

## CHAPTER VI

### CARE OF THE POOR FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT DAY

AT the Reformation the Protestant Church in all countries—we may take Scotland as one of the best examples and most familiar to ourselves—endeavoured to retain for the poor the large endowment which had been gradually accumulated in their name.<sup>1</sup> Even the statesmanlike proposals of John Knox amounted to little more than the application, in a national system, of the principles of care for the poor by which the monastery had been guided in the locality subject to it. His local college and his elementary school were simply what had been found at the abbey gates before the system was buried under corruptions; and the old Scottish

<sup>1</sup> "These twa sortis of men, that is to say the Ministers [of the Word] and the Poore, togiddor with the schollis, when ourdeur shall be taken thairanent, must be sustened upon the chargeis of the Church. . . . Of the teyndis must not onlie the minister be sustened, but *also the Poore* and schollis. . . . The Church is onlie bound to sustene and nourishe

off her charges the personis before mentioned, *to wit* the ministers of the word, the Poore and the Teacheris of the youth." The "hospital" is mentioned as to be maintained from the Church funds.—*First Book of Discipline*, c. vii. The Parochial system began with Archbishop Theodore. See details in Montalembert, iv. 209.

custom of a Sabbath gift for the poor was an attempt to revive the system of contributions, which was as old as the days of Justin Martyr. The application of Church funds to maintain "the ministers, the poore, and the teachers of the youth" was a wise purpose baffled by the greed of men with mailed hands. We ought perhaps to remember as telling against the monasteries that the Sabbath offering, which for five centuries was dedicated to the poor, came to be regarded in the sixth century, and was usually viewed thereafter, as due to the clergy, and a payment for mass. This may be entered as against the monastic system, because it was at that date that the great monastic system prevailed over the earlier organisation of the Christian Church. One fruit of the Protestant Reformation was that congregational offerings were revived as the patrimony of the poor, and the officers of the Church were installed as managers of the parochial funds. For nearly 300 years—at least from 1597 to 1845—the poor of Scotland were chiefly maintained by the kirk-sessions, from funds supplied in large measure by the weekly offerings of the congregation.<sup>1</sup> Testamentary bequests and the extra congregational liberality of living men made up in some parishes what might otherwise have been deficient, and there was from 1579 legal authority for imposing an assessment when necessary.

<sup>1</sup> There was an Interdict on the funds raised at the door of a chapel of ease being given towards the maintenance of the minister. The Assembly—it was

surely a mad moment—ordered the managers to go on in disregard of the Interdict (1837). See Wilson, *Index to Acts of Assembly*, p. 58.

A long and keen controversy led to the enactment of the present Scottish Poor Law. That law would probably have come in any case, but the division of the Church made it inevitable. By seceding from the Established Church in 1843 Dr. Chalmers completed the defeat of his own attractive scheme for the voluntary support of the poor in a parish by the Christian congregation. It was proved before the Royal Commission [see Report in 1844] that the old law, *i.e.* the law using the voluntary offerings of the Church, was unequal in its operation; that it was inadequate in populous places; that the allowances under it were too small, and that disease, especially fever, made an easy prey of the impoverished population in receipt of some dole of parochial relief. Dr. Chalmers's many eager arguments had been met by the calm, clear, condensed statements of a Scottish philanthropist as unselfish as himself, and men watched with keen interest the encounter of the head of Scottish medicine with the leader of the Scottish Church. Dr. W. P. Alison's view was embodied in the Poor Law, and the battle was only too completely won. Legal assessment became the rule instead of the exception; paid officials took the place of the kirk-session; and the responsibility for the poor was transferred from the Church to the State, from the Kirk-Session to the Parochial Board. The Church has too completely accepted this as a decree of banishment from her position as God's almoner for the poor.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *On the Management of the Poor in Scotland*, by W. P. Alison, M.D., 1840. Dr. Alison's main argument is that the mor-

If, looking back upon all this, we ask ourselves how far the present state of matters realises the highest principles of the Christian Church in respect to care for the poor, our answer must be that the modern Church has much to learn. The growth of congregationalism has led to an increase of congregational liberality, but it has also brought about a weakening of the sense of responsibility for the territorial poor. We have seen that Chrysostom said that the poor men were round the Church door that the hands of the worshipper might be purified ere they were lifted up in prayer. It is a poor substitute for that when there is a plate in the Church porch to be filled with offerings for the funds of the Church, and not for the poor of the neighbourhood. Turning to the Established Church, it is one of the results of the limited endowment of *quoad sacra*

tality is greater in Scotland than in England, contagious fever from destitution being more prevalent and more fatal. Some facts recorded in his very able book are permanently interesting. In 1838 the population of Scotland was 2,315,000, and the annual expenditure on the poor was £140,496, of which about one-half was raised by assessment. Taking the population as it stood, the tax on each person was in England 6s. 10d., in Wales 6s., in Scotland only 1s. 4d. The highest allowance in the City of Edinburgh or in Glasgow (even to a widow with a family) was £4 : 16s. to £5 a year (say 2s. a week), and the usual

pension to a disabled man or woman was about 1s. a week; whereas in England a widow with four children had from 4s. to 7s. a week (reckoning a 4-lb. loaf at 8d.), and an aged or disabled man had from 2s. to 4s. The English compulsory assessment dated from the reign of Elizabeth, the Scottish Act from 1579. If the Scottish Poor Law were assimilated to that of England, Dr. Alison's computation was that Scotland would spend about £800,000 a year instead of £140,000. Last year it spent £1,285,053, which is more than 6s. a head of the population. Population 4,472,103.

parishes that the Sabbath Day offerings are regarded as going along with seat-rents to provide the clerical income. And from those new parishes the idea has spread into many that are rich with old endowments. The cost of the maintenance of worship—that is, the payment of officials and the meeting of necessary charges—was formerly defrayed by the heritors or met by a special effort; but, as a rule, congregations now regard those things as a burden on the weekly offerings. It is by no means usual for a congregation in any branch of the Christian Church to hold itself bound to maintain its own members who have fallen into straitened circumstances. They are cast on the legal provision of the Poor Law. There is no training of childhood and youth in consideration for the poor under a system of congregational giving such as that;<sup>1</sup> and attempts to minister to the wants of the afflicted and impoverished are regarded as pious deeds of an excep-

<sup>1</sup> I ask permission to refer to an attempt made during the years of my ministry by a rich and generous congregation in Glasgow forty years ago. There was a large district in Port Dundas, entirely occupied by working people and the poor, in which our Home Mission had its sphere. Families that needed help were chosen in that district, and families of the same size, and with children of about the same ages, were chosen in the wealthy congregation of The Park Parish. Both rich and poor went heartily into the proposed

alliance. The parents and the children came to know each other, to the great good of both; clothes were transferred, when used, from the rich to the poor; times of slackness of work and of illness in the poor home were tided over; domestic service or employment was found for the poorer section of the allied families as they grew up; and I believe the friendly union was a blessing to both rich and poor. Some such simple plan might bridge the "gulf, which needs not kindness but sympathy," in all great cities.

tional few instead of being the common duty of all. The day is perhaps gone by for ever when the National Church, among the many divisions of Christian denominationalism, should be regarded as either bound or competent to undertake the care of all the parochial poor through its own voluntary offerings, and the sum which it receives from national endowments is by no means an equivalent to the great expense which it would incur if it relieved the Poor Law of its paupers. Many, perhaps most, of the lately endowed *quoad sacra* parishes are in very poor districts, and in those places the congregations contain no rich people. It would be too much to expect their congregations to maintain all the parochial poor. "By an equality," said St. Paul; and in those cases the principles of equality would bring help to those poorer parishes from some of their richer neighbours in the same city. I am well aware that this is difficult, but it could be done. And more, I do not think the poor man should be robbed of his legal right to relief from the State. The Poorhouse must ever be maintained for those who will prefer the State to the Church, and the Church must be under State inspection in relieving her poor. Dr. Chalmers's hope of the voluntary maintenance of the poor cannot be realised at present in our divided Scotland. It would need, as Carlyle told him, a Dr. Chalmers in every parish; and it would need, too, the reunion of the Church which Chalmers himself did so much to disrupt. Yet surely these two things are possible. First, that every congregation should maintain

---

its own poor members, and keep them from the hopeless brand of State pauperism, and, second, that when any church or congregation undertakes a mission in a poor district, or subdivision of a town or country village, it should hold itself bound to supply the wants of the deserving poor within that territory, if they will accept its ministrations, as I believe they would. To restore the buried doctrine of some correspondence between character and relief, to give, that is to say, to the administrators of relief the right to consider the past history and present life of the recipient, would do more to raise the moral tone of our pauper population than all other means put together. And if a church which establishes a mission would boldly take over the support of the poor, and if the poor were aware that it is to that church or missionary agency they must look, I can see a speedy end to the evils of overlapping which at present make our Home Missions an expensive disgrace to the Church of Christ. There is scarcely a mission district in a great city in which three or four competing churches are not ministering to the poor without taking any account of each other; and at the same time in that very district the stated wants of the permanent poor are left by all of them to the necessarily hard officialism of the Poor Law inspector. Churches would think twice about undertaking a mission if they were aware that a mission meant not only the opening of a Hall and the providing of an occasional week-night service and Sunday sermons, and some more or less occasional doles of coals and old clothes, but also the sufficient clothing

of all the destitute, the regular feeding of all the hungry, and the education of all the young. The Church of Christ, as we have seen, was founded upon work done for the poor, and not for the poor in respect of their spiritual wants alone. Christ made no such severance, but took up the poor in respect of all their wants, whether of body or soul. The Divine Man, the Saviour of humanity, is not rightly served when His Church confines herself to what are called spiritual ministrations. It may be said that a Christian State is bound to provide for the wants of its pauper population, and this is doubtless true if the Church fails in doing it or is overburdened or not helped in doing its duty. The keenest observer will scarcely see in what respect the administration of Poor Law relief is moulded by Christian principle, however true the Christian motives of those who devised the Poor Law might have been, and however excellent the Christian character of the Poor Law officers. But can the Church be justified in giving over to the State her own commission? Can any congregation be healthily organised which is not bearing a sensible part of the burden of the poor? It used to be a boast of Christian apologists that while Pagan worship led not to charity but to extravagant public entertainments and such-like outlays, the worship of Christ was always in direct connection with ministry to the poor. Can that be said in our day? Think what the poor man loses when there is no religion in the "allowance" he gets. Think how it is at present. It is human obliga-

tion, not Christian charity, that comes to him. In other words, as it touches the poor man's hand, his weekly aliment comes to him sanctified by no Christian principle, but extorted, as he thinks, by ordinary considerations of legal justice. I do not see how the Christian Church can ever expect to raise a fallen population until it recognises, when conducting a mission, that it is its duty to relieve alike the bodily and the spiritual needs of the lowest classes. Think what the Christians are losing by their remissness. What lessons of unselfishness, of considerateness, of helpfulness; what joy in receiving the thanks of the grateful poor, what blessing from Him who says, "When ye do it to my brethren, ye do it unto Me." St. Laurence was asked to surrender the treasures of the Church, and he presented the maimed and miserable paupers! If the Church in our day would rise to the height of this great commission, then men, women, and children passively congregated under the minister's preaching in a well-appointed church would find each their several duties in ministering to the men, women, and children of the "mission" which they have undertaken. Mothers' meetings for mothers, fathers' meetings for fathers, children's meetings with children, clothing for the naked, and food for the starving, as well as the ceaseless proclamation of the gospel of love—what a ministry of mercy this would mean! Not only twice blest to him that gives and him that takes, but surely blest fourfold to both.

Time does not permit our tracing the rise and work-

ing of many Societies for relief of the Poor in the Papal Church before the Reformation, and of some—especially of the Little Sisters of the Sick Poor, founded by Vincent de Paula in 1617, and in our day associated with the bright and brief career of the gifted Ozanam—which have sprung up in the Romish Church itself in later days. Nor does time permit our tracing the rise and progress of similar institutions in the Protestant Church. In that Church they did not begin early; perhaps the Church had too hard a battle to fight for bare life in Germany and Scotland; while in England the able-bodied poor man never lost his legal right to relief, and voluntary charity seemed to be little needed at the hands of the Church.

But perhaps, too, there was something too much of doctrine in the creeds of the Protestant Reformation. When our Confession of Faith deals with good works it refers entirely to their doctrinal value in the sight of God; and there is not one word of counsel—not even borrowing St. Paul's counsel—that they who have believed in God be careful to maintain good works.<sup>1</sup> There is no such teaching as our Lord's own dramatic representation of the Day of Judgment ought to have suggested; no word bidding men feed the hungry and clothe the naked, and visit those in prison if they would find acceptance with the Elder Brother of the poor and needy. However much we admire the grand chain of noble truths wound around the Ark of the Covenant of the Faith in our ancestral creed, we must

<sup>1</sup> The (forgotten) *Book of Discipline* has the poor in mind.

feel that it never brings within our ken the schooling and strengthening of faith by service of the Redeemer. Yet who does not know—who that ever tried it—that to minister to Christ in the poor and needy, to comfort some mourner, to feed some hungry child, to rescue and lift some one that has stumbled and fallen, is the surest path to blessing for oneself, provided it is not done for the sake of that blessing? Was not that what Jesus meant when he said that whosoever giveth a cup of cold water shall receive a disciple's reward? What can a disciple's reward be but the reward of better discipleship? And yet loving eyes will search in vain through the Confession of Faith and the Shorter Catechism if they seek any such reminder and counsel. And thus it is that our creeds sought to act on the Reason and the Soul without directing the whole Humanity to arise and work the work of Christ among our brethren and His.

We live in a better time and (as we shall see under the head of Woman's Work) there are many organisations and societies whose members have dedicated their lives to Care of the Poor. As the trumpet of Reformation was sounded in Germany, and Europe and Christendom rang again, it is fitting that the still small voice calling the Church to works of brotherhood and helpfulness should come as it does from Germany too. Not only woman's work from Kaiserswerth, but men's work too from the Rough House and the Mission House at Basel, and from the splendid municipal provision for the poor in Elberfeld and Leipsic, and from many a centre of influence in the Fatherland is being done with

the union of strength and tenderness that is as characteristic of a German Christian as of a German hymn. Would that we were also doing more! I cannot see why men should have to go outside of all churches to make a Prisoners' Aid Society, or an Orphanage, or a Magdalene Institution, or a Charity Organisation, or a Free Breakfast, or a Dorcas Club; but I see many reasons why the Church should burst from her hard shell of "doctrine" (which does not really represent more than a part of the doctrine of Christ) and embrace and enclose them all. All that is Church work, for it is Christ's work. As Luther said: "After the function of preaching the Gospel there is in the Church no higher function than this stewardship that a man shall honourably and righteously distribute the goods of the Church, so that poor Christians who cannot earn their own livelihood should be helped, and never suffer the pangs of want" (*Werke*, xiii. 2466, Walch, Halle, 1743).

There is, however, ample proof that present distress is not likely to be cured by churches. It is a sad thing to say, but it is true. Churches do not amalgamate or combine for the relief of the poor; they do not even work out separately the same principles of relief. The State has had, as we saw, to step in and legislate for the poor without calling for the aid of the Church of Christ. The poor have been benefited thereby—and the churches have suffered in the national proclamation that their aims are too narrow and their efforts too weak to be worthy of the cause they profess to represent. But this is not all. At this moment all men are awakening to

the further truth that present legislation is inadequate, as inadequate as the work of the Church. The hopeless poverty of many millions of the population, the absolute destitution of some millions, call for greater efforts, and more systematic. Human hearts and hands are needed, not only to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked, but to lift up the downcast, and to guide their feet in the way of well-doing and usefulness. Mere officials cannot do all this. The Church, of course, ought to supply them; and if all the denominations would unite to furnish such supply, the Kingdom of Christ might be seen. One cannot be without hope that the cause of Social Reform will one day unite those who quarrel over Creeds and doctrinal definitions. Meanwhile, however, what is to be done? What will be the next step?

The *Salvation Army* is not a Church; it was originally an attempt to evoke and organise Christian zeal apart from all churches, and it has neither a stated ministry nor sacraments. It would surpass wonder that it should, notwithstanding, have so many unmistakable tokens of Divine Aid in its work, if we did not see how much of Christ's spirit and purpose there is in the heart of "the Army." That a great Christian Society should have no sacraments is, from one point of view, fatal to its permanency, but it is dangerous for churches which have sacraments and little of the Master's spirit to plume themselves on their superiority to the followers of General Booth. Circumcision availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. Even as in His

lifetime, Jesus Christ, by whose blessing we all live, has to bless and own very imperfect followers, and we should learn a wider charity and a more serious self-examination if we asked ourselves what it is in the work of the Salvation Army which Christ has owned and so signally blessed. Surely we may say it is the message delivered to the poor. The soldiers of the Army have been among the poor as one that serveth; and the personal dedication of the service of a life is accepted. The drunkards reclaimed, the fallen restored, the useless rescued to usefulness, the poor people now praising the Redeemer as their own Deliverer, those are the proofs that Christ's work is being done.<sup>1</sup> Here and there a zealous congregation had done something of the same kind, but a church never. The soldiers are not paid as men who work so hard might well be, but they toil for a bare maintenance—I fear they are often nearly starved—and it is truly a grand thing to realise how many thousands of men and women are giving their lives to the service of Christ as men and women gave theirs in the first fervour of Christian history. The soldiers of the Salvation Army have the inalienable honour of seeing the meaning of the dark problem of poverty, and of

<sup>1</sup> I regret to feel it necessary to say that the authoress of *A Colony of Mercy* allows herself in *Britain's Next Campaign* to condemn the Salvation Army because the proceedings at an evening meeting were not to her mind. She was scared by the way "converts" were made. But on her

own principles she ought to have examined and appreciated the unparalleled work done by those poor people after they were "converted." That chapter is, I think, a blot on her splendid book. Few can write as she writes; few are so full of noble zeal.

making an honest attempt with all their might to solve it.

The Church of England, wiser in this than any other section of the Church of Christ, set itself to imitate the work of the Salvation Army, and its labours also have been crowned with great success. In the last published Report of "The Church Army" (1904) the public is informed that £148,000 was spent last year on the work, and that there are many thousand persons employed in its great Crusade. This army is not separated from the organised Church; the converts are drafted into the congregations, and the operations in a parish are under the control of the incumbent. It is not easy to see how more could be done in this way; in some respects Christ is more wisely preached than by the representatives of the Salvation Army; and the great social position of the Church of England lends its dignity to this organisation, which is under the Church. At the same time, one may doubt whether the present form of close connection with the Church is all gain. This "Army" is probably saved by it from some dangers of extravagance in preaching, but it must lose in spontaneity; and the very fact that its Evangelists and Mission Nurses are, as a rule, well paid officials, puts them in a less favourable relation than the Salvation Army to those whom they desire to elevate. The Church Army is a special class of missionaries: but something more than this is wanted; the need is for the members of the Church, as such, to do the work without being officials who do nothing else. The

Church Army is a great step in advance, but it is not an ideal.

Is the State anywhere ahead of the Church in this matter? Perhaps not the State, meaning thereby a nation, but the municipality is certainly ahead of the Church in Elberfeld, with 140,000 inhabitants, and in Leipsic with 400,000. In Elberfeld, under the presidency of a banker, 500 (in Leipsic there are 1000) men of all professions and most trades, united and organised themselves to see to it that no poor man shall starve or go ragged, no child grow up uncared for, and none, old or young, shall perish with cold. Those Helpers of the Poor dwell in the districts for which they are responsible. In forty years this method has reduced the expenditure for poor relief at Elberfeld from 3s. 6d. per head of the population to 1s. 7½d. per head, and at infinite gain to the poor and needy. It is impossible to go into details here. But enough has been said to show that in those cities the State (or rather the people) is ahead of all that our British churches do or even attempt. Certainly we must remember that the Germans are an order-loving people, accustomed to be directed in that order, whereas in Great Britain there is a tendency to resist any moral direction that is more than a suggestion. The German Church, as such, knows little of the congregational tie, with the pastor as leader of good works; whereas with us every living congregation is at work, and the pastor is almost invariably the leader. This means that the good and willing people are already at work. The churches do not love each other so sincerely that they

will unite in organised social effort. Those considerations show how different Germany is from Great Britain. They show that it is not all an advantage for us to be so bound up with our churches—churches which will not unite and will not help each other. The conclusion is as necessary as it is sad, that the social work of Christ among us may be undertaken by Christians, but not as representatives of churches. There is no prospect that it would be on a sufficient scale. Yet this must be said, that while it is unlikely political patriotism will supply a sufficient band of workers in England and Scotland with staying power to undertake such work as the civic social work of Elberfeld or Leipsic, it is certain that from men, possessed of the Christian spirit, there might be organised a body, company, or association to undertake such a work and to do it for years, when others like-minded could take their places. This alas! would not be the "Church's care of the poor," but it would be Christians, independently of their churches, doing Christ's work in the world. And, so that the work is done, we might be glad.

Glad for the sake of the poor: but how sadly be humbled for our churches! They do not enter in themselves, and such as would enter in they hinder.

#### NOTE ON HOSPITALS. See pp. 106-8.

In the early Church the Hospitals were attended by Parabolani (devoted), so called because of the peril into which they put their lives. They were a lower order of clergy. The church widows were sometimes allied with them. Many Hospitals were an offering to expiate their sins. Fabiola, who founded a hospital

in Rome and often (like Sister Dora in our own times) carried the sick on her own shoulders, did it because she believed she was tending the Saviour Himself. Theodoret (v. 19) praises the Empress Placilla, who waited on the sick as a serving-maid might, saying, It beseems the Emperor to distribute gold, but I am giving my own service to the Great Giver of all power.

The Order of St. John was a great power in the Middle Ages. St. John's Hospital in Jerusalem was at first maintained by gifts from Italy. Godfrey of Bouillon afterwards endowed it with lands in Flanders and in Palestine. In 1113 Pope Paschalis II. created the Order. In addition to their vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, its members dedicated themselves to the care of the sick, and later to the overthrow of unbelief. A black cloak with a white cross was their garb. The sick were to have white bread, those attendants black bread. Napoleon took their last refuge, Malta, in 1798. They were nearly extinct till revived by Frederick William IV. in 1852.<sup>1</sup>

When Basil the Great in 369 built his great hospital in Cesarea, he set a church in the centre, and around it were places for beds, and also for workshops, and homes for doctors and nurses. There was a great department for lepers. Since the thirteenth century the models for a hospital have been found in the palaces of the nobility. The Hospital of the Holy Spirit in Rome, rebuilt by Innocent III. (1198-1216), served as the model for succeeding years. The Hotel Dieu in Paris was the most renowned hospital in Europe from the seventh century. It was burnt in the end of the eighteenth century—none too soon, if all stories be true, for it had from 3000 to 4000 sick in 1233 beds. The convalescent, the dying, and the dead were lying on one bed, with a board between each pair. Modern systems of ventilation date in theory from the burning of the Hotel Dieu a hundred years ago, but in practice from the middle of the nineteenth century. During the Crimean War it was found that in the camp hospitals at Balaklava, short of every appliance but with plenty of air, the mortality was only 3 per cent, while in the great hospital at Scutari three out of five died. The present state of Hospitals makes us appreciate the self-sacrificing chivalry of Florence Nightingale, who sees in her old age the completeness of the revolution her devotedness brought about fifty years ago.

<sup>1</sup> On the whole subject see Haefler (Berlin, 1857), especially pp. 47 and ff.

## NOTE ON THE EUCHARIST (from p. 95)

The text contains what seems to me most probable, but it is a difficult subject. I think *Justin Martyr*, who has (*Apol.* i. cc. 65, 66, 67) two descriptions, means that between the general prayer and the prayer of special thanksgiving (later called consecration) came the kiss of charity (so *Bingh.* xv. iii. 3). The *Canons of Hippolytus*, xxxvi. 188 (*Achelis, Texte und Untersuchungen*, A.D. 1891, p. 112) say that first-fruits of the earth are to be brought to the Bishop in church, who is "before all things to give thanks over them to God," and to ask that they be blessed to satisfy the poor, and that the donor and his children may receive the blessings of wisdom and life eternal. Those gifts are an offering to God, and God is to be blessed for them. This seems to point to the presentation of the gifts, and prayer on account of them, before the sacramental supper begins. They were to be distributed to the needy after the supper and before dark. Swete (*Journ. Theol. Stud.* Jan. 1902, p. 163) says that in the thanksgiving or benediction pronounced over the Bread and the Cup "our Lord followed Jewish usage and possibly used Jewish forms"; and Professor W. B. Stevenson sends me a learned note reminding us that in the *Didaché* the Thanksgiving Prayer is on the model of the Jewish grace before meals, which does not ask a blessing on the food, but gives thanks for it. Justin's descriptions imply this (cc. 65 and 67); compare his *Dialogue*, c. 41.

On what the meaning of the Sacrament is, there were many views, yet not far apart. All agree that the Elements are Christ's Body and Blood, but how far in a "corporal" sense the fathers are not agreed. The *Didaché* regards them as Christ in a mystical sense; *Justin* seems to say that through prayer coming from Christ they become His flesh and blood, while still retaining the properties of bodily food; *Irenæus* argues against the Gnostics that they are still real food and yet spiritual; *Tertullian* says that Christ made the Bread His Body by saying "This is My Body." There is a significant absence in ante-Nicene monuments of any reference to the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist (Swete, *op. cit.*); see for Justin further *Dial.* cc. 41, 70, 107.

What was Consecration? I think we have the key in Ambrose on *The Mysteries*, c. ix. "The words of the Lord Jesus make the change of the elements into the Body." See also the doubtful *De Sacr.* b. 4, c. 4. It appears that the words of Jesus saying, *This is my Body*, were used in a prayer for their fulfilment. Sometimes it would seem as if *only* the very words were used. Gregory Nyssen says, "The Bread is sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer." And with this men of many minds agreed then, as they agree in our day.