

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

“REFORMATION, MASS AND PRIESTHOOD.”

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS AND THE PRIESTHOOD. By E. C. Messenger. Vol. I. *Longmans*. 16s.

A Review by the REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IN reviewing a large book of 577 pages dealing at great length and detail with Roman doctrine and with the Reformation in England, written for Protestant consumption, one must select portions for criticism. The writer says “the present work arose out of a desire entertained by the author (E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Louvain) to set forth a reasoned account of why the Catholic and Roman Church refuses to allow that Anglican clergy have the powers of the priesthood.” The essential point, he says, is the difference in the conception of the priesthood in the two Communion, which is linked up with the respective doctrines in the Eucharist. He proceeds to show that there is, as we all know, a serious difference in these doctrines. He begins with the scriptural and patristic doctrine of the Eucharist and Priesthood and endeavours to show that the teaching of Scripture and Early Tradition is that the Body and Blood of Christ are really and objectively present under the appearances of bread and wine, and that this Sacred Body and Blood are in the Mass offered up to God the Father, in memory of the Passion and Death of His Son. He maintains that this doctrine was held by the Early Church and was only reaffirmed in the Council of Trent. Of course the view of the priesthood depends on this view of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, for the Roman view is that the priest (presbyter, prester, priest) is a sacrificing priest (*hiereus*), who offers up Christ as a sacrifice on the altar.

In reading this voluminous work in which the writer acknowledges his indebtedness to Darwell Stone’s *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, Canon Dixon’s *History of the Church of England*, Canon Kidd’s *Documents Illustrating the Continental Reformation*, the collection of books published by the S.P.C.K. on *Liturgy and Worship*, and numerous other works both Anglican and Roman, we must appreciate the labour and the research which such an undertaking involved, while differing with the author in some matters, and agreeing with him in others, especially as he says, “we have endeavoured to write *history* and to be as impartial as circumstances will permit and to get at the real facts.” At the outset, we must take exception to the claim for the Council of Trent to be an œcumenical or universal council. It was nothing of the kind, and its findings afterwards briefly summarised in the creed of Pius IV have no authority at all over the conscience of Christendom. For years before it met in 1545 the Christian nations had looked forward to and clamoured for “a general unfettered

council of Christendom" to reform the ethics and doctrine of the Italian Church. At the Council, which was by no means representative, there was little liberty of speech, but much variety of opinions, and it was under the domination of a pope, whose powers were greatly extended by it. If the Christian conscience in order to be called Catholic, or universal, must accept transubstantiation, that is, that after consecration of the bread and wine, there is in the sacrament truly, really, and substantially, under either form, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the whole substance of wine into the blood; so that there are no longer two substances or realities, bread and Body, but one substance only, Body; it must also accept the other doctrines, viz. that the Roman Church is the sole interpreter of Scripture; purgatory where souls detained are helped by the prayers of the faithful; the invocation of Saints; the veneration of images; indulgences; and that the Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches and that obedience is due to the Pope as the vicar of Christ. And any further doctrines and innovations such as papal infallibility which the Pope and his council may devise, any further so-called "developments" of doctrine. The Council, in which 187 Italians sat and 83 others, has no claim to be "a general unfettered council of Christendom," such as an œcumenical council ought to be, especially as "none had suffrages but such as were sworn to the Pope and the Church of Rome and professed enemies to all that call for reformation and a free council" (Laud), none of the Eastern Churches were present or assented, and "in many sessions scarce ten archbishops and forty or fifty bishops were present." Every Christian who did not consent to all the findings of that Roman Council was anathematized. It was practically a papal manifesto against the reformers' positions, one sided, narrow based and intolerant. "For a Roman Catholic who has accepted the dogma of 'papal infallibility' there can (says our author, p. 5) never be any appeal from a later council to an earlier one, or from a papal or conciliar definition to Scripture or patristic tradition. In this sense the appeal to history would be treason to a Catholic. He can never admit that the Church has been mistaken in its definitions. Once she speaks, the cause is ended." Accordingly, the Pope is elevated as an authority superior to scripture and patristic teaching. What he says goes; even against God.

It is well that non-Romans should understand the situation. Anyone who denies that the whole Christ, body and blood, spirit and divinity are in the bread and wine consecrated by a Roman priest, or who says that they are only in it as in a sign, figure or virtue, is under the anathema of Rome. Anyone who shall say that the substance of bread and wine remains, or shall deny the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the appearances of the bread and wine only remaining, lies under the Roman curse.

Now it is easy to show, for all our writer's efforts to read back transubstantiation into Scripture, the early Fathers and even later times, that the expressions "images" and "types" were used of the consecrated elements. Johannes Damascenus (A.D. circa 780) in his *De Fide Orthodoxa* attacked those who said that the consecrated elements were "images or types of the Body and Blood of Christ, who did not say: 'This is an image of my body or a type of my blood.'" He was followed by the Second Nicene Council A.D. 787. This proves that the symbolical theory of the sacrament must have been widely held as it was by St. Augustine and many other Fathers. And yet Johannes did not teach transubstantiation, but an equally illogical theory—augmentation, that Christ's body is continually being added to or augmented by the new-made bodies of the Eucharist, which He takes into His own Body, so that all become one and the same personal body of Christ! At all events, such a theory of addition would not have appeared admissible in the eyes of Johannes, who must like all the rest lie under the anathema of Trent, if transubstantiation had been then conceived. Neither can Irenæus be quoted in defence of the position that "the doctrine of the real objective Presence ultimately formulated as 'Transubstantiation' is contained explicitly, so far as its essentials are concerned, in the data of Scripture and Tradition, that is to say, the doctrine ultimately formulated by the Council of Trent is contained in the Scriptural and Patristic statements that the Eucharistic bread and wine *became and are* the Body and Blood of Christ" (p. 3). For his emphatic assertion (iv. 18. 5)—"the earthly bread receiving the word of God, is no longer common bread but is a *Eucharist consisting of two realities, an earthly and a heavenly,*" shows that he was unaware of any such conversion required by transubstantiation, which Gore said "owed its origin to the monophysite tendency of the Eastern Church, the tendency to absorb and annihilate the human in the divine, the natural in the supernatural."

In a Greek fragment (XIII) (which Massuet the Roman Editor accepted as genuine, regarding it as an abridgment) containing a passage from the story of the examination of Sanctus and Blandina at Lugdunum under torture—the account of their martyrdom is told in a letter from Irenæus partly preserved by Eusebius—it appears that their slaves examined under torture "had nothing to say to please their torturers, except that they heard from their masters that the divine communion is the blood and body of Christ. They themselves, thinking that it was really blood and flesh, told this to the examiners. They, thinking that this was really done by the Christians, compelled the martyrs to confess. Blandina answered 'how could they endure such things who not even partook of permitted food?'"

The pagans actually believed that the Christians ate flesh, and condemned them for their Thyestean banquets, not understanding that it was a spiritual feeding on Christ, not a literal or carnal. But Irenæus did not teach this. Otherwise this fragment quoted

by Oecumenius misrepresents him, but as the letter in Eusebius mentions the charge of Thyestean feasts—cannibalism—against the Christians, it is clearly genuine, and proves that the conversion of the bread and wine into the substance of the body of Christ was not contemplated by Irenæus. Again, Dr. Messenger quotes passages from Irenæus in which he finds the Sacrifice of the Mass. We submit that he is mistaken. In iv. 17. 6 “in God Almighty the Church makes her offering *per* Jesum Christ” —*through* Jesus Christ, not Jesus Christ. When speaking here of the Christian’s offerings Irenæus says, “the conscience of him who offers sanctifies the sacrifice.” Would the Son of God need any such sanctification from men? What is the oblation in Irenæus? “We must make oblation to God, and in all things be found *grateful* to our Creator, with *pure mind* and *faith*, in *sure hope* and *fervent love*, presenting to Him the firstfruits of His creatures. This oblation the Church offers to her Maker, pure and with thanksgiving from His creation. . . .” This language is not consistent with the Sacrifice of the Mass, but agrees with the “gifts” mentioned in Clement of Rome (40. 44). There we learn what this early Bishop of Rome meant by sacrifices (*thusiai*) and offerings (*prosphorai*) to God: “the sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit” (18); “the sacrifice of praise . . . *Christ the high priest of our offerings*”; and similar passages based upon Heb. xiii. 15, 16. See also the *Apostolic Constitutions* (third century), II. 25 “the then sacrifices are now prayers, supplications and thanksgivings; *the then firstfruits*, and tithes, are now offerings presented by holy bishops to the Lord. . . .” “the gift to God is the prayer and thanksgiving of each” (53). Note the emphasis in Irenæus upon the proper spiritual condition of the offerer’s soul as a *conditio sine qua non* for the validity of his offering. With him it was no mechanical contrivance, the instantaneous result of a magical formula, but a spiritual offering from a believing soul. He also says “We need to offer something to God. He takes to Himself our good works.”

Messenger says that in the discourse in John vi. 49–52, “the real objective presence of Christ’s Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine is taught.” We maintain against that statement that our Lord is not referring to the Sacrament at all, but to the absolute necessity of His followers being united with Him in the closest possible way. The Jews were familiar with such expressions as “eating” and “drinking” being used symbolically of an inner process. Eating His flesh and drinking His blood was a Jewish or Oriental metaphor for incorporation in His body, and consequently for appropriation of His life. See Isaiah lx. 16: “Thou shalt suck the milk of the nations and shalt suck the breast of kings.” The eating of a book in Ezekiel II was a figure of the soul taking in divine commands. Rabbinical writers spoke of the bread of the Torah as “spiritual food.” “Flesh and blood” here denote the humanity of Christ. “Body” not “flesh” is the word used in connection with the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26 ff.; Mark xiv. 22 ff.; Luke xxiv. 24 ff.; I Cor. xi. 23 ff.).

When giving the bread and wine later at the Paschal Supper our Lord did not emphasise the absolute necessity of eating and drinking as He does here (v. 53), neither do the Fathers. The reading back of that Paschal Supper into John vi would be an illogical *hysteron proteron* or inversion, a putting of the cart before the horse, giving an explanation of a ritual before the ritual was appointed.

Again, to "drink blood" (an expression not used at the Last Supper) is metaphorical in 2 Samuel xxiii. 17, where the phrase is used by David, when refusing the water procured by his men at the risk of their lives. "Far be it from me that I should *drink the blood* of men who ventured their lives" (lxx). Looking at the water they fetched, he said this just as our Lord holding the cup of wine said: "This is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed, etc."

Besides this, our Lord spoke of *coming* to him, as equally necessary. "Ye will not *come* to me that ye might have life" (v. 40). And here when the Jews murmured at His saying—"Every one who *beholdeth spiritually* (*θεωρῶν*) the Son and *believeth* in Him, hath eternal life" (vi. 40) asking: "Is not this man Jesus the son of Joseph?" He replied, "No man can *come* to me except the Father draw him." Then when He went on to develop His teaching of incorporation, they resented not the symbolism with which they were acquainted; but the fact that the son of Joseph the carpenter, used it of Himself. The word carefully and deliberately chosen, *theōrōn*, of spiritual contemplation and discernment that leads to faith, lifts the whole discourse out of the material rut, in which the literal interpreters of the discourse would bury it, into the pure azure of the heavenly life. The Jews had seen Him with their eyes, and had not believed, but those who see Him with the eyes of the soul must believe. These spiritual attitudes are required for incorporation in the spiritual Body of Christ. This shows that the *faith* of the recipient is a prerequisite of sacramental grace, according to the Master's teaching; and that the sacrament does not work "*ex opere operato*," as the R. C. Church believes.

Again, he reads this real objective presence of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine into 1 Corinthians x. 6: "the cup of blessing . . . is it not the *koinōnia* of the blood of Christ, etc.?" asserting that "five times out of six, when used with a genitive *koinonia* signifies a *material* participation in an object." This word *koinonia* is followed by a genitive in ten places, e.g. "the *koinōnia* of His Son" (1 Cor. i. 9), "the *koinonia* of the Holy Spirit" (2 Cor. xiii. 13), "fellowship of spirit" (Phil. ii. 1), "in His sufferings" (Christ's) (Phil. iii. 5), *of faith* (*Philem.* 6), of the mystery (reading doubtful) (Eph. iii. 9). On several occasions, e.g. Romans xv. 26, it simply means contribution. But when followed by a genitive, five times out of six outside this passage it refers to a *spiritual* participation. And that a spiritual conception is here is proved by the preceding terms "*spiritual food*" and "*spiritual drink*" (v. 4). St. Paul used *thusia*, the general

word for sacrifice, five times, but never in connection with the Church's offerings or with the Holy Communion, but of Christ's offering of Himself, of our offering of ourselves, and of gifts he had received from the Philippians. In Philippians ii. 17 he has "the sacrifice and liturgy of your faith" (profession). In discussing Hebrews vii. 27, ix. 25-28 where "once for all" (ephapax) and "once" (hapax, three times) is used of Christ's Sacrifice of Himself—a most emphatic reiteration of the writer's belief that such a sacrifice is not to be repeated he admits—"There can, then, be no repetition of Christ's death."

What then is the sense of teaching that in the Sacrifice of the Mass the mystical death of Christ, by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, is caused by the priest so that "the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass does not differ in its essence from the Sacrifice offered upon Mount Calvary" (*Catholic Belief*. Di Bruno, p. 77)? Is not this the duly authorised Roman method of repeating Christ's death? The dogma of transubstantiation in connection with the Sacrifice of the Mass is not patient of a dramatic representation of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, it demands a real, actual creation of the whole Christ, Body and Divinity, the actual slaying by the priest at the altar of the whole Christ, the actual sacrifice to God on the altar of that whole Christ at every celebration of the Roman Mass, or it means nothing. This is the logical *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole conception.

St. Paul said, 1 Corinthians xi. 26, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup (consecration implied) you proclaim (or preach) the Lord's death until He comes." The word *katangelo* is always used of preaching in the New Testament (e.g. the resurrection, the word, Jesus, the way of Salvation, the Unknown God, light (spiritual), "your faith," "the testimony of God, the Gospel, and Christ" (three times)) and cannot bear any sacrificial meaning; nor can it mean repeat, re-enact or exhibit, or stage. It implies a proclamation.

Dr. Messenger proceeds: "there can and must be a sacrificial commemoration or memorial of Christ's Death." Christ's death itself was a sacrifice. A Commemoration of a Sacrifice cannot be a sacrifice itself. A sacrifice of a sacrifice is nonsense. The repetition of the one sacrifice once offered is also a contradiction in terms. He refers us to the Lord's saying (Luke xxii. 19), "this do (*poieite*) in my remembrance" (*anamnesis*) claiming a sacrificial use of both terms *poieite* and *anamnesis*, which we do not allow. God the Father does not need any reminder, much less one that repeats His appointed Sacrifice, of His Son's Sacrifice. He requires no "remembrancer." The passage in Isaiah lxii. 6, "Ye that are the Lord's remembrancers take no rest," should be "Ye that make mention of the Lord" (the Hebrew means "mention with praise"). It was the followers of Jesus that required the constant reminder of His sacrifice. It is *our remembrance* of Him and it only that is to be kept alive. The words were spoken by One Who was returning to the Father Who would not require to be reminded of the Son's

sacrifice, having the "Lamb as it had been slain," always before Him; and who was leaving people who had short memories which He was constantly stimulating. "Remember the word which I spoke unto you"; "that ye may remember" (the Holy Spirit would remind them), "do you not remember?" etc. The New Testament use of *anamnesis* is not, therefore, patient of the meaning "a commemoration made unto God." This is also clear from Hebrews ix. 3, where we have an *anamnesis* of sins, not a record, but a calling to mind (man's not God's) of human sins. The contrast between the Jewish sacrifice and the Holy Communion is that in the former their sins were brought back vividly to the offerers; while in the latter the recollection of man's redemption from sin by Christ's sacrifice once offered is kept alive. In Wisdom xvi. 6 we have the word—"a symbol of salvation to put them in remembrance (*eis anamnesin*) of the commandment of thy law." It occurs twice in the Greek titles of Psalms 38 and 70, which are not connected with sacrifice, the first dealing with the Sabbath and the second with deliverance. In Numbers x. 10, the word is used in connection with the blowing of trumpets, and in Leviticus xxiv. 7 of the *incense* that was placed on the shewbread, and burnt "that it may be to the bread for a *memorial*," whereas the bread was eaten by the priests. It was the *shewbread*, not the incense, the memorial that was burnt, that was treated in the Church liturgies as a type of the bread of the Holy Communion. So that *anamnesis* cannot be said to bear a sacrificial meaning in connection with the bread and wine.

The question that remains is, can "*touto poieite*" mean "sacrifice this"? Great scholars of the Roman Church denied it. Bellarmine explained this order as meaning: "that which we are doing, I consecrating and distributing, you receiving and eating." He interprets "*hoc facite*" as "do this action," and describes the statement that Catholics take the words to mean "sacrifice this" as "*impostura adversariorum, Catholici non tam inepte argumentantur.*" And yet they do. Estius (1614) said "to render this as 'sacrifice this' is contrary to the mind of scripture" (*praeter mentem scripturae*). He said the words of the Canon, "*haec quotiescunque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis*" cannot, except in a forced sense, mean "make a sacrifice." The words "*hoc facite*" give the authority for doing these things which Christ did. The "*hoc facite*" with the cup restricts it to the act of drinking. He proceeds: "that which I now do and what you do at my command, I desire to be done by you and your successors in commemoration of me—that is recollecting (*recolentibus*) my passion and death for you." This, he says, is made clear by Paul's words: "as often as . . . you will announce (*annunciabitis*) the Lord's death, and by the following words of the Mass, "*unde et memores.*" Maldonatus, the Jesuit, also rejected the rendering "sacrifice this." He says the words mean—"Do this which I have done,—that is, consecrate for the end for which I consecrated."

It is a fact that *poiein* is frequently used in connection with

sacrifice; but it would be difficult to prove that in any single instance it must mean "sacrifice": for in every case where it is used with a sacrificial animal it can mean "prepare." Messenger refers to Exodus xxix. 39 which describes the preparation of the lamb or the "doing with" the lamb. If *poiein* must be rendered "sacrifice" there, it must also be rendered "sacrifice" in verse 35 of the same chapter—"thou shalt sacrifice to Aaron and his sons"! And in 2 Samuel xii. 4, "he *sacrificed* it (the lamb) to the visitor"! The correct word *anapherō* is used in Exodus xxix. 39 and in Psalm lxvi. 15 (which he refers to) where *poiein* is used in the second clause, instead of repeating the technical verb, according to the Hebrew parallelism. There is also good manuscript authority for reading *anapherō* in the second clause. In Luke ii. 27 "to do for him (Jesus) according to the customary law," cannot mean "sacrifice" as there is no object there and the reference is to the presentation of the first-born and the payment of the redemption money. Next he refers to Justin Martyr (*Dialogue* 41) who described the offering of the cake for leprosy as "a type of the Eucharist which our Lord commanded us to do (*poiein*) in remembrance of his passion." Justin simply introduces this phrase as a quotation of the original order. This is clear from other passages, Apol. 1, 66, where he gives the Lukan¹ passage fully, mentioning the feast of bread and water in the Mithraic cult, in which there is no suggestion of an objective presence, as an imitation of that service, and *Dialogue* 117, "prayers and thanksgiving made by worthy people are the only perfect sacrifices (*thusiai*) well pleasing to God I myself assert. For these are the only things Christians have been taught to do (*poiein*) even at the commemoration (*anamnesis*) of their food, both dry and liquid, in which they remember (*memnēntai*) the passion of the Son of God." The whole service was thus in Justin's eyes an act of commemoration of God's natural gifts of food and drink, as well as of the passion of Christ, in which the only sacrifices are prayers and thanksgivings. This passage is therefore strongly against the explanation "Sacrifice this," and follows such scriptural passages as "let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually" (Heb. xiii. 15). "To do good and to distribute forget not, for with such sacrifices (*thusiai*) God is well pleased"; and "a holy priesthood to offer up (*anapherein* not *poiein*) spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5) which cannot be explained as offering Jesus Christ Himself. We grant the contention of the author that the priesthood of the Church of England is not a sacrificial priesthood in the sense in which the Roman Church claims that her priesthood is, which sense would require this alteration of St. Peter's words—"to offer up a sacrifice to God, even Jesus Christ."

Again, Messenger finds the real objective presence in Ignatius, but the language of that martyr cannot be taken literally, especially

¹ This passage is entirely absent from D. and some old Latin MSS. It inverts the order, putting the wine before the bread, and Mark and Matthew have not "This do in remembrance of me."

as he was contending against the Docetics who denied the reality of our Lord's humanity and accordingly stressed the "flesh" of Jesus. At the same time we have such passages in his letters as "taking refuge in the Gospel as the *flesh* of Christ," "*faith* which is the flesh and *love* which is the *blood* of Christ," which show his symbolical style. How far Justin was from the dogma of transubstantiation may be gathered from the way in which he used *metabole* not of the conversion of the consecrated bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, but of the conversion of them into our blood and flesh (*Apol.* i. 65). He also refers to the teaching of Tertullian, but he emphatically says, "This is my body" means "this is a *figure* of my body." He had just spoken of the "*figure* of the blood." It is impossible to make the figure of a thing—its symbol—be the thing symbolised. Tertullian's point, as he argued with Docetics, was that there was a real body of Christ and the bread was its *figure*; whereas an airy thing such as a phantom would not have a "figure," as we would say a "shadow," but the "shadow" is not the "substance." He also refers to St. Augustine as giving a definite statement of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice; but Augustine, as the Roman Catholic writer Rauschen says, "inclines to the symbolical explanation of the Eucharist" (*Die Einsetzung des Abendmahl*, p. 21). Augustine also gave us the caution that "all men are wont to call signs by the names of the things signified." He says, "Our Lord did not hesitate to say 'this is my body' when giving a sign of His body." We often find the bread and wine called the Body and the Blood without any suggestion of a change in the elements, e.g. Cyprian (*Ep.* lxiii). But that he has a symbolical meaning is clear from the passage, "In the *water* we see that Christ's people are understood, in the wine that Christ's blood is shown." He says that the sacrament is "spiritual and heavenly" when the wine is mixed with water, the water representing the people; just as water (that is the people) is mixed with flour to make the bread (*lxiii.* 13). This would involve the transubstantiation of the water into the people, if that dogma was held about the wine! Messenger quotes from the 17th homily of Chrysostom, a perfervid rhetorician with an extravagant imagination, but stopped short before an important qualification. "We do," he says, "the same sacrifice, not another, but always the same, or rather we make a memorial of a sacrifice." So Eusebius said, "Christ offered an oblation and sacrifice and charged us to offer unto God continually a memory (*mnēmē*) instead of a sacrifice" (*Dem. Evang.*, i. 10). He also said: "He gave to His disciples the symbols of the divine dispensation," while Origen (also referred to by Messenger as a supporter) was consistently symbolical. The Eucharistic Body is a "typical and symbolical body." The expression "*antitypes*" was frequently used by Church Fathers, e.g. by Gregory (Naz.), Macarius, Eustathius, Epiphanius, and Theodoret. Serapion used "likeness ('*homoioima*') of the body" and spoke of offering not body and blood but bread and cup. The same symbolical expressions, *anti-*

types, figures, etc., are found in the Coptic *Egyptian Church Order*, and in the Syrian *Apostolic Constitutions* of the fifth century.

Accordingly, we have proved that the Roman view of transubstantiation in the sense of modern Roman Divines, i.e. "that at the time of consecration, the material substance of the elements ceases to be, and is replaced by the substance of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which substance sustains the outward appearance of bread and wine, of which the substance has ceased to be" has no support whatever among the patristic authorities mentioned in this review, much less in the Scripture.

This conclusion is supported by the findings of the late Dr. Pusey (*Real Presence*, pp. 162-264) from whose work the above definition of transubstantiation is taken. "The Romans," he says, "say that the Anglican writers do not use such language, therefore their position is different from that of the Fathers. But what of their own position? Pope Gelasius said, 'the elements remain in their own proper nature,' Irenæus, that 'the Eucharist consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly.' Many of the Fathers held that they are symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images of our Lord's Body and Blood. Chrysostom declared that 'the nature of bread remains' (*Ep. to Caesarius*); and Theodoret that 'the mystic symbols do not after consecration depart from their own nature. For they remain in their former substance.' After examining the various terms used to express a change, he says that Suarez, the Roman theologian to whom he refers, admitted that none of them adequately expressed the modern Roman doctrine, and he himself points out that the only word that could signify transubstantiation (*metousiōsis*) was not used by the Fathers. He also quotes the words of Cyril of Alexandria (one of Messenger's authorities), "That becoming does not wholly imply a change of nature will be evident, for one says to God: '*Become* thou to me my shield,' 'The Lord *became* my salvation.'" He (Cyril) also speaks of a change of the elements not into the Body and Blood of Christ, but into the *energy* or *virtue* thereof. But the energy or virtue of a substance is not the same as that substance itself. The expressions become, or be changed into, the Body and Blood, cannot mean, as Pusey says, that that which is changed or becomes something ceases to be, e.g. The Word became flesh "does not mean that the Word ceased to be."

We must draw to a conclusion this review of Dr. Messenger's work with the remark that theological or doctrinal controversies should be carried on without bitterness or personalities. There was no real necessity for the writer to mention the apocryphal story of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn's sister, or the youthful marriage of Cranmer when discussing the Reformation in England, just as it should be possible for others to examine the Roman dogma of transubstantiation without referring to the private life of Pius IV or to some of his unworthy predecessors.