

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE MASS.

BY THE VEN. J. H. THORPE, M.A., B.D., Archdeacon of Macclesfield, Hon. C.F.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION is a dogmatic assertion of a particular mode of the Real Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, consequent upon the consecration of the bread and wine.

This doctrine of the Real Objective Presence is not found in any creed of the Catholic Church, nor in any decree or canon of any Council of the Undivided Catholic Church. No attempt to formulate a theory of the mode of the Presence was ever made in the early ages of the Church, and no controversy arose about it till the ninth and the eleventh centuries. Historically the controversy had its origin in the gross and materialistic conceptions held by the illiterate masses, admitted without due instruction into the Church in the eighth and following centuries, and their unintelligent misunderstanding of Christ's Words of Institution.

It was not till towards the middle of the ninth century that the doctrine of the actual conversion of the elements into the flesh and blood of Christ was formally taught by Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corbie in France, although popularly held probably for long before. He maintained that after consecration by the priest there is nothing else in the Eucharist but the flesh and blood of Christ. This crass and materialistic doctrine was vigorously assailed by many leading theologians of the day who upheld the doctrine of the real spiritual presence of Christ, not in the elements themselves, but in the souls of believing communicants. But the more materialistic theory of P. Radbert, for which the name of Transubstantiation was subsequently adopted, prevailed, till it was formulated as a dogma of the Western Church by the fourth Lateran Council in 1215¹ which decreed that "the Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament of the Altar truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the Body and the wine into the Blood by Divine power, so that to complete the mystery of Unity" (between Christ and His people) "we receive of His what He received of ours."

It was the work of the Schoolmen to clothe this view in subtle, philosophical formulæ to bring it into such a shape as would not shock and revolt the intellects of the more educated and intelligent classes. For this they invented the philosophy of substance and accidents known as Realism. It was as manipulated and shaped by the Schoolmen that the subject came before the Council of Trent. That Council bound it on the Church of Rome, so that to-day it is entrenched in Roman theology beyond dispute or question. Probably there has never been a greater disservice

¹ The word "transubstantiated" was first used by this Council to express the real or carnal presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

done to the Christian Religion than the evolution of this doctrine by the Schoolmen and its riveting on Roman theology through their influence. Theologically it has to call in the aid of a perpetually recurring miracle, wrought by the priest at his will, in order "to prevent the accidents of bread being removed with the substance, and to make them continue, suspended, as it were in the air, without anything in which to be."

Philosophically Realism is now an exploded (and absurd) theory which has been trampled in the dust by scientific thinkers.

Although, however, Transubstantiation as formulated by the Schoolmen fails hopelessly to meet the claims of reason, yet, as an attempt to do so, it was a recognition by the acutest thinkers of the Middle Ages that the claims of reason must be met, and so far they justify our application of our reasoning powers to the examination of Eucharistic doctrine. It is a commonplace with Romanists that the dogmas of the Roman Church must be received and accepted in faith and by faith. But the doctrine of Transubstantiation itself, its history and its object, conflicts with that teaching, and amply justifies the principle implied in the Church of England's appeal to Holy Scripture, sound reason and the primitive Church.

It is important that the history and development of this doctrine should be carefully studied by English Churchmen at the present time. For it is clearly possible for men to repudiate the doctrine of Transubstantiation as held now by the Church of Rome, while all the time holding that doctrine in its earlier form. The doctrine which is now held and taught by certain men in the Church of England is a return to the dogma formulated by the Lateran Council, though unencumbered by the impossible philosophical theory of the existence of attributes without any substance or object. Different though it be from the Tridentine doctrine, it tends to the re-introduction of various practices, such as elevation of the elements for purposes of adoration, ringing a bell at the moment of Consecration, observance of the Festival of Corpus Christi, reservation for purposes of adoration, and generally to the same devotional consequences as the Tridentine doctrine.

But I think we are justified in contending that both the Lateran and the Tridentine doctrines of Transubstantiation are equally at variance with the doctrine maintained by the consensus of all the most eminent theologians of the Church of England since the Reformation, and both equally impossible to be reconciled with the natural interpretation of the Liturgy or the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth Articles.

THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Whatever fault may be found with the Church of Rome, no one can accuse her of obscurity or ambiguity as to what she means by Transubstantiation. The Council of Trent puts all doubt at rest as long as its decrees are accepted as final by that Church. It says:—

Canon 1. "If anyone shall deny that the body and blood

together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore entire Christ, are truly, really and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; and shall say that He is only in it as in a sign, or in a figure, or virtually—let him be accursed."

Canon 2. "If anyone shall say that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation—let him be accursed."

Canon 3. "If anyone shall deny, that in the venerated sacrament of the Eucharist, entire Christ is contained in each kind, and in each several particle of either kind when separated—let him be accursed."

Canon 4. "If anyone shall say that, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is only in the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist in use whilst it is taken, and not either before or after, and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the hosts or particles which have been consecrated, and which are reserved, or remain after the communion—let him be accursed."

The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches that—"Not only the true body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, as the bones and nerves, but also that entire Christ is contained in this sacrament." (*On the Sac. of the Eucharist*, p. 241, Venice, 1582.)

Consistently with this doctrine (and indeed following from it as of necessity) the Church of Rome teaches that the host is to be worshipped with *latria*, that is the worship given to God Himself.

Canon 5. "If anyone shall say that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, even with the open worship of *latria*, and therefore not to be venerated with any peculiar festal celebrity, nor to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the praiseworthy and universal rites and customs of the holy Church, and that he is not to be publicly set before the people to be adored, and that his adorers are idolaters—let him be accursed."

ITS DOCTRINAL SETTING.

If this doctrine is taken alone and considered by itself, as a definition of Transubstantiation, it appears to lack nothing in confidence and clearness of dogmatic assertion. But as soon as it is set in relation to other Roman doctrines it becomes beset with difficulties and contradictions, which at once deprive it of the certainty which appears to be entrenched in its strong dogmatic statements and which makes it so attractive to certain types of mind.

The Church of Rome teaches that Christ is offered in an unbloody manner in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

“And since the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner (*cruente*) on the Altar of the Cross, is contained in this divine Sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, and offered in an unbloody manner (*incruente immolatur*)” etc. (Council of Trent, Sess. 22, Can. 2.)

Now how can that be an unbloody sacrifice in which wine is offered which has been transubstantiated into *blood*? How can there be a remission of sins in the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass, when it is written “without shedding of blood is no remission”? (Heb. ix. 22.)

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

It is the doctrine of the Church of Rome that the transubstantiation of the elements is accomplished by the very words which Christ Himself said at the Institution. The following is the form of the consecration of the wine:—“Take and drink ye all of this; for this is the chalice of my blood of the New *and Eternal* Testament, *the mystery of faith*; which is shed for you, and for many to the remission of sins.” Words are here inserted (“*and Eternal,*” “*the mystery of faith*”) which are not found in our Lord’s recorded words, and so the form in the Missal differs from the very words of Christ by virtue of which it is taught the transubstantiation takes place. Romanists cannot, therefore, have any certainty that there is ever a valid Mass if the rule as to the operative words stands.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION.

The Roman doctrine of Intention has a direct bearing on the doctrine of Transubstantiation and its derivatives. The Council of Trent decrees:—“If anyone shall say, that in ministers, while they form and give the sacraments, *intention* is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, let him be accursed.” Thus if a priest consecrate the Host without the right intention there is no Transubstantiation, and the people are led to worship as God that which is only a little flour and water. But more than this, if the Bishop who ordained him; and the whole line of Bishops before that Bishop; or the priest who baptized the Bishop; or the priest who married his parents, lacked the right intention, all the acts of that priest, as well as the particular Mass, are invalid and he is a minister of idolatry to his flock. Bellarmine (Tom. i., p. 488, Prag. 1721) says: “No one can be certain with the certainty of faith, that he has a true sacrament, since the sacrament is not formed without the intention of the minister, and no one can see the intention of another.”

When the dogma of Transubstantiation is further considered in relation to “Defects in the Mass” which may occur, and which no person present at a Mass can be assured do not occur, it is seen

how little ground there is for that certainty of which Romanists are so accustomed to boast.

DEFECTS IN THE MASS.

The Roman Missal contains the following respecting defects in Mass in consequence of which there is no Sacrament and no Transubstantiation :—" The priest about to celebrate Mass, must take the utmost care that there be no defect in any of the things that are requisite for the making the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Now a defect may occur on the part of the matter to be consecrated ; on that of the form to be applied ; and on that of the minister celebrating. If there is a defect in any of these : namely, the due matter, the form with intention, and the sacerdotal order of the celebrant, it nullifies the Sacrament." Then follows a list of the possible defects :—If the flour of which the host is made is not pure ; if the wine is not pure grape-juice or made from sour or unripe grapes ; if the priest has not abstained from food, or a mouthful of water, or even medicine since midnight. Defects may occur in the ministration itself thus :—If the celebration be made in a place not sacred, or not appointed by the Bishop, or on an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three altar cloths ; if there be not present waxen lights ; if it be not the due time of Massing ; if the celebrant has not said at least matins and lauds ; if he omit any of the sacerdotal vestments ; if the sacerdotal vestments and altar cloths be not blest by a Bishop, or other having this power ; if there be not present a clerk serving in the Mass ; or one serving who ought not to serve (as a woman) ; if there be not a suitable chalice with paten ; if the corporal be not clean, which ought to be of linen, not of silk, adorned in the centre, and must be blessed by a Bishop or other having this power ; if he celebrate with head covered, without a dispensation ; if he have not the Missal before him, even though he should know the Mass by rote, which he intends to celebrate.

If there were any grounds in Holy Scripture or in sound reason for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in face of these possible defects, any one of which, on Rome's own assertion, prevents Transubstantiation from taking place, no member of that Church, however fully and devoutly he believes that doctrine, can have any certainty that an undefective Mass is ever celebrated. If consecration do not take place, the people fall down and worship what according to their own Church is mere flour and water.

Indeed, so great is the uncertainty which exists in the Church of Rome as to the Transubstantiation of the Host, that the Pope himself does not venture to receive the wafer until it has been first tasted by an officer appointed for that purpose. The same rule applies whenever a Bishop sings Mass. This ceremony is called the PROBA and is meant as a protection against the risk of poisoning. This ceremony owes its origin to persons having been poisoned by the Host. They were taught to believe, on pain

of damnation, that the Host was God. Accepting this dogma they received the wafer and were poisoned.

And thus, before ever the dogma of Transubstantiation is examined in the light of Holy Scripture and reason, no Romanist can be certain of possessing a true Sacrament, or of worshipping a validly consecrated Host, on the principles of that Church itself.

THE BODY OF CHRIST.

As the doctrine of Transubstantiation is concerned with the body and blood of Christ it is reasonable and necessary to point out that the material Body of our Blessed Lord has not always existed in the same state or condition. Before His atoning death it was a body like our own, except probably its immunity from disease as the result of His sinless nature. On the Cross and in the tomb it was a dead body. After He rose from the dead it was greatly and mysteriously changed. This no one can deny. While it retained all the characteristics necessary to convince the disciples of its reality, and so far as it was concerned our Lord could truly say "Handle me and see that it is I myself," yet it is impossible not to see that a marked change had taken place. Thus "we are told He stood in the midst of the disciples although the doors were shut and from the marked manner in which the Evangelist repeats this statement, it is clear that he regarded this mode of entrance as supernatural. At Emmaus He suddenly vanished out of the sight of the two. He seems to have passed from place to place with a rapidity beyond that of ordinary locomotion. We never read of His retiring as of old for rest or food to the homes of any of His disciples. We hear nothing of His hunger, or thirst, or weariness. Even when He allayed the fears of His disciples by showing them His hands and His side, He indicated that He was not exactly what He had been, by speaking *not* of His 'flesh and blood,' but of His 'flesh and bones'; while the fact of the Ascension, and every notion that we can form of the heavenly abode, are incompatible with the idea that His resurrection-body was subject to the same conditions of ponderable matter as before. Nor is this all, for the manner of Our Lord's intercourse with His disciples after His Resurrection bears hardly fewer marks of change than the nature of His person. . . . Facts like these undoubtedly lead us to infer that after His Resurrection Our Lord was not the same as He had been before He died, and that the body with which He came forth from Joseph's tomb was different from that which had been laid in it, and was already glorified." (Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, p. 13 *seq.*)

Now the upholders of the doctrine of Transubstantiation have to face the facts of our Lord's bodily history and to determine (assuming for the moment their doctrine to be true) when the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, under which of the conditions of that body. Is it into the body of Christ

as He was born and lived and died? Is it the body as it hung dead on the Cross? Is it the glorified body now in heaven?

Suppose these questions be answered by asserting that the bread and wine are changed into the glorified body now in heaven, it is reasonable to ask what authority there is for this. For surely such a momentous statement demands some evidence beyond mere assertion. It is reasonable to point to the testimony of Holy Scripture to the change in our Lord's Resurrection-body I have referred to. How little we know, or are capable of knowing, about that body! Whatever knowledge we possess of bodies is of bodies under present earthly conditions. Were we to accept the philosophy on which Transubstantiation is based as sound and true we would still be faced with the insuperable difficulty that we know so little of our Lord's heavenly body that we cannot tell whether it has any substance as distinguished from accidents. And when we know that the distinction of substance and accidents, even in respect of earthly bodies, is philosophically unsound, exploded and abandoned in every field of thought except Roman theology, surely it is impossible to accept it as applying to our Lord's heavenly body of which we know so little.

THE BLOOD.

Further, great as is the difficulty respecting a change of the bread or wafer into the substance of our Lord's Body, or of any other change of the element which involves its ceasing to be part of the outward and visible sign and becoming the thing signified, the difficulty is greatly increased when we come to apply any such doctrine or theory to the Blood. For a very strong case can be made out for the view that our Lord's Resurrection-body was a bloodless one. Dean Alford's comment on St. Luke xxiv. 38-40 ("Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I myself; handle Me and see; for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have") is "observe 'flesh and bones' but not 'blood.' This the Resurrection Body probably had not—as being the animal life." Our Lord's words to St. Thomas (St. John xx. 27) imply that the marks in His blessed body were no scars, but the veritable wounds themselves. If so, they must have been wounds that had ceased to bleed. And His propitiatory death was the shedding of His blood which He did not afterwards resume.

On the other hand, Professor Milligan held the view that the conclusion drawn from our Lord's words, when compared with 1 Cor. xv. 50 ("Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God"), "seems somewhat precarious, unless we are careful to explain that our only meaning is that the blood was not in the same condition as that in which it had previously been. There seems no reason for saying that the blood might not be glorified in the same way as the more solid portions of the earthly body." (*Resurrection of Our Lord*, p. 242.)

Transubstantiation assumes that our Lord's Body is now, as

it was when on earth, composed of flesh, bones and blood, and pays no regard to the changed character of His heavenly body. There is not only no ground for this assumption but strong presumptions against it. Certainly the onus of proof that our Lord's heavenly body is not bloodless rests on Roman theologians in face of their doctrine of the transubstantiation of the wine into the substance of the blood of Christ.

THE INSTITUTION.

If we look to the circumstances of the first institution and the conduct of the Apostles at the time, we shall be forced, I think, to the conviction that the Apostles who were then present did not believe in any such change as Transubstantiation. Our Lord having broken it said of the bread: "This is My body which is given for you." Likewise after supper He gave them the cup, saying: "Drink ye all of this, for this is My blood which is shed for many."

At the time when He uttered these words neither had His body been broken, nor His blood shed, though He spoke as if the sacrifice of the Cross had been already made. In this point it is certain that His language could not be literally interpreted. Why should it be concluded that the other portions of His speech may be taken literally?

If the Apostles understood our Lord's words as Rome asserts they should be understood, why did they express no surprise? This miracle, if really wrought upon the bread and wine, was effected in a manner altogether different from any other of our Lord's miracles. When at Cana He turned the water into wine, there was not only a real change in the substance, but a change in the outward form of the element manifest to the senses. Why was this miracle made to differ from that in which Christ first manifested forth His glory by a change of water into wine; the only change of a similar kind which He had effected during His Ministry?

But the law of Moses placed before the Apostles an obstacle in the way of their belief of Transubstantiation so formidable as to be insurmountable. To partake of blood was absolutely forbidden to them as Jews. To partake of blood was a permission which to the last they formally refused to all kinds of Christians, and they prefixed to their decree the authority of the Holy Spirit. Yet our Lord called the wine His blood; under that name He gave it to them; under that name they silently and immediately received it. But if they had imagined the wine to have become really and literally His blood, we may be confident that they would not have taken it without reluctance, and without some explanation of the lawfulness of doing so from our Lord. We know from St. Peter's refusal to allow our Lord to wash his feet, that he, at least, would not have hesitated to express scruples if he felt any. The silence of the Apostles and their willingness to obey are indeed an undoubted evidence that they did not consider the bread

and wine to have been actually made the body and blood of Christ, but that they must have understood His words in a figurative sense.

THE SENSES.

This doctrine further subverts the evidence on which all human belief and Christianity itself rest. All our knowledge is derived ultimately through the senses which are five—sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch. The Apostles on the evidence of two senses believed in the resurrection of Christ. On the evidence of all our senses we must disbelieve that the bread and wine are changed into body and blood. If the evidence of two senses were reliable in regard to the truth of our Lord's Resurrection-body, that of all our senses cannot be wrong when they unite in witness against the Mass doctrine.

Indeed (to quote Archbishop Whately again), "It follows that, according to the established use of language, the advocates of Transubstantiation do not speak correctly; for the doctrine, by *their own* account of it, is, *the transformation of Christ's body into bread.*" (*Errors of Romanism*, note p. 33. The whole of this note is very valuable.)

If it be said that the change in the Mass is brought about by the power of the Almighty, it is reasonable to reply that it would have been as easy for God to make the appearances agree with the reality of things as to place them in a perpetual opposition to each other. No reason has ever been given why, if the doctrine be true, the senses should be withheld from giving their testimony to its truth.

THE MASS.

The Roman doctrine concerning the Mass is founded upon that of Transubstantiation, and is as follows:

Fifth Article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead."

Canons of the Council of Trent, can. 2, Sess. 22.

"And since, in this Divine Sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, the same Christ is contained, and is bloodlessly immolated, Who once offered Himself bloodily upon the cross; the holy Council teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by its means, if we approach God, contrite and penitent, with a true heart, and a right faith, and with fear and reverence, we may obtain mercy, and obtain grace in seasonable succour. For the Lord, appeased by the oblation of this sacrifice, granting grace and the gift of repentance, remits even great crimes and sins. There is one and the same Victim, and the same Person, Who now offers by the ministry of the priests, Who then offered Himself upon the cross; the mode of offering only being different. And the fruits of that bloody offering are truly most abundantly received through this offering, so far is it from derogating in any way from the former.

Wherefore it is properly offered according to the apostolic tradition, not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other wants of the faithful, who are alive, but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet fully purged."

It might be enough to dismiss this doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass by showing that if there be no transubstantiation of the elements in the Eucharist there can be no sacrifice.

But there are other and fatal objections to the doctrine.

According to Roman theology, it is essential to the Mass that it be celebrated by a duly ordained sacrificing priest. The claims made on behalf of the Roman priesthood are indeed great. Biel, the Romish doctor, in his "First Lesson on the Canon of the Mass," says: "The priest hath great power over both bodies of Christ"—the Church and the host. "Who hath ever seen anything like it? He who created me, if I may so speak, hath granted me power to create him; and he who created me without me is created by my means." Now if Christ bestowed such powers on any order of men their credentials ought to be clear and beyond doubt. But what are the facts?

Not once in the New Testament is the distinctive word for a sacrificing priest (*Hiereus*) applied to a Christian minister as such of any rank not excepting the Apostles. The doctrine that the Christian ministry is a sacrificing priesthood is incompatible with the commission given by Christ to His Apostles: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) Now is it not remarkable that in this commission, while there is mention of one sacrament ordained by Christ, namely, Holy Baptism, there is no direct reference to the other? No doubt it is included in the words "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"; but may we not find here another of those silences or reticences of our Lord (such as His never calling the Virgin mother) which suggest His anticipation of errors that have since distressed His Church?

The directions given by the Apostles to the first ministers of the Gospel set apart by them are equally incompatible with the assumptions of a sacrificing priesthood (see 1 Tim. iii. 15; iv. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 2, etc.).

In none of the Assemblies of the Church recorded, or glanced at, in the New Testament have we any traces of such a priesthood.

And as there is no priest appointed in the Church by Christ or His Apostles, neither is there any altar. There is one passage quoted sometimes with great confidence, and that even by men of some scholarship,¹ as if it referred to the Communion Table as an altar—Heb. xiii. 10: "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." But apart from the

¹ E.g. see Canon Daniel, *The Prayer Book*, p. 342.

fact that it would be an anachronism to speak of a Christian altar at the date when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, when Christian services were held in private houses and the Lord's Supper celebrated at ordinary tables, a critical examination of the passage shows that the persons referred to were "we *Hebrews*," not "we *Christians*." The pronoun "we" is not expressed in the original. It occurs in our translation merely as the sign of the first person plural, and it is not emphatic. The passage is therefore misunderstood when it is read as if the writer were making a contrast between a Jewish and a Christian altar. There is a very direct reference to a particular Jewish altar—the golden altar of incense as used on the Day of Atonement. The bodies of those beasts whose blood was sprinkled upon it were burned without the camp, and therefore could not, under any circumstances, be eaten. This exactly fits in with the argument of the whole passage, which is to show the unprofitableness of meats, while to interpret the altar as the Communion Table is wholly irrelevant. Our reformers were wise when they banished the term altar from our Liturgy as a name for the Lord's Table. They were also better Scholars than those who now wish to restore it.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

As I have called attention to one verse from the Epistle to the Hebrews I may perhaps here remind you that in this Epistle we have the whole subject of priesthood treated more fully than in any other part of the New Testament. The argument in the seventh chapter seems to put it beyond doubt that not only is there no sacrificing priesthood on earth under the Gospel dispensation, but there cannot be one. Contrasting the priesthood under the old law with that of Christ, the author gives three reasons for the cessation of the Levitical priesthood on the appearance in the flesh of the Son of God, "the Apostle and high-priest of our profession" (Heb. iii. 1). These reasons apply with equal force against the Roman priesthood.

(1) Heb. vii. 23. "They truly were many priests (in succession), because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death." (24) "But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable" (or an untransferable (*see margin*)) "priesthood."

(2) Heb. vii. 27. "Who needeth not daily, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this He did once when He offered up Himself."

(3) Heb. vii. 28. "For the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity; but the Word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, Who is consecrated for evermore."

A careful study of the Epistle leads inexorably to one conclusion—that there is no priest in the sacrificial sense under the Christian dispensation but Christ, "the Apostle and high-priest of our profession." Indeed, as Archbishop Whately showed so convincingly in his essays on "Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion,"

one of its most remarkable peculiarities is "that the Christian Religion alone is without a Priest." I am not aware that those who refuse to accept his conclusions have ever attempted to refute his reasons. Before leaving the Epistle to the Hebrews it may be worth while to glance at the argument drawn by Romanists from the case of Melchisedec. They refer to Gen. xiv. 18. "And Melchizedek, king of Salem brought forth bread and wine : and he was the priest of the Most High God." The word translated by us "and" they render "for he was the priest, etc.," in order to show that he brought forth bread and wine in his official capacity. (1) Their version is a mistranslation. The Hebrew word they translate here "for" they themselves render "and" in the context. (2) He brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abraham. Josephus corroborates this. (3) It is evident he offered no sacrifice, for the writer of the Epistle says nothing of his doing so. (4) Even if the bread and wine were typical of a sacrifice, for which we have no authority, they were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, of whom Melchisedec was a type.

THE CHARACTER OF GOD.

When we turn to the general teaching of the New Testament we find that the doctrine of the Mass is in sharp conflict with the character of God as there revealed to us.

"It suggests a conception of God the Father which is not in accordance with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. The specific details of the ritual, the general attitude of the celebrant, the genuflections, the prostrations, the frequent bowing of the attendant clergy and acolytes or servers, the exclusive use of the word altar instead of Lord's Table—all this, conforming as it does so noticeably with what was customary in pagan worship, seems to be adapted to a lower and more primitive conception of God as of One having the attributes of an arbitrary and vengeful potentate, different *toto caelo* from Him whom Jesus described for us in saying, 'I and My Father are One.' The Mass thus tends to keep alive the old popular antithesis between the Father conceived as manifesting the justice and wrath of God and the Son as manifesting the suffering, self-sacrificing love of God. It is needless to say that in the teaching of our Lord there is no such antithesis."

* * * * *

"Now all this" (character of God the Father) "is falsified in the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass with its specific ritual. It obscures, even so as to impugn, the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that little stress is laid on the Fatherhood of God in Roman teaching or in teaching which is assimilated to it. Nor do we hear much in such teaching of the Holy Spirit and His direct influence upon souls. We hear much more of the ministries of created beings—angels or saints—as mediators between men and the remote and unapproachable God" (Ven. W. L. Paige Cox, Archdeacon of Chester, in *Anglican Essays*, p. 155).

THE FIRST COMMUNION.

The Institution itself, however, is the final court of appeal in regard to the facts and character of the Sacrament as instituted by Christ Himself. No Mass, or Communion, can be in any essential different from the first and be true. Doctrine which does not fit in with the facts of the first Communion cannot be true now. Nor can that be true now which would have been false then. Yet "in view of the great number and diversity of Biblical problems which stimulate research and are freely discussed at the present day, it is somewhat strange that the Institution of the Holy Communion, as it is recorded in the New Testament, is in general comparatively ignored" (*The Last Supper*, by Canon Kennett, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge University).

Now neither the doctrine of Transubstantiation in any form, nor that of the sacrifice of the Mass can be made to fit in with the facts of the first Institution without leading to absurdities which render the doctrine in either case untenable.

CHANGE IN THE ELEMENTS.

1. It is asserted that, on the utterance by the priest of the words of consecration, the bread and wine become there and then the body and blood of Christ. If so, then this must have happened at the Institution. If it happened then, our Lord had two bodies as He reclined at the Table—one, His own, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and another made now by Himself on the utterance of the words "This is my Body; this is my Blood."

If so, must not one of these bodies have been already offered up at the Last Supper, and the other not offered up till the next day upon the cross?

If so, must not Christ have had one body, which was taken and eaten by each of His disciples, and another which was neither taken nor eaten?

If so, and the Apostles understood this, must they not have believed that each of them had the Body of Christ within his own body at the same time that he saw the Lord's body reclining at the Table?

If so, then Christ must have existed and not existed at one and the same time. For already His body, born of the Virgin, existed before He took and broke the bread; but His body which was made out of bread did not exist until the words of consecration were spoken by Him.

If the sacrifice of the Mass is true now it must have been true at the first Eucharist; if it was not true then it cannot be true now.

2. The time when our Lord instituted the Holy Communion is worthy of thought and attention. For the old covenant was not yet, in fact, fulfilled and abolished. Our Lord chose "the night in which He was betrayed" on which to institute this ordinance. Was there any reason why He did not defer the Institution till after His Resurrection? Might He not have instituted it equally well

after as before His Passion? I venture to think not. Apart from the appeal to our love and pity in the pathetic scene in the Upper Room, where we see the Man of Sorrows in the shadows of His coming sufferings, was there not a purpose in the *time* of the institution, that purpose being the anticipatory guarding against the whole idea of any repetition of the sacrifice?

3. Now no sacrifice was offered by Christ at the Institution, for the law of Moses was still in force. (1) The Upper Room was no place of sacrifice; (2) there was no altar of sacrifice there; (3) it was not the hour of sacrifice; (4) neither the posture of Christ nor of the recipients was that of sacrifice; (5) Christ uttered no words of sacrifice, except those of thanksgiving which are not restricted to sacrifice in their use.

4. If every time the Mass is celebrated Christ is offered afresh as a sacrifice for sin, then must Christ suffer afresh each time. For "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

5. But this doctrine is incompatible with the Catholic doctrine of the session of Christ at the right hand of God. The essential meaning of that dogma is that Christ has, after His Ascension, entered upon the Regal phase of His mediatorial work, having completed the work of atonement by His sacrifice upon the Cross. Bishop Pearson points out that the session at the right hand means not only Christ's possession in His own person of the infinite power and majesty of God, but also that "now after all the labours and sorrows of this world, after His stripes and buffetings, after a painful and shameful death, He resteth above in unspeakable joy and everlasting felicity. . . . So Christ is ascended into Heaven where, resting from all pains and sorrow, He is seated, free from all disturbance and opposition, God having placed Him at His right hand until He hath made His enemies His footstool" (Pearson, *Creed*, Art. vi.).

Christ cannot be at the same moment suffering on earth in sacrifices and reigning in heaven. And there is no atoning sacrifice without suffering. "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. ix. 22, R.V.).

If our Lord offered Himself in that first Eucharist there was no need for His sacrifice of Himself on the cross the next day.

The Twenty-eighth Article of Religion is still justified in asserting that Transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ, is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

And the same may in truth be said of that earlier and grosser form of Transubstantiation now taught by some in the Church of England, which attempts no philosophical explanation, but merely asserts that the Bread and Wine are the body and blood of Christ, and teaches the ignorant to worship them as such.

The Thirty-first Article still rightly asserts that "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."