

THE LATER MEDIEVAL
DOCTRINE OF THE
EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

BY
B. J. KIDD

PUBLISHED FOR THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

LONDON
S · P · C · K
1958

First published in 1898
(as No. XLVI of the Church
Historical Society Publications)

Reprinted 1958

S.P.C.K.

Holy Trinity Church

Marylebone Road

London N.W.1

Printed in Great Britain by

THE SIDNEY PRESS LIMITED, LONDON AND BEDFORD

A member of the Hazell-Sun Group

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A. ARTICLE XXXI, THE STARTING-POINT	7
I. History of Text	8
II. Terms	10
III. Interpretation	13
IV. A Practical Religious System	20
V. With Doctrinal Presuppositions behind it	31
B. THE MEDIEVAL DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE	33
I. The Sacrifice not discussed in the earlier Middle Ages	33
II. The earlier Schoolmen upon the Eucharistic Sacrifice	34
III. The Sacrifice as Taught by St Thomas Aquinas	38
(i) New definition of Sacrifice	38
(ii) New prominence given to the Priest and the Consecration	40
(iii) His language as to the mode in which the Sacrifice operates	42

	PAGE
C. THE LATER MEDIEVAL DOCTRINE OF THE EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE	44
I. <i>Ex opere operato</i>	44
II. The multiplication of Masses	54
III. The iteration of the one Sacrifice of the Cross	72
(i) Growth of the theory that Sacrifice involves Destruction	73
1. In later Medieval Theology	73
2. In later Medieval Art	80
3. In the sixteenth century: the meaning of "sacrifice"	82
4. Since the sixteenth century— Minimizers and Maximizers on a "Verum et proprium sacrificium"	87
(ii) Suggested criticism, in conclusion	100
INDEX	103

AUTHOR'S NOTE TO FIRST IMPRESSION

IN the earlier stages of the recent controversy upon Anglican Orders, a disproportionate amount of attention was paid to the history and meaning of Article XXXI. From it was built up by some an argument to show that the English Church had altogether abandoned the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Others, however, asserted that the Article was aimed not at the primitive, nor even at the earlier medieval, teaching upon that point; but only at certain corruptions both of doctrine and practice which had crept in unawares in the later Middle Ages. The controversy is now over. We are therefore in a position to ask, without ulterior motive, what was the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice?

A

ARTICLE XXXI, THE STARTING-POINT

ARTICLE XXXI is obviously the most convenient starting-point. Whatever it denies, whether the whole doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist or certain later phases of it only, we are at any rate brought face to face in this Article with the most recent terms of the original repudiation. The Articles as a whole first saw the light in 1552. For twenty years they were repeatedly brought back to the anvil by a generation of divines who, whatever their point of view, were at least well acquainted with the doctrinal system which they revised, and with its practical results. When the formulary took its final shape in 1571, the men who had revolted from the earlier system, medieval or ancient (for that is the question before us), had had time to make deliberate choice of the terms in which to express, with the most telling accuracy, the degree or nature of their departure from it. In this sense, then, the wording of their formulary brings down to us the preceding system of doctrine and practice in its most developed form and in the shape in which they thought it most vulnerable. That system as a whole has departed so far from our mental horizon, that to recover it in any particular we must start backward from the point at which those left it who put it down.

I. *History of the text of Article XXXI*

What, then, is the history of the text of Article XXXI? We need not go behind Hardwick, who gives the Latin of 1553 and 1563, together with the English of 1563 and 1571, in four parallel columns.¹ A comparison of these four texts justifies the most recent commentator on the Articles in remarking that "the alterations which have been made in this Article since it was first published are insignificant and immaterial. In 1553 the English of the title was 'Of the *perfect* oblation of Christ *made* upon the Cross' (instead of, as now, 'Of the *one* oblation . . . finished'); and in the last clause of the Article, 'the sacrifices of masses' were said to be '*forged* (not *blasphemous*) fables'; while 'culpa' was translated 'sin' instead of 'guilt', and there was nothing in the Latin corresponding to the word 'blasphema', which was only introduced in 1563."² It would thus appear that the doctrinal import of the Article was the same throughout its history: and thus it was not in 1571 but in 1553 that the terms of this particular revolt from the previous system were fixed. But two points of detail, relating to textual changes, seem to have escaped notice. First, our modern texts should follow those of 1563 and 1571, and read "the priests did offer", whereas they merely reproduce the version of 1553, "the priest did offer".³ Have we here a hint that, by way of extra caution, the Elizabethan revisers wanted to add one more plural to give the clue to what they meant by the

¹ Hardwick, *Articles*, pp. 331, 332.

² Gibson, *Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii, p. 687.

³ "Priests" is also the reading of the English edition of 1562 (3), though in the Latin MS. of Convocation, 1563, it is "*Sacerdotem*"; cf. Cardwell, *Synodalia*, i, p. 68. Hardwick only gives the Latin of that year.

phrase "Missarum sacrificia"? Secondly, the addition of "blasphema" in 1563 suggests a degree of mutual watchfulness between England and Rome otherwise unsuspected. The dogmatic chapters and canons of Trent "De sacrificio missae" were not promulgated till 17 September 1562. Now our Article, some nine years before, had described the "Missarum sacrificia" by the unusual word "imposturae". "Si quis dixerit", retorted the Council, "imposturam esse missas celebrare in honorem sanctorum et pro illorum intercessione apud Deum obtinenda sicut ecclesia intendit: anathema sit."⁴ But the preceding Canon ran, "Si quis dixerit blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto per missae sacrificium aut illi per hoc derogari: anathema sit."⁵ Next year the English Article added "blasphema" to its vocabulary of repudiation. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the English Divines replied to the attack on "imposturae" by accepting the challenge to use the epithet "blasphemous" under pain of anathema. That the Tridentine Council took or mistook the attack on the "Missarum sacrificia" for a real attack on the "Missae sacrificium", we are hardly justified in concluding, from the mere employment of retaliatory language on both sides, when both were at white heat. But it is important to observe a point in the history of the text of Article XXXI, which so conclusively proves its statements to have been made long before the formulation of the modern Roman doctrines, however related to them afterwards.⁶

⁴ Sess. xxii, can. v, *Canones et Decreta*, p. 121, ed. Tauchnitz. Lipsiae, 1876.

⁵ Sess. xxii, can. iv; *ibid.*, p. 121.

⁶ Cf. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, vol. iii, p. 526 n.

II. *The terms of Article XXXI**De unica Christi oblatione in
Cruce perfecta.*

[§ 1.] Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque praeter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. [§ 2.] Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, Sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae aut culpae pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosae imposturae.

*Of the one oblation of Christ
finished upon the Cross.*

[§ 1.] The offering of Christ once made, is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. [§ 2.] Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

From the history of the text of Article XXXI, we now pass to the consideration of its terms. Taken as it stands, the Article contains (1) a positive statement, and (2) a negation. The drift of the positive statement in § 1 is conveniently summarized in the title, "Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross". Taking title and text together, it asserts the all-sufficiency of the *one* offering *once* made upon the Cross: (a) "for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual", to (b) the exclusion of all "other satisfaction for sin but that alone". One may notice, in passing, the use of highly technical language, e.g., "sins both original and actual", and, again, "satisfaction" (= "satisfactio") standing along with its equivalents at the beginning, and alone (= "expiatio"), as if in pointed and emphatic isolation, at the end of this introductory § 1. For the first clause of the Article is simply introductory. It makes a positive statement by way of leading up to the negation of § 2. It might indeed have been open to us to take the

title as forbidding the idea that the negation is the substance of the Article, if it were not the case that elsewhere the titles of the Articles are bad guides to their contents. Article XIII, for instance, asserts that "Works done before the grace of Christ . . . are not pleasing to God"; while this is not true of what its title calls "Works before Justification". The prayers of St Paul⁷ and of Cornelius,⁸ at their conversion, were accepted before God, and the multitude on the day of Pentecost "were pricked in their heart",⁹ before they were justified in baptism by "the remission of their sins".¹⁰ Obviously the grace of compunction and the spirit of prayer were producing fruits "pleasing to God" before justification. The title therefore misrepresents the substance of the Article. So in Article XXXI, it only covers half its statements: and there are good grounds for regarding the negation of § 2 as the body of the Article.

For, first (*a*) the positive or introductory statement has been made in the series twice before. Article II affirms that our Lord died "to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men"; while Article XV, omitting this distinction, emphasises the earlier part of § 1 of Article XXXI by saying, "He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself *once made*, should take away the sins of the world." A third repetition of such statements can hardly have been thought necessary except as a foundation for some important conclusion to be built on it.

⁷ Acts 9. 11.

⁸ Acts 10. 4.

⁹ Acts 2. 37.

¹⁰ Acts 2. 38.

Next, (b) the position of Article XXXI in the series suggests what this superstructure was meant to be. It stands last in the group relating to the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments (XIX-XXXI). It is immediately preceded by a short protest against one abuse connected with the Eucharist, viz., Communion in one kind (Article XXX); and as immediately followed by an attack upon another, viz., the compulsory celibacy of the clergy (Article XXXII)—a custom that rested on disciplinary enactment, indeed, but was closely bound up with the doctrinal sanction derived from the exaggerated isolation assigned to the priest in the Mass. The marriage of the clergy, and communion in both kinds, were in fact the two demands universally made throughout Western Europe, and, at one time, all but conceded. Article XXXI, by its direct association with these two neighbouring statements, which affirm the legitimacy of the two reforms, would obviously seem to be concerned not with the Atonement but with the Eucharist, and moreover with certain current perversions of it, like those condemned in Articles XXX and XXXII. Its second clause, then, contains its substantive declaration. But, thirdly, (c) the structure of the Article puts this beyond dispute. The "unde" or "wherefore" of its text stands as the connecting link between the preliminary statement and the conclusion. "There was, indeed," is its meaning, "but one sacrifice once made: wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

So it appears, then, that § 1, though by no means superfluous, is only subsidiary to § 2.

III. *The interpretation of Article XXXI*

What, then, is the meaning of this cardinal pronouncement? It also, like the earlier part of the Article, abounds in technical phraseology. It would have been a simple matter to repudiate in one sentence the doctrine that there was any sacrifice at all in the Eucharist. The Lutheran ambassadors of 1538 bluntly stated, for example, that the Mass "non potest dici sacrificium: cum nemo ignoret magnum inter sacrificia et sacramenta discrimen. His enim nos dona a Deo oblata accipimus, illis vero opus nostrum Deo reddimus et offerimus."¹¹ This is a succinct and simple rejection of any sacrifice in the Eucharist, in terms that no one could mistake; and though it is probable that Article XXXI owes its parentage to this and similar Lutherizing declarations of 1538, it must be admitted that the parental features have been softened down, and the hard lines of denial obscured by expansion into the phraseology of technical criticism. We have here but one instance among many, that "as knowledge of Lutheranism grew in England, the English people rejected its distinctive tenets."¹² *Prima facie*, then, Article XXXI contains not a summary denial of one doctrine, but a careful refutation of several issues con-

¹¹ Pocock's *Burnet*, iv, p. 364. The "opus nostrum", in their definition of sacrifice, shows that their notions of it were taken merely from the system they were bent on destroying; but their language is quite untechnical, in the sense that it would be perfectly intelligible to the average layman.

¹² A. L. Moore, *Lectures on the Reformation*, p. 143. And for the best instance of this tendency, see Barlowe's *Dialogue*, edited by J. R. Lunn. Barlowe gave up Lutheranism, and gave his reasons in this *Dialogue*, 1531.

nected with it. The refutation may be summed up in the four following propositions:

Proposition 1. Article XXXI does not, in so many words, deny the sacrifice of the Mass, but "Missarum sacrificia", or "the sacrifices of Masses". It is, however, replied, and from more than one quarter, that this distinction is open to objection. We may pass by the assertion that it never occurred to any of the older commentators on the Articles, and was first discovered by Dr Newman,¹³ and repeated by Dr Pusey.¹⁴ It does not follow that, because a discovery was recently made, its authors were wrong. But there is a weightier objection from Bishop Thirlwall. He thought it "very improbable that the framers of the Article should have levelled it not against any doctrine held by the Church of Rome, but against either an error or an abuse which had crept in among the people. . . . If this had been the meaning, I can hardly conceive that it would have been so expressed. For then the only hint of that which was the object of such very severe condemnation would be contained in the single letter S, the sign of the plural number."¹⁵ This is not quite accurate. The plurals are thrice repeated in the English versions of 1563 and 1571¹⁶; and this emphatic repetition, easily as it may escape notice now, when the practical system of worship belonging to the later Middle Ages is wholly lost to us, could not but have contained a sufficient "hint" of what it was meant to condemn to a generation which had itself put down the innumerable Masses. But Bishop Thirlwall proceeds to argue that "Missae" and

¹³ Tract xc, p. 59.

¹⁴ *An Eirenicon*, i, p. 25.

¹⁵ Thirlwall's *Remains*, ii, p. 193.

¹⁶ Cf. "sacrifices", "masses", "priests".

“Missa” are but equivalents in the language of the Council of Trent. “Nec missas illas in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, ut privatas et illicitas damnat, sed probat atque adeo commendat’ (here the plural *Missae* is certainly equivalent to the singular).”¹⁷ The bishop’s quotation hardly bears out his comment. Unquestionably “Missae” was used of a single Mass in early days. “Missarum sollemnia” was the phrase in common use for the Mass from the days of Gregory the Great to the ninth century¹⁸; and even afterwards the variety of usage still continued. But it is remarkable that by the sixteenth century, as if all remembrance of the successive dismissals which gave the Mass its plural name had passed away, the Council of Trent (*a*) uses the phrase “de sacrificio Missae” throughout its decisions upon that mystery; that (*b*) where “Missae” occurs the plural reference is frequently intended, and never necessarily excluded; and that (*c*) in connection with the obsequies of the departed, where unquestionably several Masses were and still are often said, the very phrase of our Article XXXI is conspicuous, and that in close proximity to other plurals: “Curent autem episcopi ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, elemosynae, aliaque pietatis opera persolvantur.”¹⁹ It is not to the point to quote the ancient use of “Missarum sollemnia” as merely equivalent to the Mass service, or phrases such as that in the *Missa pro defunctis*, “anima famuli tui his sacrificiis purgata et a peccatis expedita”. “Sacrificia”, in such a context, is definitely plural in meaning, and refers to a number

¹⁷ *Remains*, ii, p. 196; cf. Sess. xxii, c. 6, *Canones et Decreta*, p. 119.

¹⁸ *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, ii, p. 1194.

¹⁹ Sess. xxv, Decretum de purgatorio. *Canones et Decreta*, p. 173.

of oblates offered; though it is not denied that "Missae" was used plural for singular long after the eighth century. It seems clear, however, that this was not the common mode of speech in the sixteenth century. Nor would the survival of an early terminology have been natural in theological writings then. The history and meaning of the term "Missa" had been obscured. St Thomas takes it as equivalent to "transmissa", "scilicet hostia ad Deum".²⁰ Whatever be the case with "Missae", the English "Masses" was never used of a single Mass: while as for "sacrificia" in such a connection, the endlessly multiplied acts of offering, common at the time when the Article was drawn up, afford the most natural explanation of the term. We conclude, then, that the distinction between "sacrificia missarum" and "sacrificium missae" is a real one: and thus Article XXXI denies, not the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but certain errors and erroneous practices developed out of it.

Proposition 2. Article XXXI does not condemn any authoritative doctrine of the medieval Church, but only certain widespread misconceptions about the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, whether embodied in popular belief and practice or in the current theology. It is admitted that so much may "be fairly argued" from the phrase "vulgo dicebatur". "There was", as is truly observed, "absolutely no authoritative statement of the doctrine of the Mass"²¹ before the publication of that doctrine in Session XXII of the Council of Trent, 17 September 1562. The question whether the Council "has or has not set its seal to that doctrine which the Article has marked as a popular error"²² is indeed an

²⁰ Cf. *Summa* III, lxxxiii, 4 ad 9.

²¹ Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 7.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

important one for estimating the degree of sympathy or alienation between the Roman and English Churches at the present time. But that is not in question here: and our Article professes to condemn only what was "commonly said". The Council of Trent may have definitely adopted the current beliefs, or deliberately rejected them, or covertly shielded them as with the fringe of its mantle. Evidence will be given later on to show that it followed the last course, thus taking the safe line of a *via media*. Meanwhile, it must not be forgotten that defenders of the medieval system have sometimes written as if it went no further than what is embodied in the decisions of Trent; and as if the Council of Trent had not been a reforming council. "We must not", says Ranke, writing of the later Middle Ages, "confound the tendencies of the period now before us with those evinced in the doctrines and practices established at the Council of Trent: at that time even the party which adhered to Catholicism had felt the influences of the epoch of the Reformation, and had begun to reform itself: the current was already arrested." And he adds in a note, "I hold it to be the fundamental error of Möhler's *Symbolik*, that he considers the dogma of the Council of Trent as the doctrine from which the Protestants seceded."²³ There were then elements in medieval theology which the Council declined to perpetuate, at least explicitly; and so we must look to the records of that age, and not to the decisions of the Council, to discover what the Article had in view.

Proposition 3. Article XXXI does not condemn simply "the offering of Christ for quick and dead", but

²³ Ranke, *History of the Reformation*, i, pp. 267, 268 n.

“the offering of Christ for quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt”. Cranmer, who had the chief hand in drawing up the second Prayer Book of 1552, and the Forty-two Articles of 1553, unquestionably intended to follow the guidance of primitive models. How far he succeeded, how far the careful student of antiquity was merged in the pusillanimous tool of innovators and plunderers is another matter. In the omission, for instance, of all explicit use of prayer for the dead in our public services, Cranmer may have thought he was cutting off occasion where so many would have made a corrupt use of such petitions. He deserted his model; but his model was still the primitive Church. Again, in his “Defence of the true and Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament”, he not infrequently “departed from the language of the ancient standards”²⁴; but he professed throughout that all he said “was grounded and established upon God’s most holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church”,²⁵ while more than once he distinguished between the “new devices”²⁶ which the writers of the Middle Age introduced, and the doctrine of the Scriptures and Primitive Fathers, notably in his appeal at his degradation. He cannot have been ignorant, therefore, of the distinction between “offering for quick and dead” and “offering for quick and dead to have remission of pain or guilt”: nor that the one was a primitive practice recognized by the Fathers and common to all the ancient liturgies, while the other belonged to “the doctrine lately

²⁴ Hardwick, *Reformation*, p. 209.

²⁵ Jenkyns, *Cranmer’s Remains*, ii, p. 275.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, p. 462.

brought in of the Sacrament".²⁷ In the then existing state of opinion, which could not conceive of prayer for the dead, much less of offering the Eucharist for the dead, except with a view to deliverance from the pains of purgatory, Cranmer may have been well-advised, *ex abundantia cautela*, to cast out all such petitions from a service book intended for the use of the common people. But in Articles of Religion intended to serve as a guide to the clergy, it is only to be expected of such reverence as his for Christian antiquity that he should employ language which, while excluding the erroneous developments of later times, should leave room for a basis of older and sounder doctrine. Afterwards, as by the authorization for academic use of a Latin form for the celebration of Holy Communion at funerals, and by the restoration of the commemoration of the departed in the Prayer for the Church Militant, the older beliefs and practices were in some measure recovered when the danger of misconstruction was past.

Proposition 4. Article XXXI does not condemn any doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, except in so far as such doctrine may derogate from the all-sufficiency of the one oblation once made upon the Cross. So much is obvious from the connecting particle "unde". In § 2, that only is excluded which is at variance with § 1, *viz.*, the notion that the sacrifice of the Cross was "not unique or perfect, but could be reiterated or supplemented in heaven or earth."²⁸ Such a notion is, of course, utterly out of harmony with the Epistle to the

²⁷ Jenkyns, *op. cit.* iv, p. 127. "But in this thing I only am accused for a heretic, because I allow not the doctrine *lately brought in* of the Sacrament."

²⁸ Bright, *Ancient Collects*, p. 145 n.

Hebrews²⁹; and is undoubtedly aimed at by the Prayer of Consecration³⁰ in terms very like those of § 1 of this Article. Whether the Tridentine definition of the Mass as a "verum proprium et propitiatorium sacrificium" can be satisfactorily brought into agreement with the unique claims of the sacrifice on Calvary, is a question to be dealt with later. The Article, while certainly intended to condemn something in particular, is so drawn as to condemn anything that involves a repetition of or an addition to that sacrifice—but nothing else.

IV. *Evidence for the existence of a practical religious system, which presented errors of the kind condemned in Article XXXI, in two directions*

Assuming, then, that these four propositions rightly represent the drift of Article XXXI, does the history of opinion or practice, so far as we know it, present any phenomena which would satisfy the terms of so very balanced an utterance? Was there to be found a multiplication of "priests", "sacrifices", and "Masses"? Was there a common but unauthorized belief among theologians or people that the system existed to "offer Christ for quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt"? And why should the reformers have denounced it as an institution of "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits"?

(1) *In documents preliminary to Article XXXI*

We are carried a step further in our backward search by certain documents which, though they are not

²⁹ Cf. Heb. 7. 26, 27; 9. 11-14, 24-28; 10. 10-14.

³⁰ "Almighty God . . . whole world."

earlier drafts of Article XXXI, foreshadow its terminology, and are by the same hand. Cranmer, in his "Answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner" (1550), devoted Book V to a consideration "of the oblation and sacrifice of Christ".³¹ He accepts without hesitation Peter Lombard's definition of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist: "Illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem, quia memoria est et repraesentatio veri sacrificii et sanctae immolationis factae in ara crucis"³²: though he takes this language to mean a commemoration before men, and not before God.³³ Probably he was unaware of the earlier associations of *ἀνὰ μνησιν* with memorials before God in the Septuagint.³⁴ Nevertheless, he thought himself true to the doctrine of sacrifice as taught by "the Master of the sentence, of whom all the school-authors take their occasion to write"³⁵; and to the last, avowed that he ever believed that the Eucharist was in this sense a sacrifice:

The controversy is not whether in the Holy Communion be made a sacrifice or not (for herein both Doctor Smith and I agree with the foresaid Council at Ephesus), but whether it be a propitiatory sacrifice or not, and whether only the priest make the said sacrifice—these be the points wherein we vary. And I say so far as the

³¹ Cranmer, *Works*, On the Lord's Supper, pp. 344 seqq., ed. Parker Society.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 351, and *Petrus Lombardus*, Lib. IV, Dist. xii, p. 745. Coloniae, 1609.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 351, "the Holy Communion was ordained of Christ to put us in remembrance", etc.; cf. p. 352.

³⁴ Cf. Bickersteth, *Our heritage in the Church*, p. 90, for a discussion of the LXX use.

³⁵ *Works*, Parker Society, p. 351.

Council saith, that there is a sacrifice; but that the same is propitiatory for remission of sin, or that the priest alone doth offer it, neither I nor the Council do so say, but Doctor Smith hath added that of his own vain head.³⁶

He tells us, moreover, in what sense he denies a propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist; pointing out in effect that while his adversary Gardiner was arguing for a "borrowed propitiation", to use Dr Mozley's phrase,³⁷ he himself was contending simply against an original propitiation claimed for the Mass:

To defend [says Cranmer] the papistical error, that the daily offering of the priest in the Mass is propitiatory, you extend the word "propitiation" otherwise than the apostles do, speaking of that matter. I speak plainly, according to St Paul and St John, that only Christ is the propitiation for our sins by His death. You speak according to the papists, that the priests in their masses make a sacrifice propitiatory. I call a sacrifice propitiatory, according to the scripture, such a sacrifice as pacifieth God's indignation against us, obtaineth mercy and forgiveness of all our sins, and is our ransom and redemption from everlasting damnation. And, on the other side, I call a sacrifice gratificatory, or the sacrifice of the Church, such a sacrifice as doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled to testify their duties and to show themselves thankful unto him. And these sacrifices in scripture be not called propitiatory, but sacrifices of justice, of laud, praise and thanksgiving. But you confound the words, and call one by another's name, calling that propitiatory which the Scripture calleth but of justice, laud, and thanking. And all is nothing else but to defend your propitiatory sacrifice of the priests in their masses, whereby they may remit sin, and redeem souls out of purgatory.³⁸

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

³⁷ Mozley, *Letters and Papers*, p. 217.

³⁸ Cranmer, *Works*, Parker Society, p. 361.

Cranmer and Gardiner were really arguing at cross purposes. But, at any rate, here we get an exact appreciation of that against which the Archbishop was battling—a practical system with a doctrine behind it. He repeats his thesis again and again in the course of his argument. "If we put the oblation of the priest in the stead of the oblation of Christ, refusing to receive the sacrament of His body and blood ourselves as he ordained, and trusting to have *remission of our sins* by the *sacrifice of the priest* in the mass, and thereby also to obtain release of the *pains* in purgatory, we do not only injury to Christ, but also commit most detestable idolatry. For these be but false doctrines, without shame devised, and *feigned* by wicked popish priests . . . for *lucre*. . . . Wherefore all godly men ought . . . to refuse and abhor all such *blasphemy*."³⁹ Or again, "We make not of Christ a new sacrifice propitiatory for remission of sin. . . . They therefore which gather of the doctors, that the mass is a sacrifice for remission of sin, and that it is applied by the priest to them for whom he saith or singeth, they which so gather of the doctors do to them most grievous injury and wrong, most falsely belying them."⁴⁰ It is abundantly evident, then, that the doctrine which Cranmer combated was one of repeated sacrifices in constant Masses, offered by the priest, not the people; applicable at his pleasure to this or that person, and effective *ex opere operato*, as the phrase was, for remission of pain in purgatory or guilt. This was the common doctrine of the "Papists". It was objectionable on the ground that the Mass in

³⁹ Ibid., p. 349; note the close resemblance in language, as well as in substance, between this passage and § 2 of Article XXXI, in the words in italics.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 352.

itself thus became a distinct sacrifice from the Cross; and it was rejected by the reformers, because they thought that (a) it was contrary to the express statements of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that (b) it involved the assertion of a new source of merit and satisfaction other than the Cross. But it was also attacked in unsparing terms because, as Cranmer further points out, by the development of private Masses this doctrine dominated the religious conceptions and worship of the day. After his allusion to the "false doctrines", "feigned", "for lucre" and ending in "blasphemy",⁴¹ in language directly foreshadowing that of Article XXXI, the Archbishop goes on: "And forasmuch as in such Masses is manifest wickedness and idolatry, wherein the priest alone maketh oblation satisfactory, and applieth the same for the quick and dead at his will and pleasure, all such popish Masses are to be clearly taken away out of Christian churches, and the true use of the Lord's Supper is to be restored again"; and presently concludes:

There was no papistical Masses in the Primitive Church. For these monstrous things were never seen nor known of the old and Primitive Church, nor there was not then in one church many Masses every day, but upon certain days there was a common table of the Lord's Supper, where a number of people did together receive the Body and Blood of the Lord; but there was then no daily private Masses. . . . But these private Masses sprang up of late years, partly through the ignorance and superstition of unlearned monks and friars which knew not what a sacrifice was, but made of the Mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit both sin and the pain due for the same; but chiefly they sprang of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell Masses to the people, which caused Masses so much to increase that every day

⁴¹ *Works*, Parker Society, p. 349.

was said an infinite number, and that no priest would receive the Communion at another priest's hand, but every one would receive it alone.⁴²

We must therefore look to the system of private Masses, chantries, and obits as affording the best clue to the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharist.

But before we follow it up, another important document should be noticed. It proceeded from Cranmer's hand some fifteen years before the publication of the Forty-two Articles; and it carries back the illustration of medieval doctrine and practice as to the Eucharist behind the date (1550) of Cranmer's "Defence" and Gardiner's "Answer". It is a draft article for the series of 1538, and entitled *De Missa Privata*.⁴³ "Damnanda est igitur", says the author, "impia illa opinio sententium usum sacramenti cultum esse a sacerdotibus applicandum *pro aliis, vivis et defunctis*, et mereri illis vitam aeternam et remissionem culpae et poenae, idque ex opere operato." This describes the current doctrine as to the Mass; and it is again remarkable how closely its language resembles that of Article XXXI, especially in the phrases italicized. Then the Archbishop proceeds to develop what he considers a more primitive⁴⁴ doctrine of the sacrifice, and to contrast it with this new theory. Denouncing the traffic in Masses as a thing intolerable ("privatarum Missarum applicationes et nundinationes non amplius esse ferendas"), he continues,

Porro, quia sine gratiarum actione recordatio mortis Christi rite non peragitur, ideo veteres hanc sacramenti

⁴² Ibid., pp. 352, 353.

⁴³ Jenkyns, *Cranmer's Remains*, iv, pp. 292 seqq. or *Works*, Parker Society, pp. 480 seqq.

⁴⁴ But he omits to recognize the impetratory character of the Eucharistic offering. Cf. Bramhall, *Works*, ii, p. 276, ed. Oxford, 1842, and *Tracts for the Times*, no. lxxxi, p. 131, vol. iv, ed. 1840.

perceptionem Eucharistiam appellarunt, quam et sacrificium non-nulli othodoxi patres nominaverunt, quod videlicet in memoriam illius unci et semel peracti sacrificii fiat, non quod ipsum opus sit sacrificium applicabile vivis et mortuis in remissionem peccatorum. Id quod papisticum duntaxat est figmentum; et quoniam ab hac tam impia opinione et quaestu inde proveniente, Missae privatae, illaeque pro magna parte satisfactoriae, in tantum multitudinem excreverunt quarum nec mentionem nec exemplum ullum apud antiquiores invenimus, satisfactorias quidem prorsus abolendas, caeteras vero privatas vel in totum abrogandas vel certe minuendas et reprimendas judicamus: summam denique curam adhibendam, ut hujus sacramenti verus ac genuinus usus ad gloriam Christi et Ecclesiae salutem restituatur.

The draft article was not accepted; but by the Act for Communion in both kinds,⁴⁵ the Chantries Act, the Acts of Uniformity, and the Forty-two Articles, Cranmer lived to see the system of worship and doctrine here attacked eventually put down. So the inquiry brings us into direct contact with the practical system and the doctrine it embodied. What was the doctrine as to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, once so prevalent, but then destroyed?

(2) *In the Chantry System*

The Chantry System is the best illustration of the universal prevalence of the private Masses and of their

⁴⁵ Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*.

Dec. 1547, 1 Ed. vi., c. 1, An Act for receiving in both kinds, p. 322.

1547, 1 Ed. vi., c. 14, An Act dissolving the Chantries, p. 328.

²¹ Jan. 1549, 2 & 3 Ed. vi, c. 1, First Act of Uniformity, p. 358.

1552, 5 & 6 Ed. vi, c. 1, Second Act of Uniformity, p. 369.

objects. It was not only of long standing in the sixteenth century, but had been intimately interwoven with the social life of all classes since its foundation. To take one instance. St Paul's Cathedral was "unusually rich in obits and in chantries. From the foundation of the Chantry of Master John de London, early in the reign of Henry II, to that of Robert Broket, citizen and baker, in the twenty-fourth year of Henry VIII, a continuous stream of benefactors appears amongst the records of the Cathedral."⁴⁶ Besides the chantries, there were, early in the fourteenth century, as many as 111 minor endowments for obits or funeral Masses, with a revenue, in present value, of about £2758 16s. 10½d.; and the return of chantries, dated 1 January 1548, gives fifty-three chantries served by fifty-two priests, with a gross annual value, at the time, of £646 6s.⁴⁷ The Act which dissolved the chantries destroyed 2374 chapels and chantries throughout the country, and yielded spoil to the value of £180,000.⁴⁸ But while the rich maintained their own foundations, the guilds were formed, in the later Middle Ages, sometimes in connection with the craft-guilds, sometimes as purely religious fraternities, to provide, as it were, co-operative chantries for the middle classes. Such chantries came to be an important element in social life, and obtained public recognition. At Bristol the appointment of the chaplains and the administration of the funds was in the hands of the Mayor.⁴⁹ Sometimes even private founders set up colleges of priests; while the guild rules often provided for twelve, twenty, thirty,

⁴⁶ Dr Sparrow Simpson, *St Paul's and Old City Life*, p. 97.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 98, 99.

⁴⁸ *Social England*, iii, pp. 128, 176.

⁴⁹ Ashley, *Economic History*, ii, p. 112.

or even sixty Masses for the soul of a departed member.⁵⁰ But in all cases the object was the same, Masses and alms, priests and bedesmen, as we find in Sir John Fastolf's will, 1459, "to pray for his soul and the soul of his wife, his father and mother, and other that he was beholden to, in perpetuity"; "almsful deeds and charitable works", that he might obtain "the more hasty deliverance of his soul from the painful flames of the fire of purgatory".⁵¹ It was, then, on this widespread belief in the quantitative, assignable, and so marketable value of each Mass, coupled with a belief in a penal purgatory, that the popular religion of calculation and fear was based which characterized the later Middle Ages, and produced the endless multiplication of Masses. And this is the testimony of the Chantry System to the real meaning of the later medieval teaching about the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It was assumed that each Mass was in itself a distinct act of sacrifice; and that the more Masses the faithful got applied for them, the more fruit they obtained. This is the meaning of several leading questions put by Cranmer to the bishops in his *Queries put concerning some abuses of the Mass*⁵² (January 1548). In No. 5 he asks, "What time the accustomed order began first in the Church, that the priest alone should receive the Sacrament?" and then, in No. 6, "Whether it be convenient that the same custom continue still within this realm?" Here the private Masses are attacked as modern inventions. Then doubt is thrown upon the special object of the greater number of them in No. 7, "Whether it be

⁵⁰ Ibid., ii, p. 138.

⁵¹ Quoted in Ashley, ii, p. 136.

⁵² Jenkyns, *Cranmer's Remains*, ii, p. 178; and Pocock's *Burnet*, v. p. 197.

convenient that Masses satisfactory should continue, i.e., priests hired to sing for souls departed?" And finally a question is aimed at the whole idea of the Mass as so much new satisfaction or propitiation assignable at the will of the priest or purchaser, without reference to the spiritual condition or even to the privity of the person in whose favour the work was to be done: 'What or wherein John's fasting, giving alms, being baptized, or receiving the sacrament of thanks in England, doth profit and avail Thomas, dwelling in Italy, and not knowing what John in England doth? and whether the said acts in John do profit them that be in heaven and wherein?' We have here an anticipation of Jewel's reply to Harding, and a repetition of objections to the whole system of private Masses raised on these very doctrinal grounds by the Lutheran Ambassadors to Henry VIII in 1538, and in the Confession of Augsburg, 1530. Jewel denounced the doctrine of application, and all that it involves, as "of late the Catholic and general doctrine of his [Harding's] church, universally taught by Holcot⁵³ in England, by Vincentius in Spain, by Biel in France, by Angelus in Italy, or rather by all these and others throughout the whole Church of Rome. Hereof grew such merchandise and sale of Masses, that the house of God was become a den of thieves."⁵⁴ The Englishman perhaps puts the popular doctrine in its bluntest fashion. "Dr Holcot saith: 'Quid est celebrare missam principaliter pro aliquo? R. Est applicare missam Johanni quod sit quaedam satisfactio apud Deum pro anima Johannis, si indigeat. . . .' And withal he moveth a great doubt

⁵³ Died 1349.

⁵⁴ Reply to Harding's answer, Art. XIX, Jewel, *Works*, Parker Society, p. 748.

whether the priest may apply one Mass to two several men, and nevertheless satisfy for them both."⁵⁵ The doubt was not set at rest till the seventeenth century, when Alexander VII (1655-67) condemned the following proposition: "Non est contra justitiam pro pluribus sacrificiis stipendium accipere et sacrificium unicum offerre."⁵⁶ The inference from this condemnation is that one Mass would not be so beneficial as many; otherwise where would the injustice come in? In other words, each Mass has a quantitative, and so assignable value of its own: and it is upon this doctrine that the practice of so many "sacrifices of Masses" obviously and directly rests. Not that repeated Masses, like reiterated prayers, are not of more value than one Mass. But the tendency of the time was to reckon them up numerically for the purposes of application. So it was upon this doctrine that the Lutheran orators fastened in 1538: "Porro, quod missae collocatae ad quaestum, ut sub papatu accidit, turpiter prophanentur, quodque hic abusus in omnibus pene

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 747.

⁵⁶ Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, p. 254. This decision gave the *coupe de grâce* on this point to Caietan, *Opuscula Omnia Thomae de Vio Cardinalis*, Tract. iij, qu. 2, tom. ij, p. 147, Lugduni, 1562; and Vasquez, *Disp. ccxxxi, c. 3, Opera*, tom. vii, pp. 737 seqq., Compluti, 1613; who held the contrary opinion that one Mass would be as productive for many as for one person.

The practice of saying private Masses for stipendia is now defended with more subtlety. It is held that though the worth of the sacrifice of the Mass considered in itself is infinite, its fruit or effect is finite, in such sense that many Masses offered for a particular object or person produce more fruit for that object or person than one Mass; that the more Masses the faithful get applied for them, the more fruit they obtain; and that the application of the fruit of a Mass is to a certain extent under the control of the human priest. See it laid down in De Lugo, *de Sacr. Euch.*, Disp. XIX, sect. ix, § 145, *Opera*, tom. v, p. 334; Venet. 1751. Perrone, *Praelect. Theol.*, ii, col. 296, Parisiis, 1842, ed. Migne.

templis latissime pateat, non est obscurum; nam Christi beneficium . . . pro vili stipe et mercede vendere, et tale etiam opus inde constituere velle, quod ex sui natura, hoc est ex opere operato, mereatur gratiam, et possit applicari pro peccatis aliorum mortuorum et vivorum, quis non videt summam esse impietatem?"⁵⁷ So too their predecessors, in presenting their apology to Charles V at Augsburg, 1530, asserted that the "endless multitude of Masses" depended for its justification on the substantive and quantitative value which was ascribed to each Mass. It was, they said, the "publica opinio quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato. Hic coeptum est disputari utrum una missa dicta pro pluribus tantundem valeat quantum singulæ pro singulis. Haec disputatio peperit istam infinitam multitudinem missarum."⁵⁸

V. Conclusion as to Article XXXI. It points to a previous practical system with doctrinal presuppositions. Where did these come from?

Thus the study of Article XXXI brings us face to face with a practical system of religious observance, resting for support on doctrinal prepossessions. Can we trace them to their source? Was there a later medieval as well as an earlier doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist? Or, in one word, was the doctrine of the Mass, current in the sixteenth century, primitive and Catholic? or was it of later scholastic growth? Upon the answer to that question depends in some measure

⁵⁷ Pocock's *Burnet*, iv, p. 360.

⁵⁸ Pars II, Art. III, *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 139, or Francke, *Libri Symbolici*, p. 30.

the truth or falsity of the charge so often made against the Church of England—that in her teaching on the Sacrifice of the Eucharist she has rejected part of the Catholic Faith.

B

THE MEDIEVAL DOCTRINE OF THE
EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

THE theology of the Eucharistic Sacrifice really begins in the Middle Ages, with the Schoolmen, and dates from the twelfth century.

I. *The Sacrifice not discussed in the earlier
Middle Ages*

The reason of this rather surprising lack of interest in the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is to be found in the fact that since the Renaissance of the ninth century, the attention of the learned was absorbed in the controversies relating to the Eucharistic Presence. Two monks of Corbey—one of the scholastic institutions which owed their impetus directly to our own Alcuin—originated the dispute; one of them, Paschasius Radbertus (Abbot 844–51), maintaining a theory of the Presence anticipatory of the later transubstantiation, while the other, Ratramnus (c. 840), argued in favour of a real, as against a corporal or material Presence. Hence the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist was not much discussed. The Mass, of course, was regarded as a sacrifice in some sense one with the sacrifice on the Cross. But neither was the relation of the sacrifice of the Cross to that of the Altar considered, nor even the discussion of the term “sacrifice” carried very deep. It was assumed that the Crucifixion and the

Consecration produce the same effects, and are therefore the same sacrifice; and Isidore of Seville's (595–636) definition of sacrifice remained the classical definition of it from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries. It was simply this: "Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mysticâ consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicae passionis."¹ Such a view can scarcely be called "sacerdotal". When Berengarius (c. 1040–88) in the eleventh century reopened the controversy as to the Eucharistic presence with Lanfranc (Abp 1070–89), attention was again diverted from theories about the sacrifice.

II. *The earlier Schoolmen upon the Eucharistic Sacrifice*

Before the tenet of transubstantiation was finally adopted at the Lateran Council of 1215, and the theory of the Presence settled, the period of the Schoolmen and of the *Summae Theologiae* had set in. Scholasticism proper starts with John of Damascus,² whose treatise *De Fide Orthodoxa* was translated into Latin about 1150, and Peter Lombard (died 1164) is said to have had it before him when compiling his *Book of the Sentences*. With Lombard's conception of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, Cranmer, as we have seen,³ professes himself ready to agree. The doctrine, then, that the Reformers repudiated was not that put forward by the earlier Scholastics. It is remarkable, indeed, how very

¹ *Histoire de la conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Eglise Latine*, par Dr Vacant, Paris, 1894, p. 26, n. 2. Cf. St Isidore, *Etymologiarium*, lib. v, c. 19, n. 38, ap. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, lxxxii, col. 255.

² About 740, see *Dict. Chr. Biogr.*, iii, Chr. p. 412.

³ P. 21 *supra*.

little effort was made by the Master of the Sentences and his commentators to elaborate any exposition of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.⁴ One after another, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, they are content to describe it in language that implies not a new or distinct, but a commemorative and representative sacrifice. Thus Peter Lombard starts with the simple definition quoted above: "Illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem, quia memoria est et repraesentatio veri sacrificii et sanctae immolationis factae in ara crucis. Et semel Christus mortuus in cruce est ibique immolatus est in semet ipso quotidie autem immolatur in sacramento, quia in sacramento recordatio fit illius quod factum est semel."⁵ This theory descended without modification to St Thomas (1224-74) himself. "D'après la Somme", says Dr Vacant, "la célébration de l'eucharistie, où l'on offre la même hostie et par conséquent le même sacrifice que sur la croix, est une immolation de Jésus Christ pour deux raisons; parce qu'elle est une image de la passion où le Sauveur s'est immolé, et parce qu'elle nous en applique les fruits"⁶; or, to quote St Thomas, "Tum quia hujus sacramenti celebratio imago quaedam est passionis Christi, tum etiam quia per hoc sacramentum participes efficiamur fructus dominicae passionis, convenienter dicitur Christi immolatio."⁷ And, in like manner, as the "celebratio" is an "imago repraesentativa passionis Christi", so too priest and altar bear their names as representing respectively Christ and his Cross.⁸ In fact, all the great

⁴ Brightman, in *Church Historical Society's Lectures*, vol. i, p. 193.

⁵ *Lib Sent.*, iv, dist. xii, § 7; Migne, *P. L.*, tom. cxcii, col. 866.

⁶ *Histoire*, etc., p. 45.

⁷ *Summa*, III, lxxxiii, 1.

⁸ *Summa*, III, lxxxiii, 1 ad 2.

theologians of the thirteenth century, beginning with Innocent III⁹ (Pope 1198–1216), on through the Dominicans, Albertus Magnus¹⁰ (1193–1280) with his pupil St Thomas¹¹ (1224–74), and the Franciscans, Alexander of Hales¹² (died 1245) with his pupil St Bonaventura¹³ (died 1274), and even down to Dionysius Carthusianus¹⁴ in the fifteenth century (1403–71), continue the conception of a commemorative and representative sacrifice. “Tous ces théologiens” (sc. of the thirteenth century), says Dr Vacant, “continuaient . . . à voir une image physique de la Passion, dans les cérémonies liturgiques instituées par l’Eglise; tous aussi faisaient principalement consister le sacrifice de la messe dans l’application des effets du sacrifice de la croix.”¹⁵ Dionysius merely writes as follows: “Effusio sanguinis et aquae de latere Christi, figura fuit sacramenti istius”: and then proceeds to show how the Sacrament recalls other sacrificial rites, such as those of the Old Testament; but in particular, “agnum paschalem sc.

⁹ *De sacro altaris mysterio*, lib. iv, c. 43; Migne, *P. L.*, ccxvii, coll. 883, 884.

¹⁰ *De Sacr. Euch.*, dist., vi, Tract. i, c. 1, *Opera*, tom. xxi, p. 94. Lugduni, 1651: but elsewhere he says “immolatio nostra non tantum est repraesentatio, sed immolatio vera, id est rei immolatae oblatio per manus sacerdotum quia immolatio proprie est oblatio occisi ad cultum Dei; et quoad oblationem non est repraesentatio tantum, sed verus actus offerendi”. In *Lib. Sent.*, iv, dist. xiii, art. xxiii, *Opera*, tom. xvi, p. 209. Lugd. 1651.

¹¹ *Summa*, III, lxxxiii, art. 5 ad 3, 4, 5.

¹² *Universae Theologiae Summa*, lib. iv, q. 10, m. 2, art. 2, *Opera*, tom. iv, col. 229. Coloniae, 1622.

¹³ *Sentent.*, lib. iv, dist. viii–xiii, *Opera*, tom. iv, pp. 178 seqq., Venetiis, 1754, hardly seems to deal with sacrifice at all.

¹⁴ In *Lib. Sentent.*, iv, dist. viii, q. 2, *Opera*, tom. ii, p. 97. Venetiis, 1584.

¹⁵ *Histoire*, etc., p. 37.

Christum, qui se obtulit Deo Patri pro nobis".¹⁶ So too Gabriel Biel (died 1495): e.g., "Dicitur et sacrificium vel hostia quia est . . . institutum in memoriam summi sacrificii in cruce oblatis", etc.¹⁷ Possibly this may be but the language of survivals natural to compilers.¹⁸ But even so it shows how little expansion or definition the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice actually received during the Middle Ages. Duns Scotus¹⁹ (1228–1308) went very near to denying a sacrifice in the Eucharist at all; and, says Dr Vacant²⁰ "c'était préparer les esprits aux doctrines du protestantisme". But there are other indications of the same want of interest in the doctrine of the sacrifice during the period when Scholasticism was in its prime. They are merely incidental, but therefore the more valuable. Thus the prayers for each day of the week prefixed to the ordinary of the Mass, and probably due to St Anselm (Abp 1093–1109); the office for Corpus Christi drawn up by St Thomas Aquinas in 1264; the medieval hymns on the Eucharist, some of which express for us the highest inspirations of Eucharistic worship²¹; and, finally, the meditations of the *De Imitatione Christi*²² on the Blessed Sacrament, all indicate that there was as yet no definite, still less any authoritative, theory as to the nature of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist developed in the quarters where one would have most naturally

¹⁶ Loc. cit.

¹⁷ Gabriel Biel in *Lib. Sent.*, iv, dist. viii, q. 1 (in the Bodleian Library—no date or paging).

¹⁸ Vacant, *Histoire*, etc., p. 44 n.

¹⁹ See below, pp. 75, 77.

²⁰ *Histoire*, etc., p. 49.

²¹ Mone, *Hymni Latini Medii Aevi*, Nos. 199–245, vol. i, pp. 257 seqq.

²² *De Imitatione Christi*, IV, v, § 3; ix §§ 1, 5.

looked for it, either among the Schoolmen or in the devotional literature of the time.²³

III. *St Thomas Aquinas upon the same*

How far, then, we may naturally ask, does the light thrown back by sixteenth-century controversies reveal a popular view which was in the main pernicious and superstitious? And where are we to look for its beginnings? Certainly such a view existed, as is shown by the evidence of Article XXXI and kindred statements. Certainly, too, it was an exaggeration: for the Schoolmen as a body are not guilty of even approximation to it. How, then, did it grow up? Evidence bids us to look for its origin in certain statements, scarcely more than "obiter dicta", of St Thomas: first, to the new definition of sacrifice, which, on its adoption by him, soon ousted that of St Isidore of Seville; next, to the new prominence which he assigned to the priest, and to the Consecration by contrast with the Communion of the people; and, in the third place, to certain phraseology of his as to the mode of operation belonging to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, which led to notions of its merely mechanical efficacy.

(1) *St Thomas' new definition of Sacrifice*

St Thomas is only occupied with the sacrifice of the Mass incidentally. He repeats, as we have seen, the traditional description of it as a representative sacrifice. But Dr Vacant is perfectly justified in dating the

²³ It is also remarkable that only one of the eight *Orationes post missam* taken from the Missals of 1520, 1526, and 1533 contains any reference to the sacrifice. Cf. *Missale ad usum Sarum*, ed. F. H. Dickinson, coll. 639 seqq., Parker et Soc. 1883.

“phase moderne” of the conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice from St Thomas, because he imported two new elements into the idea of sacrifice—both of them unfortunately to be classed with those purely *a priori* notions of sacrifice²⁴ out of which most of later controversy has grown. First, he emphasizes the idea of propitiation as essential to it: “Sacrificium proprie dicitur aliquid factum in honorem proprie Deo debitum ad eum placandum.”²⁵ Secondly, he makes sacrifice to consist in more than mere oblation. It involves a change of some sort produced in the condition of the victim: “Sacrificia proprie dicuntur quando circa res Deo oblatas aliquid fit; sicut quod animalia occidebantur, quod panis frangitur et comeditur et benedicitur. Et hoc ipsum nomen sonat, nam sacrificium dicitur, ex hoc quod homo facit aliquid sacrum”²⁶; where though Aquinas repeats the etymology of “sacrificium” given by Isidore, he looks for the propitiatory effect in the destruction or physical modification of the victim. In so doing he opened up a long discussion, still proceeding among his successors, how to secure this induced victim-state so essential to a real offering of that which is offered in the Eucharist, and yet avoid the necessary consequence of successively reiterated immolations of the Divine victim in each Mass. Clearly it was a definition directly calculated to produce results such as those of the practical system we have reviewed—a popular belief in repeated sacrifices.

²⁴ Sadler's *One Offering*, c. xv, p. 118 note, where he quotes from Waterland words as to “the difficulty of determining what a sacrifice properly means, and the almost insuperable perplexities among learned men about the ascertaining any precise definition of it”; cf. too Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, lect. iv, pp. 20 seqq. ed. 1884 and note 56.

²⁵ *Summa*, III, xlviij, art. 3. ²⁶ *Summa*, II^a II^{ae}, lxxxv, 3 ad 3.

(2) *St Thomas gives new prominence to the Priest and the Consecration*

Again, the same tendency was furthered by the new prominence assigned to the priest and the sacrifice in place of the Communion. The withdrawal of the Chalice from the laity, though not formally sanctioned till 15 June 1415,²⁷ had begun as early as the twelfth century²⁸: and St Thomas defends it partly on grounds of convenience, but also by the tenet that the priest communicates in the person of all. "Potest autem a populo corpus sine sanguine sumi, nec exinde sequitur aliquod detrimentum, quia sacerdos in persona omnium offert et sumit."²⁹ Thus the withdrawal of the Chalice tended to exalt the dignity of the priest's part in the offering. Unquestionably it is an offering: for our Lord in first saying, "Take, eat; this is my body",³⁰ and then, "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins",³¹ meant to suggest the sacrificial outpouring of the Blood³²; so much so that, even without an express form of oblation, the Eucharist merely as consecrated by the words of institution is a sacrifice, or representation of blood outpoured. But on the other hand the two acts of eating and drinking were to be distinct but not separate acts, still less to be done by different agents, priest and assistance. They are combined in passages

²⁷ Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.*, v, p. 61.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, iii, p. 320, n. 11.

²⁹ *Summa*, III, lxxx, 12 ad 3.

³⁰ Matt. 26. 26.

³¹ Matt 26. 27.

³² Note the scriptural habit of attributing our salvation not to the "death", but to the "Blood" of Christ—"the Blood which is the life". And see Milligan, *op. cit.*, n. 56.

such as, "Except yet eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood", etc.³³ Obviously, then, their dissociation in practice tended to give an undue importance to the work of the priest in the Mass. When it was added that "perfectio hujus sacramenti non est in usu fidelium sed in consecratione materiae",³⁴ the emphasis is further thrown off the use made of the Eucharist by the faithful on to that which was done by the priest. When, again, the Council of the Lateran in 1215 fixed once a year as the minimum of Communion,³⁵ no result can have been more natural than that successive acts of sacrifice done by the priest, i.e., "sacrifices of Masses", should in time have come to occupy the whole field of popular religion. "Worthless priests now began to enter into pecuniary contracts, binding themselves to offer Masses (say for twenty or thirty years) in behalf of the dying and the dead. The better class of prelates did not fail, however, to denounce the practice"³⁶; but without effect. The disproportionate stress thus laid on the sacrificial work of the priest in the Mass produced that multiplication of Masses against which, and the doctrines underlying it, the Reformers raised their outcry; a system of which private Masses and Masses satisfactory were, as we have seen, the typical exemplification. The laity were, in some places, even forbidden to communicate more than once a month or fifteen times a year.³⁷

³³ John 6. 53.

³⁴ *Summa*, III, lxxx, 12 ad 2.

³⁵ Hardwick, *Middle Ages*, p. 305, n. 1. Ed. 1883.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 305, n. 1.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 400.

(3) *St Thomas' language as to the mode in which the Sacrifice operates*

But there yet remains a third dictum of St Thomas, which perhaps contributed more than anything else to the new ideas about the Mass; though St Thomas himself, as the passage shows, cannot be held responsible for the edifice erected on his foundation by later hands. The passage in question runs thus:

Eucharistia non solum est sacramentum sed etiam est sacrificium. In quantum autem est sacramentum, habet effectum in omni vivente, in quo requirit vitam praeexistere. Sed in quantum est sacrificium, habet effectum etiam in aliis, pro quibus offertur, in quibus non praeexigit vitam spiritualem in actu sed in potentia tantum. Et ideo si dispositos eos inveniat, eis gratiam obtinet virtute illius sacrificii a quo omnis gratia in nos influxit, et per consequens peccata mortalia in eis delet, non sicut causa proxima sed in quantum gratiam contritionis eis impetrat. Et quod in contrarium dicitur quod non offertur nisi pro membris Christi, intelligendum est pro membris Christi offerri quando offertur pro aliquibus ut sint membra.²⁸

Here indeed there is nothing that any Christian need refuse who believes in the Eucharist as a sacrifice

²⁸ *B. Thos IV. Script.*, dist. xii, quaest. 2, art. 2 ad quartum. *Opera*, tom. vii, pp. 664, 665, Parmae, 1857; or tom. xii, p. 290, Venet. 1749. Dionysius Carthusianus repeats this presumably as traditional by his time (1403-71), and adds "Circa hos quaeritur an hoc sacramentum remittat poenam peccati mortalis. . . . In quantum sacrificium, accipit rationem satisfactionis sicque tollit poenam in parte aut in toto, sicut et aliae satisfactiones secundum mensuram poenae debitae pro peccatis ac devotionis qua sacramentum offertur. Haec Thomas in Scripto." *In Lib. Sent.*, iv, dist. xii, qu. 3, ed. Coloniae, 1535, tom. iv, p. 163. It was by laying stress on "satisfactio" that the later scholastics gave a calculative and quantitative turn to the notion of sacrifice in the Mass. Each Mass became worth so much as a set-off against a given amount of "pain" or "guilt".

which is efficacious by way of impetration for all whose will is not deliberately set in the wrong direction. But in the sixteenth century both opponents and supporters of the medieval system agreed to trace one at least of its characteristic features to the use made of this passage, viz., the then current notion that the Eucharist was a sacrifice satisfactory, which, on being offered and applied by the priest, took effect mechanically for whom he would.

But can it be shown that these positions laid down by the Angelic Doctor were "verae causae" of the system so universally objected against by the Reformers both in England and elsewhere? Article XXXI contains a concise summary of their objections; for it makes just this threefold protest against any theories involving (*a*) iteration of the one sacrifice of the Cross ("Oblatio Christi semel facta, etc. . . . expiatio"), (*b*) the need of priests to multiply Masses ("unde missarum sacrificia quibus vulgo dicebatur sacerdotem offerre Christum"), and (*c*) the mechanical operation of the Mass as so much satisfaction or compensation to be set off against sin ("in remissionem poenae aut culpae pro vivis et defunctis"). It could hardly have pointed more effectively, though, to us, to whom the medieval worship is a dead system, with so allusive a touch, to the eventual upshot of St Thomas' teaching as presented by the current theology of the end of the Middle Ages. For that theology seems to have involved the doctrines of (*a*) a re-immolation of Christ at each Mass, of (*b*) the gain to be had accordingly from repeated acts of offering, and of (*c*) the mechanical way in which such benefits were held to be attainable. It will be convenient to examine these points in the reverse order.

C

THE LATER MEDIEVAL DOCTRINE OF THE
EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

THE later medieval writers now proceeded to elaborate the traditional teaching of St Thomas.

I. *Ex opere operato*

The *ex opere operato* theory of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

It must, of course, be borne in mind that this phrase *ex opere operato* is capable of a right and a wrong use. If it means that the Sacraments are "effectual because of Christ's institution and promise",¹ it is not only an unexceptional, but a valuable phrase. This is the sense it now bears. "The Sacraments are said to confer grace not as principal causes (that belongs to God only), but as instrumental causes. As such they give grace both *ex opere operantis vel suscipientis*, as from the singular devotion of the minister and the recipient's perception of it; and also *ex opere operato*, from their force as rites of divine institution and the sanctity they have because of him who ordained them."² Thus *ex opere operato* is not only an innocent, but, as against merely

¹ Article XXVI.

² Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, iii. p. 524 n.; cf. Dens, *Theologia Moralís et Dogmatica, de Sacr. in Gen.*, N. 17, tom. v, p. 89. Dublinii, 1832; Möhler, *Symbolism*, bk. I, c. iv, § 28, p. 204. London, 1894.

subjective types of religion which make the disposition of the recipient not the condition but the cause of the benefits to be received, a necessary phrase. As such it was vindicated by the Council of Trent: "Si quis dixerit per ipsa nova legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinae promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere, anathema sit."³ This vindication belongs to Session VII of 3 March 1547, and it was tacitly accepted in England; for the rejection of the phrase found in Article XXVI of the Forty-two Articles was dropped ten years later in the corresponding Article XXV of 1563.⁴ But this was the result of theological explanation. Before the middle of the sixteenth century *opus operatum* was an ambiguous expression "easily capable of 'no godly but a very superstitious sense',⁵ and might be taken to imply that the sacramental act became almost of the nature of a magical charm, bringing grace to the recipient *ex opere operato*, whatever his spiritual condition might be."⁶ If we may conclude anything at all from the writings of the Reformers, this was the sense to which the phrase was perverted by the popular theology of the later Middle Age. It covered the comfortable notion that the sacraments are mechanical and not, as Hooker said, "moral instruments of salvation".⁷ Thus Article IX of the Thirteen Articles of

³ *Decr. de Sacr.*, Session VII, Canon 8.

⁴ Cf. Hardwick, *Articles*, Appendix III, pp. 322, 323, ed. 1884. This is also the reason why it did not occur in Article XXX of 1553 (XXXI of 1563 and 1571), although it is found in close connection with the language, out of which the Article was developed, in 1538; cf. *supra*, p. 25.

⁵ Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 322, Article XXVI of 1553.

⁶ Gibson, *Thirty-nine Articles*, ii, 612.

⁷ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V, lvii, 4.

1538 runs: "Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis."⁸ Here the English formulary borrows from Lutheran sources. For the Confession of Augsburg and its Apology have respectively: "Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato justificant, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quae credat remitti peccata"⁹; and "Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis. Haec simpliciter judaica opinio est, sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hos est, sine fide."¹⁰

Perhaps, however, this evidence might be suspected as based on the charges of opponents, and some of them Solifidians. We have already seen how easily Jewel produced passages from the later Scholastics containing this teaching in its most objectionable form. But is it not enough to note that the Council of Trent, while vindicating the phrase "ex opere operato", quietly omitted to say anything in support of "sine bono motu utentis", and dropped all allusion to it? A tenet thus abandoned did not, however, cease at once to afford matter for attack; but it soon became possible for the "Pontificians" of Romanensian Divines to deny that it had ever been held. Thus Suaraz (1548-1617) denies that any of the theologians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, charged by Vasquez (1551-1604) with

⁸ Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 270.

⁹ *Conf. Augs.*, Pars I, Article XIII; Francke, *Libri Symbolici Lutheranae Ecclesiae*, p. 18, or *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 127.

¹⁰ *Apol. Conf.*, VII, Article XIII; Francke, p. 203, or Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 247.

maintaining such an error, could possibly have been guilty of it. They only regarded the Eucharistic Sacrifice, he says, as operating "per modum impetrationis". "Est enim haec doctrina communis scholasticorum", as he claims, from the cardinal passage in St Thomas onwards: "nec aliud sensit Gabriel (Biel) lect. 26 et 27, et latius in 83. Albertus Pighius. Controvers 5."¹¹ But Suarez is hardly consistent with himself; for a few pages earlier, when dealing with the effects of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, he observes: "Inter quos effectus, primus ac praecipuus esse potest primae gratiae infusio, et remissio mortalis culpae; de quo variae fuerunt hac nostra aetate sententiae. Prima est, hoc sacrificium immediate per se, ratione rei oblatae, conferre primam gratiam et remissionem culpae mortalis ex opere operato, faciendo hominem ex attrito contritum."¹² Suarez, in fact, finds among the errors of his time this very theory of the mechanical operation of the sacraments, and moreover considers it worth no less than nine pages of refutation. After all, on this point, he does but range himself on the side of Vasquez. What, then, is the charge that Vasquez makes? "Recentiores nonnulli aperte docuerunt, per sacramentum Eucharistiae sacrificium Patri oblatum, non solum veniale sed etiam mortale peccatum eorum, pro quibus offertur, juxta ipsorum dispositionem ex opere operato, sicut per Sacramentum penitentiae, deleri, nempe ita ut ad hunc effectum in eo, pro quo offertur, sola attritio sufficiat, et virtute sacrificii, sicut Sacramenti, absque alio effectu voluntatis gratia remissionis

¹¹ Suarez, *In tert. part.*, qu. lxxiii, sect. iii, § 14, *Opera*, tom. xxi, p. 727, ed. Paris 1866.

¹² *Ibid.*, qu. lxxxiii, sect. iii, § 1, *Opera*, tom. xxi, p. 720, ed. Paris, 1866.

peccatorum semper proxime conferatur.”¹³ He goes on to say that the writers who held this view were wont to cite in their favour the passage from St Thomas as quoted above, and to appeal for their interpretation of it to Gabriel Biel, Albertus Pighius, and others. Albertus Pighius was a Romanensian Divine of some consideration (1490–1543). “His fame was not unknown in England. Cranmer knew enough of his writings to detect that Gardiner had learnt much of his divinity from their study.”¹⁴ Bishop Jewel also was familiar with his works, which are frequently referred to by our English Reformers.”¹⁵ But he was better known abroad, being chosen for one of the papal theologians at the Colloquies of Worms and Ratisbon (1540–41). In his *De Missae Sacrificio*, where he complains of the Protestants for grossly misrepresenting their opponents, he discusses what is meant by *ex opere operato* by way of defending his side against one of the imputations contained in the Confession of Augsburg, viz. the “publica opinio quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato”.¹⁶ His party, he says, “opus operatum intelligunt ipsum opus aut rem ipsam in se”. He manifests great anxiety to show that the Mass, though a sacrifice distinct from that of the Cross, is not in any sense independent of it. He complains that on this point the Confession misrepresents him and his friends: “ac si diceremus ipsum mereri de se peccatorum remissionem justificationem

¹³ *In tert. part. St Thomae disp.* 228, *Opera*, tom. vii, p. 712, ed. Compluti, 1613.

¹⁴ Cranmer, *Works*: “On the Lord’s Supper”, p. 127, ed. Parker Society.

¹⁵ Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 36.

¹⁶ Francke, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

ac caetera ejusmodi. Non hoc dicimus nec intelligimus; sed hoc intelligimus valere ad aliquid ex opere operato quod eo valet et proficit ex ipsa aut operis aut rei in se virtute ac efficacia, quam nonnunquam habet ex sua ipsius natura ac essentia, nonnunquam ex beneplacito alicujus a quo, velut efficax signum, ad hoc ipsum institum est." Thus Pighius successfully repudiates any notion of the power of the Eucharistic Sacrifice *per se* as apart from the Sacrifice on the Cross; and he seems to confine himself within the limits of a later and more accredited theology, when he adds that the efficacy of the sacrifice is due to what it is in itself and not only to the devotion of the priest. "Sed hoc dicimus, oblationem pro illis sacrificii valere iisdem ex virtute et dignitate ipsius in se sacrificii acceptissimi Deo et non tantum ex bono motu cordis offerentis atque ejus devotione ac merito."¹⁷ This statement is unobjectionable, and was the result of controversy: but it appears that a generation or two earlier *opus operatum* had been put forward in a more objectionable and uncompromising shape. Vasquez names Gabriel Biel as his authority next behind Pighius, the last of the Scholastics who immediately preceded the sixteenth-century controversialists. Vasquez is apparently quoting from Biel, whose words are these: "Imprimis, sacramentum eucharistiae, velut sacrificium summo Patri oblatum, nedum veniale sed et mortale non dico sumentium sed omnium eorum pro quibus offertur, et quantum ad reatum culpae et poenae plus vel minus secundum dispositionem eorum pro quibus offertur tollit." Then he refers to the *locus classicus* in St Thomas, "B. Thos. in 4 Scrip. di. 12, q. 2, ar. 2", and concludes: "Intelligi-

¹⁷ *Controv. Ratispon. de Missae Sacrificio*, v. Coloniae, 1545.

tur enim pro membris Christi offerri quando offertur pro aliquibus ut sint membra Christi. Sic etiam, in quantum est sacrificium, accipit rationem satisfactionis: et secundum hoc in parte vel in toto poenam tollit, sicut et aliae satisfactiones, secundum mensuram poenae debitae pro peccatis et devotionis qua sacramentum offertur ac virtutis sacrificii his pro quibus offertur ab offerente applicatur. Et ita non semper virtute hujus sacrificii tota poena tollitur, et ideo officium illud offertur pro vivis et defunctis.”¹⁸ Whether or no Gabriel Biel and the later Scholastic Divines taught that all this took effect “per modum impetrationis”, it is noticeable that his own words here, as distinct from his reference to St Thomas, make no mention of any such qualification; while, by making sacrifice partake of the nature of satisfaction for “poena” divisible into more or less, he tends to give a quantitative and mechanical turn to the mode in which the Eucharist Oblation is conceived to operate. His language lacks the safeguards of St Thomas; and, if teachers wanted balance, it is easy to see what would be the consequence in the practical system. In short, we have in Biel’s language all the elements of a merely mechanical theory of sacramental operation abundantly provided for. The Eucharist as a sacrifice can be offered effectively

1. “pro vivis”:

- (a) for the heathen or unbaptized (cf. “ut sint membra Christi”);
- (b) for those Christians whose spiritual life rises no higher than to the level of “attritio”—the sort of repentance produced by fear without

¹⁸ Gabriel Biel, *In Canonem Missae*, Lecture 85, litera L.

love (cf. "faciendo hominem ex attrito contritum");

2. "pro vivis et defunctis": as a "satisfactio" which, like other "satisfactiones,"

(a) removes "poena" (cf. "secundum . . . tollit") partially or entirely,

(b) when applied by the priest (cf. "devotionis . . . applicatur");

(c) repeatedly enough (cf. "et ita . . . defunctis").

The starting-point of this theory was, with the theologians who are responsible for it, prevailing practice. "It was their business," as Bishop Creighton observes, "to give a rational explanation of what the Church thought fit to do."¹⁹ They started with a good motive; but they went astray under the impetus of zeal without discretion. Not Reformers only, but their own successors, when face to face with the cry for reform, denounced the system which had at once made, and been made by, the Schoolmen. The Reformers attacked it mainly in connection with the private Masses, which were for the most part Masses for the dead, i.e., Masses satisfactory. Thus Melanchthon writes in the *Apologia Confessionis*, 1540: "Quod vero allegant adversarii Patres de oblatione pro mortuis: scimus veteres loqui de oratione pro mortuis, quam nos non prohibemus, sed applicationem coenae Domini pro mortuis ex opere operato improbamus"²⁰; and in another formulary, which, fortunately, for other reasons remained a "laborious fiasco" in England, the same protest occurs as in Article XXXI, but less guar-

¹⁹ *History of the Papacy*, vol. vi, p. 71, ed. 1897.

²⁰ *Apol. Conf.*, cap. vi. de abusibus, Article III; Francke, op. cit., p. 275.

dedly stated: "Quorundam nimis est curiosa perversitas qui veniam quidem peccatorum expectant, sed hanc morte Christi per solam fidem ad nos accommodatam plene non credunt et omnibus partibus impleri. Quapropter alia conquirunt sacrificia, quibus perpur-gari possint, et ad hanc rem missas exhibent in quibus sacrificium Deo Patri credunt oblatum esse, nimirum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi vere, quomodoque illi dicunt realiter, ad veniam peccatorum impetrandam, et salutem tam mortuorum quam vivorum procurandam quibus etiam regnum tam latum dant ut illis aliquando minui, nonnunquam omnino tolli purgatorii tormenta statuunt."²¹ But such teaching was equally offensive to the better men of the old learning. Gardiner, for instance, preaching on St Peter's Day 1548, after "defining the Mass as a sacrifice ordained for two purposes, to make men strong in the remembrance of Christ's passion, and to recommend to God the souls of the dead in Christ, said that all additional notions of the Mass were abuses that might be taken away. He therefore thought that chantries were well dissolved, if they were abused by applying the Mass for the satisfaction of sin, to take away sin and to bring men to heaven: 'for when men add to the Mass an opinion of satisfaction or of a new redemption, they put it to another use that it was ordained for'."²² It is interesting to notice in passing, how here, as in his after-controversy with Cranmer, Gardiner goes back to the doctrine of sacrifice as set forth in the Master of the Sentences. It was the way with the old learning in England. Their statements of the Eucharis-

²¹ *Reformatio Legum de Haeres*, c. 10, ed. Cardwell, p. 13.

²² Dixon, *op. cit.*, iii, p. 263 seq.

tic Sacrifice were shaped on the earlier medieval model, as in Tunstal's reply to the Lutherans, 1538: "Itaque si Christus et sacerdos esset, et sacrificium, et hostia, ubicunque est Christus, ibi est sacrificium nostrum; et si in sacramento altaris est verum corpus Christi, et verus sanguis Christi, quo pacto, manente veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini, non est ibi sacrificium nostrum?"²³ Theirs was the language, moderate, but neither unguarded like that of the later Schoolmen, nor merely negative like so much of Cranmer's controversial protestantism, which survived in the later Anglican Divines. For such men of the old learning in England, scholastic speculation had gone too far. And so thought their contemporaries abroad. The Spanish Dominican, Melchior Canus (c. 1506-60), testifies to the existence of a merely mechanical theory of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and devotes nearly five columns to refuting it. "Vis sacrificii in peccato remittendo quaeritur culpae remittat an poenas; an utraque potius et culpae et poenas. De qua tres video sententias ferri, quarum nullam probo. Unam ut oblatio sacra culpae etiam mortales remittere possit atque adeo gratiam conferre."²⁴ But in this repudiation Melchior Canus had been anticipated by one of the most famous Generals of his Order, Cardinal Caietan, "theologus", as Pallavicini calls him, "ejus aetatis spectatissimus et facile princeps."²⁵ The very man who, on 12 October 1518, called upon Luther to revoke his assertion that faith is necessary to the effectual reception of the Sacraments, thought it necessary to raise his

²³ Pocock's *Burnet*, iv. p. 383.

²⁴ *De locis theologicis*, lib. xii, cap. xi, § "In hujus autem confirmatione"; Migne, *Theol. Curs. Complet.*, tom. i, coll. 854, 855.

²⁵ Pallavicini, I, ix, § 1, p. 12, ed. Antwerpiae, 1673.

voice against the notion of their operating mechanically on the ground that it was a widespread delusion of his own side. "In hoc videtur communis multorum error quod putant hoc sacrificium ex solo opere operato habere certum meritum vel certam satisfactionem quae applicatur huic vel illi."²⁶ Further proof that the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice had degenerated into a hard and perfunctory theory as to the mode of operation can hardly be required. Behind the practical system of multiplied Masses, we have the protests of Romish theologians, from Caietan and Melchior Canus in the sixteenth century to Vasquez and Suarez in the seventeenth, as evidence for the current doctrine attached to it; while, in common with its opponents, some of them admit that this doctrinal basis of the reigning system is traceable, through the later school authors, up to St Thomas himself.

II. *The multiplication of Masses*

The gain to be sought from repeated acts of offering follows directly from the opinion just dealt with. "Non semper", as Biel says, "tota poena tollitur; et ideo officium illud offertur pro vivis et defunctis." The idea of the Mass as so much satisfaction applicable and effective *ex opere operato*, would plainly serve to multiply Masses *ad infinitum*; while men would readily welcome a system which released them from the necessity of religious observance in person, or in this life, and enabled them to get it done by proxy or even in the next.

1. But there is evidence to show that these tendencies were assisted by a yet more extravagant error, to the effect that the offering of Christ on the Cross

²⁶ *Quaest. et quodlibet*, qu. ii, tom. iii, fol. 76, ed. Venet., 1531.

availed indeed to take away original sin, but that the Mass was instituted to make satisfaction for the actual sins of baptized Christians. The charge is first made from the Protestant side in the Augsburg Confession, 1530: "Accessit opinio, quae auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit missam in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus."²⁷ But the charge was immediately repudiated, if not, as Bossuet²⁸ (without apparent authority²⁹) states, when the Confession was read, at any rate in two replies from the Romish side. Arnoldus Wesaliensis and Joannes Cochlaeus, "primi nominis inter Pontificios tunc temporis theologi", in their *Brevis Responsio*, say, "Quod aiunt, missas in infinitum auctas ex ea opinione, quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, instituerit autem missam pro caeteris peccatis abolendis: nobis profecto verisimile non est, eam opinionem ullius esse Doctoris Catholici, tantum abest ut apud nos vulgata sit ea opinio. Scimus enim Christum dixisse hoc facite in meam commemorationem."³⁰ This is, however, but a qualified denial. In the Confutation of the Protestant Confession, drawn up at the direction of the emperor by a committee of Divines, and re-issued in an abbreviated form on 3 August, the imputation is categorically repudiated.

Privatarum missarum abrogatio admitti ac tolerari

²⁷ *Conf. Aug.*, Partis II, Article III; Francke, op. cit., p. 30.

²⁸ *History of Variations*, Part I, bk. iii, c. 53; vol. i, p. 137, ed. Antwerp, 1742.

²⁹ Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 27.

³⁰ Coelestinus, *Hist. Comitiorum anno MDXXX Augustae celebratorum*, tom. ii, fol. 237 b (ap. Dimock, p. 28). Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597.

non potest. Neque satis intelligi potest quod assumitur, Christum sua passione satisfecisse pro peccato originali et instituisse missam pro actuali peccato; nam hoc nunquam auditum est a Catholicis, jamque rogati plerique constantissime negant ab iis sic doceri. Non enim Missa delet peccata . . . sed delet poenam pro peccato debitam, satisfactions supplet, et gratiae confert augmentum.³¹

In the earlier form of their draft they had been more emphatic:

Imponunt Catholicis asserere passionem Christi factam pro originali peccato, missam fieri pro actualibus. At hic concionatores principes suos decipiunt, dum Catholicis errorem et haeresim imponunt inauditam. Ostendant nobis eum qui sentiat Christum solum pro peccato originis in passione satisfecisse, et nos adversabimur ei quam Luthero. Nunquam ita docuere Catholici, sed dicimus Christum satisfecisse pro omnibus peccatis. At sicut concionatores dicunt illam satisfactionem nulli prodesse sine fide, ita Catholici et tota ecclesia docuit nos illius satisfactionis participes fieri per sacramenta et sacrificium missae, per bona opera et similia.³²

It thus became the habit of the Roman party to defend themselves only by repeating the denial that any such doctrine had ever been taught by their own men. In 1553 the Dominican Peter Anspach, Court preacher to the Elector of Brandenburg, at Frankfort-on-Order, characterized the imputation as a lie³³; and Bellarmine (1542–1621), fifty years later, repudiated it with equal indignation: "Impudenti mendacio tribuitur Catholicis doctoribus illa divisio quod Christus passione sua satisfecerit solum pro peccato originis, pro actualibus autem instituerit missam.

³¹ Francke, *op. cit.*, Appendix, p. 60; cf. Dimock, p. 30, and *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, p. 253.

³² J. Fischer, *Die Konfutation der Augsbургischen Bekenntniss*, p. 100, Leipzig, 1891 (ap. *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, p. 253).

³³ *Antithesis der Lutherischen Bekenntniss*, p. 45, Frankfort-on-Order, 1533 (ap. *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, p. 253).

Nemo enim Catholicorum unquam sic docuit."⁸⁴ Finally, a seventeenth-century professor at Freiburg, Thomas Henrici, thought himself safe in defying the Lutherans to produce even one scholastic who had ever taught such an error. "Neque Catholici communiter neque Scholastici docent Christum per passionem suam pro peccato tantum originali non etiam pro actualibus satisfecisse. . . . Ostendant Confessionistae vel unicum Scholasticum qui docuerit Christum pro peccato originali ita satisfecisse ut ejus satisfactio ad peccata actualia se non extendat."⁸⁵ It must be confessed that consistent repudiation such as this has weight. But indignation, feigned or real, is often the best way, and that not least with controversialists, to cover retreat from a position which can no longer be defended. The tenet in question was certainly not held by the Romish party after attention was called to it; but this is no proof that it never had been put forward. A comparison between the *Confessio Invariata* of 1530, and the *Confessio Variata* of 1540, may as reasonably suggest that the Romanists had abandoned a tenet which they could not defend, as that the Lutherans had given up a charge which they could not sustain. It appears that while both Confessions complain of the multiplication of Masses, and attribute it to the theory of *Opus operatum* and "Application,"⁸⁶ the Confession of Augsburg makes mention of the tenet as an accessory support of the

⁸⁴ *Judicium de libro, quem Lutherani vocant, Concordia*, p. 88, Ingolstadii, 1585 (ap. *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, p. 254).

⁸⁵ *Anatomia Confessionis Augustanae*, p. 456, Friburgi, 1631 (ap. *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, p. 254).

⁸⁶ *Sylloge Confessionum*, pp. 139 and 193, or Francke, op. cit., p. 30, and App., pp. 20, 21.

reigning system⁸⁷; but that the *Confessio Variata* omits to do so. It does, however, like its predecessor, and in language not unlike but less precise than our Article XXXI, assert that Christ died upon the Cross for sins both original and actual, and that, if so, the current Romish doctrine of the Mass cannot be sustained: "Passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio non solum pro culpa originis sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis. . . . Solum Christi sacrificium meruerit aliis remissionem peccatorum seu reconciliationem. . . . Honos sacrificii Christi non debet transferri in opus sacerdotis," etc.⁸⁸ It would, in fact, seem that the attack on the current Romish doctrine of the Mass had met with some success. Extravagant opinions, first exposed in 1530, were as promptly disowned; and in the later documents, such as the *Confessio Variata* of 1540, the *Confessio Saxonica* of 1551,⁸⁹ and Article XXXI of 1553, attention was only called to such of the scholastic opinions as were still maintained. Nevertheless, it was thought wise to retain the positive assertion that Christ died as well for actual sins as for original sin, if only to shut out for good an error which had been taught, and which, though dropped, might conceivably be taught or held again.

2. But what is the evidence that this error had been taught, and, for a time at least, had been part of the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice? The evidence comes from both sides—Reforming and Romish. The Reformers refer it to St Thomas Aquinas; the Romish Divines to Catherinus.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 139; Francke, p. 30.

⁸⁸ *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 194; Francke, op. cit., App., p. 21.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 283; Francke, App., p. 95.

(a) The evidence of Reformers.

In 1531 Melanchthon, replying presumably to the accusation of having, in the Confession of Augsburg, laid to the charge of the Papists things which they knew not, vindicated himself by an appeal to St. Thomas. "Ostendimus rationem quare missa non justificet ex opere operato, nec applicata pro aliis mereatur eis remissionem. . . . Quare repudiandus est error Thomae qui scripsit corpus Domini semel oblatum in cruce pro debito originali, jugiter offerri pro quotidianis delictis in altari, ut habeat in hoc ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum."⁴⁰ Seven years later the Lutheran orators sent to Henry VIII, in 1538, trace to this opinion, among others, the prevalence of private Masses, and account for the authority which it enjoyed by its assignation to St Thomas. "An potest etiam magis impium quidquam dici, quam illi de missis istis docuerunt? Nempe quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccatis originis, et instituerit missam in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus." Then they go on to say, "hae persuasiones hominum animis etiam hodie de missis privatis inhaerent: sic enim Thomas inquit in opusculo de Sacramento Altaris, cur Missa instituta sit, corpus Domini semel oblatum est in cruce pro peccato originali, sic offeratur jugiter pro cottidianis delictis in altari et habeat in hoc ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum super omnia legis sacrificia preciosum et acceptum."⁴¹ Tunstal, in his reply for the king, only takes the line that what is an objection to private Masses is equally fatal to the

⁴⁰ *Apol. Conf.*, c. xii; Francke, op. cit., pp. 266, 267.

⁴¹ Pocock's *Burnet*, iv, pp. 360, 362.

public Mass,⁴³ but does not trouble to defend St Thomas or deny that he ever taught so. But Latimer, in his sermon before the Convocation of Canterbury, 9 June 1536, had already denounced the doctrine with his usual homely vigour: "Go ye, tell me now, as your conscience leadeth you . . . was there not some that despising the money of the Lord, as copper not current, either coined new themselves, or else uttered abroad newly coined of others . . . sometimes in the stead of God's word blowing out the dreams of men while they preached to the people the redemption that cometh by Christ's death to serve only them that died before his coming, that were in the time of the Old Testament, and that now, since redemption and forgiveness of sins purchased by money and devised by men is of efficacy; and not redemption purchased by Christ."⁴⁴ To have made such accusations in the face of such an assembly, Latimer must have been sure of his facts; and his language is evidence enough that opinions of the kind were commonly taught and used to justify the multiplication of Masses. But it will be observed that Latimer, in denouncing what he elsewhere calls "a daily oblation propitiatory,"⁴⁴ states the popular doctrine in a form slightly different from that in which it is attributed to St Thomas; the Sacrifice of the Cross being, according to those whom Latimer reprobates, for sins done under the Old Testament, and according to the text assigned to St Thomas, for the original sin of Christians as well as others. When Jewel quotes it as an error of his opponent Harding's side, he

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 380.

⁴³ *Sermons*, p. 36, ed. Parker Society.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 73.

refers to it in this form, and attributes it to Catherinus.⁴⁵

Let us first dispose of the assertion for which St Thomas was held responsible by the Reformers. The passage so frequently referred to by them runs as follows: "Secunda causa institutionis hujus Sacramenti est Sacrificium altaris, contra quamdam quotidianam delictorum nostrorum rapinam. Ut, sicut corpus Domini semel oblatum est in cruce pro debito originali sic offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in altari, et habeat in hoc Ecclesia munus ad placandum Deum super omnia legis sacramenta vel sacrificia pretiosum et acceptum." The passage is found in the *Opusculum*, "De venerabili sacramento altaris", which has been printed since the fifteenth century in all the editions of the works of St Thomas⁴⁶; and it was naturally therefore assigned to him. But this work is only a later form of thirty-two discourses on the Eucharist attributed to Albertus Magnus, and also printed with his works.⁴⁷ They cannot, however, be his. For he wrote before Communion in Both Kinds had fallen into disuse, and he even attaches a special significance to participation in the chalice.⁴⁸ Sermons 29 and 30, on the contrary, explain why the laity should not receive the chalice. No manuscript or other authority of the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries assigns them to him. They came to be printed with his works apparently because his fellow-Dominican and biographer, Peter

⁴⁵ *Works, The Defence of the Apology*, pp. 557, 558, ed. Parker Society.

⁴⁶ *Opusculum de Ven. Sacr. Altaris; Opera*, tom. xvii, p. 135. Parmae, 1864.

⁴⁷ *Opera*, tom. xii, pp. 249 seqq., ed. Jammy, Lugd. 1651; and tom. xiii, p. 671, ed. Vives, Paris, 1893.

⁴⁸ *In lib. Sent. iv, dist. xii, art. 2, Opera*, tom. xvi, p. 166, ed. Jammy, Lugd. 1651.

of Prussia, thought that he recognized his writing, and that of one of his secretaries, in a manuscript which looked like the autograph of the thirty-two sermons.⁴⁹ It is impossible that either St Thomas or his master could have committed themselves to the theological error contained in the passage quoted above from the thirty-two sermons. Both, as trained theologians, uniformly teach that our Lord's Sacrifice upon the Cross was the one propitiation for all sins, original as well as actual; and that the Eucharist, though a distinct, was no independent sacrifice, but drew all its efficacy from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross.⁵⁰ A case has been made out for giving an orthodox explanation to the passage in question, and so far rehabilitating the credit of the author of the thirty-two sermons, whoever he was.⁵¹ "Ce passage", says Dr Vacant, "peut assurément s'interpréter dans un sens orthodoxe, et le contexte prouve que l'auteur des discours ne l'entendait pas en un sens hérétique. Mais il n'en offre pas moins une assertion équivoque, d'autant plus dangereuse qu'elle se trouve dans des discours destinés non à théologiens mais au peuple."⁵² But an equivocal doctrine which thus acquired currency under the aegis of great names like those of Albert and St Thomas, rapidly led to real and widespread perversions of the truth. The Reformers naturally traced the abuses of the Mass system to the door of the great Schoolmen, when they came across an assertion seemingly proceeding from such high authority, and making for the idea that, each Mass having a definite value of its own, so many Masses

⁴⁹ Vacant, *Histoire*, etc., p. 41, and *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, iii, pp. 723-30.

⁵⁰ Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, App. D. and E.

⁵¹ *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, ii, pp. 252 seqq. and 302 seqq.

⁵² *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 727, 728.

might be set off against so many actual sins. They did the Schoolmen an injustice; but they were not mistaken in regarding the abuses as the practical outcome of errors taught under their name.

(b) The evidence of late Romish writers.

Others, however, beside the Reformers, bear testimony to the prevalence of this particular error. The Spanish Jesuit Vasquez (1551-1604) attributed it to Catherinus (1487-1553), a Dominican of some distinction as one of the theologians at the Council of Trent, Bishop of Minori, 1547, and afterwards Archbishop of Conza, 1551.

Notat igitur Catherinus [says Vasquez] in eodem opusculo superius citato (*sc.* De veritate incruenti sacrificii) § *Primum igitur*, duo esse genera peccatorum expianda per sacerdotium, et sacrificium: alterum est originalis peccati, et eorum, quae cum eo conjuncta sunt: et haec vocat ipse peccata, quae erant sub priori testamento, nempe, sub veteri, juxta modum loquendi Pauli ad Hebraeos ix.⁵⁸ Alterum vero peccatorum, quae post Baptismum committuntur, et haec vocat ipse peccata, quae sub novo testamento admittuntur: et pro quovis genere suum assignat sacrificium; quia putat fore, ut sine suo peculiari sacrificio Sacramenta pro quovis illo genere peccatorum expiando non consistenterent, sicut ait in § *Cum ergo peccata*. Pro peccato itaque originali, ac aliis cum eo conjunctis, quae ipse vocat peccata sub priori testamento, assignat Christum sacerdotem, et sacrificium illius cruentum, et sacramentum baptismi quod virtute illius sacrificii ea remittat: et quia haec omnia reputantur (inquit) unum peccatum ratione unius originalis, a quo oriuntur, et cum quo conjuncta sunt, ideo pro illorum remissione satis fuit una ipsius oblatio, quae nunquam esset repetenda. Atque hoc modo explicat Paulum ad Hebraeos x. cum ait *Una enim oblatione consummavit*

⁵⁸ τὼν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, Heb. 9 15.

*in sempiternum sanctificatos*⁵⁴: ubi reddit causam, ob quam antiqua sacrificia in dies repeterentur, sacrificium autem crucis semel tantum fuerit oblatum. At vero pro peccatis commissis post Baptismum, pro quibus inquit non relinqui hostiam Christi cruentam, quod voluntarie committuntur: juxta illud ad Hebraeos x, *Voluntarie enim peccantibus nobis post acceptam notitiam veritatis jam non relinquitur pro peccatis hostia*,⁵⁵ nempe, ut ipse intelligit, cruenta, quae iterum repetatur, assignat sacrificium incruentum Missae, quod ideo asserit, quotidie repeti, et iterari, quia offertur pro peccatis, quae jam sub novo testamento committuntur; nam cum haec (inquit) plura sint, neque ab uno originali derivata, sed singula per se considerentur, quodlibet etiam suam expiationem sacrificii postulat, ac proinde sacrificium incruentum repetendum est pro his peccatis, quae sub novo testamento committuntur. Quocirca in § *Denique considerandum* addit, ad expiationem horum peccatorum non applicari nobis cruentum Christi sacrificium, sed incruentum per sacramentum Poenitentiae. Haec est tota Catherini sententia circa praesentem difficultatem explicata, quae (me quidem judice) manifeste absurda est, et contra fidem catholicam aperte pugnat.⁵⁶

So thought Vasquez, and so too Melchior Canus, who does not hesitate to characterize this teaching of his fellow Dominican and contemporary, Catherinus, as among the wildest of dreams; "Ex quo Ambrosii Catherini deliratio patet peccata ante baptismum admissa per crucis sacrificium remitti, post baptismum vero omnia per sacrificium altaris."⁵⁷ Suarez, however,

⁵⁴ μᾶ γὰρ προσφορὰ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηρεκὲς τοὺς ἀγιαζομένους, Heb. 10, 14.

⁵⁵ ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία, Heb. 10, 26.

⁵⁶ Vasquez, *Comment. in tert. part. S. Thomae*, quaest. 83, art. 1, disp. 221, cap. iv, *Opera*, tom. vii, pp. 630, 631, ed Compluti, 1613.

⁵⁷ *De locis theologicis*, lib. xii, c. 11, § "In hujus autem confirmatione". Migne, *Theol. curs. complet.*, tom. i, coll. 854-7.

attributes to Catherinus an opinion which, whether actually his or not, carries this isolation of the Mass to its final stage. So far, according to Vasquez' interpretation of his teaching, the Mass was held by Catherinus to serve as an offering to be repeated as often as sins are repeated, i.e., daily. It was instituted for this, that each post-baptismal sin might have its corresponding act of expiation: and this act of expiation operates like "satisfactio" in the Sacrament of Penance, i.e., as so much compensation. Obviously it is but one step from this to look upon each Mass, thus repeated, as, independently of the Sacrifice of the Cross, a new cause of so much grace. Accordingly Suarez, in discussing the question, "Utrum sacrificium Missae habet aliquem effectum ex opere operato", records a "sententia" to the effect that "hoc sacrificium esse veluti universalem causam, quae conferat seu concurrat ex opere operato ad omnes fructus et effectus gratiae, quos Christus per passionem suam nobis meruit, et quacumque via aut ratione nobis applicatur". The Sacrament of the Altar differs from other sacraments in this, that while each of them has but its own effect to bestow, the Eucharist "continet in se Christum passum, unde, quicquid est effectus Dominicae passionis, est etiam effectus hujus Sacramenti (D. Thos. Joan. 6, lect. 6). Alia Sacramenta habent singulares effectus, sed in immolatione hujus sacramenti effectus est universalis pro tota Ecclesia pro vivis et defunctis, quia continetur in ipso causa universalis omnium sacramentorum, qui est Christus (D. Thom. ib.)." This position, according to Suarez, was afterwards improved upon, and the Eucharist came to be regarded as a second *ἀρχή* of grace, co-ordinate with the Cross. "Fundamentum esse potest, quia hoc sacrificium aequale est sacrificio crucis, ut

patet ex principali offerente et ex re oblata; ergo tam est universale et efficax in causando, quam fuit illud in merendo et satisfaciendo." Such then, according to him, was the current opinion; and he proceeds to detail from Catherinus a dogmatic position drawn from it as a direct consequence.

Ex qua ratione intulit ulterius (ut refertur) Catherinus in opusc. de Sacrificio Missae, et super ad Heb. 10, hoc sacrificium virtute operandi non niti in sacrificio crucis, neque ab illo pendere, quia tam infinitum est, sicut illud. Unde, sicut illud ab hoc non pendet, neque in illo nititur, ita neque hoc in illo, aequalia enim sunt, sicut in perfectione, ita et in valore, et in virtute; sunt ergo tanquam duae causae universales, aequae primae in suo genere, quamvis ex voluntate Christi diversum usum habuerint; nam sacrificium crucis ordinatum tantum fuit quoad sufficientiam, hoc vero quoad efficaciam. Quod si objicias sequi, sacrificium Missae ex opere operato dare effectum baptismi, poenitentiae et similes, respondet, immediate et per se, negando sequelam: mediate autem et per alia sacramenta, concedendo illam; est enim ejus virtus veluti universalis causae, quae per se ipsam non immediate operatur, sed cum causis proximis, quae in praesenti sunt caetera sacramenta, ad hoc peculiariter instituta, ut universalis virtus hujus sacrificii ad speciales effectus applicetur.⁵⁸

Suarez, in discussing this opinion, rejects it as having not a vestige of authority in Scripture or tradition,⁵⁹ and as unreasonable in itself⁶⁰; for whatever merit or satisfaction the Sacrifice of the Mass has, it derives from the Sacrifice of the Cross. Here all Catholic theology would, of course, agree with Vasquez and Suarez. But

⁵⁸ Suarez, *In tert. part. S. Thom.*, disp. lxxix, § 1, n. 2, *Opera*, tom. xxi, p. 709, ed. Paris, 1866.

⁵⁹ § 6.

⁶⁰ § 15.

by the severity with which they attack the opposite error, they both testify to its actual hold. Whether it was held by Catherinus or not, is a subsidiary question, though worth a passing inquiry, if only for the credit of an erratic, but in some respects a useful, theologian.⁶¹

What, then, did Catherinus teach? In the passage which Vasquez fastens upon so sharply, Catherinus, speaking of the state of things under the new dispensation, says,

Cum ergo peccata sint, et expiabilia sint et ad illam cruentam Christi hostiam non pertineant, videndum est quonam pacto, utrum sine sacrificio expiantur. Videtur enim prima facie vacare sacrificium quia sunt sacramenta et pro his admissis post baptismum specialiter est sacramentum poenitentiae: unde videtur supervacuum omnino esse aliud sacrificium. Et nos dicimus omnino esse necessarium sacrificium, quoniam sine sacrificio nullum consisteret sacramentum: quod ego mox patefaciam. Sicut autem quae sub novo testamento admittuntur peccata, alterius sunt generis quam vetera sic debent habere suum proprium sacrificium et sacerdotium et hostiam et congruentes oblationes, non unam tantum, sicut quae prioris erant testamenti; quia cuncta peccata quae sub illo erant, quodammodo unum reputabantur, tanquam ex illo uno manantia quod semel admissum fuit in Paradiso. Quare unam tantum requirebat oblationem ad expiandum, ut diximus. Quae enim sub novo patrantur, per se singula considerantur et quodlibet suam expiationem postulat. Habet etiam et hoc sacrificium sua propria sacramenta sicut loco suo dicitur.⁶²

So far as this passage goes, Vasquez is hardly justified in charging Catherinus with holding that the Sacrifice of the Cross was for original sin: Catherinus actually

⁶¹ Cf. Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, p. 118, quoting Du Pin, about Catherinus.

⁶² *De Veritate Incruenti Sacrificii*, col. 162 (ed. Romae, 1552, by Ant. Bladus).

says for sins under the Old Testament. But he does say in a further passage, quoted from the same treatise by Bishop Jewel, that the Cross was for pre-baptismal sins only, and that for remedy of post-baptismal sins, Christians must not look to the Cross at all. "Apparet quod pro peccatis sub novo testamento post acceptam salutaris hostiae in baptismo efficaciam commissis, non habemus pro peccato hostiam illam quam Christus obtulit pro peccato mundi et pro delictis baptismum praecedentibus: non enim nisi semel ille mortuus est: et ideo semel duntaxat hostia illa ad hunc effectum applicatur."⁶³ To what, then, are they to look? His answer may be found in the other treatises of Catherinus. In his *Speculum Hereticorum*, he points the sinning Christian to the Sacrament of Penance as a "secunda tabula post naufragium"⁶⁴; but in his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews, to the Sacrifice of the Mass as well. After laying it down that Christ died for "peccatis quae erant sub priori testamento, quae erat originale, et quae inde manabant", he points out that the difference between the priests of the Old Testament and the priests of the New Testament is that, while the former offered the same sacrifices for the same sin continually, the Christian Priesthood is busy with new sacrifices for new sins. "At nos, quoniam pro assiduis peccatis, quae indies committuntur, offerimus sacrificium, nihil pro-

⁶³ Jewel, *Defence of the Apology*, c. xv, div. 2. *Works*, p. 558, ed. Parker Society. "The sum and meaning hereof is this," says Jewel, "that our sins committed after baptism are not forgiven by the death of Christ, but only by the sacrifice of the Mass. Which thing, what it seemeth to you, I cannot tell; but unto all godly ears it seemeth an horrible great blasphemy."

⁶⁴ *Speculum Haereticorum*, fo. E. iv. Cracoviae, 1540, ap. Denny et Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, § 194.

hibet imo necesse est assidue sacrificare, ac simul assidue litare; ut quae assidue admittuntur assiduo sacrificio expientur.”⁶⁵ Theologically, no doubt, Catherinus would have held that the Mass, though a sacrifice distinct from that of the Cross, is not a sacrifice independent of it. He does, in fact, make this recognition in several places, e.g., “Hoc ergo sacrificium novum et incruentum suam habet efficaciam ab illo cruento, cujus commemoratio sit. Nam ut hoc esset, per illud obtentum est, sicut diximus.”⁶⁶ And, of course, admissions such as this must have their due weight as mitigations of his extravagance. Neither Vasquez nor Suarez seems to take them into consideration at all. To say, however, that the Cross is for original sin, and the Mass for actual sins, might and did easily run up into the assertion that the Mass is a sacrifice independent of the Cross. Practically, it could hardly fail of such an exaggeration: and Catherinus’ purpose was clearly a practical one, like that of all the Scholastics. They had a reigning system of practice to defend. They slid in a dogmatic basis wherever it could be inferentially constructed from any accepted doctrinal principle. Here, then, was a system of many Masses daily multiplied waiting for its justification. “Pro quotidianis delictis quotidianum sacrificium”, a daily offering for daily sins, as had been the pious ideal of old⁶⁷; this became the actual belief, creating and recreated by, actual practice. A century before Catherinus’ day, sermons attributed to St Thomas himself contained a further

⁶⁵ *Comment. in Ep. ad Hebraeos*, cap. x, ap. Denny et Lacey, op. cit. § 194.

⁶⁶ *De Veritate Incruenti Sacrificii*, col. 170; and cf. for other instances, Dimock, *Dangerous Deceits*, App. G, pp. 118, 119.

⁶⁷ Cf. Dimock, op. cit., pp. 109, 110.

development, to the effect that the Cross was for original, and the Mass for actual, sins. Catherinus adopted this, and worked it up as an apologist. He gave it balance, indeed, by refusing to dissociate the Mass from the Cross; but he propounded a theory, referred to as his by Vasquez in a moderate, and by Suarez in a more exaggerated, form, and amounting to this: that the Mass is a concurrent source of satisfaction to be repeated daily at least, for every act of sin demands its particular act of expiation; in one word, a Mass for a sin. Catherinus did good service. The theory secretly underlying current practice in the ordinary mind had only to receive open exposition from a bold theologian for it to be at once repudiated as detestable and erroneous; not only by Protestants, who had long seen the drift and religious dangers of the current worship, but also by advocates of the old order as well, Melchior Canus, Vasquez, and Suarez. Their best and only defence was to repudiate all complicity in Catherinus' tenets; and then the way was open for Bellarmine⁶⁸ to deny that they had ever been held. Nor indeed had they, by any in authority; but there they were. Bishop John Wordsworth points out that the treatise *De Veritate Incruenti Sacrificii* was not published before June or July 1552, and adds: "Hanc tractationem vix credo theologis nostris innotuisse ante promulgationem articuli. Sed opiniones Catherini et similium doctorum satis notae erant, vel per se vel per alios quae similia apud nos profitebantur."⁶⁹ Probably Catherinus himself can hardly claim the distinction of

⁶⁸ *Judic. de Lib. Concor.*, Mendacium xviii., *Opera*, tom. vii, col. 604: Colon. 1617. Cf. Hooker's Answer to Travers, § 14. *Works*, vol. iii, pp. 583, 584, ed. Keble.

⁶⁹ J. Wordsworth, *Responsio ad Batavos*, p. 23 n.

having had Article XXXI drafted specially for his benefit. The Articles, too, as originally put forth, have none of the systematic form of a dogmatic confession. Their aim was practical. They dealt with a prevailing system and its presuppositions. This one in particular is directed against the private Masses in the first instance, and so against the current Roman doctrine of the Mass with which they were bound up. Its substantive clause ("Unde", etc.) rejects the belief in the Mass as a sacrifice which is efficacious mechanically for quick and dead, to have remission of sins. The first words of this clause ("missarum sacrificia") condemn the multiplication of Masses, so far as it serves this purpose ("in quibus", etc.). But this multiplication of Masses in its turn is condemned as inconsistent with the one oblation once made upon the Cross: as tending in practice to suggest the necessity of its being iterated or supplemented, as if incomplete. Of course, the imputation was at once repudiated; but the Article ignores the repudiation. It takes occasion, however, in the course of its prefatory statement, to introduce words to the effect that the one oblation on the Cross satisfied, as for original, so too for actual sins: and this quite unnecessarily, for the statement had been made twice before in the series. It is impossible not to see here an oblique reference to such views as those which had but just found their last and boldest advocate in Catherinus, but were now passing away. But just because they were passing away, it was enough for the reference to be made obliquely.

Thus, the emphasis thrown by St Thomas upon the work of the priest in the "consecratio materiae" was developed by his successors into the tenet that each act of sin requires its equivalent act of expiation, i.e., its

Mass; while his theory that the Mass attains its end when offered as an act of impetration for such as are less than contrite, was exaggerated into a belief in its mechanical efficacy, "ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis". In both these points the Roman Church met the Protestant challenge by reform. She explained *ex opere operato*. She repudiated altogether the other tenets that had been devised to increase the value of successive Masses as separate acts of expiation for sin after sin. But she has not been so bold or so fortunate as to shake herself free of St Thomas' definition of sacrifice. It is in this point that her kinship with the later medieval theology of the Eucharistic Sacrifice still survives; and on this, too, that our differences with her continue.

III. *The iteration of the one Sacrifice of the Cross, by the re-immolation of Christ at each Mass*

It still remains to consider this definition. It has been quoted above⁷⁰; and its essence is that sacrifice, to be such, involves the destruction, quasi-destruction, or physical modification of the victim. So far from having been given up, this is still the dominating conception of the Roman theology of sacrifice, and especially of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. So long as this account of sacrifice remains, the protest of Article XXXI remains unexhausted as well. We must first trace the history of this ruling idea, and then conclude with one or two very brief criticisms of it.

⁷⁰ *Supra*, p. 39.

(i) *Growth of the theory that Sacrifice involves
Destruction*

1. In later medieval theology.

The *Summa* of St Thomas is dominated by the conception of some physical modification of the victim as essential to sacrifice in other passages than that in which it is primarily laid down.⁷¹ Thus, when showing that Bread and Wine are the matter of the Sacrament, St Thomas gives as a reason, among others, that the double consecration or use of Bread and Wine severally is best calculated to represent our Lord's Passion, in which his blood was separated from his Body: "Secundo, quantum ad passionem Christi, in qua sanguis est a corpore separatus, et ideo in hoc sacramento, quod est memoriale dominicae passionis, seorsum sumitur panis ut sacramentum corporis, et vinum ut sacramentum sanguinis."⁷² He also teaches, in answer to the question how Christ can be said to be immolated in the Sacrament, that the consecrating priest acts in the person of Jesus Christ, in such sort that the act of the priest is the act of his Lord, and so there is the same priest and the same victim in the Mass as on the Cross. "Sacerdos gerit imaginem Christi, in cuius persona et virtute verba pronuntiat ad consecrandum, ut ex supradictis patet. Et ita quodammodo idem est sacerdos et hostia."⁷³ Here the theory of a physical modification of the victim as essential to a true sacrifice is only suggested by the effort to secure the identity of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist with the Sacrifice of the Cross, and that without such safeguard

⁷¹ II^a II^{ae}, q. lxxxv, art. iii ad 3.

⁷² III, lxxiv, art. i.

⁷³ III, lxxxiii, art. i ad 3.

as was supplied by the Council of Trent when it took care to distinguish between them as "incruentum" and "cruentum". For a while, however, this question of the identity of the victim in the sacrifices of the Cross and of the Altar lay dormant, till it was revived in the controversies of the sixteenth century, in which both sides started, whether to uphold or deny the Eucharistic Sacrifice, from the exclusive consideration of its relation to the Sacrifice of Calvary. The question then was as to the presence or absence in the Sacrament of Christ the One Victim. But from the fourteenth century onwards, Thomists and Scotists were busy with a discussion as to the degree of our Lord's participation therein as Priest. The Thomists, true to their master's principle that our Lord himself is both Priest and Victim, as on the Cross so at the Altar, held that he co-operated with his priests on earth in the Sacrifice of the Mass by an act of intelligence and will; that he himself is thus the real and immediate Consecrator; and that his servants here do but lend him their voice for the consecration, and determine by their intention the direction in which the benefits of the sacrifice are to be applied.⁷⁴ So Suarez,⁷⁵ later on: and they held the priest to be the minister not of the Church, but of Jesus Christ; and the Sacrifice of the Eucharist to have, as Christ's own Sacrifice, the same value as the Sacrifice of the Cross. De Lugo (1583-1660), notwithstanding some apparently discrepant language in another place,⁷⁶ observes truly enough that on any other theory than that our Lord thus perpetually wills to co-operate with his

⁷⁴ Vacant, *Histoire*, etc., p. 47.

⁷⁵ Suarez, *Disp.*, lxxvii, § 1, *Opera*, tom. xxi, pp. 689 seqq. Parisiis, 1866.

⁷⁶ *Infra*, p. 93.

earthly priests, his participation in the Mass would be only as legislator, not as priest: for in that case he is only concerned in the Eucharist as having instituted it, and it depends on a past and not on a present act and will of his. "Sacerdos, ut sacerdos, non habet instituere sacrificia, sed offerre illa; institutio autem pertinet ad legislatorem: et licet in Christo fuerit de facto utraque potestas, sed tamen ut legislator et princeps potuit instituere sacrificium, ut sacerdos vero offerre illud: ergo ratione solius institutionis non dicitur Christus nunc exercere officium Sacerdotis sed aliquid aliud addendum est, nimirum delegasse sibi ministros, per quorum manus ipse suum Sacerdotium exquere-tur."⁷⁷ This criticism was specially meant for, and applicable to, the Scotists, such as Biel and Hiquaeus. Developing Duns' assertion that our Lord, though the principal Priest in the Mass, does not co-operate therein immediately, i.e., by any act of will,⁷⁸ they held that Jesus Christ is only Priest in the Eucharist as having instituted it and then conferred upon human priests as his delegates, rather than as his representatives, the power to offer it.⁷⁹ From this they drew two important corollaries: first, that priests on earth are the ministers and instruments not of our Lord, but of the Church, so that they offer the sacrifice in dependence on the Church, to which our Lord entrusted it⁸⁰; and next, that the Mass, being thus no act of Christ himself, is of less value than the Sacrifice of the Cross.⁸¹

⁷⁷ *De Sacr. Euch.*, disp. xix, § vii, c. 95, *Opera*, tom. v, p. 329. Venetiis, 1751.

⁷⁸ *Quodlibet*. 20. *Opera*, tom. xii, p. 529. Lugduni, 1639.

⁷⁹ Biel, lect. 26, 27. Hiquaeus, *Comment. in Scotum*, lib. iv. *Sent.*, d. xiii, q. 2, *Opera*, tom. viii, pp. 831, 832. Lugduni, 1639.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 833.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 831, 832.

Conclusions such as these may detain us for a moment in passing; for they are of extreme interest in such modern controversies as that relating to the Christian Ministry, where the really vital question is whether the Ministry is from above or from below, whether it is an Order receiving its commission by transmission from Christ, or merely an office to which men are appointed only ultimately by him, but mediately and actually through the Church. One would have thought that the mere fact of the Gospels coming before the Acts, of the institution of the Christian Ministry having taken place as a nucleus for the founding of the Church,⁸² would have rendered it impossible to hold in any sort of way that the succession is in the Church, or that the Church received our Lord's Commission, and is his substitute, so that the Christian Priesthood has no more than a mediate guarantee from him. As to the consequences of such tenets, let the history of the medieval controversy speak. The Scotist view, on the one hand, assisted the development of such practical abuses in the Mass, as sprang from the substantive value attached to it, by leading men to look upon the Church with her priests and sacraments as having an absolute existence here

⁸² Cf. F. D. Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*, vol. ii, p. 148, ed. 2, 1842, and Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, e.g., pp. 222, 236. It would seem that the Ministry is prior to the Church, just as much as the Church is prior to the individual. For the latter point, see Archbishop Frederick Temple's sermon on "Individualism and Catholicism", in *Twelve Sermons preached at the Consecration of Truro Cathedral*, pp. 17-20; and for the former point, that the Commission was given to the Ministry, i.e., to the Apostles directly and exclusively, see Ellicott, *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord*, p. 398, n. 2; Gladstone, *Church Principles*, c. 5, p. 200, ed. 1840; and (if the writer may here acknowledge one among many obligations to the author) Bright, *The Law of Faith*, pp. 338-40.

and now, apart from her Lord; on the other hand, by denying our Lord's direct co-operation in the Mass as Priest, and pointing to its inferiority as a sacrifice to that of the Cross, the Scotists prepared men's minds for the merely negative teaching of Protestantism, which, rightly jealous for the uniqueness of the Sacrifice on Calvary in view of the Mass system which obscured it, wrongly but naturally threw itself for support upon Scotism, and denied in the Eucharist the existence of any sacrifice at all, and in the Church the very name or need of Priest.

It was, then, as a legacy from the preceding age that the discussions of the sixteenth century, relating to the Eucharist, were allowed on both sides to start solely from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross. This is the more surprising, if we consider the appeal so early made from the medieval to the primitive Church. In Scripture, though both occasion and context suggest death in connection with the institution with the institution of the Eucharist, "we must think not of *death*, but of *life through death*, as the essence of Christ's offering".⁸³ "The life of the flesh is in the blood."⁸⁴ "It is a fact worth noting, that the almost uniform practice of the Sacred Writers (exceptions can be easily explained) is to ascribe our salvation to the 'blood' not to the 'death' of Christ; and the two terms 'blood' and 'death' are not synonymous." So τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς διαθήκης⁸⁵ suggests an offering inclusive of far more than the Passion; though "where there is a covenant the death of him that made it must needs be

⁸³ Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, n. 56, p. 283, ed. 1884.

⁸⁴ Lev. 17, 11.

⁸⁵ Matt. 26. 28. Cf. Exod. 24. 8; Zech. 9. 11.

presented.”⁸⁶ So, too, the phrase *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* is in itself quite a general phrase. St Paul gives a separate clause as having been added specially to include the memorial of Christ’s death⁸⁷; but the substance of the *ἀνάμνησις* is connected logically with the offering of Christ’s life, as the mention of it goes grammatically with the Body and the Blood.⁸⁸ While there is thus sufficient authority for the common and early description of the Eucharist as the *ἀνάμνησις τοῦ πάθους*,⁸⁹ the Liturgies in expanding the phrase (*Μεμνήμενοι οὖν, κ.τ.λ.* “Unde et memores”, etc.) all commemorate our Lord as he is, in his incarnate and risen life. So Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the common voice of antiquity, sets forth Christ as he is, not Christ as he was, for the object of Christian faith and worship. Modern theologians on all sides have recognized this. Bishop Westcott says that “the Apostolic conception of the Resurrection is rather ‘the Lord lives’ than ‘the Lord was raised’.”⁹⁰ Dr Milligan holds that “the witness which the Church is to bear to her Lord is to be borne to him not only as the crucified, but the Risen Lord. It is not enough for her to witness to him as he was on earth; she must witness to him as he is in heaven.”⁹¹ So again, according to another writer, “the Christ in whom the Apostles believed, the Christ who created Christianity and sustained it, the Christ who was the object of that faith which makes the New Testa-

⁸⁶ Heb. 9. 16. See Westcott, ad loc.

⁸⁷ 1 Cor. 9. 26.

⁸⁸ Ibid. 24. 25.

⁸⁹ E.g., St Justini Mart., *Dial cum Tryphone*, c. 41, ed. Otto, vol. i, p. 138.

⁹⁰ *Gospel of the Resurrection*, App. ii, p. 294, ed. 4; cf. *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, pp. xiv seq.

⁹¹ *The Resurrection*, p. 203.

ment to this day the most living book in the world, was the risen Christ, the Lord of Glory. It was not Jesus the carpenter of Nazareth, it was not even Jesus the prophet of Galilee, nay, it was not even Christ crucified, as a person belonging to history and to the past; it was the crucified Christ, 'in the heavenly places'; the Lamb as it had been slain, 'standing in the midst of the throne', the Universal Redeemer as Universal Lord. It was one whose parting word to his own was, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. . . . Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world.'"⁹² Christians adore and offer in the Eucharist what they proclaim in the pulpit, not the neo-historic Christ who is now in process of being "recovered" or "reconceived" by the Latitudinarian or Socinian; not a mere message about the past work of an historic Christ for us which, if we listen to it, is enough to secure our acceptance before God, nay, even our salvation; but a Life which transcends any message about itself, a Person who could say of himself, "I am he that liveth and was dead",⁹³ and "Because I live ye shall live also".⁹⁴ "The Incarnate Son of God," writes Möhler, "who hath suffered, died, and risen again for our sins, being, according to his own teaching, present in the Eucharist, the Church from the beginning hath at his command substituted the Christ mysteriously present and visible only to the spiritual eye of faith, for the historical Christ now inaccessible to the corporeal senses."⁹⁵ But this ancient and modern way of looking at the Eucharist differs *toto caelo* from that which prevailed

⁹² Denney's *Studies in Theology*, p. 169.

⁹³ Rev. 1. 18.

⁹⁴ John 14. 19; cf. 6. 57.

⁹⁵ *Symbolism*, p. 238, Engl. tr., ed. 1894.

at the end of the Middle Ages, and in the sixteenth century. Then Papist and Protestant alike considered it in exclusive reference to the Cross. But this change was but part of a general tendency to isolate the Cross, which appears, for instance, on comparing St Athanasius' *De Incarnatione* with the *Cur Deus Homo* of St Anselm. The Divine Person of the Son is the cause of our salvation, according to St Athanasius⁹⁶: St Anselm makes all due to our Lord having freely offered what he does not actually owe to God, namely, his death.⁹⁷

2. In later medieval art.

The same tendency has a curious and striking exemplification in the history of Christian art. Until the twelfth century, all representations of the crucified form of our Lord are symbolical in treatment. The favourite figures are those of the Lamb, or the clothed and crowned Sufferer, Realism begins⁹⁸ with Cimabue (1240-1302) and Giotto (1266-1337), and the reliefs of Niccola Pisano (c. 1205-78). Even Fra Angelico (1387-1455), in his picture of the Crucifixion in the cloister of the Convent of St Mark, Florence, makes the blood issue from the feet in a conventional form,⁹⁹ and thus shows that he is not yet rid of the influence of earlier symbolism. The same progress from symbolism to realism is observable in the decoration of the altar, which affords an interesting illustration of the theological tendency to elevate the Passion above the Person of our Lord in the great act of Eucharistic worship. In the old basilicas, the associations of the altar are with our Lord in triumph. The normal decoration

⁹⁶ *De Inc.*, c. ix, ed. Robertson, p. 13.

⁹⁷ *Cur Deus Homo*, ii, 19, ed. Nutt, p. 135.

⁹⁸ *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, i, p. 512.

⁹⁹ Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, ii, p. 125.

of the conch of the apse, which is, of course, central, and dominates the whole church, is the figure of our Lord; sometimes standing among the clouds, as is characteristic of the great churches in Rome of the sixth to the ninth centuries (e.g., SS. Cosma e Damiano, S. Cecilia, S. Prassede, and S. Marco), sometimes enthroned; whether alone, as in S. Miniato at Florence (thirteenth century) and S. Marco at Venice (fourteenth century), or in the centre of a group of saints or angels, as in S. Pudenziana on the Esquiline (fourth century) and S. Vitale at Ravenna (sixth century).¹⁰⁰

This seated and glorified figure of our Lord, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ, it is technically called in Greek iconography, seems to be the usual decoration of the Byzantine apse; while a colossal half-length figure of our Lord is specially characteristic of the Norman basilicas in Sicily. To pass from the surroundings of the altar to the altar itself, it is enough to quote the following summary of the elaborate evidence given in a paper by Mr Brightman (from which I have already borrowed considerably) on "The Cross in relation to the Altar". "Speaking generally," he says, "in the West the Cross, when it occurred, was first on the ciborium, or hanging from its vault with the corona, or stood beside the altar; by the thirteenth century at least, it was sometimes placed on the altar or the re-table, but this only gradually became general, and was not *de rigueur* till the beginning of the seventeenth century."¹⁰¹ At the same time, the retention of the crucifix or cross and lights among

¹⁰⁰ *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, sub voce "Mosaics", ii, p. 1322; and *Transactions of St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, vol. iii, pt. ii, pp. 105 seqq. A paper on "The Cross in its Relation to the Altar", by F. E. Brightman.

¹⁰¹ Missal of Clement VIII, Rubricae generales missalis, c. 20.

the Lutherans of Germany and Scandinavia seems to imply that it was very general in the sixteenth century."¹⁰² Thus it would appear, not only from the history of Christian theology but of Christian art, its handmaid, from the doctrinal presuppositions of the Mass-system as well as from the association of the Crucifix with the altar toward the end of the Middle Ages, that religious feeling tended to view the Mass in exclusive relation to the Passion. No sooner then was the usual system of devotion with the Mass at its centre exposed to attack, than the question was raised, "What, then, is the relation of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist to the Sacrifice of the Cross?" The medievalist tended in practice, and even in doctrine, to represent the altar as superseding the Cross. The Protestant denied the Sacrifice of the Mass to secure the Sacrifice of Calvary. When the Council of Trent met (1545), this was the situation with which it had to deal.

3. In the sixteenth century—the meaning of "sacrifice".

It was in 1523 that Luther brought to a head his attack on the Mass in the *De abroganda Missa Privata* and the *Formula Missae*. In the latter treatise,¹⁰³ which laid down the lines on which the future Lutheran worship was to be conducted, he accepts the Mass as it stands, and proposes to retain it all but the Offertory and the Canon. "Tota illa abominatio" is the best he had to say of this section of the Mass; and the secret of his wrath against it is that on it had been erected the whole edifice of the Mass-system. He does not stop to notice that the Canon of the Mass itself is incompatible

¹⁰² *Transactions of St Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, vol. iii, pt. ii, pp. 105 seqq.

¹⁰³ See it in Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, ii, pp. 80 seqq.

with the Sacrifices of Masses and the current doctrine of the Mass that went with them. He condemns both together, Canon and all. "Loquor autem de Canone illo lacero et abominabili, ex multorum lacunis seu sentina collecto, ibi cepit missa sacrificium, ibi addita offertoria et collectae mercenariae. Tum cepit missa esse monopolium sacerdotale, totius mundi opes exhauriens, divites, ociosos, potentes et voluptuarios et immundos illos coelibes toto orbe ceu vastitatem ultimam exundans. Hinc Missae pro defunctis, pro itineribus, pro opibus. Et quis illos totulos solos numeret, quorum missa facta est sacrificium."¹⁰⁴ So he would retain anything out of the Mass-book except the sacrifice. That should not even be named, "modo sacrificii aut operis titulo non polluat^{ur}".¹⁰⁵ Now this phrase indicates his point of view. He has no idea, any more perhaps than the majority of his contemporaries,¹⁰⁶ of a sacrifice that is not satisfactory, a "sacrificium" which is not synonymous with an "opus". Luther was a destroyer, not a scholar. Rather than examine and, if necessary, reset the later medieval conception of sacrifice, he was for abolishing the notion of sacrifice in the Eucharist altogether. In so doing, he, and Calvin¹⁰⁷ after him, who starts from the rejection of Priesthood, and is quite reckless in abuse, laid themselves open to the charge of denying part of the primitive and Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist; and, on this point, left the Council of Trent in sole possession of the field.

What, then, had the Council of Trent to contribute to the settlement of Eucharistic doctrine so far as it

¹⁰⁴ *Codex Liturgicus*, ii, p. 82.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. the Lutheran Ambassadors of 1538, *supra*. p. 13.

¹⁰⁷ *Institutio*, iv, 18, p. 441, ed. Tholuck, Berolini, 1846.

concerns the sacrifice? As to what was required of it, the Council, on the one hand, had simply to insist, as against the Reformers abroad, that the Eucharist had from antiquity been regarded as a sacrifice, and not merely as a commemorative feast. On the other hand, as Dr Mozley has pointed out, it had to cover with its mantle the practical system of Masses in the later Middle Ages by protecting the doctrines on which it rested.

The popular belief of later times exaggerated the Eucharistic Sacrifice till it became, to all intents and purpose, a real one, and "the priest(s) offered up Christ on the altar for quick and dead to have remission of pain and guilt"; that is to say, offered him up as a Victim, in a sense which could not be distinguished from that in which he was offered up by himself upon the Cross. It is true that the decree of the Council of Trent just saves itself by cautious, not to say dissembling, language, from the extreme and monstrous conclusion that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the very same with that upon the Cross. It distinguishes between a bloody and an unbloody oblation; and it states that the fruits or consequences of the Bloody Oblation or the Sacrifice on the Cross, are "received through the unbloody one"—"Oblationis cruentae fructus per hanc incruentam percipiuntur"¹⁰⁸: but at the same time it asserts that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a really *propitiatory sacrifice*—*vere propitiatorium*. Now undoubtedly there are two distinct senses in which an act may be said to be propitiatory. . . . There is an original propitiation and a borrowed propitiation, a first propitiation and a secondary one. Why, then, did the Fathers of Trent, when they had all human language at their command, deliberately choose to call the Sacrifice of the Mass *vere propitiatorium*? They may have said that it was *vere propitiatorium* in the secondary sense; but no one can fail to see the misleading effect of such language, and that nothing could have been

¹⁰⁸ Sess. xxii, cap. 2, *Canones et Decreta*, p. 118.

easier to the divines of Trent, had they chosen, than to draw a far more clear distinction than they did between the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice on the Cross. It is evident that, as ecclesiastical statesmen, they were afraid of interfering with the broad popular established view of the Mass, while as theologians they just contrived to secure themselves from the responsibility of a monstrous dogmatic statement.¹⁰⁹

Now, both the proceedings and the decisions of the Council of Trent, so far as they relate to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, bear traces of this double end in view. "La question du sacrifice de la messe y fut étudié", writes Dr Vacant, "à deux reprises, en 1551 et en 1562, dans de nombreuses congrégations préparatoires; mais chaque fois l'attention des théologiens et de Pères se porta principalement sur ces deux points: que la messe est une oblation du corps de Jésus-Christ faite à Dieu et qu'elle a une valeur satisfactoire."¹¹⁰ But in making good these assertions, the first as against the Protestant, the second in favour of the popular system, the Council gave its decisions partly in a moderate but also in a more unqualified tone. Any reader of the dogmatic chapters on the subject of the Sacrifice of the Mass would perceive that they are sufficiently summed up in the following propositions:

(a) Our Lord once offered himself on the Cross for our redemption: "semel se ipsum in ara crucis, morte intercedente, Deo Patri oblaturus erat, ut aeternam illic redemptionem operaretur."¹¹¹

(b) The Mass is the representation of that offering till he come: "relinqueret sacrificium, quo cruentum illud semel in cruce peragendum repraesentaretur,

¹⁰⁹ Mozley, *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, pp. 216 seq.

¹¹⁰ *Histoire*, etc., p. 50.

¹¹¹ Sess. xxiii, cap. 1, *Canones et Decreta*, p. 117.

ejusque memoria in finem usque saeculi permaneret."¹¹³

(c) It is the same victim offered by the same priest, only after a different manner: "Et quoniam in divino hoc sacrificio, quod in missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur, et incruente immolatur, qui in ara crucis semel se ipsum cruenta obtulit."¹¹³

(d) As such, it is propitiatory, as appeasing God and applying the virtue of the one sacrifice to those who have the right disposition:

sacrificium istud vere propitiatorium esse per ipsumque fieri ut, si cum vero corde et recta fide, cum metu et reverentia, contriti ac poenitentes ad Deum accedamus, misericordiam consequamur, et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio opportuno Hujus quippe oblatione placatus Dominus . . . peccata . . . dimittit. Una enim eademque est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui se ipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, solo offerendi ratione diversa. Cujus quidem oblationis cruentae, inquam, fructus per hanc incruentam uberrime percipiuntur, tantum abest ut illi per hanc quovis modo derogetur.¹¹⁴

This is temperate language, easily justifiable from antiquity; for the context of "vere propitiatorium" seems to suggest a borrowed propitiation only. But appended to the dogmatic chapters are the canons, which certainly give to the Mass a more absolute character, and make it more independent of the Cross. Canon I runs, "Si quis dixerit, in missa non offerri Deo *verum et proprium sacrificium* . . . anathema sit¹¹⁵; and Canon III, "Si quis dixerit, missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid., cap. 2, p. 118.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p. 120.

propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumentis; neque pro vivis et defunctis pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit."¹¹⁶ We are prepared to find that there is no allusion to the connection of the Sacrifice of the Mass with our Lord's present work in heaven, either in the chapters or the canons; but making every allowance for the difference in tone between short anathemas and careful expositions, due to the isolation of the one and the orderly progress of the other, the addition of such a phrase as "verum et proprium sacrificium" is significant of a desire to cover a maximum as well as to enforce a minimum of belief upon the reality of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

4. Since the sixteenth century—minimizers and maximizers in explanation of a "Verum et proprium sacrificium".

Since the sixteenth century, therefore, maximizers and minimizers divide the field of Roman theology about the Eucharist. The Council by the text of its decisions left it open to interpret the chapters by the canons or the canons by the chapters. But more than this, it raised the further question in debate, which it wisely refused to answer in its formularies, as to what constitutes a "verum et proprium sacrificium". Most of the theologians present inclined to hold with St Thomas that the physical modification of the victim is essential to sacrifice.¹¹⁷ And thus the introduction of

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Le Plat, *Monument. Conc. Trid.*, vol. iv, p. 341, Lovanii, 1784: "Est igitur Christus in sacra eucharistia sacrificium ut in ea est, et proprie sacrificium, quod sit, quando id quod offertur afficitur intrinsecus aliqua qualitate vel nova dispositione."

the phrase, "Verum et proprium sacrificium", naturally followed by a demand for its explanation, opened up a discussion which has continued ever since.

I. The minimizers fall into two classes, the first of which (1) ignores the need for such change altogether.

Thus (a) Salmeron¹¹⁸ (1515-85) defines sacrifice as a "res sensibilis soli Deo oblata per mysticam actionem". In the Eucharist the "res" is our Lord present under the species of Bread and Wine, the "mystica actio" being the consecration. What constitutes the sacrifice, however, is not any change affecting the Person of Christ, but merely the fact that in the consecrated species our Lord exists sacramentally in a divided mode of existence, "sub diversis speciebus". The living victim is thus not really slain, but only in mystery. That is enough to express or commemorate the Cross and Passion.¹¹⁹ On this theory there is no repetition of the one oblation once offered; and the Tridentine chapters are taken as the limit of the accompanying anathemas.

(b) Again, Vasquez¹²⁰ (1551-1604) would not admit any real immolation of Christ in the Eucharist, but only the presentation of the victim.¹²¹ But this, he argued, was sufficient to constitute a sacrifice. For sacrifice, as he held, is of two kinds.¹²² There is first the absolute sacrifice, such as has a value of its own, for which it depends upon a real destruction of the victim taking place in the course of it. There is next the rela-

¹¹⁸ *Comment. Tractatus XXIX, Opera*, tom. ix, pp. 216 seqq., especially p. 225. Coloniae, 1604.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ *In tert. part.*, disp. 220 seqq., *Opera*, tom. vii, pp. 611 seqq. Compluti, 1613; cf. Perrone's exposition of him, *Praelect. Theol.*, vol. ii, pp. 243 seqq. Parisiis, 1842.

¹²¹ Disp. 222, c. 6, *ibid.*, p. 648.

¹²² Disp. 220, c. 3, *ibid.*, p. 619; cf. 222, c. 8.

tive sacrifice, which derives its value from standing in connection with an absolute sacrifice, and consists simply in the presentation of a victim formerly destroyed, provided, however, that it retains some "nota"¹²³ of the change previously effected. The Cross and the Mass therefore stand to each other as the absolute to the relative sacrifice. In the latter,¹²⁴ the commemoration of the death of our Lord is a sufficient "nota", and the "nota", consists in the separate consecration of either species. Vasquez thus goes back to the theory of a representative and commemorative sacrifice common with the Schoolmen before St Thomas' day. From the later point of view, as Dr Vacant observes, "il ne se conformait pas assez à la conception moderne qui faisait consister le sacrifice dans une immolation physique de la victime".¹²⁵ We do, indeed, find him accepting the definition, "Sacrificium est res quae per sui immutationem Deo offertur".¹²⁶ But with him it is applied in its strictness not to the Mass, but only to the Cross. Thus Vasquez threw himself across the already well-established current of speculation, which sought to find in the consecration a change that could be regarded as a real act of sacrifice. But before we come to mention this hardier type of divine who is determined to find an immolation in the

¹²³ "Sacrificium est nota existens in re, qua profitemur Deum auctorem vitae et mortis", disp. 220, c. 3, *ibid.*, p. 618. This definition is "ex parte forma".

¹²⁴ Cf. Perrone's exposition of Vasquez, "Cujusmodi (sc. relative) est sacrificium missae, quod refertur ad sacrificium crucis, cuius commemorationem imo et repraesentationem prae se fert per duarum specierum consecrationem seu mysticam immolationem". *Praelect. Theol.*, ii, p. 245, ed. Migne. Parisiis, 1842.

¹²⁵ *Histoire*, etc., p. 56.

¹²⁶ Vasquez, disp. 220, c. 3, p. 618, "ex parte materiae".

Mass which shall at once be real and yet not involve a repetition of Christ's death, we have to take note of (2) a second class of minimizers, who, accepting like Vasquez the position that sacrifice involves a change in the victim, and applying it, unlike him, to the Sacrifice of the Mass, explain the change as virtually affecting merely the material elements or even the exterior actions of the rite.

(a) Melchior Canus¹²⁷ (1506-60), for instance, who had himself been present in 1551, when the theologians were discussing the Eucharist at the Council of Trent,¹²⁷ held that the fraction of the consecrated host satisfied the requirements of destruction, and so constituted a true sacrifice.¹²⁸ In this opinion he believed that he was merely following St Thomas.¹²⁹ But the obvious objection is that this is a destruction which does not touch the sacred Victim himself; and occurs, moreover, not in connection with the consecration, but in a rite subordinate to and preparatory for the Communion.

(b) Bellarmine¹³⁰ (1542-1621) therefore endeavoured to improve upon Melchior Canus by seeking to place the requisite change in the consecration and Communion taken together. In consecration, he taught, three things take place. Bread and wine, or "res prophana, fit sacra". The thing so hallowed is offered to God by being placed upon the altar. The thing to offered is by the consecration directed ("ordinatur") to a real change which is consummated by the act of Communion. Both consecration and Communion are thus

¹²⁷ Massarelli, *Acta Conc. Trid.*, tom. i, pp. 608, 609. Agram, 1874.

¹²⁸ *De locis theologicis*, lib. xii, c. 13, *Opera*, p. 567. Parisiis, 1704.

¹²⁹ *Summa*, II, ii, 85, 3 ad 3.

¹³⁰ *De Euch.*, V, i, seu lib. 1 de *Missa*, *Opera*, tom. iii, coll. 779 seqq. Coloniae, 1619.

necessary to sacrifice, the first to put the victim in a condition for immolation or destruction, the second to complete it.¹³¹ But this again was to depart from the principle that the consecration is the all-important act, and that Christ is the offerer. And again, Bellarmine, though he provides in this way for some kind of change in the victim taking place during the rite, does not formally include its destruction as an essential element in his definition of sacrifice: "Sacrificium est oblatio externa facta soli Deo, qua ad agnitionem humanae infirmitatis et professionem divinae majestatis a legitimo ministro res aliqua sensibilis et permanens ritu mystico consecratur et transmutatur."¹³²

(c) There remains Suarez (1548-1617), who deservedly occupies a high rank among the more moderate thinkers of the Roman Church upon the subject of the Eucharist in the sixteenth century. He develops his theory of sacrifice in his Commentary on the third part of the *Summa*, which was published 1590-99.¹³³ It is enough to constitute a "verum et proprium sacrificium" if the physical modification of the victim be productive only and not destructive. Sacrifice, he argued, is an outward ("sensibilis") action whose purpose is to acknowledge the sovereign excellence of God; but a productive act is as capable of serving this end as one that is destructive. In the Eucharist, then, it is not the destruction that is aimed at *per se*, but the bringing about of something else than the original matter of the sacrifice, i.e., the "effectio et praesentatio corporis et

¹³¹ *De Missa*, i, c. 27, *Opera*, tom. iii, col. 873.

¹³² *Ibid.*, c. 2, *Opera*, tom. iii, col. 790.

¹³³ Suarez, *In tert. part.*, disp. 73-9, *Opera*, tom. xxi, pp. 601 seqq., especially d. 73, § 6, n. 3; d. 74, § 1, n. 12; d. 75, § 5, n. 6, and § 6, nn. 9, 13. Paris, 1866.

sanguinis Christi super altare Dei in honorem ejus".¹³⁴ This is the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and this is exactly what constitutes its superiority over the sacrifices of the old Covenant. Here, in the Sacrifice of the new Covenant, it is not the original matter which is principally offered but that which the matter becomes.

What, then, shall we say of the minimizers as a whole? Some ignore the necessity for a change taking place in the victim altogether. Others seek to provide for it. But both classes alike try to find an act of sacrifice in the process of making the victim present. The mystical action with its *notae* of a past victim-condition, or the introduction and perfecting, by consecration and communion, of the victim, is all they contend for. In this way, God's absolute dominion over life and death is, they think, adequately acknowledged; and this is all that is required for a true sacrifice. If the Roman Church were to put the theory of the Sacrifice of the Mass simply, as Perrone (1794-1876), a follower of Vasquez, the typical minimizer, has put it in modern times, Article XXXI might be blotted out of our remembrance; for the later medieval notions which involved the repetition of the one sacrifice would then have been disowned. His words are: "Sic ut eidem exemplo sacrificii Missae inhaereamus, per distinctam utriusque speciei consecrationem Christus ipse praesens sistitur absque reali sui immutatione, attamen ut victima. Per hanc enim hostiae veluti immolatae praesentiam Deus ut vitae et mortis auctor colitur, in quo vera sacrificii ratio, uti innuimus, consistit. Enim vero hac mystica immolatione Christus illud idem ex-

¹³⁴ Suarez, *In tert. part.*, disp. 75, § 5, *Opera*, tom. xxi, p. 667.

hibet sacrificium quod reali sanguinis effusione in cruce consummavit."¹³⁵ With such a theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Anglican formularies have no quarrel, for the offering involves no repeated slaying of the One Victim once offered upon the Cross; and, moreover, those who hold this theory recognize, with more or less directness, the special relation between the Eucharist and the self-oblation of our Lord in heaven.¹³⁶ This maximizers explicitly deny. De Lugo does not hesitate to say that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist could be pleaded effectually on earth, supposing, *per impossibile*, that our great High Priest were asleep at the side of the Father: "licet Christus nunc non attenderet, nec sciret, imo licet per possibile vel impossibile dormiret, quando offertur hoc sacrificium, adhuc diceretur offerri a Christo, sicut dicitur Rex praestare abedientiam Pontifici, quando eam praestat Legatus, licet tunc Rex dormiat, vel con cogitet de hoc . . . Vere ergo nunc offert Christus, quia Sacerdos ex Christi institutione offert nomine Christi, etc."¹³⁷ Christ's actual concurrence, in other words, is not now necessary. So, according to Franzelin, "Oblatio sacrificii Christi non est in coelo; est tamen Christi apud Patrem interpellatio sacerdotalis".¹³⁸ But so far from this intercession being the basis of the Eucharistic Offering, that is an act of an independent kind, moving in its own sphere on earth—morally, indeed, Christ's act, but really and

¹³⁵ Perrone, *Praelectiones Theologicae*, ii, p. 246, 'ed. Migne, Parisiis, 1842.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, i, col. 1129; and cf. Thomassinus, *De Inc. Lib.*, x, c. 121, tom. i, pp. 642-4. Venice, 1730.

¹³⁷ De Lugo, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, disp. xix, § vii, n. 93, *Opera*, tom. v, p. 329. Venetiis, 1751.

¹³⁸ *De Verbo Incarnato*, thesis li, pp. 534-47. Romae, 1868.

actually that of the priest. "Christus ut sacerdos princeps per suos ministros perpetuo sacrificat, et ut victima sacrificatur non in coelo sed in nostris altari-bus."¹³⁹ Thus the dominant Roman theory of the Mass, though in harmony with the rest of the Roman system which makes of the Church an independent organism, with the Pope, not Christ, for its head, and communion with him, not the Unity of the Spirit,¹⁴⁰ its bond of peace, is at variance with that conception of our worship as being now mystically conducted at the Heavenly Altar which, as at the *Sursum Corda*, *Sanctus*, and *Great Oblation*, everywhere pervades the ancient and Catholic Liturgies, even the Roman; and which finds its noblest English expression in some of Wesley's hymns.¹⁴¹ In the Roman Communion the maximizers hold the ground; and they have perpetuated not the primitive, but the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

II. The maximizers agree in holding that in some sense Christ is destroyed or suffers change in every Mass. They do not differ much even from Vasquez in their definition of sacrifice; and Franzelin gives Vasquez' definitions with approval, e.g., "sacrificium est mutatio rei, quae Deo offertur",¹⁴² adding, "a quibus minime nos dissentire patet".¹⁴³ But they insist that the act of destruction must always be a present ("hic et nunc") destruction. Thus "they maintain that the Holy

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Eph. 4.

¹⁴¹ E.g., "Victim Divine, thy grace we claim", *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 556, and for the same thought, cf. Dr Bright's hymn (No. 315), "Once, only once, and once for all".

¹⁴² Vasquez, disp. 220, art. i, *Opera*, tom. vvii, p. 618. Compluti, 1613.

¹⁴³ Franzelin, *De Sacrr. Euch.*, p. 306. Romae, 1868.

Eucharist is a distinct sacrifice in itself, and that it does not derive its sacrificial character from its relation to the sacrifice of the Cross: and most of them find its distinctive sacrificial character in the act of consecration, whereby, through the instrumentality of the human priest, the High Priest after the Order of Melchizedek places himself before God under the Eucharistic species in a victim-condition".¹⁴⁴ We will take two examples only, the one a Divine of the seventeenth, the other of this present century.

(i) De Lugo (1583-1660) was the great exponent of this theory, and as such the heir of the beliefs of the later Middle Ages; for his view involves a repetition of the sufferings of Christ at each Mass. He is at one with Vasquez and Suarez in taking sacrifice to be the recognition on our part of God's supreme dominion: "In primis certum est, per sacrificium, sicut per omnes alios cultus, significari internam animi submissionem, significari etiam supremam excellentiam."¹⁴⁵ Vasquez, however, thought it enough to say that sacrifice is a recognition of "potestatem supremam Dei in vitam et mortem nostram"; but De Lugo adds that sacrifice is an admission of these sovereign rights of God in a peculiar way. It is not mere tribute or homage. "Significat ergo sacrificium aliquid aliud, et alio modo, per quod differt ab omni alio cultu, in primis ex parte rei significatae, quia significat, dignum esse Deum, in cuius honorem nostra vita consumatur; ex parte vero modi, quia hoc ipsum significat *per destructionem aliqujus rei*, per quam explicamus affectum nostrae

¹⁴⁴ *Guardian*, 22 September 1897, p. 1458.

¹⁴⁵ *De Sacr. Euch.*, disp. xix, § 1, n. 3, *Opera*, tom. v, p. 318. Venetiis, 1751.

destructionis, si ad cultum Dei licita esset, vel necessaria."¹⁴⁶ Sacrifice in general, therefore, requires the destruction of the victim as testimony to the worthiness of God in whose honour the life is forfeited. But then destruction does not necessarily involve simple annihilation, but only destruction relative to human use. Thus a libation is a sacrifice; but it implies only the waste or loss of the wine, not its actual desition. "Adverto, quando ad rationem veri sacrificii exigimus destructionem hostiae, nomine *destructionis* non semper intelligi physicam, vel metaphysicam corruptionem substantialem hostiae, sed destructionem vel physicam, vel humanam; ita ut ex vi sacrificiationis, hostia, prout est in termino illius actionis, habeat *statum* aliquem *declivorem*, et saltem humano modo desierit."¹⁴⁷ Thus by consecration the body of Christ is destroyed "humano modo". It assumes "a lower condition", the inanimate condition of meat and drink, so that it is rendered worthless for the ordinary uses of a human body. This, then, is the induced victim-state which sufficiently corresponds to the essentials of sacrifice; for our Lord's Eucharistic Presence thus involves a lowering of the condition of his glorified human Body. It De Lugo's own words: "Hoc supposito" (viz, the possibility of "destruction" without corruption) "facile erit explicare, quomodo consecratione ipsa sacrificetur corpus Christi; nam licet ipsa consecratione non destruat substantialiter, sed tamen destruitur humano modo, quatenus accipit statum declivorem, et talem, quo reddatur inutile ad usus humanos corporis humani, et aptum ad alios diversos usus per modum cibi: quare humano modo idem est, ac si fieret verus

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, n. 6.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, disp. xix, § v, n. 65, p. 325.

panis, et aptaretur, et condiretur in cibum; quae mutatio sufficiens est ad verum sacrificium; fieri enim comestibile illud, quod non erat comestibile, et ita fieri comestibile, ut jam non sit utile ad alios usus, nisi per modum cibi, major mutatio est quam aliae, quae ex communi hominum mente sufficiebant ad verum sacrificium."¹⁴⁸ No exposition of what constitutes a "verum et proprium sacrificium" in the Mass could be more ingenious; but with all its ingenuity, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that on this theory Christ suffers again in each Mass.

(ii) Franzelin (1815-86), the great disciple of De Lugo, who with his master holds the field in the current teaching of the Roman Church to-day, has taken up this theory and gained for it wide acceptance.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., n. 67.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. *The Worship of Sacrifice*, by Rev. W. B. J. Richards, D.D., Oblate of St Charles' (fifth edition, Burns & Oates):

Q. Must the victim be destroyed in the act of sacrifice?

A. The victim in every sacrifice must undergo death, destruction, or change, according to the circumstances and nature of the offering.

Q. How can Christ be said to die in the Mass?

A. Although Christ does not die again in a natural manner, yet in the Mass he dies mystically, and undergoes what would be death but for his risen and glorified state.

Q. Explain this more fully.

Then follows the "explanation"—a darkening of counsel, in language at once offensive and meaningless and singularly inappropriate in a popular manual. Cardinal Vaughan also, in his Lenten Pastoral, 1895, illustrates the present influence, and the difficulties, of de Lugo's teaching: "Now as to the actual Sacrifice. It is not necessary for the purpose of Sacrifice that the Victim be physically destroyed or really slain. It suffices that a change takes place denoting the absolute power and dominion of God, such as shall in the moral estimation of men be equivalent to destruction. Now by the words of consecration, Christ, in his human and divine natures, is really laid upon the Altar as a Victim under the form of food. 'Although by the consecration Christ is not substantially destroyed, he is nevertheless destroyed *in so far as* he takes upon himself an inferior con-

Jam consideretur quaeso status in quo Christus Dominus summus sacerdos per consecrationem secundum ss. corpus et sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis et vini sese ut victima constituit. . . . Dat seipsum Ecclesiae suae per suos ministros sacerdotes constituendum corpore et sanguine sui in tali modo existendi sub speciebus panis et vini, ut vere sit in statu cibi et potus: ut (formaliter quatenus constituitur sub his speciebus) desinat omnis actus connaturalis vitae corporeae pendens a sensibus; ut nihil secundum corpus possit agere connaturaliter: ut corpus ejus ac sanguis in quantum praesentia ejus alligatur speciebus, permittatur quodammodo arbitrio creaturarum non secus ac si esset res inanimata; in tali vero conditione se constituit ut ipse summus sacerdos . . . exprimat . . . supremum Dei dominium et absolutam dependentiam omnis creaturae et simul . . . exhibeat satisfactionem pro reatibus olim consummatam in cruce hujus ipsius corporis traditione et hujus sanguinis effusione. At qui talis "exinanitio" [cf. De Lugo's "status declivior"] ad exprimendam majestatem absoluti dominii Dei et satisfactionem pro reatibus nostris morte completam non solum satis intelligitur ut vere et proprie sacrificialis; sed etiam, excepto sacrificio cruento in cruce, nullam sublimiorem ac profundiorum rationem veri et proprii sacrificii concipere possumus. Non ergo est dubium, in

dition—a condition inapt for the human uses of his Body—a condition under which he becomes eatable as food. This change', says Cardinal de Lugo, 'is sufficient for a true sacrifice.' But the Act of Sacrifice takes place in the twofold consecration. The words of Christ over the bread and the wine respectively are the instrument, the Knife effecting the Sacrifice and the mystic death. The word of God, 'sharper than any two-edged sword', is operative and creative. Christ indeed dies now no more; but by the mystical separation of the Body from the Blood, the character and sign of death are impressed upon the Divine Victim. . . . Be on your guard, however, against the notion that our Lord lies dormant or inanimate in the Sacred Host. No, he is a living Host, that is, a living Victim, under this Sacramental mode of existence." *Tablet*, 2 March 1895, p. 352. There is however, a better view propounded in *L'idée du sacrifice, dans la religion chrétienne, par l'abbé M. Lepin*, Paris, 1897, from other quarters in the Roman Church.

ipso modo existendi sacramentali corporis et sanguinis Christi aptitudinem et supposita institutione actualem significationem sacrificalem, et proinde rationem intrinsecam veri et proprii sacrificii non solum sufficienter sed etiam insigniter contineri.¹⁵⁰

In all this, then—in our Lord's presence as if an "inanimate thing", in a non-natural condition such that his Body cannot act on, or be reacted on by, its surroundings, in this κείνωσις or "declivior status" by which he places himself completely at the disposal of his servants—Franzelin sees the state of a victim abundantly realized, and so an actual sacrifice literally provided for. It would not be true to say that he conceives of the dead Christ as the Victim of the altar; but it is impossible to take this language to mean anything but that Christ in the Sacrifice of the Mass is present as dead. The maximizers, in short, "all agree in holding that the Holy Eucharist is not a real sacrifice in virtue of its representing our Lord's victim condition on the Cross but exclusively in virtue of an induced victim condition under the Eucharistic species; and therefore that the Holy Eucharist must be regarded as a distinct sacrifice in itself, apart from its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross; and we quite admit that this conception of the Holy Eucharist, as an additional sacrifice to the Sacrifice of the Cross, was emphatically rejected in the Church of England at the time of the Reformation, mainly on the ground that it implies a source of merit and satisfaction other than the Cross. This implication is, of course, repudiated by Roman theologians, but the objection was not altogether unreasonable, and it seemed justified by popular language on the subject."¹⁵¹

¹⁵⁰ *De SS Euch.*, pp. 380, 381. Romae, 1868.

¹⁵¹ *Guardian*, 22 September 1897, p. 1458.

in the sixteenth century; nor is it out of place now, so long as the school of Franzelin holds sway.

(ii) *Suggested criticism of the "destruction" theory, in conclusion*

The doctrine is open to criticism on several grounds. Sacrifice, if it consisted in destruction or mutation of the victim, was offered by the worshipper, not by the priest.¹⁵² The Old Testament sacrifices are sufficiently described as gifts to secure God's favour, to appease his wrath, or as thank- and tribute-offerings; but the aim of the most primitive and greatest of all, the Peace Offering, was to enter into Communion with him by sharing the sacrificial meal with him, or renewing a life-bond in the blood of a sacred victim.¹⁵³ Even the Sin Offering, "so far from terminating with the death of the victim, or being occupied solely with the idea of death (i.e., destruction), had special regard to the life of the victim and to the presentation of that life to God . . . not death, but life through death was the meaning of the sacrifice",¹⁵⁴ and the Roman theory of the Mass "proceeds upon the erroneous idea that the exalted

¹⁵² Lev. 1. 5; cf. Otley, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 236, "This was performed by the offerer, not by the priest". The priest only slew the victim when he was also the offerer, either for the whole people as its representative (Day of Atonement) or for himself.

¹⁵³ Cf. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 331, ed. 1889. Cf. "Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur, ut sancta societate inhaeremus Deo." St Aug., *De Civitate Dei*, lib. x, c. vi, *Opera*, tom. vii, col. 242, ed. Ben. Parisiis, 1685.

¹⁵⁴ Milligan, *The Resurrection*, p. 282; cf. Otley, p. 237. "Indeed it is clear that the significant part of the ceremony was not thought to lie 'in the death of the victim, but in the application of its life blood'." The quotation is from *Religion of the Semites*, p. 319.

Lord is now presenting himself to God in his death, instead of in his life won through death".¹⁵⁵ As to the "declivor status" or induced victim-condition of Christ upon the altar, which has thus been substituted for the Self-Oblation of the High Priest in the heavens, it is definitely excluded by the language of St Paul, who makes the Cross the limit of the κένωσις,¹⁵⁶ as well as by the voice of the ancient Liturgies, which are not compatible with the conception that the Sacramental Presence involves any modification of his glory. But to pursue these lines of criticism would be to stray beyond the limits of the subject. It is plain that in the prevalent interpretation by the Roman Church of her "verum et proprium sacrificium", we have surviving to this day a direct legacy from the later medieval doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Yet this doctrine is based on a theory of sacrifice which cannot be accepted as final. The attack upon Anglican Orders has already led English theologians to vindicate the wider conception of Priesthood, as set forth in the Ordinal, by a fresh appeal to Scripture and antiquity.¹⁵⁷ The day is now open for scholars to complete the reply by a similar vindication of the broader and truer notions of sacrifice, which the Church of the first ages derived from older dispensations and carried to final development in her Eucharistic Worship. Here it has merely been shown that to require the destruction of the victim as the constitutive element in sacri-

¹⁵⁵ Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

¹⁵⁶ Phil. 2. 8.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. *Priesthood in the English Church*, No. XLI of the Church Historical Society's Publications: and Dr Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood*.

fi¹⁵⁸ is to elevate an accessory into an essential, and to measure the theology of sacrifice by the narrow and unhistorical standards of a later age.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Franzelin's definition: "Oblatio Deo facta rei sensibilis, per ejusdem realem vel aequivalentem destructionem, legitime instituta ad agnoscendum supremum Dei dominium, et, pro statu lapso, ad profitendum divinam justitiam hominisque reatum." *Tract. de SS. Euch. Sacramento et Sacrificio*, IIa pars, de Sacrif. Th. ii.

INDEX

- Albertus Magnus, 36, 61, 62
 Alcuin, 33
 Alexander VII, Pope, 30
 Alexander of Hales, 36
 Angelus, 29
 Anselm, St, 37, 80
 Anspach, Peter, 56
 Articles, The Thirteen, 45
 Athanasius, St, 80
 Augsburg, Confession of, 29, 31,
 46, 48, 55
 Augustine, St, 100 *n.* 2
 Bellarmine, 56, 70, 91
 Berengarius, 34
 Bickersteth, Bishop Edward, 21
n. 4
 Biel, Gabriel, 29, 36, 47, 49 sqq.,
 54, 75
 Bonaventura, St, 36
 Bossuet, 55
 Bramhall, 25 *n.* 3
 Bright, Dr, 19 *n.* 2, 76 *n.* 1, 94
n. 3
 Brightman, F. E., 35 *n.* 1, 81 *n.* 1
 Caietan, 30 *n.* 2, 53 sq.
 Calvin, 83
 Catherinus 58, 61, 63 sqq., 66 sqq.
 Chantries, 25, 26 sqq.
 Cimabue, 80
 Cornelius, 11
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 18 sqq.,
 21, 22 sqq., 28
 Creighton, Bishop, 51
 De Lugo, 30 *n.* 3, 74 sq., 93,
 95 sqq.
 Denney, Dr, 79 *n.* 1
 Denny and Lacey, 68 *n.* 2
 Dens, 44 *n.* 2
 Dimock, N., 16 sq. *nn.*, 48 *n.* 3,
 55 *n.* 3, 56 *n.* 1, 62 *n.* 2, 67 *n.* 1,
 69 *nn.* 2, 3
 Dionysius Carthusianus, 36 sq.,
 42 *n.* 1
 Dixon, R. W., 9 *n.* 3, 44 *n.* 2,
 52 *n.* 2
 Duns Scotus, 37, 75
 Ellicott, Bishop, 76 *n.* 1
 Ephesus, Council of, 22
 Fra Angelico, 80
 Franzelin, 93 sq., 97 sqq., 102 *n.* 1
 Gardiner, Bishop, 21 sqq., 25,
 52 sq.
 Gibson, Bishop, 8 *n.* 2, 45 *n.* 4
 Giotto, 80
 Gladstone, W. E., 76 *n.* 1
 Gregory, Pope, 15
 Harding, Thomas, 29 sq., 60
 Hardwick, C., 8 *n.* 1, 18 *n.* 1,
 41 *nn.* 3, 4, 5, 45 *nn.* 2, 3, 46,
n. 1
 Hebrews, Epistle to, 20 *n.* 1, 24,
 63 sq., 68, 78 *n.* 1
 Henrici, 57
 Hiqualus, 75
 Holcot, 29
 Hooker, 95, *n.* 1, 45, 70 *n.* 1
 Innocent III, Pope, 36
 Isidore, St, 34, 38
 Jewel, Bishop, 29, 46, 48, 60, 68
 John of Damascus, 34
 John, St, 22, 79 *n.* 3
 Justin Martyr, St, 78 *n.* 4
 Lanfranc, Archbishop, 34
 Lateran Council, 34, 41

- Latham, Dr, 76, n. 1
 Latimer, Bishop, 60 sq.
 Latitudinarians, 79
 Lepin, l'Abbé M., 97 n. 2
 Liturgies, 78 sq., 94, 101
 Lombard, Peter, 21, 34 sq.
 Luther, 53, 82 sq.
 Lutherans, 13 sq., 29, 30, 46, 53,
 59

Mass, Queries concerning the, 28
 Maurice, F. D., 76 n. 1
 Melanchthon, 51, 59
 Melchior Canus, 95, 124, 53 sq.,
 64, 70, 90
 Milligan, Dr, 39 n. 1, 40 n. 6,
 77 n. 1, 78, 100 n. 3
 Moberly, Dr, 101 n. 3
 Möhler, 17, 44 n. 2, 79
 Mozley, Dr, 22, 84 sqq.

 Newman, Cardinal, 14
 Niccola Pisano, 80

 Ottley, R. L., 100 n. 1

 Papist, 23, 80
 Paschasius Radbertus, 33
 Paul, St, 11, 22, 78, 101
 Paul's Cathedral, St, 27
 Perrone, 30 n. 2, 88 n. 3, 89 n. 2,
 92 sq.
 Peter of Prussia, 61
 Pighy, 47 sqq.
 Pontificians, 46, 55
 Protestantism, 77, 80, 82, 85
 Pusey, Dr, 14

 Ranke, 17
 Ratramnus, 33
Revue Anglo-Romaine, 56 nn. 1,
 2, 57 nn. 1, 2, 62 nn. 1, 3
 Richards, Dr, 97 n. 2
 Romanensians, 46, 56

 Sadler, 39 n. 1.
 Salmeron, 88
 Scotists, 74 sq., 77
 Smith, Dr, 22
 Smith, Robertson, 100 n. 2
 Socinians, 79
 Solifidians, 46
 Suarez, 46 sq., 54, 64, 66, 69 sq.,
 74, 91 sqq., 95
 Temple, Archbishop Frederick,
 76 n. 1
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 14 sq.
 Thomas Aquinas, St, 35 sq., 37
 sqq., 47, 49 sq., 54, 59 sqq.,
 62, 71, 73 sq., 87, 89 sq.
 Thomists, 74
 Trent, Council of, 9 sq., 15, 17,
 20, 45, 82, 83 sqq.
 Tunstal, 53, 59

 Vacant, Dr, 34 n. 1, 35, 36 sq.,
 38, 62 n. 1, 85, 89
 Vasquez, 30 n. 2, 47, 49, 54, 63,
 64, 66 sq., 69 sq., 88 sqq., 92,
 94 sqq.
 Vaughan, Cardinal, 97 n. 2.
 Vincentius, 29

 Waterland, 39 n. 1.
 Wesley, Charles, 94
 Westcott, Bishop, 78
 Wordsworth, Bishop John, 70