

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1868.

ART. I.—THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THEOL. SEMY. AT MERCERSBURG, PA.

To the theory of sacramental grace which is supposed to underlie the "Order of Worship" now provisionally before the German Reformed Church, some have opposed the fathers of the same Church in the sixteenth century, maintaining that their writings are in the interest of a system quite different if not directly contrary. Others, while assuming this, have gone further, and openly proclaimed in way of challenge that such a theory finds no proper countenance from the fathers of the third, fourth and fifth centuries, and that those who pretend this only manifest the vain prattle of men too ignorant forsooth to grasp the real theological thought of the period.*

Both parties agree in finding in the baptismal formula of the "Order of Worship" the most distinct articulation of the sacramental theory or system against which they thus array both the Reformation and the primitive Church. It is involved, they assert, in the address to parents or sponsors, which is as

* "See Proceedings of the Convention of ministers and laymen held at Myerstown," pp. 19 and 22.

follows: "You present this child here, and do seek for him deliverance from the power of the Devil, the remission of sin, and the gift of a new and spiritual life by the Holy Ghost, through the sacrament of baptism which Christ hath ordained for the communication of such great grace." In opposition to this, it is maintained on the one hand that children of pious parents are not under the power of the Devil, but are so included in the Covenant of promise as to require no deliverance of this kind. They are held to be, through their birth from Christian parents, already in the sphere of grace, and just because of this, they are to be baptized to confirm them in their already existing state of salvation. Again on the other hand and pushing the opposition still farther, it is maintained that all children are in some way, by the mystery of the Incarnation and without baptism or any covenant relations, in grace and beyond condemnation, at least so long as they do not by actual sins sell such heavenly inheritance. In other words, so far as the theory is intelligible, original sin is swept away by the Incarnation, and nature has thereby become so identified with grace that the birth of the flesh is no longer flesh, but spirit, until made of the flesh by some actual transgression; and baptism is administered only to guard against this terrible evil. But let us quote the very language of this opposition. "*The infant according to the Catechism,*" it is boldly asserted, "*does not belong to the Devil previous to baptism: it has a precious birth-right in the new creation, and not until by a voluntary act of its own it sells the heavenly inheritance for a mess of pottage, can it enter upon the death-road of actual sins. To guard against this terrible evil, the Catechism teaches that it must also be incorporated into the Christian Church.*"

Now it is claimed, publicly and with the assenting request of a convention of ministers and laymen met together to seek divine aid in opposing heresy, that, as against the sacramental theory of the "Order of Worship," the fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries may be regarded as in general harmony with this crude and visionary counter-theory. Indeed the advocates of the Liturgy are challenged to produce a single line

in which a theory of sacramental grace such as is involved in the baptismal formula referred to, is confirmed by their testimony. Irenæus, Cyprian, and Augustine are specially mentioned as writers who may be searched in vain for anything of the kind. We propose, therefore, in the following article, and perhaps succeeding ones, to meet this bold challenge, and bring out in a brief and general way the sacramental system in which the early Church most clearly stood.

The Apostolic Fathers, technically so called, do not develop what may be called a doctrinal system. Their entire writings, however, give utterance to the profound truth underlying all such development, *viz.*, that in Christ the source of an independent and supernatural order of life and faith has been found, in the bosom of which alone the redemption, salvation, and glorification of mankind is possible. In the communion of this life and faith, these primitive fathers continually bore witness to their consciousness of having reached the absolute religion before which all possible forms of prechristian life which confronted them must yield. They virtually stood apart from the world, feeling that in their sphere of grace they had transcended the whole compass of the world's life as this had come to manifest itself either in the forms of religion or philosophy. In them Christianity was showing itself a vast energy, flowing from the person and merit of Christ, and organizing itself as a new and practical force in history, and challenging on every hand the attention and submission of the children of men. Their mission was not to assert in distinct, scientific form the contents of their faith, but to give in the fresh vigor of practical life a powerful exhibition of that grace which, in apprehending them, had come to be felt and to be held forth as the necessary principle of all right religious activity for the world. Although not engaged in developing any definite theological system, yet they did not dream for a moment that the new order of religious life in which they stood was made theirs in the order of nature. They received it as a mystery of

grace coming from above, and only in their obedience to it did they feel that they had come to pass out of the *saeculum* of this world's life. Only in their full surrender thereto, and their living incorporation therein, through a regeneration supernatural in every sense, did they view themselves as called to eternal life. The Church, into which, from the world without as from the dominion of sin and Satan they had been brought by baptism, they regarded as a mystery, confronting them with the very presence of a new and heavenly order of grace in which the glorified Christ ruled and reigned. This was such a universal acknowledgment,—such a necessary postulate of faith in their age, that it is every where throughout the epistles of Ignatius assumed and made the ground of that whole system of Church unity which he seems so anxious to unfold and enforce. With him it is just the fact that Christ, the living unity of God and man, is perpetually present in the Church, which gives the possibility and renders it necessary that it should exhibit His fullness in a corresponding unity,—one faith, one worship, one organization, wherein the mysterious theanthropic oneness of Christ's life continually externalizes itself. "It is not possible," he says, "that the head could have been born separately without members, God having promised a union which is himself" (Epist. ad Trall. c. xi.). Again: "For this reason did the Lord receive ointment upon his head, that he might breathe into the Church incorruption." Epist. ad Ephes. c. xvii). Again: "Be ye subject to the bishop and to each other, as Jesus Christ to the Father according to the flesh, and the Apostles to Christ and to the Father and to the Spirit, that the union may be both of the flesh and of the Spirit (eternal and internal—*σάρκα καὶ πνεύματι*)." Epist. ad Magn. c. xiii). Dorner, after a most careful analysis of the epistles of Ignatius, says: "As we find it, his (Ignatius,) view of the person of Christ developed itself through this, that he is everywhere governed by the practical thought that the idea of the Church is, to continue Christ's person and work as his continual living imago (*fortgehendes lebendiges Abbild*), in such way, however, that he, as the unifying principle of the divine and human, remains continually immanent in her

(als das einigende Princip des Göttlichen und Menschlichen ihr stets immanent bleibt)." (Dorner's *Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, vol. 1, p. 160.

It is quite needless to quote Ignatius in detail. Everywhere, page after page, Christ is viewed as the source and creative principle of a supernatural order of life whose embodiment is the Church: and all this in such real way, that, even without any direct mention of the sacraments, no one can well fail to see that these, as divine ordinances in the Church, and administered by those properly commissioned must have been regarded by him as clothed with full objective force, ever exhibiting with true effect the mediating work of the risen Lord. But Ignatius has not left us to such general inference only. He frequently refers to the sacraments, and always in the same tone of thought. "They (the heretics) hold themselves aloof from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which in goodness the Father hath raised up. (Epist. ad Smyrn. c. vii). "If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God. * * * breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live in Jesus Christ forever" (ad Ephes. v. and xx.).

No mention is made, it is true, of infant baptism: but the whole theory of sacramental grace, in which infant baptism is made to have such force as is implied in the "Order of Worship," seems to be fully congenial to his thought. Dorner, without any hesitation, says, "The many passages where Ignatius speaks of the Lord's Supper (and where also he mentions baptism), show that he held this sacrament in such high regard, because in his view it is in part the means and organ of Christ whereby he communicates to the Congregation the Spirit of unity, makes his theanthropic life their life: and in part, and this almost with still more force, because he views the Eucharist as the most blooming representation of the unity and love of the congregation, as the altar upon which they, acting in the bishop and represented as unity, offer the sacrifices of their praise and thanks, and enter into a theanthropic unity with Christ and among

themselves as one body with many members by one Spirit." (Dorner, Person. Ch. vol. 1, p. 158).

While we may hold that the peculiar Church organization which Ignatius so firmly insisted upon was *not as yet in all its particulars fully established throughout the Christian world*, yet this only makes more evident that his view of the sacrament was of universal acceptance; for at every point, as a doctrine fully settled, he uses it to show the necessity of his Episcopal system. How unless in obedience to the bishop, can we be within the altar? At the altar is to be found the bread of God, the medicine of immortality, the centre of communion and unity, where *all must come to offer their sacrifices of thanksgiving*. This, which on every hand is acknowledged, necessitates, in his line of argument, that the spiritual unity of the Church in Christ which the altar communion upholds, should continually externalize itself in the bishop who by the will of Christ stands at the altar, and in whom as officiating there the whole congregation is held together as one body. Still farther, Ignatius uses his view of the sacrament against the heretics. By him already, though not so frequently nor in such definite form as by subsequent writers, the Lord's supper was held up as a witness to the truth of Christ's person and of the resurrection of the flesh; for carrying with it as universally acknowledged the true effect of Christ's body and blood, it necessarily arrayed the whole Church against all Gnostic or Doketic views of his person. How, when the Church with one accord holds that the passion and consequent glorification of Christ are sacramentally made of real effect in the Lord's Supper, can any one dare to assert that he only suffered in appearance? How again, if our flesh and blood are in the sacrament fed and nourished by a flesh and blood in which are lodged the power of an endless life, can any one dare to assert that there can be no resurrection of the body? Already, we say, in Ignatius this method of argument is manifesting itself: and it is perfectly puerile to imagine that he stands in no general fellowship with that theory of sacramental grace which underlies the "Order of Worship;" and it is only by a

complete subversion of his real position that he can be brought into any sympathy with modern puritanism.

In Justin Martyr there is a somewhat more developed plan of thought: He is not engaged in giving form to or defending the unity of the Church in its organization. In his day this had ceased to be of so much practical force. But Christianity had already made such rapid inroads upon heathenism in the Roman Empire, that the old order of religious life and culture had become aroused, as in self-defence, to the most determined opposition. This opposition was not only that of the state in way of its penalties and persecutions, developing from the side of Christianity the patience and fortitude of a noble army of martyrs: but there was also at the same time an attack from the whole literary and philosophical culture of heathenism, both boldly from without and covertly from within in forms of heresy, which necessitated a corresponding defence upon the part of the Church. To this labor of patience and defence, requiring fortitude of will and in some measure a philosophical spirit, Justin addressed himself, and deservedly earned the double title of martyr and philosopher. From the necessity thus imposed (as well as from an inward impulse) of asserting the divine philosophy of Christianity,—of showing how it involves the highest reason, and indeed reason in its totality (*λογικὸν τὸ ὄλον*), we find in Justin the germs of a profound Christological system beginning to manifest themselves.

Our object is not to attempt to determine the characteristics of such a system in this its incipency, but rather to show how Justin, while maintaining the absolute revelation of the incarnate Logos, held that He, the world's Saviour, applied to men the redeeming power of his own endless life. Justin, like Ignatius, finds the perennial source of all salvation in Christ, but enters upon a more lengthy discussion of the objective means of its appropriation. In a general way, he thus gives expression to his view in reference to both these points. "Christ, being the first-born of the whole creation, has become also the beginning (*ἀρχή*) of a new race regenerated by him through water,

and faith, and the wood which holds the mystery of the cross." (Dial. with Tryph. c. 138).

Most clearly the new race here referred to is not the entire human family, carried beyond and out of the whole scope of original sin by the Incarnation, viewed as some magical potency now universally operative in the law of physical genesis so that by original birth each and all have at the start a heavenly birthright or inheritance. On the contrary, in most plain terms the new race is one that is made such by a regeneration through water and faith. Justin makes a broad distinction between the carnal and spiritual birth. The infant born of earthly parents in some way has his starting point in sin and bondage and is without a spiritual birth. When attempting to explain this, he refers to the transgression of Eve and the sensuality of the flesh, but never loses sight of the reality of a world of demons and the usurped dominion of Satan. "Eve who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death"—" * * * the beast (serpent) through which transgression and disobedience had their origin" (Dial. with Tryph. c. 100 and 112). Over against this birth in the sphere of death and under the dominion of Satan, Justin ever places the mystery of another and spiritual birth in the order of grace. This spiritual birth, this supernatural regeneration, he holds, has its beginning point in the sacrament of baptism. In his Apology, c. 61, he writes: "We will state how we consecrate ourselves to God being renewed by Christ" * * * * after proper preparation upon the part of the candidates, "we lead them to a place where there is water and there they are regenerated in the same manner as we also were; for they are washed in that water in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ said Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

There is no direct reference here or in any of Justin's writings to infant baptism: but there is such an acknowledgment of the objective force of the sacrament and also of the purpose of its institution, as must set aside every thought that the new

creation in Christ becomes ours by birthright while in the order of nature, which birthright we lose or sell when coming to what may be called actual transgression. Not the least shadow of such a theory crosses the pathway of his thought. On the contrary, a view of sacramental grace, similar in its general features to that underlying the "Order of Worship," seems perfectly familiar to his mind; and it is easy to see how, with such a view, any opposition to infant baptism which might arise could not long maintain itself in the early Church.

In reference to the Lord's Supper, Justin unequivocally states, that in the distribution of the elements we are nourished with the true body and blood of Christ. There has been much discussion in regard to the mode after which he supposes the body and blood of Christ to be present in the Sacrament, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed alike claiming him in their favor. The language of Justin is certainly ambiguous in this respect; but no one has ever thought of denying the truth that he views the Eucharist as exhibiting to us with true effect the body and blood of Christ, however much difference may have arisen in reference to his alleged explanation of the mystery. The passage, whose interpretation has been the subject of so much discussion, is this. "We do not receive these as common (*κοινόν*) bread nor as common drink, but even as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, who was incarnate by the word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also have we been taught that the food, which has been offered in thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστήσεων τροφήν*) by the prayer of the word which is from him, and by which our flesh and blood are nourished by a transmutation (*κατὰ μεταβολήν*), is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus." (Apology, c. 66). However the *κατὰ μεταβολήν* of this passage may be explained, there can be no question but that the whole course of thought clearly indicates that Justin regards the participants of the Supper as truly receiving therein the heavenly nourishment of the body and blood of Christ.

Justin also refers to a sacrificial element in the Supper, and has been claimed by Mœhler and Deellinger and others as favoring the Roman Catholic dogma of the mass. In his dialogue

with Trypho, chap. 117, he says, "Accordingly, God, anticipating all the sacrifices which we offer through His name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to offer, that is in the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in all places throughout the world, bears witness that they are well pleasing to Him." Again chap. 41, "And the offering of flour which was commanded to be presented for those who were cleansed of leprosy was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ, our Lord, commanded to be observed in remembrance of the passion which He endured for those who are cleansed in their souls, from all wickedness. * * * He (Malachi) then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, *i. e.* the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist."

Now while in the passage before cited the bread and wine are regarded as sacramental means through which our human life is divinely nourished with the body and blood of Christ, they are here at the same time viewed as the means through which we bring sacrificially to our remembrance the passion of Christ, and join our offerings with that great offering made once for all.

Semisch, following Hofling, holds that Justin regards the sacrifice as one of thanks. But certainly it is not the ordinary thankfulness which is awakened by bringing to the mind in way of thought only the narrative or scene of the Saviour's death. It is a special thanksgiving, a Eucharistic offering, offered in the compass and under the mystery of a peculiar sacramental remembrance of Christ's death, a remembrance through the breaking of bread and the pouring out of wine, and inseparably connected thus with a peculiar solemn altar communion of Christ's body and blood. Justin could hardly base his argument for the truth of Christianity upon the fact that the bread and wine of the Eucharist fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi, that in every place incense is offered to my name and a pure offering, unless the sacrificial offerings of Christians had for special reasons been regarded as centering themselves in the Eucharist. But why this convergence to that one mystery? Just because *there* was the sacramental memorial of that one great

offering which had been made upon the Cross in union with which alone all the offerings of the faithful become acceptable. Just because the bread when used in the Sacrament was to be no common bread, and the wine no common wine, but to exhibit in mystery the reality of Christ's body and blood as sacrificed for us, were they regarded as offerings placed upon the altar, wherein through the whole transaction, the faithful were showing forth in mystery the Lord's death until He comes. Such at least seems to be the underlying faith of Justin, and while it is by no means such as involves the doctrine of the mass, it is in its general features in harmony with the theory underlying the "Order of Worship." In no conceivable way can Justin's view of the Sacrament be twisted into conformity with the puritanic type of thought.

Semisch, to whom we have referred, and whose testimony is of great weight in a question of this kind, has taken occasion to remark in his able work on the life, writings, and opinions of Justin Martyr, that, "at first the Church was united on the question, by what instrumentality individuals obtained a participation in the redemption accomplished by Christ. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were unanimously considered as the two objective vehicles (?) by which the gifts of Christian grace passed into the hearts and lives of Christians" (see Translation by Ryland, vol. 2, p. 239).

In Irenæus, we have the great Church teacher of the close of the second century, who, familiar with the various tendencies of theological thought in both East and West, endeavors with great vigor of practical life and with a profound depth of scientific investigation to bring these tendencies into some organic unity, and to harmonize them by establishing a broad Christological base in which they may find their proper measure of meaning and truth. With a strange ignorance of his entire order of thought, this great teacher has been specially pointed out as one who cannot be shown to be in harmony with that sacramental theory, which, underlying the "Order of Worship," makes such earnest account of the broad distinction between the spheres of nature and grace as to necessitate a new birth from

above before in any sense our human life can be said to be delivered from the power of the Devil, and pass out of the condemnation of death.

Most assuredly does Irenæus, as is claimed by those who seek his authority for a visionary theory which he never held, "assert that the Logos entered the womb of the Virgin, not arbitrarily, but for a profound reason," and thereby came from thence onward to cover the whole compass of our earthly life from conception through growth and death and Hades, and upward to its height of exaltation at the right hand of the Father. But how does this gloriously accomplished redemption of humanity, as in the person of Christ, reach men and deliver them from the power of the Devil, and from the dominion of death and hell, cancelling the sin of their old conception, and the iniquity of their original birth? Does Irenæus leave us in a moment's doubt as to what answer he gives to this, the very question at issue? Does he hold the crude theory that all are born now naturally into the bosom of grace wrought out by Christ, and that the old Adamic life is now set aside, and that the new, as a natural inheritance, must be guarded from being sold by actual sins, through the sacrament of baptism? The very passage which seems to be in the mind of the writer who claims it as testimony in his own favor, is directly at variance with any such thought. "He comes to save all through himself: all I say, who through Him are regenerated into God, (omnes, inquam, qui renascuntur in Deum), infants, children, &c." (Adv., hæc., 11, 22.) It is by a regeneration therefore that the salvation is made effective for any; and this regeneration is held by him to be effected by baptism. Indeed in the very next book baptism is defined by him as "regeneratio in Deum." Dr. Schaff has well remarked in his *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 1, pp. 402, 403, that "the profound view of Irenæus involves an acknowledgment not only, as is universally granted, of the idea of infant baptism, but also of the practice of it: for in the mind of the ancient Church, baptism and regeneration were intimately connected, and by Irenæus they are distinctly identified."

No less explicit, so far as the general idea of sacramental grace is concerned, is the view which Irenæus takes of the Lord's Supper. His profound thought that Christ in his humanity, having passed through the various stages of human life, perfecting each, and having become glorified, is now and by virtue of all this the fountain of the Holy Ghost,—the living principle of a new creation for all who believe,—this his profound thought must of necessity enter into his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as indeed it conditions his whole conception of the Church, as carrying in itself the presence and fulness of Christ's glorified life, through the Holy Ghost. In Christ, according to Irenæus, the divine idea of man has reached a full realization, and this in such way that He is through the Holy Ghost the source and substance now of all such realization for the children of men. Christ is the spiritual man,—the concrete exhibition of the divine idea of human life, and thus while at the same time he is the fullest, the perfect revelation of the divine, he is also the Son of man, in whom the highest self-communication of God to the creature is reached, in whom the very fulness of the Spirit dwells to be poured out thence as the quickening power, the sanctifier of the children of men. According to Irenæus, the incarnation of the Logos viewed as the very summit of divine revelation, reaches out of necessity to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, through which mystery Christ in his own body the Church is uniting with himself by living incorporation those who thus come to share in his life and are enabled to secure their proper perfection in the resurrection of the body and full glorification; for, in his view, the idea of human life could not find its realization in Christ's perfection of it in his own person, except as through this also by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost the human race should be made to partake of its fulness—(See the valuable analysis of Duncker, "*Des hiel Irenæus Christol.*" pp. 260–262). From this how evident it must be that in his view no process of life in which men are to realize the divine aim of their being can be conceived as possible except it have its source in Christ,—except it be in the compass of his spiritual activity. Such process of life *must* have its beginning in *regeneration*;

but this regeneration, as we have seen from the statement of Irenæus, has its starting point in the sacrament of baptism. Now, and this is the point we have in view, it is evident from his whole line of thought, that this new life must be kept in being, continued in its process onward to resurrection and glorification by a nourishment reaching it from the same central source, the glorified human through the Holy Ghost. The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ must, in consistency with the profound thought of Irenæus, be viewed as carrying with it the reality of a heavenly food in the eating whereof resurrection and everlasting life are possible.

But we are not left to infer this simply from his general order of thought. He has himself given explicit utterance to such a view when mentioning the Lord's Supper. "How say they, that the flesh passeth to corruption and partaketh not of life, which is itself nourished from the body of the Lord and his blood? Either let them change their mind, or abstain from offering the things above spoken of. But our meaning is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist again confirms our meaning. * * * For as the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies receiving the Eucharist are no longer perishable having the hope of the resurrection to life everlasting." (Adver. hæ. iv. 18, 5.) Here Irenæus boldly meets a heretical denial of the resurrection of the body by citing a universally acknowledged doctrine of the Church, viz., that in the Eucharist as nourishing food, the body and blood of Christ come to be the very warrant that our body and blood shall reach an imperishable life. So again, and for the same purpose, he writes: "Since we are his members and are nourished through the creature, and he himself gives us the creature, making his sun to rise and raining, as he willeth, he owned the cup which is from the creature, to be his own blood from which he bedeweth our blood, and the bread from the creature he affirmed to be his own body, from which he increaseth our bodies. When then both the mingled cup and the created bread receive the word of God, and

the Eucharist becometh the body and blood of Christ, and from these the substance of our flesh is increased and consisteth, how do they say that the flesh is not capable of receiving the gift of God which is eternal life—the flesh, which is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, and is his member as the blessed Paul saith, that we are all members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Adver. hæ. v. 2, 2 and 3).

Who can question for a moment but that Irenæus here maintains that the consecrated elements in some way exhibit with true effect the body and blood of Christ, so that in participating the faithful are kept and preserved in body, soul and spirit unto everlasting life? The objective force of the sacrament is most unreservedly held up to view, and in such a way as at once to shock the moral sensibilities of a large portion of puritanism. It is true that in the passages thus far quoted no specific reference has been made to the activity of the Holy Spirit; and Semisch has some ground apparently for his position that "the doctrine of the Holy Ghost was too undeveloped at this time to suppose that Irenæus conceived him to be the mediating principle between the outward elements in the Lord's Supper and Christ." But in the fragments edited by Pfaff (which Semisch from his position feels compelled to regard spurious), the activity of the Holy Spirit is most plainly indicated and in full harmony also with the train of thought which characterizes the other writings of Irenæus. "We offer," one of these fragments runs, "unto God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks unto him, that he has commanded the earth to send forth these fruits for our nourishment, and afterwards, having duly performed the oblation, we call forth the Holy Spirit that he would make this sacrifice and this bread the body of Christ, that they who receive these antitypes may obtain forgiveness of sins and eternal life" (Pfaff fragm. Anecd. S. Iren. pp. 26, 27, as quoted by Dr. Pusey). Dörner while opposing the position of Semisch just referred to, gives a summary of what he regards the doctrine of Irenæus. It may be found in a note on page 495 of the first volume of his "Lehre v. d. Person Christi." "The outward elements, neither changed into Christ's body and

blood, nor merely signifying them, nor again merely carrying in themselves the incarnate Logos, are rather, by means of the operation of the Holy Ghost on the one hand, and of Christ on the other, who assumes them, raised up to be momenta of his humanity and so through sacramental union therewith belong to the body and blood of Christ, who in them or through his sacramental connection with them continually restores for himself the momentum (otherwise withdrawn until his coming again) of his objective reality, presence and visibility (der in ihnen, oder durch seine sacramentliche Verbindung mit ihnen, das bis zur Wiederkunft Christi zurueckgetretene Moment der objectiven Wirklichkeit, Gegenwart und Sichtbarkeit, sich fort wieder herstellt), in such way of course as to be perceptible only to faith, as indeed the word of God and also Christ himself in his outward historical manifestation could be apprehended in their real character only by faith."

It has not been our object, however, to ascertain whether Irenæus leans more to the Lutheran, than to the Reformed doctrine of the Supper, but only to show with what unhesitating boldness he recognizes the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the mystery of the sacrament to nourish the faithful who participate thereof unto everlasting life, and that, in maintaining this reality of sacramental grace, he is in full harmony with the general church theory underlying the "Order of Worship." Who can doubt this for a single moment? Where is there the least syllable which may be said to be in opposition?

Here then we have the clear testimony of the second century, from those writers most thoroughly acquainted with the life of the Church, and most profoundly interested in her defence and progress,—a testimony upholding with full accord and with unhesitating conviction that idea of sacramental grace for the acknowledgment of which the "Order of Worship" of the German Reformed Church is now sought to be convicted of heresy. From the feet of the Apostles, these martyrs of the second century, part of that noble army which praises God, seem to know no other theory. Indeed it is so universally recognized, so uniformly assumed as fundamental to the very idea of the Church

and Christianity, that their writings fail to be intelligible in the atmosphere or light of any other system. This of itself should be enough to challenge the prayerful consideration of those who find their whole order of thought and faith in the element of another and contrary system. If puritanism is unwilling to open its eyes to such a historical reality, waving away as of but little account to itself the faith of the second century in this respect, it may expect the same irreverence to be paid to its own tradition and history. With assurance it appeals to the canon of Scripture, but with equal assurance also did the martyrs of the second century appeal to the Apostles whose very voice was still echoing in their ears. The force of such early historical testimony may be thought to be set aside with the pat theory that already the whole church was hastening into the apostasy of Roman Catholicism, and that this whole sacramental theory is itself the clear evidence of the testimony of such a complete revolution. But why perchance may not the force of puritan tradition be thought to be set aside by the theory that it is hastening into the apostasy of rationalism, in which the whole mystery of the supernatural is no longer a reality for faith? Why must puritanism of the nineteenth century be more secure from departure from Apostolic tradition, than the whole Church of the second century in which were many who saw the forms and heard the burning eloquence of the Apostles themselves, and with which the fresh fragrance of St. John's old age still lingered like the breath of love?