

# THE MONIST

---

## CHRISTIAN THEOPHAGY: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH.

### I. PRAEPARATIO EVANGELICA.

THOSE who have attended the celebration of a mass have witnessed the most ancient survival from a hoary antiquity. There, in the often beautiful church, in gorgeous vestments, with incense and chanted liturgy, the priest sacrifices a God to himself and distributes his flesh to be eaten by his worshipers. The Divine Son is offered to the Father as "a pure victim, a spotless victim, a holy victim,"<sup>1</sup> and his holy body and blood become the food of the faithful. The teaching of the Church is explicit on this point. The body eaten is the same as that once born of a virgin and now seated at the right hand of the Father; the sacrifice of the mass is one and the same as that of the cross, and is so grateful and acceptable to God that it is a suitable return for all his benefits, will expiate sin, and turn the wrath of the offended Deity "from the severity of a just vengeance to the exercise of benignant clemency."<sup>2</sup>

All this goes back to the time when man was just emerging from the animal; it is the most striking of the many instances of the conservatism of religion. The further back we go historically the more religious do we find our ancestors; the story of progress has been one of constant secularization. But there was a prehistoric time when there

<sup>1</sup> *The Missal*: Canon of the Mass.

<sup>2</sup> *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, transl. by J. Donovan, 1829, pp. 156ff.

was nothing that we would recognize as religion at all. Behind the savage culture that we know, when religion rules the tribes with a rod of iron, there must have been a period when the grandsons of the ape were accumulating their theological ideas. Their first concept was not, apparently, that of personal gods, but that of a vast mystery; it was the weird or uncanny quality of certain things they did not understand. Along with this was the overmastering power of tribal custom. They had the conservative instinct to the highest degree; as children and savages and certain neurotics<sup>3</sup> to-day, they felt an imperative need, the reason of which they could not explain, that things should be done in the ways to which they were accustomed. The real reasons, of course, lay deep in the laws of habit and imitation; but, because they could not understand this, they gave their acts a mysterious sanction, the taboo. It was in this, and the related idea of "mana," both of them founded in the sacredness, i. e., mysteriousness, weirdness, of certain objects and acts, that the germs of all religions lay. In the earliest stages the ape-men were unable to conceive of anything very personal and definite as god. Not only was the conception of Being "without body, parts or passions" impossible to them, but even an anthropomorphic god was too abstract. Nor was this period so remote as we sometimes think. Just as in Latin the word *sacer*, meaning both "sacred" and "accursed," retains the old connotation of "taboo," so in Greek *θεός* was used with a far wider significance than we should use the word "god." The fact of success was a "god" and more than a "god"; to recognize a friend after long absence is a "god"; wine is a "god" whose body was poured out in libation to the gods.<sup>4</sup> Nor was this mere poetry or philosophy; it was, to the speakers, literal prose.

<sup>3</sup> S. Freud, *Zwangshandlungen und Religionsübungen. Kleine Schriften zur Neurosenlehre*. 2d ed., 1909, 122ff.

<sup>4</sup> G. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, 1912, p. 26.

This earliest stage of theology was totemism, at one time probably universal. The totem was a specially sacred thing connected, by some fancied resemblance, with the tribe—at that period Church and State in one. It was a sort of dreadful mascot; a thing usually an animal, that was felt to be akin to the tribe and that could bring both bad luck and good according to the treatment it received. Ordinarily it was treated with reverence, awe and fear; it could not be killed or annoyed. But at times when things were going badly, or there was urgent need of stimulating the crops on which the existence of the people depended, or the bravery of the men or the fecundity of the women which were no less essential, some more drastic form of government regulation of totems was felt to be desirable. How could the tribe absorb the good qualities of the sacred thing; its “mana,” as some of us, or “grace,” as others would say?

Compared with the first mystics who brooded over the problem of union with the divine, Caliban was a gentleman and a scholar, the exquisite flower of a long refinement by civilization. Practically the whole content of their experience, as far as it gave them any suggestion of union, was food and sex. The “god” must be either eaten, or united with his worshipers in sexual intercourse.<sup>5</sup> Both ideas have colored the language and thought of all religions, including Christianity.

The eating of the sacred animal, or, later, of the god in the form of an animal, is the one with which we are at

<sup>5</sup> See A. Dietrich. *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 1910, pages 121 and the following. On sexual intercourse with deity in classical antiquity, see, for instance, *Alcestis*, 839; Josephus, *Antiquities*, Chapter XVIII, 3, 4. The analogy of sex in the union with God, witnessed by a thousand “brides of Christ” (cf. Mark ii. 19; Eph. i. 6; v. 32) is carried out by Staupitz (T. Kolde, *Die Augustiner-Kongregation*, 1879, p. 291) and Luther (*Vorlesung über den Römerbrief*, *Scholien*, 206). On homosexual ideas in mysticism, cf. Pfarrer O. Pfister, *L. v. Zinzendorf* (Schriften zur angewandten Seelenkunde, VIII, 1910). On pederasty as a “means of grace,” analogous to the Christian “laying on of hands,” cf. E. Bette, “Die dorische Knabenliebe,” *Rheinisches Museum*, LXII, 3, pp. 438ff, 1897.

present concerned. The classic example of it is that found by Robertson Smith in the works of St. Nilus, a hermit who lived on Sinai in the fourth century of our era.<sup>6</sup> He tells how the Arabs would sacrifice boys to the Morning Star, but, when boys failed, would take a white camel, and after wounding it mortally, would suck its blood and eat its raw and still living flesh. Robertson Smith thought of the camel as a tribal god; but he was partly wrong; it was really only the raw material from which gods are made.<sup>7</sup> The animal was devoured to get its "mana," its strength, swiftness and endurance, and doubtless other more subtle qualities. For the savage thought of all the original character passing over with the flesh and blood. If bread could strengthen man and wine make glad his heart.<sup>8</sup> surely the brave, strong, sacred body of an animal could impart its own excellence.<sup>9</sup>

The eating of an animal or in some cases a human being in the same sacramental way, has been found also in Australia,<sup>10</sup> in Nigeria, and among North American Indians.<sup>11</sup>

But the totem was not the only divine being eaten. In the primitive sacrament of the first-fruits, the spirit of the corn was thus absorbed by his votaries. Thus in Wendland, Sweden, to the present day, "the farmer's wife uses the grain of the last sheaf to bake a loaf in the shape of a little girl; this loaf is divided among the whole household and eaten by them. Here the loaf represents the corn-spirit conceived as a maiden." "The new corn is itself eaten sacramentally, that is, as the body of the corn-spirit."<sup>12</sup> A similar custom is found in Lithuania.<sup>13</sup>

"In one part of Yorkshire it is still customary for the

<sup>6</sup> J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 1903, 486f.

<sup>7</sup> Murray, 35f.

<sup>8</sup> Psalm civ. 15. These words were quoted by Luther as applying to the bread and wine of the eucharist.

<sup>9</sup> J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 3d ed., *Spirits*, 1912, II, 138.

<sup>10</sup> Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, 1910, I, 120; II, 590; IV, 230ff.

<sup>11</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, I, 18ff.      <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 48.      <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

clergyman to cut the first corn; and my informant," says Sir J. G. Frazer, believes that the corn so cut is used to make the communion bread. If the latter part of the custom is correctly reported (and analogy is all in its favor) it shows how the Christian communion has absorbed within itself a sacrament which is doubtless far older than Christianity."<sup>14</sup>

Among the heathen Cheremiss on the Volga, when the first bread from the new crop of wheat is to be eaten, the villagers assemble in the house of the oldest inhabitant, open the eastern door and pray with faces toward it. The sorcerer or priest then gives each a mug of beer to drain; next he cuts and hands to every person a morsel of bread. "The whole ceremony," says the writer who has described it, "looks almost like a caricature of the eucharist."<sup>15</sup> In fact it is its crude prototype.

The Incas of Peru also ate bread and drank liquor in a manner compared by the Spaniard to the eucharist.<sup>16</sup>

The Aino of Japan also regard their cereal offering as an eaten god,<sup>17</sup> and the East Indians, Buru, call their sacramental meal "eating the soul of the rice."<sup>18</sup> "In all such cases," observes Frazer, "we may not improperly describe the eating of the new fruit as a sacrament or communion with a deity, or at all events with a powerful spirit." In many cases the rite was preceded by the administration of a purgative or emetic, the idea being to preserve the sacred food from contact with profane nourishment. Thus the Catholics take the eucharist fasting.<sup>19</sup>

In some cases the sacrament of the first-fruits was combined with a sacrifice or offering of them to the gods or spirits, and at times the latter element of the rite throws the earlier into the shade.<sup>20</sup> Here, too, the analogy with

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Prescott, *Conquest of Peru*, Chap. III.

<sup>17</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, II, 52.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

the mass is striking, as in the connection made by Paul between the feast of unleavened bread, "Christ our pass-over sacrificed for us," and Christ the "first-fruits of them that slept."<sup>21</sup>

The custom of eating a god sacramentally was practised by the Aztecs before the discovery of Mexico. Twice a year, in May and December, an image of the great god Vitziliputzli was made of dough and then broken in pieces and solemnly consumed. Acosta says that the Aztec virgins made the paste of beets and maize, which they called the flesh and bones of Vitziliputzli, and adored as such. Then, after a holocaust of victims, the priests distributed the dough after the manner of communion. The people said that they ate the flesh and bones of God. A similar mystic communion was held by the Brahmans in India, upon which Frazer remarks: "On the whole it would seem that neither the ancient Hindoos nor the ancient Mexicans had much to learn from the most refined mysteries of Catholic theology."<sup>22</sup>

At the festival of the winter solstice the Aztecs first killed their god Huitzilopochtli in effigy and then ate him. They made their idol in the form of a man, from various seeds, with bones of acacia wood. A priest, who took the name and part of the god Quetzalcoatl pierced the image through and through, which was called killing it. Then they cut out the heart, which was given to the king, and divided the rest among the people. The name of the festival was "god is eaten."<sup>23</sup> As we shall see later on, at one time the Christian host was baked in the form of a man and stabbed by the priest.

When the Mexicans craved a closer union with the living god, they endeavored to attain it by cannibalism; making a man impersonate their deity and then devouring

<sup>21</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7f; xv. 20.    <sup>22</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, II, 89.    <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 90.

him.<sup>24</sup> A curious survival of communion with a god by eating his image is found among the Huichol Indians of Mexico, who have an idol carved from lava, bits of which they scrape off with their nails and eat.<sup>25</sup>

The Hindus furnish two further customs which are also found in Christianity. The Malas eat a goddess in effigy at the time of their marriage,<sup>26</sup> just as Catholics commune before wedding.<sup>27</sup> The Veddas of Ceylon make an offering to the spirits of the dead, which they eat sacramentally, believing that it will give them health and good luck. They even extend this inestimable privilege to their dogs, hoping that the heavenly food will make them better hunters.<sup>28</sup> Even so at the "palio," a horse-race held for centuries twice every year at Siena, which I myself have witnessed,<sup>29</sup> before the race the horses and jockeys are taken into a church, where the host is offered to the jockey to kiss and to the horse to smell. This powerful charm did not, however, when I witnessed the race, prevent one of the blessed riders from getting a bad fall.

But not all our examples of god-eating are to be found among "the beastly devices of the heathen." "In Europe the Catholic Church has resorted to similar means for enabling the pious to enjoy the ineffable privilege of eating the persons of the Infant God and his Mother. For this purpose images of the Madonna are printed on some soluble and harmless substance and sold in sheets like postage stamps. The worshiper buys as many of these sacred images as he has occasion for, and, affixing one or more of

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>25</sup> *Spirits*, II. 93.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Decree of Council of Trent, C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstthums und des römischen Katholizismus*, 3d ed., 1911, 251.

<sup>28</sup> C. G. Seligman, *The Veddas*, p. 130, quoted W. M. Groton, *The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults*, 1914, 8.

<sup>29</sup> I saw the race, but not the consecration of the horses. This was witnessed by my sister, Dr. Winifred Smith, of Vassar College. So in Spain, I am informed, bullfighters take the sacrament before they enter the arena. As the danger of death is almost nil, it is probably conceived as a charm to strengthen them.

them to his food, swallows the bolus. . . . In his youth Count Hoensbroech and his devout mother used to consume portions of God and his Mother with their meals." The practice was officially sanctioned by a decree of the Inquisition, in July, 1903.<sup>80</sup>

It is a fact of the highest importance that the sacramental meal attained great prominence in many religions among the peoples of the Mediterranean during the centuries just preceding and just following the rise of Christianity. Such meals were in many cases interpreted by a refined culture in a way less gross than had been the case earlier. They were compared to the banquets given at funerals in memory of the dead; they were likened to the common meals at Sparta and elsewhere;<sup>81</sup> they were communion with the god simply in that he was the host and the worshipers his guests. Thus dinners of a purely social nature were sometimes held in temples in order to enjoy the company of the god.<sup>82</sup> But the fundamental idea, vaguely expressed but always present, was the old one, that the consecrated food was the means of obtaining obsession by a good spirit, of becoming identified with the god of the Mystery.<sup>83</sup> Caution had to be exercised lest bad demons would also enter the body of the communicant. So comparatively enlightened a philosopher as Porphyry<sup>84</sup> assures us that demons delight in impure meats and enter those who use them.

Fanatic Egypt saw nothing incongruous in treating her gods like cattle from whose milk or flesh divinity could be extracted. One of her Pharaohs achieved immortality by sucking the breast of a goddess;<sup>85</sup> another took a more

<sup>80</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, II. 94.

<sup>81</sup> P. Gardner, *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, 1911, 110.

<sup>82</sup> *Papyri Oxyr.*, I, 110, edited by Milligan, p. 97; cf. Carpenter, *Phases of Early Christianity*, 251ff.

<sup>83</sup> K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 196.

<sup>84</sup> Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, IV, 23.

<sup>85</sup> Dietrich, 101.



drastic method: "His servants," we are told, "have captured the gods with a lasso, they have found them and brought them down, have bound them and cut their throats and taken out their entrails and carved them and cooked them in hot cauldrons. The king consumes their power and eats their souls. The great gods are his breakfast, the middle-sized ones his dinner and the small ones his supper. . . . The king consumes all that comes to him. Eagerly he swallows all their magic power. He becomes an heir of might, greater than all heirs; he becomes lord of heaven, for he ate all the crowns and bracelets; he ate the wisdom of every god."<sup>36</sup>

The blood of Osiris was a great charm, which, poured in a cup of wine, made Isis drinking it feel love for him in her heart.<sup>37</sup> When the blood could not be procured, its place was taken by simple wine, consecrated by this hocus-pocus said seven times: "Thou art wine and not wine but the head of Athene. Thou art wine and not wine, but the bowels of Osiris."<sup>38</sup>

From Persia marched forth Mithra to dispute the empire of the world with Christ. His warriors told how the hero Saoshyant would kill a bull and of his fat, mingled with the juice of the white haoma, would prepare a beverage assuring immortality to all who tasted it.<sup>39</sup> That the bull was a divine animal goes without saying, for how otherwise could his flesh be the "drug of immortality"?<sup>40</sup> The sacramental banquet, however, was also a love-feast, done in remembrance of the supper celebrated by the sun before his ascension.<sup>41</sup> It could only be partaken of after long initiation, and was rightly regarded at Rome as "a

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 100.

<sup>37</sup> Griffith, *Demotic Magical Papyrus*, p. 107. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen und Paulus*, 1910, 204.

<sup>38</sup> Kenyon, *Greek Papyri*, I, 105; Reitzenstein, 205.

<sup>39</sup> Dietrich, 102.

<sup>40</sup> As Ignatius called the eucharist. *Ad Ephesios*, 20.

<sup>41</sup> F. Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, 1903, pp. 158ff.

magical meal."<sup>42</sup> So similar was it to the Christian Supper that Justin Martyr informs us it was directly imitated from the institution of Christ by evil demons, who, "in the mysteries of Mithra, set forth bread and a cup of water with certain explanations in the ceremonial of initiation."<sup>43</sup> Tertullian also noted the resemblance, so dangerous for simple souls, between Mithraism and Christianity.<sup>44</sup>

Attis, the Phrygian god who was born of a virgin, and who died and rose again at Easter time, also left his followers a sacramental meal.<sup>45</sup> His worshiper could say: "I have eaten from the drum, I have drunk from the cymbal, I have carried the earthen dish." From pictures we know that this latter was carried on the head in exactly the style in which, in the Greek Church, the holy food of the eucharist was carried by the deacons.<sup>46</sup> Another point of similarity between the communions of Attis and Christ was the use in each of fish.<sup>47</sup>

The connection of fish with the eucharist, made as early as the composition of the Gospel of Mark,<sup>48</sup> and witnessed by inscriptions in the catacombs,<sup>49</sup> is another case of the absorption by the conquering cult of the elements of vanquished superstitions. One cannot, indeed, explain it, as has been done,<sup>50</sup> by saying that "Jesus found at Bethsaida . . . a local pagan cult of the widely-spread fish-god, availed himself of it, and spiritualized it by means of an etymolog-

<sup>42</sup> Dietrich, 102. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, XXX, 1, 6.

<sup>43</sup> Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, I, 66; Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, 1912, 261.

<sup>44</sup> Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, 1905ff, II, 227.

<sup>45</sup> Frazer, *Adonis*, I, 272ff, 309f.

<sup>46</sup> Dietrich, 103f.

<sup>47</sup> M. Brückner, "Attis," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 5 vols., 1909ff.

<sup>48</sup> Mark vi. 38; Matt. xiv. 17; Luke ix. 13. That this meal was eucharistic will be shown later.

<sup>49</sup> An epitaph at Rome, dating 100-130, represents the eucharist by loaves and fishes. M. Goguel, *L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr*, 1910, 279.

<sup>50</sup> Eisler, *Transactions of Third International Congress of Religions*, II, 352.

ical coincidence between *lehem*, bread, *luhm*, fish, and *luhm*, breath or spirit." This is too uncritical of the documents, and assumes too much history in them. But of the connection there can be no doubt. Dagon, meaning "fish," was worshiped by the Philistines (Judges xvi. 23), and Lucian tells us of fish kept in sacred fountains from which they were ritually taken and eaten.<sup>51</sup> The designation of Christ as Ἰχθύς was not, as commonly stated, an anagram, but a genuine case of syncretism. He was called the Big Fish and his worshipers little fishes. Thus an ancient Christian inscription of Abercius says: "Faith shows me my way everywhere and furnishes my food: even a fish from a fountain, large and pure, which a chaste virgin captures." An allusion to baptism is often seen in this, though it much better suits the eucharist, or perhaps the ancient custom of administering the eucharist immediately after baptism. In former centuries eating fish was symbolic of eating Christ's flesh, just as now it is eaten by Catholics on fast-days, especially as a preparation for communion.

Rome, too, did not lack her sacramental meals. One of the titles of Jupiter was "dapalis," "he of the feast," and the priest who presided at the sacrifice was called "epulo," "feaster."<sup>52</sup> At ancient Aricia, near Rome, it is believed that loaves were baked in the image of the King of the Wood and eaten sacramentally.<sup>53</sup>

Something has been made of the fact that the students of comparative religion have found the eating of a god in so many and diverse religions. Surely, it is said, one key is too simple to fit so many locks; the day of the vegetation god, killed and eaten and reviving will go the way of the sun-god theory of Max Müller. When one sees the vegetation myth in Australia and Mexico, in Orestes and Ham-

<sup>51</sup> Reinach, C. M. R., III, 46ff.

<sup>52</sup> Dietrich, 229.

<sup>53</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, II, 95.

let,<sup>54</sup> he must be the victim of a monomania. But it is certain that many other religious ideas, whether true or delusive, the existence of gods, immortality, the power of witchcraft, have until recently been held all but universally: *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*. Communion with a god by eating him is just one of those ideas which arise naturally in a certain stage of culture, and, under myriad forms, survive in a hundred different societies. A similar one is baptism; the idea found in very many cults, that, by washing, a man can cleanse his soul as well as his body.

So in Greece we find the pre-Christian communion in many forms. After the great age of art and philosophy there was a reaction which Gilbert Murray has called "The Failure of Nerve." The hungry generations trod men down as they had never done before; there went up a great cry for respite from this world, for salvation. To supply this need arose the Mystery Religions, of which Orphism is a good example, promising rest for the soul and union with God. But they kept the old forms to a great extent, particularly the myth and ritual of the god torn to pieces and devoured by his adorers.

Traces of this belief are found in the ancient Minoan civilization.<sup>55</sup> A god was there sacrificed in the form of a bull, possibly at some earlier period than we know in the form of a child.<sup>56</sup> In many an old Greek legend we see the original sacrifice and devouring of a divine animal. So common were these *motifs* that Greek has special words to designate them: *σπαραγμός* for the ritual tearing of the animal to pieces and *ώμοφαγία* for the feast of raw flesh. Thus Acteon was a sacred stag worshipped at Plataeae

<sup>54</sup> Gilbert Murray, *Hamlet and Orestes*, 1914. "One of my friends has assured me that every one knew it before; another has observed that most learned men, sooner or later, go a little mad." He refers primarily to the Hamlet of Saxo Grammaticus.

<sup>55</sup> Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, 26.

<sup>56</sup> Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 489. On the omophagia in general, 478ff.

and torn by adorers who called themselves does;<sup>57</sup> Hippolytus was a horse rent by horses,<sup>58</sup> Orpheus was a fox similarly treated by "vixens," as, quite rightly no doubt, his devotees called themselves.<sup>59</sup> In Orpheus the early Church justly saw a prototype of Christ.<sup>60</sup> It is interesting to note that the worshipers frequently, if not always, called themselves by the name of the beast or god they adored. Thus the followers of Bacchus were called Bacchi and Bacchae;<sup>61</sup> thus the worshipers of Jesus "put on Christ." By eating the eucharist they became ἔνθεοι ἐν Χριστῷ just as did the votaries of Dionysus.<sup>62</sup>

Zeus himself was sacrificed at Athens in the form of a bull. At this feast, called the buphonia, near the summer solstice, an ox was killed, eaten and restored to life in pantomime.<sup>63</sup> It is interesting to note that the feast—Δαίς—became a personified divinity, just as the Roman Church, in instituting the feast of Corpus Christi day, near midsummer, has presented the mystery of the mass as an object to the adoration of the people. At Delphi also a bull, called Hosiater, or the Consecrator, and Isodaitos, "He of the equal feast," was immolated.<sup>65</sup> Plato doubtless had in mind one of these ceremonies when he describes<sup>66</sup> the killing of a bull in Atlantis, and the drinking of his blood mingled with wine. This was accompanied by an oath to deal justly, reminding us of the oath (*sacramentum*) that Pliny says the Christians took at their sacred meal.<sup>67</sup>

. In the Eleusinian mysteries animals were immolated

<sup>57</sup> Reinach, C. M. R., III, 24ff.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 54ff.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 85ff.

<sup>60</sup> Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 474; Reinach, C. M. R., II, 83.

<sup>61</sup> Farnell, *Cults*, V, 150ff.

<sup>62</sup> Lake, *Epistles of Paul*, 214; Reinach, C. M. R., II, 105.

<sup>63</sup> Harrison, *Themis*, 141.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 146.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 163; Plato, *Critias*, 119.

<sup>67</sup> Pliny, *ep.* 96.

to Demeter and their flesh eaten on the spot;<sup>68</sup> there was also a meal of *κικέων*, a mixture of grain and water, but there is no evidence that this was regarded as representing the goddess.<sup>69</sup>

But of all the "mysteries" known to us, that of Dionysus bears the closest resemblance to that of Christ. The god of wine died a violent death and was brought to life again; his "passion," as the Greeks called it, and his resurrection were enacted in his sacred rites. According to the common legend the son of Zeus and his daughter Proserpina was given by jealous Hera to the Titans, who tore him to pieces, boiled his body and ate it with herbs. His heart was taken back to Zeus and Semele, from whom he was re-born.<sup>70</sup> As this doctrine was spiritualized his resurrection was represented in a different way and was followed by an ascension to heaven.<sup>71</sup> Thus was inculcated the doctrine of immortality; Plutarch consoles his wife for the death of a daughter by the belief in a future life as taught by tradition and revealed by the mysteries of Dionysus.

All this was enacted ritually in various parts of Greece. As is so often the case, the ritual preceded the legend, which was invented to explain a misunderstood custom, in this case the sacramental eating of a totemic bull,<sup>72</sup> or, in some cases, of a kid,<sup>73</sup> for the god inherited the ritual of both beasts. Thus it was celebrated at Delphi;<sup>74</sup> and thus in Crete. In all cases the animal was torn to pieces and a fragment of his flesh given to each worshiper and eaten raw as a sacrament, in order to impart to each some of the divine life.<sup>75</sup> At first this was doubtless conceived of as purely a physical benefit, but by the fourth century, B. C.,

<sup>68</sup> Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, 1914, 375f.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 378ff.

<sup>70</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, I, 12ff; Reinach, C. M. R., II, 58ff.

<sup>71</sup> Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, 54; *Dialogue with Trypho*, 69.

<sup>72</sup> Reinach, C. M. R., II, 58ff.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>74</sup> Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 440.

<sup>75</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, II, 16.

the excellent moral effects of the initiatory feast are stressed. Thus, in a fragment of Euripides's *Cretans*, one speaks of "lengthening out a life of purity from the day when I became an initiate of Idæan Zeus, and a herdsman of night-roaming Zagreus [Dionysus], a celebrant of the meal of raw flesh."<sup>76</sup> At a later stage of Orphic theology, some offence was taken at the idea of killing a god, and the myth was changed to make the deity the sacrificer and communicant. Thus we find a god sacrificed to himself, and eating his own flesh,<sup>77</sup>—a striking parallel to the Last Supper and to the mass. It was not always in the interests of humanity to anthropomorphize the rite too much, for in Chios and Tenedos Dionysus was represented by a human victim who was subjected to the barbarous rite of holy cannibalism.<sup>78</sup>

Now all this seems to us such revolting savagery that it is hard to believe that it became imbedded in a religion of great moral purity and lofty idealism. Such, however, is the case. "The belief in the sacrifice of Dionysus himself and the purification of man by his blood," remained, according to Gilbert Murray, "a curious relic of superstition firmly imbedded in Orphism, a doctrine irrational and unintelligible, and for that reason wrapped in the deepest and most sacred mystery."<sup>79</sup> But the rite continued; for the wild worshipers roamed in the woods and tore to pieces and ate raw whatever animals they could cope with. "It is noteworthy, and throws much light on the spirit of Orphism, that apart from this sacramental tasting of blood, the Orphic worshiper held it an abomination to eat the flesh of animals at all. . . . It fascinated him just because it was so incredibly primitive and uncanny; because it was a mystery which transcended reason."<sup>80</sup> Euripides has trans-

<sup>76</sup> Quoted, Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, 1913, 257.

<sup>77</sup> Frazer, *Spirits*, I, 23.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>79</sup> *Bacchæ*, note on p. 85f

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

muted the beastly rite into immortal poetry. He thus describes the rending of the animals:<sup>81</sup>

“Great uddered kine then hadst thou seen  
 Bellowing in sword-like hands that cleave and tear,  
 A live steer riven in sunder, and the air  
 Tossed with rent ribs of limbs of cloven tread  
 And flesh upon the branches and a red  
 Rain from the deep green pines. Yea, bulls of pride,  
 Horns swift to rage, were fronted and aside  
 Flung stumbling by those multitudinous hands  
 Dragged pitilessly.”

And through it all the maenads feel the divine presence, and adjure it, “O God, Beast, Mystery, come!” It is Dionysus who is the god and the bull, to whom Pentheus speaks, when he sees him, as follows:<sup>82</sup>

“Is it a Wild Bull this, that walks and waits  
 Before me? There are horns upon thy brow!  
 What art thou, man or beast? For surely now  
 The Bull is on thee!”

When the new religion was introduced into Italy, it ran a course for a time something like that of Christianity later. In the first place its votaries were accused, like the Christians, of celebrating holy meals followed by sexual debauches.<sup>83</sup> Later they were suppressed by the government.<sup>84</sup> That nothing might be wanting to make the parallel with Christianity, the word “sacrament,”<sup>85</sup> originally a military oath, was applied by the Romans to the initiation. Indeed it is certain that that word had the connotation of consecration long before the rise of the Roman Church or its founder. It was employed, for example, by Apuleius,

<sup>81</sup> *The Bacchae*, line 700ff; *ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, line 920ff, p. 55.

<sup>83</sup> Livy, XXXIX, 8, 5, quoted Reitzenstein, 88.

<sup>84</sup> E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chap. XV. He says that the language of Tacitus in describing the introduction and attempted suppression of the Christian worship, is almost similar to that of Livy about the Bacchanalia.

<sup>85</sup> Livy, XXXIX, 15, 13; Reitzenstein, 66.



for the visible sign of the spiritual grace vouchsafed to the worshippers of Isis.<sup>86</sup>

As men became softer and more fastidious, substitutes were found for the raw flesh and blood which were originally elements of their communion. Thus the sacred ivy, regarded as an impersonation of Dionysus, was substituted for his flesh,<sup>87</sup> and wine for his blood.<sup>88</sup>

The connection of wine and blood was as familiar to antiquity as it is to us through the eucharist. It was often an offering to the gods and a means of communion with them.<sup>89</sup> The blood was the life; who imbibed it absorbed the spirit. A Greek word for soul, *θυμός*, is etymologically *fumus*, the hot "steam" from the blood.<sup>90</sup> The Romans sealed their oaths by drinking a mixture of wine and blood called *asseratum*.<sup>91</sup> Among the Hebrews, too, wine was called the "blood of the grape,"<sup>92</sup> Offerings of bread and wine were made to Asklepios, the god of healing.<sup>93</sup>

It must be remembered that this tradition of the eaten god was kept up by the mysteries among the lower strata of society only. In the world of art and letters best known to us there prevailed an enlightened skepticism. Not many wise, not many noble, were called to salvation by the blood of Bacchus or of Attis. The expressed opinion of a Roman philosopher as to the Real Presence is very much what the expressed opinion of a modern scientist is now: "When we call corn Ceres and wine Bacchus," says Cicero,<sup>94</sup> "we use a common figure of speech; but do you imagine that any-

<sup>86</sup> Apuleius, XI, 15, quoted *ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> Plutarch, *Quaestiones Rom.*, 112; Clemen, 258; J. Rendel Harris, "Origin of the cult of Dionysus," *Bulletin of J. Rylands Library*, 1915, p. 119ff.

<sup>88</sup> Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, 54; *Dialogue with Trypho*, 69.

<sup>89</sup> Kircher, *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum*, 1910, 45.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 85. They also treated wine as blood, pouring it out at the base of altars. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 1894, p. 230.

<sup>93</sup> Kircher, 92f.

<sup>94</sup> *De Natura deorum*, III, 16, 41. Frazer, *Spirits*, II, 167

body is so insane as to believe that the thing he feeds on is god?" The answer then, as now, was in the affirmative.

## II. PAUL AND HIS SYMMYSTAE.

"The most excellent of the sacraments"<sup>1</sup> was borrowed by the Christians from the older mystery religions. That they attributed the institution of their rite to their founder was inevitable. Many of the classic myths originated as explanations of ritual, in the desire to show how Dionysus or Attis or Osiris had once done what their initiates now re-enacted.<sup>2</sup> The account of the Last Supper is but an etiological cult story, analogous to the Greek myths or to the Hebrew fable of the Passover in Exodus xii, designed to authorize a custom otherwise established in the earliest community.<sup>3</sup> "The Christ of Mark," says Loisy, "is like the gods of the mysteries; what he does is the type of what happens to his worshipers and what they must do. . . . The idea and form of this institution were suggested. . . . by Paul, who conceived them in a vision, on the model of the pagan mysteries."<sup>4</sup> In fact, as soon as any institution was established, firmly or otherwise, it was fathered on Christ, or at least on the apostles. Thus the mingling of water with wine was said by Cyprian to have begun by Jesus;<sup>5</sup> thus the self-communion of priests was wrongly said to have descended "as it were from apostolic tradition."<sup>6</sup> On the way the Gnostics attributed all their peculiar institu-

<sup>1</sup> So called by the Council of Trent, Mirbt, 226.

<sup>2</sup> Reinach, C. M. R., II, p. vi, says it is simply a matter of good faith to apply to the Gospels the same process which has been generally acknowledged as the correct solution of the classic myths. Some Christians now admit the likeness of the eucharist and the earlier theophagy. See *Catholic Encyclopædia*, and E. A. James, *Primitive Belief and Ritual*, 1917.

<sup>3</sup> So called by Heitmüller, R. G. G., I, 25, though illogically he tries to extract some history from the *ἱερός λόγος*. Long arguments against his position and that of Reitzenstein and Dietrich in Schweitzer, *Paulinische Forschung*, 152ff, and by G. P. von Wetter in *Z. N. T. W.*, 1913, pp. 202ff.

<sup>4</sup> Loisy, *L'évangile selon Marc*, 1912, 405.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in *Catechism of Council of Trent*.

<sup>6</sup> Council of Trent, Mirbt, 228.

tions to Jesus a long and instructive essay has been written by C. Schmidt.<sup>7</sup>

But though we see nothing historic in the Last Supper, and are convinced that Paul founded the eucharist, it is worth while asking what analogous conceptions, if any, prevailed in the pre-Pauline community about the sacramental use of food. We shall find that there are two such conceptions plainly discernible; the first that of the Messianic feast, the second that of a spiritual nourishment. Both these are founded in the Old Testament. There, though sacrifice is a covenant with Yaweh, and a communion meal, there is no trace of the eating of a divine animal.<sup>8</sup> The Jews of the historic period had gone beyond this conception, just as had the "Olympian" religion of the Ionians, represented by Homer. But the idea that when the Messiah came he should eat and drink with his elect, is found in many places in the Jewish writings,<sup>9</sup> and doubtless considerably influenced the Christian supper. It is represented in the document known as "Q" by the marriage feast of the king's son.<sup>10</sup> It is also prominent in the Apocalypse,<sup>11</sup> though neither it nor Q nor the Jewish-Christian epistles of James or Jude or 2 Peter, know anything of the eucharist.<sup>12</sup> Thus also Luke makes Jesus say to his disciples: "And I assign unto you, as my Father has assigned unto me, a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Texte und Untersuchungen*, VIII.

<sup>8</sup> H. P. Smith, *The Religion of Israel*, 1914, pp. 39f.

<sup>9</sup> Isaiah lv. 1ff; lxv. 12ff; xxv. 68; Enoch, xxiv and xxv; Test. Levi, xxiii. 11 and lxii. 14. Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1910.

<sup>10</sup> Matt. xxii. 1-14; Luke xiv. 15-24.

<sup>11</sup> Apoc. ii. 7, 17; iii. 21; vii. 16f; xix.

<sup>12</sup> The idea that Apoc. ii. 17 refers to the eucharist is untenable. *Hibbert*, XI, 140ff. "Q" has nothing even on the Passion. Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 1908, 233. W. Haupt, *Worte Jesu und Gemeinde-Ueberlieferung*, 1913.

<sup>13</sup> Luke xxii. 30. It is uncertain whether the original was in Q. Probably not, as Matt. lacks the verse, and the word *διαθημα* is eucharistic.

The other idea which amalgamated naturally with the eucharist was that of a spiritual nourishment. "Man cannot live by bread alone," says the Deuteronomist, "but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."<sup>14</sup> The manna was to the Psalmist "bread from heaven."<sup>15</sup> Isaiah offered bread and wine and milk of a spiritual nature without money and without price.<sup>16</sup> "Those who eat me," says Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus,<sup>17</sup> "will always hunger for me; those who drink me will always thirst for me again." Philo, too, spoke of the Logos as the bread from heaven.<sup>18</sup> Nor do I doubt that this is the meaning of the fourth petition in the Lord's Prayer: "Give us this day our supernatural [i. e., spiritual] bread." The Greek word ἐπιούσιος is translated in the Latin versions *supersubstantialis*,<sup>19</sup> followed by Wyclif with "bread above other substance" and the Douai Bible with "supersubstantial bread." One ancient Latin manuscript in the British Museum reads "Panem verbum Dei celestem da nobis hodie,"<sup>20</sup> evidently a gloss, but a good one. To express so simple an idea as "daily" the author of Q would certainly not choose a word so rare that it is not met with elsewhere, was absolutely unknown to learned Origen,<sup>21</sup> and puzzled early evangelists.<sup>22</sup> Moreover "daily" would be tautological, having just been said.<sup>23</sup> Further, the petition for bread would

<sup>14</sup> Deut. viii. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 24f.

<sup>16</sup> Isaiah lv. 1f.

<sup>17</sup> XXIV, 29. Many other references in Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 1909, i. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted Pfeleiderer, IV, 23ff.

<sup>19</sup> In Matt. vi. 11. The translation of the same word in Luke xi. 3 is *quotidianus*, and this form is adopted in the ritual. Most modern versions follow this second rendering, "daily," which is also supported by F. S. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer*, 1891; F. Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, fourth edition, 1913, § 123; Dobschütz, *Harvard Theological Review*, 1914, p. 313.

<sup>20</sup> E. S. Buchanan, *ἐπιούσιος*, *Expositor*, 1914, p. 423.

<sup>21</sup> *De oratione*, XXVII, 7.

<sup>22</sup> The Gospel of the Hebrews rendered "to-morrow's bread." The Acts of Thomas (Pick, *Apocryphal Acts*, 1909, 144) omitted this petition altogether. Cf. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*, quoted by Stone, I, 91.

<sup>23</sup> Matt. vi. 25; Luke xii. 22.

contradict the injunction given a little later, to take no thought for what to eat or to drink, but to seek first the kingdom. All the other petitions in this early Christian prayer are for spiritual blessings, and the intrusion of the mere bodily needs would be strange. Etymologically the word is compared by Liddell and Scott to ἐπιτηανός, but it seems better to derive it from ἐπι meaning "super" and οὐσία meaning "substance," and to compare it with ἐπουράνιος, "superheavenly," in other New Testament writings.

The idea of a spiritual nourishment offered directly by God to the believer is also developed in the Johannine writings and in what was one of their principal sources, the Odes of Solomon. Written probably by a Disciple of the Baptist at Ephesus very near the middle of the first century,<sup>24</sup> one of these poems (XIX, 1ff) says: "A cup of milk was offered to me and I drank it in the sweetness of the delight of the Lord. The Son is the cup, and he who was milked is the Father and she who milked him is the Holy Spirit."<sup>25</sup> Elsewhere in these poems, which nowhere have any allusion to the eucharist,<sup>26</sup> milk and honey are spoken of as the mystic food of believers.<sup>27</sup> It is interesting to note in this connection that milk and honey were added to the first communion in the Monophysite churches of Armenia.<sup>28</sup> This would seem to indicate that feeding with milk was actually done as symbolic of the new and spiritual birth of the child. Sallustius<sup>29</sup> speaks of "feeding on milk as though we were being born again," in the ritual

<sup>24</sup> Preserved Smith, "The Disciples of John and the Odes of Solomon," *Monist*, 1915, pp. 161-190.

<sup>25</sup> Reading of Burkitt's manuscript of the Odes, *Journal of Th. Studies*, 1912.

<sup>26</sup> *Monist*, 186.

<sup>27</sup> J. Rendel Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, second edition, 1911, p. 80.

<sup>28</sup> Conybeare, "Eucharist" in *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

<sup>29</sup> "On the Gods," translated by G. Murray, *Greek Religion*, p. 193.

of Attis. Perhaps the same thought lies back of Paul's simile "milk for babes" (1 Cor. vi. 5). But it is plainest in the First Epistle of Peter, so called, in the words translated in our Revised Version:<sup>30</sup> "As newborn babes, long for the spiritual milk which is without guile." The Authorized Version in this case came nearer to the true meaning when it rendered λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα "sincere milk of the word," provided only we write Word with a capital, and understand it of the Logos.

But neither the celestial bread nor the milk of the Logos constituted a ritual meal. It is practically certain, however, that the first Christian community had such prior to the institution of the eucharist by Paul.<sup>31</sup> Precedent for such could be found in Jewish custom,<sup>32</sup> and among the Essenes<sup>33</sup> and probably also in the custom of the Disciples of John.<sup>34</sup> This meal was known as the "love-feast," and persisted in certain quarters side by side with the eucharist for many years. It is alluded to by Jude<sup>35</sup> and described by Tertullian.<sup>36</sup> Whether any traces of it can be found in the Gospels or in Acts, colored as these are by Pauline theology, is more than doubtful.

If we read the books of the New Testament in the order in which they were written, the first account of the eucharist is found in 1 Corinthians, written from Ephesus at about Easter time, probably in the year 55. There Paul speaks of its institution in words (xi. 23ff) which, to bring

<sup>30</sup> 1 Peter ii. 2. On this Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen*, 156, and on similar thoughts in Egyptian religions, *ibid.*, 157.

<sup>31</sup> Achelis, *Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 1912, I, 172-83; II, 78ff; Carpenter, 251ff.

<sup>32</sup> Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV, 10, 8; S. J. Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, 1914, p. 340.

<sup>33</sup> R. G. G. I., 38.

<sup>34</sup> The Mandaeans or Sabacans, the spiritual descendants of the Disciples of the Baptists, had a supper consisting of "bites and water." M. Brückner, *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland*, 1908, p. 47.

<sup>35</sup> Jude, 12.

<sup>36</sup> Tertullian, *Apology*, cap. 39.

out their literal meaning, I translate into unavoidably awkward English: "For *I* received over from the Lord that which also I delivered over to you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was delivered over, took bread, and having blessed it, broke and said: This is my body which is for you. This do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. So that whoever eats the bread and drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man try himself and thus eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For who eats and drinks not discerning the body is eating and drinking judgment to himself. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly and not a few sleep."

It is an official dogma of the Catholic Church that these words should be taken as history.<sup>37</sup> The Catholics, less subjective than the Protestants, admit that Paul received a special revelation on the subject, only they say that it revealed to him exactly what really happened.<sup>38</sup> Modern Protestant scholars have felt the intrinsic absurdity of this and have argued that Paul could not have received a special revelation on this point, because it would not be in accordance with "the acknowledged principles of economy in the use of miracles," for Paul to receive by revelation what might have been learned by other means.<sup>39</sup> This old-fashioned point of view will have less weight with impartial scholars than the other argument advanced, that Paul uses the words "received" and "delivered" in his account of the death and resurrection of Jesus, which, it is commonly

<sup>37</sup> Syllabus of Pius X, 1907, Mirbt, p. 409.

<sup>38</sup> Renz, *Geschichte des Messopfer-Begriffs*, 2 vols., 1901f, I, 122.

<sup>39</sup> Lambert, *The Sacraments in the New Testament*, 1903.

believed, he learned from the other apostles. But reasons have been put forward to show that here, too, Paul is really giving the results of his own subjective visions.<sup>40</sup> These very words, "received" and "delivered," were used in the Pirke Aboth, i. 1, of what Moses received directly from Jehovah on Sinai and delivered to the elders.<sup>41</sup> They were also technical terms of the pagan mysteries.<sup>42</sup> If we will only listen to Paul himself we shall learn whence he got his doctrine: "The gospel which was preached by me is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . When it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal his Son in me, . . . immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me: but I went up into Arabia: and again I returned unto Damascus. Then *after three years* I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas and tarried with him fifteen days."<sup>43</sup> Later, Paul was kind enough to instruct these Jewish apostles in the gospel he had received, though he dared not to do it publicly.<sup>44</sup> How he obtained these revelations in Paradise he tells elsewhere.<sup>45</sup> As he "received" the story of Christ's death and resurrection thus,<sup>46</sup> he was perfectly consistent in asserting "Christ was raised according to *my* gospel."<sup>47</sup> The whole thing was "God's wisdom in a mystery,"<sup>48</sup> and this mystery itself was Christ: "He who was manifested in the flesh,

<sup>40</sup> Preserved Smith, "A New Light on Peter and Paul," *Hibbert*, July, 1913. The conclusions here advanced have been accepted by Solomon Reinach who translated the article in French and published it in the *Bibliothèque de propagande*, Oct. 15, 1913.

<sup>41</sup> J. Weiss, in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 1913.

<sup>42</sup> Clemen, 233.

<sup>43</sup> Galatians i. 11ff.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 2

<sup>45</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 2ff.

<sup>46</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 4.

<sup>47</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 8. The pericope, according to many scholars, is Paul's, though the whole epistle is not.

<sup>48</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 7.



justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations."<sup>49</sup>

The German Wrede has put us under a great debt by at last writing a biography of the Tarsian,<sup>50</sup> showing both how it was possible psychologically for Paul to evolve these myths and possible historically for him to foist them on the Christian Church. But this is not the place to discuss the whole extent of Paul's mythology; all that here concerns us is his derivation of the eucharist. *A priori*, the possibility of his dependence on the Mysteries cannot be denied.<sup>51</sup> It has been proved from linguistic evidence, proved to the hilt, that Paul was saturated in the current conceptions of the Mystery Religions,<sup>52</sup> prominent among which was that of the eaten body of the Saviour God, who, in human form, should live, suffer violent death and rise again. He himself speaks of "the table of demons," i. e., of false gods, and of "communion with demons" as analogous to the communion with Jesus (1 Cor. x. 21). Moreover, in this particular case the evidence of his derivation of his doctrine from a vision is peculiarly strong. Hardly any scholar, not under the double dogmatic prepossession of the historicity of the Last Supper and the improbability of revelations, has denied it. Among a vast number who have admitted the vision are Chrysostom, Osiander, Calvin, Gardner,<sup>53</sup> Conybear<sup>54</sup> and Reitzenstein.<sup>55</sup>

In fact the force of the language is overwhelming. The

<sup>49</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 16. The letter is not by Paul, but well expresses the primitive Christian idea.

<sup>50</sup> *Paul*, English translation by J. F. Carpenter, 1908. According to Schweitzer the book belongs "not to theology but to world-literature."

<sup>51</sup> Heitmüller in *R. G. G.*, "Abendmahl."

<sup>52</sup> Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen und Paulus*, *passim*.

<sup>53</sup> Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, second edition, p. 453, gives references for the older scholars. He here withdraws his former theory that Paul derived the Supper from the Eleusinian Mysteries, but says that Paul was influenced by mystery concepts in general.

<sup>54</sup> *Myth, Magic and Morals*, 251ff.

<sup>55</sup> *Mysterienreligionen*, 50f.

emphatic "I," the positive statement that the doctrine was received "from the Lord," ought to be decisive. But this is not all. Note that Paul uses the same word for that which he "delivered over" to the Corinthians, and that which was done on the night in which the Lord was "delivered over." Prof. W. B. Smith has pointed out that this could not mean "betrayed," as it is commonly rendered, but must mean "delivered up" or "surrendered."<sup>56</sup> This explanation has now been adopted by Messrs. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, in their Commentary on 1 Corinthians.<sup>57</sup> They state that the words in question refer "perhaps chiefly to the Father's surrender of the Son, and the Son's self-sacrifice may also be included." Better, possibly, to say that Jesus was himself, as a mystic concept, delivered over to Paul and by him so delivered over to his neophytes.

One more point requires exegesis before we proceed to the consideration of Paul's eucharistic doctrine in general. The words "new covenant," here used first of the cup, were probably borrowed by Paul from the Jewish Messianic sect of the Zadokites,<sup>58</sup> who made a "new covenant" at Damascus, shortly before Paul's sojourn there. The Greek word *διαθήκη* commonly means "testament," and is so used by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>59</sup> But as it is the equivalent of the Hebrew *berith*, and was used to translate this word in the Septuagint,<sup>60</sup> "covenant" is almost certainly the true meaning of the word here.<sup>61</sup>

What is Paul's understanding of the words "This is my body"? It is certain that he took them literally. The "*hoc est corpus meum*" which has been decisive for the

<sup>56</sup> *Ecce Deus*, English edition, 1912, pp. 303ff. German edition, 1911.

<sup>57</sup> *International Critical Commentary*, p. 243.

<sup>58</sup> Fragments of a Zadokite Word, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 792.

<sup>59</sup> Hebrews, ix. 15ff.

<sup>60</sup> E. g., Job xxxi. 1.

<sup>61</sup> Dibelius, *Das Abendmahl*, 1911, 76ff.

Catholic Church, and which, Luther declared, was "too strong" for him, meant exactly what it said. The reason why many Protestants have maintained the contrary is simply that they believed it impossible themselves. Of course it is impossible—but that does not mean that Paul did not believe it. Kirsopp Lake puts the point aptly: "Much of the controversy between Catholic and Protestant theologians has found its center in the doctrine of the eucharist, and the latter have appealed to primitive Christianity to support their views. . . From their point of view the appeal fails; the Catholic doctrine is much more nearly primitive than the Protestant. But the Catholic advocate in winning his case has proved still more: the doctrine which he defends is not only primitive but pre-Christian."<sup>62</sup> And again: "It is necessary to insist that the Catholic is much nearer to early Christianity than the Protestant."<sup>63</sup>

The part of the text stressed by those who wish to make the rite merely commemorative is, "Do this in remembrance of me." Let us hear an expert on the subject: "Frankly," says Reitzenstein,<sup>64</sup> "I can never interpret these words of a mere commemorative meal, such as the Greek cult of the dead knows. The whole sacramental teaching which Paul adds immediately, contradicts that interpretation. The words can be better understood in a mystical sense analogous to that of an approximately contemporary narrative in a magic text in which Osiris gives Isis and Horus his blood to drink in a cup of wine, in order that they may not forget his death, but must seek him in yearning plaint, until he again becomes alive and unites with them." This then explains also the words "ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." If the eucharist be regarded as analogous to the meals held in memory of dead friends by the Greeks,

<sup>62</sup> Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 215.

<sup>63</sup> *H. T. R.*, 1914, p. 429.

<sup>64</sup> *Mysterienreligionen*, 51.

it must be recognized that these meals, also, were sacrificial."<sup>65</sup>

In the same sense must be read the words that he who eats and drinks unworthily, not discerning the body, eats and drinks judgment (or "damnation") to himself. The meaning is so clear that Mr. Scott is able to say that practically all commentators agree that the phrase refers to the failure on the part of the worshiper to see that the bread represented the body of Christ.<sup>66</sup> "Behind these words," says Bousset quite rightly, "we catch glimpses of definitely sacramental feeling, the belief in the marvelous virtue of sacred food, for weal or woe."<sup>67</sup> How perfectly crude were Paul's ideas of this magical effect is brought out in verse 30, where he attributes the prevalence of sickness and death among his converts to the misuse of the holy food. But the benefits of the Christian mysteries did not go the length of guaranteeing salvation irrespective of conduct. Paul devotes the best part of a chapter to the confutation of this belief which had evidently gained currency among the Corinthians.<sup>68</sup> Indeed some of them turned their eucharists into drunken orgies.<sup>69</sup> Whether the abominable sexual disorders among them<sup>70</sup> originated in these debauches, cannot be told. Somewhat later the accusations were made against the Christians that they united "Thyestean banquets and Oedipean intercourse" at their meetings.<sup>71</sup>

Almost all that Paul says implies his belief that bread and wine were body and blood of Christ. Thus (1 Cor. x. 16): "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a sharing

<sup>65</sup> Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, 214.

<sup>66</sup> *Expositor*, August, 1915, 182ff. He himself, however, proposes that the body here means "fellowship," and "failing to discern it" means being unbrotherly.

<sup>67</sup> *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1906f, ed. J. Weiss, *ad. loc.*

<sup>68</sup> 1 Cor. x; Lake, *Earlier Epistles*, 200 and 213.

<sup>69</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 21.

<sup>70</sup> 1 Cor. v.

<sup>71</sup> R. G. G., I, 633. "Nachapostolisches Zeitalter" by Knopf.

of the blood of Christ? The bread which he break, is it not a sharing of the body of Christ?"<sup>72</sup> If we ask *how* he conceived this, the answer must be that he never raised the question of mode, but that he appears to have assumed the reality of his contention with a literalness far surpassing that of the Fourth Lateran Council. In classical antiquity symbol and reality were not separated as we separate them.<sup>73</sup> To Greek philosophy words were things, and that was its greatest weakness. So the personification of bread, wine, war and love as Ceres, Bacchus, Mars and Venus seems to us mere figure of speech, but to the ancients implied a good deal more. Even so a child will now say of her doll "This is my baby," and if you insist that it is not her baby, but only the symbol of one, will not be convinced, and will even begin to cry if you press the point. So to the primitive Christian the bread and wine simply *were* the body and blood of his Saviour; words could not make it plainer to him than that. They just *were*.

This belief of Paul implies the other one held by the Catholic Church that the eucharist is a sacrifice. He never states this with equal clearness, but he assumes it. Indeed it could hardly be otherwise. It is probable *a priori* because it was so in the mystery religions he knew. It is probably *a posteriori* because it can be proved that other Christians of the first century, e. g., Clement of Rome, so regarded it. But it is not entirely a matter of inference. Conybeare correctly points out that the germ of the idea, at least, is found in the words, "body, *which is for you*," and (in the Gospels), "blood, *poured out for you*."<sup>74</sup> Thus Paul also speaks in one breath of "keeping the feast" and of "Christ

<sup>72</sup> Lake's translation.

<sup>73</sup> Bergh van Eysinga, *Radical Views about the New Testament*, 1912, 104. Ramsay in *Expository Times*, XXI, 516. Harnack makes the same remark. "At that time 'symbol' denoted a thing which, in some way, really is what it signifies." *Dogma*, Eng., II, 144. Cf. also IV, 289, n. 2, and Loofs in *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3d ed., I, 58.

<sup>74</sup> Conybeare, "Eucharist," E. B.

our passover that hath been sacrificed for us.”<sup>76</sup> Thus, further, he compares the holy bread with the sacrifices of Israel, which gave the Jews “communion with the altar,”<sup>76</sup> and with the things which the heathen sacrificed to devils: “Ye cannot,” says he, “partake of the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of devils.”<sup>77</sup> In this verse, which incidentally furnishes invaluable proof that Paul was familiar with the sacrificial meals of the pagan mysteries, the Catholics rightly see a clear support to their doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass.<sup>78</sup> The idea here is the same as that expressed in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions, that he who worships pagan gods, or tastes meat sacrificed to them has communion with demons.<sup>79</sup> Further the words “This *do* in remembrance of me” had the connotation in both Greek and Latin (ποιεῖτε, *facite*) of “doing sacrifice.”<sup>80</sup>

Indeed it was inevitable that the communions should be regarded as the counterpart of sacrifices, both Jewish and pagan.<sup>81</sup> And in the later developments of both religions, Paul would find prepared for him the idea of “spiritual and bloodless sacrifices,” a phrase soon borrowed to denote the eucharist. According to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs the angels offer such sacrifices to God.<sup>82</sup> In the Hermetic literature the same phrase λογικὴ θυσία is applied to the offering brought by Tat to his father Hermes.<sup>83</sup> The victim here thought of was the

<sup>76</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7.

<sup>76</sup> 1 Cor. x. 17f.

<sup>77</sup> 1 Cor. x. 21. Srawley, in *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, V, 544.

<sup>78</sup> Council of Trent, Mirbt, 242.

<sup>79</sup> II, 71. Kennedy, 273.

<sup>80</sup> Conybeare in E. B., “Eucharist.” Renz, I, 152. Cajetan, quoted below; Stone I, 9. The same double meaning is in Hebrew תשע.

<sup>81</sup> Conybeare, *Myths, Morals and Magic*, 252.

<sup>82</sup> Test. Levi, III, 6.

<sup>83</sup> *Corpus Hermeticum*, XIII. 18; Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen*, 35, 88.

Logos,<sup>84</sup> just as in similar words about Isis the victim offered to the goddess was herself.<sup>85</sup> And this victim was represented by the body of the worshiper, a comparison also made by Livy in describing the Bacchanalia.<sup>86</sup> All this serves to illuminate Paul's injunction to the Romans (xii. 1) to present their bodies to God as a spiritual service. The allusion is not directly to the eucharist but is from a circle of ideas closely analogous to that of the sacrifice of the communion. It is expressed more clearly in 1 Peter ii. 5.

Other passages in the Pauline epistles<sup>87</sup> doubtless have the eucharistic doctrine as a background, but they are too vague, apart from one in Colossians, to be discussed presently, to be of importance for our present purpose.

It will be objected that if Paul really introduced a new and pagan rite into Christianity, it would have been withstood violently by the Jewish Christians and especially by the previous apostles.<sup>88</sup> To this the answer is that he really was so opposed and on this very point. Since F. C. Baur,<sup>89</sup> few church historians have realized the tremendous strain that existed between the Jerusalem community and the Apostle of the Gentiles. It became so virulent that when Mark wrote his gospel, entirely along Pauline lines,<sup>90</sup> he could find scarcely anything to say about Peter save that

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 91.

<sup>86</sup> Livy, XXXIX, 10, 7; Reitzenstein, p. 88.

<sup>87</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 13; Galatians iii. 6-26; Romans iv. 25 to v. 9; Eph. ii. On these see B. W. Bacon in *Harvard Theological Review*, 1915, 505ff. He finds not only the Pauline epistles but the Gospels "polarized" about the two sacraments of baptism and the supper.

<sup>88</sup> Schweitzer, *Paulinische Forschung, Einleitung*.

<sup>89</sup> *Paul*, English translation, 1876, Introduction and Part I, *passim*. On this, Schweitzer, *Paulinische Forschung*, 10 and 194. Cf. further, *Hibbert*, 1913, 737ff.

<sup>90</sup> On Mark's Paulinism, Loisy, *Les évangiles synoptiques*, I, 25, 116; B. W. Bacon, *The Beginnings of the Gospel Story*, 1909, pp. xxvff. Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 248. The theory, originating with Papias, that Mark represents Peter, has been exploded.

he had denied his Lord and that Christ had called him Satan.<sup>91</sup> When, on the other hand, the Jewish faction expressed itself, it was to brand Paul as "a false apostle and a liar,"<sup>92</sup> and, "Balaam, who taught the children of Israel to eat things sacrificed to idols and to commit fornication."<sup>93</sup> Not only the Jews but the disciples of John at Ephesus and Damascus anathematized him as the perverter of their law, "the man of scoffing."<sup>94</sup> That the great schism in the early Church does not occupy a still more important place in the New Testament is due partly to the fact that Peter and Paul apparently divided the field into two spheres of influence, the Jerusalem apostles agreeing, for the sake of a tribute, to allow Paul to preach what he wished to the Gentiles.<sup>95</sup> It is also due in part to the complete triumph, after the destruction of Jerusalem, of the Pauline faction and to the desire of irenic historians like Luke to smooth everything over and make all appear according to Paul's gospel from the beginning.<sup>96</sup>

As to the eucharist, though there was opposition, its adoption was made easier to the Jewish Christians by the fact that they already had a common meal with which it was soon identified. This "love-feast," as we know from Jude, Tertullian and other sources, continued to the second century at least.<sup>97</sup> The difference of opinion among scholars as to whether it was identical with or different from the eucharist, is doubtless due to the fact that the two, at

<sup>91</sup> Mark viii. 31-34; xiv. 66-72.

<sup>92</sup> Apocalypse ii. 2; the allusion to Paul has been recognized by Renan and many others.

<sup>93</sup> Apocalypse ii. 14. The reference is to the doctrine of 1 Cor. x. Spiritual fornication, or idolatry, is meant.

<sup>94</sup> In the recently discovered *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, cf. G. Margoliouth in *Expositor*, Dec. 1911 and March 1912.

<sup>95</sup> Galatians ii. 7. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic and Morals*, 11. Hibbert, 1913, pp. 748ff.

<sup>96</sup> Hibbert, 757. Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 158f.

<sup>97</sup> Conybeare, "Agape" in *Encyclopædia Brit.*



first distinct, were gradually merged. It is noteworthy that the purely Jewish Christian literature, so far as it has survived in the New Testament—namely Q, James, Jude, 2 Peter and the Apocalypse—says nothing of the great rite of the Gentile Church. Nor—and this is very significant<sup>98</sup>—does the Shepherd of Hermas, one of the earliest Roman Christian writings. Little later the Didache,<sup>99</sup> in giving an account of the eucharist, carefully refrains from speaking of the Last Supper, of the body or blood or of the sacrifice of the cross. Instead of the words of institution, he recommends a simple prayer connecting the cup with the “vine of David.”

A somewhat stronger opposition is probably seen in the Epistle to the Hebrews. O. Holtzmann has recently pointed out in this book a polemic against the eucharist.<sup>100</sup> Other scholars<sup>101</sup> have seen reference to the eucharist without polemic, and still others<sup>102</sup> have denied that there are any references at all. The verses which Holtzmann relies on are xiii. 9f: “Be not carried away by diverse and strange teachings: for it is good that the heart be established by grace, not by foods wherein they that occupied themselves were not profited. We have an altar of which they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.” This seems to agree well with the interpretation of Holtzmann, and it is on the whole supported by other verses in the epistle. Thus in vi. 2, the writer speaks of baptism and laying on of hands but omits the eucharist. More striking is ix. 9: “gifts and sacrifices which cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshiper perfect, being only, with meats and drinks and divers washings, carnal ordinances.” The reference is,

<sup>98</sup> Réville, *Révue de l'histoire des religions*, LVI, 26.

<sup>99</sup> IX, 10; Gardner, *Exploratio Evan.*, 458; *Religious Experience of Paul*, 119, etc.

<sup>100</sup> *Z. N. T. W.*, 1909, 251-60, against him, Goguel, 219.

<sup>101</sup> Srawley, *E. R. E.*, V, 543.

<sup>102</sup> Lambert, 391.

of course, to the old dispensation, but through it the author seems to hit at the new ceremonialism. Again, the insistence in x, 12 that Jesus was sacrificed once only for our sins seems to read almost like a Protestant polemic against the repeated sacrifice of the mass. The Paulinists also seem to be scored in the verse against those who have counted the blood of the covenant a common thing (xii. 29). The verse "forget not to do good and to communicate," refers, naturally, not to communion but to giving to the poor, as in Romans xv. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 13.

One other passage in Paul has been left for discussion until now, because it seems to refer to those who oppose his eucharist doctrine. I mean Col. ii. 16f: "Let no man therefore judge you in food or in drink, or in respect to a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day: which are but a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ's."

The Synoptic gospels adopt the Pauline view entire. I will spare my reader the exhibition of the texts relating to the Last Supper in parallel columns, and the long comparison of them, with the purpose of discovering what is historic or original in them. All such attempts have definitely failed. Those who favor Mark and those who prefer Luke,<sup>103</sup> cannot show that there is anything but Paul in the lesson of the narratives. The words attributed to Jesus, are, says Loisy, "the doctrine of Paul and are simply incomprehensible as addressed by Jesus to his disciples on the day of his death."<sup>104</sup> Mark did not need to copy them from 1 Corinthians, for the usage had become established at Rome when he wrote. His omission of the Pauline words "Do this in remembrance of me" has no significance, for they seemed to Mark implied, or, as Germans would say, *selbstverständlich*. Schweitzer and others have seen in the verse added by Mark, in which Jesus says that he will

<sup>103</sup> As Heitmüller, and Bacon, *H. T. R.* V, 322ff.

<sup>104</sup> *L'évangile selon Marc*, 403.

no more drink of the fruit of the vine until he shall drink it new in the kingdom of God, a genuine reminiscence. This, however, is untenable; for the idea here is also Pauline, closely similar to that of 1 Cor. xi. 26.

There are at least three other allusions to the eucharist in Mark besides the account of its institution. The first of these of which I shall speak is positive proof that words about the sacrament could be attributed to Jesus, though he could not possibly have spoken them. When the sons of Zebedee ask for the chief places in Christ's kingdom, he replies (x. 38). "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" This joining of the cup and baptism is surely a figurative allusion to the two Christian sacraments. But as the content of the pericope is a prophecy of the death of James and John, a *vaticinium ex eventu* certainly not genuine, the allusion to the eucharist placed in Jesus's mouth is certainly later than his time.

From the earliest days it has been recognized that the miraculous feeding of the multitudes is a symbol of the spiritual nourishment of mankind by the communion bread. John, the first commentator on the synoptics, so took it, and joins on to it his version of the sacramental words attributed to Christ.<sup>105</sup> How carefully the symbolism is carried out is shown in one narrative of Mark by the seating of the people in groups, as was done in the early Church, and his other narrative by the instructions to pick up the fragments. This may be compared with the miraculous instructions given by Tertullian,<sup>106</sup> and followed in the Roman Church to-day, to let none of the precious body of the Lord be left on the floor, if dropped.

The use of fish in connection with the eucharist at Rome

<sup>105</sup> Loisy, *L'évangile selon Marc*, 191ff; 225ff, to Mark vi. 32ff and viii. 1ff. Cf. John vi.

<sup>106</sup> *De corona mil.*, 3.

where Mark wrote has been noticed above. The reason for his repetition of substantially the same miracle is probably to be found in his use of sources, though it has been conjectured that he wished to symbolize the callings of the Jews and Gentiles respectively.

Matthew and Luke add nothing on this subject to Q and Mark. In Luke, however, we have an interesting textual problem on which I believe I can throw light. Some manuscripts,<sup>107</sup> headed by D, omit the words (xxii. 19b-20): "given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. And in like manner the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you." The textual evidence together with "the suspicious resemblance of this passage to 1 Corinthians" led Westcott and Hort to bracket it as an interpolation. The words are evidently taken from Paul, but as it is just as possible that Luke borrowed them as that his copyist did, and as they are present in most of the decisive authorities, they are retained by Von Soden and regarded as genuine by Jülicher, Cremer, Clemen, Schweitzer, Lambert and others.<sup>108</sup> If, then, they were in the original, why does the Codex Bezae (D) omit them? The answer is this: The reviser of D (or rather, probably the scribe of an earlier manuscript he copies), was from Asia Minor,<sup>109</sup> probably from Ephesus, at which place there was the strongest opposition both to Paul and to his eucharistic doctrine. The Disciples of John there, as is proved by the Odes of Solomon<sup>110</sup> and the Johannine writings, presently to be discussed, refused to take the eucharist bread or to recognize it as the flesh of Christ. Even as late as the second cen-

<sup>107</sup> Besides D, the old African and Italic Latin versions omit them, and Tatian changes the order of words.

<sup>108</sup> Lambert, 245.

<sup>109</sup> Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, 151ff.

<sup>110</sup> Preserved Smith, "The Odes of Solomon and the Disciples of John," *Monist*, April 1915, pp. 186f.

ture the Docetae of Asia Minor, probably an offshoot of the Johannites, took the same position.<sup>111</sup> Now the reviser of the manuscript represented by D and the Latins did not dare to omit the story of the institution as a whole, but he did delete the words implying a sacrifice and the command to repeat. Like the Fourth Evangelist later he hoped thus to keep the spiritual lesson and to avoid the ritual repetition.

Acts occasionally mentions the celebration of the Supper (ii. 42; xx. 7), but as it adds nothing to our knowledge, save to show that it and Paul's interpretation of it were thoroughly established in the community and at the late date at which Luke wrote, the book need not be further noticed.

Of the New Testament writings there remain to be discussed only the Gospel and First Epistle of John. On their teaching the most extraordinary diversity of opinion has prevailed. Some scholars have denied that the Gospel refers to the eucharist at all. Others have seen in it only an intensification and emphasis on the sacramental theory of Paul. Many think that John "spiritualizes" Paul's teaching, though without saying definitely how. The data are these: (1) John omits the account of the Last Supper and substitutes for it foot-washing, with a probable allusion to baptism. (2) In the sixth chapter he joins to the narrative of the miraculous feeding a long discourse of Jesus on the necessity of eating his flesh and drinking his blood: "I am the bread of life. He who cometh unto me shall never hunger and he who believeth on me shall never thirst." "I am the living bread coming down from heaven. If any one eat of this bread he shall live forever. For the bread which I shall give him is my flesh which is for the life of the world. Then the Jews contended with one another saying, How can this man

<sup>111</sup> Ignatius *ad Smyrn.*, 6.

give us his flesh to eat? Then said Jesus to them, Verily, verily I say unto you, if ye eat not the flesh of the Son of man and drink not his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. The feeder on my flesh and the drinker of my blood hath life eternal, and I shall raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is true nourishment and my blood is true drink. The feeder on my flesh and the drinker of my blood remaineth in me and I in him."

Knowing the methods of the Fourth Evangelist, his total independence of historical tradition and his custom of writing into the narrative the lessons he thought needed in his own day, it is easy to see in this debate, nowhere recorded in the Synoptics, the controversy actually in process at Ephesus, between the Pauline Christians on one side and the Jewish and Baptist parties in the Church on the other. (3) It is possible that there is some allusion to the eucharist in the story of the wedding at Cana, but, if so, it is vague and not to our purpose.<sup>112</sup> The water and the blood issuing from Jesus's side at the passion have been interpreted as referring to the two sacraments. It is quite possible that the parable of the true vine (John xv. 1ff) situated as it is in Jesus's last discourse to the disciples, is an allusion to the eucharist cup, suggested by Mark xiv. 25. It is noteworthy that the prayer of consecration in the *Didache* connects the cup with the vine of David.

How shall we interpret these seemingly conflicting data? Why did John refuse to regard the Last Supper as historical, while embodying the doctrine of the flesh and blood of Jesus in such strong language? Did he omit the Last Supper simply as he omitted the baptism of Jesus and as he says that the master baptized not, but his disciples, as though his Christ were superior to sacramental

<sup>112</sup> John ii. 1ff. His sources were Mark ii. 18-22; Matt. xxii. 1-14; Luke xiv. 15-24, and IV Ezra X. Similar tales were told of Dionysus turning water into wine at his epiphany. This pericope was in ancient rituals a lesson for Epiphany. Bacon, *H. T. R.*, 1915, p. 115.

acts?<sup>113</sup> Surely not. His Jesus, who weeps and suffers hunger and washes his disciples' feet, is not above eating with them a ritual meal. Or does he transpose the institution of the eucharist to the earlier account of the feeding of the multitudes to show that Jesus's eating with his disciples was no new thing at his death, but that his every meal with them was consecrated? This view<sup>114</sup> also seems insufficient, and at variance with certain verses in the discourse quoted above (John vi).

The solution of the enigma, I am persuaded, will be found in the situation at Ephesus where the evangelist wrote. There, as we know (Acts xviii. 19ff) was a church founded by Paul, in which, naturally, the eucharist would be celebrated. But there was also a powerful element in the church drawn from the Disciples of John,<sup>115</sup> who had no eucharist, and who would doubtless oppose it, just as the Bohemian Brethren absorbed into Protestantism for long kept their own distinctive tenets. But we have already proved from Hebrews, from Colossians and from the D recension of Luke xxii, that there was opposition to the eucharist, and especially at Ephesus. Now, though the sources of the Fourth Gospel are many—the Synoptics, the Apocalypse, Philo, the Hermetic literature, and of course the Jewish scriptures—the ones from which he drew most heavily for his doctrine were the Pauline epistles and Odes of Solomon,<sup>116</sup> these latter written at Ephesus by the Disciples of John, and consequently full of allusions to baptism, but with none to the eucharist. Unhampered as he was by any trace of independent tradition,<sup>117</sup> he felt

<sup>113</sup> John iv. 2. Schweitzer advances this view, *Paulinische Forschung*, 157ff.

<sup>114</sup> Bacon, 434f, maintains it.

<sup>115</sup> Acts, xix. 1ff. That the Disciples would have no eucharist is obvious and is also proved by the Odes of Solomon. *Monist*, April, 1915, p. 186f.

<sup>116</sup> So Harnack and Rendel Harris. *Monist*, 1915, pp. 171ff.

<sup>117</sup> This fact, still disputed, has been pretty well established by Loisy, Bacon and others.

free to deal with the facts as he liked. As a follower of Paul he wished to preserve and emphasize the great spiritual lesson which he found in the words about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Jesus. On the other hand he could not ignore the Disciples of John and their heirs, supported as they were by Jewish Christians, who abominated the supper as a heathen rite. Whether the evangelist had once himself been a disciple of the Baptist remains uncertain,<sup>118</sup> but that he did write with them constantly in his eye has long been recognized.<sup>119</sup> He therefore rejected the founding of the eucharist, and substituted for it a washing reminiscent of the one sacrament universally accepted, while at the same time conserving the lesson that Jesus is the bread of life. Not without reason does his language hark back to the Jewish Scriptures, to the Apocrypha and to Philo,<sup>120</sup> in showing that the Logos is the true nourishment of the soul. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood," says he, "ye have no life in you." By this he would not have understood in the old, literal way: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (John vi 63).

How then shall we explain the emphasis on the "water and the blood," i. e., the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, in John xix. 34 and 1 John v. 6? It has been proposed to regard the "blood" here simply as an allusion to the passion. It is probable that the Docetae,<sup>121</sup> at whom these verses may have been aimed, denied the passion, and it has been shown that it would be most appropriate to connect the blood of martyrdom with the water of baptism,

<sup>118</sup> Gardner, *Ephesian Gospel*, 87f.

<sup>119</sup> Baldensperger, *Der Prolog zum vierten Evangelium*, 1897; Dibelius, *Johannes der Täufer*, 1911; B. W. Bacon, *Fourth Gospel*, 290.

<sup>120</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 4; Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 29; Pfeleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, 1906ff, IV, 231ff. Probably also to the supersubstantial bread of the Lord's prayer.

<sup>121</sup> This explanation offered by Bacon.



for the one might well follow the other.<sup>122</sup> Such an explanation would obviate all difficulties, but I am inclined, nevertheless, to see at least a secondary allusion to the eucharist in the "blood." If this is true, there is certainly a contrast to the teaching of the earlier chapters of the gospel. It can be instantly seen by comparing John iii. 5 with 1 John v. 6. The first passage reads: "Except a man be born by water and the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." The second: "This is he that cometh by water and blood and spirit, Jesus Christ. . . . Because these three are witnesses, the spirit and the water and the blood." In the first chapter of the gospel, then, the spirit and baptism were all that was necessary, but in the epistle and in the later, probably subsequently added, verse in the gospel, the eucharist is joined with them as one of the means of salvation. Though I am no friend of the hypothesis of interpolation, by which many wild theories have been proved, I have unusually strong reason for claiming that this verse is subsequently added. Bacon,<sup>123</sup> among other authorities, recognizes that the whole of chapter xxi, and that John xix. 35 are added by a later editor. The evidence for the last verse is overwhelming; it reads: "And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true, and that man knoweth he speaketh the truth that ye may believe." The introduction without antecedent of "that man," ἐκεῖνος, *ille*, would be simply incomprehensible in the original narrative. The word points to the author of the gospel as seen by some one else. The solemn asseveration, as to a new and disputed fact, also strongly indicates editorial revision. Now it is absurd to regard the asseveration, and that alone, as interpolated. Something else must have been introduced with it, something

<sup>122</sup> So R. Winterbotham in *Expositor*, 1911, 62ff, and J. Denney, *ibid.*, 1908, 416ff. The latter regards the "blood" as referring primarily to the passion and martyrdom, secondarily to the eucharist.

<sup>123</sup>P. 191.

to which the asseveration applies, and this can only be the previous verse about the water and the blood. This, then, was added by the editor, who introduced it from the epistle. If we regard the gospel and epistle as by the same hand, we are then reduced to the necessity of reconciling the omission of the eucharist in one to its recognition in the other document. The true explanation has been suggested by Percy Gardner:<sup>124</sup> "In old age, when he wrote the epistle, the Evangelist seems to have relied, as was natural to a man of failing powers, somewhat more on the visible rites of the Church." It is remarkable that we find exactly such a change in Luther's dogma, and that completed in ten short years. In 1520 he put the essence (*res*) of the sacrament in the Word, and stated that the actual rite was not necessary to salvation; in 1530 he was ready to affirm that the real essence (*res*) of the sacrament was in the elements, and that participation in them was absolutely indispensable to secure their benefits. So with the Evangelist; in his younger years the spiritual lesson was all important; later, as the rite became more firmly established and as he became more ecclesiastical, he accepted the communion as essential.

Most of the Gnostic sects known to us adopted the eucharist, with its ideas of immolation and theophagy.<sup>125</sup> Many of their dogmas were probably founded directly on mystery cults with which they were connected in pre-Christian times. How easily pagan ideas amalgamated with Christian is seen in the eucharistic prayer in the Acts of Thomas:<sup>126</sup> "Come, communion of the male. . . . Come, thou that discloseth secrets and makest manifest the mysteries. . . . Come and communicate with us in thy eucharist."

<sup>124</sup> *Ephesian Gospel*, 213.

<sup>125</sup> A good account of their dogmas in W. M. Groton, pp. 35ff.

<sup>126</sup> Chaps. xlix and l; Pick, *Apocryphal Acts*, 268f.

Here emerge the two primitive conceptions of the mysteries and of communion with the divine after the manner of sex.

Clement of Rome in the first century calls the communion an offering and a sacrifice.<sup>127</sup> By making it the "liturgy" *par excellence* of the Church, he puts it in the place of the highest form of divine worship which it has ever since held in the Roman Church.

Ignatius also thinks of it as a sacrifice, and as charged with a magical quality for keeping both body and soul deathless. "The bread," says he, "is the medicine of immortality, the antidote preserving us that we should not die, but live for ever in Jesus Christ."<sup>128</sup> This is but a literal interpretation of John's teaching by a younger contemporary. Ignatius also states plainly that the body is the same as that which suffered on the cross.<sup>129</sup>

According to Justin Martyr, "God, anticipating all the sacrifices offered in his name by the command of Jesus Christ, namely the eucharist of the bread and the cup, which are offered by Christians in all places throughout the world, testified that they are well-pleasing unto him."<sup>130</sup> He also speaks of the eucharist as becoming the body and blood of Christ through the prayer of the Logos. To him also it is a memorial of the passion and a magical charm for giving men immortality. His comparison of this sacrament with that of Mithra has already been mentioned. In this connection it is interesting to note that with him and quite a number of other early Christians, the elements were not bread and wine but bread and water.<sup>131</sup> Paul speaks only of the "cup," without denoting

<sup>127</sup> *Ad Cor.* 40, 44; cf. 36. Srawley, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, V, 546; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, IX, 868; Goguel, 224; Lambert, 412.

<sup>128</sup> *Ad Eph.*, 20. Srawley, 546.

<sup>129</sup> *Ad Smyr.*, 6; cf. *Ad Rom.*, 7.

<sup>130</sup> *Dialogue with Trypho*, 117. *First Apology*, 66, 67. Srawley, 547; Lambert 415.

<sup>131</sup> Harnack, *Brot und Wasser. T. & U.*, VII, 2, 1891.

its contents, but both he and the gospels imply that it was wine.<sup>132</sup>

It was the insistence on the element of sacrifice that gave rise to the rumors in the Roman world of "Thyestean banquets." Early in the second century Pliny<sup>133</sup> felt it necessary to inform Trajan that the meal partaken of by the Christians was of harmless and ordinary food, and that he found nothing criminal in it but only a perverse and excessive superstition. In the same letter he uses the word *sacramentum* of the morning service, but does not connect it with the supper which was eaten later in the day. The word, which we have seen was already used of the rites of Bacchus and Isis, became the regular translation of the Greek "mysterium," the initiation into holy secrets and magical practices characteristic of all the "mystery-religions," including Christianity. The word is found in the Septuagint only in the latest books, Daniel and the Apocrypha, when the Hellenization of the Jews was well under way.

Though Clement of Alexandria does not emphasize the sacrificial aspect of the eucharist, he is familiar with the conception of sacrifice as originally a feast upon a victim, and neither the idea of the Real Presence nor that of transubstantiation are foreign to his thought.<sup>134</sup>

Irenaeus call the bread and wine an offering to God the Father of the body and blood of his Son, and says that it is efficacious for the body as well as for the soul. When consecrated, the bread is no longer bread but of two elements, a heavenly and an earthly, and prepares our bodies for the resurrection. He compares it to the sacrifices of the Jews to its advantage, as being offered by children, not servants.<sup>135</sup>

<sup>132</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 21; Mark xiv. 25 etc.      <sup>133</sup> Ép., 96.

<sup>134</sup> Tollington, *Clement of Alexandria*, 1914, II, 155.

<sup>135</sup> *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xviii, 4. *De corpore et sanguine*, V, ii, 2. Srawley, 547.

As has been shown, the fundamental idea in eating the God was to become like him. This was carried so far in the pagan religions, that the initiates not only imitated what the god was fabled to have done, but were actually called by his name. The adorer of Bacchus became a Bacchus; the follower of Attis was called Attis.<sup>136</sup> This dogma could not be better expressed than it was by Cyril of Jerusalem, who, in his Fourth Mystagogic Catechism teaches: "By taking the body and blood of Christ, you become one body and one blood with him. For thus we become Christ-bearers (χριστοφόροι) by his body and blood being digested into our members."<sup>137</sup> The language of ritual again became the mother of legend, and the myth of St. Christopher was born.

The "highest" doctrine of the sacrifice of the communion is found in Cyprian near the middle of the third century. "The priest," says he, "imitates what Christ did, and offers then in the Church to God the Father a true and complete sacrifice,"<sup>138</sup> and again: "The passion of the Lord is the sacrifice we offer."<sup>139</sup>

Cyprian's idea of the effect of the magic food was that of the savage medicine-man. He tells in one place of a little girl who had eaten some meat sacrificed to idols and thus became possessed by devils. When she came to the Lord's table, she accordingly refused the consecrated cup and fell into fits.<sup>140</sup> A similar magical effect is attributed to the host by the Acts of Thomas.<sup>141</sup> A youth who had murdered his mistress partook of the eucharist and immediately had his hand withered. The Apostle forthwith invited him to confess his crime, "for," said he, "the

<sup>136</sup> As in Catullus's famous poem of that name.

<sup>137</sup> Quoted, Dietrich, 107.

<sup>138</sup> Ep. LXVIII, 14. Mirbt, 24b.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>140</sup> *De lapsis*, cap. 25. Dietrich, 107.

<sup>141</sup> Cap. XLVIII.

eucharist of the Lord hath convicted thee." It is well to bear in mind that the magic of the host is not a medieval invention but as primitive as the rite itself.

The Didascalia, in the second half of the third century, speaks of "offering the acceptable eucharist, which is the symbol (ἀντίτυπον) of the royal body of Christ."<sup>142</sup>

In the next age the Apostolic Constitutions call the bread and wine "symbols (ἀντίτυπα) of his precious body and blood" and an "unbloody sacrifice," celebrated to commemorate the Lord's death.<sup>143</sup>

Eusebius of Caesarea says that Christians are "fed with the body of the Saviour," and that Christ delivered to his disciples the symbols of his divine incarnation, charging them to make the image of his own body.<sup>143</sup> (Are we listening to the priest of Aricia and his image of the Wood-King baked in bread?) Here and elsewhere the words for image (εἶκων, *figura*), imply the real presence.

Tertullian's fetishism made him dread any disrespect offered to the magic food. He speaks of "handling the Lord's body" and of "offering violence to it." The bread he also calls the "figure of the body," and "that which represents the body," without, however, implying that the body is absent. Rather than saying that he began to confound the bread with the body, it is truer to see in him the first to distinguish them.<sup>144</sup>

In many writers of the period of Rome's decline and fall the sacrificial idea comes to dominate all others. Strange, this fascination of blood, that *ganz besonderer Saft*, for the savage and religious mind! Only by some horrible cruelty and suffering inflicted, generally against their wills, on others, can man escape from the bogies of his own conscience! Like other Christian doctrines, that of the

<sup>142</sup> Srawley, *E. R. E.*, v. 549.

<sup>143</sup> *De Solemnitate Pasch.*, 7.

<sup>144</sup> Srawley, *E. R. E.*, v. 549.

atonement is rooted in the primeval practice of the savage in cursing some senseless object, or killing some harmless animal or innocent person, in order to get rid of his own sins on vicarious shoulders.<sup>145</sup> Some such idea haunted the mind of Athenagoras when he speaks of "the bloodless sacrifice of the Christians," as the counterpart of the bloody sacrifice of the cross. Thus does Cyril of Jerusalem dilate upon the "holy and most awful sacrifice," "Christ immolated for our sins to propitiate God who loves men," offered in the eucharist. Thus Chrysostom gloats over "the Lord lying slain, and the priest standing over the victim praying, all reddened with that blood."<sup>146</sup>

Before closing this section on the primitive Church, it is pertinent to notice one question which early came up, as to the ministration of women in the eucharist. From the first, women had taken a part in divine service and had prophesied with the men. Such were the daughters of Philip the Evangelist, from whom, according to Harnack,<sup>147</sup> Luke derived much of his peculiar material. But St. Paul, who commonly lent his influence to the worst social oppressions of the age,<sup>148</sup> in this also advocated the subjection of women,<sup>149</sup> thus adding to the burden of that much suffering sex. As, however, the practice continued here and there, we meet with later efforts to deal with it. The most interesting of these is in the Apostolic Church Order.<sup>150</sup> It is but one instance of many to show the inveterate tendency of men to refer back to authority, and, if there is not a command of God covering the subject they desire to deal with, to invent one. Just as Paul

<sup>145</sup> J. G. Frazer, *The Scapegoat*.

<sup>146</sup> *De Sacerdot.*, VI, 4; Srawley, *E. R. E.*, 551f.

<sup>147</sup> *Luke the Physician*.

<sup>148</sup> E. g., passive resistance to tyranny, Romans xiii. 1ff, and slavery, 1 Cor. vii. 20f.

<sup>149</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 34ff; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 12.

<sup>150</sup> Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apocryphen*, 1909, 165. Pick, *Paralipomena*, 68b.

fabled that Christ had instituted the Supper, so the later author felt free to write history as follows: "The Apostle John said: 'You have forgotten, brethren, that when the master demanded the cup and the bread and consecrated them with the words, That is my body and blood, he did not allow them [*sc.* Mary and Martha] to come to us.' Martha said, 'It was on account of Mary, for he saw her smile.' Mary said: 'I did not laugh; it is rather as he said to us before that weakness should be saved by strength.'"<sup>151</sup>

This obvious invention did not entirely suppress the abuse at which it was aimed, or else the practice cropped up afresh from time to time. The service of women at the altar was condemned by a council of Nimes in 394, but still persisted in certain parts of France. In the sixth century in Brittany women called "conhospites" offered the blood of Christ to the people and carried the elements around on portable altars. This "unheard-of superstition" was denounced and suppressed by the bishops Licinius of Tours and Melaine of Rennes. It is continued elsewhere, however, until the ninth century.<sup>152</sup> It is profitable to compare with this the service of maidens at the grail, an ancient vegetable sacrifice which finally became identified with the eucharist.<sup>153</sup>

PRESERVED SMITH.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

<sup>151</sup> I. e., woman by man.

<sup>152</sup> *Monumenta Germ. Hist., Leges*, I, cap. 2, p. 42. I owe this reference to Miss R. J. Peebles. Other examples of women who dispensed the eucharist in the early Church or in heretical sects given in article "*Frauenämter*," in *R. G. G.*; Lydia Stöcker, *Die Frau in der alten Kirche*, 1907; L. Zscharnack, *Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche*, Göttingen, 1902.

<sup>153</sup> Peebles, *The Legend of Longinus*, 1911, 209.