

tion. If it is the very same sacrifice as that of the Cross—a renewal of that sacrifice—then it must be for the same purpose. But if the death of Christ on the Cross was the full price of our redemption, what more is needed? Then, the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass is utterly useless.

Finally,—it is said that this sacrifice is to be offered up “in honour of the saints to obtain their patronage and intercession.” What! The crucified Redeemer, the Lord of glory, offered up as a sacrifice by human beings to the honour of other human beings—the Saints, to obtain their patronage and intercession!—Is this Christianity? Can it be possible that these words were spoken by Christians—or is not this rather a pagan speaking of the sacrifices he offers up to appease his gods many and lords many? My brethren, is *this* agreeable to reason? Is it possible to believe that God ordains that He Himself should be offered by us, as a sacrifice in honour of saints—dead men—to obtain their patronage and intercession? Is it not, rather, rightly styled *a blasphemous fable*?

This, then, is not a reasonable doctrine. Here, again, as reason is utterly irreconcilable with Transubstantiation, the foundation, so it utterly revolts against the superstructure, the pretended propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass.

*The propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass has no foundation in Holy Scripture.*

II. Let us proceed to examine the Mass by the light of HOLY SCRIPTURE. The defenders of the doctrine bring forward several passages to prove it; but some of them are nothing to the point, as many of their own doctors allow; and others, if they can be understood to speak of a sacrifice under the Gospel at all, do certainly not (nor is it pretended) assert that it is the same identical sacrifice with that of Christ on the Cross. Indeed if we grant them every text they