ecclesiast. 3, 12). Athanasius²³ teaches with reference to (John 6) that the eating of the flesh and blood of Christ is not to be understood literally. Christ imparts himself in Holy Communion to the believer in a spiritual manner (*πνευματικῶς ἀναδίδοται*) and gives him *φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς* (Ep. 4 ad Serapionem). Gregory of Nazianzus²⁴ calls Holy Communion *τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀτίτυπον* (orat. 1, p. 38), bread and wine he calls the *τύπους τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας* (orat. 17, p. 273). It is a sacred act *δι' ἡμεῖς Χριστῶ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς θεότητος* (or, 3, p. 70), which elevates us to heaven *ἄνω φέρουσα μυσταγωγία* (or. 17, p. 273). The words of consecration draw the divine Word (Logos) down from heaven, and He then imparts himself to the bread and makes it a substitute for his earthly body (ep, 240 ad Amphiloich.)

Most remarkable is that we find St. Augustine²⁵ (the only one of the church fathers of the West to take this position) among those embracing the spiritual view. Doubtless this is a consequence of his doctrine of predestination, which forced him to the assumption that only the believer, i.e. the elect, receives this heavenly food, that faith is the organ wherewith it is received, and that therefore it is a spiritual food. Bread and Wine are the “*figurae corporis et sanguinis Christi*” (ad. Ps. 3), “—non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere: Hoc est corpus meum, -- cum signum daret corporis sui” (c. Adimantum Manich. c. 12), “*Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quandam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei (baptism) fides est* (ep, 98, 9). But St. Augustine’s own definition of a sacrament²⁶ shows that he saw in the Lord’s Supper not merely a sign but the actual mediation of that which it signifies. His doctrine of the worthy and unworthy partaking of Holy Communion proves this: “*Qui non manet in Christo ...procul dubio nec manducat carnem eius, nec bibit eius sanguinem, etiamsi tantae rei sacramentum ad iudicium sibi manducet et bibat.* (in Johann. tract. 26, 18). He also expresses himself very definitely against the assumption of the ubiquity of the glorified Body of Christ, which must have been emphasized at that time already in support of the realistic conception of the sacrament.

The doctrine of Irenaeus (cf. p. 8) concerning the Lord’s Supper is still the dominant one in the fourth and fifth century. Cyril of Jerusalem²⁷ teaches it: “In the form of bread the Body is given to you, and in the

²² Eusebius of Caesarea (260?-340?) was the father of church history, and has the reputation of being the most learned of the church fathers after Origen. His “*Demonstratio evangelica*” in 20 books is a work intended to convince the Jews of the truth of Christianity from the evidence of their own Scriptures.

²³ Athanasius (c. 293-373), the father of Greek orthodoxy, was bishop of Alexandria from 326-373, and the most eminent theologian of the fourth century.

²⁴ Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 330-389). His surviving works consist of about 45 sermons, 243 letters, and 407 poems (dogmatic and moral poems).

²⁵ St. Aurelius Augustineus (354-430), the greatest of the fathers of the church was bishop of Hippo in North Africa.

²⁶ *Dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem: quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem* (Sermo 272); -- *Sacramenta signacula quidem rerum divinarum sunt visibilia, sed res ipsae invisibiles in eis honorandae* (de catech. rudibus c. 50).

²⁷ Cyril (c. 315-386) was bishop of Jerusalem since 351. His writings are extremely valuable for the history of theology and ritual. They consist of 23 treatises, 18 of which are addressed to catechumens and 5 to the newly baptized. The former are for the most part doctrinal and present to us in a more complete and systematic manner than the writings of any other father the creed of the church; the latter are ritual and give us a minute account of baptism, chrism, and the Lord’s Supper. Their style is simple and unattractive.

form of wine the Blood is given to you, so that partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ you may become members of the same body and of the same blood as He. Thus we become bearers of Christ who imparts (some) of His body and of His blood to our members.” “He converted water into wine which is similar to blood at Cana of Galilee, and should it be unbelievable that He convert wine into blood?” seems to favor the doctrine of transubstantiation, yet he uses the same word *μεταβάλλειν* (cat. 21, 3) of the consecration of the anointing oil. Gregory of Nyssa²⁸ although one of the most faithful followers of Origen otherwise deviates sharply from the spiritual concept of Communion of his master, and gives the realistic conception a speculative foundation which had never before been attempted. He points out (or. Cat. c. 37) that it is the resurrected and glorified Body of the Lord, that is received in Holy Communion, and that it completely permeates our body as leaven affects the entire lump of dough, and gives it immortality. Then he raises the question, how it is possible that the Body of Christ divided among so many believers all over the earth and throughout all times can be and remain whole in every partaker of it. The answer is: As the food and drink which Jesus consumed during his earthly life became the substance of His body by the process of assimilation and thus was elevated to divine dignity, so bread and wine are changed into Body and Blood of Christ even today, but no longer by the slow process of assimilation, but by the consecration through a sudden act of the omnipotence of God. Every celebration of Holy Communion is therefore actually a continuation of the incarnation of the Logos. This seems indeed to lead to the doctrine of transubstantiation, yet Gregory does not appear to have followed the theory to its logical conclusion, for in a sermon on baptism (Opp. III, 370) he too makes a comparison between this process and the consecration of the water in baptism and of the anointing oil in chris. St. Chrysostom²⁹ expresses himself very definitely for the realistic conception of the Eucharist (hom. 45 ad Joh. 6,54): Christ did not only offer himself to be seen by those who desired him, but also to be touched and to be eaten, and that we might sink our teeth into his flesh, and become intimately united with him, and to fulfil our every desire. Hilarius of Pictavium³⁰ teaches likewise: “...Verbum carno factum est, et vere nos Verbum carnem cibo Dominico sumimus.” St. Ambrose³¹ says (de initiandis c. 8): “Sacramentum istud quod accipis Christi sermone conficitur...Non valebit Christi sermo ut species mutet elementorum? (Ps., 33, 9) Sed quid argumentis utimur? Suis utamur exemplis incarnationisque sacramento adstruamus mysterii veritatem.... Liqueat igitur quod praeter naturae ordinem Virgo generavit, et hoc quod conficimus corpus ex Virgine est.... Ante benedictionem verborum coelestium species nominator, post consecrationem corpus Christi significatur... sanguis nuncupatur.”

Theodoret,³² proceeding from the analogy of the union of the two natures in the person of Christ, expresses himself sharply against the doctrine of transubstantiation (Eranistes dial. 2, ed. Hal. IV. 126): “For after consecration the mystic elements do not lose their proper nature. It remains its former self, and it retains its form and its appearance, and is visible and tangible, just as it was before. But it is known what it has become, and it is believed, and it is worshipped as being that which it has become.” This a clear expression of consubstantiation. In a letter from the same period, falsely ascribed to Chrysostom, addressed to Caesarius we read: “Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus, divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit.” Pope Gelasius I³³ also speaks clearly on the subject: “Certe sacramenta, quae sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est: propter quod et per eadem divinae

²⁸ Gregory of Nyssa in Cappadocia, became bishop in 371 or 372.

²⁹ Chrysostom (St. John Chrysostom, c. 345-407) the greatest orator of the ancient church. His works include Homilies, Commentaries, Epistles, Treatises, and Liturgies.

³⁰ St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers (died 367). Above quotation is from de trinitate 8, 13.

³¹ St. Ambrose (c. 340-397) was elected Bishop of Milan in 374. His writings in which he followed in many things the Greek theological writers are generally ascetic in tone.

³² Theodoret (c. 390-455) a church historian became Bishop of Cyrus in Syria in 423. His chief work is an Ecclesiastical History, a continuation of the work of Eusebius bringing it down to 428.

³³ Gelasius I, Pope of Rome from 492-496 was one of the earliest popes to assert the supremacy of the papal chair, not only over temporal authority, but also over general councils of the church.

efficimur consortes naturae, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini...Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum (in regard to the union of the two natures in Christ), quod in a eius imagine (Communion) profitemur.”

When Caesarius of Arles³⁴ (hom. 7) says: “Quid mirum est, si ea quae verbo potuit creare, possit verbo creata convertere?” we must count him among the representatives of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Into the same group belongs Pope Gregory I, the Great³⁵ because of his remark: “Bonus pastor pro ovibus suis animam suam posuit, ut in sacramento nostro corpus suum et sanguinem verteret, et oves quas redemerat carnis suae alimento satiaret (in evangg, L. I, hom. 14, 1).

At an early date the idea of a sacrifice had crept into the celebration of Holy Communion. At first this referred only to the external elements that were brought as thank offerings and offerings of love by members of the congregation. Soon, however, another step was taken, and the Body of the Lord represented by the consecrated bread was designated as a sacrifice. In the fourth century this expression had become common, although the word offering was still used of the bread and wine as before. When used of the Body of the Lord, the word offering was understood to mean a vivid representation or visualization of the sacrifice of Christ, who has offered himself up once for all.

St. Augustine still refers the term offerings to the elements that were brought: “In ea re, quam offert ecclesia, ipsa offertur.” (de civ. Dei 10, 6) Cyril of Jerusalem applies the term to the Body of Christ, but merely in the sense of a reminder of his sacrifice, not in the sense of a repetition of it. He Calls Holy Communion *πνευματικὴ θυσία* and *ἀναίμακτος λατρεία*. St. Chrysostom also says: “We sacrifice daily, but by calling to remembrance His death, moreover by calling to remembrance His sacrifice.”

St. Augustine also writes (c. Faust. 20, 18): “Christiani peracti sacrificii memoriam celebrant sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis. (C. 21) Huius sacrificii carno et sanguis ante adventum Christi per uictimas similitudinem promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adscensum Christi per sacramentum memoriae celebratur.”

Gradually the sacramental memorial celebration of the sacrifice of Christ developed into the unbloody but actual repetition of His sacrifice. This forward step in the sacrificial idea in the mass is connected with the old custom of including in the Communion service an intercession for the living and the dead and of observing the memory of the departed by bringing oblations and Partaking of Holy Communion on the anniversary of their death, in order to express, the communion in the Lord which extends beyond the grave. This was in itself a beautiful and fruitful idea to combine these special intercessions which emphasized Christian fellowship with the celebration of the sacrament which emphasizes the fellowship of Christ with his church. The thought behind this custom seems to have been that intercessions of a Christian derive their efficacy from the atoning sacrifice of Christ, the visual symbol of which was present in the Lord’s Supper. These intercessions seemed to be more effective if the vicarious atonement and sacrifice of Christ was actually repeated in the celebration of Holy Communion. Several other factors contributed to this practice. The idea of the priesthood was becoming more and more general, and this necessarily brought with it a corresponding emphasis on the idea of a sacrifice in the mass. The doctrine of transubstantiation which was regarded as a repeated incarnation of Christ led naturally to the idea of a repeated sacrifice of Christ. The tendency to imagine the deity in visual form in the sacrament and to regard it as having magical power gave further impetus to the idea of a repeated unbloody sacrifice. These doctrinal tendencies affected the liturgies, and the changes in the liturgies gave the doctrines greater support, eventually the idea of a sacrifice in the mass received universal recognition by its general acceptance as a doctrine of the church, especially in connection with the development of the doctrine of purgatory. This remained a thought foreign to the Eastern church at first. St. Augustine propounded the doctrine hesitantly and without connecting it in any way with Holy Communion. He regarded the “ignis purgatorius” as a continuation

³⁴ Caesarius of Arles (?-543) was appointed Bishop of Arles in 502. He defended the Augustinian doctrines against the Semipelagians.

³⁵ Gregory I, the Great, was Pope of Rome 590-604. To his administrative skill is due the organization of the medieval papacy.

after death of the “ignis tribulationis”. Caesarius of Arles was the next to teach the doctrine of purgatory, and Gregory the Great elevated it to the position of a solid dogma of the Roman Catholic Church.

The customary “oblationes pro defunctis” now became Masses for the read, the purpose of which was not to receive the Body and Blood of the Lord on the part of the living, and thus to signify their Christian fellowship with the departed, but purely the repetition of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ for the salvation of the soul of the departed, i.e. to diminish the intensity and duration of the torture which they endured in purgatory to atone for the unforgiven sins they had committed in life. Inasmuch as suffering, accidents, and other hardships of life were looked upon as punishment for sins, the atoning power of the mass was in a similar way applied to these during the lifetime of the Christian. For such purposes, it sufficed that the priest partook of the sacrament, and there originated the, so-called “missae solitariae.”

A brief digression may be pardoned here on the origin of the doctrine of purgatory. The Scripture passages which were first used to support this doctrine are Matt. 12, 32 (it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come), and 1. Cor. 3, 11-15 (Every man’s work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is.... If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.) The reference to baptism for the dead in 1. Cor. 15, 29 is adduced as further support for the doctrine, as is Luke 12, 59 (I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.) The *sedes doctrinae* seems to be 2 Macc. 12, 43-46: “Darnach hiess er (Judas) sie eine Steuer zusammen legen, zwei tausend Drachmen Silbers; die schickte er gen Jerusalem zum Sündopfer. Und tat wohl und fein daran, dass er von der Auferstehung der Toten eine Erinnerung tat. Denn wo er nicht gehofft hätte, dass die so erschlagen waren, würden auferstehen; wäre es vergeblich and eine Torheit gewesen, für die Toten zu bitten. Weil er aber bedachte, dass die so um rechten Glauben sterben, Freude und Seligkeit zu hoffen haben; ist es eine gute und heilige Meinung gewesen. Darum hat er auch für diese Toten gebeten, dass ihnen die Sünde vergeben würde.”

Patristic basis for this doctrine is equally weak. Passages cited from the writings of the old church fathers in support of it refer only to the salutariness and necessity of intercessions for the dead. Such expressions are found in the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Athanasius, Cyril, Jerome, Epiphanius, Chrysostom. Indeed Clemens of Alexandria and Origen speak of a *πῦρ καθάρσιου, καθαρτικόν* but this is synonymous with the *ἐκπύρωσις τοῦ κόσμου* the fire which will consume the world at its end (2. Pet. 3) The view of a place of punishment between death and resurrection, in which certain sins of the believers are purged is foreign to the entire ancient church until Augustine, and to the Greek church even after his time.

Already in the previous period the celebration of Holy Communion had been separated from the Agapes. Integrated with public worship it was regarded as the culmination of the service. According to the pattern cited above from the Apostolic Constitutions, there developed in this period a wealth of beautiful Communion Liturgies. Catechumens, penitents, and unbelievers were excluded from the Communion Service. The sharp distinction between the “missa catechumenorum” and the “missa fidelium” gradually disappeared with the universal introduction of infant baptism and the greater rarity of heathen proselytes in countries where the Christian church was well established. There was no Confessional Service preceding the Communion Service. This was unnecessary because of the contents of the sermons and the warnings included in the liturgy. In the Eastern and North African church the Communion of children was customary, but in the Western church it never did become general and was later forbidden on the basis of 1. Co. 11, 28-29. Daily celebration of Holy Communion was still customary in a few of the churches of North Africa. As a rule it was restricted to Sunday Services and Church Festivals. Not all baptized members partook of Communion each time. These who did not partake of it left the service at the beginning of the Communion Service, and many of the communicants themselves left before the close of the service. It was left to the desire of the individual, how often he wished to commune. Once a year was considered sufficient in the Greek church already in the fourth century. Such indolence also invaded the Western church later on. In the fifth century the churches of the West required members to commune weekly. Later on they threatened those who did not commune at least on the three high festivals with excommunication.

The abuse of giving Communion to the departed had to be decried by the councils repeatedly. House Communions for the sick and the captives with both elements persisted throughout the fourth and fifth centuries. Travelers often took consecrated bread along on their journey, regarding it as an amulet to ward off danger. Otherwise the removal of the wine from Holy Communion was regarded as a Manichaean heresy, and only in North Africa was *communio sub una* permitted in communing children because of a disturbing experience with a little girl, whom the wine had induced to vomit. In the Greek church individual crises occurred at an early date in which the bread dipped in wine was given instead of giving each element separately. In the Western church this was frowned upon, but in the Greek church eventually became the dominant custom, both elements being handed to the communicant on a spoon.

The old custom of sending the consecrated elements to distant congregations or bishops at Easter time as a symbol of fellowship was forbidden by the Council of Laodicea in 372. At Communion Services the remaining bread was divided among the clergy after the service. (The bishop received four, the presbyter three, the deacon two, and the *Ordines minores* only one part!) Later on care was taken to consecrate only sufficient bread for those who wished to commune. The elements were still brought by members of the congregation as oblationes. The names of the donors were read publicly in the service and included in the general prayer. Some members insisted upon preparing the bread themselves. The bread was therefore common or leavened bread. Later on, however, the custom arose in the Western church to use unleavened bread. In the Greek church, where the custom of using unleavened bread on the part of the Ebionites was long regarded as judaizing heresy, leavened bread was consistently maintained. No offense was taken at the custom obtaining in the West, however.

The color of the wine commonly used was indifferent, mixing it with water was, however, insisted upon. Only the Monophysites of Armenia used unmixed wine in order to designate the unity of the Nature of Christ thereby.

The consecration was made with the reading of the words of institution, calling upon God to receive the offering graciously.

After the custom of sending out the residue of the consecrated bread was forbidden, the bread which had not been consecrated was used for this purpose. Later on the custom arose of taking this remaining unconsecrated bread, blessing it, and distributing it among those who had not communed after the close of the service. This was intended as a symbolical substitute for the sacrament. The Greeks called it *ἀντίδωρα* the Latins “*eulogiae*.”

According to the fifth mystagogical Catechesis of Cyril of Jerusalem (a Catechism Sermon to those who were about to be baptized) the procedure at Holy Communion was the following: (Note how the sacerdotal acts are stepping into the foreground and the true character of the sacrament is being gradually lost!)

First the deacon hands the bishop and the presbyters at the altar water to wash their hands. This is symbolical of the cleansing from sin, for the hands are symbols for acts, washing the hands indicates that our works are clean. Then the deacon calls for the holy kiss, the symbol of atonement. The bishop says: “Raise up your hearts.” The congregation replies: “We have raised them up unto the Lord.” In a prayer the bishop thanks the Lord referring to Heaven and earth, angels, archangels, and emphasizing the words of David: Praise the Lord with me. We also remember the seraphim which Isaiah saw in the spirit and say: “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of Sabaoth. After having sanctified ourselves with spiritual songs, we ask God, who loves men, to send His Holy Spirit upon what we have prepared on the altar, making the bread into the Body of Christ and the wine into the Blood of Christ. For certainly what the Holy Spirit has touched is sanctified and changed. Next follows a prayer for peace and spiritual and temporal welfare of all based on this sacrifice of atonement. Then we remember the dead, first the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God may hear our prayer in regard to their intercessions. Then we pray for all of our people who have departed, for we believe that it will bring their souls salvation if the sacred offering lies before us. The prayers close with the Lord’s Prayer. Then the bishop says: “The holy things for the holy.” What lies on the altar is holy after it has received the Holy Ghost, you who are deemed worthy to receive the Holy Ghost are holy also. Then you say: “One is the holy one, one is the Lord Jesus Christ.” For indeed only He is holy, -- we become holy only by partaking of His

sacred nature through Practice and Prayer. The singer now invites us to receive the holy mystery with the words: "Taste and see, how gracious the Lord is." The communicants then take with their hollow hand (the right, supported by the left) the body of the Lord. It is impressed upon the communicant that he must lose nothing of what he receives, so that nothing of that which is more precious than gold and jewels may fall to the ground. After you have partaken thus of the Body of Christ, you approach the cup in which is His Blood. Do not stretch out your hand toward it, but bow in veneration and say "Amen" as you do in prayer and adoration; thus sanctify yourself and receive the Blood of Christ. While your lips are still moist, touch them with your hands, and sanctify your eyes, your forehead, and your senses. Then wait until the prayer, and thank God, who has deemed you worthy of such great mysteries.

The important parts of the **Latin Mass** are:

Confiteor, in which the priest after several introductory intonations and response and responses makes a confession of sins while calling upon the saints.

Introitus, a short prayer introduced by a Bible passage. This is the actual beginning of the mass. The introit is different for every Sunday and festival day. It is usually taken from the Psalms. From its introductory words the Sunday often received its name.

Kyrie Eleison

Great Doxology

Collect, a short prayer which has received its name either "quia ex selectis s. scripturae et ecclesiae verbis compendiosa brevitate collecta est," or "quia vota omnium in unum colligit."

Epistle - Gradual - Hallelujah. Originally the Gradual was an entire Psalm, which the congregation intoned, later only a few verses of a Psalm sung by the choir. Meanwhile the deacon ascended the steps of the altar (hence the name Graduale) to read the

Gospel. The followed the

Sermon, with which the missa catechumenorum closed. The Priest spoke

The Creed (the Nicene). Then followed the

Offertorium, a prayer while the gifts or offerings (bread and wine) were brought to the altar. This was introduced with "Dominus vobiscum." The preparation of these offerings proceeded amidst prayers which were in part spoken silently by the priest and hence were called

Secreta. Then began the Sursum Corda the

Preface. (in Gaul called Contestatio): Dignum et justum est, etc. This prayer of thanksgiving closed with a threefold Sanctus. All parts of the mass up to this point are really merely the preparation for the

Canon of the Mass, the real kernel and essence of the mass. It embraces the eucharistic formula of consecration and the prayers which precede and follow it. Its name indicates that it is the same at all times of the church year. Among the prayers of the canon

Memento pro vivis was an intercession for the offerentes and the communicants, whose names were read publicly,

commemoratio, in which the merits of the mother of God, the apostles, the first Roman popes and martyrs were used to induce the Lord to hear their prayers,

memento defunctorum, whose names were read from the

The canon closes with the prayers:

Nobis quoque peccatoribus and the **Pater noster**

After several more prayers and the singing of the

Agnus Dei by the choir the

Distribution took place: corpus (sanguis) Domini n. I. Chr. custodiat animam meam (tuam) in vitam aeternam.

Amen! After twice rinsing the chalice with water which the priest drinks **postcommunio** begins, which contains prayers of thanksgiving for the communicants and closes with "**Ite, missa est**" and the **Benedicat**.

In the **Greek mass** are found several other peculiar formulae and names, as e.g. the **Prospora** and the **Proskomidie**, or the bringing and preparation of the offerings; the **Ektenie** or the common general prayer, the individual parts of which were answered by the choir with *κύριε ἐλέησον*; the reading of the **Beatitudes** (Matt. 5,3ff.); and the **Cherubim Song** of the choir as a mystical representation of the cherubim.

The Lord's Supper from the Separation of the Eastern and Western Churches until the Controversy over Holy Communion (692-844)

From the seventh to the ninth centuries the sacramental idea in Holy Communion yielded more and more to the sacrificial. The natural consequence of this tendency was that the actual eating and drinking of the Lord's Supper came to be regarded of little importance and in the regular Sunday services was left entirely to the priests. Canonical law required, however, that a layman must commune three times per year. Thus the Concilium Agathense (a. 506) c. 18 required that "Saeculares, qui natale Domini, pascha et pentecosten non communicaverint, Catholici non credantur nec inter catholicos habeantur." This remained in force throughout the period, except that later more freedom was granted in the choice of a time at which to commune.

A further consequence of the sacrificial idea was that the presence of the congregation at mass was no longer regarded as essential, and the "missae privatae" or "missae solitariae" at which only the celebrating priest and his assistants were present became more common. Particularly was this true of the masses for the dead ("missae solitariae"). Yet several synods and liturgical authorities of the ninth century take offense at such a solitary mass. The Council of Mayence (a. 813) required the presence of the congregation at private masses, because otherwise the "Dominus, vobiscum" and the "Sursum corda!" would be meaningless.

In the larger congregations there were daily masses read at 9:00 AM. The Council of Orleans (a. 538) decreed in c. 14 "ut hora tertia missarum celebratio in Dei nomine inchoetur." The various church councils encouraged the laity to daily attendance at mass as a special mark of piety. The celebrating priest as well as the laymen who communed were required to approach the altar jejune (without having breakfasted). The latter were also required to abstain from marital relations for a period of several days previous to their communion. The men took the consecrated host into their own hands and introduced it into the mouth. Women were not permitted to touch it. The 36. e. of the Council of Auxerre (578) states: "Non licet mulieri nuda manu Eucharistiam accipere.... Non licet mulieri manum suam ad pallam dominicam mittere." And in the 42. c. "Ut unaquaeque muliere quando communicat dominicalem (veil) suum habeat; quod si non habuerit, usque in alium diem dominicum non communicet."

The custom of bringing oblations on the part of the members of the congregation continued and came to be regarded as a particularly meritorious deed, which was compared with the offering of Abel. Whatever remained after the communion, the so-called "Eulogiae" were given to the clergy or distributed to the poor. In monasteries the common meals were begun with such "Eulogiae." The bread used remained leavened bread until the ninth century. The first recorded instance of the use of unleavened bread is found in Alcuin³⁶ (ep. 75 ed. Froben. I, 107): "Panis, qui in corpus Christi consecratur, absque fermento ullius alterius infectionis debet esse mundissimus." Earlier than the eighth century there is not the slightest hint or reference to its use. On the contrary there are definite indications that common leavened bread was regularly employed. 1) In the Roman church the consecrated host which was sent by the church of the bishop to the associated churches was called "Fermentum." 2) In the treatise "De Sacramentis" attributed to Ambrose is the statement: "Tu forte dicis: Meus panis est usitatus, sed panis est ante verba sacramentorum: ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi." 3) The elements, employed in Holy Communion were offered by the members of the congregation and were therefore doubtless leavened or common bread.

As in the previous period the bread used was the common round bread which was marked so that it could easily be divided or broken into individual portions. We must not imagine that it was a thin wafer as we customarily use. In the catacombs there are pictures depicting the bringing of oblations in which the bread is

³⁶ Alcuin was a scholar of the 8. century, confidant and adviser of Charlemagne, born at York ca. 735, died at Tours as abbot in 804.

often marked with a cross or with the letters A and O. The breaking of bread continued to be practiced, necessitated by the shape and size of the loaves. Wafers as we have today began to be used no earlier than the 12th century. The wine was still mixed with water. Cyprian required the mixing of wine with water because Christ had used mixed-wine. Augustine too calls the mixing of the wine with water a “praeceptum Christi.” The church fathers and councils all agree with these. The second Trullan Council (692) condemns both the custom of the Encratites, who employed only water, as well as that of the monophysite Armenians, who use only wine, as gross heresy (*αἵρεσις πονηρά*). The color of the wine was indifferent, although in the earlier centuries the red was preferred, perhaps because of its similarity to blood, perhaps because red wine was considered choicer. Later a preference for white wines developed, largely because the red produced stains. That the cup was given to the laity is beyond doubt. At sick communions, however, it was customary to dip the host in wine and thus give both elements at once.

To the masses for the dead, which were held for the welfare of the souls of departed relatives, i.e., for the shortening of their suffering in purgatory, private masses for various other purposes were added in further exploitation of the sacrificial conception of the mass. Such other purposes were the recovery from illness, the blessing or prospering of some undertaking, or for rain or fertility. The multiplication of masses which this produced was curtailed by the rule that the same priest could not read more than one mass per day at any one altar, cf. the 10. c. of the Council of Auxerre (578) “Non licet super uno altario in una die duas missas dicere, nec in altario ubi episcopus missae dixerit, ut presbyter in illa die missas dicat.”

The desire to secure as many masses for the dead in advance as possible brought about a peculiar association of churches and convents for the purpose of reading masses for each other’s members. Lists of names of the dead were exchanged, and masses for the dead were thus read simultaneously at several different churches and monasteries. These associations were called “Societies of the Dead” (Todtenbund) and seem to have originated in England according to the letters of Boniface. Gradually the practice spread to the Continent and several monasteries had such agreements with other monasteries for centuries on end.

Among the various western liturgies particularly the one of Milan, the Ambrosian, has preserved its identity to this day, despite attempts particularly on the part of Charles the Great to force the clergy of Milan to adopt the Gregorian or Roman liturgy. Another that persisted distinct from the Roman is the Spanish, various called the gothic (because it developed during the rule of the Goths in Spain) or the Mozarabic. This liturgy shows clear evidence of oriental influence, being similar to the Greek liturgy in many respects. The so-called Gallic and the Allemannic liturgies are clearly patterned after the Gregorian or Roman Mass. All liturgical writings of the western church are without rubrics. To supply this want “Ordines ecclesiastici” were added which differed in minor details from one another more widely than the liturgies themselves.

The Greek church continued to insist on leavened bread, this insistence being one of the points of controversy between the eastern and the western church in the great schism which eventually led to their complete separation, and which, produced the epithets: “Azumae” for the Roman Catholics and “Fermentarii” for the Greek Catholics.

The iconoclastic Council of Constantinople (754) evidently favored the spiritualistic conception of the Lord’s Supper by insisting that the only true and permissible picture or representation of Christ was to be found in Holy Communion. The second Council of Nicaea, (787) however, condemned this view as heresy, and all the later church fathers insisted very definitely on the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion. The doctrine of consubstantiation is still found clearly expressed by Johannes Damascenus (†754), the greatest dogmatician of the old church. He says, “The bread and wine are not types of the body and blood of Christ, but the body itself of the Lord, who said, not This is a type of my body, but This is my body, not This is a type of my blood, but This is my blood.” That he is not thinking of an actual conversion of the elements into body and blood is clear from his illustration taken from Is. 6,6 “A coal is not simple wood, but is united with fire, so the bread of Communion is not simple bread, but united with the Godhead.” The later writings of the Greek Fathers express themselves unequivocally for the theory of transubstantiation, but without sharing the consequences which the Latin scholar drew from it. Theirs was more of a liturgical than a dogmatically formulated transubstantiation. It was introduced gradually, was not the result of doctrinal disputes or decrees of

church councils, and therefore not so widely divergent from the former position, as the corresponding doctrine in the Roman Catholic church.

The Doctrinal Disputes concerning the Lord's Supper (844-1079)

Until the ninth century, the Lord's Supper had never been the part of any doctrinal controversy in the church. This is rather remarkable, for almost every other doctrine of the church had in these centuries been hotly debated by the various parts of the Christian church, and concerning the Lord's Supper there were several widely divergent and contradictory schools of thought. The explanation for the situation is no doubt the mysterious nature of the Sacrament, which makes the whole question more or less intangible.

In the ninth century events took a turn which precipitated not one, but eventually two controversies, on the subject. Ever since the time of Gregory the Great (590-604) the doctrine of transubstantiation had spread throughout the Western church, except that it was not well received in France. In the year 844 Paschasius Radbertus published a document in which he embraced this doctrine, supported it with proof and defended it. He could by this time refer to an abundance of legends according to which under special circumstances the Body and Blood had actually been seen as such, mute evidence of the firm hold that the doctrine must already have had on the minds of the people. This publication caused a storm of protest from many of the great theologians of his time. Outstanding among these was the monk Ratramnus, who adhering to the doctrine of Augustine taught that the Body and Blood of the Lord are "realiter" but only "spiritualiter et secundum potentiam eaten in Holy Communion. Most of the German theologians adhered to the teaching of Ratramnus, the French chiefly to Radbertus' position. An attempt was made by Walafrid Strabo and Christian Druthmar to express the mystery in Holy Communion with the term "impanatio" (in pane) or consubstantiation. Gradually the controversy quieted down and the doctrine of Radbertus finally survived.

Two centuries later, about 1050, Berengar of Tours renewed the controversy. He denied not only the transubstantiation of the element but taught also that the presence of the body of Christ in Holy Communion is not substantial, but consists merely in the presence of his power in the elements. Not only the act of consecration, but also the faith of him who receives the Eucharist determines the sacrament, and without the latter, the bread is devoid of any power or virtue. This flagrant attack on the established doctrine of Radbertus aroused a storm of protest led by Lanfranc of Bec. He militated against the teaching of Berengar at the Synod of Rome in 1050, which as well as another at Vercelli condemned the new doctrine of Berengar. Meanwhile Berengar made the acquaintance of the papal legate Hildebrand, who disliked the fanaticism of Berengar's opponents and contented himself with the sworn declaration of Berengar that he did not deny the presence of Christ in Holy Communion, i.e. that the consecrated elements were body and blood of Christ. Emboldened by this agreement Berengar made a journey to Rome in 1059 with the hope of securing a favorable expression from the pope on the strength of his agreement with Hildebrand. At Rome he found a strong faction of opponents to his views, which forced him not only to renounce his teachings by casting his writings into the fire, but also forced him to subscribe under oath to the grossest form of the doctrine of Radbert. After his return to France he immediately recanted, and the animosity of his opponents reached a new high pitch. Meanwhile Hildebrand himself had become pope, but tried vainly to settle the controversy. As a result the orthodoxy of the pope himself was called into question by Berengar and his adherents, and Hildebrand was forced to demand from the Synod of Rome in 1079 an unequivocal decree concerning the transubstantiation. Berengar was sufficiently indiscreet to refer to his private dealings with the pope, whereupon Gregory VII (Hildebrand) curtly commanded him immediately to renounce his error. Quaking with fear, Berengar obeyed, and the pope dismissed him, forbidding any further dispute on the question. Berengar withdrew to Tours where he lived in strict asceticism, penitently and died in the good graces of the church at a ripe old age in 1088.

Church historians point out that this controversy is not only important because it helped to crystallize the doctrine of transubstantiation, but because it marks the establishment of scholasticism in the Roman church. Henceforth criticism of church doctrines was no longer tolerated, and doctrines taught in the church had to be

reasonable that is they had to agree with human reason and had to be rational or at least capable of being rationalized.

The Crystallization of Transubstantiation into Dogma

The papacy achieved the height of its power and splendor early in the thirteenth century. The visible manifestation of the papacy in its full power and glory was the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. 1500 prelates and delegates from all Christian nations assembled and paid homage to the pope as head of the church and judge and lord of the world. Here that goal had been achieved toward which so many of the former popes had been striving, to combine temporal power with spiritual into one all-embracing domination of the world. Pope Innocent III was the first really to wield both. He had political sway in Italy, sole supremacy in the church, virtually domination of the world.

The Importance of the Fourth Lateran Council for our subject is that here the doctrine of transubstantiation, which by this time was universally taught in the Roman church received the official stamp of approval by the church in Council assembled. The decree, freely translated reads:

There is but one universal church of believers, and without it no one whatsoever can be saved; in it Jesus Christ is at the same time priest and sacrifice, for his body and blood is truly contained in the sacrament of the altar in the external form of bread and wine, inasmuch as by God's almighty power the bread is changed into his body and the wine into his blood, so that we to complete the mystery of the communion, ourselves receive of his essence as he has assumed ours. This sacrament no one can prepare except the priest, who is properly ordained, according to the ministry of the keys which Jesus Christ himself entrusted to the apostles and their successors.

At the same time this council also established auricular confession, the veneration of sacred relics, and reverence of the blessed virgin Mary.

The only other really important development in the Roman mass was the withholding of the cup from the laity. This too was a historical development that had its roots in antiquity and was centuries in the making. In the early church both the bread and the cup were distributed to all who communed, as we have seen. Sects which, like the Manichaeans, discarded wine, were condemned as irregular. Early popes commanded the use of both elements. However, as there was frequent occasion to carry the consecrated elements from the church to sick persons at their homes, it became customary, for convenience, to dip the bread in the wine, administering both in one. As early as the third century communion of the sick seems to have often been in this manner.

In the 13th century Robert Pullyen, of Oxford, approved the custom of giving to the laity the bread only. This view was adopted by scholastic theologians, who taught that Christ was wholly present in the sacrament under either form and that consequently, one form was sufficient for a valid observance of it. Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura, especially, advocated the administration of communion under one form only. As this view predominated in the course of time, it became the custom in the Western church generally to withhold the cup from the laity. Against this the heretics of the Middle Age protested (Waldenses, Hussite sect of Calixtines – Utraquists), but the Council of Constance, 1415, defended the custom. The Protestant churches were united in regarding the communion in both kinds as essential to the right observance of the sacrament. The practice in the Roman Church was confirmed and made binding by the Council of Trent in 1563. It is defended on the ground that the wine is not necessary to the completeness of the sacrament, since the whole Christ, as to His body, soul, and divinity, is not only in each species, but in every particle of both, he who receives the consecrated bread receives the whole Christ.

In its thirteenth session the Council of Trent (1545-1563) issued several decrees concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Canon 2 reads,

“If any one shall say that, in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there remains, together with the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the substance of the Bread and Wine and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into (His) Body and of the Wine into (His) Blood, the species only of the Bread and Wine remaining—which conversion the Catholic Church most fittingly calls Transubstantiation—let him be anathema.”

Canon 3 of the same session states that “If any one shall say, that at the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist the whole Christ is not contained in both elements and after their separation in each of them, let him be anathema.” It is to be observed that the question as to whether the cup should be withheld generally or whether under certain circumstances it might be permissible to grant the cup to the laity in certain countries, was referred to some future time and occasion for decision. (Resolution adopted in 21. session.)

A direct consequence of the transubstantiation doctrine is the adoration of the host decreed by the same Council in the same session. Canon 6: "If any one shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the only-begotten Son of God ought not to be adored when publicly displayed, and therefore ought no less to be revered in special festive celebrations, than He is carried about in processions according to the praiseworthy and commonly obtaining custom of the holy church, and ought not to be exhibited before the people for the purpose of adoration, and that those who adore Him are idolaters, let him be anathema."

The dogma of the mass has not changed essentially in the Roman Catholic Church since the Council of Trent almost four centuries ago. It is in its present form nothing short of blasphemy, supposedly being a bloodless repetition of the sacrifice of Christ performed by the priest. In the light of Hebrews 9, 24-28 the Roman mass is not only superfluous but a direct insult to the Savior who was once offered to bear the sins of many.