

## ON THE FICTITIOUS sacrifice, OF THE MASS

With JOHN SUDORIUS of Clermont-Beauvais responding, on April 7 in the Year 1627.

### FIRST THESES.

I. Just as those who constitute many Gods, concur in the same impiety of Atheism: so also those who acknowledge no sacrifice of Christ properly so called, and who contend that sacrifice is to be repeated daily in innumerable places, with a different endeavor overturn the altar of Christ. The preceding disputation has confuted the former. With the latter, who strive to establish the fictitious sacrifice of the Mass, we must contend.

II. As to what pertains to the word, Baronius asserts that the name Mass, is most ancient, and that (as he says, the Christian faith professes) it seems to be accepted from the Hebrew or Chaldaic nomenclature, Deut. 16.10. And that the same name was handed down by the Apostles themselves Peter and Paul from the Hebrew fountains to the Romans, and by James to the Jerusalemites, Baron. to the year of Christ 34. n. 59. The same is, as to the origination of the word, the opinion of not a few of the Pontificians, whom Vasques commemorates, tom. 3. on 3. Thom. disp. 221. c. c. t. Nevertheless Vasques himself does not profess that faith which Baronius calls Christian, indicating it to be more probable that the word is in no way Hebrew, or derived from the Hebrew; nor does Bellarmine, to whom it does not seem that this Hebrew word was in use by the Apostles, and he proves it by reasons, of which this is the chief. If that Hebrew word had been in use by the Apostles, certainly the Greeks, and Syrians, and other nations would have retained it; they retained other similar words, Amen, Alleluia, Sabaoth, Hosanna, Satan, Sabbath, Passover: For Hebrew words came to us through the Greeks, since the Apostles themselves, and the first Doctors of the Church wrote in Greek. Moreover among the Greeks there is no mention of this word MASS, book 1. on the Mass. ch. 1. Rhenanus is also very far from the same faith. That age said Missa for missio [dismissal], whence that word was accommodated to the sacrifice, from this occasion: The Catechumens who are also called auditors, and hearing by Tertullian, remained in the temple, until the Bishop had expounded the Gospel. Then the Levite cried out, Let the Catechumens depart. Notes on book 4. Tertull. against Marcion. and in the book on the Crown of the soldier. Lindanus wonders why the origination of this name is repeated from a Hebraism higher, and says that this was done insidiously by some, book 4. panop. c. 37.

III. Therefore from the Catechumens and faithful having been dismissed, who were called, the Mass was said to be twofold, of the Catechumens and of the faithful. And this custom flowed from the Gentiles, as Rhenanus not obscurely teaches, in the cited place. But clearly Polydorus Vergilius, as Cassander reports in the liturgicals, ch. 17. He thinks that the word Missa is taken from the customs and institutions of the ancients, just as most other things. He adduces the testimony of Apuleius, in whom the priest in the sacred rites of Isis, the sacred rites having been performed, announces by a speech and in the Greek rite, [Greek text]. The same custom therefore, he says, is observed by ours, that the sacred rites having been performed it is pronounced by the deacon, Ite Missa est. Among the Romans in the dismissal of the Senate, in funerals, in sacrifices, the power of departing was made through the priests or heralds by the

word, *Illicet*. To this rite, what corresponds among the Greeks (to whom the word *Missa* is unknown), Lindanus testifies that he has not yet sufficiently learned. But from the liturgy which is called of Chrysostom he not badly conjectures that something similar was among them. For at the end it is said, [Greek text]. Likewise the Priest says the canticle of Simeon, [Greek text]. Thus [Greek text] is for them the *Missa*, the word having been taken from the canticle of Simeon: which Casaubon also observes, *Exercit.* 16. num. 58. where he praises the most beautiful and most holy institution of our Churches, by which the whole celebration of the sacred Supper is concluded with the hymn of Simeon, which the people sings on bended knees.

IV. When this word began to be used is not agreed: There are those who contend that this name was minimally heard before Ambrose. It is certain that it was minimally used by the Apostles or Apostolic men: For many of the Pontificians determine that those ancient decretal epistles of the Popes are adulterated: Nay it is consonant with the truth, that those who were more absent from the time of the Apostles, wrote in Greek, so that the word *Missa*, which is Latin, and is sometimes found in those epistles, is not of the author, but of the interpreter: But whether that epistle, which is the second of Pope Cornelius to Lupicinus of Vienne, and is extant in tom. 1. *Conc. edition.* Colon. Ann. 1618. is to be numbered among the supposititious ones we do not dispute. In it these words are found, publicly neither in the more well-known crypts is it permitted for Christians to perform Masses. We certainly concede that this name is ancient, yet so that the more an Ecclesiastical writer among the Latins approaches to the times of the Apostles, the less he makes mention of this word.

V. Various ones annotate the various significations of this word and the analogies of signification, but we determine that it is little apt to signify either a sacrament or a sacrifice, for it is not taken from any essential part of the sacrament, nor from any rite pertaining to the sacrament: The Mass of the Catechumens, was neither a sacrament, nor a sacrifice: in whose celebration it was not permitted for them to be present: The Mass of the faithful was made after the consummated sacrament, and the mysteries having been performed: nor for this cause alone did ours repudiate this word, but because the absurd signification of the sacrifice of the body of Christ, for the remission of the sins of the living and of the dead was added to it; nor would they have abhorred this word, if there had been agreement between them and the Pontificians concerning the matter.

VI. The contention about the name having been omitted we must deal with the matter itself. The Pontificians adduce various definitions of the sacrifice. Perronius, that he may seek patronage for the sacrifice of the Mass, thus defines sacrifice according to the primitive institution of the word. Sacrifice is the oblation of something conjoined with the destruction of the same thing, or the representation of destruction, which is made to God for the redemption and confession of the destruction which we have merited, book 2. on the Eucharist. p. 327. He thinks therefore that for a true external, and properly so called sacrifice the representation of the destruction of the thing which is offered suffices; and thus we readily grant that the Eucharist can be called a sacrifice, insofar as namely in it is represented, and commemorated the death which Christ underwent, that he might conciliate eternal redemption for us. But Bellarmine proposes another definition to us. Sacrifice is an external oblation, made to God alone, by which for the

acknowledgment of human infirmity, and the profession of Divine Majesty, by a legitimate minister some sensible and permanent thing is consecrated and transmuted by a mystical rite, book 1. on the Mass, ch. 2. 1. This definition of Bellarmine is competent only to legitimate sacrifices: otherwise it is agreed from Scripture that sacrifices were offered by the Gentiles (who were neither legitimate ministers, nor offered to God alone, nor properly made the thing offered sacred from profane).

VII. Here therefore is the state of the controversy. Whether the Mass is a sacrifice of such a kind as Bellarmine defined; for it is not to be so nakedly proposed. Whether the Eucharist ought to be offered to God. But we from this definition elicit many arguments against the Mass. And 1. the sacrifice which they pretend that Melchizedek offered was made without some immutation of the thing offered: for they acknowledge that no immutation in this sacrifice appears in Scripture. Nor do they respond to the point, when they say that the immutation is made by the cooking of the bread, and the pouring out of the wine: For the thing which was offered according to them was bread already cooked, which before the sacrifice was not yet consecrated. We ask therefore that they may teach, what immutation was made in that bread? what they invent concerning the pouring out of the wine, is rejected with the same facility, by which it is established.

VIII. Besides, if for the reason of sacrifice it is required, that a sensible thing be offered, they are compelled to confess that the body of Christ is minimally offered, since it falls in no way under the senses, or that only the species of bread and wine are offered, which are obvious to the senses. The doctrine is exceedingly perplexed and intricate, which wants the matter of the sacrifice, to be a sensible thing, and yet asserts that that is not sacrificed which falls under the senses, but that is sacrificed which is remote from them. Bellarmine responds, we offer the body of the Lord in the species of bread as made from bread, and the body of Christ is not the victim absolutely, but the victim in the species of bread, in which that body is plainly visible. But it is absurd to teach that the body of Christ is still made, more absurd that it is made from bread, since not even a crumb of bread enters into the constitution of the consecrated thing? but most absurdly is a sensible thing established which lurks under a species, which is most abhorrent to the nature of that thing, as if someone should say that he sees a sheep if the species of an apple, or nut were offered to him. Would a lamb be plainly visible to you, if a little crust flitted before your eye?

IX. Thirdly, the thing which is offered to God ought to be consecrated by a mystical rite, to be made sacred from profane, and dedicated to God. But that the body of Christ is made sacred from profane by the accession of a sacrificial rite, who unless profane will assert? They respond, that the bread, which is a common thing, is turned into the body of Christ: Whether therefore the bread alone is sacrificed? By no means, they say: but that which is thus made sacred from profane, so that it remains. But the bread does not remain while it is consecrated, but is turned into something else, and therefore not the bread, but that which is made from the bread is sacrificed. This response does not even touch the force of the argument. Whatever is sacrificed to God, that ought to be made sacred from profane: the body of Christ is sacrificed to God, Therefore it is necessary indeed that a consecrated thing be offered to God: one thing is not consecrated, and another minimally consecrated is sacrificed. Nay if a place were given to the

opinion of Cassalius, which Bellarmine says is only improbable, by which he determines that there are two sacrifices of the Eucharist, one of the bread and wine, the other of the body and blood of Christ it would always be necessary that the body and blood of Christ be rendered sacred from profane, which is impious. Besides, since the oblation of the bread and wine, which is made in the Mass, precedes the consecration, in what way can it be pretended that these elements are consecrated? but that it precedes the consecration Bellarmine teaches book 1. on the Mass ch. 27. Fourth proposition, and the thing itself cries out, since they teach that the essence of the sacrifice is placed in the consecration: but the elements do not constitute the sacrifice which is offered to God. See Bellarmine *ibid*.

X. But that is most grave. For a true sacrifice it is required, that that which is offered to God in sacrifice, be plainly destroyed. And of this thing Bellarmine adduces a twofold cause, book 1. on the Mass. ch. 1. One, because sacrifices prefigured the death of Christ, that is, the most excellent sacrifice, which consisted in the destruction of the thing offered. The other, because sacrifice is the highest protestation of our subjection and external worship, which requires, that not only the use of the thing be offered to God, but also the substance itself, and therefore not only the use, but also the substance be consumed. What therefore? in the sacrifice of the Mass it is necessary that the substance of Christ be consumed, otherwise that sacrifice is not representative of the death of Christ, nor is the highest worship exhibited to God in it.

XI. They retort, that through the consecration Christ is ordained to destruction, because the body of Christ, although it suffers no lesion in itself, receives the form of food; but food is ordained to eating, and hence to destruction, it therefore loses not natural being, but sacramental being, because it ceases to be sensible food; I respond, that which is only ordained to destruction, that by this very thing is not yet offered in sacrifice. Likewise what loses only sacramental being, but not natural being, its substance is not consumed, which Bellarmine required in sacrifice: to lose some respect, is not to be plainly destroyed, as he was speaking above: that sacramental being is the use which we receive from Christ: It is the use of the thing: But he had said that it does not suffice that the use of the thing be taken away, but that it is also necessary that the substance itself be consumed, nor is Christ ordained to us for food, that he may be destroyed, since he is food which does not perish: nay Christ is said to be food figuratively only, not properly. the eating is therefore figurative, the destruction consequently figurative, whence it follows that it is only figuratively a sacrifice: nor ought it to be omitted that in the sacrifice of an animate thing, no other destruction can be established, than the death of that thing; it was necessary that the animal from which something was cut for eating be slain. Likewise since from divine ordination Christ is food to us, we receive the highest benefit from God; but to receive from God is not to destroy the thing, which we may offer to him: for these differ in the whole genus to receive and to give. Besides the hosts which are reserved and minimally consumed, would not constitute a sacrifice: but they contend that many are to be reserved: nor do you respond to the point, if you say that the hosts are reserved so that the people may consume them when necessity urges, for the consumption of the sacrament, as it is done by the people, is not a part of the sacrifice, Bellarmine teaching book 1 on the Mass. ch. 27. Fourthly, it would follow that the body of Christ was ordained (since according to the Pontificians Christ offered it in the Eucharist) to this, that it might be the food of Christ himself:

that the soul of Christ needed food, and that Christ died for himself: for to no other end is Christ ordained for food, than that salvation may be received by him: the reason of the consequence is this, because then at last the sacrifice is accomplished when it is consumed by the priest by reason of the divine ordination to food; But Christ according to them was a priest in the celebration of the Eucharist. Therefore it was necessary that the sacrifice be immediately consumed by him by reason of the ordination to food: and thus Christ was the salutary food of himself.

XII. But what Bellarmine notes, that Christ in the daily sacrifices does not eat himself, nor immediately consume the sacrament, but only delivers it to consumption, does not pertain to this. For in the celebration of the Eucharist Christ was also according to them the immediate priest, and hence immediately ate himself and this sacrifice was ordained, that it might be the food of Christ himself. But Bellarmine most excellently contradicts himself saying that through the consecration Christ receives the form of food, food is ordained to eating, and hence to destruction. But before he had said, that the consumption which is made by the priest, is not so much the eating of the victim, as the consummation of the sacrifice, and properly corresponds to the combustion of the holocaust: just as if you should say, This is ordained to food, food to eating, and this to destruction, yet so, that when you eat it, that eating, is not the eating of food. Did he eat the holocaust, who delivered it all to the most voracious fire? thus the food is eaten by the priest, nevertheless not by eating.

XIII. Who could recount the innumerable opinions of the Pontificians, when they seek in what consists the essence of the sacrifice of the Mass. Vasques who has few things against ours in this dissertation, is wholly in confuting his own, in whom he notes many contradictory, absurd, and adverse things to the sacrifice of the Mass, so that he may say that it was always most difficult in the school of the Theologians to assign the nature and reason of true sacrifice in this sacrament in 3. p. Thom. tom. 3. qu. 83. disp. 120. c.1 But Bellarmine in book 1. on the Mass. ch. 27. collects these corollaries from the opinions of his own: That in the Mass there are two sacrifices one of the bread, the other of the body of Christ; That the Church has an inanimate sacrifice and much viler than the Hebrews formerly had: that the sacrifice of the Church and the sacrifice of Christ are not the same as to the thing offered: finally he reduces many into these straits, that they either confess that there is not a real sacrifice in the Mass, or that Christ is truly and really killed by the priests. At last Bellarmine timidly proposes his own opinion, nor in the eight propositions, which he pursues, does he define, in what the whole reason of the sacrifice is placed. But Vasques places it in the consecration alone insofar as the death of Christ is represented by it, than which nothing could be said more absurdly; as if the particle of the definition, such as is the consecration in the definition of sacrifice, would embrace the whole essence of the thing.

XIV. Bellarmine says that sacrifice ought to be offered by a legitimate minister, who may accomplish it in the common name: and we embrace this opinion, which Bellarmine will hardly reconcile with the decretal epistle which is the second of Pope Anacletus, of which these are the words: The beginning of the priesthood was of Aaron, although Melchizedek first offered sacrifice, and after him Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but they did these things by spontaneous

will, not by sacerdotal authority, Therefore not according to this Epistle was that a true sacrifice which they want Melchizedek to have offered. Bellarmine himself also asserts that the sacrifice of Abel was minimally commanded by God book 2. on the Sacrament. ch. 32. According to this condition we reject the Missatic sacrifice: for we nowhere read that priests endowed with the power of offering the body of Christ were instituted by God; nay the Writers of the N.T. never attribute the name of Priest to the Pastors of the Churches, it is so far from it that they concede to them any authority to sacrifice the body of Christ: Paul professes that he [Greek text] Rom. 15.16, which cannot be drawn to the Missatic sacrifice: and when Paul describes the office of Bishops and Pastors, he adds nothing about the priesthood, which nevertheless would have most pertained to stimulating them to sanctity: And when the various offices instituted for the edification of the Church are recounted: Rom. 12. Ephes. 4.1. Cor. 12. no vestige of the sacerdotal office appears.

XV. But they wrongly determine that the Apostles did not attribute this sacerdotal dignity to the Pastors, that they might better distinguish the Christian sacred things from the Judaic, and lest they should be thought, if they used the same words, to either innovate or confirm those ancient rites: For the Apostles everywhere borrow words from the old Testament, and its sacred things: Paul calls the doctrine of faith the law, Rom. 3. 26. he designates the efficacy of the spirit by the same name. Rom. 8. 2. and indeed at that time, when the Jews obtruded nothing except the Law: Christ, he calls the Passover, 1. Cor. 5.7. sanctification, the purging out of the leaven. v. 8. he proposes to us the true circumcision Coloss. 2. 11. in the same chapter in which he rebukes those, who adhered to the Judaic elements. v. 8. See Gal. 5. 2. he calls all the faithful temples. 1. Cor. 3. 17. &c. priests 1. Pet. 2. 5. he praises their true sacrifices. Rom. 12. i. Heb. 13. 16. Philip. 4. 18. he describes communion with Christ by a similar phrase, We have an altar, &c. Heb. 13.10. Nay the Apostle is wholly in this in the epistle to the Hebrews, that he may teach, to what the Levitical sacrifices pertained, and the ancient rites, namely to the oblation made on the cross, and to Christ as the true priest: why does he not explain those figures about the Missatic sacrifice, to which the Pontificians draw them? why also does he not teach that so many priests played beforehand to today's sacrificers? This whole Epistle is occupied in the description of the Christian priesthood: nor does it discuss that Priesthood which they pretend to be perpetually in force in the Church.

XVI. They say that it did not pertain to the scope of the Apostle, that he should make mention of the sacrifice of bread and wine, because such a sacrifice does not make perspicuously for the excellence of Christ or Melchizedek, Therefore it to be kept silent among the Jews intent on the Aaronic sacrifice. This Response would avail if the Pontificians constituted the sacrifice of bread and wine: but the Apostle could have easily preached the excellence of the Christian priesthood above the Aaronic, by saying that not animals, but Christ himself is offered: and therefore that Melchizedek excels others in dignity, because he offered that sacrifice, whose complement appears especially in the Christian sacrifice. They add that the Apostle omitted this oblation with deliberate work, lest he be compelled to explain the mystery of the Eucharist, which was higher, than that it could then be understood by them. But why does he explain higher things in the same epistle? ought the Apostles to have said nothing about the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, &c. on account of the sublimity of those mysteries? Why did the Apostle propose

the mystery of the Eucharist so clearly to the Corinthians? nay he excites the attention of the Hebrews to those things which he teaches afterwards to be accurately expounded: did it not pertain to the scope of the Apostle to teach that Christ is a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek? But that according to Bellarmine does not have place, unless a perpetual action of sacrificing be attributed to the ministers of Christ; otherwise Christ would have (as he teaches) an idle priesthood, since the sacrifice of the cross was done only once, nor can it be repeated further.

XVII. Ours ask whether today's priests are to be called successors of Christ. They respond that the Church of Christ acknowledges no successors of Christ in the Pontificate: nor does anyone of the Catholics thus speak if he wishes to speak well and circumspectly, since Christ has only vicars and ministers in the sacerdotal office. But Vasques in question. 22. disputation. 85 chapter 3. says that Christ is truly without a successor, but he thinks that the priests are called successors by the council of Trent, because they so succeed Christ, that from Christ himself remaining still a priest, but not dwelling with us they have a participated dignity, that they may visibly minister for him and in his name to us: But he is ineptly said to succeed Christ, who ministers in his name, at that time and place, in which Christ is the primary agent, and principal priest.

XVIII. The Fathers of the Church often call Pastors priests, but figuratively, in which way we read in the liturgies that the deacons were called Levites: and that so that they may teach some similitude between the ministers of both covenants. See Is. 66. 21. Or by priests they understand Bishops, distinct from presbyters, although today presbyter signifies a priest. Thus Augustine. Will he say that so great a consensus of Catholic priests is a conspiracy of the lost, (he had previously named many Bishops, Irenaeus, Cyprian &c.) Nor let him think that the holy Jerome, because he was a Presbyter, is to be despised. Where priest is not a mass-saying sacrificer, whom they are accustomed to understand by the word Presbyter, but a Bishop: Augustine calls the same ones Bishops at the end of the book. Augustine against Julian, book ch. 3. and book 2. against Julian. near the end. For the sake of which Catholic truth the holy and blessed and most illustrious priests in the handling of the divine eloquences, Irenaeus, Cyprian, &c. to whom I add the presbyter, whether you will or not, Jerome, &c. In Isidore on the order of celebrating a Council, first to the priests, then to the Presbyters entrance is given. See Ambrose. epistol. 33. The books of Chrysostom on the priesthood are so many treatises on the Episcopal office. In the laws of the Emperors Contius notes that priest is taken for Bishop.

XIX. The reason is similar, when the Fathers deal with altars: For if they often name altars, they often also call the same tables: Whence an argument is sought not less firm for the proof of a banquet, than for the proof of a sacrifice: nor is an external, and properly so called sacrifice offered in heaven, in which an altar is constituted. Apoc. 8. Finally what kind of sacrifice the Mass is Contarenus has expounded in these words in his Catechesis, The Mass is a sacrifice of praise, it is a sacrifice of thanksgiving, it is a sacrifice, because it is a memorial of that unique sacrifice, by which Christ offered himself for us to the Father through the Holy Spirit, it is also a sacrifice because it is an oblation, by which we offer Christ and his passion, and the whole

Church through Christ to almighty God, which things can all be admitted, but recede greatly from the state of the question between us, and the Pontificians.

XX. If the opinion of the Council of Trent, by which it is determined that Christ offered his body, and blood under the species of bread and wine to God, is true, the oblation of Christ accomplished on the cross was superfluous, because in the oblation which they pretend Christ to have made in the supper, the human race was redeemed: for if this sacrifice which they pretend Christ to have performed in the Eucharist was not propitiatory, neither will the Missatic sacrifice be propitiatory; if it was propitiatory, it is necessary that he redeemed the world in the Eucharist. They say indeed that the sacrifice of the Mass is of finite value, because in it the offerer is the Son of God through the minister, so that the action is immediately produced by a human suppositum. But that cannot have place in the sacrifice which they teach Christ to have offered in the last supper, where Christ immediately offered himself. Many moved by this argument in the Council of Trent only wanted it to be defined that Christ indeed commanded the oblation, but not that he offered himself. See the history, of the Council. of Trent. book. 6. p. 638.

XXI. But how will the Papal Mass be able to be reconciled with the institution of the sacred Supper, which the Evangelists propose, which Paul received from the Lord? In it no action of one sacrificing appears, no vestige of a sacrifice: No elevation of the host: The blessing of the food placed on the table, and destined for sacramental use, is not a sacrificial rite: nor do they sacrifice, who do not handle the food except with a previous blessing: Bellarmine openly accedes to this opinion, Since the Evangelists, he says, have not expressly said that Christ offered himself to the Father in the Supper, yet neither have they expressly said that he did not offer himself. book 1. on the Mass. ch. 24. Likewise. the condition remains, the action of offering, which indeed we certainly know to exist, even if perhaps we may not be able to easily distinguish and separate it from those actions which are done at the same time. book 1. on the Mass. ch. 12. Here Jansenius acknowledges a sacrifice of thanksgiving, whence it was called the Eucharist, he thinks an oblation made to God probable, and thus concludes, But that either from this place or from other places of Scripture it cannot be efficaciously proved that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is a sacrifice, yet from the Apostolic tradition of the Church it is efficaciously proved. Concord. of the Gospels. ch. 131. He would be ridiculous in the Papacy who would want to celebrate the Mass today in the way in which Christ instituted the Supper. The liturgy of Christ has long been obsolete.

XXII. But since the Eucharist was instituted in commemoration of Christ, until he returns to us, it is clearer than light that in the Eucharist Christ himself is not offered. Commemoration, says Jansenius, is only of an absent thing. *ibid.* But Christ is established as present. That commemoration which is made while we await Christ, necessarily presupposes the absence of that thing, according to which Christ must return to us: But as to the substance of the body Christ must return to us. Therefore. They say that commemoration is not opposed to absence, but to oblivion: We grant: but they must grant that the commemoration of a thing departing, and separated from us, is opposed to presence: nay Paul teaches that that commemoration is made not by sacrificing Christ, but by announcing the death of Christ. Therefore we do not so dispute.



That cannot be a sacrifice, where a commemoration is made. But there cannot be a sacrifice of that thing, as present, of which as absent a commemoration is made.

XXIII. It is added, that it is impious to think that the body of Christ, is not only daily made by the sacrificers, but also offered. In the Christian priesthood the same and only one is the victim and the priest: nor is it fitting for the glorious Christ, that he so demean himself to the needy elements, that he can be turned in them, cast down, exposed to beasts, and affected with innumerable insults, from which he was immune even in the state of exinanition.

XXIV. But the Apostle is plainly ours in many places of the epistle to the Hebrews. Where there is no shedding of blood, there is not even a propitiatory sacrifice: there is no shedding of blood in the Missatic sacrifice, The Major is of Paul, Heb. 9. 22. nor does the Apostle say it was not done, but Estius also confesses, that this is the best collection: If in the old law no legal remission was made without the shedding of blood, therefore neither in the new law is true remission of sins made without the shedding of the blood of Christ. They say, just as in baptism sins are not remitted without the blood of Christ shed on the cross, so neither through the sacrifice of the Mass are they remitted without the bloody sacrifice of the cross, from which the Mass obtains efficacy. This Response depresses the sacrifice of the Mass; for thus it has no other efficacy, than the legal sacrifices, which are not propitiatory per se. Either the sacrifice of the Mass washes away the same sins, which were obliterated by the sacrifice of the cross, or others: if others, it does not borrow force from the sacrifice of the cross, if the same, the Missal oblation is superfluous, as properly propitiatory.

XXV. To these, in the Judgment of Paul, the iteration argues the imperfection of the sacrifice, if the Levitical sacrifice was imperfect, because it was repeated, especially that solemn one, which was performed once in a year, and in one place only, what must be determined about the sacrifice of the Mass which is repeated ten thousand times in infinite places on each day? See Heb. 10. 1. 2. 3. 4. Nor do they elude this argument, who teach that the legal sacrifices were various in number, but here the same thing is offered. For by the name of sacrifice either the thing offered is understood, or the action of the offerer. Let us grant that the thing offered is not diverse, yet the objection taken from the various and distinct actions, by which that thing is offered, will remain: for the imperfection of the sacrifice will be proved from the mind of Paul by the iteration of the sacrificial action: nor do they defend themselves better, who respond that all those actions are reckoned as one, because they are referred to one, namely to the oblation on the cross: by equal reason, the Levitical oblations would have been perfect, which all are referred to the sacrifice of Christ which they prefigured.

XXVI. We also urge the following words, by which it is taught that the oblation of the body of Christ was made once: this host having been offered for sins, Christ sits at the right hand of the Father. Likewise by this one oblation he has consecrated in perpetuity those who are sanctified. From which we elicit this argument. Which sacrifice made once for all is of infinite and perpetual value, that leaves no place for any expiatory sacrifice, nor for the repetition of the sacrifice, Such is the sacrifice of Christ, Heb. 10. 12. 14. They Respond. that Christ is not offered to God more often through death. Ineptly, for to what purpose is he offered to expiate the sins of those,

whose all sins are expiated in perpetuity? They Add that by this iteration, what was obtained for us by the death of Christ is applied to us. But the application of the sacrifice and the oblation of the sacrifice are as far apart as heaven, For the priest [Greek text], Heb. 5. 1 . So that his principal action is about God: but the application is about men, and thus imprudent they overturn the nature of the priesthood. Again the application follows the sacrifice: but it is not properly a sacrifice, just as the sprinkling followed the slaughter: But what need is there of a sacrifice, that the sacrifice may be applied to us? Will they require another Christ, who may serve to apply Christ? Why would I not gather that the Mass ought to be a bloody sacrifice, that the bloody sacrifice of Christ may be applied to us, if they well gather that there is need of an external sacrifice, that the sacrifice of Christ may be applied? thus it would be necessary for Christ to die, that his death might be applied to us. But how is the value of the sacrifice of Christ applied to us, by the missatic sacrifice, since that is of infinite price, but this of finite according to themselves? must not Christ be applied to us, as he delivered himself for us: But he delivered himself as a price of infinite value. How does it happen that Christ is so cheapened offered by the mass-sayers, when they teach that that oblation, can be defiled by no unworthiness or malice of those offering, Sess. 22. ch. r . If it cannot be defiled by the iniquity of man, how does it happen that by the slighness of the same it is so diminished, that from infinite it becomes finite? And hence it is clear why ours teach that the sacrifice of the Mass is contrary to the Sacrifice of the cross. Scripture proposes various means of application, why did it keep silent about that in which they place the sum of Religion? At last they are compelled to come to us, and confess that that sacrifice is a sacrifice of religion, which we do not deny: for God is worshipped in the celebration of the Eucharist: Bellarmine adds that it pertains also to commemorating the sacrifice of the cross, which we willingly admit.

XXVII. Thus also we gather. If the host has been transferred into the holy of holies, where now is the highest priest, it is absurdly pretended that the host is still on earth. and that the High Priest still sacrifices on earth: For by this one oblation having been accomplished Christ sat down at the right hand of the Father, nor does he any longer stand here performing the office of a priest, Heb. 9. & 10. Nay this is the reason of the oblation of Christ, that it ought to be brought into the sanctuary which pertains to the High Priest alone. Are the common sacrificers High Priests, or do they bring the host into the sanctuary?

XXVIII. Moreover where there is remission of sin, there is no longer an oblation for sin, Heb. 10. 18. But that we have obtained remission of sins is manifest from the preceding verse. The Vulgate Interpreter thus translates this place now there is no oblation for sin. They flee again to the distinction of the acquisition of so great a benefit, and of the application of the same. But they do not consider that they recede both from Paul and from themselves: from Paul who teaches that there is no need of a host, from the time that this most holy victim has been sacrificed, through which we obtain remission of sins: for it could be retorted that there is still need of a host applying: for the sacrifices of the old law were also representative and applicative of the sacrifice of the cross: if Therefore the saying of the Apostle does not exclude, as Bellarmine speaks, representational and applicative sacrifices, how does it exclude the legal sacrifices instituted for the same ends according to him? Likewise they disagree with themselves: for they determine that Christ offered in the last supper for the sanctification of all

the elect. See Estius on chapter 10. of the epistle to the Hebrews. up to the end of the age: how Therefore was it applicative of the sacrifice of the cross? for application requires the existence of the thing. If it was not applicative, how is the Mass established as an applicative sacrifice? Will the Mass again be an applicative sacrifice of the applicative sacrifice? Will faith or baptism be a sacrifice, because each is applicative of the death of Christ?

XXIX. And thus we have three sacrifices distinct in ends, the sacrifice of the cross by which a most sufficient price was paid for all our sins: the sacrifice performed by Christ in the last supper, by which he either acquired the same price or applied it, and the sacrifice of the Mass whose efficacy is very limited, and is simply applicative of a finite and indeed small value, lest of course many Masses may be offered in vain for the same thing to be obtained. But another difficulty recurs, when that applicative sacrifice is offered for the impenitent, nay for those whom you know to be impenitent, Bellar. book 2. on the Mass, ch. 4. how can the benefit of Christ be applied to them? nor is this difficulty less, if it is only an applicative sacrifice, it is not properly propitiatory, or it is propitiatory in that way in which the legal sacrifices were, which did not afford propitiation per se.

XXX. Let us now weigh the principal arguments of the Pontificians, which some prefer to seek from tradition, than from Scripture: In the Council of Trent George Ataiades asserts that this sacrifice is nowhere found in Scripture. History of the Council of Trent. book 6. p. 639. But Bellarmine thus constructs the argument from Genesis. Melchizedek was in that ceremony of bread and wine a most manifest figure of Christ instituting the sacrament of the Eucharist in bread and wine: But Melchizedek offered bread and wine as a priest of the most high God. Therefore. Bellarmine proves the Major by no other argument, than tradition, and says that dogmas are fabricated from figures, when the explication is collected from the Scriptures understood according to the common consensus of the Fathers: But we contend that the articles of faith, especially of the greatest moment, are to be sought from the Scriptures themselves: The Apostle, who examines all things pertaining to the Melchizedekian sacrifice, only forgot the Mass, which with him we desire to be delivered to oblivion. This reasoning is also vain: Christ must agree in the priesthood of Melchizedek in that which is proper to this priesthood: But those things which the Apostle enunciated, can be common to others: just as if he should say the Apostle badly expressed this figure, who did not make mention of that thing according to which Christ is properly a priest according to the order of Melchizedek: if you take separately those things, which the Apostle commemorates, they will perhaps be fitting to diverse persons. But that all those things can be ascribed conjointly to one person they will never find: Certainly in the Levitical sacrifice bread and wine were also offered either as a complete sacrifice, or as a part of the sacrifice. For if they want the oblation of bread and wine to have been an appendage in the Levitical sacrifice, this most excellent sacrifice is cast down below the Levitical priesthood: But if it was most proper to Melchizedek to offer bread and wine; this sacrifice is not competent to Christ, who according to them did not offer bread and wine. Must Christ be offered under the species of all things, which prefigured him? Was Melchizedek a figure of the mass-saying priests? He is called the High Priest in the Canon of the Mass, and everywhere by Paul, which priests not all mass-sayers are: Finally the Apostle refers the type of Melchizedek to Christ also offering on the cross. Heb. 5.7. &c. See dispute. 1 on the priesthood of Christ. But if

Melchizedek was a figure of Christ offering in the supper, it is necessary that the excellence of the priesthood of Christ be placed in the unbloody sacrifice, since Scripture commemorates no other excellence of the priesthood of Christ, than that he is a priest according to the order of Melchizedek. But what else is this than to overturn the bloody sacrifice of the cross?

XXXI. The Minor also of the argument cannot be proved from the Hebrew text, or the Greek, or the Vulgate Interpreter, or the Chaldaic paraphrase. Josephus narrating this history makes mention only of a banquet, making no word about a sacrifice, book 1. Antiq. and Pererius acknowledges this about Melchis. disp. 5. Philo speaks thus, stretching his hands to heaven he prayed for good things for him, and having slain victims he gave a splendid feast to his companions rejoicing. &c. [Greek text] book on Abraham. Therefore that sacrifice was bloody, and Eucharistic: That is the opinion of Cajetan, Isidore Clarius, Peter Comestor, and others; that the bread and wine pertained to refreshment. Bellarmine denies this, contending that they were first offered to God than given to men, who participated in the sacrifice. For in the first place, he says, there was no cause, why he should offer bodily refreshment to Abraham, who had returned from battle with immense booty, and whose companions had taken food before the meeting of Melchizedek. But little (says Pererius) in this confutation there seems to be of strength. For someone may say, that Melchizedek did not know this, nay he thought that they ought to be refreshed and recreated by fresh food on account of the labor of the fight and the fatigue of the journey. But although Melchizedek had known this, he would have wanted nevertheless to declare by that gift his benevolence toward Abraham, and from his victory his singular joy and pleasure. Thus solidly is confuted the chief confutation of Bellarmine. Afterwards the same thinks, that this was only a Eucharistic sacrifice; how Therefore is it drawn to a propitiatory sacrifice such as they pretend the mass to be? They Urge these words For he was. But the causal is not extant in Scripture: and although the conjunctive sometimes signifies the causal, it is ineptly gathered that the same signification is to be ascribed to it in this place.

XXXII. Thus also Bellarmine gathers, if the Priesthood of Christ endures up to the consummation of the world, and in eternity, the rite of sacrifice also ought to endure, otherwise he would have an idle priesthood. But the sacrifice of the cross was done once; nor can it be repeated, Therefore a sacrificial rite must be admitted, which may be attributed to Christ through his ministers. , Let Bellarmine respond to Vasques, What the Theologians say that an eternal priesthood cannot be, which is not going to have a perpetual sacrifice is false: Disput. 85. ch. 1. & 3. And afterwards he shows that the priesthood remained in eternity without any sacrifice: Let Thomas respond, who, in the judgment of the same author, did not explain the perpetuity of the priesthood in any other way, than by reason of the effect, Vasq. ibid. nor can Vasques sufficiently wonder at the most learned Theologians, who do not think with him that the perpetuity of the priesthood of Christ is gathered from the hypostatic union, ibid. ch. 3. Pererius says that the opinion of those who say that the sacrifice of Christ is eternal by reason either of the person or of the effect, is unlearned, foolish, frivolous, ridiculous, and he alleges the example of Noah, whose sacrifice could be said to be eternal by reason of the effect, so also Bellarmine. But, says Vasques, this reason is not efficacious: because the fruit of the sacrifice of Noah was the temporal conservation of the whole universe, which is not going to be in eternity: and God is going to destroy the world by fire, so that there will no longer be generations, ibid.

XXXIII. The Apostle clearly expounded the perpetuity of the priesthood of Christ, because Christ was made a priest not by a carnal law, but by the power of an indissoluble life: Heb. 7. 17. because consummation was made through this priesthood, v. 11. that is: he acquired eternal redemption and accomplished true and perpetual propitiation; because the decree about this priesthood will never become void, v. 18. 19. because for this priesthood to be perpetuated, there is no need that men succeeding each other in turn discharge it. v. 23. and therefore the mass-sayers cannot pertain to this office, who are no less mortal and infirm than the Levitical priests were formerly: because he can most absolutely save those, who approach to God through him, so that he is always living, that he may intercede for them, v. 25. finally the law constitutes priests men laboring under infirmity: But the word of the oath the son [Greek text], v. ult. If you contend, says Bellarmine, that Christ intercedes as a priest, then it is necessary that he always offer, and therefore that the Eucharist is a sacrifice which is perpetually offered by Christ through ministers; This response is Absurd. Is it not enough that Christ has entered into the holy places through his own blood, that he may appear perpetually before God for us? would there be no priestly intercession of Christ, if the Missatic sacrifice should cease? Christ will not Therefore intercede as a priest for us in the time of Antichrist, whom Bellarmine still expects, by whom all external worship will be abolished. What is this audacity of men, who arrogate to themselves the authority of sacrificing Christ himself, so that Christ ceases to be a priest in heaven, if he is not sacrificed by them on earth, and the intercession of Christ depends on such a sacrifice, which is performed here?

XXXIV. Bellarmine's other argument is thus instituted, The celebration of the Paschal Lamb was an express figure of the celebration of the Eucharist; but that immolation was a certain immolation of a victim offered to God, Therefore the celebration of the Eucharist must be an immolation of a victim, that the figure may correspond to the thing figured. A similar argumentation will prove this collection to be vain; To burn incense is an express figure of our prayers, Psalm 141. 2, Apoc. 5. 8. But to burn incense in the old law was a sacrifice properly so called. Bellar. book 2. on Images, ch. 17. Therefore our prayers are sacrifices properly so called, that the figure may correspond to the thing figured. Why would I not also gather that the rites of baptism are an express figure of the blood of Christ shed for us, But this rite is not sacrificial. Therefore neither was the shedding of the blood of Christ sacrificial: thus the sacrifice of Christ would be abolished: They concede that the Pontificians the brazen serpent was a figure of Christ to be immolated on the cross, who nevertheless was not immolated on wood. Again, Bellarmine's Major is false. The immolation, says Ribera, of the lamb, was an open type of Christ to be immolated on the cross book 5. on the temple, ch. 4. Scripture cries this out Is. 53. 7. John 1. 29, 36. & 19. 36. 1. Pet. 1 19. Apoc. 13.8. Add also the place which Bellarmine cites, 1. Cor. 5.7 . from which he confesses that it cannot be certainly established, when the immolation of Christ was made. But if it were done in the Mass, the Apostle would have said, Our Passover is daily immolated, which would have been most efficacious for exacting a perpetual purging out of the leaven. Bellarmine acknowledges that Scripture does not explain this figure, and flees to the Fathers, and to certain circumstances, which can be applied to the Eucharist: But the Fathers no less frequently transfer this figure to the sacrifice of the cross: and because the Eucharist is representative of that, this figure can also be accommodated to it.

XXXV. But that we may not dispute how the Paschal lamb was sacrificed; it is agreed from Scripture, that it was conjoined with blood: the worship of God having been constituted in the place which God had chosen, it was slain, Deut. 16. 2.16. And the Jewish rites teach that it was not permitted to roast the lambs in the houses before the solemn immolation of the lamb in the temple. Therefore the Jews, from the time that the temple was destroyed, do not slay the lamb, nor do they any longer observe the Mosaic ceremonies in its eating. Besides from the lamb nothing was permitted to be reserved for the following day, which they do not allow to be affirmed about their hosts: But Bellarmine insists. The feast follows the immolation, Therefore some immolation ought to have preceded the eating of the supper, just as the slaughter of the lamb preceded the eating: whence he gathers that Christ sacrificed in the last supper: The vanity of this argument will be clear by a similar reasoning: as many as have been baptized, have been baptized into the death of Christ, and buried together by baptism into the death of Christ, Rom. 6.3.4. Therefore it is necessary that the death of Christ precede baptism: or those who have been baptized, have been sprinkled with the blood of Christ: Therefore it is necessary that the blood be shed before baptism. The Pontificians reject the Conclusion, who teach that baptism was instituted before the passion of Christ, distinct also from the baptism of John: nor was it only a preparation for the Sacrament, but true baptism in the Holy Spirit not liable to iteration, Bellar book 1. on baptism, ch. 5. just as Therefore, as many as were baptized, were washed by the blood of Christ, although minimally shed in reality, because the blood was destined to that, so rightly in this feast the Apostles ate the flesh of Christ, as of the lamb already slain from the origin of the world: which also the Apostle teaches that God proposed in ancient feasts. 1. Cor. 10. But by the same reason of Bellarmine the sacrifice which Christ offered in the Eucharist was minimally applicative of the sacrifice of the cross, for the application of the sacrifice no less than the eating, requires the immolation of the sacrifice, if it was not applicative, how is the Mass an applicative sacrifice?

XXXVI. There follows the Prophecy of Malachi ch. 1. v. 11. which we do not deny pertains to the times of the Christian Church: Thus the Vulgate Interpreter, In every place there is sacrificed and offered to my name a clean oblation, receding from the Hebrew truth: which can be thus expressed, incense is offered to my name and a clean oblation: so Sanctes Pagninus offers incense: from whom, as to the matter Arias Montanus does not disagree. The LXX. [Greek text], and the various readings note that [Greek text] was badly put from Justin: the interlinear Greek version in the Complutensian Bibles thus reads, incense will be offered. Thus vanishes this reason of the Pontificians: the word to sacrifice taken per se in Scripture signifies a sacrifice properly so called: for that word does not appear in this place: Were they Therefore going to institute the Levitical sacrifice of incense namely oblation? for also in the Roman Church those who are not priests, offer incense. Bellar. book 2. on images. ch. 17. , where he also asserts that the oblation of incense is not a sacrifice. But the word of offering is general, which is extended to many things, which are not sacrifices properly so called. Besides in what way the word to sacrifice must be taken, so will the appellation of priests be taken: But God promises that he will purge the sons of Levi who will justly offer the gift, Malachi. 3. 3. if that must be taken properly, properly Therefore the Levitical priesthood will be restored. They vainly urge the word [Hebrew text], for if you take it properly, a sacrifice will be offered by today's sacrificers made from fine

flour with frankincense and oil, or any Judaic sacrifices will be offered? the [Hebrew text] will also be introduced: For Isaiah predicts, using this word, that the Gentiles will be an oblation to God, Is. 66. 20.

XXXVII. They Insist. The place cannot be understood about spiritual sacrifices, which the Jews had common with us: Likewise when it is understood about an oblation succeeding the Judaic ones, it is manifestly to be understood about an oblation, which did not have place at that time. I Respond. although the Jews had spiritual sacrifices common with us, as to the thing, yet as to the mode of the thing there is the greatest difference; for the Christian worship is so distinguished by Christ from the Judaic, even the legitimate one, John 4. 23.24. that that is going to be in spirit without carnal rites, and in truth without Judaic shadows, which Malachi teaches are to be removed. Therefore they did not have spiritual worship common with us: such as Christ instituted with John. The Gospel succeeded the law, which nevertheless has many things in common with the law: in the Mass they want God to be worshipped in a spiritual way, which nevertheless succeeded the Judaic sacrifices, with which they join some spiritual worship: the doctrine of the Apostles succeeded the doctrine of the prophets, although as to substance it is not diverse, because it is now proposed in another way. But here it must be observed that the Vulgate Interpreter uses words of the present tense, is offered, is sacrificed, from the circumstance of which time they gather a sacrifice in the last supper: Therefore let it be permitted to us to gather that the missal celebration obtained in the time of Malachi.

XXXVIII. We see therefore the fulfillment of that Prophecy in the Christian worship about which John 4. Rom. 12.1. 1. Pet. 2. Heb. 13. &c. which is bound neither to place, nor to any shadows. Isidore Clarius acknowledged this on this place, Hence it is clear that the ceremonies of the law were to be abolished in the time of Christ, and that all the faithful through the whole world were going to sacrifice the pure host of prayer; Nor do we teach that our sacrifices are unclean, for offered through Christ they are acceptable to God, 1. Pet. 2.5. what God cleanses is clean; what God has purified, you shall not call common. Acts 10. 15. But their conjecture is most vain, who think that Malachi used the singular number, because the Pontifical host is one in number, but the spiritual sacrifices are various: For we would gather, either that there was one Judaic sacrifice, or that David or Paul spoke about the Missatic sacrifice, when they said, Sacrifice and oblation you did not want, Ps. 40.7. Heb. 10.10. but because the Eucharistic rite pertains to the worship of God, the Fathers thought that it was comprehended by the prophecy of Malachi.

XXXIX. From these things the Response to the place of John 4. which they add is easy, which Ribera teaches pertains most especially to the internal worship of the soul, and shows that many have so expounded, especially Jansenius and Montanus, to whom we add Maldonatus, who determines that by these words the whole worship of Christians is comprehended: Nevertheless let the Pontificians see, how the Mass pertains to spiritual worship, which overflows with more rites, cautions, gestures, and those more laborious, than which we observe in the Levitical priesthood. Bellarmine Insists. the Samaritan woman spoke about the adoration which is sacrifice, Therefore the response of the Lord is understood about adoration through sacrifice. Excellently. In the same chapter the disciples speak about bodily food, v. 31. Therefore the response of Christ is to be understood about the same food, v. 32. This is the custom of

Christ, that taking occasion, he may quickly raise his hearers from bodily things to spiritual things; which he perpetually does in the conversation, which he had with the Samaritan woman.

XL. From the institution of the Eucharist they bring forth nothing which has not been confuted by us. That the words, Do this, do not pertain to the consecration of the priests, Matthew and Mark sufficiently indicate, who omitted them in their Gospels. Likewise, Do this, is, as Paul expounds, commemorate the death of the Lord. That this word is explained beyond the mind of Scripture, so that it may be the same as to sacrifice, Jansenius and Estius teach. He teaches that by the word of doing, many actions are comprehended fitting to the laity of receiving, eating, &c. and he proves this from the canon of the Mass, Bellarmine also embraces the opinion of John Hesselius of Louvain, who wants these words to be referred to all things, that is, to that, which Christ did, and that which the Apostles did, so that the sense may be, that Christ commanded that the action of the supper be celebrated in memory of his passion, and therefore that so great mysteries are to be taken attentively and reverently. Nay Bellarmine teaches that these words do not pertain to the consecration, and therefore neither to the constitution of the sacrifice: For the purpose is for the Apostle to emend the error of the Corinthians, who did not err in the consecration, because they did not take the Eucharist with due reverence, See Bell. book 4. on the Eucharist. 25. §. ult.

XLI. Where blood is shed for the remission of sins, there is a propitiatory sacrifice: But they say, in the supper blood is shed, because Luke 22. [Greek text] is to be joined with the word [Greek text], for the Evangelist indicated that the blood is shed, as it is in the chalice: I Respond. 1. sacramental and not real effusion is not a sacrifice. 2. they do not want the blood to be shed in the Mass, otherwise it would be bloody. It is shed, they say, in the species of wine, this is a wonderful effusion of blood because the blood does not go out from the body; but for a real sacrifice it is necessary that the blood be shed in its own species: This fictitious sacrifice rests on the no less absurd figment of transubstantiation, about which elsewhere.

XLII. They Add the place of Acts 13. 2. [Greek text], This word, says Bellarmine, signifies public ministry. i.e. external; But here it does not signify the ministry of the word or of the Sacraments, for we do not preach to God or dispense the Sacraments to him: And when this word is put absolutely in Scripture, everywhere it is taken for the ministry of sacrifice: Therefore Erasmus translates, Sacrificing to them, and the Greeks call the celebration of the Mass [Greek text]. I Respond. Bellarmine absurdly gathers, that the minister of the Word does not minister to God, because he does not preach to God: of whom therefore is he the minister, if not of God? Do the Magistrates who are called [Greek text], Rom. 13. 6. rule God? Certainly they are ministers of Christ who are dispensers of the mysteries of God, 1. Cor. 4. 1. although they do not preach to Christ. They Insist. Luke would not have added, & fasting, because to fast, is to minister to God: as if the ministry of the word cannot be conjoined with fasting, whose use was in the Apostolic Church in the vocation of Pastors, or the sending of the same to the Churches, Acts 14, 23. They Therefore were performing the Evangelical ministry: in which way Paul calls himself [Greek text], Ro. 15. 16. And that is clear, because first mention was made of Prophets and Doctors, as Cajetan reasons, confirming the sense of Oecumenius, who translates [Greek text]. When on a certain day they were exercising their ministry of prophesying, &c. as Arias



Montanus translates this place: which is the very opinion of Erasmus, although he used the word of sacrificing, which is not extant in the Vulgate Interpreter: in the same way Ferus: See Theophylact and Chrysostom. Lyranus extends this ministry to good works. Finally Sanctius and Lorinus on this place think this argument to be minimally necessary.

XLIII. If as often as the word [Greek text] is put absolutely sacrifice would be signified, the Angels also would be Missatic priests, Heb. 1. ult. the Magistrates would be priests, Rom. 13.6. Epaphroditus ministering to Paul would have sacrificed to him, Philip. 2. 25. the Philippians also would have sacrificed to Paul, Philip. 2. 30. the distribution of alms would be a sacrifice, about which it is here inquired. 2. Cor. 2. 12. The Fathers understood by this word the public prayers, which are commonly called divine offices. Therefore we read [Greek text] at which time they would not allow the Mass to be sung, in Theodor. book 4. ch. 13. otherwise 14, whose words the interpreter thus rendered, Having performed in the usual way the evening ministry of prayers. In the same [Greek text] book 1. ch. 23. the interpreter translates, to perform the sacred ministries. About this word see more in Cassander in the liturgicals, ch. 6.

XLIV. Finally Bellarmine brings forth the place 1. Cor. 10. The table of Demons was a properly so called altar. Therefore also the table of the Lord: because they are compared among themselves. I Respond. Paul does not compare table with table, but participation, i.e. communion, which depends on each table according to contrary effects. 2. the Gentiles did not feast on the altar, but they spread a table in the idol's temple, on which they were accustomed to feast: for although we acknowledge that table is sometimes taken for altar, as Malachi. 1.12. yet it is certain that the Gentiles did not recline at the very altars of the idols. This was the old custom of idolatry; that tables were spread for feasts in the shrine of the idols, Judg. 9. 27. Philo brings the causes why the ancients performed feasts in the temples, book on the planting of Noah. See Is. 65. 11. 1. Cor. 8. 10. nay they even spread tables for the idols themselves. See Hieronym. on Is. 65. to which the Pontificians refer the table which they spread for the idol Bel. In the same way sacrifice is not compared with sacrifice, but the participation of the Gentile sacrifice and of the Christian Eucharist is distinguished by reason of contrary effects. Therefore this is the reason of the comparison, just as the Gentiles after the sacrifices exhilarated themselves with feasts, to which the idolothya were applied. Thus we also have our sacrifice, which also pertains to a feast, the body and blood of Christ, which are proposed to us on the Eucharistic table: and just as they are partakers of the idols, who recline at the profane table of the idols, so also of Christ, who approach his table. But to want to recline at both tables, is to feign an association between Christ and the Evil Spirit. But now let us retort, Just as those, who were partakers of the table of demons, are said [Greek text], although they did not transmit the very substance either of the demons, or of the idol into the stomach, so those who recline at the table of Christ, are partakers of Christ, although they may not draw his substance through the mouth into the belly. About the place Heb. 13. 10. it does not pertain to act at length: it is certain that a stone altar is not erected there, it is certain that it is treated there of the death and passion of Christ, and of such a sacrifice which was accomplished outside the gate, and whose blood was transferred into the sanctuary: and the adversaries confess that nothing about the Mass was handed down by the Apostle in this epistle: About the Canon of the Mass and private Masses it will be treated afterwards.

XLV. The Missatic sacrifice which we have confuted was invented for profit, since in it Christ is venal, and procured for ambition: for if the Encomiasts of the sacerdotal office, (which is attributed to a vile sacrificer) dare to praise it, as most approaching to God, and in which a certain glory of the Divinity shines; what finally will be the glory of that thrice Greatest Pontiff of course, from whose sublimity the Mass-sayers are further absent, than the Nethinim formerly from the Jewish High Priest? The whole authority of the Priests among the common people depends on this sacrifice. Durandus the irrational wants the Mass to be said from such a sending, by which from the mass-sayers, Christ is sent to the Father through the oblation, by which he intercedes for us with him. And this sending, he says, or legation alone is sufficient, and suitable, to loose the enmities and offenses between God and men, book 4. ration. ch. num. 49. Thus the sacrificer is constituted the only sufficient and suitable Mediator between God and men. Let it be far from us to glory in another sacrifice than that, which Christ accomplished on the cross: In this one altar we will rest: to this true victim for sins, to this our one Priest be praise and glory. Amen.