

## ARTICLE III.

FORMULATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE  
MASS AT THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR C. WALKER, D. D.

1. *The History of the Council of Trent.* Written in Latin by Pietro Soave Polano, and faithfully translated into English by Nathaniel Brent, Knight, etc.

2. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, with their History.* By Rev. J. Waterworth. Dedicated, by permission, to Right Rev. Nicholas Wiseman, Bishop of Melipotamus, etc.

3. *Memoirs of Council of Trent.* By Rev. J. Mendham.

4. *Catechism of the Council of Trent.* Translated into English by Theodore Aloise Buckley.

5. *Catholic Doctrine, as defined at the Council of Trent,* expounded in a series of Conferences, delivered in Geneva. By Rev. A. Nampon, S. J. Proposed as a means of reuniting all Christians, etc., etc. With the commendatory approval of Bishop Frederick and of Archbishops Hughes, Spalding and Purcell.

THE two main issues as to the Lord's Supper,—the first, that of the nature of the presence involved; and secondly, that of its sacrificial character,—while constantly running up into each other, and in popular apprehension inseparable, need to be carefully distinguished. Of the two, that of the presence is comparatively unimportant; in its ultimate element is more largely in the metaphysics of physics than one of a moral and spiritual character. The experience of a large ecclesiastical community, the Lutheran Church, shows that this doctrine of a bodily presence in the elements, objective to the recipient and ubiquitous in its nature, is comparatively innocuous, need not affect any of the great fundamental truths of Christianity. This, the fact, with consubstantiation, or impanation, might be also, with transubstantiation, sup-

posing it pure and simple, with none of the accompaniments involved in the doctrine of sacramental sacrifice. Had Lutheranism entangled itself with the idea of an Aaronic succession, and its kindred idea of the Aaronic priesthood, as has been the case with a section of Anglicanism, the effect of consecration upon its theology and ritual would have been much more disastrous. This last touches the nervous center of the Christian system, affects in its influence the position of every truth of that system. While, in one direction, it evacuates the spiritual priesthood of the Christian believer, in another, it brings down the sole priesthood or prerogative of Christ to that of the Christian ministry, or, to put it in another form, exalts the Christian minister to the place and prerogative of Christ. As formulated in the Council of Trent, and reaffirmed in that of the Vatican, this doctrine of the Church of Rome presents itself for acceptance, and, pronouncing an anathema upon those rejecting, makes its demands upon our careful examination. Its affirmations, for three hundred years, have confronted the heart and intellect of Oriental and Protestant Christendom. Nothing, it would seem, ought to be easier than to say what is their meaning and substance. Why necessary, at this time, to subject them to investigation? It would appear, at the first glance, that nothing of this kind would be needed.

And yet we often, in regard to this subject, find conflicting statements. Indeed the popular view of Romish, as of Protestant communities, involves certain features that are by many Romish theologians repudiated. It does really seem as if there ought to be no doubt about it. The doctrine has been long before the world. The men who were burned for rejecting it, and the men who burned them, evidently thought that they understood each other. Was it all a logomachy, or upon points of minor importance? Questions of this kind naturally come up when it is asserted or implied that this doctrine is misrepresented or misunderstood, or that it is es-

essentially that of others, say, of the English or the Lutheran churches; in other words, that of men who opposed it, drew up intended dogmatic affirmations of its unscriptural character, or who died at the stake for rejecting it. In the interests of love, as well as those of unity and truth, this question demands candid examination. If the discordant elements of Western Christianity be ever brought together, it must be by a frank and full admission of their really existing differences. Theological and ecclesiastical quarrels, like those of social or political life, may be temporarily patched up by other and shorter processes. But they will break out again, and rage more furiously than ever. "Nothing is to be extenuated" as to one's own position. "Nothing is to be set down in malice" as to that of others. "The truth thus makes free" on both sides. As there is this freedom of truth and of light, so will there be that of love and mutual forbearance.

At the same time, with every such desire and feeling, there may still be difficulties. There will be such difficulty in regard to this particular doctrine of the Roman mass. One of those difficulties, very soon manifesting itself, is that of its apparent inconsistency: the inconsistency, first, of its dogmatic statements, with popular belief and impression, both among Romanists and Protestants; secondly, the inconsistency of these statements in themselves, as with others, equally authoritative on the same subject, elsewhere. So again, the element of indefiniteness—intended indefiniteness—where, as we know from the record of the Council formulating this doctrine, it was the object and specific intent, not to decide certain points that among themselves were definitely and keenly contested. The fathers of Trent were not perfectly agreed among themselves; and intelligent minorities, although outvoted, always, in some form or other, exert their influence.

But there was also another disturbing force, in the shape of outside pressure. This pressure from without was from different and opposite directions. The members of the Coun-

cil had their own local constituency. They had to consider the effect of their decisions as related to the interests and wishes of the Pope. The "arrival of the Holy Ghost by the regular mail from Rome," to quote a profane joke perpetrated at the time, was apt to have its influence. So, too, there was to be taken into account the wishes and feelings of the Emperor, of the King of France, as of other temporal sovereignties; the feelings and expectations of the church at large; the positions and views and statements of Protestant opponents. Upon this particular point of the sacrificial character of the Mass and its form of declaration, there was eventually an attempted, if not an actual, compromise. This word "compromise," in its good sense, means the throwing out of all that is doubtful; agreeing, in this, to differ; harmoniously affirming what is undoubtedly true. In its bad sense, it means the sacrifice of truth in an ambiguous or imperfect conclusion. A says twice three is six. B says it is eight. A, with a rising inflection, repeats his first proposition. B, still more positively, reaffirms his. Whereupon they lock horns, and, each exhausting himself in the effort to put his antagonist over the precipice, they agree to call in arbitration, and compromise on seven. A congratulates himself that B has been compelled to come so much nearer his position. B congratulates himself for the same reason. The truth, in the meantime, falls between them. This is not the case, as we have seen, in all compromise; was not necessarily so in the case before us. But the actors were in a position which constituted a temptation to it. An extract will make manifest the character of that temptation, as also of the various influences operating to a decision.

"On the eleventh of August," says one of the historians of the Council, following Pallavicino, "came up the question which had already divided and agitated the theologians, to wit, Did Christ offer up himself as a sacrifice to the Father at the last supper, or solely on the cross?"

“Seripando, who had been the one principally employed in preparing the draft of the decrees, had designedly omitted all allusion to this question, as one which had hitherto been left undecided, and which in his judgment had better now be avoided.

“But no sooner had the decrees been laid before the congregation, than the question was mooted, that Christ could not be called a Priest of the order of Melchisedec unless it were also declared, on what occasion he fulfilled the type, by using and offering up the symbols of that Priesthood, bread and wine.”

This argument, if it can be called one, based upon the assumption that the bread and wine provided as an ordinary refreshment, after a long march, for Abraham and his weary and hungry followers, was a sacramental and sacrificial offering—of which there is not a word or hint in the account in Genesis, or in any subsequent allusions to it, the real peculiarity of the priesthood of Melchisedec being clearly intimated in the Epistle to the Hebrews—was immediately urged, and insisted upon, by a portion of the Council, and was eventually incorporated in the decree, as adopted.

“Madrucci,” says the historian, “supported by the bishops of Otranto, Castagno, and very many of the fathers, at once maintained the affirmative, supporting their opinion by obvious texts of Scripture and from numerous passages from writers of the Greek and Latin Church.” But the chief defenders of the doctrine were Guasparre, Bishop of Leira, and Diego Lainez, the General of the Jesuits. Lainez viewed the question as a matter of fact, and, as such, to be decided by testimony. He adduced, accordingly, extracts from more than forty writers, ancient and modern, both Latin and Greek, who assert plainly the sacrificial act of Christ at the last supper. These testimonials he confirmed by a lucid exposition of the different passages of Scripture which bear upon the subject; and he replied, to the only objection urged against this opin-

ion, that it derogated from the sacrifice on the cross. He contended that our salvation is not to be ascribed solely to the death of Christ, though that was the final and crowning act, but to the life and death of Christ as a whole, and as embracing no one salutary and satisfactory act, but countless acts of obedience to the will of the Father, each of which was of infinite value, conducive to human salvation, and for which God, as St. Paul tells us, has exalted him.

In other words, as salvation depends not only upon Christ's expiatory sacrifice of himself upon the cross in a death of suffering, but also upon his incarnation, his teaching, his obedience, his example, so each one of these, and all, and each moment of his earthly life, might generally be called his sacrifice. Ergo, his institution of the supper may be specifically called his sacrifice of propitiative expiation. The dexterous transition, in this argument, from the general to the specific, in the meaning of the word sacrifice, is a piece of logic worthy of a general of the Jesuits. How often since then, and in how many different forms, repeated, not only by Romish but by Protestant theologians, the intelligent reader need not be reminded. If applicable to the supper to prove that a sacrifice expiative, why not, under the terms of the argument, to the teaching, or the obedience, or the example, elsewhere, and at other times, of the Institutor? Arguments sometimes prove so much that they prove nothing.

The contrary opinion, says the narrator, was supported by the Archbishop of Granada, Braga, and Lanciano, and by four other bishops; their chief ground being, as has been said, that the opinion which they impugned, derogated from the sacrifice upon the cross. They contended that Christ offered himself, indeed, at the last supper, but only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and not a sacrifice of satisfaction or propitiation; so that he did not, on that occasion, offer himself a sacrifice to the Father.

A third party among the fathers recommended that the

decree should, indeed, declare that Christ offered himself to the Father at that last supper, under the species of bread and wine; but that no mention be made of the nature of the offering, seeing that the opinion of the prelates did not agree concerning it.

“This suggestion,” says the narrator, “as may be seen from the decree in question, in the first chapter on the doctrine, was finally adopted, and this with only two dissentients.”

An examination, however, of the contents of the decree will show that the statement thus made needs modification. Putting this, for the present, aside, it is to be noted that four classes of opinion appear in this discussion. The first, represented by Seripando, were disposed to pass over the matter without any specific expression of opinion. The second, by Lainez, would have had a statement affirming a propitiatory sacrifice in the supper, without derogating from the sufficiency of that upon the cross. The third, represented by the Archbishop of Granada, that in the supper was a sacrifice, not of propitiation but of thanksgiving. And the fourth was that of those who would have affirmed that an offering or sacrifice of Christ was made, in the supper, under the species of the elements, without any specific decision as to the nature of such sacrifice.

What that decision really was, may be seen in the decree as finally adopted. Undertaking to be a compromise, it is substantially one of the extremes, that advocated by Lainez. Why, after the discussion, and when the final draft was made, there were only two dissentient votes, does not appear. We who have lived in the days of a general council, under the sectional control of an Italian majority, that of the Vatican, and know how many silent dissentients it contained, may hazard a conjecture as to the case before us. But we pass on to the decree as it was adopted.

Beginning, in the preamble, with the declaration that

the Eucharist is a true and singular sacrifice, it goes on to describe its time of institution, and its peculiar character.

“Forasmuch as, under the former Testament, according to the testimony of the Apostle Paul, there was no perfection of the Levitical priesthood, there was need, God the Father of mercies so ordaining, that another priesthood should arise, after the order of Melchisedec, our Lord Jesus Christ, who might consummate, and lead to perfection as many as were to be sanctified. He, therefore, our Lord and God, though he was to offer himself once on the altar of the cross, unto God the Father, by means of his death, there to operate an eternal redemption; nevertheless, because that his priesthood was not to be extinguished at his death, in the last supper, on the night in which he was betrayed, that he might leave to his Beloved Spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man needed, whereby that bloody sacrifice once to be accomplished on the cross, might be represented, and the meaning thereof remain until the end of the world, and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of sins, which we daily commit, declaring himself constituted a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec, he offered up to God the Father his own body and blood, under the species of bread and wine; and, under the symbols of those same things, he delivered his own body and blood, to be received by his Apostles, whom he then constituted Priests of the New Testament; and by these words, ‘do this in remembrance of me,’ he commanded them, and their successors in the priesthood, to offer them, even as the Catholic Church has held and taught. For, having celebrated the Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their going out of Egypt, he instituted the new Passover, to wit himself, to be immolated, under visible signs, by the church, through the ministry of priests, in memory of his own passage from this world unto the Father, when, by the effusion of his own blood, he redeemed us, and delivered



us from the power of darkness, and translated us into his kingdom. And this is that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by the unworthiness of them that offer it, which the Lord foretold by Malachias, was to be offered, in every place clean to his name, which was to be great among the Gentiles; and which the Apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, has not obscurely indicated, when he says, that they who are defiled by participation of the table of devils, cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, by the table, in both places, meaning the altar. This, in fine, is that oblation which was prefigured by various types and sacrifices, during the period of nature and of the law; inasmuch as it comprises all the good things signified by those sacrifices, as being the consummation and perfection of them all."

Here then are two sacrifices of immolation. One of these is the offering or sacrifice, offered once upon the cross, by means of Christ's death to operate an eternal redemption, the effusion of his own blood, redeeming us, and delivering us from the power of Satan, translating us into his kingdom. The other, this, on the night before the crucifixion. As to the first of the sacrifices, thus described, it is to be said that the decree, so far, is thoroughly scriptural; and there is no conflict in it with any of the contending elements, either of Oriental or of Protestant Christianity, then in existence. Saving Socinianism, which at the date of the decree had scarcely become an appreciable force to be taken account of, the great Christian leaders of earlier times, as those contemporaneous, would have been in perfect accord with it. With Chrysostom, and Augustine, and John of Damascus, and Luther, and Calvin, Cranmer, and Zwingli, alike, there would have been full and hearty acceptance of this affirmation: Christ offered himself once on the cross, unto God the Father, there to operate an eternal redemption; that, then and there, by the effusion of his own blood, he redeemed us, and delivered us from the power of darkness and translated

us into his kingdom. So far there is no difficulty. All is scriptural, will be accepted alike by friends and enemies.

But this sacrifice, thus offered once, is not alone. There is another. And it is in reference to this other that all the difficulties of the case have existence. The last, indeed, constitutes the peculiar sacrifice of the Mass, as distinct from that on the cross. As described, it is different, and yet identical; the same in its efficacy, and yet additional; a repetition, not of that on the cross, but of that on the night before; having the same efficacy, and yet not adding to or derogating from it. The problem is to adjust the affirmations in regard to the one with those in regard to the other, so as to get out of them a consistent whole; or, to put the matter in the form in which it was put by the opposing Bishop of Granada, it is "to affirm the sacrifice of the mass, in its peculiar efficacy, without derogating from the all-sufficiency of that on the cross."

The nature of this problem will become manifest, in the light of certain particulars of affirmation, in the language above quoted. The sacrifice of the Mass, for instance, is differentiated, first of all, as to the time of its offering, secondly as to its character,—on the night before the crucifixion and not in the crucifixion itself; and it was unbloody. That on the cross, again, is offered once, is not to be repeated; this of the Mass is to be offered frequently, is to be constantly repeated, to the end of the world. That on the cross is all-sufficient, operates an eternal redemption; this of the Mass is truly propitiatory, one by means of which men obtain mercy, and find grace, in seasonable time of need; the Lord, by the oblation thereof, is appeased, granting the grace and gift of penitence, forgiving even heinous crimes and sins; it is the oblation prefigured in Old Testament types and symbols; in it Christ is contained and immolated; its salutary virtue may be applied to the remission of sins; such application extends not only to the persons actually receiv-

ing the element of this sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, but to others of the faithful living, present or absent; and also to the faithful of the dead, those not as yet fully purified.

Not less complicative are the affirmations of the grounds or reasons, first, of the institution of this sacrifice of the Mass, secondly, of its peculiar efficacy. One of these reasons is that of the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood and sacrifices. These are made perfect, not, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the one great High Priest, making his one great sacrifice on the cross, and presenting it forever in heaven, but in the representative sacrifices of the Mass, repeated by human priests, standing in his place on earth. So again, all the types of the Old Testament as to pardon and purification from sin, find their antitype, not in the one pardon and purification, which come through the one sacrifice of the cross, but through these repeated sacrifices of the human priests, in the Mass. In this last, these typified results are consummated, and made perfect. Christ's eternal priesthood, thus, of the order of Melchisedec, is perpetuated, not in heaven forever, interceding there for his people, but in the successive intercessions of his representative priests on earth.

This word "represent," as used in this connection, is to be carefully noted. It is not in the sense of simply presenting over again to memory or cognition, something that had previously taken place, or had been known. It here means "to take the place of;" and its peculiarity, applied to the institution of the Mass, is that it describes an event, a sacrifice, the repetition of another that had not, as yet, except in divine intent, taken place. The unbloody sacrifice, offered up, in the institution of the supper, the immolation then and there made, represented, was in the place of the sacrifice on the cross, which was made the next day. So too, it represents it, not symbolically or eucharistically, that is as a sacrifice of thanksgiving, but as dispensing its saving power

then and in all its subsequent offerings and repetitions. Just as the officiating priest offers it, not *in propria persona*, but as Christ, in the place and exercising the prerogative of Christ, and by the act of sacrifice calls these efficacious agencies into exercise. This, moreover, being exercised, in the immolation, under the species and appearances of bread and wine, but, in reality, upon the soul, body, and divinity, the psychological, corporal, and divine Christ, is propitiative and sanctifying, exerts such influence alike for the living and for the dead.<sup>1</sup>

So accordingly, in the Canons of the Council, we have the following declarations:—

“If any one saith that in the Mass, a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God or that to be offered, is nothing else, but that Jesus Christ is given us to eat: let him be anathema.”

“If any one saith that by these words, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ Christ did not institute the Apostles

<sup>1</sup> An illustration of similar confusion presents itself in recent statements. “As to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist,” says Newman to Pusey, and this at an early stage of their movement, “I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine decrees.” “Pusey,” says his biographer, “acquiesced in the formal work of the Council of Trent, on the subject, except so far as its words were modified by the doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory.” “Truly,” as “true,” not transub, nor consub, but subsubstantiated bodily substantiated in some way or other. This is the asserted fact, which trans and consubstantiated seeks to relieve. With all, it is ubiquitous body: body, a thing in its very definition outlined, without outline, in other words the old contradiction of long condemned Monophysitism.

“The thing,” says Dr. Dix, making a similar effort, “signified called Res, the body and blood of Christ, His glorified Humanity, which after a manner, inexplicable and without parallel in the range of our knowledge, becomes present, after consecration not locally or physically, according to the laws of material or carnal bodies but supralocally, hyperphysically, and spiritually, in some way believed by the Church but known only to God.”

And yet this same authority would speak of it as an extension of the Incarnation.

priests, or did not ordain that they, and other priests should offer his own body and blood: let him be anathema."

"If any man saith that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross; or that it profits him only who receives it; or that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema."

Here the question, and the difficulty urged, in the council, during the discussion, immediately present themselves. If the sacrifice of the Mass be thus efficaciously propitiative and sanctifying, if it be the antitype of the Old Testament types, and the consummated perfection of Old Testament sacrifices, and extend in its influence, as it is offered to the living present and absent, as also to the dead; if it be all this, is any other, or more needed? If the priesthood of Melchisedec find its antitype, not in the great High Priest, offering up himself, but in the Apostles and their priestly successors offering him in the Mass, and this latter is necessary, how can it be affirmed that the former is either necessary, or perfect and all-sufficient? Is not the sacrifice on the cross, thus, made only supplemental, or introductory? So too as to the attainment through the Mass of grace and mercy, the forgiveness of heinous sins, the collation through it of the benefit of the sacrifice on the cross? Does not this imply that the latter needs to be helped out by the former, to the attainment of its divinely proposed results? So again, if the Old Testament types and symbols are so, not of the sacrifice on the cross, but of that in the Mass, in what peculiar position is the former placed to the latter? "He told them," says Father Paul, reporting the speech of the Bishop of Veglia, against such affirmation, "they should consider well of it; because one propitiatory sacrifice being offered, if this be sufficient to propitiate, no other can be offered, but only for thanksgiving. And he maintained that a propitia-

tory sacrifice in the supper must needs imply, that by that we are redeemed, and not by his death: which is contrary to Scripture and Scripture doctrine, which ascribe our redemption to that death." At an earlier period of the discussion, also, it had been urged by others, that if Christ offered himself, in the supper, that on the cross would have been superfluous; because mankind would have been redeemed by that which went before. Then, again, opposing the assertion that the sacrifice of the altar was instituted by Christ for a memorial sacrifice of that which he offered on the cross, it was argued that there cannot be any memorial, except of a thing past. Therefore the Eucharist, as first instituted, could not then be a memorial sacrifice of a fact which had not taken place, the oblation the next day of Christ on the cross. It will thus be seen, that Scripture and good sense had their representatives in this discussion; although, here, as in too many other cases, fearfully in the minority.

One mode of relief sought from these difficulties, in its inferences is no less opposed to Scripture: the affirmation of the essential identity of these sacrifices; that is, that while, in certain respects different, the sacrifice on the cross, and that in the Mass is the same. The language of the Catechism of Trent really comes to this position; while alluding to these distinctions, at the same time, affirms the identity of the things distinguished.

QUESTION LXXXIII.—“The sacrifice of the Mass, the same with that offered on the Cross.”

“We, therefore, confess that the sacrifice of the Mass is and ought to be considered one and the same sacrifice, with that on the Cross; for the victim is one and the same, namely our Lord Christ, who offered himself, once, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. The bloody and unbloody victim are not two, but one victim only, whose sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist.”

QUESTION LXXIV.—“There is also One Priest of both.”

“The Priest is also one and the same Christ the Lord; for the ministers who offer sacrifice, consecrate the holy Mysteries, not in their own person, but in that of Christ, as the words of consecration itself show; for the priest does not say this is the body of Christ, but this is my body; and thus acting in the person of Christ, the Lord, he exchanges the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of His body and blood.”

This, in language immediately following, is truly a propitiatory sacrifice by which God is appeased and rendered propitious to us.

But if such be the case, is not this representative sacrifice in the Mass, really, that of the cross repeated? Although instituted in point of time before, and called by a different name, yet really that on the cross? What efficacy is there in the latter that is not affirmed of the former? Is it not, as now repeated, to all intents and purposes that of the cross over again? Distinction, as we have seen, is made between bloody and unbloody; so also between the atoning sacrifice on the cross and the representative one in the Mass. But if what is called unbloody is an immolation of the real and true substance of soul and body, of body and blood, and if everything that is efficacious belonging to the sacrifice of the cross, is affirmed of that in the Mass, it at once becomes manifest that their distinctive attributes, to all practical purposes, are annihilated. In the language of the Catechism, just quoted, they are one and the same.

Such then is the difficulty. Its explanation is not far to seek. There was a popular idea, then as now prevailing, that of the reënactment, in the Lord's Supper, of the one great sacrifice on the cross; and priestly application of it to the necessities of special cases. The problem was, how to save what was assumed to be true, in this popular conception, and at the same time avoid gross errors, manifestly in conflict with the clear statements of Scripture. They thus,

as we have seen, distinguished the sacrifices in words and in time; but identified them in efficacy and essence. The Mass is not the one great sacrifice, on the cross, never to be repeated. But it represents it. Representing it, that is, taking its place, containing all its efficacy, it dispenses, communicates it to the faithful.

Is it any wonder that opposing Protestants and unsophisticated Roman Catholics find it the great sacrifice on the cross repeated? Do not the distinctions, in any rational significance of them, annihilate the difference?

However that may be, and upon either supposition, the original charge against the doctrine of the Mass, that of derogating from that of the cross, is easily sustained. If, for instance, they are distinct and different, the affirmation of the necessity and peculiar efficacy of the repeated sacrifices of the Mass, or of any one of them, derogates from the perfection and all-sufficiency of that on the cross. If that was "once for all," and "all-sufficient" how is, or can be, any other needed? If, on the other supposition, they are identical no less is its assertion derogatory, to the one and, the all-sufficient oneness of that on the cross; for in that case it needs to be constantly repeated. In other words, its perfection is made perfect, and filled out in these repetitions. Take either horn of the dilemma, and we come to the same antisciptural conclusion.

That conclusion, it is sometimes asserted or insinuated, is substantially that of the English communion service. The language of a writer of that church may well be quoted in reply to such assertion. "I think," says Bishop Thirlwall, "it can hardly be denied that there is a very wide and important difference between the general view which our Church takes in her Liturgy, and the Roman view of the Mass. The difference is marked by their several names and distinctions. The one is an office for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion; the other, for the



celebration of a sacrifice. These differences, indicated by the titles, are equally conspicuous in the contents of the Liturgies. In the Anglican, the idea which is almost exclusively predominant is that of Communion. There is, indeed, an offertory, and an oblation of common things, for sacred and charitable purposes. There is mention of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which appears to include the whole rite; and the communicants offer themselves, their souls, and bodies, as living sacrifices. But of any other kind of sacrifice, and particularly of any sacrificial oblation, of the consecrated elements, there is not a word. The consecration is immediately followed by the communion, which is the great business, the whole. On the other hand, the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on those who say that there is not offered to God, in the Mass, a true and proper sacrifice; or that the offering consists only in Christ being given for manducation; or that the sacrifice of the Mass of thanksgiving; or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice is only one performed on the cross, and not propitiatory. A more direct conflict of views, if they are supposed to relate to the same subject, not essentially different from each other, it would be difficult to conceive; for that which the council so emphatically denies to be the sacrifice, is the only thing which our church gives the name of sacrifice. That which the council declares to be the true and proper sacrifice of the Mass, is an offering as to which our church is absolutely silent." She is thus silent, we may say, in her communion office. But in her thirty-first Article she is very free and outspoken; and in terms which can scarcely be misunderstood.