

**ONE HUNDRED DEFECTS
OF THE MASS: FROM
THE ROMAN MISSAL**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649259069

One hundred defects of the Mass: from the Roman Missal by Robert Maguire

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

ROBERT MAGUIRE

**ONE HUNDRED DEFECTS
OF THE MASS: FROM
THE ROMAN MISSAL**

ONE HUNDRED
DEFECTS OF THE MASS;

From the Roman Missal;

(“DE DEFECTIBUS IN CELEBRATIONE MISSARUM OCCURRENTIBUS.”)

EXAMINED BY THE

REV. ROBERT MAGUIRE, B.A.

Clerical Secretary of the Islington Protestant Institute.

LONDON:
SEELEY, JACKSON, AND HALLIDAY,
54 FLEET STREET.

1854.

BT from G.K. Scott on report.



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction	3
I. General Rubric	4
II. "Defects of Matter" in General	4
III. "Defects of the Bread"	10
IV. "Defects of the Wine"	12
V. "Defects of Form"	4
VI. "Defects in the Officiating Priest"	5
VII. "Defects of Intention"	9
VIII. "Defects of Disposition of Mind"	6
IX. "Defects of Disposition of Body"	6
X. "Defects in the Service itself, in the Arrangement of the Vestments," &c.	45
<hr/>	
SUM TOTAL OF "DEFECTS"	100
Conclusion	32

TO THE READER.

* * We quote these "Defects" from the original *Latin* Missal. We say the *Latin* edition, because "The Defects of the Mass" are uniformly omitted from *all* the editions of the "*English* Missal, translated for the use of the Laity." We may, in passing, inquire, Why this omission? Why conceal "Defects" under cover of the Latin language, and in editions generally inaccessible to the Laity? We now, however, present them in the English tongue "for the use of the Laity!" This part of the Roman Missal is entitled, "*De Defectibus in celebratione Missarum occurrentibus.*"

ONE HUNDRED

DEFECTS OF THE MASS.

"DEFECTS of the Mass!" Who can presume to charge *any* Defect on a Service, conducted with such splendour, associated with such claims, characterised by such amazing pomp—a Service, in fact, designed to constitute the very soul of worship—the central glory of the Church of Rome?

An important question this! Rome herself shall answer it, in minute and accurate detail.

The Church of Rome has, from time to time, so encumbered the original institution of the Lord's Supper with additional ceremonies and novel principles, as almost, if not altogether, to hide its real import from view, and by withdrawing the cup from the Laity has so impaired this Institution in the Christian Church, as to offer a mutilated Sacrament to Christian people. Even what she *does* give, she conveys through the medium of a dead language, and unintelligible to her worshippers. Her trumpet gives an uncertain sound. Who, then, shall prepare himself to the battle? 1 Cor. xiv. 8.

But these are not the questions on which we just now propose to dwell. We propose to consider the Roman Mass as it stands. We allow the Roman Catholic for the moment to hold in undisturbed possession the principles on which he erects the Mass, and, with him, opening the Roman Missal, we proceed to inquire, What certainty he has that all is right?—what surety that the Mass is what it professes to be?—to consider, in a word, "THE DEFECTS OF THE MASS" as enumerated in the *Roman Missal*! The very title of our subject is supplied to us by the Church of Rome, and we instance no Defects of the Mass but such as she herself enumerates.

I. The directions concerning "the Defects of the Mass" are prefaced by the following general Rubric:—

"The Priest about to celebrate Mass must give all diligence, lest there should be anything deficient in those things which are essential to the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Now a Defect may happen on the part of the *matter* to be consecrated, on that of the *form* to be applied, and on that of the *Priest* who celebrates. For whatever of these is deficient, namely, the due *matter*, the *form with Intention*, and the sacerdotal order of the officiating Priest, the Sacrament is not completed."

Defects in any one or more of these particulars are *vital*, and lay the axe to the very root of the tree. There are, besides, some other Defects which, though not vital, yet, when occurring in the Mass, so impair its efficacy, and involve "either sin or scandal," as to leave day by day a lingering doubt in the minds of Roman Catholics, as to whether they ever have received, or ever can receive, a perfect Sacrament. Upon a review of such, and more particularly of the essential Defects, we now enter. Rome will unveil her own Defects, and speak for herself in this review. Let us calmly and candidly mark the inevitable results.

II. "Defects of *matter*" may be threefold:—"If any of those things be wanting which are requisite for the same." As, for instance, it is required:—

1. "That the bread be wheaten.
2. "That the wine be of the grape."

These Defects, here stated in general terms, are subsequently subdivided into the more minute details of their own peculiar Defects respectively, and are specially treated of in Series III. and IV. *infra*.

And—

3. "That the matter to be consecrated be in the sight of the Priest during consecration."

So that if the Priest should have his eye fixed on any other object, or if the elements lie not before him or within his sight, the Sacrament is useless, which, of course, the people cannot possibly ascertain.

Can any Roman Catholic, then, be *sure* that these Defects do not happen, or be certain that they do not very frequently occur?

III. The "Defects of the Bread" are Ten in number; namely,—

1. "If the bread be not wheaten, or, though wheaten, yet mixed with so much of any other grain as to neutralise the wheat.
2. "If the bread be otherwise adulterated.
3. "If it [the Host] be made of rose water, &c. it is *doubtful* whether the Sacrament is made.
4. "If the Host begin to be corrupted. And
5. "If it be not unleavened, the officiating Priest sins grievously."

These are doubts and uncertainties which it behoves the *Baker* to solve, or rather the parties, whoever they may be, who make the Host or Wafer. They alone can tell, but surely the people cannot, whether these Defects occur in the Bread. The Baker *may* commit some of these mistakes. Can he not? If he does (and he is not infallible), he destroys the efficacy and the value of the Sacrament. Such, however, is the certainty which Roman Catholics enjoy!

Again:—

6. "If the Priest should perceive, before consecration, that the Host is corrupted or not of wheat, that Host must be removed and another consecrated;—
7. "If he perceive this, *after* consecration, even after he has taken the Host, let him consecrate another;—
8. "If he has not eaten the Host [thus consecrated], let him eat it after he has taken the Body and Blood, or let him give it to another, or else reverently preserve it;—
9. "But if he has eaten it, nevertheless let him eat that also which he has consecrated, because the command concerning the *perfection* of the Sacrament is of greater weight than the taking of it fasting."

What strange Rubrics these, and how conflicting! Directions are given to produce Christ on the altar, and then, for some reason, to set Him aside again. Christ Himself, that is, in Romish theology, the Consecrated Host, is to be devoured, if He be made of wheat; but if it be discovered that He is made of that which is not wheat, He is given away, or carefully locked up and superseded by another!

Will not Roman Catholics, then, be careful to inquire whether the consecrated Host be made of wheat, before they worship it?

And then, If it be of wheat, why ought they to worship it?

And again, If the Host, by consecration, be transubstantiated, that is, changed—*wholly* changed into quite

another substance, how can the Priest possibly "discover after consecration that it has not been made of wheat?"

Although there ought in reality to be a tremendous difference between a transubstantiated Host and a Host *non-transubstantiated*; as great a difference, indeed, as exists between the creature and the Creator; yet we know that there is not a Priest in Christendom who could of himself distinguish between two Hosts thus circumstantially distinct. Let us suppose, then, a transubstantiated Host, or at least a Host after consecration, presented to a Priest, in order that he may tell whether it has been made of wheat or not so. How can he decide? He must analyse it *as though* it were *not* transubstantiated, and thus belie the assumed effect of the words of consecration; and, after all, his decision must be either a truism or a contradiction. For, if it be found to be not wheaten, it continues to be not wheaten; and if it is of wheat, it is adjudged, by virtue of its consecration, to be no longer wheat, but *flesh*! That is, if it is not wheaten, it is not wheaten; which is a palpable truism: and if it is wheat, it is *not* wheat, but clearly, infallibly, *flesh* and *blood*; which is a palpable contradiction!

Either, then, Transubstantiation is false, or, to detect the original substance of the Host, *after* consecration, is impossible.

✓ And yet again,—If the Priest can transubstantiate wheaten bread, why can he not also transubstantiate bread not purely wheaten? Does the adulteration of bread—so easily detected by the chemist or the housewife—baffle the power of the Priest? If so, he is not half so powerful as Roman Catholics generally imagine him to be!

Moreover:—

10. "If the consecrated Host disappear either by any accident, such as by the wind, or by a miracle; or, being taken by any animal and cannot be found again; then let another be consecrated."

Thus the Church of Rome would teach us that the body of Christ, which is now glorified in heaven, is subject to accident, or may be removed by the wind. But are we not informed that even in the days of His humiliation, "the winds and the waves obeyed Him?" Can it be,

then, that Christ, now ascended into glory, is liable to become the sport of the winds which, while on earth, He commanded?

Again: The consecrated Host may be removed "by a miracle." But the Priest (it is said) works a miracle in the consecration of the Host; yet it appears that some one else may work another "miracle" to remove it. This is miracle against miracle!

And again: The consecrated Host may be taken away by some animal and never be found again. That is to say, that He who "came to seek and to save that which was lost," may Himself be lost, *never* to be found again! That a beast of the field or a fowl of the air may now devour the very body of Christ. Remember, this is a Defect that may occur *after* consecration!

Tell me!—Is this to glorify that Blessed Saviour who loved us, and who still loves us, even with an everlasting love? Is He now subject to the changes and chances of this mortal life—exposed to accident, offence, and injury? No, certainly no! He is now ascended up "far above *all* power and *every* name that is named, not only in *this* world, but also in that which is to come," Eph. i. 20, 21.

IV. The "Defects of the Wine" are Twelve in number, namely:—

1. "If the wine be rather sour, or made of unripe grapes, the Sacrament is not made;
2. "Or, if there be so much water mixed with it, as to corrupt the wine, the Sacrament is not made.
3. "If the wine has begun to grow sour or to be corrupted;—
4. "Or, if it be new wine;—
5. "Or, if it be not mixed with water;—
6. "Or, if the water be rose water, the officiating Priest sins grievously."

Here, then, are questions which neither Priest nor people can possibly decide—questions which can be answered only by the vintner and the wine merchant; and yet on these it depends, whether a Roman Catholic is to have a true Sacrament or not;—whether he is to enjoy the reality or be put off with the pretence.

For instance,—Who can tell whether the wine which is used in any given celebration of the Mass has been