indistinct' (נִקְפוּ; cf. Is 10^{34} 17^{6} 24^{18}; perhaps a technical term). In course of time the *lacuna* was filled up from the word in the margin, which thus took the place of what Ley believes to have been the original reading, אֵדַע ('I shall know') or אֶרְאֶה ('I shall see'). The whole verse would thus read: 'And after my decease shall I learn this, and freed from my flesh shall I see God.'

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Sacrifice in Ancient Ritual and in Christian Sacrament.

BY THE REV. E. P. BOYS-SMITH, M.A., HORDLE VICARAGE, LYMINGTON.

II.

In Christian Sacrament.

THREE observations at this point may contribute to a firmer grasp of the results reached hitherto, while also affording a transition to the sequel. First, the act of sacrifice was not an individual act, but the act of a clan or kindred community. Early religion was not concerned with individuals, and personal worship had little or no place. Least of all was there room for this in sacrifice; for that was intended as a bond of life, and the life of the whole kin was regarded as one. It followed, therefore, that all those in whose veins the same blood flowed were concerned in any act of sacrifice, and the obligation upon all to bear their part in it was strenuously enforced. The community might in different cases be that of a household, a clan, or a nation, but in every case all the responsible members of it were bound to take their share in the sacrifice, refusal to do so being equivalent to cutting themselves off from their kin. Secondly, it should be observed that in all the more efficacious sacrifices in which blood was shed there were of necessity two steps, one consisting in the slaying of the victim that there might be libation of its life; the other, in the participation in this life by the parties human and Divine who thereby were bound to one another by its common possession. The latter step was the really important one, but as it could not be taken without the former, both were essential factors in the act of sacrifice. Although, therefore, there were particular sacrifices in which the victim was never slain, but was sent forth to lead an inviolable life far from human use or habitation, it is none the less true of sacrifices generally that the slaughter of the victim on the one hand, and the sacrificial meal with the offering of the blood in the sanctuary on the other hand, were equally parts of the sacrifice. And, thirdly, it should not be overlooked that in earlier usage, and in the most sacred sacrifices, the victim consecrated was held to be in some sort related to the men who offered it and to the god to whom it was offered. This supposed kinship made its life a natural and continuing bond between God and man, where otherwise the tie would have been little else than that of food received in common.

Now the connexion between ancient religion and Christian sacrament is to be traced of course through the usages and ideas of the Hebrew people. Their sacrificial customs rest on the same basis as those of other races round them, embodying the same fundamental beliefs and following largely the same forms. Of course the cruder and more barbarous ideas of sacrifice are modified in the Hebrew practice of historical times, and accessory notions were introduced, particularly from the Canaanites, in whose cult much prominence was given to the religious dues payable to God. For the Canaanites regarded Baal as the Lord of the land, and from them the Hebrews borrowed largely what may be called the local and agricultural side of their worship. In the Jewish Law, therefore, as it prevailed in the age of the second temple, and as it regulated the practice of the central sanctuary, both alien and late ingredients in sacrifice are to be found. But this is of the less consequence, because the connexion between ancient religion and Christian sacrament was not through the general usages of

the central sanctuary which are embodied in the Law. The connecting link was the Passover, which, unlike the other principal feasts, goes straight back to Israel's nomadic life, whereas Pentecost, Tabernacles, and others were of Canaanite affinity. While, then, much the same account might be given of the Passover, and of many of the sacrifices offered in the temple at other times, it is only important to examine closely the former. When, moreover, it is borne in mind that in the earlier stages of Hebrew life in Canaan, sacrifice was offered by clans and households all the land over, it is easily understood that these local acts of worship afford the characteristic types of Hebrew sacrifices. Only in the seventh century was sacrifice restricted to the central sanctuary, and even then with very imperfect success. The customary ideas of Hebrew religion down to the eve of Christian times were moulded therefore less by the ordinances of the temple priesthood than by the traditional sacrifices of families and tribes.

Of these last the Passover was a striking instance. From the first it was the act of a body of kinsmen, and even in the days of late Jewish ecclesiasticism it retained its primitive features in an exceptional degree. 'Take you lambs according to your families,' ran the Law, which the later statement defined further, 'according to their fathers' houses, a lamb for an household.'[1] It was no act of individual piety, but the service of all who recognized themselves and one another as of one blood. Originally the lamb was slain and eaten at the family centre, wherever this might be; and though in later times all kept this feast at Jerusalem, the lambs being slain in the temple precincts, the household features of the ancient order were retained as closely as possible, the flesh being eaten at home, the instruction being given by the head of the family to its assembled members, and none being allowed to go out of the house wherein the Passover was being kept, before the morning. The blood—*i.e.* the life—was in part poured out as a libation to Jehovah, after the manner of Semitic sacrifices in general, and in part put upon the posts and threshold of the door of the house in which the family was mustered, thus virtually covering its members. Meantime the flesh—as being the more material and less holy portion of the victim—was consumed sacramentally by the sons of the house. All these were bound to assemble, and to take their part in the act, though, of course, the restriction of the service in later times to Jerusalem made it impossible to enforce this rigidly. And the whole lamb had to be consumed within the limits of the night, the underlying purpose being that every morsel of the consecrated life should be transferred to the Lord on the one hand, or the sacrificing family on the other, to form a living bond between them. It must be noted that the sacrifice of the Passover was by no means completed when the lamb was slain, but that it consisted in the sharing of its blood and flesh among the Lord and the household which offered it, and that the leading feature of the sacrifice was the sacrificial meal at which the lamb was eaten with the blood on the threshold. Also that the lamb was selected some time in advance, and was solemnly set apart (under the later law) from the 10th to the 14th of Nisan, as a consecrated creature. And, meantime, the whole sacrifice was connected with that act of redemption, when the Lord saved His people out of Egypt. The 'Haggadah' rehearsed by the head of the house, in response to the inquiry which a younger member always made, 'What mean ye by this service?' told the story of that eventful night, —'a night of watching unto Jehovah,'[2]—of which indeed the Passover was considered a memorial sacrifice.

This, then, was the sacrifice which filled the minds of Jesus and His disciples at the time when He instituted the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He was presupposing and adapting the old ideas and rites connected with sacrifice in Hebrew religion, and He was choosing as the starting-point for His own ordinance the most conservative, not to say archaic, of contemporary sacrificial services. Here, as elsewhere, He did not destroy, but fulfilled. 'With desire,' He said, 'I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.'[3]

Now, when it is remembered that the ancient purpose of sacrifice underlying the Passover was to unite God and man by means of an act of communion in one life shed in order to be shared by the Lord and His people alike, it becomes at once easy to understand how this old rite might find a place in the spiritual community of God's kingdom

[1] Ex 12^{21} 12^{3}.

[2] Ex. 12^{42} margin.

[3] Lk 22^{15}.

among men. But as soon as one looks at the matter from this point of view, the thing that strikes upon attention is the fact that the Christian sacrament does not answer to the whole sacrifice of the Hebrew Passover, but only to a part of it. The Lord's Supper answers to the Paschal meal: in that the flesh of the Lamb was eaten, just as in His own ordinance Jesus 'took bread, and when He had blessed, He brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye, this is My body.'[1] But the sacrifice of the Passover did not begin with the sacramental eating of the lamb, it began with its consecration, with the offering of its life through death, and the presentation of the life-blood to the Lord at the threshold of the house. And the analogy would make the Christian sacrifice begin with the consecration of Jesus Himself, and with the offering of His life, as that of the 'Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'[2] Then the sacrament answers to the solemn meal at which all the members of the household joined in sharing the body of the lamb of whose life-blood Jehovah was partaking too. On another occasion Jesus said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink of His blood, ye have not life in yourselves';[3] that thought so evidently prompted by the central idea of sacrifice, he embodied in the Christian Passover meal, which forms the sequel to His gift of His own life as a ransom in the stead of those many ransoms which the Jewish law of sacrifice provided. And that those of His first followers who had insight into the mind of Jesus understood His purpose so, is well shown in St. Paul's language, 'Our Passover also hath been so sacrificed, even Christ, wherefore let us keep the feast;'[4] where it is the sacrificial meal which it remains for believers jointly to receive, the offering of Christ's life and the Divine acceptance of His blood being already past.

From the standpoint, then, of historical religion the oft-debated question, 'Ought one to speak of the Sacrifice of the Lord's Supper?' presents itself in a somewhat different guise. It cannot be answered with a simple 'yes' or 'no.' The Christian sacrament is in reality the second half of a sacrifice, neither more nor less. And it follows that it is equally incorrect to say that in the Lord's Supper there is a renewal of Christ's offering upon the cross, and to say that it is merely a memorial of His sacrifice. To speak of His death, as if it alone constituted a sacrifice, is to misunderstand what a sacrifice was meant to be: that self-immolation was only the first act in a sacrifice. And to speak of the Christian ordinance continually celebrated as a sacrifice, is again to misunderstand the term: that Christian service is only the second act in a sacrifice. The one is the offering of a sacred life and its acceptance on the part of God, the other is a means of receiving of that life on the part of man. And only when both acts are joined together is there communion in one holy life between God and man, which is what sacrifice aims at.

There are, of course, other aspects of the Lord's Supper which transcend the scope of sacrifice. Even in the case of the Jewish Passover there was something of the like nature, since in all later generations it became a eucharistic memorial of the redemption from Egyptian servitude wrought by the arm of Jehovah when He turned the face of His people towards the home He promised them in a land of their own. And so the Christian Passover is a eucharist in remembrance of Jesus Christ, and of the redemption which God wrought in Him; and it is a common pledge to seek in the same self-sacrifice, which knew no limit in His own case, a means of overcoming selfishness and sin which cling so closely—so entering into Life. But to dwell on these or the like aspects of the Christian service would be to digress from the aim here in view, which is to show the true connexion between the Christian rite and sacrifice. It may, however, be of interest to point out some few ways in which light is thrown upon other points of controversy connected with the Lord's Supper, so soon as it is considered from the standpoint of historical sacrifice.

As a first instance, take the use of the term 'altar' in our churches: Is it a term which ought to be employed for the 'holy table'? As a matter of correctness it cannot be defended. What really answers to the ancient altar is the cross of Christ. For the paschal lamb, though its life was offered in the sanctuary, was not eaten at the altar but at home. And so the holy tables in our churches correspond with the household board around which each family ate the Passover, and the members of a congregation answer to the members of the

[1] Mk 14^{22}. [2] Jn 1^{29}.
[3] Jn 6^{53}. [4] 1 Co 5^{7}.

family in ancient times. It is quite in accordance with this that early Christian usage often spoke of the 'altar of the cross'; while, on the other hand, the most conservative communities of Christians, as, *e.g.*, the Church of the East Syrians, do not employ the term 'altar' for the holy table. It would certainly conduce to the general understanding of the nature of the Christian sacrament if this use of the term were discontinued among ourselves.

A matter of more importance than the use of a word is the question of 'reserving the sacrament.' In ancient sacrifices generally, it was required that the whole of the sacred flesh should be consumed by those who were partakers in the service. And in the Passover this rule was particularly stringent, the Law declaring that all must be eaten during the night, and nothing left remaining till the morning. In case it was impossible to act on this, the Law appointed that in such an event all remaining should be burnt. The reservation, which was common in mediæval times, and is habitual now in the Roman Church, is entirely out of harmony with sacrificial tradition. Where the elements are reserved only for the *present* use of the sick, who are necessarily absent, there is no breach of the spirit of sacrifice, or of sub-apostolic usage, as Justin Martyr shows[1]; even there, however, reservation implies a relaxation of the ancient usage, which was as strict as possible.

Again, of more consequence is the growing practice of non-communicating attendance at celebration of the Christian sacrament. Any one who looks at the matter from the historical standpoint, cannot fail to see how this violates not only the feelings and usages of the past, but also the very object of sacrifice itself. All those who were held to be members in the family or community on whose behalf the sacrifice was offered, were held bound to take their part in it, and to share in the reception of the life which had been rendered. In many cases the utmost care was taken to ensure that no single member of the kin was absent, and still more that none was present without receiving of the consecrated flesh himself. In the Passover it was required of every son of Israel that he should eat of it as often as he was present at its celebration. And to refuse to do so would have been held equivalent to cutting oneself off from the people of the Lord. It was only at times and in places where the purpose of sacrifice had been forgotten, where it was no longer understood as an act of communion in a life surrendered, and the rite had become debased into a sort of magical charm merely, that the fellowship of general participation in the sacrificial meal fell into abeyance. And in the Passover this point of decadence was never reached. In that, and in all other instances of sacrifice at its best, the greatest stress was laid on the actual participation of all who had the right to be present at the feast. And in early Christian times this feeling was perfectly understood, and very strongly entertained in regard of the Christian sacrament. In some cases, indeed, the very strength of the feeling led to a singular abuse; for the proper distribution of the bread and wine was discontinued, and Christians were left to come and take as each desired, in order that if there were any present who did not intend to participate, they might not be forced to incur guilt by refusal of what was offered them, so bringing upon themselves virtual excommunication. Non-communication when present was always in early times regarded as an anomaly, as in fact it must be by anyone who considers the nature of sacrifice, and recollects that the Lord's Supper is a Christian Passover; for the old purpose remains, although transfigured, and although the ancient ties of blood, which formerly united the members of one house, are now replaced by the spiritual relation of those who are brethren in Christ. The anomaly was only tolerated to begin with when the wholesale admission of heathens to baptism gave rise to the question whether it were the lesser evil to bring men still practically heathen to share in this holy mystery, or to allow men professedly Christian to be placed in the position of the excommunicate by being warned off from the table of the Lord. The difficulty was then evaded by allowing those who, though baptized, were confessedly still heathen at heart, to be present without communicating. And in mediæval times, when the nature of sacrifice was little appreciated, and superstition mingled largely with religious practice, this anomaly acquired an established position. In our own Church at the time of reform it was very rightly condemned; and there can be no excuse for reviving it in an age like the present, when research has shown with greater clearness than ever before how entirely opposed it is to the

[1] *First Apology*, cap. 65.

central purpose of sacrifice which Jesus had in view in the sacrament He appointed.

Another matter which receives light when regarded from this point of view is that of sacerdotal theory in connexion with the consecration of the Holy Communion. For it cannot fail to strike one immediately that no priest had any function to fulfil at the Paschal meal; nor would any priest be present save, of course, where it was being eaten in a priestly family. The head of the house presided at the feast, and ordinarily he would be a layman. And in the Christian sacrament, the priest, as being a presbyter or elder, presides similarly, as in early times the bishop alone did ordinarily[1]. But in no case is there room for strictly sacerdotal functions in this Christian Passover. A wider survey of ancient sacrifice leads to the same result. For everywhere sacrifice preceded sacerdotal orders, and the latter commonly arose as the meaning of sacrifice became overlaid by later accessory ideas. Among the Hebrews this was markedly the case. Sacrifice was offered as an act of the family in the natural home of the clan down to the date of the building of the temple, and still later. And the rise of a definite priesthood was due chiefly to two causes; first, borrowing from the Canaanite practice at the sanctuaries scattered over the land which the incoming Hebrews respected and often frequented; and, secondly, the organization of the temple service in Jerusalem when that became a national sanctuary, and especially when the offering of sacrifice was limited to this one centre. There was little of sacerdotalism in the old priestly tribe of Levi in ancient days; and the position of the Levites became entirely subordinate in later days when the priesthood was restricted to the house of Aaron. The sacerdotalism of the Jewish law grew up and centred in the practice of the temple, when sacrifice was ceasing to be that act of communion in a life rendered to God and man which it was meant to be. And it is very significant that Jesus selected as the basis for His own ordinance that one among Jewish sacrifices which best retained its primitive character, and was least closely connected with the temple. For in the Passover the priest's function was to the last limited to the slaying of the lamb; and to that there is nothing correspondent in the Christian sacrament, it being done once for all upon the cross.

Lastly, may it not well be said that a truer appreciation of sacrifice affords a safeguard against materialistic views of the Christian sacrament, of whatever kind they may be? For the purpose always was a communion of life. And though in an ignorant age the life was identified with the flesh and blood, the real aim was a fellowship in life and not in material food. And now that the distinction is more readily appreciated, there is nothing materialistic in retaining the ancient forms. They have become more consciously symbolical than of old, but no truer account can be given now of the soul's craving than that which found expression in sacrifice long ago,—the hope of communion with those bound to one, and with the unseen God, in the bond of that sacred life laid down for us by Jesus our Saviour. In the offering of Christ and the sacramental eating of His flesh and blood we may enter into communion with God, for so 'we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin.'[2]

[1] Justin Martyr assigns this τῷ πρωεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

[2] 1 Jn 1[7].

Recent Gift-Books.

Messrs. Gardner, Darton, & Co. have published *A Nobody's Scrap-Book* (3s. 6d.), and *The Chatterbox Christmasbox* (1s. net), one for the older, one for the younger members of the family, both grotesque enough. They have also published *Chickabiddy Stories*, by Edmund Mitchell (2s. 6d.), with illustrations by Norman Hardy. Mr. Mitchell, whose *Temple of Death* made us catch our breath with horror, now makes us lose it altogether with laughter.

Those of us who, being interested in Zenana missions, wish knowledge about them of an attractive and telling kind, should see the *Stories*