

THE MYSTERY OF FAITH

THE MYSTERY OF FAITH

*Regarding the MOST AUGUST SACRAMENT
and SACRIFICE of the BODY and BLOOD
of CHRIST*

BOOK I: *The Sacrifice of OUR LORD*

by Maurice de la Taille, S.J.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE
PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY
OF ROME

*The sacrifice of the Mass ... is ... at
once the representation and offering of
the Passion of our Lord.*

ST PETER CANISIUS

New York & London
SHEED & WARD

1940

NIHIL OBSTAT

Arthur J. Scanlan, S.T.D.
Censor Librorum.

IMPRIMATUR

✠ Francis J. Spellman, D.D.
Archbishop, New York.

New York, August 2, 1940.

COPYRIGHT, 1940, BY SHEED & WARD, INC.

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE HADDON CRAFTSMEN, INC.
CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY

MEMORIAE
PII PAPAE X
SANCTISSIMAE

ABBREVIATIONS

- A. H. *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, ed. G. M. DREVES, S. J., and C. BLUME, S. J., accedente H. M. BANNISTER, tom. 1-55, 1896-1915.
- B. BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Vol. 1. *Eastern Liturgies*, 1896.
- C. S. C. O. *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, accurantibus L. B. CHABOT, etc.
- D. H. DENZINGER, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, etc., 10, ed. BANNWART.
- D. A. C. *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*. Dom CABROL et Dom LECLERCQ.
- D. B. *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. HASTINGS.
- D. T. C. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*. A. VACANT. E. MANGE-
NOT.
- F. D. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolicae*, ed. FUNK, 1906.
- F. P. *Patres Apostolici*, 2, 1901, ed. FUNK.
- J. T. S. *Journal of Theological Studies*.
- L. B. LE BRUN, *Explication . . . de la Messe*, 1777-1778.
- P. G. *Patrologia Graeca*, accurante J. P. MIGNE.
- P. L. *Patrologia Latina*, accurante J. P. MIGNE.
- P. O. *Patrologia Orientalis*. R. GRAFFIN and F. NAU.
- P. S. *Patrologia Syriaca*. R. GRAFFIN.
- R. RENAUDOT, *Collectio liturgiarum Orientalium*.
- R. S. R. *Recherches de Science Religieuse*.
- S. Th. I S. ST THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*. 1st part.
- T. a. S. *Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*. J. ARMITAGE-ROBINSON.
- T. u. U. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. O. v. GEBHARDT, ADOLF HARNACK, CARL SCHMIDT.

PREFACE

In this treatise I deal first with the sacrifice and then with the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, with the sacrifice offered by our Lord Himself before the sacrifice offered by us every day in our churches, with the Last Supper before the institution of the Mass. Hence I have inverted the usual order followed in the schools in treatises on the Eucharist. The reason for this will, I think, be plain when we consider how the communion is related to the sacrifice, and how our Mass is related to what Christ did at the Supper before He said: Do this. I have simply followed the natural order, dealing first with what came first, and then with everything that followed therefrom in natural sequence.

It will cause some surprise that I have never of set purpose undertaken in any part of this work to vindicate the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but merely as occasion offered dispelled some shadow of difficulty arising from certain sayings of the Fathers. In explanation I may say that I did not intend to treat the Blessed Eucharist fully from every aspect, and having for the most part omitted apologetical matters, I turned to phases on which faith seeking knowledge would shed some theological light. Other greater reasons weighed with me against undertaking a work well and abundantly done by many great theologians. In the first place, the Real Presence of our Lord appeared to me to be quite sufficiently proven from the arguments advanced and sifted through the whole course of this book, particularly in what is written of the sacrifice of our Lord and the sacrifice of the Mass. Besides, it would be frivolous to deny the constant and firm faith of the Church in the Real Presence, even from the first century. Who accepts today the sophisticated exegeses of the sixteenth-century reformers? Even the Protestants, particularly those of the so-called liberal school, have eventually come to admit that the Real Presence is taught by the sacred writings, especially from the time of St Paul (as we shall see in its proper place). For the theologian this is enough: for the real sources of theology are the documents of divine revelation; to one who denies the authority of these documents the theologian as such has nothing to say, because theology is for believers. Sacred theology, however, having in mind the good of believers, is bound to solve difficulties advanced by an adversary who, "while believing nothing in things divinely revealed, brings difficulties

against faith" (I S. 1, 8). Hence we have answered adversaries who, though interpreting rightly St Paul's mind, would have it that his mind was foreign to the mind of our Lord; we have also answered those who have maintained that, in the matter of our sacrifice, the teaching of the Church today is other than the teaching of the early Church.

In explanation of the doctrine, I have kept separate as a rule Scripture documents and the teaching of the Fathers or the Doctors of the Church. It may be thought that I have been prolix in my quotations from the Fathers, but I will be readily forgiven when it is remembered that the ideal of a theologian is not to advance his own special findings, but what he has actually gathered from the Fathers and Doctors. His purpose is to record them honestly, co-ordinate and refine them, and, where necessary, set them down in detail. At times I have presented the teachings and pronouncements of certain mediaeval theologians both of the East and of the West; they were not writers of the first rank; some, indeed, were tainted with heresy or schism. My object was, not to advance their teachings as authentic masters of the faith, but to show that they were historical witnesses of the teachings handed down to them by their predecessors of olden days. Meantime, that I have bestowed the highest encomiums on one or other of these writers, Nicholas Cabasilas, for example, need not be taken amiss. Had Cabasilas, in dealing with the unity of the Church, bestowed the care and skill that he showed in dealing with the sacraments of the faith, he would be above all praise. Hence Catholic theologians of former centuries are in no way culpable for praising what is good in what he wrote; rather they are to be commended, according to the phrase of Moses: O that all the people might prophesy, provided, as St Paul says, Christ is announced.

For I have written, not to dispute but to illuminate, not to sharpen my wits or to obtain praise for learning, but to build up the faith, that the knowledge of the faith may be enriched, to enable us to appreciate the full benefit of the gift of God: unto the praise of the glory of His grace, in which He hath graced us in His beloved Son. In whom we have redemption through the remission of sins, according to the richness of His grace, which hath superabounded in us in all wisdom and prudence. That He might make known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, which hath proposed in Him in the dispensation of the fulness of times, to re-establish all things in Christ, that are in heaven and on earth, in Him (Eph. 1⁶). For theology is a speculative science of revealed truth, but revealed in such manner as to aim at fostering piety. Hence St Paul calls it the acknowledging of the truth which is according to godliness (Tit. 1¹). Hence in theology there is no place for anything which does not foster

piety. One must keep in mind, however, that though theology has to do with what is of the highest importance and value to our spiritual progress, it still remains a science. Indeed it is a science in the strict meaning of the word, an ordered group of knowledge, resting on its own principles, with all its parts connected and coherent among themselves, after the manner of an organic body. Hence no part of theology, no smallest portion of any province of theology, can be fully explored and solidly founded without reference to its corresponding part and corresponding member. Those who have scant knowledge of the argumentative method of theology scout this idea, as though it meant our becoming the victims of systems of theology. Perish, indeed, all such systems, which are, as Cardinal Billot says, "the ruin of theology" (Cardinal Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis*,⁴ I, 426). But a system and a body of doctrine are poles apart. A body of doctrine is certainly coherent, just as truth is coherent; no one element of it can be in opposition to another, and, if we are concerned with necessary elements, no one element can be sacrificed without the loss of another, so much so that you tear down the whole building, so to speak, if you remove a single stone. Such is the glory of truth at its summit, without admixture of any prejudgments resting on error.

A system, however, is quite a different thing. It is not deduced from the first principles of the branch of knowledge in question (such as are, in theology, the articles of faith), inferring therefrom manifold conclusions, from the complexus of which arises a new increment of knowledge, a new birth; a system is merely a hypothetical explanation of things impossible of demonstration; not having a principle of demonstration, it merely provides a form or mould for the elements in question, a mould formed and conceived by the mind artificially, by the help of which we can conveniently unite and co-adapt the elements according to our scheme. Such a systematic method is useful, even necessary in the physico-mathematical sciences, in which we merely investigate the quantitative relations between the measurable effects of natural agents, but do not investigate the essences of things and potencies; such quantitative relations are then given by convention symbolical expression such as is well suited to the end in view, according to time and circumstances. In theology the case is quite different: we ask ourselves, *What properly is this, what in its intrinsic essence is this matter with which our faith concerns itself?* There is no theology that does not reject systems; but theology does require an organic articulation and complexus of all the elements among themselves. If you find the latter in this book, know that I am quite unrepentant; I accept the imputation so gladly that I would go on to say that in my opinion, no part of the book could be completely

understood by a reader who had not read the whole. And so, while I beg you, prudent reader, to pardon me for the many defects in the work before you, at the same time I earnestly ask critics not to condemn me unless first heard with toleration from the opening chapter to the conclusion.

Each smallest portion, as well as the whole work, I submit without reserve to the universal episcopate and to the Roman Pontiff.

Amiens, March 19, 1915, Feast of St Joseph.

THE AUTHOR.

POST-SCRIPT

I had scarcely finished this work when I was summoned to a military camp as war chaplain. Thus I had no opportunity to study any interim writings. Still I must not omit here the learned discussion of Dom. R. H. Connolly, O.S.B., published in Texts and Studies, vol. 8, n. 4, and entitled The So-Called Egyptian Order and Derived Documents. From this work of Dom. Connolly it appears:

First: The opusculum (A), first written in Greek, the Coptic and Arabic versions of which (in lack of the original text) we had called Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae (or, for the other Ethiopic version, Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopicae), and some notable parts of which are given in Latin in what are called Reliquiae canonum Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum by Hauler (Leipzig, 1900), and which opusculum we have often referred to in three forms, is nothing else than the Apostolike Paradisos of Hippolytus, which was formerly looked upon as lost.¹

Second: From this work are derived what we call the Canones Hippolyti (B) compiled by a much more recent writer who corrupted and interpolated the text.

From these two facts it is inferred that the value and authority of A, which we have cited as indicating the Liturgy, not necessarily of the Church at Rome, but at least a Roman liturgy of the beginning of the third century, has been greatly enhanced; on the other hand, B, to which we have alluded only very rarely, is not a little lessened in authority.

After Dom. Connolly had arrived at his conclusions and independently confirmed them, he discovered that the same conclusions had been reached

¹ The first title of the book is: *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina. Accedunt Canonum qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum Reliquiae*. What we say here refers only to that part of the *Reliquiae* from page 101, l. 31, to the end of the book. The Latin version only we call the *Apostolike paradisos*, or it will be under the name of Hippolytus.

in 1910, and the results published in Alsace, by E. Schwartz, Ueber die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen, in Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg, n. 6.

As occasion arises, we shall note any other matters of importance derived from new sources.

From the Overseas Canadian Forces, Feb. 11, 1919,
Feast of our Lady of Lourdes.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

This translation was made substantially from the second edition published in 1923, but with certain additions and emendations from the third edition published in 1929.

§ 3. The Supper and The Sacrifice of Melchisedech	94
A. Testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews	94
B. Patristic Testimony	95
(a) <i>The Melchisedechian Character of the Supper</i>	96
(b) <i>The Resemblance Between the Offering of Melchisedech and the Sacrifice of the Cross</i>	99
(c) <i>The Oneness of the Melchisedechian Supper and the Passion</i>	100
(d) <i>Epilogue on Hebrews IX. 14</i>	107
§ 4. The Supper and the Promise of the Eucharist	110
Epilogue on Some Theological Principles of the Discussion	115
§ 5. Some Circumstances of the Supper	117
A. The Betrayal by Judas	117
B. The Sacerdotal Prayer of Christ	121
C. The Going Forth from the Cenacle to the Garden	123
<i>Appendix A: The Obligation of Christ to Submit to Death</i>	125
§ 6. Triple Conclusion	136
A. The Nature of the Oneness of the Supper and the Passion	136
B. The Oneness of the Apparent Sacrifice of Bread and Wine and of the Real Sacrifice of the Body and the Blood of the Lord	145
C. The Offering to Death in the Supper Requires the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist	149
§ 7. The Council of Trent	154
A. The History of the Definition	154
B. The Tenor of the Decree	157
<i>Chapter IV: THE PARTAKING OF THE EUCHARIST BY CHRIST</i>	163
§ 1. Scripture, the Fathers and Later Theologians	165
§ 2. Intrinsic Reason	174
<i>Chapter V: THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST CONTINUED IN HEAVEN</i>	181
§ 1. Christ as Celestial Victim	184
A. Scripture Testimonies	184
B. The Testimony of the Fathers	185
(a) <i>The Sacrifice and the Resurrection</i>	185
THE VICTIM PERFECTED BY THE RESURRECTION	185
THE PRIESTHOOD RATIFIED BY GOD IN THE RESURRECTION	191
(b) <i>The Sacrifice and the Ascension</i>	196
(c) <i>Theological Proof</i>	207
(a) <i>Our Justification is a Proof of the Eternity of the Sacrifice of Christ</i>	207

	<i>(b) The Sacrifice of the Mass is a Proof of the Eternity of the Sacrifice of Christ</i>	214
§ 2.	Christ as Eternal Altar	215
	A. Is Christ the Altar of His Sacrifice?	215
	B. Is the Risen Christ the Altar of His Sacrifice?	220
	C. Our Material Altars and the Heavenly Altar	227
§ 3.	Christ as Eternal Intercessor	235
	A. The Prayer of Christ in Heaven	235
	B. Does Christ Adore in Heaven?	241
	C. The Stigmata of the Passion	244
§ 4.	Conclusion on the Various Teachings Regarding the Heavenly Sacrifice	247

THESES

- I. *Latreutic and propitiatory sacrifice is due to God. The offering of Sacrifice may be really distinct from the immolation. The offering is to be distinguished from the acceptance by God and from human partaking (Chapter I, page 1).*
- II. *The Passion of Christ was a sacrifice in the strict sense, lacking no element—visible or invisible—of a true sacrifice (Chapter II, page 27).*
- III. *It can be shown from the Supper narrative that Christ as priest offered His Body to the immolation in blood of the Passion (Chapter III § 1, page 50).*
- IV. *The same can be shown from the comparison of the Supper narrative with the figures of the Mosaic covenant and the legal pasch (Chapter III § 2, page 75).*
- V. *The same can be shown also from the comparison of the Supper narrative with the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the priesthood of Christ according to the order of Melchisedech (Chapter III § 3, page 94).*
- VI. *Finally it can be shown from the comparison of the Supper narrative with the promise of the Eucharist (Chapter III § 4, page 110).*
- VII. *It is confirmed by three circumstances of the Supper (Chapter III § 5, page 117).*
- VIII. *The teaching of the Fathers and Theologians regarding the obligation of Christ to die is set in clearer light by the above doctrine (Chapter III. Appendix A, page 125).*
- IX. *Conclusions may now be reached concerning the nature of the unity existing between the Supper and the Passion, between the apparent sacrifice of bread and wine and the real sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ; the agreement of the doctrine regarding the reality of the eucharistic sacrifice and that of the Real Presence (Chapter III § 6, page 136).*
- X. *It is illustrated from the history and teaching of the Council of Trent (Chapter III § 7, page 154).*
- XI. *It is highly probable that Christ Himself received the*

- eucharistic food and drink at the Supper* (Chapter IV, page 165).
- XII. *The sacrifice offered by Christ at the Supper and actually given to God in the Passion received a certain consummation in the Resurrection and Ascension, and continues for ever, as is clear from Scripture, the Fathers and Theology* (Chapter V § 1, page 184).
- XIII. *Connected with the victimhood of Christ is His eternal dignity as altar of the sacrifice* (Chapter V § 2, page 215).
- XIV. *Consistent with this is the dogma of the eternal intercession of Christ* (Chapter V § 3, page 235).
- XV. *From all this a conclusion can be reached as to various teachings regarding the heavenly sacrifice* (Chapter V § 4, page 247).

CHAPTER I
OF SACRIFICE IN GENERAL

CHAPTER I

Before coming to the discussion of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, some preliminary remarks on sacrifice in general are necessary. We shall consider first the *latreutic*, then the propitiatory character of sacrifice. Having considered the *offering* of sacrifice, we shall consider the partaking of the sacrifice.

§ 1. Sacrifice as Latreutic

The doctrine of sacrifice as latreutic is contained in TWO STATEMENTS.¹

¹ Many modern theologians think that in sacrifice as latreutic, it is God as the *Author of life and death* that is primarily worshipped. Their argument is that in order to acknowledge the supreme dominion of God, man (as far as rested with himself) would be bound to destroy himself, and to hand himself over to death; however, he is not allowed to do this, and so he substitutes for himself other things, animate or inanimate, to be destroyed in God's honour. Thus Lugo (*De sacrament. euchar.*, disp. 19, sect. 1, n. 5): "Sacrifice is a protestation whereby man acknowledges that he has his whole being from God, and hence it is meet that this same being and this same life, should be consumed and destroyed in His honour and worship. This is not lawful as a rule, hence the life or the being of some other thing is offered by us in place of our own life, as a protestation that we should offer our own

First: Some kind of invisible internal offering of ourselves is due to God; this offering is of such nature

life in the same way, were it lawful and fitting." According to this explanation, sacrifice as latreutic would not signify something of itself perfecting man, but rather reducing him to a lower condition. However, this view is not in accord with reason because, save where there has been commission of sin, no infliction of evil has that actual intrinsic perfecting character, which must be inherent in every virtue—and religion, as part of justice, is one of the moral virtues. Nor has this view the support of patristic authority. Eusebius of Caesarea (*Demonstr. evangel.* l. 1, c. 10. P. L. 84-85) is sometimes appealed to—unjustifiably—as favouring this meaning. In the passage in question Eusebius is speaking of sacrifice, not only as latreutic and eucharistic, but also as propitiatory and expiatory, and it is to sacrifice as latreutic that this explanation pertains; for, as we shall see, the punishment of death, not only temporal but also eternal, is due to man for sin, and for this punishment there may be substituted the death or the slaying of another living thing. Following St Thomas, therefore, we shall explain latreutic sacrifice, not as a diminution but as an enrichment of man's life, for worship in external sensible forms is required by the nature of men, not that by loss of life or existence they may be further removed from God who is a Subsistent Being and the plenitude of life, but because "by acts of this kind [sacrifice] we COME NEARER TO GOD" (3 C.G., 119, par. 3). In the solution of this question, therefore, we must first of all look to God as our END, or as the highest Goodness, perfecting all things. See in

that it cannot be given to any other being without very grave sin.

Second: This offering must be outwardly and sensibly signified.

FIRST STATEMENT

All beings are made to attain to God in the manner appropriate to the nature of each. But rational beings are superior to the rest. They partake of God by knowledge; indeed by the decree of God, if worthy, they will possess Him; and to this end they are inspired, helped, and drawn by God. Hence it is strictly in accordance with the dues and merits of the highest Goodness²

Zacharias Pasqualigo, *De sacrificio novae legis*, quaest. 6, n. 5, Rome 1707, t. I, p. 6, a sharp criticism of the teaching of Lugo upon the desire to destroy ourselves in honour of God.

² Like other duties, the duty of latria is referred back ultimately, not to the divine omnipotence whereby God keeps all things in being, but to the absolute GOODNESS and LOVABLENESS which calls all things to itself, demanding in its own right all love, so that should a person not seek after God, he turns his back on good and inclines to evil. Indeed the question arises, why, even prior to the divine will intervening, and freely decreeing any law, we must be ready to obey the divine will, should it issue a command. The reply is: God is Goodness itself, of itself worthy of love and super-love. The foundation of all duty, therefore, is the worthiness OF THE DIVINE GOODNESS. But lovableness in God is itself love (God being a pure act of love, so not moved to love, being Himself love); hence the primary foundation of all obligation is the will—not free but natural and necessary—whereby God wills Himself, or loves His own goodness. Nevertheless, the ultimate and primary reason of latria, just as

(or of the first cause beyond which there is no ulterior end, since it is itself the ultimate end) that man should pay homage to his creator, his providential Guardian and source of happiness, with that interior cult with which it behoves him to worship THE SUPREME GOOD, from which all good things come (while nothing is good unless directed to Him), and in whom, since He alone is good, is accumulated the one Goodness of all good things. Hence St Thomas: "Amongst other things which pertain to latria, sacrifice seems to have certain characteristics peculiar to itself . . . ; external sacrifice is representative of interior true sacrifice, according to which the human mind offers itself to God. NOW OUR MIND OFFERS ITSELF TO GOD, AS TO THE PRINCIPLE OF ITS CREATION, THE FOUNDATION OF ITS ACTIVITIES, AND THE END OF ITS HAPPINESS. All this is applicable only to the highest principle of things. For it has been shown that the creative cause of the rational soul is alone the Most High God; and He alone can bend the will of man to what He wishes, as was shown above. It is clear also,

of all the other duties, is not to be sought in the agents themselves, but in the end intended by the agent. For the end which is in view is the first cause and the key to the whole moral order. We have the same in the domestic and political order. All dependence originates in the demands of the COMMON GOOD, and he on whom the care and solicitude for the common good properly falls is by that very fact in command.

from what has been said above, that in the fruition of Him alone the happiness of man consists" (3 C.G., par. 7).³

The first and the highest duty of man, therefore, is to hand himself over, to surrender, to submit himself to God; and the name *latria* is given to this duty.

Moreover, seeing that the divine Goodness is the diffusive principle of all the good conveyed to us, it is in accordance with the duty of *latria* that the benefits conferred on us by God should receive recognition by thanksgiving (*eucharistia*).

And further, seeing that this first Goodness is the one and only source whence the supreme good and all other goods leading up to its attainment may be hoped for, he who devotes himself to the pursuit of the supreme good expresses thereby his desire for God's help and God's gifts, all of which he may with more reason expect to receive, in so far as God does not allow Himself to be outdone in generosity. Hence the language of the saints: "The more

³ Clearer still, perhaps, are the words of the holy Doctor in *Ps.* 37, 3: "The Lord desired those things to be offered to Himself, not on account of their intrinsic properties, because He Himself said: *Shall I eat of the flesh of bulls?* BUT IN ORDER THAT WE MAY KNOW HIM AS THE SOURCE OF ALL OUR GOODS, AND AS THE END UNTO WHICH ALL THINGS ARE TO BE REFERRED, and so it is unlawful to offer sacrifice to any one but God. For God is the end and we can add nothing to Him: hence we must give glory to Him, so that all that we do, we do for His glory."

closely a man is united to God⁴ the more generous he is to the supreme majesty, and the more generous also will be the benefits conferred on him, and every day he will become more worthy of richer spiritual graces and gifts" (St Ignatius Loyola, *Constitution of the Society of Jesus*, p. 3, c. 1, par. 22). Impetration, therefore, namely, the securing of favours by petition, is implied too in all *latria*.

SECOND STATEMENT

Taking our nature as it is, and in the present condition—wherein it is by the senses only, and the organs of sense, that man apprehends anything in his mind or performs any mental act—this essential duty of *latria* must be clothed in sensible rites; and these rites must be such as to express the supreme dominion of God, and our absolute dependence on Him. Thus St Thomas says: "NOW BECAUSE IT WAS CONNATURAL FOR MAN TO ACQUIRE KNOWLEDGE THROUGH THE SENSES, AND MOST DIFFICULT FOR HIM TO TRANSCEND SENSIBLE THINGS, provision was made for man by God that even in sensible things, a commemoration of di-

⁴ "To be more closely united with God, and to be more generous with Him, is to dedicate one's whole self unswervingly to the divine service" (*ibid.* *Declaratio* T). Here the Saint has in mind dedication by the vows of religion. Later in this work we shall speak of the analogy between the vows of religion and the sacrifice.

vine things should be made for Him, thereby directing the mind of man to divine things with greater facility, man's mind being incapable of contemplating divine things in themselves. Hence also SENSIBLE SACRIFICES were instituted; these sacrifices man offers to God, not that God has need of them, but that MAN SHOULD BE GIVEN TO UNDERSTAND THAT HE IS UNDER OBLIGATION TO REFER HIMSELF AND ALL HE HAS TO GOD, AS TO AN END, and as to the Creator, Lord, and Ruler of the universe" (C.G. 119, par. 1).

It is but just and reasonable, moreover, that both in body and soul, man should ratify and proclaim this unique relation of his to God—"that man should serve God with the whole being which he has from God, not only with his mind but also with his body," as St Thomas says when treating of vocal prayer (2-2, 83, 12, c).

Furthermore, man is a gregarious animal, born for the companionship of his kind, and the Most High God is the Author, the Legislator, and the Consummator of this social relation. Hence our worship of God must be sealed with the social impress, and it can neither be social nor public unless ratified and given outward manifestation.⁵

⁵ It is only on these grounds, and indeed only in social—that is domestic or public—worship that a legitimate minister (one constituted by law) or a legitimately instituted rite could be demanded by the natural law. But under the present dispensation we are

Visible sacrifice therefore is in conformity with the psychological requirements of our present condition, the moral debt of our nature to

not justified or accepted by God unless we enter into the society of the body of Christ which is the Church; Vasquez therefore very rightly says: "Although in the written law, and indeed in most nations, special signs were instituted as distinguishing marks of all sacrifices, and also special men were appointed for adoration and other religious rites; nevertheless OF ITS OWN NATURE SACRIFICE DOES NOT POSTULATE THESE TWO THINGS, because according to the natural law by which sacrifice was introduced it would be lawful for any one to honour God with this kind of worship also, and hence to select for himself any sign fitting in itself for the worship of God in this way—especially were man not to dwell after the manner of his kind in towns or cities, but each one by himself; as long as no human or divine law were opposed to this legitimate freedom of the natural law, any individual could offer sacrifice by any sign whatever appropriate for sacrifice, and for this reason real sacrifice would have been possible without any public institution" (in 3^{am} d^{em} disp. 220 c. 3, n. 20). In the treatise *De Eucharistia* (disp. 675, sect. 3) and passim in his *De Incarnatione* (part I, disp. 645, sect. 1, n. 1), Suarez discusses this in the same sense and at some length. St Thomas also favours this view where he says that before the Law "certain ceremonies were appointed, not actually on the authority of any particular law, but simply in accord with man's will and his devotion when showing honour to God" (1-2, 102, 1. c.). And again: "Before the Law the ancients offered sacrifices with a certain devotion of their own will, and as seemed fitting to them, in order to make protestation, that in the things which they had received from God, and which in divine reverence they used to offer, they were doing honour to God, the beginning and the end of all things" (*ibid.* q. 1^m). But for social worship, the representative of the commonweal must of necessity have public authority.

God, and the social element of our make-up. Hence from every point of view it is man's duty, deeply immersed as he is, especially since the fall,⁶ in sensible things, to pay wor-

⁶ It might be questioned whether sacrifice would be required in every condition of human nature. St Augustine apparently holds that in the primeval state of innocence and happiness there would be no place for exterior sacrifice. He writes (*Civ. Dei*, 26-27. P. L. 41, 700-701): "We must speak on the interpretation of the saying *as in the years that are past and the days that are gone*. It is quite possible that reference is here made to the time when the first men were in paradise. For then they offered THEMSELVES to God pure and clean from any defilement of sin, as clean victims"—that is to say, without the assistance of signs. St Thomas agrees with St Augustine, for while including sacrifice among the sacraments (4 D 2, 1, 3, c, fi), he excludes the sacraments from the state of original innocence (3 S. 61, 2). However, there are theologians who say that sacrifices were appropriate and even necessary in the state of original innocence. Suarez (*Da sacramentis in genere*, disp. 3, sect. 3, n. 4) is probably one of them. He upholds the appropriateness of *sacraments* in the state of original innocence by arguments which can be employed equally as well to show the utility of *sacrifices*. Vasquez (in 3^{am} p^{em}, disp. 130, c. 1, n. 4), though without giving names, speaks of some of his contemporaries who said that Adam and Eve and their children, had they remained in innocence, would have been bound to offer sacrifices to God. Billuart explicitly supports this teaching of the necessity of sacrifice in the state of original innocence (in 3 S. 61, 2, in reply to objection 3^m). However, we follow St Augustine and St Thomas. We think that IN THE STATE OF PRIMEVAL ELEVATION, because of the complete sway of the spirit over the body, sacrifice would not have been necessary. BUT IN A STATE OF PURE GUILTLESS NATURE (and our present state, considering merely natural

ship to God in sensible things, and show by some exclusive form of external worship, chosen especially for the purpose, his reverence, his obedience and his striving towards God, as his unique First Cause, his omnipotent Ruler, his ultimate End. Peter the Venerable says very justly: "And when the world ceases to offer sacrifice to God, it will cease to be God's" (*Tract. contra Petrobrusianos*, P. L. 189, 793).

It is a crime and a sacrilege to offer sacrifice to any other than the true God, for this is to attribute to the creature the dignity of the Creator.

Apart, however, from that one special sign of divine honour, any other protestations of veneration or homage may be accorded to others besides God; for example, to the saints. St Augustine says: "Christians celebrate the memory of the martyrs with religious solemnity. . . . But though we build altars in memory of the martyrs, we do not build them to the martyrs. What bishop at the altar where the relics of the martyrs lie, ever said . . . we offer to thee, Peter, Paul, or Cyprian? What is offered is offered to God, who crowned the martyrs, at the memorials of those whom He conditions, is far lower than that, as will be shown in the treatise *De gratia*), it is very likely that latreutic sacrifice would have been necessary or at least appropriate, because of the greater mingling of the spirit with the senses in such state.

crowned . . . THEREFORE WE HONOUR THE MARTYRS WITH THAT WORSHIP OF LOVE AND SYMPATHETIC ASSOCIATION, WITH WHICH EVEN IN THIS LIFE, MEN OF GOD ARE WORSHIPPED, MEN WHOSE HEARTS WE FEEL ARE PREPARED TO UNDERGO SIMILAR SUFFERING IN THE CAUSE OF THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL. . . . But that worship which is termed *latreia* in the Greek, and for which the Latin language has no word, is a service proper to and due to the divinity alone; and with this we do not worship, and we teach that no one should worship, any other than the one God" (*Contra Faustum*, I. 20, c. 21, P. L. 42, 384-385).

Thus, prompted by nature from the very dawn of his creation or taught by God Himself, man has been wont to give gifts and presents⁷

⁷ Compare Lagrange: "In sacrifice we always meet with the idea of offering. . . . It is the one concept which unites the bloody and the bloodless sacrifices" (*Etudes sur les religions sémitiques*, 1st ed. 1903, p. 249). We find the same substantially in the second edition, 1905, pages 266 and 270.

It is difficult to understand how Christians can entertain any doubt on this matter. Apart from the testimony of the Old Testament, we have the authority of Christ Himself: *If therefore thou offerest thy gift at the altar, etc.* (*Matth.*, V, 23). *For whether is the greater, the gift, or the altar which sanctifies the gift?* (*Matth.*, XXIII, 19); *Offer the gift which Moses commanded* (*Matth.*, VIII, 4); also the authority of the Apostle: *Every high priest is ordained . . . that he may offer up gifts . . .* (*Hebr.*, VI, 1); *he is appointed to offer up gifts and sacrifices . . . there would be others who*

to God, FOR THIS ONE END ONLY—A PROTESTATION AND AN INDICATION OF HIS INTERNAL SURRENDER, as appears in the offerings which Abel from his flocks dedicated to God, and Cain from the fruits of the earth.⁸ The objects thus offered to God, as we see at a later period in the pouring out of oil, in the libation of wine, the loaves of proposition and so on, BECAME SACRED TO GOD; IN THIS SENSE THAT, SET APART FROM OTHER THINGS AND REMOVED FROM THE USE OF MAN, THEY WERE SO FAR WITHDRAWN FROM HUMAN OWNERSHIP, AS TO BE TRANSFERRED INTO THE PROPER AND (SO TO SPEAK) PER-

would offer up gifts according to the law (*Hebr.*, VIII, 3-4, compare IX, 9 and XI, 4). In every one of these passages from the New Testament, sacrifices are referred to, and the Greek word *doron* is always used for *donum* or *munus*. Even from the time of Clement of Rome, it is the same with the Fathers, also with every one of the liturgies. In the liturgies, *dona et munera* are gifts and presents (see below, later in this work).

⁸ Cassian (*Collat.* 8, c. 23, P. L. 49, 763) thought, and Suarez (*De Religione*, I. 1, c. 3, n. 4) agrees with him, that these men offered sacrifice, led by the natural law alone. Renz (*Die Geschichte des Messopferbegriffs*, t. 1, p. 20-27) and Grimal in our own time (*Le Sacerdoce et le sacrifice de N.S.J.C.*, p. 14) think that they were led by revealed law. Chrysostom (*Hom. 18 in Genes.* n. 5, P. G. 53, 155) declared that they were instructed by the authority both of the natural conscience and wisdom given from above, a view which appears to have the favour of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, XI, 4. The author of the *Didascalia* said that they were not bound by any law in the matter, natural or revealed (c. 16, F. D. 1, 350).

SONAL DOMINION OF GOD, TO BE, AS IT WERE, CONSUMED IN DIVINE USES.⁹

⁹This is why ancient peoples commonly looked upon sacrifices as banquets prepared for God. That they did so is a well-attested fact in the history of religions. Here I should like to make one point clear: if we have occasion to refer to the history of religions at any time in the course of this work, it must be understood that we are not basing our teaching concerning sacrifice on the history of religions. Our doctrine is founded principally on the revelation contained in the sacred writings, and also on reason, whose province it is to make clear the essentials of sacrifice, such essentials "as the nature of man requires" (*Trent* sess. 22, c. 1). On the other hand, the history of religions is in a state of flux, and with regard to pre-historic conditions, it can offer us no more than conjecture. Accordingly of itself the history of religions gives no solid foundations to build on (cf. G. Foucart, *Histoire des religions et méthode comparative*, 1912, Introduction, particularly p. xcix, cxlv, clx). At the same time, where real facts of history, suitable for the illustration of our teaching, are available, we shall freely draw on them. However, in this connexion we must distinguish very carefully between historical facts and the interpretation superimposed on those facts by historians themselves. For example, it seems to be fact that the Egyptian sacrifices, from 4000 years before the death of Christ onwards, were banquets prepared and offered to a divinity, as G. Foucart (*op. cit.*, p. 138 foll.) and many others before him have shown. But that the offering of these banquets had, even in the minds of the more cultured Egyptians, a purely realistic meaning exclusive of all symbolism is not a matter of fact but of the author's interpretation. It seems to me that the words of M. J. Lagrange, O.P. (*Etudes sur les Religions sémitiques*, 1903, p. 266-267), on the Semitic peoples, equally apply to the Egyptians, and others as well: "If sacrifice were only a culinary proceeding to feast the gods, it would have vanished immediately a less abject idea of the

The term *sacrifice* was given to this offering from its intrinsic nature: "For sacrifice," says William of Paris, "is a gift which is made sacred in the offering, and to offer sacrifice is essentially this, to make the actual gift sacred by the offering" (*De legibus*, c. 24. Opera omnia, Paris, 1674, t. 1, p. 72). Clearly, therefore, without the actual HANDING OVER OF THE EXTERNAL GIFT, NO PRESENT ACT OF SACRIFICE IS MADE: although at the same time the most important constituent of sacrifice is not the external but the internal and invisible gift. In the light of all this we see how appropriate is St Augustine's definition of sacrifice, a definition adopted by the scholastics, for example St Thomas (2-2, 85, 2; 3 S. 22, 2, c. and passim), and also by the liturgists, like Durandus (*Rationale divinorum officiorum*, lib. 1. cap. 9, n. 2). "Sacrifice therefore," says St Augustine, "is the visible sacrament of the invisible sacrifice, that is, it is a sacred sign (*Civit. Dei*, l. 10, c. 5. P. L. 41, 282).¹⁰ This implies two elements: a sign, and a thing signified. Our internal surrender is what

gods was conceived . . . whether there is question here of a gift or of food prepared for the gods, we must assign a large part in it to symbolism." In the second edition, his words are possibly not so trenchant: "If sacrifice were only a culinary proceeding to feast the gods, it would never have found a place in religion" (1905, p. 267).

¹⁰ Compare *ibid.*, c. 19 and 20, and col. 297-298.

is signified; the sign which signifies it is the thing made sacred, that is the gift which we offer.¹¹ Each element is required by the integrity of true sacrifice; if there is nothing signified, the sacrifice is fictitious, it is a mere outward show; if the external sign is wanting, the sacrifice is improper in that it lacks an essential element of sacrifice.

But as truth, the negation of fiction, accrues to the sacrifice from the invisible element, we sometimes find in the works of St Augustine, and after his time in the works of the earlier theologians, the expression *true sacrifice* used for the internal sacrifice: "That," says Augustine, "which every one calls sacrifice, is the sign of TRUE sacrifice. Hence MERCY is true sacrifice" (*Civ. Dei*, l. 10, c. 5, P. L. 41, 273). Hence "true sacrifice is every action done to bring us into holy union with God, referred to that good end in which we can be truly happy" (*op. cit.*, l. 10, c. 6, col. 283). Similarly William of Paris: "That true and general sacrifice which is first and before all else to be offered to God, and which God first and before all else requires, and without which He will not accept anything that is offered to Him, is each one of our own selves. . . . The first and the

principal sacrifice therefore which is required of us is ourselves; without this offering nothing that we offer to God will be acceptable to Him" (*op. cit.*, c. 28, p. 99-100). On the other hand, since the sign proper accrues to sacrifice from the visible element, later theologians have used the expression *true sacrifice* for external sacrifice.¹² However, it is customary with the Fathers to commend each element, and to teach that each element is found in true and proper sacrifice; so too with ecclesiastical writers. Thus Procopius, a very learned scholar and an enthusiastic exponent of patristic teaching, speaking on sacrifice in general, remarks that the Fathers "teach among other things, that it is part of our duty as victims, that men should inflame their souls with love, and so offer them as a gift to God" (*In Leviticum*, 2 fol. P. G. 87, 698), and St Cyril of Alexandria, referring particularly to the sacrifice of the Christians, says: "For in our sacrifices, we to a certain extent immolate and offer our soul, AS IN AN IMAGE, to God, when we die to the world and to the wis-

¹¹ A. Dillman (*Handbuch der Alttestamentlichen Theologie*, 1895, p. 470-471) is helpful, when discussing the relation of the outward sign to the internal consecration according to the Law and the Prophets of the Old Testament.

¹² The earlier theologians very often called the sacrifice of Christ the true sacrifice *par excellence* as contrasted with the figures wherein it was foreshadowed. In this case the reality of the sacrifice of Christ does not by any means exclude the sign proper, or the sensible covering; it simply excludes the comparative emptiness and imperfections of the sacrifices of the Old Law, figures of the sacrifices of Christ to come. See the quotation from St Augustine in chap. III, p. 59.

dom of the flesh, when we mortify our vices and are, so to speak, crucified with Christ; and thus living a pure and holy life, we spend our days in submission to His holy will" (*De adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, l. 11. P. G. 769).

In like manner, Eusebius of Caesarea, speaking of the glories of the sacrifice of the Mass, says: "We offer therefore a sacrifice of praise to the Most High God; we offer a sacrifice sealed by the divine Spirit, an august and sacrosanct sacrifice, we offer in a new manner a clean victim in sacrifice, following the New Testament. But a sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit. On the one hand, therefore, we make sacrifice and make a burnt-offering, when we celebrate the memorial of that great sacrifice, thanking God for our salvation, and offering to Him religious hymns and holy prayers; and on the other, when we consecrate ourselves wholly to Him and to His Pontiff (Who is the Word): prostrate in body and soul immolated before him" (*Demonstr. evangel.*, l. 1, c. 10. P. G. 22, 92-93).

Among the Latin Fathers the words of St Gregory are equally clear. Speaking of the wonders of the sacrifice of the Mass he says impressively: "But when we celebrate these mysteries, we must immolate ourselves to God with a contrite heart; for we who celebrate the mysteries of the Passion of the Lord, should be an image of what we do.

When we offer ourselves also as victims, then indeed there will be for us before God a real, true victim" (*Dial.*, l. 4, c. 59. P. L. 77, 428).¹³

Speaking of Christ's own sacrifice, St Leo the Great says that the Cross was presignified by the prophets, as an altar "where the OFFERING OF HUMAN NATURE WOULD BE CELEBRATED BY THE SAVING VICTIM" (*Sermo* 55, c. 3. P. L. 54, 324).¹⁴

Thus for the proper understanding of sacrifice as latreutic, we must distinguish, exactly as in the sacraments, between the *sign* and the *reality*. For the handing over of the external gift, though it is in itself *res*, that is to say it is real giving, is nevertheless not a *res tantum*; it is a *res et signum*. The offering of the internal gift is a *res tantum*. Later we shall inquire if anything is in sacrifice by way of *signum tantum*.

Meantime, be it noted that, just as latria itself has, as we have already seen, a eucharistic and impetratory character, so all sacrifice, in so far as it is symbolical of latreutic devotion, possesses the same twofold significa-

¹³ Compare *Hom. 37 in evangel.*, n. 9. P. L. 76, 1279, speaking in praise of Cassius, Bishop of the City of Narsis: "His life was in harmony with his sacrifice."

¹⁴ On these words of Leo, Thomassinus says: "Thus the Cross was the world's altar, upon which the whole body of the faithful, drawn together from all countries of the earth and all the ages of time, were slain unto God, in the sacrament of their Head" (*De Incarn. Verbi*, l. 10, c. 10). Compare also St Leo, *Serm.* 59, c. 5. P. L. 54, 340.

tion, as eucharistic and as impetratory.

§ 2. Sacrifice as Propitiatory

A. VINDICATION OF SACRIFICES IN BLOOD

We have seen that the obligation of sacrifice arises first of all from the duty of latria as such. We must now consider a second source of obligation, arising from the necessity of making atonement for the sins of men. This brings us to the propitiatory character of sacrifice. Man sinned and offended God, and thus became hateful to Him. It was therefore essential that any honour paid to God, and any gift offered to Him, should above all else show indications of sorrow as well as some kind of reparation and compensation; otherwise the gift offered and the goodwill made known would savour of contumely, as coming from one who was both unworthy and unfriendly. For just as the man who is without sin, when fulfilling the religious obligation of latria, declares that he is turned to God; so the sinner, turned away from God, contrary to right order, by his sin, must make reparation for the outrage to the divine justice that he is guilty of. The injury will not be forgiven, nor the evil undone, unless adequate compensation is made for the sin. The greater the inten-

sity of love in the person converted to God, and turned away from sin, the more adequate will the compensation be. The greater the difficulty to be overcome—namely, the stronger the appetite (for a purely natural good) that has to be subdued, or the more arduous the task to be performed—the more intense will be the effort required. Thus also it comes about that not only is the guilt of sin wiped out by the compensation that has been made, but also the debt of punishment is cancelled by the satisfaction given.

Here there are two things which we must distinguish: the first is *Propitiation in the strictest sense*. By this, God is appeased and the balance of commutative justice is restored. The second is what is specifically called *Satisfaction*. By this, the punishment of the judge is anticipated, and the accused inflicts punitive justice upon himself. Hence the compensation we have been considering has two elements which are really distinct: one, propitiation, which is indemnitive; the other, satisfaction, which is punitive. But the one term, *propitiation*, is often used to cover both.

Clearly, then, *death* or *pain* from a motive of love plays a most important part in propitiation: for it is a fact that nothing is so repugnant to the natural appetite of man, even when free from sin, as suffering or death; hence there is no wider or

nobler field of victory open to love (*John*, XV, 13; *Philip.*, II, 8).

Moreover, seeing that sin in man implies, as a natural consequence, the immediate subjection of the spirit to the flesh, like a king driven from the throne by rebellious subjects, it was fitting that the flesh, the breeding ground of sin, should undergo *real or metaphorical death* in the eradication of sin. Add to this that every sin merits eternal death, but for the sinner eternal death begins with temporal death, as an integral part of the whole. Hence the Apostle: *the wages of sin is death*.

The attestation of repentance and the indication of reparation, therefore, could not be expressed by a more fitting rite than the slaying of an animal, and the shedding of blood, wherein as commonly estimated lies the life of the flesh.¹⁵ Hence practically in every age and nation, sacrifices were offered in blood, as Scripture says: *Without the shedding of blood there is no remission* (*Hebr.*, IX, 22).

There appears, then, to be no reason why we should attribute sacri-

¹⁵ "It was God's mercy that permitted to man the substitution of blood other than his own; this was the significance of the sacrifice of animals" (Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, Regensburg, 1857, p. 208). Compare *ibid.*, p. 209, what Döllinger has to say on the spontaneous approach of animals to the altar among the Greeks. More recently S. I. Curtiss, *Ursemitische religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients*, 1903, p. 25: "The sacrifices had unquestionably a substitutive character."

fices in blood to the obligation of latria, saying, so to speak, that the destruction of life in itself pays honour to God. This is the teaching of those theologians who say that the Most High God, the supreme Lord of life and death, could not be perfectly honoured or worshipped without the deprivation of life and the infliction of death, but seeing that this was neither lawful nor becoming, the slaying of an animal was substituted. On the contrary, *in itself*, the destruction of the works of God, the loss of life or existence, gives no praise to God the Creator, the Ruler, and the ultimate End of all things; rather, in the words of king Ezechias, *The living, the living shall give praise to thee* (*Is.*, XXXVII, 19). And Christ our Lord says: *For He is not the God of the dead but of the living* (*Luke*, XX, 38). Irenaeus (*Adv. Haeres.*, l. 4, c. 20, n. 7. P. G. 7, 1037) very wisely says: "The glory of God is living man."¹⁶ But where there has been sin, death of the flesh is exacted, not only as medicinal, but also as penal. Even now we are deserving of death. God threatened our first parents: *Thou shalt die the death*. And it was with this threat in mind that St Paul said: *The wages of sin is death*.

¹⁶ Remember our remarks above; also compare the words of P. Smend (*Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, 2, 1889, p. 138-141) where he points out that among the ancients sacrifices were first of all gifts which were presented to God.

Therefore, just as death, as penal, can and does accord with the justice of God, so too the sacrifice in blood satisfies the justice of God sacramentally or symbolically, that is to say it expresses the desire of making satisfaction, as far as lies in us, together with the added hope of assuaged justice.

William of Paris illustrates this well: "The second cause was the very vehement and very powerful emphasis of the plea for justice and mercy, which these sacrifices made. By the very act of offering and giving these animals over to death, men acknowledged that they themselves were deserving of death; and in this action, they expressly admitted, that did God will to judge them as their sins deserved, He could in justice inflict death on them. In the fact that the death of animals was commuted for the death they deserved, men could read distinctly the mercy of God towards them" (*op. cit.*, c. 2, p. 29).

We are now in a position to arrive at a conclusion touching the theological dispute: is destruction (formal or equivalent) of the offerings as such essentially necessary to constitute a true sacrifice? Where the primary and prevailing end is latreutic only, we hold that destruction is not necessary, that it is sufficient if, in the words of St Thomas (2-2, 85, 3^m), something is done over the offerings as evidence of their passing from the possession of

man to the possession of God, which would be a pledge of the offering that we make of ourselves. In this we follow Suarez (*De Eucharistia*, disp. 73, s. 5, n. 4-5), who denies the necessity of destruction in every sacrifice. Where, however, the propitiatory purpose is more prominent, we say that slaying or destruction of some kind is the more fitting. In this sense (with some reserve, however), we interpret the words of Bellarmine (*De Missa*, l. 1, c. 2, last par.), Vasquez (disp. 220, c. 3, n. 22 foll.), Lugo (disp. 19, s. 1, n. 7), and the greater number of modern theologians, chief among them being Cardinal Billot.

Propitiation, however, since it includes the concept of compensation for injury done to the divine right, is an actual recognition of the injured right of God, and thus includes a latreutic attitude towards the divine excellence; indeed it is simply a kind of latria, appropriate to the state of the sinner. Hence it also is both eucharistic and impetratory. Indeed it implies special gratitude for special mercy—special, because it is shown towards one who is unworthy and undeserving. Further, it not only implies impetration for pardon, namely, pardon received through petition, but it also implies that, pardon being granted and no other obstacle to the influx of goodness and favour towards men being placed, other benefits besides pardon are obtained from God.

Every propitiatory sacrifice is therefore also eucharistic and impetratory.

B. OFFERING AND IMMOLATION

From all we have said it follows that change of itself, or destruction of itself, does not suffice to integrate the sacrifice. No matter what the change, or how complete the destruction, an *offering* to God of the thing changed or destroyed is absolutely essential,¹⁷ and this offering must be sensible, ritual, liturgical (that is, it must contain the action of the liturgus, the duly constituted sacrificer, without whom there is no sacrifice). The sensible *offering* is not always necessarily distinguished (that is, as one thing is distinguished from another) from the *change* of the thing sacrificed; it suffices that it be implied (as sometimes happens) in the outward contingencies of the sacrifice, namely, in the actual rite of slaying, of changing the condition of the victim, whatever that change may be.¹⁸ But where the offering is distinct from the immolation, it must consist in some action suitable to indicate surrender and dedication or

consecration of the victim. Such an action, common among the Hebrews especially, was the pouring of blood round about or upon the altar.¹⁹ This we know from *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*. For an animal slain, even by a layman, outside the temple, was commonly regarded as being presented to God, in the fact of the priest bringing the blood to the altar, the altar supplying, so to speak, the place of the divinity by whose presence the victim was sanctified.²⁰ The reason is: sacrifice being in the nature of a gift, there must be some sensible act of presentation or of handing over of the gift. This

¹⁹ Modern writers for the most part, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, agree that among the Semites from the earliest times the pouring of blood on the consecrated altar was properly and especially chosen as a sacrificial rite. See Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, drittes Heft, *Reste Arabischen Heidentumes*, 1887, p. 113; Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, 1901, p. 338-341; Marti, *Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion*, 1907, p. 42-43; G. A. Barton, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, s. v. *Altar* (Semitic), n. 1. The Egyptians touched the mouth of the idol with blood (Foucart, *op. cit.*, p. 142 and 150). Similar rites are found among the very ancient Irish peoples (J. A. McCullagh, *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, 1911, p. 237).

¹⁷ Foucart notes the necessity of the offering as distinct from the immolation (*op. cit.*, p. 384).

¹⁸ It is plain at the same time that real identity between offering and immolation has no place where immolation is the action, not of the liturgus or priest, but of another; for the offering must be the act of the liturgus or priest.

²⁰ If there did exist a sacrifice—at the moment we merely say “if”—in which the altar was the body of the victim and the priest was the victim himself, the offering would then consist in the priest offering his own body in sacrifice with the shedding of his own blood. Whether this is really possible, or how possible, will be discussed later in this work.

same statement is clear from *Leviticus*, I, 2 foll. There we read that the slaying of the animals appointed for the sacrifice was permitted to others than the priests, though the duty of offering the animals fell on the priests alone (compare *Exod.*, XVIII, 1; *Hebr.*, V, 1-4).

This is clear particularly from the sacrifice of Christ. He certainly did not slay Himself. That was the work of the deicide Jews, although He did offer Himself immaculate to God (*Hebr.*, IX, 14). At another time we shall consider the manner of this offering. Therefore, the slaying of the victim might be a dreadful crime, yet the offering of that victim (still to be slain or already slain) might be a religious and holy action. Thus the crime of the Jews was awful, and the priestly offering of Christ the Lord most holy.²¹

The word *immolation*, therefore, in its very strictest sense implies the destruction or the slaying of the victim, though not without reference to some kind of offering. Sacrifice, therefore, in its proper sense has two factors: the (outward) act of offering and the immolation. The victim IS EITHER OFFERED TO BE IMMOLATED, OR IS OFFERED BY IMMOLATION, OR IS OFFERED AS IMMOLATED. Neither the offering in itself alone, nor the immolation in itself alone suffices to confer victimhood; both are required.

We often find writers who use the words *offering* and *immolation* without making this distinction clear. They employ one or the other word for the whole act of sacrifice. This is more or less natural, because there are many sacrifices where the offering is distinguished from the immolation merely in concept, so that in these cases the sacrifice is actually either the one or the other. Besides, even where both offering and immolation are distinct, neither pertains to the sacrifice without the other. Hence it resulted that offering and immolation were looked upon as synonymous, offering being used for immolation and immolation for offering. In this sense we say that Christ immolated Himself for our salvation, though He did not slay Himself; He simply offered Himself to the slaughter. We say that Christ offered Himself on the altar of the Cross, because it was on the Cross that He was immolated, and in so far sacrificed, in fulfilment of the offering which we know that He had already made as Priest. When dealing with the sacrifice, however, as far as possible we shall always adhere to the distinction, not only in thought but in word, between the offering and the immolation; we shall likewise distinguish both offering and immolation, as part, from the total act of sacrifice.

The word *sacrificare* stresses the action of the sacrificing priest, and thus indicates offering directly, or

²¹ Suarez, *De Incarnatione*, disp. 46, s. 1, n. 2.

slaying indirectly. It will suffice, then, for true sacrifice, that something be offered EITHER AS TO BE IMMOLATED, OR AS IMMOLATED.²²

Sacrifices are bloody from the slaying. They are bloodless, therefore, when there is no slaying: and this may be either because the offering is not connected with the immolation, as when inanimate things are sacrificed, or because a blood sacrifice being presupposed, from which a victim in a permanent state of victimhood is the result, any given sacrifice of that victim is referred back to the presupposed immolation, repeating, so to speak, that principal offering in virtue of which it is made. In this case the sacrifice is bloodless, but it is essentially relative to the sacrifice in blood, as will be explained later.

²² Sacred writers use the word *sacrifice* indiscriminately either for the offering of a victim to be immolated (or immolated already), or for the immolation of a victim already offered (or to be offered), according as either element of the sacrifice is directly presented. Should it be asked which of these uses is the more appropriate and the absolutely true one, I reply: where the offering comes before the immolation, the sacrifice apparently has its proper and substantial reality rather in the immolation wherein was enacted and eventually accomplished that to which the offering was directed, so that the final issue is a concrete and perfect sacrifice. If, on the other hand, immolation had already taken place, the sacrifice would be enacted precisely by the offering.

Moreover, this very word *sacrifice* is frequently used in the passive sense (that is in reference to the thing acted upon), for the thing offered in sacrifice.

§ 3. Acceptance of the Sacrifice

Even after the offering and the immolation (where there is immolation), there is a further *twofold extrinsic consummation* pertaining to the sacrifice—one on the part of God, the other on the part of man. We look to God for the *acceptance* of the sacrifice, while it is fitting that man should *partake* of it.

A. NECESSITY OF DIVINE ACCEPTANCE

When we give anything to a person, it is given with a view to its acceptance. If man makes a gift to God, he is in hopes that God will accept that gift. If God rejects it, the gift will not pass into the ownership of God; therefore it is not sacred, it is profane. A victim is not thrown at God, it is not hurled into heaven; in that case it would not be a victim at all. FOR IT IS RATIFIED AS A VICTIM AT THE MOMENT, AND ONLY AT THE MOMENT, WHEN IT IS ACCEPTED BY GOD, AND THUS PASSES INTO THE CONDITION AND THE DIGNITY OF THINGS DIVINE.

If it is refused, cast off, and despised by God, it is just a useless mass of material substance, the offensive slaughter of brute animal, the filth and refuse of flesh and blood. The *sacrifice* which is not ratified by God is void. The *priesthood* which is incapable of transferring gifts to God, which is in-

capable of pledging in turn. God's gifts to man, is void.

If, however, God does accept, He is looked upon, in virtue of the sacrifice accepted, as in duty bound towards man. For in the fact that the sacrifice is offered as propitiatory or impetratory, there is on the offerer's side a kind of tentative compact, or treaty, or contract with God, with the end in view that God would deign to accept it, and if so, that He would grant pardon (propitiatory sacrifice), or that He would confer a benefit (impetratory sacrifice). But if God does not accept what is offered, there is no contract. If God refuses to accept the sacrifice, no effect is secured. No pact has been struck between God and man. But if God does accept, a bilateral contract immediately intervenes: and man will certainly and necessarily obtain that for which the sacrifice was ordained.

B. OUTWARD SIGN OF DIVINE ACCEPTANCE

But seeing that the inner workings of the mind of God are not known to man, it was at all times natural that men should endeavour to discover some outward sign of the divine acceptance. And there was this further reason: in the sacrificial contract between God and man, just as in ordinary contracts, there had to be some kind of mutual signification of giving and re-

ceiving. This signification might be expressed either by a human or a divine act. Where acceptance was expressed by a human action, this action might be of two sorts. One way—inchoative and imperfect—was the pouring of the blood of the victim on or round about the altar. Though this action coincided with the ritual offering, therefore, it was different from the viewpoint of its different aspects; for what man gave, the altar accepted; the altar, permeated, so to speak, with the presence of the divinity, took the place of God. What the altar received, therefore, was looked upon as taken up by God.

The other—the more perfect way—was that of the holocaust. For after the sacrifice was offered, by the sprinkling of blood upon the altar for example, various parts of the victim were placed upon the kindled fire, and thus devoured by the fire, with the end in view that under the symbol of fire God Himself would be taken as consuming and feasting on the victims.²³

²³ See in *Leviticus*, III, 11 and 16, how these burnt animal portions were looked upon as a kind of food or bread for God, following the Hebrew text and the Septuagint version. Compare Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, p. 338-341, where it is explained how in the ordinary sacrifices even of the burnt offerings and holocausts, the fire was extrinsic to the essential parts of the sacrificial action, which was the slaying of the living thing (= immolation), and the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar (= the offering). When to the

Each of these ways was weak, because each was liable to falsification on man's part; the human sign could exist, and the divine thing be absent. In other words, man could signify that a thing was acceptable to God, yet that thing could be really hateful to Him.

On the part of God, divine acceptance was usually made known by fire sent down from heaven (*Gen.*, XV, 17; *Judg.*, VI, 19-20; *Paral.*, XXI, 26; *Kings* (3), XVIII, 38),²⁴ "which fire," as William of

sacrificial action, perfected as far as man was concerned, there was added God's acceptance, this did not mean that the sacrifice was thereby completed, but that the already complete sacrifice was *extrinsically* consummated, having reached its intended goal. Döllinger (*Heidenthum und Judenthum*, 1887, p. 208) wrote very beautifully of the Greek sacrifices: "The fire was the organ of union, comparable as it was to the mouth of the deity to which the offering was brought, or to which the substance of the offering was fetched in the form of the smoke of sacrifice."

²⁴ Theodoretus in *Gen.*, XV, 17. P. G. 80, 173: "When it is said that at the setting of the sun, there was seen a smoking furnace and a lamp of fire [passing between the divisions of the slain animals] this was a sign THAT THE SACRIFICES WERE RECEIVED." Chrysostom (in h. 1. P. G. 53 and 348) and Cyril of Alexandria (*Glaphyr.*, in *Genes.*, l. 3, n. 4. P. G. 69, 120) interpret the passing of the fire as indicating the divinity (Cyril), and consuming the offerings (Chrysostom) as signifying (after the Chaldean manner) the oath of the divine compact, or the sanction of the agreement. From what we have said, all this leads to our own interpretation. Read Aaphrates, *Demonst.*, 4, n. 2 and 3. P. S. part 1, tom. 1, p. 131-143, on the fire encircling the sacrifices of the Patriarchs and of the Hebrews.

Paris (*op. cit.*, c. 24, p. 72) writes, "would eat His part of the sacrifices, taking His place, as it were." This was the more perfect way,²⁵ for a sign coming from God could not be false. But even then, as we shall see, it was not the most perfect way of all. At best it was only figurative. For the victims were carnal, and even though they were food for the divine fire, they did not actually pass into the divine sanctity, they merely prefigured the perfect Victim, which was to be the food for the divine glory, and to be borne into the sanctuary of divine holiness, into the holy of holies.

§ 4. Partaking of the Sacrifice

A. REASONS FOR PARTAKING

In so far as circumstances permitted, men have always converted to their own use as food and drink, part of the gifts and victims dedicated to God. Nor was this by any means a violation of the sacrifice; rather it was a consummation of it. For sacrifice aimed particularly at opening a path to obtain the favours of God, when He was appeased by

²⁵ In the Jewish holocausts, this more perfect or divine way of signifying acceptance reached a greater perfection than in the case of other peoples in that the fire of the Jewish sacrifices was sacred because of its origin (*Levit.*, IX, 24, *II Paral.*, VII, 1-3, *II Mach.*, I, 19-22), and in the Law it was commanded to be maintained, and the use of an alien fire was forbidden (*Levit.*, X, 1).

our victims, or when He was moved to bestow gifts on us in return for our own to Him. This communication of divine gifts was most appropriately signified by a banquet²⁶ in which God would feast men with food proper to man himself. For then men did not come to an altar as to an ordinary table; they came to a table which was sacred and divine, and at this table they were fellow guests of God,²⁷ who summoned them to His banquet, and bade them sit at His table.²⁸ And if a lamb, or

²⁶ I say the communication of divine gifts was appropriately SIGNIFIED by eating; but it was MERITED AND SECURED by the actual offering of the sacrifice accepted by God. Hence there was a real sacrifice (held to be adequate to its end), even when there was no partaking, such as in the pouring out of oil, in the burning of incense and the holocausts of animals. For in this case, although there was no signification of the bestowal of divine favours, yet the fact of asking God for them was held to secure a certain right to them. Yet where the nature of the sacrifice allows of partaking, as in ordinary burnt offerings, the sacrifice becomes more perfect by our consummation; but in holocausts it is more perfect by the divine consummation. The most perfect of all sacrifices, therefore, is that which is a holocaust, and which we are at the same time permitted to partake of. Such was and is that which, according to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, XIII, 10-12, was burnt whole without the camp, and of which nevertheless we partake, as we shall see at length later.

²⁷ "The Godhead . . . was Himself the host, in that He called His servants to His table" (Smend, *op. cit.*, p. 140). Compare Döllinger to be cited below.

²⁸ Compare Lagrange, *op. cit.* 2nd ed. 1905, p. 246-264; Lesêtre, art. *Sacrifice*, in *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 5, 1314-1315.

bread, or a cup was distributed, it was not looked upon as common food, it was the lamb of God, the bread of God, the cup of God. St Paul declares this to be a universal dogma, in reference to all sacrifices of both Jews and Gentiles (not to mention our own sacrifice), when in the same Epistle he writes, first, of the Jewish sacrifices: *Behold Israel according to the flesh; are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?* (1 Cor., X, 18); and then of the sacrifices of the Gentiles: *I would not that you should be partakers with the devils; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the tables of devils* (1 Cor., X, 21-22). Therefore, just as those who were partakers of the sacrifices to idols were rated as table-companions of the devils, those who partook of the sacrifices to God were rated as table-companions of God. The use of the common table is, for those who sit at that table, the most effective and closest bond of unity.²⁹ William of Paris speaks of this effect of the sacred banquet as the fifth cause of sacrifice: "The fifth cause is familiarity and nearness to God. For the offering of gifts and the partaking of the sacred table beget the greatest confidence of nearness to God, and make us partakers with

²⁹ For a description of this manner of feasting on the sacrifices, and the significance attached to it by Eastern peoples, see in Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 1887, p. 122.

the family of God, for one is considered a member of the family of the person from whom he receives nutriment, and by whose table he lives. Clearly, then, these sacrifices impressed on the partakers the sense of familiarity and nearness to God, since by partaking of the same table they became in a manner sitters at the table with God. Now apart from the union of the father and mother as cause of our being, this is the most effective bond of familiarity. For this reason, seeing that God could not be in their presence to eat with them, He sometimes sent fire from heaven to consume His share of the sacrifice, and, so to speak, to take His place" (*op. cit.*, c. 2, p. 30).

Hence he represents the person partaking of the sacrifice as speaking to the divinity in these terms: "By this sharing of the immolations, by this that I am admitted to thy sacrifices with thy other worshippers, I proclaim that I am one of thy family and of thy worshippers" (*op. cit.*, c. 24, p. 72).

In this divine intercourse was figured particularly the *future* attainment of heavenly favours, for which man would be prepared by the sacrifice of justice, and to which he would be initiated by feasting on victims consecrated to God. But there was also figured a *present* sanctification. Because the thing made sacred to God, by the fact of its being made sacred, acquired a sanctification of its own. Now that

it was above and before anything else the property of God, it passed into the nature, so to speak, of a divine thing, clothed as it were with the sanction and the unction of the divinity itself. Therefore, the *sacrificial action was a sanctification*. Indeed the sacrificial form and condition of the gifts and victims consisted precisely in this sanctity with which they were endowed by the act of sacrifice, and which they conserved as long as the things sacrificed remained incorrupt. For this sanctity inherent in the sacrifice was regarded as infused into the partakers of the victim; it not only destined them for future partnership in the divine sanctity, but it made it present to them here and now. For the man who ate of the sacrifice, by communion with the victim sacrificed to God, became himself, so to speak, a victim sacrificed to God; and the signification was in the highest degree perfected by the fact that nothing else was indicated but that man consecrated and dedicated himself interiorly to God, and consequently became united to Him also.

Finally, besides the communion with God from the partaking of the sacrifice, there was further the communion of the partakers one with another.⁸⁰ William of Paris speaks of this as an additional reason for the sacrifices: "The sixth cause was

⁸⁰ See Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 119-123, and Döllinger, to be cited later.

to make or to unite the people of God into one body, in other words, that from the many, they would form one household and one family. For there is nothing so conducive to make the whole household of children and family one as the partaking of food in common; so also the communion of spiritual food and drink more than any other thing, makes for one spiritual household family" (*op. cit.*, c. 2, p. 30).

Here, then, we have all the reasons why the partaking of the sacrifice, offered by way of banquet, is by no means repugnant to the nature and character of sacrifice; on the contrary, this partaking by way of banquet is most appropriate to sacrifice.

B. DISTINCTION BETWEEN SACRIFICE AND BANQUET

We may state that for the most part it occurs that in the one action a sacrifice is offered to God and a banquet is prepared for us. There is a danger, however, in attempting to explain the nature of sacrifice by stressing the banquet; rather it is the other way round: the banquet must be explained by the sacrifice. The banquet is not sacred unless it is consecrated to God by the sacrificial offering and the divine acceptance. There is no sacred banquet without the supposition or understanding of a sacrifice previous to the banquet. Hence the true char-

acter of sacrifice cannot be explained by merely pointing to the banquet in the case where the offering is wanting. No matter how much you insist on the signification of a banquet prepared for me, you will never show that it is a sacrifice celebrated by me as long as you say that it is not offered by me. If, therefore, the Church has a sacrifice, she must offer it in the truest sense. If she has the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, she must truly and sensibly offer the Body and Blood of Christ. She possesses no sacrifice if, while making no offering, she possesses only the banquet of the Body and Blood of Christ, though it was once offered on the Cross in sacrifice, and offered by Christ Himself. Suarez, therefore, very justly says: "Although in the ancient sacrifices the things offered and sacrificed were sometimes consumed by the priests or by the people, still this was not common to all the sacrifices, as is clear in the cases of the holocausts; and even in those sacrifices in which this consummation occurred, it did not pertain to the essence of sacrifice but, after the sacrifice was consummated,³¹ it used to be done to signify that man was admitted to the participation of divine things by the sacrifice" (*De Eucharistia*, disp. 73, s. 5, n. 6).

³¹ *Meaning*: after the act of sacrifice was *intrinsically* (i.e., *in essence*) consummated, the *extrinsic* consummation took place, consisting in the signification of acceptance.

Hence the error of those writers who, collecting innumerable excerpts from the Fathers in which they state that the Eucharistic sacrifice is a banquet prepared for us, think to prove that the actual teaching of the Fathers was, not that the Body and Blood of Christ was, properly speaking, offered by the Church, but that the Victim once offered by Christ alone is now placed before us as food by the priests of the Church.³² For al-

³² This is what Renz unsuccessfully attempted to do throughout the whole of his work (*Die Geschichte des Messopfer-Begriffs*, 1901). Against this kind of procedure, speaking of the sacrifices of the Greeks, Döllinger (*op. cit.*, p. 209-210) had already written as follows: "They did not eat of the burnt-offerings, the sin offerings, the offerings to the dead, or of those which, made to confirm an oath or a compact, were weighted with a curse; with the rest, however, there was joined a sacrificial banquet also; the participators of these ate the roasted flesh of the animal, at them they drank of the wine which had been consecrated by libation, AND SO THEY ASSOCIATED WITH THE DIVINITY, AT WHOSE TABLE THEY ATE, AS HIS GUESTS, while at the same time the food sanctified by the divinity, and which they took in common, formed a close bond of union between them, so that the chief aim and the most effective bond of religious fellowship, consisted in such sacred feasts, HENCE THE FEAST AND THE SACRIFICE CAME TO BE SO ESSENTIALLY CONNECTED THAT EVEN THE NAMES OF THE TWO ACTS WERE INTERCHANGEABLE." See also *ibid.*, 371-373, how it was the custom among the Persians that even in private homes, libations were first made of the wine on to the fireplace, before the cups were drunk. In reference to which Döllinger says: "So the Persians had in the home a SACRIFICE, which had for them at the

though in the one same action Christ is offered to God by the Church, and is given to us to be partaken of, nevertheless this same action on the one subject has two formalities absolutely distinct; it bespeaks two opposite terms of reference, namely, God and ourselves. For the banquet that is prepared is prepared for me; the Body and Blood that is offered is offered to God.

William of Paris in his lucid way expressed this beautifully: "The Church of God is at once His house and His temple. Because it is His temple He must be worshipped same time the significance of a SACRAMENT," etc.

The Most Reverend J. Bellord, Bishop of Milevis, proposes the banquet theory of sacrifice even in a more radical manner than Renz (although his arguments against those who maintain that destruction is necessary for sacrifice are good) in *The Sacrifice of the New Law* (*Ecclesiastical Review*, July 1905, p. 258-273), where we read: "There is no death indeed in it [the Last Supper], NOR SYMBOL OF DEATH [!] The use of the two distinct species was not a rehearsal of the bloodshedding of the next day; IT MEANT ONLY THE PROVISION OF THE TWO MATERIALS OF A COMPLETE BANQUET, food and drink . . . even if the chalice had passed away after the prayer in the garden, and Jesus had not suffered death, the Last Supper would still be a full and perfect sacrifice." Later we shall see that this is a direct denial of the teaching of the Fathers. Meantime in England, J. Wilhelm and T. Scannell (*op. cit.*, p. 452) said: "It is altogether too gross a notion to see in the ancient sacrifices NOTHING BUT a banquet in which the gods were supposed to take part. The eating of the victim accepted by God is simply the symbol of the union with God intended by those who offer the sacrifice."

in it for the three ends mentioned (praise, propitiation, impetration), hence in His temple there are both altar and sacrifice. Because it is His house—and He has a large family—it requires a table whereat to eat, a table that is suited to the home and to the family. It is not necessary to pile up proofs to show that the altar and the table are one and the same thing, just as the temple and the house are one and the same thing. But we speak of it as an altar when we have in mind the offering and the sanctification (*meaning*: the act of sacrifice), and as such it is of course essentially referred to God, in the fact that it is appointed to the honour and worship of God; we speak of it as a table, when we have in mind spiritual food, and as such it is essentially referred to the family for whose spiritual refection it has been set up and prepared; so that one and the same thing is sacrifice as offered to God, and at the same time food which sanctifies as partaken of by the faithful” (*De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, c. 2, t. 1, p. 437-438).

The Council of Trent, therefore, taught that in the passage where St Paul speaks of the table of the devils and the table of God, in each case table means altar (sess. 22, c. 1. D. 939).³³ It added the following

³³ St. Paul was not the first to speak of the altar as a table, but as Smend well says (*op. cit.*, p. 139): “In the Scriptures, altar and table are interchangeable terms (*Ez.*, 41, 22; in the book of MALACHIAS, the altar is

canon: “If any one says that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, or that what is offered is other than Christ gave us to be eaten, A. S.” (D. 938). This chapter should suffice upon the matter of sacrifice in general, as understood and defined by the Council of Trent: “visible sacrifice . . . as the nature³⁴ of man demands.”

called the table of Jahve (I, 7, 12), and again in the priestly codex, the sacrificial offerings even in bread, are called the bread of Jahve (*Levit.*, III, 11, 16, etc.).”

³⁴ Man's nature demands sacrifice, in the same sense as it demands morality, religion, public and domestic social order. But this demand of nature does not preclude aberrations. One of the consequences of original sin is that man's nature is very fallible and very weak. It is not in monsters that we seek the authentic type of genus. Similarly it is not from perversions, whether legal or moral, that we may arrive at that right order which is approved to the mind of men, however blinded, by eternal law. Thus the history of Magic will not give us the understanding of Religion among men. (Compare F. Bouvier, *Magie et Magisme in Dictionnaire Apologétique*, D'Alès, tom. 3, col. 61 foll.) These general remarks are necessary in view of the attitude of some present-day writers, among them Loisy (*Essai historique sur le sacrifice*, Paris, 1920). That he should be of their company is not surprising, for he is an atheist, and his religious philosophy has nothing in common with ours. We know that there is a God, that He is to be worshipped, that He has made Himself known to man in His creation. Loisy, on the other hand, assuming that the origin of religious worship is to be explained without God, and without the knowledge of God, makes these introductory assumptions on sacrifice in general: (1) Necessarily antecedent to the religious attitude towards divine power, as we find it recorded in history, there were prac-

tices more or less magical. To such practices the more stupid of the savage races now existent are addicted (thus Loisy assumes that degenerates are to be treated as primitives, and the corruptions of a later period referred back to a prehistoric age). (2) Sacrifice, therefore, belongs to that class of religious acts which by a "mystico-magical" power are thought to influence invisible forces. These forces are either hurtful and so to be eliminated, or useful and so to be controlled, or benevolent and so to be flattered (p. 5-10). Therefore, just as sacrifice cannot be a primitive symbol of some religious instinct, so too the offering of gifts can have no place among the primeval elements of a sacrificial rite, for such offering of gifts would imply a personal divinity. "It seems impossible to derive the whole economy of sacrifice from the ritual gift, for we do not find in the origin of religions the idea of personal gods with whom we could hold converse by tribute and prayer, but of forces scarcely personified, we might say scarcely conceived, which one controls by virtue of ritual action" (p. 36). Assertions of this kind have no proof whatever in facts. They are merely a priori statements, which govern the interpretation of facts (and govern their interpretation pretty cavalierly as when from a great number of things widely dissimilar, one is treated as the origin of another, different from it and even contrary in type, of higher nobility

than its supposed origin): so much so that the whole system, based on such foundation, is merely an explanatory hypothesis, as valid or invalid as the philosophy—evolutionist materialism—on which the hypothesis rests.

The application of the theory to the Scripture teaching of the expiatory death of Christ, and also to the ecclesiastical sacrifice of the Eucharist, which runs through the whole work, necessarily postulates that Christ did not actually offer up His death for us, that this offering was a mere figment of the imagination of St Paul, which he attributed to Christ; Christ, therefore, did not institute a commemoration of His death to be celebrated by us, but a commemorative rite was attached to an originally less elaborate supper of the early Christians. For it is on this supposition only that the Mass, looked upon as a mystical commemoration of some kind of MYTHICAL offering (p. 53, 72, 87, 116, 125, 305-306, 417, 526-528, etc.), can be assimilated to the "mysteries" in which the pagans represented their MYTHS, and so reduced along with these mysteries, to the primeval magic of religion. For this Pauline origin of our sacrifice, and the consequent exclusion of any offering by our Lord, necessary as it is to Loisy's theory, is contrary to historical fact, as will be shown later. Thus the *mystery of faith*, by reason of its historical institution, is an enduring bulwark against those who attack the transcendent character of Christianity.

CHAPTER II

THE SACRIFICE ENACTED IN THE PASSION

CHAPTER II

§ 1. The Reality of This Sacrifice

There are those outside the Faith who have tried to prove that Christ had no intention of offering His death for the remission of sins. We shall spend no time upon them. Our concern is with the teaching of the Church. Not only does our faith teach that the death of Christ was redemptive, that is, it adequately and even superabundantly satisfied God for us,¹ but it also teaches that His death was a real and true sacrifice offered by Christ Himself. To deny this or doubt it is to deny or doubt the Catholic faith.

Moreover, many centuries before, it was foretold by *Isaias*, LIII, 10 (according the more probable reading, compare *Condamin, Le Livre d'Isaie*, p. 323 and 349); and Christ Himself on the very threshold of the Passion (shortly we shall show that He actually did offer the sacrifice in the Last Supper), openly declared that He was sanctifying Himself, that is, offering Himself in sacrifice for others; *for them do I sanctify myself* (*John*, XVII, 19).

¹ *Isa.*, LIII, 1-13, with *Acts*, VIII, 32-35, *I Peter*, II, 24, *Mark*, X, 45, *Matth.*, XX, 28, *I Peter*, 18-19, *Apoc.*, V, 9, *Eph.*, I, 7, *I Tim.*, II, 6, *Tit.*, II, 14, *Hebr.*, IX, 12.

St Paul, as we have seen, institutes a comparison between the eating of the sacrifice to the idols and the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ. And he confirms in express terms the truth of this sacrifice, when he says *Christ our pasch is sacrificed* (*I Cor.*, V, 1), that Christ gave Himself *an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness* (*Eph.*, V, 2). So much so that He is a victim of propitiation (*Rom.*, III, 25), a victim for sin (*II Cor.*, V, 21),² by whose Blood we are cleansed (*Tit.*, II, 14).

St John also agrees, he calls Him a *propitiation for our sins* (*I John*, IV, 10 and II, 2, coll *II Mach.*, III, 33, *Septuagint Numbers*, V, 8, *Septuagint Ezech.*, IV, 27), he says that we are cleansed (*I John*, I, 7), or freed (*Apoc.*, I, 5) by His Blood. In these words, as in the words of

² Such is the sense of the words *made sin for us* in the Douay version, according to Augustin, *Ep.* 140, c. 29, n. 73; *Enchirid.*, c. 1, 41; *Contra Maximin.*, I, c. 2; *Contra duas epist. Pelagian.*, l. 3, c. 6. P. L. 33, 570; 42, 744; 44, 600. Cyril Alex., in h.l. and many other interpreters and exegetes, even Rationalists; Chrysostom (in h.l. P. G. 61, 477 foll.), Cornely (in h.l.) and Grimm, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum*, s. v. ἀμαρτία, agree with him.

St Peter (*I Peter*, I, 2) that we are sprinkled with the Blood of Christ. There is an evident allusion to the Mosaic sacrificial rite.

The title *lamb* as a designation proper to Christ and used both by St Peter and St John also refers to the sacrificial rite. He is a *lamb unspotted and undefiled* (*I Peter*, I, 18-19), who *taketh away the sin of the world* (*John*, I, 19), as the Lamb of God, that is dedicated to God; He is the *lamb slain* (*Apoc.*, V, 6 and 12, XIII, 8).

But even without any of these testimonies, the abundantly clear and compelling evidence of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (IV, 14 and foll.) would be quite sufficient to convince us of this. For the whole trend of the *Epistle* goes to show that in the one sacrifice of Christ, contrasted with the sacrifices of the Law, which were a shadow of it, the ancient priesthood was abrogated and a new priesthood instituted. No apter or more powerful proof of the actuality of the sacrifice could be desired than this comparison of the figure and the reality.

Moreover, the Priesthood of Christ so forcefully insisted on in Holy Scripture, both by the Psalmist (*Ps.*, CIX, 4, compare with *Hebr.*, V, 6, VII, 15, 17, 21) and by St Paul in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (*priest*, V, 6, VII, 15, 17, 21; *high priest* (*ἱερέα μέγαν*), X, 21; *high priest* (*ἀρχιερέως*), II, 17;

III, 1, IV, 15, V, 10, VI, 20, VII, 26, IX, 11; *great high priest*, IV, 14), would of necessity be wanting, if Christ did not offer sacrifice in the strictest sense of the word: *For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is necessary that he also should have something to offer* (see *Hebr.* VIII, 3, compare V, 1). And really, if we deny to the Passion its sacrificial character, the priesthood of Christ does not exist; it is from the Passion that Christ is Victim, and the sacrificial condition is in the Eucharist only from the Passion.

From the time of the Apostles on, the theologians of the Church have always taught this doctrine of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. Thus the very early author of the *Epistle* attributed to Barnabas (about A.D. 72),³ "He was crucified for our sins . . . He was to offer the vessel of the spirit (*i.e.*, *His body*) as a victim, that the figure represented in Isaac, who was offered on the altar, might be fulfilled. What, therefore, does He say according to the Prophet? . . . 'You will give vinegar and gall to drink to me who am about to offer my Flesh for the sins of the new people.'" (*Barnab.*, VII, 3-5. Compare VIII, 2-3, V, 1-2. F. P. I, 58-60, 62, 50).

³ M. d'Herbigny, R.S.R., t. 1, p. 417 foll. and 450 foll., sums up for this date with great probability.

Clement of Rome calls Christ "our Pontiff" (*I Cor.*, 64. F. P. 1, 82), the "pontiff of our souls" (*ibid.*, 61, 3, p. 180), and the "pontiff of our offerings" (*ibid.*, 36, 1, p. 144), "He gave His Flesh for us, He gave His Flesh for our flesh, His Soul for our souls" (*ibid.*, 46, 6, p. 162). Polycarp also calls Him "the eternal pontiff" (*Epist.*, XII, 2, P. P. 1, 310).

Justin calls the second goat, offered at the same time as the emissary goat that was sent into the wilderness, a figure of Christ, who "was an offering for all sinners willing to do penance" (*Dial.*, 40. P. G. 6, 564).

Tertullian writes: "Isaac, led a victim by his father, and carrying the wood for himself, thus early foreshadowed the death of Christ, GIVEN AS VICTIM by the Father, and carrying the wood of His own Passion" (*Adv. Judaeos*, 10. P. L. 2, 626).

Following this early period, there is no doctrine of the Church so universally insisted on as this teaching on the sacrifice of Christ. J. Rivière, in his erudite work, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption* (*Revue d'étude historique*, 1905), has collected a number of examples of this teaching of the Church. To these we add a few specimens of outstanding significance.

Zeno of Verona: "This, I say, is the perfect Lamb, for in it THE HIGH PRIEST, CONCEALED IN HIS VICTIM by reason of the mystery, today gave

to God the Man whom He offered in sacrifice" (Lib. 2, tract. 55, in die paschae. P. L. II, 511).

St Ephraem abounds in the praises of this great sacrifice. Thus he writes in the *Hymnus azymorum*: "The Lamb of truth, knowing that a rejected priesthood and polluted sacrificers did not suffice for Him, became for His own Body the Priest and the Prince of sacrificers. Our Sacrificer, become Victim by His own sacrifice, abolished the victims and showered His grace all over the world. No lamb is greater than the heavenly Lamb. Since the priests were earthly and the Lamb heavenly, He was both Priest and Victim for Himself. For polluted priests were not worthy to offer the immaculate Lamb, the pacific Victim who brought peace to heaven and earth, bringing peace to all by His Blood" (*Hymn azym.*, hymn. 2, str. 2, 3, 5, 6, ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 576-578).

St Hilary, contrasting the sacrifices of the Law with the sacrifice of Christ, says that the sacrifice of Christ was superexcellent in this: that the sacrifices of the Law were commanded to be offered under threat of a curse, while that sacrifice was offered in the most perfect freedom: "Therefore He offered Himself to the death of the accursed, in order to destroy the curse of the Law, by freely offering Himself a Victim to God the Father, so that the curse which sin caused, and which was attached to the necessary

and intermittent victims, should be lifted by a voluntary victim. In another place in the Psalms mention is made of this sacrifice: *Sacrifices and oblations thou wouldst not: but a body thou hast fitted to me*; by offering to God the Father, who rejected the sacrifices of the Law, the pleasing Victim of His Body. The holy Apostle thus speaks of this offering: *This he did once offering himself a pleasing victim to God*; He would redeem the whole human race by the offering of this holy and perfect victim" (*in Ps.* 53, n. 13. P. L. 9, 345).

Indeed, so widely promulgated and so firm was the faith of the Church in the truth of the sacrifice of Christ, that it was looked upon as an established fact in the controversies that arose between the heretics and the Catholics. The question of how the priesthood was to be attributed to the Incarnate Word was interwoven in all their discussions. The Catholics maintained against the Arians that Christ was not Priest by reason of His more sublime nature (see Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69, 37-39. P. G. 42, 260-261; Ambrose, *De Fide*, l. 3. c. 11, n. 87. P. L. 16, 607); against Nestorius, that He is Priest (though by reason of the human nature), and yet at the same time God (see Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Nestorium*, l. 3, c. P. G. 76, 116-125); and finally against the Eutychians, that in one and the same Priest there are two natures

unconfused (see Theodoretus, *Eranistes*, Dial. 1. P. G. 83, 57; Leo the Great, *Ep.* 124, c. 4. P. L. 54, 1064).⁴

A summary of the whole teaching of the Church on the true character of sacrifice is to be gathered from the works of St Augustine. He declares: "By His death, that is BY THE ONE TRUE SACRIFICE OFFERED FOR US, He washed away all sin" (*Trin.*, l. 4, c. 13, n. 17. P. L. 899). "In the wonderful and ONE TRUE SACRIFICE the Blood of Christ was shed for us." This "ONE ONLY TRUE and wonderful sacrifice was signified in figure by the many sacrifices which went before" (*Contra Advers. Leg. et Prophet.*, l. 1, P. L. 42, 624). In-

⁴ Thus Epiphanius: "We believe without the shadow of doubt that the Son is truly the Son of the Father [*i.e.*, born of the substance of the Father, not made from nothing], and as such is adored by those who desire to attain to eternal life, but He was also made Priest, because He offered Himself to the Father in His own Body on behalf of the human race. Fulfilling the office of the priesthood for all mankind, He, Priest and Victim, offered Himself" (*loc. cit.*). Thus Cyril: "If any one says that it is not the Word which is from God, made our Priest and our Apostle, after the Word was made flesh and a Man like unto us, but another than the Word, of different species, born of a woman; or if any one says that He offered Himself an oblation for Himself, and not rather for us alone . . . A. S." (*Anathematism.* 10, *ad calcem epist.*, 17. P. G. 71, 121). Thus Theodoretus: "If therefore to offer gifts is the proper office of priests, and as Man Christ is called Priest, and moreover He offered no other victim than His own Body, therefore Christ the Lord had a body" (*loc. cit.*). Compare Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, 12, 11, and Cardinal Franzelin, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 5, 516.

deed, all the sacrifices that were ever offered, even those offered to the devils, were predictions OF THE ONE TRUE SACRIFICE TO COME, which was offered for all the sins of all believers . . . Therefore do the devils arrogantly demand for themselves THE TRUE SACRIFICE which is due to the one true God, and which Christ alone offered on the altar of God, the devils imitating it with their victims of cattle . . . On the other hand, in the victims of cattle which the Hebrews offered to God, the Victim to come was plainly foretold. Hence Christians now celebrate the memorial of that same sacrifice, by the most holy offering and partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ" (*Contra Faust.*, l. 20, c. 18. P. L. 42, 382-383). And again: "Here in dwelling at some length on the TRUE SACRIFICE, my aim was to prove that this sacrifice is due only to the one true God, the sacrifice which the one true Priest, Mediator between God and man, offered to Him, and that it was fitting that the sacrifices, which were promised in figure of that sacrifice, should be celebrated with animal victims, so commending to us the Flesh and Blood to come, the unique Victim by which the remission of the sins, contracted by flesh and blood, could be obtained . . . And thus it was fitting that, just as the Hebrews celebrated religious predictions OF THIS TRUE SACRIFICE, so also the pagans celebrated sacrilegious imi-

tations of it" (*op. cit.*, l. 22, c. 17, col. 409). Therefore, "In many different ways all these signified the one sacrifice, the memorial of which we now celebrate. Hence when this sacrifice was revealed to us, and in its own time offered, those other laws regarding the celebration of the sacrifices were abrogated, but they still retained for us their value as signs" (*op. cit.*, l. 6, c. 5, col. 231). Finally, "Before the coming of Christ the Flesh and Blood of this sacrifice was foreshadowed in similitude by the sacrifices of victims; in the Passion it was celebrated in real truth; after the Ascension, the equivalent sacrament of memorial is celebrated . . . Thus the sacrifices of the pagans and those of the Hebrews are far apart, even though the difference is found merely in the different persons to whom they were immolated and offered. The sacrifices of the pagans were offered to the sacrilegious arrogance of the devils; those of the Hebrews to the one true God, in order that an image promising the true sacrifice to come should be offered to Him to whom it was to be offered in real truth in the Passion of the Body and Blood of Christ" (*op. cit.*, l. 20, c. 21, col. 385-386).

From all this it is clear how contrary it is to the tradition of the Fathers, to treat as metaphorical that sacrifice whence was derived all the truth that was in the ancient sacri-

fices and all their value as figures of truth to come, as well as all the reality of our own sacrifice of the Mass. For only in that sacrifice of the Passion and Death of Our Lord do we find combined and in plenitude all the laetific and propitiatory signification and efficacy of sacrifice.

To examine the Fathers in detail would be waste of time, for up to the present no one has called in question the dogma declared by the Church (*Trent.* sess. 22, compare can. 3 and 4. D. 938-940, 950-951), apart from the Socinians,⁵ a few Protestants and Rationalists. Gihl writes: "That the propitious death of Christ is a true and real sacrifice, is taught explicitly by the word of God, and this has at all times been believed and acknowledged by Christians" (*Das heilige Massopfer*, 4. 33).

"The sacerdotal office is in a sense the basis and the foundation of all the benefits of Christ to us; these benefits are really to be considered as so many effects of the death of Christ who gave Himself, an expiatory victim to God, on behalf of man. And truly from this expiatory sacrifice offered on the Cross, redemption, reconciliation, and full satisfaction spontaneously flow. This dogma: that Christ, true Priest, offered to God a true sacrifice on the Cross, is opposed among others by Socinians and Rationalists" (Madu-

reira, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae specialis*, t. 2, tract. 1, c. 3, par. 23, p. 195).

The first of our theologians, as far as I know, to cast a faint shadow upon this dogma was H. Rivière (*Revue pratique d'Apologétique*, Oct. 1 and Nov. 1, 1911). It is true and it has never been denied by any Catholic theologian, that Christ the Redeemer made satisfaction for us by a moral act (*ibid.*, Nov. 1, p. 162), by an exercise of His liberty (*ibid.*, 163), by virtue and merit of His love (*ibid.*, 164), by obedience yielded freely through charity (*ibid.*); but it is agreed by all theologians of all ages, that it is not by any moral act or free act, or act of charity or act of obedience, that we are redeemed, but by one particular act of that fourfold sort, the act by which Christ suffered His Passion in such a way that He was thereby offering the sacrifices of His Body and Blood. That sacrifice was in no way METAPHORICAL (*ibid.*, p. 174 and Oct. 1, p. 32), in no way a sacrifice improperly so called, to be admitted as a sacrifice only in the wide sense that there was a value before God in Christ's death, rendering it apt to win divine favour for us; but in the strictest possible sense as a sensible offering of the Passion made by Christ Priest, to give the supreme worship of latria to God, and to make propitiation for man. Theologians have always realized that such

⁵ Compare Billuart, *De Incarn. dissert.*, 19, a. 4; Franzelin, *De Verbo Incarnato*, Th. 51.

a sacrifice in this strict acceptation was the foundation of speculative theology, and have never spoken of it otherwise (*ibid.*, p. 32), save when through want of caution they have made use of language lacking precision, or have been for a space of time devoid of sobriety of judgment.⁶

§ 2. Intrinsic Nature of the Sacrifice of Christ

Christ is the Head of mankind in two ways particularly—He presides as Ruler over us, and He infuses grace. He possessed the virtue of infusing grace by natural right in His Incarnation from the union of the humanity to the divinity. Divine ordinance, however, decreed the free exercise of this right only from His Passion. Hence the activity of

that virtue of infusing grace must be considered as consequent on the sacrifice of Christ.⁷

He had already before the sacrificial action the office of presiding or ruling, and in virtue of this office He presided over men as Prophet and King, and in virtue of this office also He was Priest for man whom in His own Person He represented—the true God-Man, as God turning towards man, as Man turning towards God.⁸ It was fitting, therefore, that He should offer sacrifice for us “all of whom Christ bore, as He also bore our sins” (Cyprian, *Epist.* 63, n. 33. P. L. 4, 383). And it was especially fitting that He should sacrifice Himself, thus representing human nature as its Head, as in person He represented God. We have now to consider the two elements of this sacrifice—the visible and the invisible element.

⁶ This truly Catholic writer softened his teachings in a later work, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*. (*Etude théologique*, 1914, p. 202-216 and 301-308.) Meantime we are most grateful to the author for opening up questions which must be answered as a matter of course. When we attribute to our Redeemer an act of sacrifice in the true sense of the word, we should be willing not only to pay the homage of our faith, but also as a theologian should, to give reasons for that faith. In other words, we must examine and find out how every element of a true and properly so called sacrifice (that is, liturgical and ritual), is found in the Sacrifice of the Redeemer, including the actual offering of the priest. We shall attempt this in the present and the following theses up to the ninth, which should be compared with the thirteenth. See p. XVII.

⁷ Nicholas Cabasilas, the greatest of the Greek theologians of the Middle Ages, justly remarked that it is only after the Cross, that we are properly members of Christ. “For only after the Cross are we knit to Christ. Before His death we had no communion with Him. For He was the Son and He was the Beloved; we were criminals, slaves and enemies. But after His death when the price was paid, the chain of the devil broken, we received the liberty and adoption of children, and became members of that blessed Head” (*De vita in Christo*, 1. P. G. 150, 520). The word “after” is used, of course, of logical posteriority.

⁸ Because He did not assume the angelic nature, hence He is not the Priest or the Pontiff or the Liturgus of the angels. As Man, however, HE IS THE BORN PRIEST of men.

A. THE INVISIBLE ELEMENT

The invisible element signified in the Passion of Christ our Head, is the dedication of the human race to the worship of God and the alienation of the human race from sin. We have seen already the words of Leo the Great: "Therefore the Cross of Christ has the sacrament of the true and already foretold altar, on which by means of the victim of salvation, the offering of human nature should be celebrated" (*Sermo* 55. P. L. 54, 324). Dealing with this subject, St Thomas notes the following objection: "The Passion of Christ is not a sign. Therefore, it seems that the Passion of Christ is not a sacrament"—He answers: "The Passion of Christ is . . . a sign of something to be observed by us, according to the saying of I St Peter, IV, 1: *Christ therefore having suffered in the flesh, be you also armed with the same thought: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sins, that now he may live the rest of his time in the flesh, not after the desire of men, but according to the will of God*" (3 S. 48, 3, 2^m). Indeed, in the same Epistle, St Peter had already written: *Christ died once for our sins: the just for the unjust, THAT HE MIGHT OFFER US TO GOD* (*I Peter*, III, 18). Here is the invisible sacrifice, of which the visible sacrifice was the sacrament. To this invisible thing signified, which carries with it the detesta-

tion of sin, there is a corresponding reply on the part of God, in man being redeemed and restored to his rights in the celestial heritage, *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ who is at the right hand of God, swallowing down death, that we might be made heirs of life everlasting* (*I Peter*, III, 21-22).

The greatest difference between the sacrifice of Christ and the ancient sacrifices was that in the ancient sacrifices the invisible element was really signified by the visible element, but it was not effected. Indeed, it was regarded as presupposed. But in the sacrifice of Christ, what was signified was effected by virtue of the sacrifice. For our turning away from sin is not a pre-condition of the sacrifice of the Cross, but follows on that sacrifice.

Up to the present we have spoken of what is signified in this sacrifice, and of what is signified as pertaining only to ourselves. But in this sacrifice there is something pertaining to Christ, and indeed to Christ principally and first of all. For the sacrifice of the Cross, from its laetitic and eucharistic aspect, is a sign of the internal dedication of Christ Himself to the praise and worship of God the Father, and from its propitiatory aspect it signifies the desire of Christ to make compensation to the divine honour outraged by us. Hence Suarez, wisely speaking of the signification as pertaining to Christ, and

then of the signification as pertaining to us, says:

“Signification is essential to all sacrifice, because without signification there can be no worship of latria which is the essence of sacrifice: and this signification is found in the sacrifice of Christ. For it signified the interior acts whereby Christ offered His life to appease God; it also signified the destruction of sin, and the death of death itself, which the sacrifice was to cause” (*De Incarn.*, in 3 S. 48, 3, *commentarius*, n. 2.; compare part 1^a, disp. 46, s. 1, n. 2). Le Grand similarly: “The sacrifice of Christ, both in respect of Christ as Man and in respect of us, was an attestation of the supreme dominion of God and of perfect subjection to Him . . . In this sacrifice also Christ gave thanks for the benefits conferred on man” (*De Incarnatione Verbi Divini*, Disser. 10, c. 1, concl. 4).

There need be no fear that what we have said would imply that Christ offered the sacrifice for Himself in the sense condemned by the 10th anathema of Cyril. Because there are two ways in which sacrifice may be offered *for* a person. In the first way, a priest may offer the sacrifice as presenting the sacrifice of another—he celebrates Mass on behalf of a person giving a stipend. In the second way a priest may offer the sacrifice in favour of somebody—in this sense we say that a priest offers the sacrifice for him in whose

favour the donor of the stipend desires the Mass to be celebrated.

When we consider the first way, there is nothing essentially wrong in saying that Christ offered the sacrifice for Himself—because He presented His own sacrifice, not the sacrifice of another. Although to ward against ambiguity, it would be better not to use an expression of this kind. But in the second way, the only one condemned by Cyril in this connection, we are far from saying that Christ offered the sacrifice for Himself. For in this way sacrifice is offered for a person with this end only: either to make atonement for him, or to obtain benefits for him. When Christ offered the sacrifice He had no such end in view in respect of Himself. His end was to make atonement for us and to intercede for us.⁹ At the same time it was actually meritorious for Christ. But this merit was by reason of the charitable intention of the ultimate aim of Christ, which arose from His will to offer the sacrifice for us. For just as prayer said for another can

⁹ “Note that speaking strictly, the person who offers the sacrifice in thanksgiving for benefits conferred on himself or on another, does not on that account offer the sacrifice for him on whom the benefits were conferred, because to offer the sacrifice for another is to offer in his favour and benefit” (Lugo, *De Eucharistia*, disp. 19, sect. 10). For of itself thanksgiving does not envisage the benefit of the person for whom thanks are made, but rather (if this were possible) the benefit of him to whom gratitude is shown.

be meritorious for myself, though I do not ask anything for myself, so Christ merited by the sacrifice which He did not offer for Himself, but for us. It is thus that we must interpret St Thomas (3 S. 22, 4, 2^m),¹⁰ and also St. Bonaventure.

Nor is it wrong to say that Christ received glory for Himself by the sacrifice, not indeed as needing the sacrifice for Himself, but as the Head of those who did need it. For just as it was preordained that Christ should enter heaven as our Head, and what is not open to the body cannot be open to the head, Christ our Head could enter only by way of His sacrifice, by means of which alone the way to glory was open to us His body. And as He purchased the state of glory for Himself, in so far He presides as Head over us, united to Him as members. This solution will not come under the anathema of Cyril.¹¹ It furnishes,

¹⁰ Vasquez writes well: "Christ profited nothing in His death by way of the sacrifice, but only by reason of devotion, as the holy Doctor said above, q. 22, a. 4, ad 2^m, and thus Christ did not receive in Himself the effect of His Priesthood, rather He communicated it to others, because as the same holy Doctor taught in the body of the article cited by us, Christ did not offer Himself to the Father for Himself, but for others. The sacrifice of His death, however, is said to have profited Him, because it was a work of merit for Him; now the extent of the merit must be measured by the devotion of him who merits" (in 3^{am} *partem*. disp. 231, c. 3, n. 11).

¹¹ "If anyone says that Christ offered the

moreover, a right interpretation of a number of sayings of the Fathers on the Resurrection and the Ascension of Christ which will be considered later (Chap. V). Keep in mind throughout this enquiry that the angle from which we view Christ as an individual, is not the same as that from which we view Christ as our Head. They are two different angles, just as within the individual Person of Christ Himself we have the divine and the human nature, and each nature must be considered from a different viewpoint.

B. THE VISIBLE ELEMENT

Three things are required for the complete constitution of the visible element of sacrifice—the victim, the immolation of the victim, and the offering of the victim. We shall deal with these three in turn.

A) THE VICTIM

We may consider the victim prior to the sacrifice, which is the material consideration, or formally—as the actual subject of the sacrifice.

The Victim Materially Considered

Materially considered, the victim was rational and clean.

sacrifice for Himself, and not for us only (FOR HE WHO ABSOLUTELY KNEW NO SIN HAD NO NEED OF SACRIFICE) let him be anathema" (*loc. cit.*, P. G. 71, 120).

By clean we mean that the victim was free from every stain and contagion or debt of sin, not only because in Christ the Victim was infused with the sanctity of the Word, (this sanctity is incompatible with what is unclean, it absolutely excludes even the slightest deordination from the Person of the Son of God), but also because though His human nature was derived from Adam, it was not derived in the manner in which sin, or at least the debt of original sin, was propagated.¹²

¹² The rectitude of a soul in innocence at its origin connaturally implies (in the providence of God) the subordination of the lower elements in man to his reason (compare St. Thomas, 2 D. 30, l. 1. et 3^m etc.). Hence rebel or sinful flesh is not of itself capable of subjecting the soul in a connatural manner, so as to turn it to God. Therefore where procreation takes place in the manner which connaturally propagates concupiscence, the debt of original sin is propagated there also, so much so that it is only by a privilege that the propagation of sin and concupiscence could in such case be prevented. Now on the part of her parents the propagation of Mary was subject to the common law, and according to this law there exists the concupiscence habitual to conception, and this is not only present in the parents as a material consequence or accompaniment of original sin, but is of a nature to produce a like effect in the progeny (unless prevented). And so the debt of original sin was contracted by Mary, and it was only by a privilege that she was free from sin as well as from concupiscence. BUT ONCE GIVEN THE VIRGINAL MATERNITY OF MARY, there was no place in the procreation of Christ for concupiscence as inherited from a sinful or guilty stock. Therefore the human nature of Christ (even prescinding from the hypostatic union) was

Secondly, the victim was rational, gifted with reason, and so a willing and loving victim, in heart's desire one with the Priest, as also one with the Priest in value and acceptability. It is quite true that any offering whatever coming from Christ would be clothed by His divinity with infinite worth, and by His charity or love would possess all-sufficient power of atonement for every sin.¹³

of necessity clean, without the need of any special privilege—not freed, nor preserved, but free (compare 1-2 S. 82 and 83). This in substance was taught repeatedly by St. Augustine: "For the Virgin had not conceived by the concupiscence of the flesh: AND FOR THIS REASON the flesh was propagated in Him without the propagation of sin" (*Op. imperf. c. Jul.*, 4, 79, P. L. 44, 1384). "He offered Himself a clean victim . . . For the flesh which He received from us, this Flesh He offered. But whence did He receive it? From the womb of the Virgin Mary, in order to offer it clean, for the unclean" (*Ennar. in Ps. CXLIX*, 2, n. 6. P. L. 36, 1953). Compare Didymus Al. (*Contra Manichaeos*, 8. P. G. 39, 1096): "If Christ received His Body in the ordinary way of propagation, and not a body formed outside the ordinary course, He too would be considered as subject to that sin which every child of Adam also contracts."

¹³ Should it be asked how a mere creature can never completely make satisfaction to God for sin, whereas the Man-God could, the answer lies in the difference of love in the two cases. Through sin whereby we turn away from our last end, we reject in practice, as far as it is possible for us, the supreme amiability of God, and therefore so to speak, tear out of our hearts and reject all the love which every created and creatable creature owes to the great goodness of God. Now no mere creature can give to God all the created and creatable love wherewith He can be loved. Therefore no mere creature can make adequate

But by offering *Himself* He showed much more His love and His desire to make satisfaction to God: for the virtue of the Passion which He accepted was to increase the difficulties to be surmounted by His love.¹⁴

Therefore, the very highest significative virtue accrued to the sacrifice from the fact that Christ was at the same time its Priest and its Victim. And since sacrifice in its proper sense is in its significative virtue, the sacrifice of our Redeemer was of all sacrifices the most perfect and the most effective to appease the divine majesty. Looked at from this aspect, the closest of all the ancient sacrifices to the one true sacrifice was that of Abraham, ready to sacrifice Isaac his son.¹⁵ Considered,

compensation for the evil we have done in rejecting this love as far as in us lay. The one Incarnate God alone in His created nature can do this. For He necessarily possesses the highest perfection of created love, not only relatively to any other created love, but also absolutely by comparison to any creatable love whatever. Hence God Himself alone can give the love that we have excluded by sin.

¹⁴ Compare 3 S. 46, 6 in the body of the article, under the title 4 and 6^m.

¹⁵ Note the words of St Francis de Sales (*Traité de l'amour de Dieu*, l. 10, c. 10): "O God, who could tell which of the two loves was the greater, that of Abraham who to please God immolated his own son, or that of the son who to please God submits to immolation, and permits himself to be bound and stretched on the wood, and like a gentle lamb patiently wait the death blow from his Father? I esteem the father more highly for his longanimity, but then again

therefore, from every aspect, the Victim of our salvation was by far the most fitting for the end desired.

Here the words of St Augustine are to the point: "What priest so just and so holy as the only Son of God who needed no cleansing from His sins, whether original sin, or the sins of daily life? What more suitable could man choose to be offered for him than human flesh? And for this immolation, what so fitting as mortal flesh? What so clean to cleanse the sins of men, as the Flesh born without any contagion of carnal concupiscence, Flesh nourished in and born from a Virgin's womb? What offering can be so acceptable and so pleasing as the Flesh of our sacrifice made the Body of our Priest?" (4 *Trin.*, l. 4, c. 14. P. L. 42, 901).

St Thomas is in perfect agreement with St Augustine: "It is a most perfect sacrifice. In the first place, being the flesh of human nature, it is appropriately offered for man and received under the sacramental veil. Secondly, being mortal and passible, it was suited for immolation. Thirdly, being without sin, it was effective for the cleansing from sin. Fourthly, BEING THE FLESH OF THE OFFERER IT WAS ACCEPTABLE TO GOD BECAUSE OF THE INEFFABLE CHARITY OF HIM WHO IS OFFERING HIS OWN FLESH" (3 S. 48, 3, 1^m).

Moreover, the fact that Christ was at the same time Priest and Victim,

I boldly grant the prize to the son for magnanimity."

explains to us in what manner He was borne down for our sins and inflicted, so to speak, with the punishment of our transgressions (*Is.*, LII, 12, LIII, 13). For the priest offering sacrifice for the sins of the people is looked upon as bearing *the sins* of the people. And the victim immolated for sin, by His VICARIOUS death, indicates the *punishment* deserved by the guilty, and by intercession averts it, and by averting, supplies for it: Thus therefore Christ went to His death bearing our sins, though the burden of our sins was not placed on Him by the Father (for this would be unjust), but it was the Son Himself who took up the burden, desiring (under the impulse of love) both to act as our Priest and to surrender Himself as our Victim; and so in His sacrifice Christ made Himself both *the bearer of sin* and *the bearer of punishment*.

In the essential character of sacrifice, then, we find the reconciliation of the penal or expiatory nature of the Passion of Christ with the justice of God and the innocence of Christ. "That which was punishment in the eyes of man, was sacrifice in the eyes of the Father" (Adolphus, *Expositio super Epistolam B. Pauli Ap. ad Hebr.*, c. 9. P. L. 79, 1381). We see, therefore, how the substitution of Christ for the human race, which was required for vicarious satisfaction, is a fitting consequence of His Priesthood, and is realized in the sacrifice; we see too

how necessary it is in explaining the sacrificial character of Christ's vicarious satisfaction for us, that we avoid the adoption here of the strictly penal explanation of such satisfaction.¹⁶

The Victim Formally Considered

When we come to consider the victim as formally underlying the sacrifice, we are at once confronted with the question: how could that sanctification in which the formal condition of victim consists (Ch. I) accrue to Christ. For even before the sacrifice, the perfection of sanctity was in the human nature of Christ from the unction of the divinity united with it in the one Person.

However, a little clear thinking will show that this difficulty is not peculiar to this point of theology, it is constantly met with in other points of doctrine, and with equal force. One might ask, for instance: How could Christ merit such things as are already His, and due to Him by natural right, such as the glory of His Body, and so on (3 S. 19, 3). The usual solution given to all these

¹⁶ J. Pohle (*Soteriology*, authorized English version by A. Preuss, 1914, p. 111), therefore wisely remarks: "that the death of Christ was a true sacrifice, and that He Himself was a true Priest. It is these facts which give to the Redemption its sacerdotal and hieratic stamp, and furnish us WITH A KEY TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ATONEMENT." Hence later on (p. 115) he insists on safeguarding the dogmatic character of this fact.

difficulties is as follows: in these cases, Christ did not merit these things in such a way as to make things hitherto less due, now more due to Himself, but made them from being due to Himself on one ground, now due to Him on one or more additional grounds. On this matter read Toletus (in 3 S. 19, 4, conc. 2). Thus in the matter now before us, we must say that perfect sanctity, as inherent in Christ through the Incarnation, could not indeed be increased in Him, but could come to be inherent in Him on added grounds, in the words of Rupert of Dietz (*in Levit.*, l. 2, c. 5. P. L. 167, 791): "The great High Priest of the true heavenly tabernacle was sanctified first in the Holy Spirit, and afterwards in His own Blood."

In this sense we must understand St Thomas, where he advances and solves the objection: "Every victim, from the fact that it is offered to God, is sanctified to God. But from the beginning the humanity of Christ was sanctified and united to God. Therefore, it cannot be said properly that Christ as Man was a Victim." He replies: "It must be said that the sanctity of the humanity of Christ from the beginning did not prevent His human nature when offered to God in the Passion, from being sanctified in a new manner, that is as Victim actually presented then, for He acquired the actual sanctification as Victim AT THAT MOMENT from the charity and grace

of the union which had from the beginning sanctified the same humanity absolutely" (3 S. 22, 3, 2^m). In other words, the existent sanctification of Christ FROM THEN ONWARDS acquired a new relation to the offering whereby He was made Victim (Compare *ibid.*, 2^m). For although He could not acquire this sanctity (since He already had it), it was in Him now as it would have been, had it been induced in Him by the offering.

Hence Christ the Victim now appears as *the Holy One of God* on an additional ground in so far as He is now definitely constituted *the Lamb of God*.

B) THE IMMOLATION

It should be noted here that despite the fact that the sacrifice of Christ is often called the sacrifice of His death (and in the sense to be explained immediately, properly so), the immolation did not have place at the precise moment of the separation of the Soul from the Body. For in that moment the soul is separated from the inanimate body, so that a living body does not underlie the separation: because life is terminated extrinsically, as the philosophers say, at the first moment of its non-existence (that is when the soul, the principle of life, leaves the body), while death begins intrinsically at the first moment of its existence. Now the inanimate body is in no

way the subject of voluntary passion, because every principle of a voluntary act, either of the will itself, or commanded by the will, is lacking in such a body. But it was essential that the immolation of Christ should be actually voluntary in Him who was accepting and enduring it; for it was precisely this voluntary acceptance that gave worth to the Victim, as well as merit to the Priest: because the Victim and the Priest are one in will just as they are one in reality. Hence the immolation is to be placed, not in the death but in the Passion, in so far as the Passion was the road to the death (*St Thom.*, 3 S. 50, 6).

In this it is like all other immolations in which violence inducing death is involved. Hence from the viewpoint of immolation, strictly the sacrifice should be called the sacrifice of the Passion.

Nevertheless, from another aspect the sacrifice of Christ may rightly be called the sacrifice of His death, in this way that, had the Passion of Christ not been death-bringing, it would not have been an immolation. Under this aspect, both the Passion as the road to death, and the death as the terminus of the Passion, are looked upon as one thing. For as Cajetan (in h. l.) justly remarks: "Although the being dead, considered in itself alone, is neither an act elicited nor an act commanded by the soul," nevertheless "as the death terminates the process of its coming,

it falls under the one same title of merit as its coming: for in one and the same act the martyr is willing to be slain and to have been slain. And thus precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints: and thus the death of Christ was meritorious."

Just as it can be said in this sense that Christ offered His death, so we too can be said to offer the same death after Him, when we offer the Body and Blood of Christ sanctified for ever from His Passion.

C) THE OBLATION

In determining the manner of Christ's offering of His death and Passion, it should be noted (as theologians agree), that He suffered it willingly. Thus Peter the Venerable (*Tractatus contra Petrobrusianos*. P. L. 197, 797): "He is said to offer Himself, because He surrendered His soul to death not by compulsion but freely." St Thomas: "Christ did not slay Himself, but of His own free will He exposed Himself to death, and so He is said to have offered Himself" (3 S. 22, 2, 1^m). Now, that voluntariety was all-embracing and continuous: He could not only have avoided His enemies or prevented them; but also He could have let them work their fury upon Him yet prevented Himself from suffering any pain; or He could have submitted to these pains yet have kept Himself from death (such was

the power of His Soul united to the divinity). All this notwithstanding, He allowed His enemies to afflict Him, and submitting to pain, He submitted likewise to the law of death.

Following Eusebius of Caesarea (*De Theophania*, fragm. 3. P. G. 24, 609-612), Hilary treated this doctrine at length in the tenth book *De Trinitate* (cap. 23 seq. P. L. 10 361 seq.), and Philippus Eleemosynarius, a medieval writer, in a very complete and brilliant exposition upheld it against the opponents of his time (*Epist.*, 5; 6; 7. P. L. 203, col. 40-44, 52-56, 62-65).

It was also taught by Augustine (4 *Trin.*, n. 15-17. P. L. 42, 898-899. Compare Arnobius Junior, *in Ps.*, 27. P. L. 53, 360; Leo the Great, *Serm.* 54, c. 2. P. L. 54, 519-520). St Bonaventure (3 D. 16, art. 1, q. 3), St Thomas (3 S. 47, 1), Cajetan (in h.l.) and Suarez (*De Incarnatione*, t. 1, disp. 46, s. 1, n. 3), and later theologians generally, follow St Augustine.¹⁷ The voluntariety therefore extended to the Passion—which was of a nature to lead to death yet might have been prevented by Christ from leading to it—and to the death which, while it was the connatural termination of the Passion, yet

need not have terminated it, had Christ willed otherwise. It rested, therefore, with Christ that the Passion should happen at all, and that it should be death-inducing. Looked at from every aspect, therefore, the immolation was free.

But an act of the will, even with such an all-embracing ambit, does not suffice to constitute a sacrificial offering. There must be something more. It must carry with it a direction of the gift to God, and this direction must be outwardly manifested. For an offering is the active tender of a gift; and a sacrificial offering must be sensible, that is, in a manner plain to the senses. Hence modern theologians very wisely lay stress on this external character of the offering, taught explicitly by the earlier writers. Thus Franzelin speaking of the “voluntary submission to the torments and death AND THE DIRECTION OF THE OFFERING OF CHRIST HIMSELF TO THE FATHER,” remarks that it was essential “that the intention should be made manifest by an outward act” (*De Verbo Incarnato*, th. 50). And Gühr: “The priestly activity and self-sacrifice of our Saviour were first of all in His spirit and in His heart, but it did not remain interior and invisible, for Christ’s Heart’s desire and will to sacrifice Himself appeared in outward act” (*op. cit.*, p. 38). Pesch is even more explicit: “In the sacrifice of Christ we have a sensible offering made to God . . . For Christ offered Himself immaculate. This of-

¹⁷ Scotus is opposed to their teaching. He says (assuming that by a miracle His glory did not redound to His Body), the Soul of Christ could not have kept the Body from the Passion and death (3 D. 16, 2). But, he does not seem to take into account the condition of a soul free from the debt of sin.

fering is not merely an inward intention, it is also external and sensible" (*De Verbo Incarnato*, 2, n. 545).

Possibly an objection may be raised from Cajetan; he writes: "For in sacrifices which consist in action, the sacrificial rite is external, as in the sacrifices of animals and of the altar. But in the sacrifices which consist in suffering, the sacrificial rite is to be found in the interior action, wherein a person offers his suffering of his own free will. And thus Christ offered His sacrifice by an interior action, while the outward action of His executioners was not sacred, it was rather a dreadful sacrilege" (in 3 S. 48, 3).

But this solitary teaching of Cajetan would leave us in the untenable position that it could be said that Christ did not offer sacrifice in the strict meaning of the word at all. There would have been no outward sacrificial action whatever, and hence no visible sacrament or sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice. For an obviously cogent reason, therefore, we must reject this teaching of Cajetan: that the sacrificial action of Christ was merely internal.

Admittedly, then, the sacrificial action of Christ must have been of necessity external. And now we arrive at the very heart of our subject. Where or when did Christ perform that voluntary and active dedication of Himself to the worship of God as Victim, SENSIBLY, LITURGICALLY, AND RITUALLY (Chap. I)? Our ques-

tion is: BY WHAT EXTERNAL ACT DID CHRIST ASSUME THE BEARING OF A PRIEST towards His Passion, BY WHAT RITE DID HE OFFER THE SACRIFICE? What did He do by way of sacrifice whence a victim would result? Theologians have tried to find in the actions and words of Christ, from the garden to the Cross, some indications of this sacrificial activity. Many have remarked, for example, that it was in order to show the voluntariety of His Passion and death that He prostrated the soldiers in the garden, or, when at the very moment of His death, He cried in a loud voice.

Thus St. Ephraem (*Evangelii concordantis expositio*, Moesinger, 1876, p. 236): "They were laid prostrate before Him forcibly, in order to show them that of His own free will He delivered Himself to them." St. Thomas similarly following Chrysostom: "He made manifest His power, when His onrushing enemies fell backwards before Him on the ground. By this let the faithful learn that it was of His own free will that He was taken. *He offered because he willed*" (in *Joann*, XVIII, lect. 1, 6). Some point to His cry: "In order to show that the Passion inflicted on Him by violence did not seize His Soul from Him, Christ kept the natural strength of His Body, so that even at the moment of His death, He cried out with a loud voice" (3 S. 47, 1, 2^m). Suarez says that they were laid prostrate: "Lest it should be thought

that He had fallen from His Majesty and power, or that His Passion was unwilling, and that He was compelled to suffer." And that He cried out in a loud voice in order to show "that He was the Lord of life and death, and that it was not from necessity but freely, that He submitted to death, which He could easily prevent" (*ibid.*, disp. 38, sect I, n. 9).

All this does certainly go to show, and clearly show, His free will in accepting the Passion and enduring it; there is not, however, the slightest indication of directing the gift to God, there is nothing whatever to compel us to see in Christ a Victim given over to God's ownership, or consecrated to the divine worship. Was it not possible for Christ to exercise these two actions in the garden and on the Cross, and yet not to offer sacrifice, dying though He was? Suppose these two actions had not taken place, then would there be no sacrifice of Christ? Such a thing has never been suggested. In respect of the Passion of Christ, it has never been imagined, that Christ was Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, at the very moment when He prostrated the soldiers, or when He cried with a loud voice at the moment of His death. Adorable and salutary though these actions of our Lord may be, yet they did not imply any proper specific exercise of the new and eternal priesthood.

While admitting that these two actions of our Lord do not imply

any sacerdotal act, possibly one may look elsewhere. There are the words, for instance, at the moment of His death: *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*. Quoting them, Eusebius Emisenus writes: "The Spirit has gone above and the Body is on the Cross for us. For like a lamb He offered all that was corporeal in Him" (*Fragmentum primum*. P. G. 86, 541). But when we consider these words, we might weigh carefully the wise remark of Suarez: "Offering on the Cross Christ did not utter any words [expressive of sacrificial action]. If we could imagine any phrase of His of that sort, it undoubtedly would be: *Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit*. But these are words of beseeching rather than of offering" (*De Eucharistia* disp. 75, s. 2).¹⁸ Apart from all this

¹⁸ It is worth while noting what the real bearing of the passage from Eusebius is: the words do not refer to a sacrificial gift at all. He merely wanted to show (1) the truth of the death of the Lord; (2) particularly the manner of His death. According to Eusebius (and his views were not orthodox) the manner of His death was this: the assuming nature was separated from the Body. Immediately before the expression quoted, he had said: "Have you learned from the Lord the manner in which the Lord died?" Still further up (540-541) he had advanced the same argument: "What therefore follows: Did not Christ die for us? How did He die? *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*. The spirit departed, the Body remained without the spirit. Did not Christ die therefore?"

Hence the conclusion of Eusebius is that He died, and that He died because the spirit departed from the assumed Body. He adds this as a confirmation: that the Lord did not offer that spirit, which dying He commended

it should not be forgotten that the sacrificial offering is pragmatic, it must be in action, and not merely in words (although the action in which the offering consists can be accomplished in words, as we shall see later).

Possibly it might be argued that the sacrificial offering is in the words of the Lord in the garden: *not my will but thine be done*. As a matter of fact, Albert Stoeckl (*Das Opfer nach seinem Wesen und nach seiner Geschichte*. Mogunt, 1861, p. 379-380) did think that a form of offering was to be found in the words of our Lord: "*Father, not my will, but thine be done*. These were words of free oblation, with which the Saviour began His Passion, and impressed on it the character of sacrifice." But in the first place there is no pragmatic offering in mere words, we have remarked that even if the words declare an offering it is not thereby pragmatic. Secondly, as they stand,

to the Father to be returned to heaven. He offered the Body only, for now that the spirit had gone, only the Body could be said to be dead: "For He offered whatever was corporeal in Him." To sum up: His death and the nature of His death is proved, and what we know otherwise from our faith, is verified: that the Flesh, not the divine spirit, was sacrificed by the Lord. Hence even Eusebius did not think that this commendation of the divine spirit was an offering. For if it were, it would not be the offering of that spirit which is commended to God, but then according to Eusebius, the spirit commended to God is the divine, not the human spirit. But the divine spirit is not offered to God, only the human Body. Therefore in the commendation there is no offering.

the words are not words of offering. The offering must be free, it must be in the absolute disposal of the offerer; in other words no obligation to present the gifts to God. But here Christ speaks words of consent to some apparently inevitable law: *If it be possible, let this chalice pass . . . nevertheless, etc. . . . If it may not pass . . . thy will be done*. Finally, the ancient Fathers and Theologians did not at any time see in these words anything pertaining to sacrificial action. It is not credible that it was left to our time to discover here the formal element of the sacrifice of Christ.

Moreover, when we consider all the words, actions and gestures in the garden and on the Cross, we have still to answer the question: without them, would there be no sacrifice? On the other hand, notwithstanding these words, actions and gestures, is it not possible for the sacrificial action to be lacking, as it certainly was lacking when St Stephen said: *Receive my spirit?*

Or we might look to the complexus of words, movements, and gestures of our Lord through the whole course of the Passion. Throughout all, the evidence of self-surrender to death for our salvation in obedience to divine ordinance is clear. Here we have more than sufficient indications of sacrificial intention and trend. But, could not all this from the garden to the Cross be the same, and yet no sacrifice of-

ferred?¹⁹ Do we not find the same or similar in the martyrs of every age both before and after Christ, and yet their death was not a sacrifice, except in the broad or metaphorical sense? NOW SACRIFICE MUST BE IN ITSELF PLAINLY EVIDENT AS SACRIFICE, because sacrifice is in the nature of a sign—a pragmatic locution signifying an invisible thing; before all else therefore it should be self-evident. Now nothing is self-evidently a sacrifice—hence an adequate sign—hence a sacrifice at all—if it is wholly indeterminate in the line of sacrificial *being*. But anything that could be just the same if it were not a sacrifice is certainly so indeterminate. Therefore the Passion of our Lord is not sufficiently specified as a sacrifice (properly so called) by this complexus of events.

That our Lord did at times enunciate the sacrificial character of His Passion (for instance, *I sanctify myself*), or that the Scriptures proclaimed or the Fathers [passim] declared it, has no bearing on the present question. Declarations of this kind did not make it a sacrifice; they were made because it was a sacrifice. Therefore, it is a sacrifice apart from these declarations of fact, and if so,

¹⁹ Note that to give oneself to death (like soldiers and martyrs), and to give oneself to death by way of sacrifice to God, are not identical: for sacrifice includes the concept of GIFT PRESENTED TO GOD (as a sign of internal dedication). This gift concept is intrinsic to all true sacrifices, without it a sacrifice can neither be, nor be known to be.

it must be evident as a sacrifice, because as we have said, it is of the essence of sacrifice to be of itself discernible.

Since then, neither these particular events, nor the general complexus of the Passion of our Lord FROM THE GARDEN TO THE CROSS, give of themselves any indication of the essential form or character of a sacerdotal offering, we must look for this elsewhere. We shall find it where the Scripture clearly shows it, and where the Fathers and early Theologians constantly recognized it. We shall treat of it in the following chapter.²⁰

²⁰ Meantime it seems scarcely worth the trouble to discuss the teaching found at times in certain books of devotion: that Christ sacerdotally offered Himself throughout His whole life, from the moment when entering into the world He said: *Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not: but a body thou hast fitted to me. Holocausts do not please me: and then I said: Behold I come (Hebr., X, 5-7 and Ps., 40, 7-9)*. Because *in the first place* this state of mind was invisible in Christ; indeed, in His early years absolutely invisible. By it *secondly* was verified the affective, indeed, but not the effective desire of offering Himself. In other words, Christ did then offer the sacrifice in affection and will, but not in actual fact; enunciating, so to speak, a future thing, not a present act. Hence there was no actual giving and dedication, though it was intended that it should be done at some future time. No actual contract was made with God for the expiation of sin, it was desired merely, and (if an outward intimation was at any time given) foretold. But such an offering is not sufficient for true and proper sacrifice; an actual giving *de praesenti* is required, a giving that is plain to the senses, and not in words only but in action.

CHAPTER III

THE OFFERING OF THE PASSION ENACTED
BY CHRIST IN THE SUPPER

CHAPTER III

We propose to prove in sections I to IV that Christ as Priest, consecrating in the Supper the image of His Passion, offered to God the reality of His Passion. This will be shown as follows: we shall study the Supper in the light of

(1) The Passion, § I;

(2) The ancient covenant and the ancient pasch, § II;

(3) The "Epistle to the Hebrews," § III;

(4) The promise of the Eucharist, § IV.

Further, our argument will be

confirmed in § V from certain circumstances of the Supper.¹

¹To this direct testimony indirect testimony will be added later in this work from OUR OWN eucharistic celebration. Once proved that it is a sacrifice, from the fact that in it Christ made Victim from His passion is offered, then we will reason backwards with due respect to the different periods of time, that in the Supper Christ had offered His Body to be immolated in the Passion. For we do what He did, apart from the difference of time in regard to the Passion. *Then* Christ was not immolated yet, He was to be immolated. *Now*, in the Mass, He is not to be immolated, He has been immolated.

§ 1. The Supper and the Passion

A. FROM SCRIPTURE

St Matthew, XXVI,
26-29.

St Mark, XIV,
22-25.

St Luke, XXII,
15-20.

I Cor., XI,
23-26.

15. And he said to them, with desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you, before I suffer.

16. For I say to you, that from this time I will not eat it, till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

17. And having taken the chalice, He gave thanks, and said: Take and divide it among you: for

18. I say to you that I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, till the kingdom of God come.

26. And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed and brake, and said: take ye and eat. This is My Body.

22. And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessing, broke and gave to them, and said, take ye, this is My Body.

19. (a) And taking bread, He gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, saying: this is My Body, (b) which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of Me.

23. For I have received from the Lord, that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus Christ the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread.

27. And taking the chalice He gave thanks, and gave to them saying: drink ye all of this.

23. And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, He gave it to them, and they all drank of it.

20. In like manner the chalice also, after He had supped, saying: this is the chalice the new testament in My Blood, which shall be shed for you.

24. And giving thanks, broke and said: take ye and eat; this is My Body which shall be delivered for you: do this for a commemoration of Me.

28. For this is My Blood of the new

24. And He said to them: this is My

25. In like manner the chalice also,

St Matthew, XXVI,
26-29.

testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins.

29. And I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine until the day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of My Father.

St Mark, XIV,
22-25.

Blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many.

25. Amen I say to you that I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until the day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God.

St Luke, XXII,
15-20.

I Cor., XI,
23-26.

after he had supped, saying: this chalice is the new testament in My Blood: this do ye, for the commemoration of Me.

26. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come.

If these Supper narratives are examined, we see immediately that some kind of bloody death is placed before us in the words and things which designate the Body and Blood separately. For the separate mention and representation of the Body and Blood, and in particular the indication of the Blood as shed, of the Body as given, obviously imply a slaying.

Secondly, a propitiatory intent is added in the words "for many" (*Matth.*, v. 27) and still more in the words "which shall be shed for many" (*Mark*, v. 24); "for you" (*I Cor.*, v. 24); more especially with the addition of the clause "unto the remission of sins" (*Matth.*, v. 27).

From all this it follows that some sacrificial action is accomplished, in such manner that, though no bloodshedding is enacted, some bloodshedding is implied. That is, the Pas-

sion of Christ is placed before us, implied in the bloodless rite, with some kind of propitiatory benefit.

We are now to prove more distinctly that a bloodless offering of an immolation in blood is contained in these expressions.

I say then *in the first place*: that there is MERELY A REPRESENTATIVE SLAYING of Christ in the Supper.

I say *secondly*: that in this representation of the slaying to come, there is AN OFFERING of Christ.

I say *thirdly*: that this offering is not representative only, or apparent only, but that IT IS REAL AND PRESENT.

I say *fourthly*: that the offering of the victim is made WITH A VIEW TO THE REAL IMMOLATION, which is represented as future.

In a word: Christ is here and now offered to an immolation, in the image of that immolation.

First Statement: There is merely a representative slaying

The words pronounced over the bread and wine express death, and they express death in blood. But it is evident that in the actual time in which Christ is speaking, though there is the presence of the Body and Blood, still no slaying is enacted. The slaying of Christ is represented, therefore, though it is not effected. In the Supper, then, was no immolation of Christ; it was merely by similitude, or a representative immolation, consisting in the symbolic virtue, which is given to the visible species by the words designating the Body as delivered to death, and the Blood as flowing from the Body.

Second Statement: There is an offering

To constitute an offering it is sufficient, as we have already said, that the will, directive of the gift to God, should be expressed in a sensible rite.

Now the rite in the Supper appears wholly voluntary. Christ not only approaches it of His own free will, but He even accomplishes it gladly,² and commands His apostles to repeat it.

² Moses Bar Kepha (IX s.) aptly proves the freedom of His will from the thanksgiving, in the *Explanatio mysteriorum oblationis*, edited and translated into English by

Specifically, He indicates His freedom by renewing the covenant, or testament (for a contract must as a matter of course be voluntary); and giving in particular is a proof both of liberty and of liberality.

The direction of the gift to God is shown in the previous thanksgiving and blessing on the gifts and presents (that is, on the bread and wine) as *eucharisteria*, gifts, that is, of God to be surrendered to God; it is shown particularly in the surrender of His Body, made not indeed to the apostles, but *for* the apostles, and made undoubtedly as a Victim to God; it is shown in the shedding of His Blood, *for* the apostles, *for many* even, unto the remission of sins, for which in the justice of God we were condemned to punishment, which the expiatory Victim removes from us, paying the price to God for us. Hence there was most decidedly a direction of the gift and the price to God, to gratify and appease Him.

Third Statement: There is a real present offering

There really are here both an apparent offering and a real offering.

R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington (*Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy*, Oxford, 1913, p. 52).

“By that *He gave thanks*, He declared to us . . . that He assents to the will of the Father—for *thanksgiving is assent*—as though He said: I assent to thy will, O Father, that I receive suffering and death for the human race.”

There is the apparent offering of the bread and wine, there is the real offering of the Body and Blood. I mean by this that Christ outwardly appears to be offering to God the *eucharisteria* of bread and wine, after the manner of Melchisedech. "For when He showed to God and the Father the bread and wine which He held in His hands, He appeared to be offering and dedicating them as gifts to Him" (Nicholas Cabasilas, *Expositio Liturgiae*, c. 2. P. G. 150, 377), as was said above. But He did not offer those things which in the moment of the sacramental Supper were not actually there, since Christ did not say: This is bread, He said *This is my body*; He did not say: this is wine, He said *This is my blood*. He did not offer bread, therefore, because it was not there; nor did He offer wine, because it was not there; if He did offer anything, He offered what He said was there: His own Body and His own Blood. The offering of bread and wine, then, was apparent only; in it the offering of the Body and Blood was hidden from the senses, but it was open to the eyes of faith. This latter offering, therefore, was not like the former, a mere effigy of some more secret giving; it was itself substantially a true and real giving.

Again, this offering of the Body and Blood was so really true that it was not merely foretold or promised, it was there and then effected.

That is, Christ actually in that very moment was given into the ownership and keeping of God: a *present* offering was enacted.

There is a twofold proof of this.

In the first place: the Body is not said to be about to be given, it is given now.³ Therefore the giving or the surrender of the reality to God takes place now, and in this the offering consists.

It is proved in the *second place*

³ Renz (*op. cit.*, t. 1, p. 120-141), in his desire to deny to the Supper any sacrificial offering whatever, tries to weaken the force of the present participle (*didomenon*, which is given) in opposition to the generally received teaching of our apologists, holding that the sacramental words must refer to the real immolation in blood of the Passion. Although absolutely upholding the reality of the sacrificial offering made in the Supper, Lebreton (art. *Eucharistie* in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique*, col. 1564) himself nevertheless denies the force of the argument drawn from the present participle, referring back to St John Chrysostom (*in Matth.*, hom. 82. P. G. 58. 738 foll.), who, when speaking of the giving and the shedding, refers all to the Passion. It appears to me, however, that the fact of the words having in view the Passion, is no argument against the meaning of the words in the present tense, because they express the present offering to the future Passion, as will be proved directly in the fourth statement; for the words "is given" must be interpreted "is given to death," as in *Gal.*, I, 4 and *Rom.*, VIII, 32 (Compare Holtzmann, *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, *Die Synoptiker*, 3, 409). Wherefore as the words "which shall be shed for you" imply a present representative immolation, so they denote a present deputation to a future real immolation. And thus the words both look to the Passion, and express something done in the Supper.

from the fact that (1) under the concept of offering there is accomplished some propitiatory action *de præsenti*, which itself (2) shows that this offering is made in the present.

(1) That a propitiatory action is here and now accomplished is gathered in three ways.

First, in *general*, from the present participles applied everywhere (in the original Greek)

“which is given for you” τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον (*Luke*, XXII, 19),

“which is shed for many” τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (*Mark*, XIV, 24),

“which is shed for many unto the remission of sins” τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (*Matth.*, XXVI, 28).

These verses show amply that something is now done for us, that something has now taken place that is beneficial for us, that some salutary result is now effected, that propitiation is now made.

Secondly, and in a *special* way, from the fact that not the Blood only, but the chalice itself is said to be shed for us; “this is the chalice . . . which shall be shed (in original Greek, rather ‘is shed’) for you” (*Luke*, XXII, 20), the propitiatory rôle of the chalice, as such, can only be referred to the present time, since from now on there is no future occasion in the course of the Passion for the shedding of the chalice.⁴

⁴ However, Father Knabenbauer (*Commentarius secundum Lucam*, in h. l., p. 574-

Thirdly, indirectly, by reason of the New Testament, which is here and now sealed, as will be shown below, whence it follows that our propitiation is here and now *made*.

(2) That propitiation, as immolative and present, denotes that the offering is made in the present must be maintained as certain, because the propitiatory virtue of itself is inherent in the sacrifice, not in a mere foretelling or preliminary figure or promise, but in the very sacrificial action, wherein the Victim is actually offered to be immolated or offered as immolated.⁵

575) considers that in the original Greek the word corresponding to “which is shed” (*literally*, “which is poured out”) should be referred not to the chalice, but to the Blood. He quotes for his contention some corresponding passages in the Apocalypse where grammatical similarity is found. However, such a contention requires a looser grammatical construction, such as is found in Apocalypse, but not in the more classic Greek of St Luke. Moreover in the Apocalypse itself we find this very word *poured out* used directly in reference to the “vials of wrath” (*Apoc.*, XVI, 1; compare XVI, 2, 4, 8, 10). Hence the argumentation of Knabenbauer is not conclusive. However, even if his contention were valid, it would only invalidate one quite subsidiary argument.

⁵ St Augustine appropriately on *Ps.*, 129, 4. “Because with thee is propitiation”:

“And what is this propitiation but the sacrifice? And what is the sacrifice unless it is offered for us? Innocent Blood shed, washed away the sins of the guilty.”

Fourth Statement: The offering is directed to that real immolation which is represented as future

This is proved *indirectly* and *directly*.

Indirectly, because had not Christ been offered to that real immolation which is represented as future, He must be regarded as offered to a mere figment of an immolation, which is not the reality of immolation. But there is no true sacrifice unless there is an offering of a victim as already really immolated or to be immolated, and, if there is no sacrifice, no propitiatory influence can result. But we have already shown that propitiatory influence has here and now resulted; therefore, an offering is made of Christ as to be really immolated at the Passion.

Directly, in two ways.

For (1) it is clear by the very fact that the Blood is shed by Christ in figure before God,⁶ and the Body is slain in figure WITH A VIEW TO THE REMISSION OF SINS, that the Body is deputed to a real slaying and the Blood is deputed to a real shedding for us. For in the symbolic shedding of the Blood, in the symbolic slaying of the Body, in the symbolic death of the Flesh of our Lord, AND THAT ACTUALLY PROPITIATORY, there is not merely promised a true slaying

of the Body, a real shedding of the Blood; not alone is the Victim vowed⁷ to God, but it is now actu-

⁷ The word *vowed* ("vovere") is not used here in the classic sense wherein the victim is said to be vowed (that is, made sacred) by the offering, and made non-sacred ("de-voveri"), that is desecrated ("desacrari") by the immolation.

The words of J. de Maistre, well known though they are, must not be omitted on this subject; he is speaking apropos of human sacrifices (although there is more room for doubt today in regard to the origin of human sacrifices than appeared in his time).

"It seems evident that the first human victims were those found guilty by the law; for what Caesar (*De Bello Gallico*, 6, 16) said of the Druids is really true of all the nations: that the punishment of guilt was somehow pleasing to the divinity. The ancients believed that every capital crime in the State became an obligation on the nation and that the criminal was *consecrated* (*sacer*) or vowed to the gods, until both the criminal and the nation were freed by the shedding of his blood.

"Hence the reason why the word 'sacer' in the Latin has a good and a bad meaning, and why the same word in the Greek signifies what is holy and what is profane; why the word *anathema* signifies at the same time something offered to God as a gift, and something given over to His vengeance; finally why in the Greek and in the Latin also a man or a thing were said to be *desecrated* (expiated), in order to express that they have been cleansed from a crime of which they have been guilty. This word 'desacrari' (to be made non-sacred) seems to be contrary to analogy, the unacquainted ear would expect 'reconsecrate' or 'sanctify'; the error, however, is only apparent, the expression is really very exact. *Sacer* in the ancient languages signifies *what is handed over to the divinity*, on any title whatever, and what is *bound* in such manner that punishment makes it *non-sacred*, *expiated* or *freed*, like religious absolution."

⁶ I say *before God*, because Christ not only makes intercession to God by the words of praise and thanksgiving, but He also shows that the action which is accomplished is propitiatory.

ally made sacred to God, in view of that future true shedding and true slaying.

Therefore, just as Christ is here and now given over into the ownership of God, so, too, here and now He is dedicated to the Passion. In that representative immolation, therefore (call it symbolic, sacramental, mystical),⁸ the offering of

"When the laws of the XII tables pronounced the sentence of death, they said: *sacer esto* (let him be consecrated), that is to say, let him be *devoted*; or, to express it more correctly, *vowed*; for, strictly speaking, the guilty were only made *devoted* by execution." (*Eclaircissement sur les sacrifices*, Ch. 2).

Here it is of interest to note that often in Virgil the victims placed on the altars are called *things vowed*, "Lustramurque Jovi votisque incendimus aras" (*Aeneid*, 3, 279); and at times the gods are said to be summoned to the "vota"—to the "vota" I say, not by the "vota"; that is, the descent of the gods or their favour is invoked upon the "vota" or victims.

We find it often in the language of the Church: both in the Fathers, like St Augustine (*in Ps.*, 61, 27. P. L. 36, 178), "I shall pay my vows before them that fear him—What are his vows? The sacrifice which he offered to God." And in the Liturgies, as in the Postcommunion of the feast of the Most Holy Name of Jesus ("Almighty and eternal God, who hast created and redeemed us, look favourably on our vota").

⁸ Rightly J. Wilhelm and T. S. Scannell, *Manual of Catholic Theology*, vol. 2, London, 1898, p. 456:

"We use the term *mystical* in reference to the mystery in which the effusion takes place; it is opposed to *real* and EQUIVALENT TO REPRESENTATIVE, commemorative, or relative."

Actually it strictly corresponds to the word *sacramental*, inasmuch as sacrament is

Christ to the immolation in blood is actually made.

Later on this will become clearer (p. 215), as it will be shown that the Body of Christ was His altar. When Christ, therefore, sacramentally sheds His own Blood on His own altar, He is thereby (Chap. I) acting as the High Priest offering to God in the mystery the life of His Victim.

(2) It is clear from the fact that Christ said that His Body is given *for us*. This could have only one meaning, that His Body is given over to death.

Thus from every aspect we are impelled to the conclusion that the Body and Blood of Christ in the bloodless imitation of the Passion was pledged before God to the endurance of the Passion in blood; in other words, that in that rite of mystic immolation, the actual Victim of the Passion, as Victim, was offered to God by Christ as Priest.⁹

taken strictly for some sacred sign: so that mystic immolation is immolation by sign or by sacrament.

⁹ Rightly, therefore, both the Greek text throughout uses the present tense, and the Latin text of the Vulgate version, though retaining the present tense "which is given for you" (Luke), still declares the shedding in the future "shall be shed" (Matth., Mark, Luke). For the present tense indicates the present representative immolation wherein is made the offering to the real immolation denoted by the future tense. Hence each reading contains the truth, so that one obtains light from the other, but the Latin obtains a greater light from the Greek.

Recapitulation

In the Supper, Christ appeared as though giving bread and wine to God; and He showed thereby that He was giving something to God: not what was apparent, but what was hidden; not bread, but what He said He was holding in His hands in the place of bread, namely His own Body; not wine, but what He said He mingled in the chalice in the place of wine, His own Blood. He gave His Body; He gave His Blood; He gave each separately, as far as was indicated, by way of signifying, in the appearances and in the words. He gave Himself in the effigy of death; He gave Himself to death for us, and by death He gave Himself as Victim to God.

When Christ is said to have given Himself as Victim to God, the meaning is not only that such surrender of Himself was made known by Christ in words. Indeed in the sacrifice of the Redemption, just as in every true sacrifice generally, the ritual offering, significative of the internal oblation will, did not consist just in the mere oral expression of that will, as, for instance, in the words "I offer" or the like; it consisted in a LITURGICAL RITE applied by the liturgus himself, wherein, in respect of the Victim to be immolated, the actual intention would be PRAGMATICALLY expressed of handing over and consecrating the gift

to God.¹⁰ The Eucharistic rite was indeed a certain complexus of things and words, but it was such that the words alone of themselves would not perfect the offering made to God, but would only indicate (and effect) the presence of the Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine to propitiate for sins. This presence implied by the words constituted the oblation rite in the Supper, wherein Christ was actually given over to God as Victim, deputed to an expiatory death for us.

B. OUR ARGUMENT IS CONFIRMED BY TRADITION

Before entering on a discussion of the teaching of the Fathers we must make one remark by way of preface. Apart from controversies with heretics, the Fathers as a rule did not put forward their teaching in so didactic and peremptory a manner as to leave the intellect no choice, nor did they express their meaning so clearly as to allow no way of escape. Hence outside a few passages which of themselves might attest the opinion of an author, a theologian is bound to set down what is more obviously the trend of the teaching, or what the actual

¹⁰ Thus St Thomas (*in I Cor.*, XI, lect. 5) on the words *took bread* remarks that by that action this is first of all signified: "that He freely accepted the Passion, of which this sacrament is the memorial." Therefore, the will to submit to the Passion for us was expressed in the Supper rite.

words present to us and naturally suggest. Now if all the testimonies, with no clear exception, converge on the same point, a powerful argument is available as to the mind of the Fathers, based on that "cumulative probability," which Cardinal Newman shows can transcend all mere opinion, and beget certainty; in other words, the only explanation of this universal and consistent unanimity is that the Fathers were convinced of this particular teaching. The certainty becomes all the greater if we find a like unanimity (as in matters Eucharistic we do) in the Liturgies. It will be well to keep this in mind in this chapter and in the others to follow until we arrive at the examination of the Mass; the Fathers have dwelt at greater length on the Mass, so that that chapter will reflect a clearer light back on to the discussion on the Supper.

A) INDIRECT TESTIMONY

I. The Fathers imply indirectly that the very sacrifice of the Passion was offered in the Supper, when, making the distinction between the act of sacrifice (or the offering) and the slaying (or mactation), they assign the latter to the deicide Jews, reserving the act of sacrifice to Christ consecrating the bread and wine in the Supper.

Thus St Ephraem (*Hymni*

Azymorum, Hymn 2, ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 576-578):

Str. 2.

"The Lamb of truth knowing that rejected priests and polluted sacrificers did not suffice for Him, BECAME FOR HIS OWN BODY PRIEST AND PRINCE OF SACRIFICERS."

Str. 3.

"The sacrificers of the people slew the prince of sacrificers.

"Our Sacrificer, become Victim, abolished the victims by His sacrifice, and spread His graces throughout the whole world."

Str. 5.

"No lamb is greater than the Lamb of heaven.

"Since the priests were of the earth, and the Lamb was of heaven, He became both Victim and Priest for Himself."

Str. 6.

"Polluted priests were indeed unworthy to OFFER the immaculate LAMB, the pacific Victim, which brought peace to heaven and earth, reconciling all things in His Blood."

Str. 7.

"HE BROKE THE BREAD in His hands for the sacrament of the sacrifice of

His Body; HE FILLED THE CHALICE in the sacrament of the offering of His Blood. Priest of our propitiation, HE OFFERED THE SACRIFICE FOR HIMSELF."

Str. 8.

"He clothed Himself with the Priesthood of Melchisedech, the figure of Himself. He did not bring forth victims, but He offered bread and wine, the ancient priesthood is gone, libations are past."

II. Possibly the same doctrine is suggested when the suffering of martyrdom on our part is taken to be the perfection of the Eucharistic banquet: here there is apparently a confirmation, to a certain extent, that on the part of Christ the perfection of the Supper was the immolation of the Passion.

St Augustine: "Let us see, he says, let us hear the Lord further: 'I will pay my vows in the sight of them that fear him.' What are His vows? THE SACRIFICE WHICH HE OFFERED TO GOD.¹¹ You know what sacrifice? The faithful know the vows which He paid before them that fear Him:

¹¹It should be noted how, when he is speaking of the sacrifice offered in the Supper, St Augustine speaks absolutely of the sacrifice of Christ; not as if referring to a sacrifice other than that whereby Christ redeemed us. He is simply speaking of "the sacrifice which He offered to God" as if He had but one sacrifice. Compare Karl Adam, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin*, 1908, p. 73.

for there follows: 'The poor eat and shall be filled.' Blessed are the poor, because they eat that they may be filled: for the poor eat; those who are rich are not filled, because they are not hungry. The poor eat: hence there was the fisherman Peter, John another fisherman, James his brother and the publican Matthew. They were of the poor, who ate and were filled, SUFFERING SUCH THINGS AS THOSE THEY FED ON ('*talia passi, qualia manducaverunt*'). HE GAVE HIS SUPPER, HE GAVE HIS PASSION: he is filled, who imitates. The poor have imitated: for they have suffered so, that they followed in the footsteps of Christ" (*in Ps.*, 21, 27. P. L. 36, 178).

III. The taking away of sin, which is the work of the Redemption, is at times attributed to the Supper itself. We have an example of this in St Gregory Nazianzen, when among other incidents of the Jewish rite, he shows the typical significance of the circumstance that the lamb was to be eaten towards evening.

"The lamb will be eaten by us. And it will be eaten towards evening, because in the end of ages is the Passion of Christ: seeing that HE TOO TOWARDS EVENING IS PARTAKER OF THE SACRAMENT WITH HIS DISCIPLES, DISPELLING THE DARKNESS OF SIN" (*Or. 45 in sanctum Pascha*, n. 16. P. G. 36, 644).

He explains the late time of the Passion by the evening hour of the

Supper, and he also says that the Supper itself accomplished the remission of sins.¹²

The same conclusion is arrived at, I believe, if death is said to be destroyed by the Supper (because Christ, as St Paul says, overcame death and destroyed sin in the same sacrifice). Cyril of Alexandria (*De adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, 3. P. G. 68, 285-293)¹³ expresses this

¹² The expression of Amalarius in the Middle Ages is equivalent (*De officiis ecclesiasticis*, l. 1, c. 12. P. L. 105, 1023):

"He gave thanks, because the old order was about to pass, and all things would be new. The Law did not take away sins, it punished them. ON HOLY THURSDAY Christ brought the Old Law to an end, HE TOOK AWAY SIN" (compare *ibid.*, 12 and 13). Similarly John, Bishop of Rouen (*De off. eccl.*, P. L. 147, 49), describing the Supper:

"HE DECREED THAT A MYSTERY BE CELEBRATED WHEREIN THE WOUNDED BY SIN, and the weakened in virtue, WOULD BE RESTORED TO ETERNAL SALVATION, and the darkness of sin dispelled, those having true peace in their hearts, would be illumined with the light of faith. For on that day He brought the Old Law which punished sin, to an end, and instituted the first sacrifice of His Body and Blood, whereby sins are taken away."

Thus the unity of the Supper and the Passion. The mystery of our reparation is already accomplished by Christ in the Supper. Our Redemption is brought about by the actual sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. The sacrifice of the Cross, therefore, is already being enacted in the Supper.

¹³ "From the morning,' therefore, that is from the beginning of the world, death has destroyed those who lived on earth, 'until dinner time,' that is until the time of the table. For when the time of the holy and mystic table, that is of that (table) in Christ, came to us, whereon we eat that life-giving heavenly bread, death, which up to then was terrible and insuperable, was de-

clearly, in the example of David staying the hand of the Exterminating Angel by the victim, which, bought at a great price, he offered on the altar, on the threshing floor;

stroyed (*I Cor.*, XV, 26), AS PROPITIATION WAS MADE TO GOD. . . . Christ therefore, who is typified in the person of David, set us free. For seeing that the peoples of the Earth were being consumed by death, He became advocate for us with the Father: FOR HE OFFERED HIMSELF FOR US, AND OF HIS OWN WILL SUBMITTED TO DEATH, and stayed the exterminator. . . . By the threshing floor you will interpret the Church. . . . Christ bought this spiritual threshing floor, the Church I repeat, for fifty sicles, that is no small price (for He gave Himself for her); and in her He built an altar. And since He is Himself the Liturgus, for He was made High Priest, He is also the Victim, He offered Himself (as in image and type of the oxen for the sacrifice), and He was made a holocaust and a pacific victim. . . . The altar being built, whereon would be placed the victim and the holocaust, the destruction was stayed. For the Lord heard the cry of the earth, and the ruin was curbed. For when Christ offers Himself in sacrifice for us, death is destroyed, and destruction averted. . . . What was said of the altar being small in the beginning and that it later grew, points to the future progress of the Gospel in its own time, and to the earlier needs of the holy Churches, which later became greater and larger: for as the days go on, the altars are spread, other Churches are added to the former, and the faithful increase to multitudes untold; they have been redeemed by the sacrifice enacted in Christ, having Christ Himself for Liturgus and Holy Victim, and a sweet-smelling, cleansing and, as it were, wondrous altar."

The Eucharist is undoubtedly meant here; in it both Christ offered Himself to the death of the Cross for our redemption and the Church offers the same price and pledge of our redemption in her constant ministrations and offering.

David built the altar small, it was enlarged later by Solomon (*II Kings*, XXIV, 11 foll.). Cyril develops the allegory, showing that not only was death destroyed at the moment when our Lord partook of the Supper, but, also, that on the very Eucharistic altar a sacrifice was offered by our Lord whereby death was overcome: for, he says, it was offered on an altar, which later as it were grew, until gradually the Eucharistic celebration was spread throughout the nations.

The victory over death in the Supper is found in writers of the Middle Ages. The following is a chant in a prayer *Oratio ad communionem* (A. H. 51, 297), in an English manuscript prayer book of the eighth or ninth century:

“For thy all-powerful Flesh is food
indeed;

And thy Blood, O Jesus, the true
drink of the faithful

BY THIS SACRED MYSTERY THOU
DIDST REDEEM US FROM
DEATH

That we may live in thee, O Lord,
in faith and sobriety.

Deign therefore we beg of thee,
that we may be

Partakers of this holy mystery, to
the glory of thy name.”

But at a much earlier date, we find in the most ancient of our anaphorae, what I believe to be the expression of the same idea; I refer to

the passage which introduces the Supper narrative:

“And who when He was given over to His voluntary Passion, in order to overcome death, to break the ties of the devil, to trample hell underfoot, to illuminate the just, to come to the end, and to manifest His Resurrection, taking bread and giving thanks to thee, said: ‘Take ye and eat, this is my body which shall be broken for you,’” etc. (*Latin Verona Fragments*, ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 106-107).

That is to say, the ends enumerated, though all reflect the Redemption, seem nevertheless to be referred to the actual consecration of the Eucharist, as the cause of it all. Christ, as it were, willed to celebrate the rite, in order to redeem us from death, from the power of the devil, from the pains of hell, and to restore us to light and life.

IV. We find ample confirmation of this in the Fathers. At times they computed the three days of the death of our Lord from the Supper hour. As He was given in food as one already dead, His death was to be regarded apparently as having already taken place. Possibly this is not a satisfactory explanation of the three days of death, but, as regarding the significance of the Supper, it is an absolutely true tradition. For the Sacrifice of the Passion commenced in the Supper. Our Lord offers Himself to undergo death, and

gives Himself as Victim of the anticipated death.

Thus Aphraates:

“He who took His own Body in food, and His own Blood in drink, IS REPUTED WITH THE DEAD. Before He was crucified, the Lord with His own hands gave His own Body to be eaten and His own Blood to be drunk. . . . From the time when He gave His Body in food and His Blood in drink, three days and three nights elapse” (*Demonstratio*, XII, *De Paschate*, n. 6 and 7. P. S., part 1, tom. 1, col. 517 and 520).

St Ephraem, the friend of Aphraates, in the *Evangelii concordantis expositio* (ed. Moesinger, p. 221 and 277), gives this reckoning not once only but twice, though he also speaks in this same work, just as he does in his other works, of the other reckoning which commences with the death of Christ:

“From that moment wherein He broke His Body for His Disciples, and gave His Body to the Apostles, three days are computed, wherein He was accounted with the dead” (p. 221).

“From the day in which He gave them His Body and Blood, this triduum is consummated” (p. 267).¹⁴

St Gregory of Nyssa, discussing

¹⁴This reckoning of the triduum is also spoken of by a Syrian writer, as generally received, though he accepts the other (anonymous author of the *Expositio officiorum Ecclesiae*, usually attributed to George Arbela. Translation by R. H. Connolly, C. S. C. O., 91, 68).

the question who commenced the sacrifice of the Redemption, was it Christ, or Judas, or the Jews or Pilate, makes use of this reckoning more remarkably than all the other Fathers, to claim the Great Action for Christ:

“He who disposeth all things by His power DOES NOT AWAIT for the impending betrayal, nor for the onslaught of the Jews, nor the iniquitous sentence of Pilate, ALLOWING AS IT WERE THEIR MALICE TO BE THE ORIGIN AND THE CAUSE OF MAN’S REDEMPTION, BUT IN HIS WISDOM HE OPENS THE WAY BY A SACRIFICE INEFFABLE AND INVISIBLE TO MEN, AND HE OFFERED HIMSELF FOR US AN OBLATION AND A VICTIM, PRIEST AND AT THE SAME TIME THAT LAMB OF GOD WHO TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD. WHEN did He do this? AT THE VERY MOMENT when He openly showed that His own Body was to be received as food, because the sacrifice of the lamb was now perfected. For if the Body of the Victim were in life, it would not have been suitable for food. And therefore when He granted to His disciples that they should eat His Body and drink His Blood, at that very moment, BY HIS OWN WILL, in celebrating the mystery by His power, His Body was ineffably and invisibly offered in sacrifice. The Soul, too, residing in His breast, was in the disciples (in whom the authority of the Dispenser placed It, together with the divine power

united to It). If a person computes the time therefore from that hour wherein the sacrifice was offered to God by the High Priest, who invisibly and ineffably immolated His own lamb FOR THE SIN OF ALL MANKIND, he will not be departing from the truth" (*Or. 1 in resurrectionem*, P. G. 46, 612).

It is abundantly evident that this separation of the Soul from the Body must not be interpreted in St Gregory of Nyssa in a realistic sense, as if the visible Body of Christ were really from this moment without the soul.¹⁵ In Aphraates and Ephraem, Christ was only reputed as dead; here too Christ is looked upon as dead in a moral sense, from the fact that by the Eucharistic communion His Soul was in the disciples, yet in such a way that His Body was visibly elsewhere, or vice versa. The death itself, which was the future term of the sacrifice now commenced by Christ, was sufficiently denoted and made present thereby. For that Christ was partaken of in food, was an *effect* of the death, as offered; and again the partaking supplied an *indication* of the death to which Christ was given over. The Supper was partaken of, therefore, for the reason that Christ had already offered the sacrifice of His death: whence it followed that, so far as His will was concerned, the sacrifice, His actual death, was

now irrevocably effected. This is a most appropriate and convincing illustration of our explanation of the Supper.¹⁶

After the time of St Gregory of Nyssa we come across a very remarkable specimen of this teaching in the "Commentaries" of Procopius, both on *Genesis* and on *Exodus*.

¹⁶ Next to Gregory of Nyssa comes Jacob Sarugh (x521), a Syrian writer, so well known that he was entitled *Doctor*; in the opinion of the latest critics, however, he was not altogether free from Monophysitism. In a *Homilia in Hebdomadam sanctam* (translated into English by R. H. Connolly at the end of another entitled *A Homily of Mar Jacob of Sarugh on the Reception of the Holy Mysteries*, *Downside Review*, Nov., 1908, p. 282), he says: "While He was alive and reclining with them, they (the Apostles) ate Him, AND DEAD WHILST LIVING THEY KNOW HIM TO BE, without doubting. IF HE WERE NOT DEAD, THEN HIS BREAD WAS NOT HIS BODY; and if He were not alive, He would not have broken His Body and given to His Apostles . . . THEY AFFIRM THAT HE IS SLAIN, WHILST THEY LOOK UPON HIM ALIVE AND SPEAKING. . . . They drink His Blood and affirm that it is Blood, while He is alive." That is to say, the death of Christ was essentially and to an extent really involved with the mystery of the bread and the chalice.

"They thought that yea in truth his Blood was dropping (there). . . . HE IS THE DEAD WHO WHEN DEAD WAS ALIVE. . . . PRIEST AND BURNT OFFERING."

The whole explanation is in the last words: because the Priest was offering Himself in sacrifice, sacrificing His own life, presenting His death to God. In that He was offering sacrifice, He must be alive; in that He was offering sacrifice, He must be regarded as dead, that His Blood may appear to be shed, and the Victim to be present. Hence the death is anticipated throughout the Supper mystery, it is, at it were, interwoven with the Eucharist, and made available for the benefit of men.

¹⁵ For the contrary opinion see Renz (*op. cit.*, t. 1, p. 363-364).

He is asking the question, why it was that the paschal lamb in the Law was to be slain towards evening, not at noon; his answer is: that this was so because Christ would begin that paschal sacrifice of our Redemption in the Supper, and it was to be completed on the Cross:

“Why then is the paschal lamb not slain in the sixth hour but rather towards evening? Let us turn to the writings of the New Testament and we shall find a fitting answer. Those who crucified Christ did so at the sixth hour. But Jesus our High Priest immolated the lamb which He took towards the evening, when He celebrated the paschal banquet with His disciples and imparted to them the sacred mysteries. (When the Law was brought to an end, the beginnings of the Gospel were established.) And He who within was Priest, and outwardly Lamb, OFFERED HIMSELF. IF WE PLACE THE BEGINNING OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST IN THE SUPPER, we shall keep to the number of three days and nights, during which in the type of Jonas he lay in the tomb. But in this reckoning, the day of the Resurrection will also be included. . . . Christ as sinless Victim offered Himself to God and the Father in the odour of sweetness; and as Lamb He was immolated for our sins on the altar of the Cross” (*in Ex.*, XII, 5. P. G., 87, 566-567).¹⁷

¹⁷Note the distinction between the offering which Christ made of Himself in the

In reference to the Creation, discussing whether the day came before the night or vice versa, he says:

“Those who say that the day came before the night are apparently in opposition to the order of the feasts and in the first place to the triduum of our Lord’s burial and Resurrection. For the Law places the night before the day always and everywhere, as is evident in the feast of the azymes. . . . For a like reason three days and three nights must begin and end in the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord. The day wherein our Saviour suffered may be added to the previous evening of the Parasceve. The Sunday may be added to the third night when He arose from the dead” (*in Genes.*, I, 5. P. G. 87, 56).¹⁸

Supper (“*He offered Himself. . . . He offered Himself to God and the Father*”), while He immolates Himself sacramentally, and the real immolation in blood enacted on the Cross (“*those who crucified Christ. . . . He was immolated on the altar of the Cross*”).

¹⁸The unknown author of an old *Sermo de symbolo ad catechumenos* (c. 6, n. 6; in the works of St Augustine, P. L. 40, 657) bears witness to this same reckoning in the West, as fairly well known. He has no desire to nullify it.

Mediaeval writers had no hesitation in adopting this reckoning in their expositions of the liturgical customs of Holy Week. Rupert of Dietz puts to himself the question, Why is it that the Body and Blood of Our Lord is not consecrated on Good Friday, and that there is no celebration of the sacrifice throughout Holy Saturday, and it must be held over until the day of the Pasch? Were this done the three days of the death of Our Lord would be more definitely

V. So intimately are the Supper and the Passion interwoven that by the Eucharistic rite the Blood of

stressed. He replies that the three days of death could be reckoned from the time when Our Lord offered Himself in sacrifice in the Supper, anticipating the immolation where He was slain on the Cross by the Jews:

"The first day of the week is the third day from that immolation which was on the Cross. BUT FROM THE OTHER (the immolation of the Supper), THE SABBATH ITSELF IS THE THIRD DAY. . . . THE THREE DAYS OF DEATH THEREFORE, WHICH CANNOT BE COMPLETE IN SO FAR AS HE WAS SLAIN BY THE JEWS, is beautifully and reasonably transferred to the time when HE WAS IMMOLATED WITH HIS OWN HANDS" (*De divinis officiis*, l. 6, c. 22. P. L. 170, 166-167).

Sicard of Cremona in his *Mitræ* follows Rupert, answering the same question and the same objection in shorter and more expressive words: "Our Lord on the day before He suffered, taking bread and the chalice, blessed and gave to His disciples, saying: This is my body, This is my chalice' (sic). IN THAT MOMENT HE WAS IMMOLATED IN HIS OWN HANDS, to this immolation He added: 'Do this in commemoration of me.' FROM THAT (day) therefore, which must not be omitted, seeing that it is strictly joined to the rest, FRIDAY IS THE SECOND DAY, wherein He as it were rests in the tomb. SATURDAY IS THE THIRD DAY, wherein as it were He arises from the dead" (*Mitræ*, l. 6, c. 13. P. L. 213, 319).

Before them John, Bishop of Rouen, in his *De officiis ecclesiasticis* (P. L. 147, 52) had said the same thing; he is intricate but to the point. The gist of his words is: In the liturgy of Holy Week the day of the Supper is reckoned in the three days of the death of our Lord substituted, as it were, for the Sunday when "the burial of the Lord cannot be celebrated because of the glory of the Resurrection." And this is done appropriately, seeing that "on the day of the Supper . . . HE MADE KNOWN THAT HE WOULD SUFFER for all His Apostles, BECAUSE

Christ is said to be deputed to the real shedding: from it, as it were, the Lord was given over to death. Thus St Hilary asks whether His Passion was involuntary because He said, "Let this chalice pass from me."

"Was He unwilling to suffer? On the contrary earlier He had consecrated the Blood of His Body to be shed unto the remission of sins" (*in Matth.*, c. 31, n. 7. P. L. 9, 1068).

This passage is quoted by the Eucharistic Doctor, St Paschasius Radbertus, cited later in this chapter.

VI. The sacrifice of the Supper and the Passion is so indivisibly one that early writers said that *the sacrament of the Eucharist was offered by Christ on the Cross*. Thus Albert the Great:

"[This sacrament] is productive of special grace before God: for offered on the Cross it finds special grace for all men" (*Liber de sacram. euchar.*, Dist. 1, c. 4).

And if as a fact the death was offered in the Eucharistic Supper, it was in the death that the Eucharistic celebration was brought to perfec-

He gave to them HIS FLESH to eat, WHICH WAS TO SUFFER ON THE MORROW, and at the same time also His Blood, WHICH WAS TO BE SHED."

Appropriately, then, he includes the Thursday in the three days of the death of our Lord, because in the sacrament of His Passion Christ had already given to His disciples the very Flesh which was to be torn in the Passion, and the Blood which was to flow from His wounds. Those are his words at least.

tion; hence the Supper would ultimately derive its nature as a sacrifice from the immolation in blood to which it looked forward.¹⁹ Hence it could be said that the Eucharist was *celebrated* ("litata") on the Cross.

Thus in the fifteenth century John Mauburnus, in his *Carmen in septem nomina*²⁰ *sacramenti corporis et sanguinis Domini Jesu* (A. H. 48, 523; compare 15, 22), says on the sixth name, *sacrifice*:²¹

"Hail sacrifice offered on the Cross,
Hail, pontifical sacrifice of Christ."

¹⁹ This admitted, the argument of our apologists against the sixteenth century reformers is forceful: the Supper was a sacrifice because the Body of Christ was immolated on the Cross: and thus the sacrifice commenced in the Supper was consummated on the Cross. The argument will often crop up later; for the present one example will suffice. We take it from Tilmann Smelingo (*De septem sacramentis*, Cologne, 1538), who simply deduces the sacrificial character of the Supper from the words of our Lord, because:

"To the disciples in the Supper under the species of bread He gave His own Body, which under its proper species He offered on the Cross; and WHAT HE COMMENCED IN THE SUPPER HE CONSUMMATED ON THE CROSS" (c. 5, p. 342, 343). Again speaking of the chalice:

"It is evident that the Eucharist is a sacrament. What Christ adds: 'which shall be shed for many' or 'which shall be shed for you,' as THAT AS FULFILLED ON THE CROSS, proves that it is a sacrifice" (p. 343).

²⁰ The names are: Eucharist, Gift, Food, Drink, Communion, Sacrifice, Sacrament.

²¹ The word *sacrifice* is meant here in the passive sense for the victim; as we know from abundant examples throughout the Middle Ages.

Bede²² (*in Luc*, XXII, 15. P. L. 92, 595) and Amalarius²³ (*De eccles. offic.*, I, 15. P. L. 105, 1032) say in the same sense that the Eucharist was *consecrated* on the Cross. Thomas Walden,²⁴ that it was consecrated with the Passion. St Quodeusvult,²⁵ that the Eucharistic Flesh of Christ was *provided* ("confectam") in the Passion.

St Thomas never really discussed the sacrificial character of the Supper expressly; still it would seem that he has not left us without some guidance.

For in the Commentary on the Fourth Book of the *Sentences*, explaining the letter of the twelfth distinction, which is: "*Is Christ daily immolated, or was He immolated once only?*" the holy Doctor distinguishes two things in the sacrifice whereby Christ once made propitiation for us:

First, what was done by the Jews to Christ, with the corresponding torture of Christ;

Secondly, what was done by Christ towards God, namely, *to offer and to sacrifice*.

He states that the *first* is not re-

²² See chap. V.

²³ To be developed in Book II.

²⁴ To be developed in Book II.

²⁵ To be quoted later in this work. Possibly, however, he intended nothing else but that the Supper took place within the Passion, in the manner to be explained later. Most certainly he did not mean by the word "confectam," destroyed or lessened.

peated²⁶ daily by us in the sacrifice of Christ; but that the *second* is repeated: namely, that the offering and the act of sacrifice can be made daily by us, as truly as it was done by Christ once. The holy Doctor assigns two reasons, which include one another, why this can be done by us: one pertains to the victim, the other to the method of offering. As pertaining to the victim, the reason assigned is that the victim of that sacrifice which Christ offered is perpetual (this reason will be examined later in this work); as pertaining to the manner of offering, the reason assigned is that the manner of offering once made by Christ was such that we can also offer daily under Christ our Head. This is the passage:

“It must be known that all those words which import a relation of the Jews to Christ, and the punishment of Christ, are not said to be done daily. For we do not say that Christ is daily crucified and slain: because the action of the Jews and the punishment of Christ are transient. But those which imply a relation of Christ to God the Father are said to be done daily, as to offer, to sacrifice, and the like, because

that victim is perpetual, and it was once offered by Christ in the way that it can also be daily offered by His members.”

Now if we daily do, when we offer, what Christ did, when He once offered the sacrifice of His death, if the manner of our offering follows the manner of the offering of our Lord, will not Christ be considered as having offered His own death in the Eucharistic rite?

Now we arrive at the more direct testimonies.

B) DIRECT TESTIMONY

I. Hesychius, a priest of Jerusalem,²⁷ expressly states this teaching, between the years 430 and 450, in his commentary *in Leviticum* 8, book 2 (P. G. 93), declaring (1) THAT NOT ONLY DID CHRIST OFFER HIS SACRIFICE IN THE SUPPER (*Lev.*, VIII, 22), *Moses offered the second ram:*

“Why is the *second* ram now spoken of here? Because the Lord *first* partaking in the Supper of the figurative lamb²⁸ with His apostles, afterwards offered His sacrifice, and in the *second* place slew Himself

²⁶ However, it is *daily* represented by us, as is clear from the letter of the distinction, and from the constant teaching of St Thomas (3 S. 83, 1). But it is one thing to be represented in image, and another to be repeated in reality. St Thomas is now treating of real repetition in the question he is answering.

²⁷ Compare Vaccari, *Esichio di Gerusalemme e il suo "Commentarius in Leviticum,"* in *Bessarion*, Jan., June, 1918, p. 8-46, p. 22 in particular. Vaccari proves conclusively that the Commentary was originally written in Greek at Jerusalem by Hesychius, presbyter.

²⁸ That is the legal lamb.

like the lamb"²⁹ col. 882). But (2) THERE ESPECIALLY HE CELEBRATED IT ("Christ celebrated the usual supper of the paschal festivity with His disciples. Then in a most special way Christ celebrated His own sacrifice," col. 882). (3) WHEN HAVING PARTAKEN OF AND DISTRIBUTED THE CHALICE, HE POURS OUT HIS OWN BLOOD ON HIS OWN BODY, AS IT WERE ON AN ALTAR" ("For drinking Himself and giving His apostles to drink, He then sheds the intelligible³⁰ Blood on the altar, namely His own Body," col. 885); (4) BY THE SACRAMENTAL SPRINKLING OF WHICH HE OFFERED HIS PASSION FOR US ("For Christ Himself by the sprinkling of His own Blood for our salvation offered His Passion for us," col. 885); (5) BRINGING IN PROPITIATION NOW AT THE SUPPER ("For on that day on which He gave the mystery of the Supper, on that same day He obtained pardon or propitiation, that is the remission of sins, saying: 'This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins,'" col. 888).

Hesychius, too, making the distinction between the offering and

²⁹ Meaning: He sacramentally slew Himself, and thereby offered Himself as the second ram; not the legal victim now, but the Victim of His own sacrifice.

³⁰ "Intelligible," in our version of Hesychius, has the same sense as spiritual with Latin writers (compare Vaccari, p. 21). That the Flesh or the Blood of Christ was called spiritual by the Fathers will be shown later in this work.

the immolation, remarks (1) that Christ was offered by no one but Himself; (2) that He could not even have been immolated by others had He not surrendered Himself to the Passion; (3) that He surrendered Himself by the sacramental immolation which He made in the Supper:

"FOR NO ONE OFFERED HIM; nor could He be immolated, had He not surrendered Himself to the Passion. FOR THIS REASON not only did He say: 'I have the power to lay down my life, and I have the power to take it up again,' but anticipating even, He immolated Himself at the Supper of the apostles: a fact which is known to those who understand the virtue of the mysteries" (*in Lev.*, 4, l. 1, col. 821).

Finally, speaking directly and explicitly of the sacrifice of our Saviour, whereby salvation was purchased for Jews and Gentiles, he says definitely:

"For He immolated His own Flesh, He was made High Priest of His own sacrifice in Sion: when He gave the chalice of the new testament in His Blood" (*in Lev.*, XVI, 11-13, l. 5. P. G. 93, 993).

Similarly explaining in another passage how "The Lord will send forth the sceptre of his power," that is the Cross, "out of Sion," that is in the Cenacle:

"For there, he says, the Only-Begotten immolated Himself, there HE

COMMENCED HIS PASSION" (*in Ps.*, 109, 2. P. G. 93, 1324).

The teaching of Hesychius, then, cannot be questioned; he dwelt at greater length on the explanation of our Lord's Supper than the other Fathers.³¹

When other writers say that Christ offered His Blood in the Supper, what do they mean but that the offering of His life was made by Him, or, what is the same thing, the offering of His death and of His life-giving Passion? Among ourselves when we say that a man offered his

³¹ The tone of Isaac the Armenian, junior, reflects exactly the same teaching of the oblation significance of the Supper in respect of the Passion. He is remonstrating with his people for returning to the custom of the Jewish sacrifices:

"Since Christ, the Son of God, AS SLAIN FOR US AND OFFERED HIMSELF TO GOD THE FATHER A VICTIM FOR US AND TOOK BREAD AND THE CHALICE, and said to His disciples: 'Do this is commemoration of me'; how would it be lawful to return to the Jewish manner of sacrifice?"

"For if the victims of cattle had anywhere been profitable to men, and reconciled them to God, and purchased the remission of sins, what was the use OF THE SLAYING OF CHRIST, WHEREBY HE OFFERED HIMSELF A VICTIM FOR US, and reconciled us to God? On the contrary, it was because irrational victims were powerless to reconcile us to God, or to obtain remission of sins, then, the Son of God, OFFERING HIMSELF A VICTIM FOR US to His Father, said: 'This is my body'" (*Invectiva I contra Armenos*, c. 9, parag. 2. P. G. 132, 1184).

Have we not ample evidence here that Isaac has in mind the one sacrifice of Christ, the one sacrifice of the Redemption, consisting of an immolation, and that in blood, in such a way that it is nevertheless offered now, when the Eucharist is consecrated?

blood for his country or for his friends, do we not mean that he gave up his life and handed himself over to death? This, then, must be the meaning of the words of St Ambrose: "We saw the Prince of priests coming to us; we saw Him AND WE HEARD HIM³² offering His Blood for us," (*in Ps.*, 38, n. P. L. 14, 1051).³³

³² Among other evidences that he is speaking of the Supper in the passage, the words WE HEARD should be noted. For in the Supper, Christ is *heard* to offer, He offered there by words, that is by the words of the consecration.

³³ Rupert of Dietz appears to me to state the same doctrine. He says that Christ, High Priest in the Supper, wherein He sacramentally immolated Himself, offered Himself the Lamb to be immolated in the Passion, so that even now in the Supper He had purchased salvation for all the elect of ages past:

"Finally on the fourteenth day, towards evening, when He ate the lamb of the ancient pasch with His disciples, in that moment HE THE LAMB OF THE NEW SACRIFICE ON THE POINT OF BEING CAPTURED AND LED TO BE IMMOLATED, first immolated Himself to God the Father with His own hands, taking bread and wine and by the wonderful and ineffable power of the act of sacrifice, transferring them into the sacrament of His Body and Blood."

In the mind of Rupert, what is the relation of this sacramental immolation to the immolation in blood? He explains, adding these words:

"With His own hands, as has just been said, HE THE HIGH PRIEST OFFERED HIS BODY AND BLOOD UNDER THE SPECIES OF BREAD" (*In Exod.* 2, 6, P. L., 167, 613).

You see that the Lamb, before being impiously led by wicked men to be immolated has already been offered to God in a most sacred rite by the hands of the High Priest, While He is sacramentally immolated.

The trend in the ancient Eastern Liturgies is something very similar. Christ is indeed said to be given up,

Rupert compares the sacrifice of Christ with the sacrifice of Abel, and describes it thus:

"On that evening of the most sacred Supper, our Lord God, Jesus Christ, Priest and Sacrifice, offered by His own hands, and accepted in the odour of sweetness, betrayed by the sacrilegious disciple, is captured by the Jewish people (His own brothers in the flesh), and, led outside the gate of the city, is crucified." (In Genes, 4, 5, P. L. 167, 330).

Such is the whole sacrifice, enacted on the Cross in blood, but bloodlessly offered in the Supper. Rupert therefore assigns the actual effects of the Cross, the Redemption namely of the human race from the beginning to the end of time, to the Supper, as oblation of the Blood to be shed from the Cross.

"The High Priest . . . fulfilled His Priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech. For He brought forth bread and wine, saying: 'This is my body, this is my blood,' and THUS HE OFFERED HIMSELF A TRUE SACRIFICE FOR THE FAITHFUL ABRAHAM, and He blessed him: FOR HE PURCHASED THE BLESSING BY HIS BLOOD, that is, HE PURCHASED THE REMISSION OF SINS FOR HIM, nay also FOR ALL THE ELECT who awaited Him from the beginning of the world." (In Genes. 5, 12, P. L. 167, 378).

Very truly said, provided the Supper is linked up with the Cross in the undivided oneness of this unique sacrifice. Many more references will follow later (*passim*, and particularly in Th. V) from Rupert. All of them are definite and unambiguous.

Meantime it is worth noting how Gerhoh of Reichersberg links up the Supper, the agony in the garden and the Cross, as one in the holocaust of Christ. Speaking on the words of the Psalm: "May he make fat thy burnt offering," he addresses Christ thus:

"MAY THE BURNT OFFERING OF THY IMMOLATION IN THY SUPPER, ON MOUNT OLIVET, ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS, be made fat for us, that its sweet richness and its rich sweet-

BUT MORE TRULY TO HAVE GIVEN HIMSELF UP for the life and the salvation of the world: conveying as it were that in the Supper He surrendered Himself to God for us. We have in the very ancient Liturgy of *St. James* within the anaphora:—

"Coming down from heaven, and Incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, He dwelt with the apostles, and having accomplished the whole economy of the salvation of our race, desiring, sinless though He was, to submit to a voluntary and life-giving death on the Cross for us sinners, 'on the night on which He was given up,' nay on the night on which HE GAVE HIMSELF UP FOR THE LIFE AND THE SALVATION OF THE WORLD, taking bread into His holy and immaculate and sinless and immortal hands, and lifting up His eyes to heaven, and showing Himself to Thee God and the Father, giving thanks, consecrating, breaking, He gave to His holy disciples and apostles, saying: 'Take ye,'" etc.

This is also presented in a shorter form in the very old Liturgy of *Saint Mark*:—

"JESUS CHRIST ON THE NIGHT ON WHICH HE GAVE HIMSELF OVER FOR OUR SINS, AND SUBMITTED TO DEATH

ness, may so strengthen us that we who await thy revelation may obtain all grace." (*Commentarius in Psalmos*, part 1, Ps. XIX. 4, P. L. 193, 960). This one sacrifice of Christ he calls later "the holocaust of the new Pasch" (*ibid.*, 962).

FOR ALL, reclining in the Flesh with His holy disciples and apostles, taking bread," etc.

Later on in the ninth century there is a still shorter form in the Liturgy of the Greeks, both in *St. Basil*³⁴ and *St. Chrysostom*.³⁵

In our own times the Syrians of Antioch use a shorter form, found in the anaphora called that of *St. John the Evangelist*³⁶; so do the Greeks both Catholic and Schismatic in the liturgy of *St. Basil*³⁷; in the *liturgy of St. Chrysostom*,³⁸ the same Greeks have a longer form.

Among our own ancestors in the West, the drink which Christ offered in the Supper was sung of as proffered from the wood of the

³⁴ "He left as a memorial of His salutary Passion, what we offer now, by His command, for when He was about to undergo His voluntary, glorious and life-giving death, on the night on which He gave Himself for the life of the world, taking bread," etc. (B. 327).

³⁵ "When He had come, and had completed the whole economy for us, on the night on which He gave Himself, taking bread," etc. (B. 327).

³⁶ "On that night on which He gave Himself for the life and the salvation of the world, He took bread," etc. (Max Saxoniae *Missa Syriaca Antiochena*, p. 26).

³⁷ "As above in the Mass of the ninth century (B. 494; cf. Max Saxoniae *Missa Graeca*, p. 70).

³⁸ "On the night in which He was given up, or rather gave Himself up for the life of the world, etc." (B. 494; cf. Max Saxoniae, *Missa Graeca*, p. 43.)

That in a number of these passages Christ is mentioned as having given Himself for the life of the world, will be considered later, page 75 seq.

Cross, for instance in the *Prosa de corpore Christi*, for Tuesday within the octave of Corpus Christi (A. H. 10, 40, from the *Missale Suessionense*, Paris, 1516):—

"May glory be on high from the memory of Christ,

Who gives the mysteries of the bread of life.

A virgin bore this bread; her Son
OFFERED THE DRINK

Which He gave on the SACRED
WOOD OF THE CROSS."

The Blood of the Cross therefore was offered by Christ in the Supper.

In the ancient Ambrosian rite, Christ is represented on Holy Thursday as having given Himself to His Passion, because He offered Himself as Victim in the sacrament:—

"Can we despair of thy mercy, we who have been considered worthy to receive the high office of offering this great Victim to thee, that is the Body and the Blood of our Lord Jesus, WHO FOR THE SALVATION OF THE WORLD GAVE HIMSELF TO THAT HOLY AND VENERABLE PASSION? WHO INSTITUTING THE FORM OF THE SACRIFICE OF SALVATION, FIRST OFFERED HIMSELF AS VICTIM, and first taught that He should be offered?" (Canon antiquus missae ambrosianae in coena Domini, in Muratori, *De rebus liturgicis dissertatio*, c. 10, P.L. 74, 914).³⁹

³⁹ Later on the same text was published in the *Codex Sacramentorum Bergomensis*,

II. Moreover the Fathers and writers of the Church have left us these three points of doctrine:—

Christ offered Himself once;
He offered Himself at the Supper;
He offered Himself TO BE IMMOLATED.

Clearly then Christ at the Supper offered Himself to the future immolation of the Passion. Cassiodorus leads the way for all the writers of a later age; he is speaking of the sacrifice offered after the manner of Melchisedech in bread and wine by our High Priest:—

“Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.’ The Prophet also says that the Father made this promise to the Son. For to whom could it be truly and evidently applied but to our Lord and Saviour, who consecrated for our salvation HIS OWN BODY AND BLOOD in the giving of the bread and wine? As He says in the Gospel: ‘Unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink of His blood, you shall not have eternal life.’ But let not the human mind see anything of blood-letting, anything corrupti-

(Ad Utramque I. P. Migne Patrologiam . . . Actuarium Solesmense. Series Liturgica. Tom. I. Veterum Ambrosianae Liturgiae Monumentorum . . . Collectio. Vol. 1, fasc. 1, Solesmes 1900, p. 62) where there is no discrepancy of the text, except that the sentence commencing “Can we despair,” etc., is not interrogative.

ble in that Flesh and Blood . . . but a life-giving and saving substance, the very Word made Flesh, whereby are given the remission of sins and the gifts of eternal life. The most just king instituted this order by a mystical similitude, when He offered the fruits of bread and wine to the Lord. For it is clear that the victims of cattle, which were of the order of Aaron, came to an end; and that instead of them the institution of Melchisedech remains, which is celebrated in the distribution of the sacraments throughout the whole world. . . . Priest Christ is said to be pre-eminently, He who ONCE OFFERED HIMSELF TO BE IMMOLATED FOR US.” (*Expositio in Psalterium* Ps. 109, verse 5. P. L. 70, 796-797).

The unknown author of the Commentary on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, erroneously attributed to Primasius, gives at greater length the same teaching as Cassiodorus, whom he follows almost word for word. After quoting from the *Enarratio in Ps. 109* (n. 17, P. L. 37, 1460) of St. Augustine, he says:—

“It must be remembered that Christ is not a Priest, because He is the Only-Begotten of God the Father from eternity, co-eternal and consubstantial with Him, remaining true God with the Father, but because He was born of a Virgin, made Man in this latter age to offer the Victim which He offered for us, namely His own Flesh and Blood

received by us. But there are various reasons why He is said to be a Priest *according to the order of Melchisedech*, and not according to the order of Aaron; and the first is because Melchisedech was not a priest according to the mandates of the Law, but according to the dignity of a unique priesthood, OFFERING BREAD TO GOD not the blood of brute animals: CHRIST WAS MADE PRIEST, not temporal but eternal, IN THE ORDER OF HIS PRIESTHOOD NOT OFFERING legal victims, but, LIKE HIM, BREAD AND WINE, namely His own Flesh and Blood, so that He said: 'My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.' He also committed these two gifts, that is bread and wine, to His Church to be offered in memory of Him: clearly then the sacrifice of cattle came to an end; it was of the order of Aaron, and the other which was of the order of Melchisedech remains instead, because Christ confirmed and taught the Church to hold it. . . . There is also a third reason why Christ is said to be a Priest *according to the order of Melchisedech*, and not according to Aaron: namely because as there is but one reference in Sacred Scripture to Melchisedech and his priesthood, so too Christ ONCE OFFERED HIMSELF TO BE IMMOLATED FOR US." (Ps. Primasius, *in Epist. ad Hebraeos*, V. 6, P. L. 68, 716-717).

Similarly Alcuin (*in Epist. ad Hebr.* V. 6, P. L. 100, 1033-1034)

and Rabanus Maurus (*in Epist. ad Hebr.* V. 6, P. L. 112, 743).⁴⁰ And very beautifully St. Bruno of Grenoble:—

"'Thou art a priest.' Truly this is applicable to Christ, who consecrated for us unto our salvation His Body and Blood in the giving of the bread and wine. Christ is properly called a Priest who once OFFERED HIMSELF TO BE IMMOLATED FOR US." (*In Psalm 109*, 4, P. L. 142, 408).

In fact, not only the Fathers, but the Liturgies also declare that our Lord offered Himself TO BE IMMOLATED, when He instituted the form of our sacrifice in the consecration of His Body and Blood:—

". . . Standing round thy altars, O Lord of hosts, and glorying in the knowledge of thy immaculate Lamb, WHO OFFERED HIMSELF TO BE IMMOLATED FOR US, MAY WE BE NOURISHED UNTO ETERNAL LIFE, BY THE CELESTIAL SACRIFICES IN HIS BODY AND BLOOD, whereby we are redeemed from our sins." (Preface of the Mass for Wednesday⁴¹ after Easter in the Gelasian Sacramentary, bk. 1, c. 48, P. L. 74, 1115).⁴²

⁴⁰ Cf. *Glossa ordinaria* on the same passage (P.L. 114, 652).

⁴¹ The same preface for Wednesday after Low Sunday is found in the *Codex Sacramentorum Bergomensis*.

⁴² Ed. Wilson, p. 93 in the Secret (*ibid.*), we find "Receive, we beseech thee, O Lord, the victims of human REDEMPTION." The plural "victims" following a liturgical manner of the Church indicates the twofold

He offered Himself to be immolated, in order that we may offer Him immolated, and that we may be nourished with the Flesh and Blood of the Immolated.

Finally in a Chaldean anaphora, wrongly called by the schismatics that of *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, and by Catholics the *Second* (cf. Max Saxoniae, *Missa Chaldaica*, p. XVII.), there are extant the following words (their antiquity is apparent from the reading *by the eternal Spirit*), linking up the Supper and the Passion as one:—

“*By the eternal Spirit He offered Himself immaculate to God, and sanctified us BY THE OFFERING OF HIS*

species of our sacrifice, that is the bread and the chalice. It is worth noting that Edmund Bishop proved lately (*Liturgica Historica*, 3, *The earliest Roman Mass Book*, Oxford, 1918, p. 61) that “The Gelasianum is substantially the Roman Mass Book of the SIXTH CENTURY.”

BODY ONCE MADE, and reconciled heaven and earth BY THE BLOOD OF HIS CROSS. Who was given up for our sins, and arose to justify us. Who with His apostles on the night on which He was betrayed, celebrated this great, tremendous, holy and divine mystery: taking bread, He blessed, etc. . . . BEHOLD O Lord, NOW TOO, THIS OBLATION IS OFFERED in Thy great and tremendous name.” (Le Brun *Explication de la Messe*, vol. 3, 1778, p. 539-541).

He made the offering of His Body once; we are sanctified by that offering once made. Doing what He did in the Supper we make the same offering that He made. Conclude then: the undivided Action of our Redemption is in the Supper and in the Passion, because in the Supper Christ offered His own Body to the death in blood which He was to undergo on the Cross.

§ 2. The Supper and the Ancient Covenant and the Ancient Pasch

A. IN SCRIPTURE

Long ago the Lord had entered into a covenant with the Hebrew nation. When the Law was promulgated, having offered the sacrifice of cattle, Moses sprinkled the blood on the people and said: *This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you* (*Exodus*, XXIV, 8, and *Hebr.*, IX, 20).¹ Thus the covenant was sealed by a sacrifice.

At the Supper, having consecrated the bread, Christ gives the chalice, with the words: *This is my blood of the testament* (Matthew and Mark). He actually calls it the "new testament." *This chalice is the new testament* (Paul and Luke).

These passages certainly show that a new testament is being set up distinct* from the old—the old has passed, the new has come. The com-

¹ The *Exodus* description of the sacrifice, and the description of the same sacrifice in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* differ in two particulars, due in all probability to the prominence of the Eucharistic antitype in the later writer's mind. First, in the *Epistle* we find: *He took the blood with water*. In *Exodus* water is not mentioned. Secondly, the *Epistle* has: *This is the blood of the testament, which the Lord hath made with you concerning these things*. Referring to these words in the *Epistle*, Westcott says: "It is possible that the corresponding phrase at the institution (*Matth.* XXVI, 28) of the New Testament may have influenced the quotation."

pact is sealed with blood; can it be other than sacrificial? It was customary in ancient times for peoples to sanction even their everyday civil contracts with the sacrificial shedding of blood. Thus in profane writers we find such expressions as:² "They said that the treaty could be ratified in my blood" (*Cicero, Pis* 12, 28). "You did not wish to break the treaty concerning the agreement for the provinces ratified in my blood" (*Pro Sestio*, 10, 14). "With the blood of Hannibal, I shall sanction the treaty with Rome" (*Livy*, 23, 8). But a compact with God must above all have the seal of sacrifice. But now we have a new sacrifice taking the place of the old: the old was ratified by the blood of victims, it was particularly incumbent, therefore, that for the new covenant there should be a new victim.³

It is quite evident, then, that here at the Supper a sacrifice is celebrated, for a new pact in blood between God and man is made and sealed. (Compare Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 68; Rivière, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption, Ess. d'ét. hist.*, p. 94; Lebreton, *op. cit.*, col. 1565). But there can be no question that it was

² Quoted in Theil *Dictionnaire Latin-Français* under the words *ictus* or *ico* and *foedus*.

³ On the ancient custom of ratifying an agreement with the blood of victims, see Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 3, p. 119-123; Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 26-28.

here at the Sacrifice of the Passion and in this sacrifice alone, that the new pact was struck. Because it was by the work of Redemption alone that Christ made peace between heaven and earth, reconciled us with God, and made us the heirs of the testament. But the work of Redemption belongs to the Passion. Therefore it is here, *before* the sufferings of the Passion, that the sacrifice of the Passion is celebrated.⁴ Here and

⁴ The question could arise that the sacrifice enacted in the Supper was not the actual sacrifice of the Passion but a living representation of it in the Body and Blood of the Lord. Altogether, aside from the difficulties referred to already, this view confronts us with another obstacle. The covenant would be merely *represented* as concluded here, and not really concluded. But when Moses said *This is the blood of the testament* the covenant was actually in the process of being made. Now Christ was fulfilling the figure when He said: *This is the blood of the testament*. Therefore the necessity that the covenant should be made was all the more compelling. Hence we conclude that the sacrifice of the Passion was not merely represented at the Supper, it was actually made.

The words of Mangelot on this matter call for comment: "This chalice filled with wine, *says Jesus*, is the new alliance in my Blood . . . Evidently the application [of the term from *Exodus*] is not to the wine of the cup, the application is to the Blood contained in the blessed cup of the Eucharist (I. Cor., X. 16). It is the Blood which shall be shed on the Cross, the Blood which seals the NEW ALLIANCE of God with men CONSTITUTED BY THE SACRIFICE OF THE SAVIOUR . . . The Blood of Jesus then is the blood of the alliance, the blood which seals it. Like the blood of the cattle immolated by Moses, it will be shed on the Cross, AND THIS SHEDDING WILL BE A SACRIFICE. At the

now Christ is given over to death, and all that our Priest does in the sacrificial action of the Last Supper

Supper it was already in the cup, as the blood which was soon to be shed, and thus the cup containing blood shed was the anticipated representation of the sacrifice of the Cross. But by this institution of the chalice, representative of the Blood of the Cross, Jesus contracted with humanity a new alliance concluded by His Blood shed, and arrived at His last hour with them, He disposed of His Blood, and by His testament gave it in drink, in the blessed cup, to His apostles" (Mangelot, *Eucharistie dans St. Paul*, in R. P. A., Nov. 15, 1911, p. 260-261). We take it that the learned author here agrees with our teaching, because if not, we are forced to the conclusion that he has in mind two sacrifices, one earlier in the Supper, the other subsequent on the Cross. In that event he would have to distinguish two testaments, or two alliances of our Lord: one on the Cross sealed by the death of Christ ("a new alliance constituted by the bloody sacrifice of our Saviour", sealed by "the blood which shall be shed on the Cross"), the other here in the Supper, consisting in the institution of the chalice ("by this INSTITUTION OF the chalice JESUS CONTRACTED a new alliance"). But has anyone ever thought that Christ made two testaments or two alliances? What would the author of *the Epistle to the Hebrews* have said of such a suggestion? How can we admit a new covenant consisting not of our Lord's CELEBRATION of the Eucharistic rite, but of our Lord's INSTITUTION of our own Eucharistic celebration? As though one were to say that the new covenant was not in existence before our Lord said *Do this for a commemoration of me*, and it was only then that the blood was of the new covenant or the chalice was the new testament. Whereas Catholics know well that what the words of consecration signified, they effected, before the words *Do this* were uttered; hence too they know that the chalice was there and then the testament, and indeed the testament in

is to make the bloodless offering of His own Blood to an actual shedding later.

We arrive at the same conclusion

blood (*This chalice is the new testament in my blood*), before the command for the continuance of the rite was given. As a matter of fact, had Christ never given the command *Do this*, the words already prefaced (*this chalice* etc.) would still remain true. Hence it is a real pleasure to give to the words of this able and learned theologian an interpretation quite in harmony with our own teaching. To sum up, there are two possible ways of avoiding the interpretation I give.

The first is: the conclusion of the testament was effected on the Cross, in the Supper it was only represented. My reply to this is: at the Supper Christ said: *This chalice is the new testament in my blood*. These words are definite. If you say that the word *is* means *signifies*, you will find that the adversaries of our faith will drag you further than you want to go.

The second is this: the conclusion of the testament was effected, but not by the Supper; it was effected by the institution of the Mass: *Do this for a commemoration of me*. I reply: altogether apart from the institution, which follows after the act integrally accomplished, the truth of our Lord's words spoken in the Supper concerning the work He had done must stand.

A third, and rather extraordinary way of avoiding this interpretation was attempted by a certain apologetic writer, who was well known in the xvi century. Jodocus Ravestyn Tiletanus (Josse Ravesteyn) in his *Apologiae seu Defensionis Decretorum Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini . . . pars altera*, (Louvain 1570, fol. 336, b) refers the establishment of the New Testament back to Abraham. He says that it does not belong either to the Supper or the Cross. Chemnitz had written "The Mediator, the Son of God made that testament in the night on which He was betrayed." For some reason Ravesteyn objects to this expression and says: "And St. Paul himself expressly con-

tradicts this misstatement, and in the very chapter of the *Epistle to the Galatians* quoted here. For he says distinctly that the new testament, that which was made with Abraham for the blessing of the Gentiles in his seed, was given four hundred and thirty years before the law was made. Therefore it cannot be true that the new testament was established on the night on which Christ was betrayed." How simple truth is; but stray from it once, and how wayward our paths become.

We must therefore stand absolutely by the teachings of tradition. The ancient Fathers unanimously held that the testament was FOUNDED on the Supper, and was SEALED with the Blood of the Testator on the Cross. There is a host of witnesses. One might select Manegoldus (*Contra Wolfelmum*, c. 18 and 19, P.L. 155, 166) an Alsatian writer. The anonymous writer Mellicensis (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*) speaks of him as the "master of modern teachers." Towards the end of the middle ages, Blessed John Rusbroch (*Speculum aeternae salutis*, c. 5) writes: "Because on the following day, He was to meet His death and leave them, He desired beforehand to FOUND His testament, which He would leave to His apostles first, and then through them to all adherents of the Christian faith until the end of time, and this He first SEALED courageously with His own Blood, and after Him all the apostles."

In the xvi century special reference should be made to the author (possibly St John Fisher of Rochester) of the *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum contra Martinum Lutherum* written in the name of Henry VIII, and especially commended by the Holy See: "Not only what He previously did in the Supper belongs to the TESTAMENT, but His offering on the Cross also belongs to it, FOR ON THE CROSS HE CONSUMMATED THE SACRIFICE WHICH HE COMMENCED IN THE SUPPER." (Ed. Pottier, Andegav. 1850, p. 900).

the food of the pasch,⁵ said: *For I say to you, that from this time I will not eat it, till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God* (Luke XXII, 16); and having partaken of the ordinary wine cup, he added: *for I say to you that I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, till the kingdom of God come* (Luke, XXII, 18). None the less He at once commenced the new Supper of un-

leavened bread and wine. Imagine a person present at this scene. What other conclusion could he come to than this: that the kingdom of God had come here and now? That at long last the pasch was fulfilled? That it was fulfilled precisely in this bread and in this chalice which for the second time the Lord distributes to the disciples, having already finished the legal pasch?⁶

Eck agreed with the "Defender of the Faith": *Here is defended the book of the mighty king of England on the sacraments, from the calumnies and impieties of Luther* (1523, fol. 1, i. b). The words cited above from the *Assertio* are true undoubtedly both of the sacrifice and of the covenant or testament. The new alliance was actually entered into at the Supper, and from thence on it continued in the making until, by the fact of the death, it was concluded.

The words of Diego Andrada de Payva of Lisbon, a Portuguese theologian, termed in the *Nomenclator* "the most celebrated of all the Spaniards", are rich in significance. He writes against Chemnitz: "This cup filled with His Blood, Christ called the new testament . . . because it contained THE BLOOD OF HIS CROSS, whereby all things in heaven and on earth are reconciled, and which is the fountain and the source of all divine favours." (*Orthodoxarum explicationum libri decem*, lib. 7, Venice 1564, fol. 237).

⁵ After the fourth century Catholics in general held that our Lord ate the legal pasch before the Eucharistic supper, though a negligible number (of whom later), were still in doubt. The only reason for this doubt was, that they thought that the Eucharistic supper itself was sufficient fulfillment for the pasch, and that the Lord had in mind the Eucharistic supper when He said: With desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer (Luke XXII. 15).

⁶ This second or eucharistic eating of the azymes and the drinking of the chalice (following so unexpectedly on a pronouncement apparently opposite) harmonizes very beautifully with this change of the testament. Huck (*Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* 2) therefore and others not only have little regard for the rules of critical exegesis, when between v. 17 and v. 18 they insert verses 19 and 20, but they seem not to have grasped the mind of St. Luke.

Berning (*Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, 1901, p. 115) is wiser and more penetrating: "Such is the train of thought in Luke. Step by step he first puts before us the paschal supper of the Old Testament, connecting with this the words of the Lord that the time has come for the fulfillment of the pasch; a new Kingdom, the true Kingdom of God, contrasted with the figures of the Old Testament appears, and every figure—this includes the paschal supper—which pointed towards a future and higher pasch, must cease. Then the Lord at once comes to the institution of the Sacred Supper at which the meat is the true Paschal Lamb, Jesus Christ, and at which His Blood in the chalice, the true chalice of benediction, is drink; in place of the old paschal supper, the new Supper, Paschal, sacrificial, and covenant of reunion for the disciples of Christ, must come, to be repeated until His future second coming". Some of the earlier exegetes adopted this interpretation, Ludolphus Carthusiensis (*Vita Christi*, c. 53) for instance: "I will not eat, I will celebrate no more in figure and sym-

What, therefore, is implied in the other Evangelists, we find openly declared in St Luke: that the Eucharistic Supper was the true Pasch, that it was the reality corresponding to figure, and hence the very Paschal Sacrifice of the true Lamb.

At any rate, there is no question that the real antitype of the legal pasch was the very sacrifice of the Passion in which the true Lamb was slain,⁷ and in which finally took

bol, but in truth and reality. For later He partook of His own Body in the sacrament." Some of the xvi-century Reformers fully realized that the first chalice was linked with the second as the figure with the reality. FROM THIS some of them like Schwenkenfeld (Compare Goetz, *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage* 2, p. 78), deduced the presence of Christ spiritually at least, while others, like Luther (*ibid.*, p. 87) inferred the real presence.

We shall deal with the Fathers in the second section.

⁷ Thus Irenaeus: "Times out of number Moses points to the Son of God; he even knew of the day of His Passion, he actually predicted it in figure, calling it the Pasch; and on the very day, the day which Moses foretold long ago, the Lord SUFFERED AND FULFILLED THE PASCH. Not only did he describe the day, he even described the place, and the lateness of the time, the going down of the sun. He said: *Thou mayst not immolate the Pasch in any one of thy cities, but in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, that his name may dwell there: thou shalt immolate the pasch in the evening, at the going down of the sun* (*Adv. Haer.*, 4, 10, 1. P.G. 7, 1000). And before Irenaeus Justin: "The blood of the pasch, sprinkled on the door-posts and lintels, saved those who were in the slavery of Egypt while the first-born of the Egyptians perished. For the Pasch was Christ, who later was immolated, as Isaias said: *He*

place the passing of the Lord to the Father. Hence St Paul says: *Christ our pasch is sacrificed* (*I Cor*, V, 7). The faithful always understood the paschal immolation of Christ to be the Passion of His death.

The paschal sacrifice of Christ, therefore, consists in the Supper and the Passion combined. That is to say, the Supper and the Death made up the one, unique, integral and perfect fulfillment of the figurative pasch,⁸ and of this as really one we make the one commemoration, in the Mass, commemorating at once Christ supping and Christ dying.⁹

was led like a lamb to the slaughter. For it is written that you took Him captive on the day of the Pasch and likewise that He was crucified on the day of the Pasch" (*Dial.* 3. P.G. 6, 732). Later we shall consider the testimony of Clement of Alexandria. Tertullian writes (*Advers. Marc.*, 4, 10. P.L. 2, 460); "He even knows the time when He whose Passion the Law prefigures, was to suffer. Because he chose the day of the pasch out of the many Jewish festivals. For in this Moses foretold the sacrament. *It is the Pasch of the Lord*" etc.

⁸ From the many examples of this interpretation we select one from the *Epistola heortastica* 42 of Athanasius: "For we are summoned brethren . . . to that great, heavenly and all-sufficing *Supper*, that is to the Pasch, or to Christ IMMOLATED, for *Christ our Pasch is immolated.*" (P.G. 26, 1440). That Athanasius, like others, means the Passion by the immolation of Christ our pasch is plain from the *Epist. heort.*, 6, 2; 11, 14; etc. (col. 1384, 1412, etc.).

⁹ We often meet sayings in the earlier writers where they state that the Mass is a commemoration of the Supper as well as of the Passion. We have an example in a

The fact that in the ancient Jewish pasch there were the slain lamb, and the azymes or unleavened bread, and the chalice, presents to us a most remarkable figure of the antitype—the sacrifice of Christ, which being offered and partaken of under the appearances of bread and wine, was to be completed with the death of Christ.¹⁰

Hence it is not surprising to find St Paul (*l.c.*) interweaving (by the use of the word *for*) the actual bloody immolation of our new Pasch with the remembrance of the

passage doubtfully attributed to Hippolytus (*In Prov. IX. 2. P.G. 10, 628*): “*She hath set forth her table: . . . His adorable and holy Body and Blood which are daily consecrated and offered in sacrifice in COMMEMORATION in the mysterious and divine table, the memorial of that unforgettable first Supper mysterious and divine.*”

¹⁰ I know that the feast of the unleavened bread and the pasch could be separated. Origen knew of it (*in Levit.*, hom. 9, n. 5. P. G. 12, 514) before our modern theologians. Yet in *Deuteronomy* (XVI. 1-8) at any rate both festivals are quite naturally fused into one (Compare W. J. Moulton, art. *Passover* in D. B. 3, 685): so much so that Hummelauer after saying in commenting on *Exodus* XII. 14-20. “The feast of the UNLEAVENED BREAD with the octave, is looked upon as one day like the Christian festivals,” goes further when he comes to comment on *Deuteronomy* XVI. 7 foll., and speaks repeatedly of what was to be done “either on the day of the *pasch* or within its octave.” In the New Testament certainly there is no distinction between the two (*Matth.*, XXVI, 17; *Mark*, XV, 1; *Luke*, XXII, 1. Compare Lesêtre article *Pâque* in Vigouroux, *Dict. de la Bible*, t. 4, 2. col. 2094).

unleavened bread.¹¹ Remember that he is writing here to Christians converted from paganism, hence not very conversant with Jewish symbolism, but as we know from I Cor., X, and XI, quite familiar with the Eucharistic teaching. He is recalling the memory of the Eucharistic Supper, by reason of which the teaching on the unleavened bread was necessarily well known to the Corinthians.¹² Hence the words interweaving the unleavened bread with the Passion are most appropriate. It reads as if the Apostle were saying: Think well of the meaning of the unleavened bread: it is the cleansing of all the vileness and filth of corruption and sin: Think well on it, I pray you. Remember that it was in unleavened bread that Christ offered the paschal sacrifice of His death—that death by which we were redeemed, so that redeemed now by the unleavened bread, we may live unleavened in

¹¹ *Know ye not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole mass? Purge out the old leaven that ye may be a new paste. For Christ our Pasch is sacrificed. Therefore let us feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.*

¹² It really makes very little difference here whether the Apostle celebrated in leavened or unleavened bread. This one thing at least we do know, that instruction on the Eucharist for the most part centred upon the story of the Last Supper and here the ritual of the unleavened bread played a very important part.

Christ—that is, since by the sacrifice of Christ we are now delivered from the stain and the contagion of sin, by communion with Christ we may live in sinlessness and innocence.¹³ St Paul, therefore, commemorating the Passion with the Supper as one, implies that the one same paschal sacrifice of Christ was enacted both in the Supper and in the Passion: that is, that the Supper and the Passion are parts of the one sacrifice.

To this argument drawn from the Pasch, the following objection may be raised: the Supper and the Passion could be merged into one sacrificial celebration, one undivided fulfilment of the ancient pasch, without the sacrifice of the Passion being offered in the Supper, but only in the sense that the Victim of the Passion was consummated by partaking, which would mean that the sacrificial banquet of Christ's Passion was celebrated, although the sacrificial act of the Passion had not yet taken place.

Two replies can be given to this objection: *First*, there can be no sacrificial banquet upon a victim not yet *offered*. Nothing can become a victim until it is offered. It is actually by the offering that what is offered is made sacred to God. Therefore, without the offering

there is no sacrifice, there is nothing sanctified, there is nothing which becomes sanctifying. Now the flesh of the victim is required only as sanctifying, as sanctified, as divine, as something made sacred to God. On the other hand, the Lord could have given Himself in banquet previous to the *immolation* in blood for this reason: that the victim once constituted under the symbols of immolation, not only was destined for immolation, but was then made apt to be received as food and drink. The very nature of the offering, therefore, made it possible for the banquet to anticipate the immolation.

My second reply is addressed to Catholics: Every Catholic must believe that what Christ gave to the disciples in the Supper, Christ offered to God in the Supper. It has always been the faith of the Church, that in the Supper a true sacrifice was enacted by our Lord. As evidence of this we can refer to the many testimonies of the Fathers in the first chapters of this work. And it was defined at the Council of Trent (*session* 22, c. 1 D. 978). Now, admittedly, the sacrifice of the Passion was partaken of in the Supper by way of banquet; therefore, the sacrifice of the Passion was offered in the Supper: the Victim of the same sacrifice was both offered to God, and given to men for their partaking.

¹³ Hence St Thomas says very well that the words *Let us feast* in I Cor., V., 8 should bear the same interpretation as the words of St John on the bread of life: namely the spiritual and sacramental eating of Christ.

B. IN TRADITION

The Fathers imply the same teaching when they say, that not only was the new covenant proclaimed, or announced, or represented in the Supper, but actually entered into and sanctioned—though of course without prejudice to the Passion. Upon this St Ephraem leaves no room for doubt: “When therefore, he says, He had administered to His apostles . . . and had so lowered Himself before them as humbly to wash their feet . . . HE THEN SANCTIONED ANOTHER PASCH which was to bring the former pasch to an end, and was to establish the pasch of the nations unto eternal life.” Later interpreting *Isaias*, VI, 1-8, he represents our Lord as saying: “This table is an altar, this cenacle is a temple, I am the Lord . . . I am the Son of the living Father, I came down from heaven in this sixth millennium, TO GIVE A NEW COVENANT TO MY CHURCH.” Finally, he exclaims: “O wonderful night in which the mysteries were revealed, THE OLD COVENANT BROUGHT TO ITS END, and the Church of the Gentiles enriched; blessed night, blessed time in which the Supper was consecrated” (*Sermo 3, in hebdomadam sanctam*, n. 3-7 ed. Lamy, t. I, p. 416-428).

When the Fathers combine the Supper and the Passion in such a way as to make of both one unique fulfilment of the ancient pasch, they

clearly indicate the same teaching. Here, also, we may quote St Ephraem saying that the true Pasch of the true Lamb, who was made Victim for all, was offered in the Supper; the true Pasch which was to bring us out of the Egypt of perdition and bondage into the haven of salvation; finally, the true Pasch in the commemoration of which the Church would celebrate the sacrifice, whereby she herself would be sanctified: “In place of the ordinary table which men use for food, I have brought you the Altar and the Victim of propitiation . . . the pasch of Egypt which was offered in figure has come to an end today; henceforth I am the Pasch. The table was His altar which He wholly consecrated. On the evening of this Pasch the cenacle was a church; the table was the sacred altar; the reclining apostles were the priests; the Head of the guests was Jesus Himself, THE OFFERING AND THE OFFERER; the disciples the partners with Him at the feast. WITNESSES OF THE NEW PASCH, THEY GAZED IN WONDER AT THE SACRIFICE; for they had never partaken of the like . . . BY THIS PRESENT PASCH THE PASCH OF EGYPT WAS BROUGHT TO A CLOSE. That pasch had been offered so that the first-born might not be slain; THIS PASCH WAS OFFERED BECAUSE OF THE SLAYING OF THE FIRST-BORN; the former pasch was celebrated to commemorate the deliverance of a people. THIS PASCH

LED THE PEOPLES INTO THE PLACE FROM WHICH THE PEOPLE HAD GONE FORTH. The victim of the former pasch was a lamb. Our VICTIM is Himself the Shepherd who feeds all. The former pasch was instituted by Moses in memory of the deliverance; this was instituted by the LORD IN ORDER THAT THE COMMEMORATION OF IT MIGHT SANCTIFY US. Henceforth you will eat a clean pure Pasch, bread kneaded and baked by the Holy Spirit. I have wine to give you in drink, wine mingled with fire and the spirit,¹⁴ that is the Body

¹⁴ This expression of Ephraem is unique in Eucharistic theology. Occurring here, it calls for comment. Ephraem usually presents some kind of fire and spirit contained in the Eucharist. Is Christ Himself this fire and spirit, or is it the Holy Spirit who proceeds from Him? Two discourses of St. Ephraem may throw some light on this. I shall quote one (*Adversus Scrutatores*, *Sermo* 10. Opera omnia, tom. 3. Syr. and Lat. Rome 1743, p. 24,) though competent critics might suggest some emendation of the published text: "The hidden spirit which is not eaten, is within thy bread; the fire which is not drunk burns in thy wine. Spirit in thy bread, fire in thy wine. TWO THINGS TO marvel at WHICH OUR LIPS HAVE TASTED . . . [The Lord] fermented them [men] with fire and the Spirit, in order that they might grow in a wondrous mysterious way, and that they might become fire and the spirit . . . IMMATERIAL FOOD AND DRINK is prepared FROM FIRE AND THE SPIRIT for men with material bodies . . . Fire come down from heaven consumed the victim of Elias. FAVOURING FIRE comes to us, THE REPARATIVE VICTIM OF OUR LIFE. [A better version according to Paulus Peeters, S.J. is 'the fire of love has been for us the victim of life'] That fire of the sacrifice of Elias burned the flesh placed upon it; all of this other fire, O Lord, HAS BECOME OUR

and Blood of God, WHO IS MADE VICTIM FOR ALL" (*Sermo 2 in sanctam hebdomadam*, n. 6-10, ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 380-390). "Then all afire with love, Jesus rose from the place where He was reclining, and began to fulfil the mysteries AND BRING THE TRUE PASCH TO PERFECTION. And so rising from the Supper . . . He took a towel, etc. . . . On the night of this Pasch He commanded His Church, TO COMMEMORATE THE LAMB, THE SON OF OUR GOD, WHO BEING SLAIN FOR US, GAVE HIS BODY AND BLOOD" (*Sermo 3 in hebd. sanctam*, n. 1 and *Sermo 4*, n. 7, ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 390 and 426). We see His condition as victim in the sacrifice which Christ offered in the Supper. He is the Victim from His

food in thy sacrifice." Probably by the words spirit and fire we must understand Christ Himself contained in the Eucharist, and particularly as imparting to us the spirit of life which is from Himself, and the fire of holy love, which being sent on earth, He ardently desired to be enkindled. The reason is that on the one hand throughout the whole discourse, the spirit evidently runs parallel with the fire, and on the other the fire is expressly said to be the actual victim, the actual food. However the Spirit and the Fire are each considered as food for us, not indeed sensibly, but in a mysterious way, that is in a manner immaterial or indivisible. We have a confirmation of this conclusion in the *Sermo Adversus scrutatores*, 19 (*Ibid.*, p. 35) Of the ancient custom of giving the term *Spirit* and even *Holy Spirit* to the Word, read Coustant in *Prefatio generalis ad opera St Hilarii*. par. 1, art. 2, n. 57 fol. (P.L. 9, 35 seq.) or a later helpful note of Edmund Bishop in T. a. S., vol. 8 n. 1, Appendix, n. 6, suppl. not. 3, p. 159-162.

death ("because of the first-born slain"); He is the Lamb, soon to be slain, now offered to God; so much so that actually before the immolation, He is given to the apostles in food; from thence on He is the true, one perpetual Pasch, by whose Body and Blood we are nourished and sanctified.

For the moment we pass over the similar testimony of Chrysostom (*in I Cor., hom. 34, n. 2. P. G. 61, 288*), it will be discussed in a more opportune place. It may be that Sophronius of Jerusalem has left a trace of this teaching in his *Anacreontica*:

"He gave to man the Lamb Redeemer, Figuring His own death in the mystic Supper" (*Anacreontica* 8. P. G. 87 ter. 3774).

Put in another way: Christ gave Himself to the apostles in the sacramental representation of His death, to be eaten as the redeeming Lamb, that is as the Victim of His redemptive Passion.¹⁵

¹⁵ In his hymn *pro magna feria quinta* (P.G. 89, 477) Cosmas of Jerusalem, companion of St John Damascene, uses similar words when he sings of the *cup of redemption*: "Thou, the Pasch didst offer thyself for those on whose behalf thou wert about to die, saying: Eat my Body and be strong in the faith. THY CUP, THE REDEMPTION OF THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE, thy cup of gladness which thou didst fill, thou gavest in drink to thy disciples. Thou wert sacrificing thy very self, saying: Drink of my Blood and be strong in the faith, O Christ, hastening to thy Passion which dispensed immortality to all the children of Adam, thou didst say to

Euthymius Zigabenus, as I think, expresses the teaching of the Catholic Fathers. He connects the eating and the slaying of the lamb in the new Pasch by which the old pasch was abrogated. "For as painters draw lines and sketch in pictures on the same tablet, and clothe them with colour and give them form, so AT ONE AND THE SAME TABLE CHRIST outlined the shadowy and figurative pasch, and likewise INSTITUTED THE NEW AND PERFECT PASCH. AND THE SLAYING OF THE LEGAL LAMB PRE-FIGURED THE SLAYING OF THE RATIONAL LAMB, the shadow must needs fade with the rising of the sun, and the figure disappear with the COMING OF THE REALITY" (*In Matth., XXVI, 26. P. G. 129, 664-665*).

The Lamb slain in the Passion is the reality which corresponds to the figure. Christ places this reality before His apostles at the Supper. This would have been impossible if Christ had not offered the Victim of His Passion in the Supper and given the Victim in food to the apostles. This being so, the slaying was implied, and it is from the slaying that the partakers are feasted.

Of the Latin writers Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem, 40. P. L. 2, 460*)

thy disciples: I have desired to be partaker of this pasch with you, because the Father sent me His Only-Begotten Son as propitiation for the world." Christ therefore distributed the chalice of redemption in the Supper—the chalice which He offered in sacrifice.

considers that it was in the Supper and the Passion combined that the ancient pasch was fulfilled. "Christ, whose passion the Law prefigures, knew WHEN it behoved Him to *suffer*. Because out of the many Jewish festivals He selected the paschal day. For Moses had predicted the sacrament in the Pasch: *It is the Pasch of the Lord.*" Note the relation between the pasch and the Passion.¹⁶ And he immediately proceeds: "And also FOR THIS REASON He showed His love: *With desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer.* O thou who didst destroy the Law, and didst desire also to observe the Pasch! Did the Jewish sacrifice of rams give Him pleasure? *Led like a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before the shearer would not open his mouth,* was it He who desired to fulfil THE FIGURE OF HIS SAVING BLOOD?" He desired, therefore, to eat the Eucharistic Pasch.¹⁷ Indeed, BECAUSE the Pasch

is the Passion, FOR THIS VERY REASON the Pasch is the Eucharist. That is to say: the one true proper Pasch of the Lord consists indivisibly in

bread and wine, from which the Eucharist is consecrated, is truly and actually His own creation. For if Christ were to introduce into the sacrament an alien creation, He would desire to eat a thing that was not His own, but something alien to Him. This would be unworthy of the Most High God. Such being the case, Marcion's argument—he contrasts the God, the creator of material things, and the author of the Old Testament, with God the Founder of the New Testament—falls to the ground.

Why Tertullian adds the words *that is the figure of my Body* is not difficult to understand. For since his argument concerned the bread element (called already by Irenaeus in a similar case, the earthly element: see later) of the Eucharist, he must have been regarding the thing eaten not as it really was, the Body of Christ, but as what it appeared to be, in which sense it was a figure of Christ's body. Reasonably considered, the passage from Tertullian contains no theological error. As a matter of fact we ourselves regard the species as figures and symbols of the Body and Blood. However he did certainly err in the exegesis when he thought that in the words of our Lord *This is my body* the pronoun *This* stands for that which can be seen, the species—as though our Lord had said *This* which can be seen, which you can touch, break and partake of, *is my body*. For in reality the pronoun *This* stands for the thing indicated by the element which can be seen, touched, broken, partaken of, not for that element itself.

Apart however from this exegetic error, Catholic teaching permitted and indeed demanded Tertullian's addition: *that is the figure of my Body*. For evidently a thing in itself sensible cannot *be* the actual Body of the Lord in the Sacrament, it can only be the figure of the Body, that is the index of the fleshly Body. It can only be the figure of the Body, otherwise as Tertullian notes im-

¹⁶ Compare *De Baptismo*, 19. P.L. 1222: "The day of the Pasch is more solemn than the day of baptism, because in the Pasch the Passion of the Lord (in which we are baptized) is fulfilled."

¹⁷ Add the words almost immediately following: "And so He confessed that with desire He desired to eat the pasch *as His own* (For it would be beneath the dignity of God to desire a thing that was not His own). He made that bread which He took and which He gave to His disciples, His own Body, by saying *This is my body*, that is the figure of my body". The words "as his own" are aimed at the refutation of Marcion's error. For *as His own* Christ desired the new Pasch in this manner: that the

the bloodless rite and in the slaying in blood. In this pasch the figure of the blood, that is, of the death of Christ, is signally fulfilled. Thus Tertullian.

mediately, one would have to say that the bread was suspended on the Cross ("The puerile view of Marcion would demand the crucifixion of the bread"); and when the Lord speaks of His Blood, one would have to say that the bread contained the Blood, which is an absurdity ("for blood can only be from flesh"). Therefore the bread element was not actually the Body of the Lord, it was merely the figure of the Body, that is the index of the fleshly Body, far other than the bread. But the bread would not be the figure of the fleshly Body, if Christ did not have a fleshly Body ("for without the real Body there would have been no figure"). Christ therefore had a nature of flesh, a real body, not a mere phantom or empty appearance, as Marcion with the Docetists holds. Clearly then when Marcion says that Christ did not have a real proper fleshly body, he is speaking against Christ.

Moreover Tertullian says against Marcion, that on this the Old Testament agrees with Christ. In Jeremias bread stood for the Body of Christ *by a figure of speech*, and in the sacrament also bread is conditioned to the Body of Christ as a true figure. (Compare *Adv. Marcion.*, 3, 19. P.L. 2, 348.)

Such is the argument of Tertullian in no wise prejudicial to the teaching of the Church, which is, that underlying the species there is the real Body of Christ, while the species are an index or figure of it. In his argument against Marcion it would have been futile to base his reasoning on the real Body of Christ, since Marcion did not admit that Christ had a real body, with the Docetists he held that it was only apparent. Rather Tertullian had to prove to Marcion that there was a real body of Christ. Later in the same work he refers back to this proof of the Incarnation which he has drawn from the Eucharistic bread. He writes (*Adv. Marc.*, 5, 8, Coll. 489): "In the sacrament of the bread and the

Leo the Great in a similar strain gives the reason why the Passion was to be referred to the day of the Pasch: namely, that the Passion itself fulfils the paschal figure. He also points out the manner in which the fulfilment of the figure was accomplished—that is, by the offering which the Lord made of His Body and Blood in the Supper. Evidently, then, Leo considers the Supper and the Passion to be one indivisible sacrifice, corresponding adequately to the offering, the immolation, and the partaking of the figurative lamb: "We see how it was decreed in the divine counsels, that the sacrilegious leaders of the people and the impious priests who repeatedly sought occasion to vent their rage on Christ, did not receive the power to let loose their fury, except at the solemnity of the pasch. For it was fitting that what had long ago been foretold in figured mystery, should

chalice in the Gospel, we have already proved the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ against a mere phantom body in Christ, asserted by Marcion".

In respect of the exegetic error of Tertullian, to which we referred above in this note, we might remark that others too erred in a similar way, even St. Augustine—"his attention being directed to other matters" (Billot, *De ecclesiae sacramentis*, 4, t. 1., p. 384) in *Contra Adimantum*, 12, 3. P.L. 42, 144. But all these errors are easily explained once we notice the incorrect interpretation of the pronoun *This*, so that the dictum of Hilary remains always and everywhere true: "On the reality of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, there is no room left for doubt". (*Trin.*, 8, 13, P.L. 10, 246).

be openly verified in the eyes of all; that the true Lamb should replace the figured lamb, THAT THE DIVERSITY OF VICTIMS SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO AN END IN ONE SACRIFICE. For all these things regarding the immolation of the lamb, that through Moses had been divinely instituted, foretold Christ and really PREDICTED THE SLAYING OF CHRIST. In order, THEREFORE, that the shadows should yield before the substance, and the images fade in the presence of the REALITY, the ancient observance is abrogated in the new sacrament, victim is exchanged for Victim, blood is replaced by Blood, and the legal festivity in being changed is fulfilled."

That is to say, while the Jews were occupied not so much in the observance of the festival as in the desire to put Christ to death, "Jesus firm in His purpose, intrepid in the performance of His Father's will, sealed up the old testament, and instituted the new Pasch. Reclining with His disciples to partake of the mystic Supper, while in the hall of Caiphas there was debate as to how Christ should be to death, He was instituting the sacrament of His Body and Blood, and teaching them of the nature of the Victim which was to be offered to God" (*Serm.* 58, 1, 3. P. L. 54, 332-333; compare *Serm* 60, 2, col. 244).¹⁸

Like Leo, St Fulgentius expounds

¹⁸ Compare these words with the Ambrosian Liturgy cited above, p. 71.

to us the change of the testament and the fulfillment of the pasch. Putting to himself the question, why St Luke speaks of two chalices, he answers: just as the Old Testament, which is indicated by the first chalice, merges into the New which is in the second, so the ancient pasch merged into the true Pasch of the Supper and the Passion combined. "It appears to me that here we have another mystery of the Christian faith—that in the two chalices we must recognize the two testaments. And particularly because Truth Himself has shown this to us, so that there should be no difficulty for inquiring minds. Because the Lord deigned to call the chalice which He gave to be drunk, the new testament. We know this from the words of the Gospel. The three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke being undoubted witnesses to it . . . Hence also it is that the blessed Paul commemorating the mystery of the Supper, says that the Lord called the chalice by no other name than the new testament. In other places in Scripture the word chalice may be interpreted in any other way according to the rule of faith. But in this place of the Gospel on which we are speaking now, we are not permitted to interpret it otherwise than the way shown by our Lord and Master who says *this chalice is the new testament in my blood* (Luke XXII. 2). And just as this chalice is called the New Testament,

it is reasonable to see the Old Testament in the chalice which He had previously distributed. Hence the Lord Himself, who gave each testament to His faithful people, likewise gave them the two chalices. For this reason in the same Supper HE ATE THE JEWISH LAMB WHICH THE LAW COMMANDED TO BE OFFERED, AND ALSO GAVE THE SACRAMENT OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD which was to be instituted for the salvation of the faithful. He ate the Jewish pasch wherein Christ was promised, that he might come to our Pasch WHEREIN CHRIST WAS SACRIFICED . . . Thus He ate the ancient pasch in which it was SIGNIFIED THAT HE WAS TO SUFFER before suffering for us of His own free will." (*Epist.* 14, 40-43. P. L. 56, 428-431).¹⁹

It is worthy of remark here that of the three converging sentences in which St Fulgentius contrasts the new Pasch with the old, the first clearly indicates the Eucharistic Supper ("He gave the sacrament of His Body and Blood"); the third clearly points to the Passion (. . . "suffering of His own free will"); while the second seems to bestride, so to speak, both the Supper and the Passion (. . . "so as to come to our

¹⁹ After Fulgentius, St Bruno of Asti (*Com. in Matth.*, pars 4, 104. P.L. 165, 291-292), Baldwin of Canterbury (*Lib. de sacr. alt.* P.L. 204, 683-684); and of the Eastern Fathers, Theophylactus (in h.l. *Lucae*, P.G. 123, 1069), declared that the succession of the two testaments was shown in the two chalices.

Pasch in which Christ is sacrificed"); as if making the integral paschal sacrifice of our Redeemer to issue both from the Supper and the Passion.

The anonymous writer of the treatise *De solemnitatibus, sabbatis et neomeniis*,²⁰ who wrote, (as far as we can conjecture) after Leo, certainly united the Supper and the Passion in the unity of one individual paschal sacrifice. For though this writer says that the true Lamb was not immolated or slain before the fifteenth day of the first month (n. 5 and 6),²¹ nevertheless he says at

²⁰ Cardinal Pitra who published this work in the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, t. 1. p. 9-13, thought (too trustfully perhaps) that it was written about the time of the first paschal controversy under Pope Victor. To me it appears strange that the learned writer was not aware that this work had been published already, for it is extant in full at the end of the epistles of St Jerome in the edition of Vallarsius, P.L. 22, 1222 foll. Shortly after I had seen this in R.S.R., Oct.-Dec. 1916, p. 461-462, another publication appeared (1918) in the *Corpus Vindobonense* (part. sect. 1 of the works of St Jerome) supervised by Isodore Hilberg. Unfortunately he did not know Pitra's text which was based on the better codices, he was satisfied with the Vatican codex as used by Vallarsius; however he gave a more accurate and correct recension of the text of Vallarsius.

I had thought hitherto (*loc. cit.*), because of a somewhat oriental colouring of the work, that it was originally written in Greek. I would not venture to say so now: as a matter of fact it will soon be shown by A. Vaccari that it was written in Latin.

²¹ The most significant words in the Solesmes edition are these:

"In deigning to give the sacraments of His Body and Blood in His lifetime to His

the same time that it was offered in sacrifice by the Lord,²² on the threshold of the Passion on the fourteenth day in the Supper, where the ancient pasch was abrogated by the new Pasch (n. 5). That he considers the immolation or the slaying on the fifteenth day and the sacrificial action on the fourteenth day as being one indivisible sacrifice, is evident from the question he puts (n. 5): Why, contrary to the appointed order in the figurative pasch, was the true Lamb to be given in food

disciples, He did this contrary to the figure, for the lamb which was the type of Christ had to be slain in the pasch . . . had to be eaten by the people AFTER the slaying. To me it appears that the Lord acted thus, lest having eaten the legal pasch with His disciples, IF HE HAD NOT AFTERWARDS CHANGED THE SACRIFICE, SAYING *This is my body*, it might be believed that the obligation to eat the legal pasch would still continue . . . Moreover there is this to be considered, that it was not the fourteenth day towards evening as prescribed by the Law, that this *Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world* and Christ our Pasch was sacrificed, but on the fifteenth day on which day we know that the Lord observed the festival day of the Jews with its sacrifice. But what we must have in mind is this: that the Lord first ate the figurative lamb, and afterwards strengthened His disciples with the food of His Body; and after the Jewish typical pasch [immolated on the fourteenth day], Christ our Pasch was immolated [on the fifteenth day]. I think that this was, not that the reality should come before the figure, but the figure before the reality" (n. 5 and 6).

²² For by the sacrifice of His Body and Blood the Lord made an end of the sacrifice of the legal lamb, the sacrifice being changed, as the author says.

before being slain or immolated.²³ This question obviously presupposes that what was eaten at the Eucharistic Supper, was the Victim of the Passion. For had the author meant the victim of some bloodless sacrifice, preliminary to the sacrifice in blood, why not deny the statement implied in the question? He does not say this however, but he admits the inversion of the order and he also gives two reasons for it. True the reasons he gives are not very satisfactory, but a better reason can be found. In the 15th Homily, known generally as that of St Eligius of Noyon (but probably belonging to the ix century), it is interesting to note the legal paschal lamb as a type of things to come: the Supper and the Passion: "Readers must not be satisfied merely with the historical meaning of the sacred books, they must also consider in them what the prophetic language intends to convey by allegory: there is the series of readings on the paschal lamb for example. The Law commanded the Jews to immolate the paschal lamb, and (as a type of future things) the paschal lamb indicates the immaculate Lamb, the Son of God the Father, THE SUPPER OF WHOSE PASSION WE CELEBRATE today" (P. L. 87, 849). Here certainly the antitype (i.e. what cor-

²³ A similar question was to be raised later by a more modern theologian, Baldwin of Canterbury, and the reply was more satisfying.

responds to the type) is placed in the Supper and the Passion combined.

Similarly St Paschasius Radbertus, noting that the legal pasch was the figure of the Passion of the Lord, goes on to say that the figure was fulfilled in the Supper: "Luke says that there were two chalices given to the disciples in the same supper: the first chalice before the eating of the lamb and before the breaking of the bread; the second, when He blessed the bread and broke and gave to the disciples . . . We are given to understand here THAT THE LEGAL LAMB WITH ITS CHALICE CAME FIRST AS A FIGURE OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST. Afterwards the Body and Blood was consecrated in fulfillment of the reality." (*Epistola de corpore et sanguine Domini ad Frudegardum* P. L. 120, 1395). If the Supper fulfils that which was the figure of the Passion, must it not be really joined to the Passion? And if the figure was to be fulfilled in the order of sacrifice, must not the Supper be really joined with the Passion as one sacrifice?

Rupert has good reason for placing the following two statements in juxtaposition:

First, the kingdom of God arrived with the Eucharistic chalice, which latter is the fulfillment of the figure.

Second, the Passion was the initiation of the kingdom of God.

This can be only if the Supper is the banquet of the Passion, just as

the victim of the typical sacrifice was the food in the typical pasch: "Luke alone recorded the words of the Lord spoken in the first supper of the typical pasch, which, obeying the command of the old Law, He ate with His disciples . . . It was Luke alone who was careful to record the words of the Lord, saying that with desire He desired to eat the pasch of that year with His disciples . . . He added that the cause of this desire was that He would not eat that Pasch and drink of the chalice of the same typical pasch, until it was fulfilled in the kingdom of God. It was fitting therefore that *He should proceed to write down the manner of its fulfillment.* Hence having related what was already said in the same Supper, he says: *And taking the bread he gave thanks and broke, and gave to them saying: This is my body which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner the chalice also after he had supped, stating: This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood which shall be shed for you. AND SO IN THIS WAY IS FULFILLED IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD THAT WHICH WAS FIGURED IN THE FORMER PASCH AND IN THE FORMER CHALICE. Because in that very moment the kingdom of God came, AND THE BEGINNING OF THIS KINGDOM WAS HIS PASSION, to which He was given over on that night, to rise again on the third day.*" (*De gloria et honore filii hominis. Super Matth.*, I, 10. P. L.

168, 1545). The kingdom of God commences in the Supper, not only in the eating, but in the very offering, of the Lamb who is about to die: "*On the first day of the azymes the disciples came to Jesus saying: Where wilt thou that we should prepare for thee to eat the pasch? But Jesus said: Go ye into the city to a certain man, and say to him: the master saith: my time is near at hand, with thee I make the pasch with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus appointed to them, and they prepared the pasch.* The fourteenth day of the first month was the first day of the azymes, and towards the evening of that day was the pasch, that is the immolation of the lamb . . . Towards the evening of that day, when the moon was full, the lamb was slain with a mystic rite, it was eaten with unleavened bread and wild lettuce. On that day when the lamb was commanded to be eaten in all the houses, already kept from the tenth day to be immolated towards the evening, Judas sought to betray the Lamb of God, and the opportunity was given in this manner: *Go ye, says the Lord Jesus, into the city to a certain man and say to him: the master saith: my time is near at hand etc.* For He came from Bethany into the city, that is into Jerusalem, and by coming and remaining there for some time, He afforded the opportunity for the traitor. . . . For would it

be seemly, would it be just and lawful to consummate the ancient pasch, TO OFFER THE [*the reading may be: THIS GREAT*] SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, WHICH HE MADE ON THAT NIGHT, IN ANY OTHER PLACE THAN JERUSALEM? The Law says: *Do not offer thy sacrifice in every place, but in that place which the Lord hath appointed, in one of thy tribes thou shalt offer victims, and shalt do all things whatsoever I have commanded thee.* Made under the Law, He owed obedience to the Law, TO OFFER THE SACRIFICE not in Bethany or any other place, but in the place which the Lord had chosen, that is in JERUSALEM . . . Hence I have mentioned this, so as not to omit the reason why the kid or the lamb TO BE SLAIN had to come to the place OF IMMOLATION, that is because made under the Law, He must obey the Law" (Ibid., col. 1541-1542). Note the offering, made in the Supper, of the Lamb to be immolated,²⁴ the Lamb to be given

²⁴ The words which follow a little later appear to me to express the same meaning: "SUFFERING without the camp, that is WITHOUT THE CITY, He cleansed all the just of ancient times in His Blood, the elect and the first fruits of sinners doing penance, namely the thief who was crucified with Him. WITHIN THE CITY, however, the night before with His apostles . . . following the typical supper of the lamb, HE OFFERED IN HOLOCAUST THE SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, a thing well known to Christian or Catholic faith." (col. 1583). Within the city He offered His sacrifice, without the city He was immolated in His Passion.

over to the hands of evil men by the betrayal.²⁵

We have much the same meaning in the following *post-pridie* prayer in the Mozarabic Mass for the vigil of the Resurrection: "Having before our eyes, O holy omnipotent Father, the triumphs of this great Passion, we humbly beseech thee, that this Pasch which our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son MADE [i.e. in the Supper] A LIVING VICTIM and COMPLETED [i.e. in the Passion] may become for us a safeguard unto salvation and life." That is to say, by His sacerdotal offering Christ made Himself a living paschal Victim; immolated, He completed it in His death.²⁶

Similarly in the venerable Chaldean Liturgy (said by some to be the Persian, but really an offshoot

²⁵ In controversy with the reformers of his time Jerome Fossanus O.S.A., maintained from the parallel of the legal lamb, that the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ was made in the Supper, before He submitted to the immolation of the Cross. He says: "The typical lamb used to be offered to the Lord before being slain" (a very doubtful assertion). From this he concluded that the Supper was a sacrifice; so too he says "The sacrifice in blood and the bloodless sacrifice are said to be one and the same"; thus finally Christ in the Supper "shows that He is the true (not the typical) Pasch to be immolated in blood" (*De admirando mysterio et Christo adorando in eucharistia*, lib. 3. *De sacrificio*. Turin, 1554, fol. 131-132).

²⁶ Many of the mass prayers found in the Gelasian Sacramentary for the paschal season may be interpreted in this sense. v.g. the Collect and Secret for Wednesday after Easter, the Secret of Friday, etc., P.L. 1115-1116, ed. Wilson, p. 93 and 95.

of the Syro-Antiochene), we read that in the Supper the Lord instituted the true Pasch which is the Pasch of the Lord immolated on the Cross: "He left us a memorial of our redemption, this mystery which we present in thy sight: for when the time arrived when He was to suffer and come to His death, on that night when He was betrayed for the life of the world, having in obedience to the Law of Moses made the pasch with His disciples, He then in place of this pasch INTRODUCED HIS OWN PASCH BEFORE HIS DEATH, the memorial of which we now make, as He gave to us to do, until His return from heaven: FOR OUR PASCH IS CHRIST WHO WAS IMMOLATED FOR US. AFTER HE HAD SUPPED THEREFORE IN THE LEGAL PASCH OF MOSES HE TOOK BREAD etc.," The Supper narrative concluded, the deacon addresses the faithful: "Contemplate the gentleness, the humility, the obedience of our Redeemer, enlightened by faith, with the consciousness of sin forgiven, attend! And let us turn our eyes to the only-begotten Son of the Father, BEHOLD HIM LED TO THE DREAD SUFFERINGS OF THE CROSS." (Max Saxonia *Missa Chaldaica*, p. 32-33). The meaning appears to me to be: that through the mystery of the Supper He is led to the Cross, and thus we know that the Pasch who was *immolated* on the Cross, appears as *introduced* in the Supper: that is, the sacrifice of the one Lamb, com-

menced in the Supper, is completed on the Cross—as He hastens on from the offering to the immolation.

It may be that this teaching on the oneness of our Lord's Pasch is not well known in the schools today, yet it is undoubtedly preached in the Church at the present time. Leaving other examples for a more opportune place, I quote one which may well be called a classic, from the great work of Cardinal Manning, *The Glories of the Sacred Heart*: "In that hour and in that action [of the Paschal Supper], He offered up the Lamb that was slain from the beginning of the world. The atoning sacrifice predestined from the beginning of the world was then offered up. The true Lamb was there. The types and shadows passed away, the reality was come. Jesus without spot or blemish, the Lamb immaculate and holy, was brought up into the courts of the

temple . . . In this last Paschal Supper, when Jesus sat at the table, and took bread, blessed it, and broke it, gave it and said: *This is my body*, and the chalice when He had blessed it, and said *This is my Blood*, He began the act of oblation finished upon Calvary, which redeemed the world . . . He made a free and voluntary offering of Himself. He had not yet shed His Blood, but throughout His whole life He had offered His will, and now He offered His death; for that shedding of Blood was the completion of the sacrifice."²⁷ When our people hear these words, they recognize the faith which is in them and they understand it *because of the knowledge of truth which is according to holiness*.

²⁷ *The Glories of the Sacred Heart*, by Henry Edward, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Third edition, London 1877, p. 130-140.

§ 3. The Supper and the Sacrifice of Melchisedech

A. TESTIMONY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

The Epistle to the Hebrews (c. c. V-VII) declares at length that Christ was a *priest according to the order of Melchisedech* IN RESPECT OF THE SACRIFICE OF HIS PASSION AND DEATH, whereby as the eternal Redeemer He opened the way to heaven for us.¹

Though St Paul speaks of other resemblances between Christ and Melchisedech (Hebr. VII 1-3), these are superficial and, so to speak, personal, there is no doubt whatever that the pre-eminent resemblance between the two (though for just reasons not Hebr. V 11-14), that which underlies all the others, always understood and proclaimed by tradition, and solemnly declared by the Council of Trent (*sess.* 22, c. 1. 938), is the resemblance of the bread and wine in each case, as the external material of the sacrifice.² This is

¹ All exegetes, I think, admit this. St Anthony of Padua represents them faithfully: "The purpose of the Apostle was to show forth Christ as a priest . . . from the blood sacrifice of the Cross . . . where Christ was made the Mediator of the New Testament, and wrought our redemption, consummating the sanctified through the one offering." (*In S. Pauli epistolas commentarius* t. 6, p. 224. Paris 1896. Particularly compare Hebr. VII. 1-26 and VII. 27 (Coll. C. H. Huyghe, in h.l. Ghent 1901, p. 161).

² It is noteworthy that while St Jerome

precisely the reason why Christ is said to be a priest *according to the order of Melchisedech*; that is, not merely because of Melchisedech's pre-eminent degree and dignity, but also in accordance with the same order and manner of offering sacrifice, and as if after the model of Melchisedech: *according to the order of Melchisedech* (Hebr., V. 6) = *according to the similitude of Melchisedech*.³ Now if the following

takes for granted St Paul admitting a ritual similarity between Christ and Melchisedech, he does not do so on his own authority, he says rather that he found it in the Greek writings: "The Apostle at first merely magnifies the difficulty when he says: *of whom we have much to say and hard to be intelligently uttered* (V. 11); not that the Apostle could not explain it, but that the occasion to do so did not arise. For at the time he was speaking to the Hebrews, that is to the Jews and not to the faithful to WHOM HE WOULD FREQUENTLY REVEAL THE UNDERLYING SACRAMENT. Now if the vessel of election stands in awe at the mystery and confesses that what he is treating of is ineffable, is it not meet that we wretched worms should merely confess the knowledge of our own ignorance, and as a person just getting a glimpse of a high building through a tiny hole, should say: that the Apostle compares the two priesthoods, the old and the new . . . ; and that all that follows in praise of Melchisedech, IS REFERRED TO HIM AS A TYPE OF CHRIST FROM WHOM THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH FLOW. All this I have read in the writings of the Greeks." He had recently been going through them all: "I have read the writings of the ancients in order to find out the teaching of each, and my answer to you is from their combined wisdom". (*Epistola ad Evagrium*, n. 2. P.L. 22, 677).

³ Thomassinus (*De Incarnatione Verbi*, I, 10, c. 16, n. 3) writes: "The other likenesses to Melchisedech though manifold and

two statements are combined: 1) Christ showed Himself as priest according to the order of Melchisedech in His Passion; and 2) the resemblance between Christ and Melchisedech is primarily in the rite; is any other inference possible than that Christ offered the sacrifice of

elegantly portrayed, are nevertheless superficial, additional and merely touch the fringe of the subject; but when we consider the two as priests, the chief and primary agreement must be sought for in the manner of sacrificing . . . As I have already said, St Paul indicates this clearly enough, where, while disparaging the butchery connected with the Aaronic ancient victims, he declares that the nobler priesthood was initiated in Melchisedech. It would be absurd to speak of a resemblance between the priesthood of Christ and that of Melchisedech, and a divergence from the Aaronic priesthood, for such could no longer exist, were the sacrificial action of Christ different in kind from that of Melchisedech and similar to that of Aaron."

The authors of the commentary on the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (on the verse VII. 17) in the work published by Migne *Scripturae sacrae cursus completus* (t. 25, col. 335) agree: "In no other place did Christ show that He was a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech (as David foretold in Psalm 109 and promised that He would be) EXCEPT IN THE SUPPER in which He offered Himself under the species of bread and wine." Opportunely then St Anthony of Padua (*loc. cit.*, p. 224) asks: "Why the Apostle while representing the priesthood of Melchisedech as type of the priesthood of Christ omits to mention the offering of bread and wine"? The same "difficulty" was raised some time back by Franzelin (*De S. Euchar. Sacram. et Sacrif.*, 1868, p. 338). In estimating the adequacy of the solutions offered one should keep in mind the rule that in general an interpretation ought to be more than just tolerable; it should flow naturally.

His Passion in the consecration of the bread and wine? Therefore in the Supper Christ made the sacrificial offering of His death which was to be undergone on the Cross.

In a word: St Paul refers the priesthood of Christ according to the order of Melchisedech and according to the similitude of Melchisedech to the sacrifice of the Redemption. Hence an almost insoluble exegetic difficulty arises if we do not admit the numerical oneness of the sacrifice of our Lord, offered liturgically in the Supper, and hence continuing on throughout the whole Passion until His death.

B. PATRISTIC TESTIMONY

The Fathers illustrate this teaching in three ways.

First, they place the Melchisedechian priesthood of Christ in the Supper.⁴

⁴ We are omitting those Fathers who place the priesthood of Christ as functioning in the Supper but without formally calling it Melchisedechian. We give one example of such reference found in the *Sermo major de fide*, attributed with some probability to St Athanasius (P.G. 26, 1284): "By His own Body He was made and was called *High Priest and Apostle* (Hebr., III. 1) through the mystery which He gave us when He said: *This is my body which is given for you, and my blood of the new testament not of the old which is shed for you*". Theodoretus certainly quotes this passage as from Athanasius (*Dial.* 2. P.G. 83, 180). Undoubtedly the priesthood mentioned in Hebr., III. 1 must be interpreted as referring to the Passion whereby we are

Secondly, they see a direct resemblance between the gifts offered by Melchisedech and the Victim presented by Christ on the Cross.

Thirdly, they look upon the Melchisedechian sacrifice of Christ as one in the Supper and in the Passion.

A) THE MELCHISEDECHIAN CHARACTER OF THE SUPPER

First, then, the Fathers place the Melchisedechian sacrifice of Christ in the Supper.⁵ Outstanding among them is Cyprian who, in his epistle to Caecilius on the sacrament of the chalice of the Lord, establishes the

redeemed (compare II. 17). Thus Athanasius was convinced that the priesthood of the Passion was exercised in the Supper.

⁵ Here again we omit the passages from the Fathers where in their exposition of the priesthood of Christ *according to the order of Melchisedech*, they appeal to the ecclesiastical sacrifice of the Eucharist, that is not to the Supper but to the daily Mass. Petavius (*De Incarnatione Verbi* 1, 12, c. 12, n. 6, foll.) and Thomassinus (*De Incarnatione Verbi*, 1, 10, c. 16) have collected a number of such passages. Once it is established that in the Supper our Lord offered the sacrifice *according to the order of Melchisedech* it is naturally inferred that we have the Melchisedechian priesthood of Christ in the Mass; for as we shall see later, the Mass is the sacrifice of those who under Christ as Head, offer Christ as Victim. Hence just as the Church is one with her Head, as the member is one with the body, so is our sacrifice one with the sacrifice of Christ. But we are not dealing with the Mass now, we are treating of the Supper, and we are culling testimonies, which, with one or two exceptions, are rarely quoted.

resemblance between the priesthood of Christ and the priesthood of Melchisedech in the fact that Christ offered to sacrifice to God in bread and wine. "We find the sacrament of the sacrifice of the Lord prefigured in Melchisedech the high priest, as Sacred Scripture attests, where we read: *And Melchisedech king of Salem brought forth bread and wine.* He was a priest of the Most High God, and he blessed Abraham. In the Psalms the Holy Spirit declares that Melchisedech was a type of Christ, saying to the Son in the person of God the Father: *Before the day-star I begot thee. Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.* The order mentioned here has without doubt its origin and descent from that sacrifice, in the fact that Melchisedech was a priest of the Most High God, that he offered in bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is more a priest of the Most High God than the Lord Jesus Christ who offered sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the same sacrifice that Melchisedech had offered, that is bread and wine, namely His Body and Blood? In *Genesis* therefore, in order that the blessing of Abraham could be ritually celebrated by Melchisedech the priest, we have first the image of the sacrifice of Christ, situate in the bread and wine; the Lord, perfecting and fulfilling this, offered bread and a cup mingled with wine, and He who is the pleni-

tude of the reality fulfilled the reality of the prefigured image." (*Epist.* 63, n. 4. P. L. 4, 375-377).

We have already seen how St Ephraem (pp. 58-59) tells us that Christ took upon Himself in the Supper the character of the Melchisedechian priesthood: "He broke the bread . . . He mingled the chalice . . . He the Priest of our propitiation offered the sacrifice to Himself . . . He assumed the priesthood of Melchisedech the figure of Himself."

Commenting on Psalm 109, St Jerome, as it were in the person of the Psalmist, addresses Christ giving praise to Him because He is to offer His Body and Blood for us in the rite of Melchisedech, when He gives us the sacrament, that is in bread and wine in the Supper: "FOR IN THAT MANNER IN WHICH MELCHISEDECH KING OF SALEM OFFERED BREAD AND WINE, SO SHALT THOU TOO OFFER THY BODY AND BLOOD, TRUE BREAD AND TRUE WINE. This is that Melchisedech who gave us the mysteries which we have. It is He who said: *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood.* He gave us His sacrament according to the order of Melchisedech." (*Tractat. de Ps. 109. Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. 3, pars. 2, p. 201).

St Leo speaks in the same strain when he says that the priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech was discharged by Christ, when He consecrated the bread and wine in the Last Supper: "It was He

WHOSE FIGURE MELCHISEDECH THE HIGH PRIEST WAS, not offering Jewish sacrifices to God, but IMMOLATING THE SACRIFICE OF THAT SACRAMENT WHICH OUR REDEEMER CONSECRATED IN HIS BODY AND BLOOD." *Sermo*, 5, c. 3. P. L. 54, 154).

Arnobius Junior distinctly says, that Christ was made a priest according to the order of Melchisedech because of the mystery which He consecrated in bread and wine: "By the mystery of the bread and wine He was made priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, who alone of all priests offered in bread and wine, when Abraham returned victorious from the battle" (*In Psalm 109*, P. L. 53, 496).

These early Fathers have a host of mediaeval followers. Thus Isidore⁶

⁶ "Christ our Lord and Master first instituted the sacrifice which Christians offer to God, when before He was betrayed HE GAVE HIS BODY AND BLOOD to the Apostles, as we read in the Gospel: *Jesus took bread and blessing gave to them* (Matth XXVI. 26). Melchisedech king of Salem first offered this sacrifice as a TYPE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, and he was the first to intimate in image the same mystery of this great sacrifice, BEARING THE LIKENESS OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, THE ETERNAL PRIEST, of whom it is said: *Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.* Hence Christians are commanded to offer this sacrifice, the sacrifices of the Jews, which were commanded to be offered, in the bondage of the ancient people, abandoned and abrogated. And so we do WHAT THE LORD HIMSELF DID FOR US, BEING WHAT HE OFFERED not in the morning but towards the evening after He had supped. For thus it behoved Christ to fulfill the type towards

sees in Melchisedech a figure of Christ doing what we do now when we offer the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord, the true Pasch. Bede⁷ holds that it was actually in the Supper that Christ showed Himself a priest according to the order of Melchisedech. Claudius of Turin agrees with Bede.⁸ Theodulf of Orleans makes the sacrifice of our Lord in the Supper the antitype of Melchisedech.⁹ Amalaricus,¹⁰ Cardinal Humbert,¹¹ Gerhoh

the evening that the HOUR OF THAT SACRIFICE might show the evening of the world. And therefore the Apostles did not communicate fasting, because the typical pasch had to be fulfilled, and only thus should they pass on to the true sacrament of the Pasch" (*De ecclesiasticis officiis*, l. 10, c. 18, n. 1-2. P.L. 83, 754).

⁷ Having quoted Luke XXII. 19, he continues: "Having completed the ceremonies of the ancient pasch . . . He passes on to the new Pasch . . . in order to show that by substituting the sacrament of His Body and Blood for the flesh and blood of the lamb in the figure of bread and wine, it was of Himself that it was said: *The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech* (l. 6. P.L. 92, 596 in *Lucae evangelium expositio*).

⁸ "Melchisedech did not offer fleshly victims but bread and wine, like Christ offering to God the Father the oblation of bread and wine, that is His Body and Blood" (*In Hebr.*, VII. 17, P.L. 104).

⁹ "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him. For it is the saving sacrifice offered in type of the Body and Blood of Christ by Melchisedech in the Old Testament, which in the New Testament the Mediator between God and man fulfilled." (*Liber de ordine baptismi*, c. 18, P.L. 105, 259-260).

¹⁰ Christ the Lord is a priest for ever ac-

of Reichersberg,¹² say the same. From the Greek writers of the Middle Ages we select Euthymius Zigabenus. He follows closely in this sense.¹³

The Liturgies also reflect the Melchisedechian character of the Supper. For instance, at one time in the church of Milan, there was the following passage in the canon proper to Holy Thursday: "We therefore beseech thee, O Lord, graciously to regard this oblation which we offer to thee in our celebration of the day of the Lord's Supper, at which our Lord Jesus Christ thy Son instituted the rite of

according to the order of Melchisedech who, king of Salem, that is king of peace, offered bread and wine in figure of the true priesthood of Christ, who OFFERED to God bread, that is His immaculate Body, and wine, that is His Blood: and according to this type the Church now offers bread and wine in the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord". (*Eclogae de ordine romano*, n. 19. P.L. 98; or 105, 1234).

¹¹ The priesthood of Melchisedech was merely a shadow of the priesthood of Christ "Because Melchisedech did not offer to the Deity his own body and blood in bread and wine" (*Adv. Graecorum calumnias*, c. 42. P.L. 143, 958-959).

¹² "Christ was . . . a priest according to the order of Melchisedech who offered bread and wine, whereas He immolated Himself to the Father, as food and drink for the faithful" (*In Psalm 109*, 4. P.L. 194, 696).

¹³ "Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech. In very truth a priest, for He gave the mystic bread and wine to the apostles in the Supper, just as Melchisedech gave bread and wine to Abraham and his companions returning from war". (*In Psalm 109*, 4. P.G. 120, 1088).

sacrifice in the New Testament, while He transformed bread and wine, which the priest Melchisedech had offered in figure of the future mystery, into the sacrament of His Body and Blood." (*Canon antiquus missae Ambrosianae in coena Domini*, in Muratori, *De rebus liturgicis dissertatio*, c. 10. P. L. 74, 944). These words mark the similarity in the actual rite of sacrifice between Christ offering and Melchisedech offering.

To sum up: The *Epistle to the Hebrews* places our Lord's establishment of the Melchisedechian priesthood totally in the offering of the sacrifice of the Passion. The Church through the Fathers assigns this establishment particularly to the Supper. Is not the natural conclusion this: that the Passion was offered in the Supper? And hence that the one indivisible sacrifice of Christ results from the Passion and the Supper, the one unique fulfillment of the ancient figure?

B) THE RESEMBLANCE BETWEEN THE OFFERING OF MELCHISEDECH AND THE VICTIM OF THE CROSS

St Ambrose is our first witness here. He does undoubtedly see the type of Christ in Melchisedech, by reason of the bread and wine.¹⁴ And

¹⁴ Compare *De Mysteriis* 8. P.L. 16, 404: "Melchisedech met Abraham and brought forth those things which Abraham venerated and received . . . Therefore the sacrament

yet the holy Doctor says "Melchisedech, who according to the Latin interpretation is said to be king of justice and king of peace, blessed Abraham. *For he was a priest of the Most High God.* But who is the King of Justice and the King of Peace, but He to whom it is said: *Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech*, that is the Son of God, the Priest of the Father WHO BY THE SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY MADE PROPITIATION TO THE FATHER FOR OUR SINS?" (*De Abraham*, l, 1, c. 3, n. 16. P. L. 14, 427).

How does Christ correspond to Melchisedech? How, in other words, does our High Priest *according to the order of Melchisedech* accord with that Melchisedech who offered bread and wine? He accords in this, that He offered the sacrifice of His Body and Blood and thus placated the Father for us, He offered the sacrifice of the Redemption, He offered the Victim of the Passion. Such is the reply of Ambrose. But may I ask: How does the Victim of the Passion correspond to the offering of bread and wine, unless the Victim is offered in bread and wine by Christ as Priest, enacting the sacrifice of our Redemption and of His own death, in the Supper?

Sedulius Scotus is even more definite in this sense. He says that there

which you have received is not a human gift, it is divine, it was brought forth by him who blessed Abraham, the father of the faithful" etc. etc.

was this in common between Christ and Melchisedech: that Melchisedech offered sacrifice in bread and wine, and Christ offered Himself in sacrifice on the altar of the Cross. Thus it appears to me that the immolation, and the crucifixion, of Christ is placed before us as offered under the species of bread and wine. "According to the order of Melchisedech. Because Melchisedech offered bread and wine for Abraham, in figure of Christ offering His own Body and Blood to God the Father on the Cross." (*In Hebr.*, V. 6. P. L. 103, 258).

St Bruno the Carthusian similarly places the antitype of the offering of Melchisedech in the crucified Flesh of Christ: "As Priest of the most high Father, HE OFFERED ON THE CROSS THE SACRIFICE OF THE TRUE BREAD AND WINE, THAT IS THE SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD." (*Expositio in Psalm 109*, 4. P. L. 152 1228). Is it not plain that Bruno interweaves the Supper and the Passion in the offering of the one sacrifice?

C) THE ONENESS OF THE MELCHISEDECHIAN SUPPER AND THE PASSION

To begin, let us recall how according to Cassiodorus and his school, Christ exercised the order of Melchisedech in the bread and wine of the Supper, while at the same time the priesthood of Christ admits of one sacrificial activity, by which He

once offered Himself to be immolated (See p. 72).

Moreover the Fathers implicitly acknowledge the oneness of the Supper and the Passion in this, that at one time they speak of the order of Melchisedech wholly in the Passion, at another the very same Fathers speak of it wholly in the Supper. Chrysostom for instance, explaining Psalm 109. 4, establishes the likeness between Christ and Melchisedech primarily in the fact that Melchisedech, like Christ, brought bread and wine; then he proceeds upon this foundation to build other similarities.¹⁵ Indeed commenting on the fifteenth chapter of *Genesis*, he finds the whole character of the type verified in the one mystery of the bread and wine.¹⁶

¹⁵ "Why did he say according to the order of Melchisedech? Both ON ACCOUNT OF THE SACRAMENTS, because he also offered in bread and wine for Abraham, also because this priesthood is free from the Law, and as St. Paul says *hath neither beginning of days nor end of life*. For what he had in figure, that Christ had in reality". (*Expositio in Psalm 109*, n. 8 P.G. 56, 276-277. Compare editor's preface, parag. VII. col. 20-21, who gives the text as genuine, though some consider it doubtful).

¹⁶ "Afterwards Melchisedech king of Salem, bringing forth breads and wine, offered them to him (*For, he says, he was a priest of the most high God*) and he accepted what was offered by him. Rightly and justly he accepted them from Melchisedech; for holy Scripture indicated his power, saying *he was a priest of the most high God*, BUT WHAT WAS DONE WAS IN TYPE OF CHRIST, AND THE VERY THINGS OFFERED PRE-SIGNIFIED THE MYSTERY. Hence he did not re-

We must note what Chrysostom, commenting on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, says about the priesthood of Christ *according to the order of Melchisedech*? He repeats what the author of the *Epistle* says: namely that Christ was priest precisely when He offered that sacrifice, by the one offering of which He completed the whole work of the Redemption.¹⁷ Moreover, dealing with the Jews, while he argues at length that the translation from the priesthood of Aaron to Christ's priesthood *according to the order of Melchisedech* was foretold by the prophets, he nevertheless follows the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, saying nothing about the likeness between Christ and Melchisedech in respect of the rite, as though influenced to silence for the same reason as the Apostle—not as silent because he does not know, but passing over in silence what he does know.¹⁸ Now as Chrysostom sees on the one hand the Melchisedechian priesthood of Christ wholly in the Lord's consecration of the bread and wine, and on the other hand sees it wholly in the Passion, what other possible

ject it" (*In Genesim* hom. 36, n. 3. P.G. 53, 356-357; compare hom. 35, n. 5, col. 328).

¹⁷ "He was made priest when He took flesh, when He offered the sacrifice . . . St Paul points implicitly to the greatness of the sacrifice, which being ONE SUFFICED, AND OFFERED ONCE availed more than all the others." (*In Epist. ad Hebr.* hom 13, n. 1-3. P.G. 62, 103-107).

¹⁸ *Adv. Judaeos*, 1, 7. P.G. 48, 922-925.

inference follows from his words but this: that in its Melchisedechian character the Supper was one with the Passion, because the sacrifice of the Passion was offered in the mystery of bread and wine by a priest *according to the order of Melchisedech*?

Theodoretus has the following remarks on *Psalms* 109, 4:

1) Christ as *priest according to the order of Melchisedech* offered Himself to God for all mankind.

2) The office of this His priesthood commenced on the night of the Last Supper, after which He went up to the Cross.

3) Having discharged that office, He does not again offer, except through the members of that body of which He is the Head.¹⁹ And in

¹⁹ "Melchisedech is not the priest of the Jews but of the world. So too Christ the LORD OFFERED HIMSELF TO GOD FOR ALL MANKIND, and not for the Jews only. HE COMMENCED HIS PRIESTHOOD ON THE NIGHT BEFORE HIS PASSION: *when having taken bread, and given thanks, he broke and said: Take ye and eat; this is my body. In like manner also the chalice, when he had mingled, he gave to his disciples, saying: Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins. . . .* Moreover Christ is priest now, He does not Himself offer, but is the Head of those who do offer. For He calls the Church His body and through her, He as Man discharges the priesthood . . . It is the Church who offers the symbols of the Body and Blood, sanctifying the whole of the faithful through the first fruits (Christ)" (*In Psalm* 109. 4, 2. P.G. 80, 1772-3).

the *Epistle to the Hebrews* he states again:

1) Christ (by the Passion) offered His Body and Blood, as a *priest according to the order of Melchisedech*.

2) Afterwards He offered no other sacrifice.

3) Our sacrificial activity is simply the memorial of that one sacrifice.²⁰

Compare these triple statements, and again there is no other probable inference but that one and the same indivisible sacrifice had place in the Supper and in the Passion, commenced in the Supper and completed in the Passion, and that when we do what Christ did in the Supper, we make the memorial of that one sacrifice.

Amongst the Latin Fathers we have St Augustine. He evidently held that the Victim of the Passion was offered by a priest *according to*

²⁰ "ONE SACRIFICE sufficed for salvation . . . Because at the same time Priest and Victim *He offered His own Body*. What ministry does He exercise WHO OFFERED HIMSELF ONCE AND OFFERED NO FURTHER SACRIFICE? . . . If then the legal priesthood came to an end, and moreover THE PRIEST WHO IS ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH OFFERED SACRIFICE, AND MADE EVERY OTHER SACRIFICE UNNECESSARY, why do the priests of the New Testament offer a mystic liturgy? To those who are instructed in divine knowledge it is quite clear that we do not offer another sacrifice, but we OFFER THE MEMORIAL OF THAT ONE SAVING SACRIFICE. FOR the Lord Himself commands us to do so: *Do this for a commemoration of me.*" (*In Hebr.*, VII. 27 and VIII. 1-4. P.G. 83, 733-736).

the order of Melchisedech. "For He is not a priest in that He is the Son of the Father, God of God, co-eternal with the Progenitor, but because of the assumed flesh, BECAUSE OF THE VICTIM WHICH, RECEIVED FROM US, HE WILL OFFER FOR US . . . I am speaking to the faithful. If the catechumens do not understand, they must have done with sloth and secure instruction. HENCE THERE IS NO NEED TO REVEAL THE MYSTERIES. Scripture will tell you what that priesthood is which is *according to the order of Melchisedech*." The very obscurity of his words is to us, the faithful who know, the most telling evidence that he refers to the flesh offered by the priest in the sacrament. Nevertheless that he is here concerned with the actual sacrifice of the Passion is suggested by the trend of his language ("because of the VICTIM which, received from us, He will offer for us"); moreover his hearers (though some of them were still without knowledge of the Eucharist) would be taken to know of what sacrifice the Victim was commemorated.²¹

In proving to the Jews that the

²¹ In the book *De diversis quaestionibus* LXXXIII, q. 61, n. 2 (P.L. 40, 49) we find this double proposition: Christ offered Himself a holocaust for our sins (in the sacrifice of the redemption); and He instituted the *likeness* of this holocaust to be celebrated in memory of His Passion: "He is also our *priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech*, who offered Himself a holocaust for our sins and commanded the likeness of His sacrifice to be celebrated

Eucharist was presigned in Melchisedech, Isidore refers to the "rite" of the sacrifice which Christ carried out in such manner that He fulfilled it. "For the figure of this sacrifice was depicted beforehand in the priesthood of Melchisedech. For when he blessed Abraham he was a priest of the most high God, and because of the mystery of the holocaust to come he offered bread and wine in sacrifice to the Lord. This he first expressed in type of the Son of God, to whom, in the person of the Psalmist, the Father says: *Before the day-star I begot thee: thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech*: THAT IS, ACCORDING TO THE RITE²² of this sacrifice, which Christ also fulfilled in carrying it to completion in his passion.²³ St Paschasius

in memory of His Passion; and so, that which Melchisedech offered to God, we see offered now throughout the whole world in the Church of Christ." Our sacrifice therefore is similar to the holocaust by which Christ redeemed us. A probable inference from this would be that, like our own sacrifice, the sacrifice of the Redemption was offered under the appearance of bread and wine. However I must admit as also possible that the likeness may be here taken as that of the symbol to the reality, of the sacramental immolation to the immolation in blood. In that event it would have no bearing on the present question.

²² Note the words "according to the order . . . that is according to the rite".

²³ St Martin of Leon (P.L. 208, 1339) inserting this passage of Isidore in his 34th Sermon, concludes it more tersely: ". . . that is according to the rite of that kind of sacrifice which Christ fulfilled in His Passion."

Radbertus says that the true Pasch in which the figures of the Passion were fulfilled, was celebrated in the rite of Melchisedech: "Let the faithful soul consider the difference between the typical pasch in which the lamb was slain and eaten in the same supper, and the Pasch which is immediately afterwards celebrated in bread and wine *according to the order of Melchisedech*. . . . The legal lamb with its chalice came first in figure of the passion of Christ. Then the Body and the Blood in the chalice came in fulfillment of the truth, SO THAT WHAT WENT BEFORE IN MELCHISEDECH SHOULD BE WHOLLY FULFILLED IN CHRIST . . . Let the faithful soul understand in this action, that the most loving Jesus, taking bread and wine, passes from the figure and shadow of the reality on to the true sacrament of the Pasch, so that no jot or tittle should be taken from the Law, nay He being the corner stone holding together both laws, as the true Melchisedech offers bread and wine, which was the prefigured sacrament of His Body and Blood." (*Epist. de corp. et sang. Dom. ad Frudegardum*, P. L. 120, 1359-1360).

Elsewhere in similar words, he shows that the whole sacerdotal function of our Redemption was enacted in the rite according to Melchisedech: "The legal lamb of old, which freed the people from the bondage of Egypt, by its annual immolation in memory of this de-

liverance availed to sanctify the same people until He, to whom this victim bore witness should come, AND BEING OFFERED A VICTIM FOR US TO THE FATHER IN THE ODOR OF SWEETNESS, after He had offered the legal lamb SHOULD TRANSFER THE MYSTERY OF HIS PASSION TO OTHER CREATED THINGS, BREAD AND WINE, made *a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, approaching in his own person to God, to make intercession for us.* And since even now, in the daily commemoration of the same blessed Passion, OUR REDEEMER DOES ALL THAT WHICH HE DID ONCE IN THE TIME OF HIS PASSION, this to my mind is the first and the principal reason for the constant repetition of the memory of His most holy death by us, when we immolate every day His most sacred Body and Blood on the table of the altar" (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, 9, 2. P. L. 120, 1294-1295). He offered Himself to the Father the Victim of the Redemption: He did this when once He transferred the mystery of His Passion from empty figures to the Melchisedechian species of the truth, made forever priest and sacrificer of His own Body and Blood.

Rupert of Dietz applies to the sacrificial action of the Supper the words of the Apostle representing Christ opening the way to heaven by His unique sacrifice: "Christ the Lord, Saint of saints, to whom the Father said with an oath: *Thou art*

a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, He the High Priest, He the Victim also, instituted the rite of the new sacrifice for us, on the night on which he was betrayed, taking bread and the chalice of wine and blessing and saying: This is my body, this is the chalice of my blood. For it was then that HE EXERCISED FOR THE FIRST TIME THE OFFICE OF HIS PRIESTHOOD, putting an end to the ancient priesthood, and after eating the typical lamb, HE WHO IS THE TRUE LAMB OFFERED HIMSELF TO GOD THE FATHER WITH HIS OWN HANDS: AND THIS IS WHAT THE APOSTLE SAYS: *that not by the blood of goats and oxen, but by his own blood, he entered once into the holies having found eternal redemption.* FOR IT WAS THEN THAT HE, THE ETERNAL PRIEST, OFFERED THAT VERY BODY WHICH WAS PUT TO DEATH BY THE UNGODLY, AND THAT SAME BLOOD WHICH WAS SHED ON THE CROSS." (*De divinis officiis*, 1, 5, c. 15. P. L. 170, 138-139). With His own hands He offered to God in the Supper the sacrifice of the Redemption, which the Apostle says was offered once.²⁴

²⁴ Later we shall cite another passage from Rupert more opportunely in the same sense and at least equally worthy of consideration. Meantime compare what he had written already (1, 2, c. 8, col. 39-40): "The High Priest about TO GO HENCE TO THE HOLY PLACE OF HEAVEN BY WAY OF THE PASSION, SACRIFICES IN A WONDERFUL MANNER according to His own order, according to the rite of a heavenly sacrifice, taking bread etc". It has been already shown how this

Already we have seen St Thomas grouping together, in the sacrifice of Christ, the immolation in blood made by the Jews, the offering of the eternal Victim, and the manner of offering which we can follow in our own sacrificial offering; so here too when dealing with this question, he groups together the same three, distinguishing in the teaching of the Apostle: the affirmation of the priesthood, the affirmation of the eternal priesthood, and the affirmation of the priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech: "The Apostle says *Priest*: because He offered Himself to God the Father (Eph., V. 2, *He loved us, and hath delivered himself up for us an oblation and a sacrifice to God*). And lest it be thought that this priesthood of Christ was the same as that of the old Law, he distinguishes it under two aspects. First, in respect of its dignity, because it is *forever*. Its Victim has the virtue of leading us to life everlasting: it *lasts forever*. Secondly, in respect of its rite, because animals were offered in the old Law, here

BREAD AND WINE IS OFFERED; and for this reason he says: *according to the order of Melchisedech*" (In *Hebr.* V. lect. 1). Now in the first point of the distinction we know that the sacrifice of the Passion is meant, not only from what is immediately sub-

true Melchisedech offered the sacrifice in bread and wine for Abraham and all mankind of all ages past.

joined: that the Victim of the Passion lasts forever, but also and especially from the *Epistle to the Ephesians* quoted by St Thomas, where St Paul refers to the Passion, and hence St Thomas also refers to it. But nevertheless this celebration is said to be enacted in bread and wine in the rite of Melchisedech.

Finally we have the following *Prosa de Eucharistia*²⁵ (from the Breviary of Bourges, Venice printed 1481. A. H. 15, 52-53), wherein the question is asked what was the anti-type of the sacrifice offered by Melchisedech, and the answer is that it was *that Bread* which imparts life to the partakers, which *was affixed to the Cross*, and was slain by the Cross, as was said by the Prophet (Vulgate): *And I was a meek lamb, that is carried to be a victim: and I knew not that they had devised counsels against me, saying: let us put wood in his bread*, that is the wood of the Cross:

"Choir of the New Jerusalem rejoice,

And wonder what this victim is,

²⁵ This must not be confused (as was done by J. Mearns, *Early Latin Hymnaries, an Index of Hymns in Hymnaries before 1100*, Cambridge 1913, p. 18) with the Hymn of St. Fulbert of Chartres, *Chorus novae Hierusalem, Nova meli dulcedinem*, etc. in J. Stevenson, *The later hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Durham, 1851, or in H. A. Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus*, Halis 1841, tom. 1, p. 221 and therefrom in P.L. 141, 352. Ulysse Chevalier in his *Repertorium* carefully distinguishes the two.

Which Melchisedech the priest
foresaw

Offering in praise, when on the
way

He mystically met Abraham:

He figured Christ who in our belief
IS LIVING BREAD AND FIXED ON THE
CROSS

Who rising does not die again.

Christ as BREAD is set before us,

Which TAKEN gives life to the soul;
AND IN THE BREAD THE WOOD IS
PUT,

WHEN THE WOOD OF THE CROSS
DEALS DEATH TO HIM."

The sayings of the Fathers, early theologians and Liturgists are instructive, but no less instructive is their *silence*. Not even one (to my knowledge) definitely declared for that dual sacrificial action of our Lord, which many later theologians (mainly post-mediaeval) are wont not exactly to propound directly as a thesis but to assume:²⁶ AS IF IT

²⁶ It is notable that Muratori, a man extraordinarily well versed in patristic and liturgical studies, even when defending a twofold sacrificial activity in Christ our Priest, yet does so in such fashion as to lend the great weight of his authority to our teaching: "As we know, he says, from Psalm 109 and from the Epistle of St Paul to the Hebrews, Christ was Priest and Pontiff according to the order of Melchisedech. Anyone who honestly and dispassionately considers this truth must see what we are looking for. To the Jews and the Gentiles alike, priest or pontiff was simply sacrificer. Deny the right of sacrificing to anyone, and you must forthwith deny him the right to be called priest; Christ the Lord on

WERE AN INFERENCE NECESSARILY FOLLOWING ON THE NUMERICAL DISTINCTION, WHICH ON THE ADMISSION OF ALL MUST EXIST BETWEEN THE SACRIFICIAL ACTIVITIES REPEATED BY THE CHURCH AND THE SACRIFICIAL ACTION WHEREBY CHRIST REDEEMED US. But this inference does not follow (as we shall see more clearly later), for the numerical distinction between the sacrificial offerings of the Mass and the sacrifice of the Redemption does not imply a duality in the sacrifice of the Supper and the Passion.

In our own day Dr Alexander MacDonald, a Canadian theologian, formerly of St. Andrew's, Antigon-

the Cross was truly Priest and Victim; but He did not offer sacrifice like Melchisedech on the Cross. He only discharges this office, when in imitation of Melchisedech He offers bread and wine to God in the sacred mysteries. And seeing that there is no sacrifice without a priest, and no priest without a sacrifice, seeing also that there is no other place where Christ fulfils the priesthood and the sacrifice after the manner of Melchisedech, except in the consecration and the offering of the bread and wine, we must necessarily place this other sacrifice of our Lord in that sublime action." (*De rebus liturgicis dissertatio*, cap. 18. P.L. 74, 999). When he says that the Melchisedechian priesthood of our Lord was exercised in the Supper, he is at one with all the Fathers and with the whole Church. But when he says that the Melchisedechian sacrifice was not the actual sacrifice of the Cross, is he not in opposition to the plainest evidence of the Scriptures? The Catholic theologian should be consistent, and admit that the Melchisedechian sacrifice was commenced in the Supper and completed on the Cross.

ish, later Bishop of Victoria, now of Hebron, wrote well:

“The idea that under the New Dispensation there are two sacrifices, or that Christ was offered TWICE (i.e. by Himself), or that the Eucharistic sacrifice is other than that which was offered up on Calvary, is foreign to the mind of the Church in every century of her existence from the days of the Apostles. In vain will you seek for such an idea in the writings of the New Testament. St Paul indeed is the only one of the New Testament writers who deals expressly with the subject, and certainly St. Paul speaks only of the one sacrifice of Christ. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he insists again and again on the oneness of Christ’s sacrifice; he rings the changes upon it. After introducing our Lord as priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech he passes right on to speak of His “one oblation,” which is that of Calvary; this is only what we should expect; for the Eucharistic sacrifice, though offered after the order of Melchisedech, was consummated on Calvary, and would not at all exist but for the death of the Victim on the Cross . . . On the supposition that the Eucharistic sacrifice is other than that of Calvary, a distinct oblation containing within itself all the elements of a real sacrifice, would be, to say the least misleading.” (*The Sacrifice of the New Law*, in the *Ecclesiastical*

Review, Dec. 1. 1905, vol 33. p. 629). Here in a nutshell we have the whole teaching of antiquity.

D) EPILOGUE ON HEBREWS IX. 14

I think that this discussion on the Melchisedechian priesthood of Christ furnishes a key to the explanation of several passages in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. Of these by far the most important occurs in *Hebr.*, XIII. 10: *We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle*, which will come up for consideration later. For the present we shall confine ourselves to another passage (*Hebr.* IX 14), the interpretation of which has been a source of trouble to exegetes: *The blood of Christ, who by the Holy [the better codices have ETERNAL] Spirit offered himself unspotted to God, shall cleanse etc.* It is very true that if Christ offered Himself to death in the Eucharistic rite, He did offer Himself to God by the eternal Spirit, that is, by some spiritual power of the divinity, the same almighty power which the Church at a later period was to invoke in her epicleses, call it the power of God, or of the Word or of the Holy Ghost, or of the Word and the Holy Ghost. The other sacrifices were not offered by the divine power, but by an action of some kind within the ambit of human power, for instance, the

pouring out of blood, the kindling of fire, or some such action.

Hence Chrysostom (in h. l.) "The phrase of Scripture *through the Holy Spirit*, makes it clear that He did not offer Himself through fire, or through any other agency than the Holy Spirit" (P. G. 63, 120). Hence the words of the Church in the *Roman Missal*: "According to the will of the Father BY THE CO-OPERATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, thou didst by thy death give life to the world." Just as Christ in the Supper offered Himself by the divine Spirit, so we also offer Him when we celebrate Mass. Possibly this is the allusion of St Paul, when he speaks in liturgical figures of his apostolate among the Gentiles. To my mind he is here directing the attention of the reader, not so much to the Mosaic rites, as to the Eucharistic mystery of our faith and Redemption:²⁷ (*the grace*) *which is given to me by God, that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles: sanctifying the gospel*

²⁷ Crampon writes in reference to this passage: "St Paul describes his preaching among the pagans, under an image borrowed from the Mosaic sacrifices." I think however, that the words *sanctified by the Holy Spirit*, have an implication other than the Mosaic sacrifices, because the Law did not have this sanctification of the Spirit, but only of the flesh. The Melchisedechian priesthood of our Redeemer alone was capable of spiritual sanctification, as we learn from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*.

of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Spirit. (Rom. XV. 15-16). These words of St Paul are certainly applied to our sacrifice in the offertory of the *Greek Liturgy of St James*: "Deign O Lord, to make us . . . ministers of thy unspotted mysteries . . . and in thy bounty . . . accept from us sinners the proposed gifts, and grant that our oblation may be made acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Spirit (B. 48; compare Salaville D.T.C., art. *Epiclese* col 222-223). But the Roman Church in the past declared far more definitely and distinctly, that our offering was made by the Holy Spirit: "Graciously regard the gift of thy people, O Lord, in which there is NO ALIEN FIRE ON THY ALTARS, NOR IS THE BLOOD OF IRRATIONAL ANIMALS SHED, BUT BY THE OPERATING POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, our sacrifice is now the Body and the Blood of the Priest Himself" (*Oratio missae tertiae in Natali Domini* in the *Liber sacramentorum romanae ecclesiae*, dicto Leonino P. L. 55, 147).²⁸

We think then that Christ offered Himself by the Eternal or by the Holy Spirit, precisely in that by the consecration of the bread into His Body and the wine into His Blood, He acted as Priest of that unique sacrifice, whereby He found eternal

²⁸ Compare the Chaldaic anaphora cited towards the end of the III Thesis. (p. 74.)

redemption for us—that is the sacrifice of His Passion and death.²⁹

²⁹ Hence commenting on the words of *Exodus: on that night they shall eat flesh roasted at the fire*, Rupert wisely remarks: “Because a Virgin conceived Him from the Holy Spirit who is eternal fire, and, as the

Apostle says, *He* by the same *Holy Spirit offered himself* a living Victim to the living *God*: by the same fire He is roasted on the altar. For by the operation of the Holy Spirit, the bread becomes the Body, and the wine becomes the Blood of Christ.” (*De Trin. et op. ej., In Exod.* l. 2, c. 10. P.L. 167, 617). See also Scheeben *Dogmatik*, 3; n. 1491, on this argument.

§ 4. The Supper and the Promise of the Eucharist

Introducing His discourse on the Flesh to be given TOGETHER WITH THE BLOOD (John VI. 53-59) Christ said to the multitudes: *The bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world* (verse 51 Vulgate, and verse 52 Douay).¹ Therefore before Christ was to give His Flesh with the bread as food, He was to give it over to death in sacrifice, for the life of the world; and He was to give it as bread.² This declaration of

¹ A longer form of this verse: *The bread which I will give, is my flesh which I will give, for the life of the world* is found in a number of the Greek Fathers (compare Maldonatus in h. l.). Two Syrian versions, the Pischita and the Syrian version of the Hexapla have the longer reading also, and so too have the *Diatesseron* of Tatianus (cf. *Ciasca Tatiani evangeliorum harmoniae, arabice*, p. 35). Apparently the longer reading must be abandoned, for the phrase corresponding to the second *I will give* is absent from most of the other codices, N.B. C.D. also from the ancient Latin version, and from the Syrian versions Cur and Sin. It is absent also from the Ethiopian version, as my learned colleague L. Gry informs me. The ancient codex *N* (N) puts the phrase corresponding to *is my flesh* after *for the life of the world*, and Tischendorf-Gebhardt follows this reading. The remaining witness whom Nestle follows, puts the word *is my flesh* before. This latter sequence which we follow is apparently the more probable; if we choose the former however it would favour us even more in the present discussion.

² Among non-Catholics, even Loisy writes: "The scene indicated by the context wherein is dominant the thought of Christ given in food, as flesh and blood in a state of death, is evidently this: *And the bread*

death in bread would scarcely be intelligible at all until the time arrived when Christ in the Last Supper said to His apostles: *This is my body (which is given for you), this is my blood which is shed for many unto the remission of sins*. For it was at the time of the Supper that He revealed the mystery to the eyes of faith, giving His own Flesh over to death under the appearance of bread. It was at the time of the Supper, as Christ had foretold, that the Eucharistic bread was the Body of the Victim devoted to death, the Body to be immolated.

Hence too "all the best of the ancient authors very rightly say that these words are to be understood of the Eucharist" as Maldonatus (in h. l.) holds; and Cajetan likewise

which I shall give, is my flesh, my flesh given for the life of the world. The idea of the Passion and that of the Eucharist are as closely linked together in the fourth Gospel as in St Paul and in the Synoptic narratives of the Last Supper . . . It would be going too far to deny in this discourse all allusion to the death of Jesus; the idea of the death is there in the background, invisible but ever present; and the idea of Christ, Lamb of God, true Paschal Victim, true Pasch of the Christian, is suggested in the date which the Evangelist assigns to the multiplication of the loaves" (*Le quatrième Evangile*, p. 455-456.) What Toletus had already written is worthy of note: "The *Flesh* which is to be given unto death for *the life of the world*, that very same *Flesh* is *the bread which I will give*" (In h.l. Col. Agr., 1589, p. 585). And he says this notwithstanding the fact that (unlike the Greek writers and Maldonatus, see below), he very rightly reads *I will give* but once in the text.

writes: "He clearly says that this bread will be His Passion and death."³ For as Knabenbauer (in h. l.) says: "Both the sacrifice of the Cross and the Eucharist are indicated here." Indeed both are al- luded to as one. Christ gave His Flesh—bread, for the salvation of the world: He offered the sacrifice of His death in bread, we make the commemoration of this sacrifice, when subordinate to Him we offer the death of Christ. Thus therefore both the Eucharist and the Passion are intertwined in the realisation of the one fulfillment of the promise of Christ. *The bread which I will give*

[in sacrifice] *is my flesh for the life of the world.*⁴

Two considerations help to clarify this point still further.

In the first place, the series and the interconnection of the statements of the Lord through the whole dis- course after the multiplication of the loaves. For having said that He is the bread of life, which must be eaten (v. 27-50), He goes on to tell how this must be. In explanation He lays down two conditions: (1) that the bread is the bread of SACRIFICE (v. 51 or 52. Vulgate); (2) it is to be eaten after the man- ner OF A SACRIFICIAL BANQUET (v. 54-58).

In respect of the first, He explains the SACRIFICIAL OFFERING of the bread as the offering of His Flesh to redeem the world from death to life. In respect of the second, He points out distinctly the character of the SACRIFICIAL BANQUET in bread (now coupled with the drink) in the following way: the bread is the Flesh which must be eaten, the wine the Blood which must be drunk; by this separate mention of eating the Body and drinking the Blood not only is the death condi-

³ "He clearly says that this bread will be His Passion and death . . . and IN SAYING *I will give* HE SIGNIFIES THAT HE WOULD SUFFER AND DIE BY A VOLUNTARY GIFT" (Cajetan, *Evangelia cum commentariis*, in h.l. Paris, 1540, fol. 251. D). The authority of Cyril of Alexandria favours this interpretation, he writes on this text: "*And the bread which I will give, is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world.* He says: I die for all, in order to give life to all through myself, and I have made my Flesh the price of the flesh of all mankind. For in my death death will die, and the fallen nature of man will rise again with me. Moreover that Christ offered His Flesh *for the life of the world*, will be plain to us from His own words: *For them do I sanctify myself . . .* Note how He says *I sanctify* for I CONSECRATE AND I OFFER an immaculate Vic- tim in the odour of sweetness. For what was offered on the altar was sanctified or called holy in the Law. Therefore Christ gave His Body for the life of all, and by His Body He again put life into them. For after the lifegiving Word of God dwelt in the flesh, He made that flesh lifegiving. For this reason the Body of Christ gives life to the partakers of It." (P.G. 73, 565).

⁴ In the *Catena aurea* (in h.l.) St Thomas adverts to this, giving the following words as from Bede: "*The bread which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world.* THE LORD GAVE THIS BREAD WHEN He gave the mystery of His Body and Blood to the disciples, and WHEN He offered Himself to the Father on the altar of the Cross."

tion indicated, but the feeding upon the victim of the immolation also.

But the condition of sacrificial banquet is consequent on the sacrificial offering which is necessarily presupposed. For the bread is the sacrificial food (to be given to man), because it is the sacrificial gift (made to God). And so when Christ was explaining the lifegiving virtue of the Eucharistic mystery, it was necessary for Him to speak first of the sacrificial offering. (For as will be shown in the third book, the Eucharist is a sacrament only in as much as it is the Victim of a sacrifice to be partaken of by us). Once admit then that the bread in v. 51 (Vulgate v. 52) is said to be offered to God by way of sacrifice, and it will be practically impossible to avoid this conclusion: the sacrificial offering of the bread is the offering of Christ to death *for the life of the world*.

Secondly, consider the interpretation forced on those theologians who, regardless of the sequence of the sentences, refuse to see in v. 51(52) any sacrificial offering of the bread. To them Christ here signified: (1) nothing more than that the bread is His very own Flesh; (2) and none other than the Flesh which He was to offer on the Cross. Christ therefore enunciating two identities, the one that of the bread with the Flesh, the other the identity of this Flesh with the real Flesh to be uplifted on the Cross, merely

desired by this second identity to emphasize the reality of the Flesh contained in the bread. On such a supposition however this second identity would be purely material, formal in no wise, for an expression such as “. . . my Flesh is taken from the maternal womb” would serve Christ’s purpose just as well. Hence this interpretation must be rejected as unsatisfactory.

You may urge perhaps that here Christ not only declares the identity, but affirms also a SYMBOLICAL relation in the bread to the sacrifice of the Cross, just as if He were to say: the bread which I will give to you, will be my Flesh which is given to God on the Cross in such a way that the sacrifice of my Passion will also be represented by a previous sacrifice under the appearance of bread (and wine). But obviously this explanation strains the meaning of the text. There is no word about a representative nexus as between sacrifice and sacrifice. Hence if this explanation contains any element of truth, it can only be considered as a consequence of the literal meaning of the text, which we have admitted.

We may remark in addition that the explanation of our opponents cannot well be defended in either of these interpretations, unless the expression *I will give* only once pronounced, has a double reference to two things worlds apart—according as it is applied to the bread or to the

Flesh. To the Flesh as to be given to God for us (*for the life of the world*). To the bread as to be given to us, not to God for us. Hence in respect of the bread, giving is affirmed and not offering, and in respect of the Flesh offering is affirmed, not giving. But there is a certain violence and distortion in this two-fold explanation of one single phrase; while the sentence is clearer and simpler, if the direction of giving once uttered, is specified both in the Flesh and in the bread by the words *for the life of the world* (Cf. Titelmann in h.l.).

Those who with Maldonatus admit the repetition of *I will give* in the text evade this last difficulty by saying that it is permissible to admit one kind of giving in the bread, and another kind in the Flesh—bread given to man in food, Flesh given to God as Victim. When “He says *give* TWICE, He indicates that He is speaking of diverse modes of giving” (Maldonatus in h.l.). However, not only must we reject this reading of the text; but the only reading other than the one I have followed which is at all probable is: *The bread which I will give for the life of the world is my flesh*. And this reading bears out our interpretation in so many words.

Another attempt to evade this difficulty consists in saying that the expression *for the life of the world* is absolute, as in the Pauline form of the Supper the words *for you*

(Cor IX. 24) are absolute. There would be no difficulty here, if the phrase *I will give* is understood as the giving of bread to us, not to God; and if we understood the phrase *for the life of the world* of the sacrificial offering of the flesh made to God. For the one locution *I will give* would not have two opposite directions. But this contention falls to the ground owing to the weakness of the parity between I. Cor., XI. 24 and John VI. 51 (or 52) on which it rests. Because in St. Paul we have: *This is my body which . . . for you*; but St John has not . . . *is my flesh which for the life of the world*; which is absent; thus the sentences do not run parallel. But even if the suggested interpretation were probable (and I have nowhere seen it approved), it certainly remains that the sacrificial offering of the Flesh of Christ unto death—*is my flesh (which) for the life of the world*—is assigned as formally causing and explaining the giving of the bread as food (*the bread which I will give*). Hence again follows what we have said above, that the eating of the Eucharistic food is set before us, as the partaking of the sacrifice in blood.⁵ But if the sacrifice in blood

⁵ Even with the longer reading with *I will give* twice, we should arrive at the same conclusion. Claudius de Sainctes (*De rebus eucharisticis, sexta repetitio* c. 4, Paris, 1575, fol. 227, b) who adopted the longer reading made the following admirable comment: “The Son of Man connects the two gifts:

is partaken of in the Eucharist it is also offered in the Eucharist. For every Catholic knows that what the faithful receive in the sacrament is precisely what was offered to God in the sacrament. Hence looked at from every aspect the words of St John convince us that Christ offered His Passion in the Supper.

May I appeal to the Eastern Liturgies quoted earlier in this chapter? We read that on the night on which He gave Himself *for the life of the world*, He took bread and consecrated it. In the *Greek Liturgy of St James*, for instance, Christ "*on the night on which he was betrayed*, nay on which He gave Himself *for the life and the salvation of the world*, . . . taking bread . . . gave etc." Similarly in the present *Syro-Antiochene Liturgy*: "On that night on which He gave Himself *for the life and salvation of the world*, taking bread etc." Finally, in the pres-

the bread which I will give, is my flesh which I will give, for the life of the world. He promises twice that He will give His Flesh. He promises once that He will give His Flesh to us, and once that He will give It for us, AND HE DESIRES US TO UNDERSTAND THE FIRST GIFT THROUGH THE SECOND, seeing that He deliberately unites both. And so let him who desires to know without error how the former gift is to be made remember how the latter was made. For what justification have we for separating the former giving from the latter, since this latter giving is added merely to interpret and to explain the former? He says: *The bread which I will give, is my flesh which I will give, for the life of the world.* THIS CONNECTION ALSO CONTAINS AN ALLUSION TO THE ANCIENT SACRIFICES."

*ent Liturgy of St John Chrysostom: "On the night on which He was betrayed, nay gave Himself over for the life of the world taking bread etc."*⁶ Expressions of this kind must describe Christ's manner of giving Himself for the life of the world—that is, giving to God in the Supper His own Flesh unto death, giving Himself Victim under the appearance of bread and wine.

Consider now the prayer over the oblata in the *Graeco-Alexandrine Liturgy of St. Mark*: "O Lord Jesus Christ, High Priest, bread which came down from heaven and raised our life from corruption, [bread] WHO GAVE HIMSELF *a spotless lamb for the life of the world*, we beg and we invoke thee, O God, lover of men, to look graciously upon this bread and these cups which the most holy table receives by the angelic liturgy and the archangelic choir and the priestly sacrifice". Is it possible to find a plainer interpretation of the Gospel than these words imply? That Christ gave Himself at once as bread and as lamb for the life of the world, and that in this His priesthood manifested itself? And truly the flesh of the lamb was given as bread for the life of the world, He gave Himself over to death in bread.

⁶ Compare the *Syriac Liturgy of St Ignatius*: "On the night of the Pasch on which He was given over *for the life and the salvation of the world*" (R. 2, 217), and many others in a like strain (*ibid.*, p. 245, etc.).

Hence the wisdom of the Armenian Church offering her prayers to God the Father through the Son: "victim and anointed (i.e. the christ or priest), Lamb and heavenly bread, at once archpriest and sacrifice." (B. 436; compare Max Saxon., *Missa Armenica*, p. 33). From the parallel or the antithesis of the two triads (victim = sacrifice = Lamb; anointed = archpriest = bread), we have a proof that the sacerdotal office of our Redeemer is assigned especially to the consecration of the bread, just as the victimal condition is found in the slaying to which the lamb was submitted.

Hence too the same Armenian Church (B. 419; cf. Le Brun, *Explication de la Messe*, t. 3, p. 109, and Max Saxoniae, *Missa Armenica*, p. 12-13), following the Greek *Liturgy of St. James* (B. 309) proclaims that the Father transmits to us the bread of heaven to be our Saviour and Redeemer: "O God our God, WHO DIDST TRANSMIT THE HEAVENLY BREAD, our Lord Jesus Christ, the nutriment of the whole world, AS SAVIOUR AND REDEEMER and Benefactor, blessing and sanctifying us, do thou O Lord, bless now also this proposed oblation; take it unto thy celestial altar". These words tell us that Christ was our Redeemer and Saviour under the very species of bread, that is to say in the Eucharistic rite.

John Gropper, learned theologian of the Church of Cologne, later

Cardinal, advanced this exegesis of ours in the Council of Trent, against the Reformers. Before the assembly of theologians gathered together in 1551, between the XIV and XV session, he presented the following two combined propositions: *First*: "And so Christ offered Himself to the Father for us on the Cross, from Him all received salvation. But He had previously offered Himself in the Supper under those species (and He commanded us to do this); AND THIS OFFERING OF THE SUPPER WAS THE SAME WITH THAT OF THE CROSS: for the sacrifice of Christ EMBRACES THAT WHOLE ACTION". *Secondly* "Then He fulfilled what He had promised (John VI): *The bread which I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world.* NOW TO GIVE HIS BODY FOR THE LIFE OF THE WORLD IS NOTHING ELSE THAN TO BE IMMOLATED, SEEING THEREFORE THAT HE GAVE HIS BODY IN THE SUPPER, HE GAVE THE FLESH OFFERED BY HIM FOR THE LIFE OF THE WORLD as the previous words of St. John denote. And thus are interpreted, and are to be interpreted, the words: *For them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified*" (Theiner *Acta authentica* Conc. Trident., 1, 818).

EPILOGUE: SOME THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES OF THIS DISCUSSION

To sum up finally, two theological arguments may be added to the

proofs we have so far advanced in these pages.

First. It is of faith that Christ offered a true sacrifice in the Supper. But unless He offered Himself to the immolation of the Passion, He did not offer a true sacrifice. For sacrifice is the offering of a victim immolated or to be immolated. Therefore there is no true sacrifice without true immolation. But there is no true immolation in the Supper; the immolation there is merely by way of symbol. What is represented in symbol is the immolation of Christ not yet made. Hence Christ is not offered in the Supper as already immolated, but He is offered as to be immolated. Therefore in the Supper He is offered to the immolation of the Cross.

Second. Had Christ in the Supper offered a sacrifice numerically other than the sacrifice of the Passion, He would already have made propitiation for the whole human race before the Passion. For on the

one hand, it is impossible to conceive the sacrifice of Christ as void (that is, not accepted by God) or ineffective (that is, without its own proper fruit);⁷ on the other hand, since it is ratified and efficacious, it cannot be less fruitful than the actual sacrifice of the Passion: for in the sacrifice personally offered by Christ Himself, there exists no reason for curtailing the fruit, such as we shall find in the Mass later. The sacrifice is therefore abundant, precisely because it is NOT SUBORDINATED to the sacrifice of the Cross, as our Mass is, but it is simply COORDINATED AND CONNUMERATED with it. But we shall have more to say of this, when we come to the definition and evaluation of the sacrifice of the Mass.

⁷ Bear in mind that this sacrifice (in which there is a pact or covenant with God) is, on the word of Christ Himself, offered for us *unto the remission of sins*. Moreover St. Paul openly declares that the Melchisedechian sacrifice of Christ was ratified and efficacious, efficient and sufficient.

§ 5. Some Circumstances of the Supper

A. THE BETRAYAL BY JUDAS

On the same night on which he was betrayed (I. Cor., XI. 23) Christ had the Supper; that is to say, at the very beginning of His Passion in its SOURCE, which was the betrayal of Judas.

That Christ's Passion had its source in the betrayal of Judas is evident from the very *action* of the drama. It was the action of the traitor and nothing else that gave Him over to His enemies. Nothing in the Passion is so insistently stressed by the Church in the Holy Week liturgy as this. Christ's own *words* to Pilate point to the same thing: *Thou shouldst not have any power against me, unless it were given to thee from above. Therefore he that hath delivered me to thee hath the greater sin.* (John XIX. 11)¹ as though Judas

¹ That Judas alone is referred to here, or at least referred to principally, even if we include the high priests and the Jews, is taught by Cyril of Alexandria in h.l. P.G. 7, 641 (compare Pusey edition 1872, t. 3, p. 73); by St Thomas in h.l.: "He that hath delivered thee to me hath the greater sin, that is Judas"; also by Denis the Carthusian in h.l. and by Calmet in h.l. Among modern writers, by Dehaut and Lesêtre *L'Évangile expliqué* 1904, and later Lagrange in h.l. also by Calmes *L'Évangile selon St Jean*, 1904. Non-Catholics also agree, v.g. Grotius in h.l. A. Barnes *Notes explicatives et pratiques sur les Évangiles*, Lausanne, 1880, p. 394; M. F. Sessler *The Gospel according to St John*, 5, 1891 in h.l. (Coll. Mc. X. 38).

by his betrayal caused and began that dread time in which in the designs of the Father, Christ was to be given over to men to do what they willed with Him. Finally, the order and sequence of the Synoptic *narratives*, where in each case we have the treachery of Judas set down as the head and source of the Passion, make it quite plain. Altogether apart from this, in the Synoptics the treachery of Judas is so closely knit with the Supper as to be either its prologue (*Matth.* XXVI. 21-25, *Mark.* XIV, 18-21) or its epilogue (*Luke* XXII 21-23). And in St John we read: *And when the supper was done, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, to betray him.* (*John* XIII. 2. compare XIII. 18, 26, 27, 30).

Evidently then the Supper is involved in the Passion, just as we have seen already the Passion was involved in the Supper. It is no surprise then to find the Supper and the Passion forming one body and substance of sacrifice, as it is one in narrative and general action.

St Thomas (3 S. 83, 5, 3m) taught expressly that the Supper, in consequence of the betrayal and selling of Christ, must be looked upon as part of the Passion: "The Passion of Christ was undergone in stages,

448; not to mention Loisy in h.l. Not a few modern writers however think (wrongly, I believe) that Judas is not intended, among them Knabenbauer and Durand in h.l.

so to speak. For in the first place, there was the betrayal of Christ . . . Secondly, there was the selling of Christ . . . Thirdly, there was the presignification of the Passion of Christ made in the Supper" etc.

Rupert, one of the earlier theologians of the Middle Ages, explained often and at length the teaching on this matter. In his Commentary on St. Matthew, the Supper is included in the Passion in such way that the Supper itself also includes the whole propitiation of the Passion: "Not before this time did He institute this sacrament of His Body and Blood; it was only WHEN HE WAS IN THE AGONY OF HIS PASSION, on the same night on which He was betrayed, when even now the wood was being prepared, on which according to the rite of the spiritual mystic and sacred law, the slain limbs of this kid would be laid, the fire of great love or of the Holy Spirit by whom He desired to be offered being kindled on the altar: IT WAS THEN THAT HE OFFERED HIS OWN FLESH FOR SIN, that is to say ALL THE BOUNTY OF HIS PASSION NEEDFUL FOR US, UNDER THESE APPEARANCES OF BREAD AND WINE, by saying: *This bread (sic) is my body, this chalice is the new testament in my blood which shall be shed for you.* Justly and fittingly: for when should this, the sacrament in which His death is announced, be justly and fittingly instituted or given, but in the very threshold of His Passion? But it will

be said: the Blood was not yet shed, it was shed on the following day. I reply: THAT LAMB OF GOD HAD ALREADY BEEN SOLD, THE KID OF THE TRUE SACRIFICE HAD ALREADY BEEN BETRAYED, and hence one rightly considers the apostles clean. HIS PASSION WHICH EVEN THEN WAS ON ITS COURSE, HIS VERY BLOOD WHOSE SHEDDING WAS BEING GOT READY ON THAT NIGHT, CLEANSED THEM." (*De gloria et honore filii hominis. Super Matthaeum*, 1, 10. P.L. 168, col. 1547-1548).

Previously and more tersely in his third book: (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 18. P.L. 167, 1659):

"It should be known that before the Passion He had said many things about this sacrament, and yet He did not give it until His Passion did come. FOR HE WAS NOW ALREADY SOLD, as the Apostle says: *On the same night on which he was betrayed.* Why?, Because this lifegiving mystery HAD NO OTHER FOUNDATION THAN THE VERY PASSION OF THE LORD".

Meantime in the twelfth book *De victoria Verbi Dei* (c. 12, P.L. 169, 1472) he wrote: "Of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord it is certain, and does not need our affirmation . . . that IT HAD ITS BEGINNING IN THE PASSION OR DEATH. For this sacrament was instituted as nearly as possible to His death, that is WHEN HE WAS ALREADY SOLD TO DEATH, and *on the night on which he was betrayed.* For us who live

and come after Him was reserved and given that sacrament, in which under the appearances of bread and wine LIES HIDDEN THE BENEFIT OF HIS DEATH AND RESURRECTION".²

The famous argument of Cardinal de Bérulle against the Protestants is well worthy of diligent study: "How can you say that the presence of an ordinary lamb, or of bread and a cake of pure flour, set on God's table which is His altar, is a true sacrifice; yet that the presence of the living bread come down from heaven, the only Son and unique Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, a presence effected by the High Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, AT THE MOMENT WHEN HE BEGINS TO DEDICATE AND OFFER HIMSELF UP TO THE CROSS, is not a true sacrifice? . . . If we observe the movements of Him who weighs each action, performing each in due time and measure, we shall see that this mysterious action was reserved by Him to the last hour of His life, WHEN THE REAL PASSION IN BLOOD

² Compare on *Exodus*, 1, 4, c. 7. P.L. 167, 704): "What is that table behind the propitiatory prepared in the tabernacle of the Lord, but the table of the holy Body and Blood of the Lord, WHICH HAD ITS BEGINNING IN THE PASSION OF OUR SAME LORD JESUS CHRIST? For while He was troubled in mind, when being in an agony He prayed the longer, when His sweat came as drops of blood trickling down upon the ground, amidst all this the worker of our atonement and redemption, prepared the table by taking bread etc."

WAS ALREADY ON ITS COURSE (IF WE LOOK FOR IT IN ITS BEGINNING, NAMELY IN THE HEART OF JUDAS AND THE PLOTTING OF THE JEWS), in order that this religious and sacred action SHOULD FIND ITSELF BROUGHT WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF HIS PASSION, and SHOULD BE INITIATIVE AND DEDICATIVE OF THE MYSTERY OF THE CROSS, and that the MYSTERIOUS OFFERING WHICH HE MAKES OF HIMSELF TO GOD HIS FATHER IN THE EUCHARIST, SHOULD BE FOLLOWED ON AND CARRIED OUT VISIBLY AND IN BLOOD IN HIS HUMANITY, without the interruption of any other action or mystery . . . Thus it is that here He takes the first step on the way to death, whether interiorly in the intention of His heart, or LITURGICALLY IN THE CEREMONY WHICH HE INSTITUTES, or exteriorly in leaving the Cenacle to go to the garden, where His Blood was to trickle from every part of His Body, and where the enemy waited His coming to capture Him and lead Him to Calvary. For He rises from this last holy table whereon He has offered the Eucharist, to meet the agonies of death which lay hold upon Him in the garden, and He arises from the table too with these beautiful words on His lips: *that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father hath given me commandment, so do I* (*John XIV. 21*). And assuredly seeing and considering that the Son of God did not delay THE OFFERING OF HIMSELF TO

DEATH till the actual moment of torment, that His love forestalled and outmatched the malice and rage of the Jews,³ and seeing that in this Last Supper He had no other topic of discourse but His death and Passion, and that He saw it there present in the heart and plot of Judas who was with Him at the same table, and that He was even then making a perpetual memorial of His suffering, and that in this new and christian Pasch He was delivering up the same Lamb that was to die for our Redemption on the Cross: this being so, is it then so unbecoming the dignity of Christ when instituting the marvels of the Eucharist, or the mystery of the Cross so intimately bound up with it, or the connection between the two mysteries (as if it were another Saviour and not the same whom we see celebrating the mystery of the Eucharist in the Supper room on Sion and enduring death and the Passion on Mount Calvary), that you would have to torture your minds to believe, that it has pleased our Lord in the act of His Testament TO REMEMBER HIS DEATH, and to present to God THE OFFERING AND THE VOLUNTARY ACCEPTANCE THEREOF, while He is instituting the sacrament and perpetual memorial of it? If you are willing to be led by the light of His words, they clearly tell you: *This is my body which is given for you,*

³ Bear in mind the words of St Gregory of Nyssa above (p. 62).

this is my blood which is shed for you (Luke XXII. 19), plainly words of oblation and sacrifice. For to be given for us and to be offered for us, are one and the same thing" (*Discours II. du sacrifice de la messe célébré en l'Eglise chrétienne, chap. 12. Oeuvres complètes* ed. Migne, Paris 1856, p. 700-702).

Recall Leo the Great cited above (IV): "While in the hall of Caiphas there was discussion how Christ could be slain, Christ Himself was instituting the sacrament of His Body and Blood, and showing of what nature the Victim was which was to be offered to God."

In the Liturgies the Holy Thursday masses should be carefully studied, for they are filled with the name and the blame of Judas. His treachery appears to be closely knit with the Supper—Christ bearing with the companionship of the traitor for the salvation of the world. Thus the preface of the evening mass in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*: . . . "Through Christ our Lord. On that night the guilty conscience of the traitor could not endure His warning at the sacred banquet, instead, fleeing from the company of the apostles, he took the price of blood from the Jews, in order to destroy the life which he had sold.⁴ Today then the traitor supped his own death and before leaving took

⁴ Sold "distraxit" i.e. "vendidit". Compare note 265 of Hugh Menardi O.S.B., in *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* (P.L. 78, 319).

THE BREAD INTO HIS BLOOD-STAINED HANDS. FROM THE HANDS OF THE SAVIOUR, so that feasted with the food a greater punishment might overtake him, whom not even this supreme excess of love could turn away from crime. AND THUS OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST THY SON SUFFERS THE EATING OF THE LAST SUPPER WITH HIS ENEMY by whom He well knew that He was to be immediately betrayed, so that He might leave TO THE WORLD AN EXAMPLE OF INNOCENCE, AND FULFILL HIS PASSION FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MANKIND. The meek God therefore feasts the barbarous Judas and endures his ruthless fellow-guest at the table, until having plotted for the Blood of the Master, he would destroy himself with his own rope. "O Lord patient through all! O Lamb gentle in the banquet of Thyself. THAT FOOD OF HIS WAS STILL ON JUDAS' TONGUE, WHILE HE WAS INVITING THE JEWS TO TEAR HIS LIMBS ASUNDER. But thy Son our Lord as a loving victim patiently permitted Himself TO BE IMMOLATED TO THEE FOR US, and obtained pardon for the world's sin. Through Him we humbly pray thee, O Lord, saying in lowly confession" etc., (*Sacram. Gelas.*, 1, 1, c. 40 P.L. 74, 1102. Ed Wilson, p. 72. Cf. the same Preface with a few slight alterations or additions in *Sancti Gregorii Magni liber sacramentorum* P.L. 78, 82). Even now at the Supper Christ could offer His death, the death

which was being prepared for Him by His traitorous table-companion. "On that night on which he was handed over, nay on that night on which He gave Himself over." . . . (Cf. p. 52 seq., p. 110 seq.).

B. THE SACERDOTAL PRAYER OF CHRIST

Immediately after the Supper and before submitting to the torments of the Passion, Christ addresses the Father in a prayer which is truly liturgical,⁵ in which He explains the

⁵ Thus Cyril of Alexandria explaining the ninth verse of the prayer: "Again He meditates as Man, Peacemaker and Mediator between God and man; our great most holy Pontiff appeases the anger of the Father by His prayers, offering His own self in sacrifice for us. For He is Victim and Priest, clean sacrifice and true Lamb who taketh away the sin of the world." (Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joann Evangel.*, 1, 11, c. 8, on the verses of XVII. 9-17. P.G. 74, 505-508). So truly liturgical is the prayer, that Bede conjectured and Alcuin openly stated, that it was actually the very hymn, which being said (or sung, as Bede and Alcuin say), the Lord went out to Mount Olivet (Bede *In Marci evangelium expositio*, 1, 4. P.L. 92, 273); Alcuin *Epist.* 164. P.L. 100, 430). Rupert of Dietz declares for the liturgical character of the prayer: "Why does He speak thus, and why does He, High Priest and saving Victim, pray thus?" Later, on verse 26: "So did He High Priest, Atoner and Atonement, Priest and Sacrifice, pray for us, and henceforth His gaze was fixed on one thing only. For when the prayer was concluded, the strong cry of His heart did not cease, seeing that He merely signified in the words of the prayer His reason and purpose for submitting to the cords, the insults, the blows, the spittle, the scourg-

power and the fruit of His sacrifice, much in the same manner as the Church at a later period was to develop in the course of the different parts of the Mass, the manifold phases and varied aspects of her own brief sacrificial action.⁶ In His liturgy therefore our High Priest links the Supper and the Passion together as two elements of the one sacrificial activity: the whole discourse arises out of and rests on the Supper and is wholly directed to the Passion.⁷

ing, the crowning with thorns, the Cross, the nails, the lance, the cup of vinegar and gall, remaining silent and not opening His mouth through it all" (*Comment. in Joann.*, 1, 12. P.L. 169, 757 and 764). Indeed, as Knabenbauer says in h.l.: "This prayer is called by later writers with great unanimity, the sacerdotal, pontifical prayer of Christ . . . wherein He consecrates His sacrifice, and prays to the Father for its fruits."

⁶ "As befitted the occasion and the very nature of things, the prayer in which Jesus 'consecrates Himself and His own' to Him, is grave even to solemnity. Here again it seems a preface to the prayers of the Church. It has been said that the 17th Chapter of St. John is 'a model of liturgical supplication'. This observation is just and the analogy is seen easily. One of the first preoccupations of the Christian liturgy must have been to reproduce the words and the actions of Christ in prayer" (Durand, *Le discours de la Cène*, in R.S.R. November-December, 1911, p. 525-526). Compare the comment of Cyril of Alexandria on *Matth XXVI. 27* and *Luke XXII. 19* which will be considered later: that the thanksgiving of our Lord was a type of our anaphora.

⁷ "Having concluded the long and powerful discourse on the shedding of His Blood, the discourse which the Lord addressed to His disciples just before the Passion, and

In the course of the prayer Christ plainly says: *For them do I sanctify myself* (*John, XVII. 19*). The early writers⁸ and with them all modern interpreters declare,⁹ that Christ was

having also prayed to His Father for His own, John the Evangelist immediately commences the Passion in these words: *When Jesus had said these things, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron.*" (*Alcuin In Joannem, XVII. 26* and *XVIII. 1*. P.L. 100, 968). So exegetes generally. Evidently we must reject the curious teaching of Rupert of Dietz, when he says that this prayer was made at greater length in the garden (cf. *Luke XXII. 43*) by our Lord (*Op. cit.*, col. 750-751).

⁸ Chrysostom: "*What is: I sanctify myself?* I OFFER SACRIFICE TO THEE . . . For that He referred to His sacrifice when He said *I sanctify*, is clear from what follows . . . since indeed He was dying for them. For when He said He was dying for them (what He did say was: *For them do I sanctify myself*). . . ." (*In Joann XVII. 19-20*. P.G. 59, 443). Cyril of Alexandria has similar words on the same verses (P.G. 74, 544), and *In Joann.*, VI. 51, (compared C. VI above), and in book 10 *De Adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, (P.G. 68, 688), we read these beautiful words: "When He says *I sanctify* He means this: I OFFER AND I DEDICATE MYSELF an immaculate Victim to God and the Father. For what is dedicated to God is said to be sanctified." Rupert (*In Levitic.*, 1, 2, c. 5. P.L. 167, 792): "In John the Evangelist He says of the sanctification of His Blood which He was about to shed: *For them do I sanctify myself.*" St. Thomas in h.l.: "*I sanctify myself*, that is I offer myself in sacrifice."

⁹ Cajetan is perhaps the plainest of all: "*And for them do I sanctify myself.* This is the PRESENT TASK whereby Jesus sanctifies Himself, OFFERING HIMSELF FOR THEM IN THE PASSION AND DEATH. *I sanctify*, i.e., I depute myself to God for them. That is, TO OFFER AND SACRIFICE HIMSELF TO GOD FOR THEM." (in h.l. op. cit., fol. 251). On this matter we have already seen Gropper (see p. 115).

referring to the sacrifice of the Passion in these words; nevertheless the present tense is rightly used by our Lord at the Supper: for the sacrifice is present, and the work of our redemption runs on continuously from the Supper to the Cross.

C. THE GOING FORTH FROM THE CENACLE TO THE GARDEN

When Jesus had said these things, he went forth over the brook

To contemporary writers mentioned by Knabenbauer (in.h.l.) we may add Calmes: "In the Greek, the word for 'I sanctify' (ἀγιάζω) sometimes means the offering of a victim, and again the purification or sanctification resulting from this offering; it is applied to the apostles in this latter signification, but when the Saviour applies it to Himself, He has in mind His own voluntary immolation . . . I offer myself in sacrifice, so that they may be sanctified in truth." Durand (*loc. cit.*, p. 539): "In the final prayer of the High Priest of the new alliance, one finds no difficulty in interpreting the words: *I consecrate myself*, as referring to the saving sacrifice of the Cross." Loisy writes: "The double meaning of the word 'consacré' gives rise to something like a play of words: Christ consecrates Himself, that is to say VOWS HIMSELF TO DEATH IN QUALITY OF VICTIM, in order that the disciples may be consecrated, that is to say sanctified, given to God and united to Him by the spirit which Jesus will communicate to them". (*op. cit.*, p. 808-809.) There is no play on words however in the word *sanctifico* which our Lord uses. Sanctification of the victim offered to God is the same as sanctification of the partakers of the victim offered to God; from the one the other is derived, and the divine sanctity itself is conveyed to those who feed on the victim by means of the food itself.

Cedron, where there was a garden into which he entered (John XVIII. 1), and He prayed saying: My Father, IF IT BE POSSIBLE, let this chalice pass from me. Nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt (Matth. XXVI. 39). Here clearly IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE in some way for Christ to refuse, and still in some way the drinking of the chalice of the Passion WAS AGAINST HIS WILL. Before the Supper His freedom was complete, and He had a most ardent desire of giving Himself for us. Now there is A NECESSITY that He must submit to AND IT WAS AGAINST THE GRAIN. He must desire the Passion and yet He willed that He were not bound. The reason is, that in the meantime He had at the Supper handed Himself over to death. Freedom and voluntariety must have been absolutely clear when the offering was made. Now that the offering was made, THE OBLIGATION OR NECESSITY OF GIVING WHAT HE HAD OFFERED lay upon Christ willy nilly.¹⁰ For what has been offered to the Lord is owed to the Lord, and it is not lawful to withdraw from God a thing which is made sacred to God. Therefore Christ was now obliged to drink the chalice of death, to which He had vowed Himself in the chalice of the Blood; He who had vowed Himself to immolation could not be de-vowed from immo-

¹⁰ The necessity or obligation was not psychological, it was moral; the former leaves no room for choice.

lation. Hence we see in what sense Christ was free, and in what sense He was not free from the obligation of dying for us. He was free before the Supper; after the Supper He was no longer free.¹¹

This did not escape the attention of the Fathers. They prove from it that the Passion of Christ was voluntary and spontaneous, because at the Supper, though no pressure had been brought to bear upon Him, He does of His own free will sacrifice Himself, and so to speak deposes Himself to the Passion. They also and especially show that, from the very fact that the Supper had place before the Passion, from the time of the Supper Christ was no longer free to refuse the Passion.¹²

Thus in a passage quoted above, having shown that the Lord was free from any necessity or obligation before the Supper, from thence on Aphraates represents Him as de-

¹¹ See Appendix A. (p. 125) which immediately follows: Christ and the obligation of dying.

¹² Thus the author of the tenth among the homilies of St Cyril of Alexandria (very likely St Cyril himself, though there are doubts, owing to the expression *one of the Holy Trinity* interpolated towards the end): "Let us hasten to the mystic Supper, the fatted calf is immolated, not today by the enemies of God, but by Himself, in order to show that His saving Passion is spontaneous." (*Homilia 10, in mysticam coenam*, P.G. 77, 1017). Chrysostom had already said (*In Matth. XXVI. 26, Hom. 82, n. 1, P.G. 58, 738*): ". . . And He gives thanks, teaching us how we should celebrate this mystery, SHOWING THAT HE DID NOT COME UNWILLING TO THE PASSION."

prived of the power or at least of the right of defending Himself before His enemies, as one who by reason of the Supper was reputed amongst the dead. After the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist, he goes on: "NOW THE LORD HAD NOT YET BEEN APPREHENDED. Having said these words, He rose from the place where He made the Pasch, and where He had given His Body in food and His Blood in drink, and went to the place where He was APPREHENDED. NOW He who took His own Body in food and His own Blood in drink IS REPUTED WITH THE DEAD. But the Lord gave His own Body with His own hands, and before being crucified He gave His own Blood to be drunk . . . When they accused Him He did not speak, He answered nothing to His judges. Though He could of course physically speak and reply, IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE FOR HIM WHO WAS REPUTED WITH THE DEAD TO SPEAK." (*Demonstratio XII. de Paschate*, n. 6. P.S. pars 1, tom 1, col 517).

In the *Evangelii concordantis expositio* (ed. Moesinger, 1776, p. 229-230), St Ephraem writes: "*Father, let this chalice pass from me.* He who had described His own death through His prophets, and had pre-figured the mystery of His death in His just, when His own time to suffer death arrived, HE CERTAINLY DID NOT REJECT DEATH, HE DID NOT REFUSE TO DRINK THE CHALICE OF HIS

DEATH. . . . Rather, towards the evening ON THE NIGHT ON WHICH HE GAVE HIMSELF OVER, He gave His Body to His apostles, and dispensed His Blood to His disciples, and commanded them to do this in memory of His Passion." St Ephraem shows here that Christ did not absolutely oppose the Passion, because the Lord Himself had not only preordained His Passion, but had also delivered Himself over to it in the institution of the sacrament, and hence He could not desire to withdraw Himself from it.

Saint Leo the Great declares this in distinct terms: "He says: *Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from me* (Matth. XXVI. 30). It must not be thought that the Lord Jesus wished to avoid the Passion and death, He had already GIVEN THE SACRAMENTS OF IT TO THE DISCIPLES". (*Sermo* 58, c. 4. P.L. 54, 335¹³). Similarly St. Paschasius Radbertus (*Expositio in Matth.*, I, 12. P.L. 120, 908) on the words: *If it be possible, let this chalice pass*: "Surely He was not unwilling to suffer, who shortly before HAD CONSECRATED THE BLOOD OF HIS BODY TO BE SHED *unto the remission of sins*"?

APPENDIX A. CHRIST AND THE OBLIGATION TO SUBMIT TO DEATH.

The question here is: in what sense was Christ free from the ob-

ligation of undergoing death, and in what sense was He not free.¹

A. THE OPINION DENYING THE OBLIGATION

(a) *The Denial of the Fathers.*

Most of the Fathers say that Christ was free from the obligation of submitting to death. We have first of all St Hilary. He argues for this freedom from the excellence of the sacrifice of Christ as contrasted with the ancient sacrifices: "*I will freely sacrifice to thee*. The sacrifices of the Law which were the holocausts and offerings of goats and bulls, DID NOT HAVE IN THEMSELVES ANY PROFESSION OF FREEDOM, because a curse was inflicted on those who abstained from the sacrifices, they violated the Law and fell under the curse of the Law (*Deuteron.*, 27. 21). THEREFORE WHAT WAS DONE WAS DONE UNDER COMPULSION. For the infliction of the curse prevented the neglect of the sacrifices. Our Lord Jesus Christ freed us from this curse, according to the Apostle: *Christ*

¹ Understand clearly that we are not discussing the PSYCHOLOGICAL FREEDOM OF CHRIST, that is His mental capability of making or not making a free choice. We are speaking simply of HIS MORAL FREEDOM. In other words, admit in Christ the obligation to submit to death, admit also the absolute sinlessness of Christ, we are not here discussing His power of choice apart from any psychological necessity. We ask merely: was Christ under this obligation to die, and how and whence?

¹³ More from the Fathers in Appendix A. immediately following.

bath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written: cursed be every one that hangeth upon a tree (Gal. III. 13, compare Deuteron., XXI. 23). Therefore He offered Himself to the death of the accursed, in order to lift the curse of the Law, BY THE VOLUNTARY OFFERING OF HIMSELF AS VICTIM TO GOD THE FATHER; so that the curse inflicted for the sin of omitting the NECESSARY VICTIM might be lifted by a VOLUNTARY VICTIM" (*In Psalm. 53, n. 13. P.L. 9, 345*).

St. Gregory Nazianzen explicitly asks this question (*Or. 45 in S. Pascha, n. 22. P.G. 36, 653*) as he says "overlooked by many, but as I think, worthy of diligent study": "How is it, that the Father was well pleased with the death of the Only Begotten, and at the same time refused to accept the offering of Isaac by his father, providing the ram in place of the rational victim? It is clear that the Father did accept the sacrifice, but it was a sacrifice that He did not demand."

Cyril is wholly intent in showing that in the Passion and death of the Son, the Father merely consented to the Son's will to suffer, and permitted the Jews who willed, to vent their rage on Christ. Thus on St John: "Christ says that the power was given to Pilate from above, not in the sense that God the Father imposed on His own Son the sufferings of the Cross, but from the fact that the Only-Begotten actually DID

GIVE HIMSELF TO SUFFER FOR US. The Father then PERMITTED THE MYSTERY TO BE FULFILLED IN HIM. Here then the words *given from above* mean and state that there is the acquiescence and consent of the Father, and the will of the Son Himself." (*In Joann. 19. 11 P.G. 74, 641*). Evidently Cyril is speaking of Christ as Man, seeing that he is contrasting the will of the Son, and the mere permission of the Father.

Again on *Zacharias XIII. 7*: "Willingly then He laid down His life for us, GOD AND THE FATHER LEAVING HIM TO HIS OWN GOODWILL, AS MAN, and so to speak, PERMITTING that by His Blood He should purchase life for all, as I have said." (*P.G. 72, 236*). Finally on *Psalm 68. 27*: "Because HE PERMITTED the Son to suffer, He is said to have given Him over. But it was not of necessity that the Son suffered, it was of His own free will; for His Passion was a saving Passion . . . But because in His good providence, as had been predestined, the Father gave His own Son over to death, it does not follow that those who were the ministers of His will were free from guilt. For they did not act as they acted with the purpose of pleasing God. . . . Christ humbled Himself: but they put Him to death." (*P.G. 69, 1173*).²

² Ambrosiaster, among the Latin Fathers, says something similar: "In permitting Him to be slain, God is said to have handed Him over, as the Lord said to Pilate: *Thou*

Chrysostom anticipated Cyril, in the explanation he gave of the verse: *Having joy set before him, he endured the cross* (Hebr., II. 2): "*The prince of this world cometh, and in me hath not anything.*" Therefore had He willed it so, it was possible for Him not to come to the Cross. (*In Epist. ad Hebr.*, hom. 28, n. 2. P.G. 63, 194). Ambrose apparently agreed with Chrysostom: "Had Christ so willed, He need not have died. But He did not think to avoid death as being in terror of it, nor could He have saved us better than by dying" (*De excessu fratris sui Satyri*, 1, 2, 45. P.L. 16, 1327). Theodoretus certainly followed him: "Scripture says, that it would have been possible for Him, had He willed it so, not to suffer". (*In Epist. ad Hebr.*, XII. 2. P.G. 82, 679).

The unknown author of the com-

shouldst not have any power against me, were it not given to thee from above. For the power was given to Pilate, but it was given to him as a willing agent; in other words, he was allowed to do what he willed, namely to hand Him over: for while he is dissimulating, he does hand Him over; because had Pilate been unwilling, Christ would not have been put to death. He did permit His death therefore, but He permitted it at the hands of those who desired to slay Him, and desired it not under compulsion but of their own accord. They therefore were not guiltless, because what was permitted to them, they themselves desired; because their guilt was in their desire. Nevertheless God did permit it, knowing that in the conflict with the devil it would help many." (P.L. 17, 394, according to the more probable reading).

mentary on the *Epistle to the Hebrews* erroneously attributed to Oecumenius speaks in a similar manner: "It would have been permitted to Him, says the Scripture, to live in joy and glory in this world . . . But He did not will it so; rather He willingly bore the Cross" (*In Epist. ad Hebr.*, 12, 2, P.G. 109, 424).

Theodorus Andidensis re-echoes this teaching almost in the words of St. Gregory Nazianzen, just cited: "The bishop prays that the sacrifice of His Only-Begotten Son who is offered in sacrifice, may be acceptable to God the Father. For indeed He who is sacrificed offered Himself as a Victim to the honour of His Father although the Father did not demand it." (*Brevis commentatio de divinae liturgiae symbolis ac mysteriis*, n. 19. P.G. 140, 444).

The great Anselm illustrates this teaching very lucidly: "Though not subject to the penalty of death since He was sinless, that Man FREELY GAVE UP THAT LIFE WHICH WAS HIS FOR THE HONOUR OF THE FATHER: when for the sake of justice, He permitted it to be taken from Him . . . And hence the human nature in that Man, did not suffer under compulsion, but in perfect freedom . . . NOT UNDER A COMPELLING OBEDIENCE, but by the disposition of the divine wisdom. For the Father did not compel Him to do WHAT HE OUGHT NOT TO EXACT FROM HIM; and this great honour

which the Son so FREELY OFFERED to the Father in such goodwill, could not but be pleasing to the Father . . . Thus that Man redeems all others, estimating what He freely gave to God as a substitute for the debt which they owe to Him." (*Meditatio*. 11. P.L. 158, 766).

St Bernard's words are few but profound: "GOD THE FATHER DID NOT DEMAND THE BLOOD OF THE SON, BUT HE ACCEPTED IT WHEN OFFERED; not thirsting for blood, but for our salvation; because in blood was salvation. Salvation surely, and not as Abelard understands and writes, the mere display of love." (*De erroribus Abelardi* c. 8, n. 21-22. P.L. 182, 1070).

(b) *Patristic Solution of a Scripture Difficulty.*

An objection may be urged here:

During His life Christ often mentioned the commands of the Father. Chrysostom solves the difficulty: "*This commandment I have received from the Father.* What commandment was this? To die for the world. But surely He did not wait to hear the command and then acquiesce. What need for Him to learn? No sane person would say so . . . When He says that He received a command from the Father, He means that what He does is pleasing to the Father: lest after His death it might be thought that the Father had abandoned and betrayed Him.

Long before this He had said: *The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep*, thus showing them that the sheep were His, that it was all His own work, and needed no command." (*In Joann.*, hom. 60, n. 2 and 3. P.G. 59, 331; compare hom. 62, *super Joann XV.* 10, col. 412).

Cyril of Alexandria writes in a similar strain: "The question now arises: where and how did Christ observe the command of His Father. Let the wisdom of St Paul lay bare the mystery, when he says: . . . *He humiliated himself, becoming obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross . . .* That is to say, seeing that God and the Father decreed to save sinful man, and that no created being could do this, being far above the power of any creature, the Only-Begotten Son of God, knowing the will of God and the Father, submitted to this dispensation. He went down into the depths of voluntary infirmity, even so deep as to humiliate Himself to the most shameful death . . . Hence in the voluntary obedience of the Son, we have the fulfillment of the will of the Father. This will the Son says takes for Him the place of commands. For He is the Word, He knows the counsels of the Father and penetrates His ways. Indeed being the wisdom and the power of the Father, He does His will, holding that will in place of a command, and after the manner of men,

calling it such." (*In Joann.*, XV. 9-10 P.G. 74, 373).

Janssens (*Summa Theologica* etc., t, 5. p. 621-622) following Pesch (*De Verbo Incarnato* p. 339) discounts these sayings of Cyril and thinks to have deprived them of value by this consideration: "The Fathers were arguing with Arians, and maintaining the equality of the Son and the Father against them. The Arians based their contention on the command, arguing therefrom inferiority and compulsion in the Son". Furthermore he is surprised that "Petavius, Cardinal Franzelin, Stentrup and others did not perceive this sufficiently." But as a matter of fact, though it may have been before the Nestorian controversy, the point at issue is the "economy of the flesh" assumed, is "Jesus proposing Himself to us as an example of holy conversation" and "therefore made under the law and deigning to assume the poverty of our condition" (col 372 ff.). What he said was Christological, and most effective in our sense—that the man Jesus must not be held to have been subject to commandment properly so-called.

As a matter of fact Janssens himself did not impose the same limitation on the teaching of Anselm, which is in perfect harmony with the solutions of Cyril and Chrysostom. Anselm says: "Thus then He freely obeyed the Father, in

that of His own will He chose to do what He knew would be pleasing to the Father. Finally since the Father gave Him that good will, though it was a free will, yet He is not without reason said to have received it as a command of His Father. And so in this way He was obedient even unto death; and as the Father gave commandment, so did He; and from the chalice which the Father gave Him He drank. For there is PERFECT AND ABSOLUTELY FREE OBEDIENCE OF THE HUMAN NATURE, when it spontaneously submits its own free will to the will of God, and when it carries out in action the good will which it accepts WITHOUT ANY DEMAND WHATSOEVER HAVING BEEN MADE." (l.c.).

Hence St Thomas reflected the true sense of the Fathers when he interpreted St Paul: *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all*: "The Father delivered Him up to death IN DECREERING THAT HE WAS TO BE INCARNATE AND TO SUFFER, and by inspiring in His human will that charity whereby HE WOULD OF HIS OWN FREE WILL SUBMIT to the Passion: WHENCE IT IS SAID THAT HE HATH DELIVERED HIMSELF". (*Eph. V. 2*) (*In Rom. 8. lect. 6*). Here that decree of the Father, concerning both the Incarnation and the Passion, cannot be looked upon as a command; since it is agreed that God did not command the Word to be made Flesh. It must therefore be taken for an

eternal ordination and predefinition. In the *Summa Theologica* (3 S. 47, 3, o) St Thomas gives a fuller explanation—he tells us that on the side of God the Father nothing is added to this predefinition of the death and to the inspiration of the will but the mere permission of decide.

Seeing therefore that, according to St Thomas and the Fathers, all these commands (in Scripture spoken of as commands of the Father to Christ) are dealt with as preordinations of divine providence, we may say with Suarez that: "In His human nature Christ desired nothing but what the divine will predisposed Him to desire, according to St John VIII. 29: *For I always do the things that please him,*" and that: "In His human will, Christ desired nothing but what He knew was the will of God." Meantime however he would add that: "For an obligation of precept, the superior must desire to impose an obligation on the inferior to do something, AND HE MUST MAKE KNOWN PRACTICALLY THIS WILL, BY A COMMAND TO THE INFERIOR. . . . It is one thing therefore to predetermine my act of will, and another to bind me to that act. Hence although Christ clearly saw the will of God predetermining all His actions, He did not for that reason see that He was bound *ex praecepto* to do them". (*De Incarnatione*, pars. 1, disp. 37, s. 4, n. 9). God could certainly pre-

define Christ, even with Christ's own knowledge, to many actions in no way obligatory. It may not be said either that these predefinitions, by the fact of their being known, are real commands. For, according to what is undoubtedly the truer teaching, all the actions of Christ were predefined and Christ knew these predefinitions, so that the absurdity would follow that all the actions of Christ were acts under precept, and that He could do nothing that was not a command—an untenable position, as Basil points out: "If the Saviour could do nothing of Himself BUT BY THE COMMAND OF THE FATHER, He is neither good nor bad. For He is not the cause of any of the things that are done. What an absurdity, that other men could of their own free will do good or ill, and the Son who is God do nothing freely"? (*Adversus Eunomium*, 1. 4. P.G. 29, 697). Possibly Basil may have had in mind the higher nature of Christ, but if his argument applies at all, it must apply equally to the human nature of Christ. For that Christ as Man knew of these predefinitions has nothing whatever to do with His obedience or humiliation, it belongs rather to the dignity and eminence of the Son of God; hence Cardinal Franzelin justly wrote: "These commands are eternal designs which the Father communicates to the Son, not by commanding but by generating Him" (*De Verbo Incarnato*, 3. p. 445). And

indeed it was befitting that they should be communicated by intuitive vision to the human intellect of Christ.

Dismissing therefore the objection that a command to submit to death is implied, we may add that in *Isaias* LIII. 10, there is at least a suasive proof of this immunity from the obligation of submitting to death. For it is predicted there that He will enjoy an eternal posterity, that is redeemed mankind, IF HE OFFERS HIMSELF IN SACRIFICE. The tenor of the words of *Isaias* here implies a choice, as no obligation to offer sacrifice is asserted, except on the supposition that our Redemption is willed by Christ Himself.

Hence we conclude from the teaching of the Fathers: 1) that we must deny any suggestion OF A POSITIVE COMMAND from the Father to Christ; and 2) that Christ GAVE HIMSELF OVER TO DEATH, free from the obligation to do so.³

B. OPINION AFFIRMING THE OBLIGATION

Though it is shown by the authority of the Fathers that Christ was free from any obligation to submit to death, nevertheless Christ Himself confesses in the garden that He is under an obligation. For in the

garden He endeavours without success, to bend the Father's will which is contrary to His own; and here too He says that He cannot refuse the chalice, not as though lacking the power to do so, but clearly as bound by an obligation to accept it.

Moreover we must admit that St. Paul gives praise to Christ for at least some kind of real obedience in His Passion and death: *He humbled himself becoming obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross* (Phil., II. 8). *For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners, so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just.* (Rom., V. 19). Add to these testimonies the following from the Epistle to the Hebrews: *Whereas he was indeed the Son of God, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered* (Hebr., V. 8).

Besides, the very same Fathers whose authority we appealed to on behalf of His immunity from the obligation, attest this obligation of obedience. Hilary, for instance, explaining in what sense the Son says that the Father was greater than He: "Referring all this to obedience to the Father's commands, He added: *But that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father hath given me commandment, so do I: Arise, let us go hence.* Rising He hastens to consummate the sacrament of His Passion, because He loved to give effect to the

³ Cardinal Franzelin mentions by name a number of modern theologians who follow this teaching (*op. cit.*, p. 450). Add Billot (*De Verbo Incarnato*, th. 28 and 29).

command of His Father." (*Trin.* 1, 9, c. 55. P.L. 10, 316).

Ambrose speaks of His obedience as one of the duties of Christ, just as obedience is one of our duties: "The Arians are wont to object the obedience of the Son, because it is written: *and being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man, he humbled Himself becoming obedient unto death* (*Phil.*, II. 7-8). He first said *man* and then *unto death*, to show that the obedience unto death was not an obedience of the divinity, but of the Incarnation, in which He took upon Himself OUR DUTIES as well as our name" (*De Fide*, 1, 2, c. 10 P.L. 16, 578).

Cyril is more forceful. He affirms the free will of Christ in choosing the Passion, and says nevertheless it was not lawful for Him to refuse the Passion. Thus on the words: *Father, if thou wilt, remove this chalice from me. But yet not my will but thine be done* (Luke XXII. 42): "Certainly His Passion was not involuntary, abhorrent though it was because of the ignominy, and because of the ruin of the Jewish synagogue which it implied . . . Seeing however . . . THAT IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE FOR HIM NOT TO UNDERGO HIS PASSION, He chose it with the assent of God and the Father. Though what happened was in no wise agreeable to Him, nevertheless He made the Cross voluntary for Himself, for the life and the salvation of all man-

kind." (*In Luc.* XXII. 42. P.G. 72, 920-924). Compare what St Thomas writes *In Philip.* II, 1 (infra).

It would appear that obedience in the proper sense is meant, for it is stated that the death of Christ would not have the same title to glory, without the special merit of this virtue of obedience.

C. SOLUTION OF THE SEEMING CONTRADICTION

Hence we find in the Fathers an apparent contradiction. For on the one hand they say that the Passion was not obligatory, and that no command whatever was given to Christ; then again the same Fathers state that the obligation of suffering unto death was incumbent on Christ. Two considerations will help to solve this difficulty.⁴

The first consideration is that the positive law of God and the demands of the natural law are not the same. For no matter how free Christ

⁴ Many modern theologians have conjured up some kind of "broad command"; whether this is a command and so obligatory, or not obligatory and hence not a command is not at all clear. Moreover, taken as a *command* and so binding, it is not easy to reconcile with the opinion of the Fathers, who say in so many words that it was not a command, and leave the whole matter to Christ Himself, merely attributing assent to the Father. As *broad*, to be taken in a wide sense only, it is difficult to reconcile with any satisfaction to the words of Christ in the garden, where He says He was bound seemingly against His will, by the will of the Father.

may have been from positive commands, as imposed upon Himself especially—such as the particular command to submit to death—still He could never be free from the obligations of the natural law, for the natural law is co-created, so to speak, and made known to Him by God, with the very principles of man's created nature. Anselm, replying to this objection by Boso, explains this matter very clearly. "God the Father did not deal harshly with that Man, as you seem to think, He did not give Him over to the sentence of death, the innocent for the guilty. For He did not force Him to an unwilling death, He did not permit Him to be slain against His will; on the contrary that Man freely submitted to death in order to redeem mankind."

Boso then puts forward as an objection the words of Scripture on the obedience of Christ, on the command of the Father, on the admission of necessity in the garden; he concludes: "All this goes to show that Christ went to death rather at the command of obedience than of His own free will". To this Anselm replies: "Evidently you are not making a proper distinction between what He did under the command of obedience, and what He suffered because He was obedient, though obedience did not demand it. Boso: "Please state this more clearly". Anselm: "Why did the Jews pursue Him even unto death?" Boso: "Be-

cause in His words and in His life, He steadfastly maintained TRUTH AND JUSTICE". Anselm: "I SAY THAT GOD DEMANDS THIS OF EVERY RATIONAL CREATURE; AND EVERY RATIONAL CREATURE OWES THIS TO GOD BY OBEDIENCE". Boso: "Undoubtedly". Anselm: "THEREFORE THAT MAN OWED THIS OBEDIENCE TO GOD THE FATHER, THE HUMANITY TO THE DIVINITY; AND THE FATHER REQUIRED IT OF HIM". Boso: "Certainly".

Anselm: "There then you have what He did as demanded by obedience . . . Hence God did not compel Christ in whom there was no sin to die; rather Christ submitted to death of His own accord, not under obedience to give up His life, but under obedience to maintain justice. He persevered so bravely in this attitude, that because of it He suffered death." (*Cur Deus Homo*, I, 1, c. 8 and 9. P.L. 158, 370-371).⁵

⁵ Honorius of Autun or whoever was the author of the *Elucidarium* gives this teaching very concisely: "Why did He die? Because He was obedient, it is written: *He was made obedient to the Father unto death*—, Why did the Jews put Him to death? I would like to know this. BECAUSE HE STEADFASTLY AIMED AT JUSTICE AND TRUTH IN HIS LIFE AND TEACHING; THE HUMANITY OWED THIS OBEDIENCE TO THE DIVINITY, God requires it from every rational creature. Would any father allow his beloved son, his only son, to be slain, if he could prevent it? When God saw that His own Son desired this great work, that is, the defeat of the cruel tyrant and the freeing of the captive from that tyrant, He gave assent to this great work and permitted His death." (*Elucidarium*, lib. 1, c. 20. P.L. 172, 1125).

The doctrine of Anselm is plain: Christ was subject to the precepts of the natural law, whereby a man is bound to seek justice; that obligation and no other intervened in His Passion and death. Carefully considered, the words of St Thomas (*In Philip.*, II. 8) will be found to convey the same meaning: "Had He not suffered from obedience, He would not have been so worthy of praise: because obedience gives merit to our sufferings. But how was He made obedient? Not by the divine will, because that is the rule; but by the human will, which is ruled in all things according to the will of the Father: *Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt* (*Matth.* XXVI. 39). And Paul fittingly introduces obedience in the Passion, because the first prevarication was committed by disobedience . . . That this obedience is great and commendable is clear; because obedience is great when it follows the command of another against one's own will". The holy Doctor is praising that obedience in Christ, which as a rule bestows merit on our *sufferings*. Now as a rule we are not bound by special divine commands to endure this and that suffering, but we certainly are subject to the divine law, in which justice and truth are prescribed, including for instance, the profession of faith which often entails great sufferings, sufferings which are particularly meritorious, because they are signal examples and glorious results of

subjection to God. Thus therefore we must interpret obedience in the Passion and death of Christ, as flowing from the obligations of the natural law.

But even yet the difficulty is not fully met. For admittedly it was because of justice which opposed their injustice, that the Jews hated and persecuted Him. Yet seeing that it was possible for Him to turn aside from His enemies, as He had often done before, or at least deliberately to keep out of their way, it can not be said that He submitted to death because of the obligation of the natural law, unless it be shown HOW THE TURNING AWAY FROM DEATH, WHICH WAS LAWFUL FOR HIM AT ONE TIME, HAD NOW BECOME UNLAWFUL.

Therefore our *second consideration* is this:

Apart altogether from any positive command, it is possible for anyone to be bound by the natural law to a thing in itself not at all obligatory, if a person of his own free will were to contract an obligation of religion towards God in respect of this thing. This may be in two ways: either by the making of a vow,⁶ or, by the sacrificial offering

⁶We are now comparing a vow and a sacrifice purely under this aspect: that each entails some religious obligation. From other aspects a vow and a sacrifice have many points of difference, among which we may note two in particular: 1). A vow is in the nature of a PRAYER, in which a promise is ENUNCIATED; the offering of a Victim is an

of a victim to immolation. In the case of a vow, one is obliged to do what he formally vowed he would do. In the case of a sacrifice, he is bound to consecrate by immolation the victim which he offered to immolation. This second obligation is by far the more sacred, for what is not only promised but actually given over into the ownership of God, cannot be withdrawn from His altars without dreadful sacrilege. Now, to say that Christ made a vow, would be gratuitous and rash, for there is not the slightest indication of a vow in the Scriptures. On the other hand, there undoubtedly was a sacrificial offering—in the Supper; that offering, once made, bound Christ by a religious obligation to dedicate His Victim; in other words the very strictest obligation of duty bound Him to undergo death for us, and not to avoid it.

By this means we can reconcile all that we are taught by the Masters of faith:

1) The Father never imposed on Christ the command to die.

action in which A GIFT IS HANDED OVER. 2). A VOW IS A PROMISE REFERRING TO THE FUTURE, AN OFFERING IS A GIFT GIVEN HERE AND NOW.

2) There was no obligation TO GIVE HIMSELF, TO OFFER HIMSELF, TO DELIVER HIMSELF TO DEATH IN SACRIFICE (Isaias, Hilary, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Cyril, Anselm, Bernard, Thomas).

3) Nevertheless He was under obligation to go from the Supper room to His Passion (Hilary), to die (Ambrose), to accept the Passion in the garden (Cyril), and there to obey the divine law unto death (Thomas).

Hence we arrive at the conclusion that Christ contracted this last obligation, not from the nature of things, nor from a command of the Father, but because He offered Himself to God in the sacrament.⁷

St Bernard (loc. cit.) sums up the whole matter in a few words: "God the Father did not demand the Blood of the Son, but nevertheless HE ACCEPTED IT WHEN OFFERED".

⁷ Remember the passages from Aaphrates, Ephraem, Leo the Great, cited above (p. 124 seq.). Hence it is that consistently with all we have said, the other Fathers whom we have quoted, stress the liberty IN THE OFFERING made by Christ; so Hilary: ". . . by freely offering Himself a Victim"; Cyril, "He gave Himself to suffer"; Anselm, "He freely offered Himself."

§ 6. Triple Conclusion

A. THE NATURE OF THE ONENESS OF THE SUPPER AND THE PASSION

We may now settle the question left unanswered in a former chapter (chap. II): precisely where and when did Christ make the sacerdotal, sensible, ritual offering of Himself to that immolation, undergone in the Passion, by which we are redeemed?¹ For we see that in the Supper, where He gave His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine, "He offered Himself to God to be immolated for us". Therefore it was in the Supper actually that Christ ritually offered the sacrifice of His Passion.

The Supper and the Passion therefore are mutually complementary. In the Supper began the sacrifice which was to be immolated on the Cross. True, the real immolation is in the Passion and Death, but the essential character of a liturgical offering is in the symbolic immolation of the Supper preeminently.²

¹It should be remembered that we are dealing here with SACRIFICE IN THE STRICTEST SENSE, AND NOT MERELY IN THE MORAL OR METAPHORICAL SENSE, SUCH AS WOULD BE THE DEATH OF THE MARTYRS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT OR THE NEW, OR OF A PERSON ENDANGERING HIS LIFE, AS A SOLDIER FOR HIS COUNTRY.

²And in this sense we have a lead from Dionysius Bar Salibi (*Expositio Liturgiae*, c. 12, Labourt translation, p. 72) in praise "of that sacrifice WHICH THE LORD SACRDOTALLY COMPLETED in the cenacle, on the evening on which He was to give Himself up

Hence the sacrifice of the Redemption on the Cross and in the Supper was numerically one; we may not say that there was one

for us. For after He had discharged the duty of the legal pasch, He assumed the office of ARCHPRIEST". It is in fact customary with the Fathers to confer on Christ IN THE SUPPER sacerdotal and pontifical titles ("priest and prince of sacrificers" Ephraem p. 58; "Pontiff, High Priest by a mystery," Athanasius probably and Theodoretus certainly, p. 101; "our Pontiff," Cyril of Alexandria, p. 121; "Pontifex summus," Rupert, p. 104, cf. p. 118), titles which certainly imply majesty and dignity; just as it is also customary to give Him AS SUFFERING titles suggestive of immolation, hostia, victim, sacrifice, which connote the afflicted and abject state of Him who was *a worm and no man*.

To the passages we have already cited from Rupert, we may add the following, in which the sacerdotal office and the victimal condition are so contrasted as to assign the victimal condition to the Passion and the sacerdotal office to the Supper (*Comment. in Matth.*, I, II, P.L. 168, 1579): "Christ is Priest and Victim but under different aspects: He is Priest because as the Apostle says: *Being an high priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hand, that is of this creation, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but BY HIS OWN BLOOD HE ENTERED ONCE INTO THE HOLIES, having obtained eternal redemption*, BRINGING FORTH THE SACRIFICE OF BREAD AND WINE, ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH IN THE SACRAMENT OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD". Rupert then goes on to specify Him in various ways the Victim of the Passion. Note how evidently Rupert makes one the sacrifice of the Redemption and the Melchisedechian sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharistic bread and wine.

The same contrast of dignity in the Priest and of humility in the Victim was generally adopted by our apologists against the Protestants, for instance, in the *Volumen acatholicum XX articulorum confessionis augustanae editum a Jacobo Heilbronner . . .*

preliminary sacrifice in the Supper, and another succeeding it on the Cross; but in the Supper room was made the bloodless offering of that immolation in blood which was to be undergone on Calvary. For this representative immolation, or immolation by similitude, or mystic immolation which Christ made in the Supper WAS THAT BY WHICH HE OFFERED the real proper immolation in which He was slain at the hands of His enemies. And so it was, as the ancient Gallican Liturgy was wont to say, that in Christ offering, the image of immolation passed into true sacrifice.³ So that Christ made only the one sacrifice, and made it

anno MDCVII, compendio recognitum et castigatum a Sebastiano Heissio S.J. (Diltingae, 1608, art. 8, de sacrificio missae, p. 71-72). "You say on p. 183 that the sacrifice of the Mass is contrary to the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist . . . The sacrifice of the Mass is not contrary to the words of the institution; as a matter of fact Christ Himself offered this sacrifice in these very words. FOR HE WHO ONCE DIED A VICTIM IN BLOOD on the altar of the Cross, is the very same TRUE PRIEST AND PONTIFF who offered Himself in a bloodless manner in the Last Supper, and made true sacrifice."

³"We celebrate today, dearly beloved, the most sacred solemnity of the approaching Pasch, and the saving effigy of the immolation of the Lord, changed by the offering of Christ into the spiritual sacrifice" (*Missale Gothicum, missa in coena Domini*, P.L. 72, 265). The effigy of the sacrifice is said to be changed into the spiritual sacrifice, not only because it is accomplished by the intervention of the Holy Spirit, but also because it is celebrated in such a rite, that the true offering of the true Body and Blood unto death for the remission of sins is visible only to the eyes of faith.

only once; consequently, if the sacrifice is considered primarily as the act of the Priest, it is more prominent in the Supper, where Christ ritually offered Himself to death; if it is considered primarily as the slaying of the Victim, it is fully implemented on the Cross, on which offered by Himself Christ dies.⁴

To guard against erroneous interpretations, we must make five observations.

First observation.—The unity constituted by the Eucharistic oblation and the immolation in blood, is not, nor need it be, unity *in genere rei*; but it is unity *in genere signi*—for it is a oneness as sacrifice; and sacrifice as such, is a sign, an actually existing sign of invisible and internal dedication. The case of the sacrament of the Eucharist is similar, in so far as the form of consecration is not one thing with the sacramental species *in genere rei* but only *in genere signi* or *sacramenti*.⁵

⁴This does not warrant the conclusion that Christ was not Victim in the Supper, or that He was not Priest on the Cross; but, as will be explained later, in the sacrifice of Christ, the priest was never without the victim, nor the victim without the priest. Christ therefore was Victim in the Supper and Priest on the Cross, and the reason is: that He was the Priest of His Victim and the Victim of His Priesthood.

⁵The Salamanticenses rightly interpret the principle and the parallel in these words: "As the sacrament is one, not by a physical but by a moral oneness, it can therefore consist of two things so widely different as external realities and words; so too the sacrifice has a like oneness, after the manner of

Second observation. Moreover these two parts, Eucharistic oblation and immolation in blood, do not form one sign after the manner of merely integrating parts (such as are the quantitative or homogeneous parts of a body which integrate or make up the whole body), but after the manner of constitutive elements (such as in material bodies are the principles constitutive of the essence). One of these parts, the oblation, is after the manner of determining form. The other, the immolation in blood, is after the manner of the matter, sustaining and being the subject of the determining form. By this union the sign is completed in its essence, to be just this sign and not that, the mode of union being comparable to that by which all corporeal essences arise from the union of an indeterminate but determinable principle (which we in our philosophy call technically matter) and a determining principle (which we call form).

For just as in the Eucharist we see that the continuing appearance of bread and wine is determined to a *sacramental essence* (as significative and indicative of the presence of Christ) by the transient form of the consecration, and, when it has

artificial being; in consequence it is capable of being constituted of physically different acts, especially in that it implies one thing directly and another thing indirectly, although essentially it implies both one and the other" (*De Eucharistiae sacramento*, disp. 13, disp. 13, dub. 2. parag. 3, n. 29).

received this formal element, is itself (as theologians say) *sacramentum tantum*; so too in the sacrifice of Christ, the whole Passion up to the death is determined to the *sacrificial essence* by the Eucharistic offering of Christ, and having received this formal determination, it actually is, and is called, the sacrifice of the Redemption, going on uninterruptedly in the process of completion (*fieri*), until with the occurrence of death it is complete (*in facto esse*).⁶

Indeed the unity resulting from both the constitutive elements in the sacrifice of Christ is far stricter than the unity in the example of the sacrament as above, BECAUSE THE OFFERING COMMENCED IN THE SUPPER ACTUALLY CONTINUES ON THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE PASSION, whereas in the sacrament the words are transient. For that offering must be

⁶ For the sacrifice only ended in the death. Hence it was not until after the death that the veil of the temple was rent (compare Chrysostom, *De coemeterio et de cruce*, n. 2. P.G. 49, 297); without the death the work of the Redemption—our ransom, the conclusion of the covenant, and the passage from the old priesthood to the new—was not completed, though all this as well as the sacrifice itself was in the process of completion (*in fieri*) throughout the whole duration of the sacrifice: as is shown in the Supper from the very manner of our Lord's announcement (in words of the *present tense*) of the relation of His Body to death—to which it is now given over for us—and the virtue of the Blood unto the remission of sins, for which purpose it is even now in its own way being shed,

lasting, which once made, FAR FROM BEING REVOKED, IS KEPT UP BY CONTINUED ACTS OF THE FREE WILL, SHOWING THEMSELVES FORTH OUTWARDLY THROUGH SO MANY ACTS AND WORDS OF THE LORD UNTIL HIS DEATH.⁷ There is not a single moment in which the same Priest who offered in the Supper does not appear to us continuing His offering, confirming and sanctioning it, not only internally but also outwardly, that is by the shedding of His Blood.

Hence we conclude how truly it was said by the Council of Trent, that Christ offered Himself in blood ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS (*on the altar of the Cross He once offered Himself in blood . . . of which bloody offering etc., D. 940*). For though the Council did not attribute to Christ any act of blood-shedding (that being entirely the action of the Jews), and hence does not repre-

sent our Priest as making use of any liturgical rite in blood (which would be contrary to the Scriptures and all the Doctors), yet even on the Cross, while Christ shows that He does of His own free will feel pain and taste death, by this very fact He, so to speak, seals and confirms, robes and crowns His solemn offering, which He bloodlessly celebrated in the Supper.⁸

Hence too we see, when comparing the MASS with the sacrifice of our Lord, how aptly the Council declared: "For the Victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who once offered Himself on the Cross, ONLY THE MANNER OF OFFERING BEING DIFFERENT." (*ibid.,*). For the difference between our offering and

⁷ In one sense it could be said that Christ offered Himself to death before the Supper and the Passion. Indeed from the moment of His entry into the world throughout His whole life, He said: *Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not, but a body thou hast fitted to me: holocaust did not please thee; then I said: Behold I come (Hebr., X. 5-7 and Ps. 39. 8)*. But this offering, apart from being for the most part invisible, indeed concealed in the beginning in the maternal womb, was not effective, it was merely affective; it was made in purpose, not in act; it was announced in words of *the future*, not of *the present*. Hence by these purposes, words or other significations, no actual covenant was contracted with God for the remission of sins; the covenant was merely looked forward to and foretold. Not so in the Supper and the Passion.

⁸ In this sense the Doctors quoted (p. 50 seq.) say that the Eucharist was offered on the Cross, and consecrated, in that on the Cross and from the Cross the seal of ultimate will and freedom was given to the consecration which had been made of the Body unto death and of the Blood unto the remission of sin. This explanation of the words of Trent holds on the supposition that the Council intended to use the word *oblation* in the strictest sense, as in contradistinction to *immolation* and the integral *sacrificial action*. Should it be thought that the Council used the word *oblation* in a wider sense, so that *offerre sacrificium* would be the same as *peragere sacrificium*, in that case of course the Council does not favour our explanation here, nor in the passage immediately following. Nevertheless the teaching which we have enunciated not only remains true, but also the stricter acceptance of the phrase which we have been explaining.

the offering of Christ is this, that ours is altogether bloodless,⁹ while the offering of Christ on the Cross was in blood in the manner shown. Nevertheless there was not one offering on the Cross and another in the Supper, but it was numerically one same offering: made ritually in the Supper, continued morally on the Cross; all this because of the identity of the Priest and the Victim, —a rational Victim whose constant will in suffering unto death was none other than the continued will of the Priest faithful in sacrifice to the end.¹⁰ Moreover in the Supper Christ offered without us, in the Mass He offers through us; hence

⁹For though the sacrifice of Christ in blood is presupposed to our bloodless sacrifice, yet in this bloodless sacrifice, no real immolation is enacted, provided or promised. Indeed our sacrifice is bloodless for the very reason that the unique immolation in blood of the Passion is presupposed to it, as will be shown later in this work.

¹⁰For although Christ in the Supper offered bloodlessly, nevertheless because He offered Himself to BE IMMOLATED BY THE SUFFERING of the Cross, and because He consummated His offering by dying on the Cross, His sacrifice was not bloodless but bloody (recall the definitions above (I) of bloody and bloodless sacrifice. At the same time when He said *Do this*, He truly *instituted* and *left us* a bloodless sacrifice, as the Council of Trent says (D. 938), and He can also be said to have commenced it, in that He dedicated the actual sacramental rite which we follow as often as we celebrate bloodless sacrifices, because we offer a victim not now *to be* immolated, but a victim immolated in the past, and now abiding in the glorious state of a victim taken up to God.

again the manner of offering is different.

In the third place, if we compare the Mass with the Supper, note with what truth Christ said *Do this*, namely, do what I have done; for apart from the difference of time it is absolutely the same. For the Supper looked to the immolation as future, the Mass looks to it as past.¹¹ Hence it is that the Supper looked forward to the Passion, which the Mass presupposes. Therefore the sacrifice celebrated in the Supper was not completed immediately upon the consecration (and transubstantiation), but it continued on until Christ died. Our sacrifice of the Mass on the other hand, is completed immediately upon the consecration, because the immolation has already taken place. The difference between the Supper and the Mass therefore, is the difference between the offering of a victim to be immolated and the offering of a victim already immolated. This does not imply any particular excellence of the Mass as compared with the Supper, as if the Mass were in itself more complete as sacrifice than the Supper; for as we have said the Supper looks forward, the Mass presupposes. The Mass presupposes something which the Supper did not presuppose (for it had not yet taken

¹¹Here we presuppose what will be proved later, that the Mass is simply our present offering of a past immolation enacted in the Passion.

place). The Supper looked forward to something to which the Mass does not look forward (for it has taken place). But each has its own complement in the immolation of the Passion—though differently, because of the difference in time.¹²

Finally, note that the numerical distinction between our sacrifices and the sacrifice of the Cross does not in any way militate against the numerical oneness of the sacrifice of the Cross and the Supper. There are just as many sacrifices as there are priestly offerings—your sacrifice is not mine, this morning's sacrifice is not yesterday's, and no one of them is the same as that which Christ made without us. On the other hand, His offering was, as we have said, numerically one, made in the Supper and perfected in the Passion.

Third observation. Although the Passion unto death together with the Supper was one sacrifice, nevertheless in its bearing upon our salvation the necessity of the Supper was not so great as the necessity of the Passion. For suppose that there was not the Supper rite, the Lord could have used any other rite or number of rites for His purpose, had He so willed. As a sacrifice therefore, it was not a matter of absolute neces-

¹² Of course, under another aspect the Supper is infinitely preeminent over the Mass, just as the principal work of Christ is infinitely preeminent over the ministerial action of His priest, and as the inexhaustible fountain over the streamlet.

sity (*de jure*, so to speak) that the Passion should be linked with the Supper. But our Lord did *de facto* select the Supper rite in preference to others, and so joined the Supper to His Passion unto death, in the one sacrificial action. In the economy of our salvation therefore, once supposed that our salvation was to be attained by the real and true sacrificial death of our Lord, in itself the Supper was by no means as necessary as the Passion. Hence we may distinguish various degrees of necessity. In the first place, our salvation could have been attained without the Redemption. Secondly, our redemption was possible without sacrifice properly so called. Thirdly, a real and true sacrifice of our Lord was possible without the Supper. It was offered with the Supper because such was the good pleasure of our High Priest according to the order of Melchisedech.¹³

Fourth observation. Although the formal element of the sacrifice is conspicuous in the Supper chiefly, while the material element is mainly in evidence in Christ's torments, it is nevertheless in the Passion unto death rather than in the Supper rite that the sacrifice has its absolute and substantial reality. Three examples illustrate this.

The first example is from actual

¹³ Apart from other reasons possibly not known to us, the two following are fairly obvious: a sacrificial banquet was given us, and a daily repetition of that saving sacrifice.

material things. For it is to material things that the distinction of *matter* and *form* belongs, being applied to moral entities by a certain analogy. When we ask which of the two component elements in material things is more justly called the actual substance, the reply must be that the matter (assuming that it is endowed with form) is more properly and strictly called substance than the form, for it is there after the manner of subject, and the subject in act is the substance itself. Hence, the offering being presupposed, the Passion is truly, substantially, and absolutely the actual sacrifice of the Redemption. None the less the Supper can be truly called Christ's sacrifice and so the sacrifice of our Redemption, in as much as the form has its subsistence from the subject.

We take another example from rational psychology. As students of St Thomas are aware, the holy Doctor teaches that choice is "materially" and "substantially" in the will, though it is "formally" in the reason (1-2. 13, 1): for the act of choosing is undoubtedly in the will, but on the condition that some direction has been received in the will from the reason. Hence when we are concerned with an intrinsic ordination of two elements to each other, something may be "materially" in the one element and "formally" in the other, in such a way however that it may be said to be

"substantially" there, where it is "materially": provided that the formal element is presupposed. And such is the case in the sacrifice of our Lord. It must be said that the sacrifice is substantially and actually where it is materially, namely in the Passion: not however to the exclusion of the Supper, in which too the sacrifice is truly found, in so far as sacrifice strictly denominates the sacrificial rite celebrated by the priest.

Finally, a third example may be taken from the *sacramentum tantum* of the Eucharist. For this is said to be substantially permanent and therefore to consist, as a real thing, of the species, although it has as its form (according to the teaching to be explained below) words which are past. So too the sacrifice continues in its course throughout the whole Passion, although it began in the oblation rite of the Supper now past. Nevertheless just as the actual words are also the sacrament in so far as their indicative virtue is linked up with the signification of the bread and wine, so also the Supper is the sacrifice, in so far as the significative virtue of the Supper affects the immolation of the Passion in that sensible and enduring manner which we have explained above.

Fifth observation. As in the sacrificial, so in the moral order the part played by the Passion, wherein Christ permitted Himself to be immolated, is more important than the

part played by the Supper, in which He consecrated Himself to God for death. For although in other sacrifices, where the priest and the victim are not the same, it is possible for the work or the service of the subject submitting to immolation to appear of less value than that of the person performing the outward rite, here however, where Christ offers HIMSELF in sacrifice, the grandeur of the work and the service stand out more luminously in the heroic anguish of the Passion unto death, than in the offering of the Passion under a symbol: so that it is most of all from the element of suffering, that the ritual element acquires and derives its moral value.¹⁴ In a word: the sacrificial concept and the moral value are more inherent in the Passion than in the Supper. So at last we know how we must interpret the words of St. John in the Gospel, as referring to the Passion and to the Eucharist, but in due order: *Having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end* (XIII. 1).

Such then is the unity of the sacrifice of our Lord, as we derive it from the quotations of the written or the traditional word of God, set down above, throughout this chap-

¹⁴ Nevertheless in the moral order the Supper is important from this (that amongst other things) by the Supper the obligation to suffer and to die for us was voluntarily assumed, as explained in the preceding pages.

ter; but especially from the *Epistle to the Hebrews* which inculcates so definitely, not only the oneness of the Victim (*one sacrifice*, Hebr., X. 12), but also the oneness of the sacrifice of our Lord (*nor yet that he should offer himself often*. IX. 25; *Christ was offered once*, IX. 28; *for by one oblation he hath perfected them that are sanctified*. X. 14).¹⁵

¹⁵ When dealing with this oneness of the sacrifice of our Lord, the replies of the post-Tridentine theologians to the Protestants are most certainly right, when they distinguish the all-abundant propitiation provided on the Cross, and the application of this propitiation distributed, so to speak, in the Mass; and in so far they really do meet the Protestant objection against the Mass. These replies however do not throw light upon the relation of the Supper to the Cross, as we have already seen. Moreover even in respect of the Mass itself, they do not throw the fullest light, unless it be shown how this duality of the Cross and the Mass is compatible with the real intrinsic oneness of the two sacrifices. Only when this is definitely established will the mind be set at rest, grasping the interior connection of things, and will faith attain to the understanding which it has sought. I am in full agreement with Cardinal Cienfuegos (*Vita abscondita*, disp. 6, sect. 1, parag. 2, num. 12, Rome 1728. p. 437) on this point when he writes: "Even though this solution contains the true doctrine, it by no means avoids or overcomes the difficulty stated." The same eminent theologian had written shortly before (parag. 1, n. 1, p. 427): "A difficulty arises, . . . one of great complexity, not so simple of solution as some have thought. For the Doctor Eximius, disp. 74, sect. 1, when setting forth the strongest arguments of the heretics, wherewith as with an irresistible machine, they assail the sacrifice of the Mass, wisely remarks: 'This fundamental principle though in appearance weak, obtains very great strength for the Epistle

Therefore as God has joined together the Supper and the Cross, has included the Cross in the Supper, and consummated the Supper by the Cross, we must beware of separating where there is no separation but only unity. *What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*¹⁶

of St Paul to the Hebrews, where we find a similar argument employed to prove the weakness of the ancient sacrifices, seeing that after all of them, the sacrifice of the Cross was necessary. If effective, this line of argument proves in the same way that this sacrifice alone sufficed to consummate our salvation'. And thus one who studies the subject thoroughly, sees the full difficulty; while one who skims over it lightly and hastily, fails to realize its depth and to credit its full force." Later, having dealt with the arguments from the Mass, he argues (parag. 3, num. 17, sq.) forcefully on the insufficiency of that solution from the Supper, usually given by modern theologians, unless, he says, we add: "That the sacrifice of the Cross and the bloodless sacrifice are simply one numerically, as our teaching contends". (num. 30. p. 444). However when he comes to assign and explain this oneness, Cienfuegos is not very satisfying.

Call to mind the remarks on this matter on p. 107.

¹⁶ In his book *Lecons sur la messe*, which has just reached me, (March 19, 1919), Rev. P. Batiffol has the following fine passage: "Christ is at the same time Priest and Victim. As Victim He is immolated, as Priest He offers Himself in sacrifice . . . Oblation and immolation are distinguished as priest is distinguished from victim, even when priest and victim are one. In this sense we may say that at the Supper Christ is offered without being immolated (*meaning*: in blood), seeing that Christ died once only for sin (*Rom.*, VI. 10). But at the Supper He offered Himself . . . The oblation of the Supper and the oblation of the Mass have this in common, that they are the oblation of a victim offered at another point of time and

The Most Rev. Alexander MacDonald, whom we have already quoted, teaches this same written doctrine: "Jesus Christ instituted His sacrifice at the Last Supper, and took measures to perpetuate the institution. There He made the sacrificial offering of His Body and Blood, there He bore the part of a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech . . . Then the rite being accomplished, laying aside His priestly dignity, He went forth in His character of predestined Victim, suffered Himself to be led as a lamb to the slaughter, and so finished on Calvary what was begun in the upper room. He offered as priest, and priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech. He suffered as Victim, as that Lamb which was slain from the foundation of the world. He was not yet Victim in act when He made the offering; He was less than priest, yea in the strong words of the Prophet, as worm and no man, when He finished the sacrifice . . . True, He was Priest also in Calvary, Victim also in the upper

space; at the Supper this offering is made of the Victim which *will be* immolated on the Cross: at the Mass the oblation is made of the Victim which *has been* immolated on the Cross." (p. 175-180). The "sacrifice [of the Cross] has already been offered by Christ at the Supper and we in turn offer this sacrifice at the Mass in the form in which Christ offered it at the Supper, and gave us the power to offer it". And the same writer remarks: "This teaching has the advantage of being the actual doctrine of the Liturgy." (p. 130).

room . . . But to speak of what was uppermost in each case, He was Priest in the Cenacle and Victim on Calvary. Therefore He offered His sacrifice truly and literally as a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech". (*The Sacrifice of the New Law*, in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Dec. 1, 1905, vol. 23, p. 629).¹⁷

B. THE ONENESS OF THE APPARENT SACRIFICE OF BREAD AND WINE AND OF THE REAL SACRIFICE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD.

Here again we have the solution of the doubt already spoken of (see p. 9):—whether in any sacrifice there can be, beside that which is the *res tantum* and that which is *res et signum*, something after the manner of *signum tantum*? It is clear that in the sacrifice of Christ BESIDES THE OFFERING OF THE BODY AND BLOOD TO DEATH, which was at the same time *sign and reality*, in the appearances or the species of the bread and wine there was also something in the nature of *sign only*, for the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ is represented under the form and the appearance of a sacrifice of bread and wine—, and this is a *sign only*. Christ therefore offered Himself under the appearance of the Melchisedechian sacrifice.

When we arrive at the considera-

tion of the Mass, and not of the Supper, we shall find every page of our theology and liturgy telling us of this indivisible duality—, the apparent sacrifice of bread and wine, and the real sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Justin was the first of the Fathers to mark clearly the significative role played by the bread and wine in the constitution of the sacrifice of the Mass, where he said:

"We are taught that this food which is eucharistiated, FROM WHICH OUR FLESH AND BLOOD ARE NOURISHED BY ITS CHANGE,¹⁸ is the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Jesus". (*Apol.* 66. P. G. 6, 428-429). "He has the same thing in mind where he says that Christians offer the sacrifice IN REMEMBRANCE OF THEIR SOLID AND LIQUID NUTRIMENT, wherein is also made A MEMORIAL OF THE PASSION which the Son of God went through for them". (*Dial.* 117, P. G. 745-748). In other words these two things,—bread and wine—being naturally changed into our own flesh and blood, are chosen most fittingly to confer on our sacrifice significative power in respect of the Body and Blood of Christ

¹⁸ *Kata metabolen* = per mutationem = change (See Clement of Alexandria, *Paedag.* 1, 6, P.G. 8, 309). Justin is speaking here of the natural change of the Eucharistic food into our flesh, just like any other food; he is not referring to the conversion of the bread into the Flesh of Christ. (Compare F. H. Colson, *Notes on Justin Martyr*, in *J.T.S.*, Jan. 1922, p. 166).

¹⁷ Call to mind Manning, cited above.

slain in the Passion.¹⁹ And thus we note the aptitude of the bread and wine to designate THE PROPITIATORY Victim, composed of bloodless flesh and shed blood. Irenaeus in the fourth book *Adv. Haereses* (17, 5. P. G. 7, 1023) follows the same line of thought as Justin, where no matter the interpretation given to his words (to be treated later), we must take him to see in the very properties of the bread and wine as food and drink a particular suitability for our sacrifice: wherein praise is given to God "who gives us nourishment." This particular aptitude of the bread and wine is therefore its aptitude to give an Eucharistic signification (that is, of praise and thanksgiving) to our sacrifice of the Mass.

Now our Mass sacrifice is both Eucharistic and propitiatory. Hence these two concepts of the aptitude of the bread and wine in our Mass, as noted by Justin and Irenaeus, are by no means in conflict, rather they

¹⁹ St Gregory of Nyssa partly says the same thing when he compares the Incarnation and the Eucharist: "In the Incarnation the grace of the Word sanctified THE BODY WHOSE SUBSTANCE WAS BY NOURISHMENT FROM BREAD, AND IN A MANNER ACTUALLY WAS BREAD [bread being changed by vital assimilation into the Body of the Word]; here in like manner the bread [of the Eucharist] is consecrated by the word of God and by prayer, not indeed that it should become the Body and Blood of the Word by way of food and drink, but as changed immediately into the Body of the Word, according to what was said by the Word: *This is my body* (*Orat. catech.*, c. 37. P.G. 45, 97).

are complementary one to the other. From Justin and Irenaeus onwards this has become the teaching of the Church. Our sacrifice has, so to speak, a twofold character: the one real, as far as concerns the Body and Blood of Christ, the other apparent, in the bread and wine only.

Isaac de Stella (*Epistola de officio missae*) in the xii century explained this teaching in the following words: "The visible priest approaches . . . to offer visible victims—victims of the earth, earthly, on a visible material altar, consecrated visibly with material oil. Everything is external here: all that is done, and how it is done, is openly seen by all . . . SINCE THEN AMONGST THOSE FOODS WITHOUT WHICH OUR ANIMAL LIFE IS NOT SUSTAINED, THE CHIEF ONES ARE BREAD AND WINE, BY THEM IS APTLY OFFERED THE STRENGTH AND THE VIGOUR OF OUR ANIMAL LIFE. For they are the chief constituents of our sustenance and represent the whole of it. Hence what more can one who desires to be at peace with his God do, than out of his poverty to offer his whole sustenance, he slays all that lives the animal life in him". (P. L. 194, 1892-1893). Evidently these words bear on the external appearance of our sacrifice, they have not yet touched its true internal reality. Hence Isaac goes on: "Nevertheless there is needed a more sublime plan. In this action the slave does everything that the slave can do, but even then he does not

fully satisfy; he himself can do no more, yet all he can do is not enough . . . and so he raises himself in prayer, and turning to Him who can do all things, he says: "This our offering do thou, O Lord, vouchsafe etc., . . . Hence as a new priest, not now the Melchisedech of old, and having, not from the fruit of his labour, nor from the earth, . . . but . . . from the divine gifts and presents, a celestial Victim of Flesh and Blood from heaven—, this he offers, not as before in fear, not offering a victim of servitude, but saying in joy and exultation: *a pure victim to thy most excellent majesty*, etc." Here we have plainly indicated the true reality of the saving sacrifice, beneath the veil of the symbols of the Melchisedechian sacrifice.²⁰

Turning to the Greek Fathers, Nicholas Cabasilas²¹ in his *Liturgiae*

²⁰ Robertus Paululus, Isaac's contemporary, follows him word for word practically. He links the victim of bread and wine which is seen, with the Victim of the Body and Blood of Christ, which is believed or is the object of faith, in this way: "WE OFFER VISIBLE VICTIMS OF BREAD AND WINE ON A VISIBLE ALTAR . . . and all this is done still outside (the tabernacle) . . . The second altar which is inside (the tabernacle) . . . the golden altar, signifies the altar of faith (that is the altar which is invisible, and hence to be believed not seen) . . . On this altar (of faith) the priest offers . . . the invisible Victim of Flesh and Blood". (*De officiis ecclesiasticis*, 1, 2, c. 26-27, P.L. 177, 427-429)

²¹ Meanwhile in his *Antirrheticum contra Eusebium*, c. 45, Parag. 2 (*Spicil. Solesm.* 1, 440-441) St Nicephorus of Constantinople had written: "What we also now OFFER IN

Expositio in the xiv century, has a full chapter, the title of which runs: *These gifts are offered to God, as the first fruits of human life*. Here we find the following words: "We consecrate these gifts to God, as signifying the first fruits of human life, for they are the nutriment of man, by them his corporeal life is sustained; AND NOT ONLY DOES THE NUTRIMENT SUSTAIN LIFE BUT IT ALSO SIGNIFIES IT." Naturally it is man's life, and not any other kind of animal life, that is signified by the bread and wine. "For what is suitable for man only, that we call human nutriment, for it is proper to man only to bake bread that he may eat and to make wine that he may drink." (*Liturgiae expositio*, c. 3. P. G. 150, 377).²² Human life therefore is dedi-

SYMBOL (that is the bread and wine), . . . we really receive, changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, mystically and invisibly".

²² How careful Cabasilas is to exclude all intrinsic or absolute reality from the sacrifice of bread and wine, is plain from another passage: "What is offered in sacrifice is not bread, but the very Body of Christ . . . That immolation, as considered in the subject, is not in the bread, but in the Body of Christ; it is not, and it is not called, the sacrifice of the bread, but the sacrifice of the Lamb of God" (*Liturgiae expositio*, c. 33, P.G. 150, 440). The immolation of which he is speaking, the only real immolation which he admits in our sacrifice, is the immolation in the Blood of the Passion, as is absolutely clear throughout the whole chapter.

I think then that in the *De sacrosancto missae sacrificio commentarius* (Antwerp 1574), Matthaeus Galenus Vestcapellius does not fully appreciate the mind of Cabasilas though professing to follow him, for to the

cated to God under these species. But what human life is dedicated to God unless the human life of Christ is in the first place thus dedicated? He intimated by the addition of the sacramental words that He was given over to God. Secondly, our human life is dedicated, its spiritual and invisible immolation is promised and vowed to God by the sensible immolation of our heavenly Victim.

Defending Catholic dogma against the heretical archbishop Hermann of Wied, the Canons of Cologne

natural substances of the bread and wine he attributes the elements of some kind of new victim, imperfect and preliminary, which is to pass subsequently into the perfect Victim of the Body and Blood of Christ, which succeeds it. In other words he thinks that in our sacrifice there must be some kind of destruction of the bread and wine, and this a real immolation: "Let us teach then that the victim of bread and wine is not and does not remain quite immune from destruction." (*op. cit.*, c. 7, fol. 104). He seems to place this destruction in the transubstantiation by which the bread ceases to be. His reason for this theory was that he had already included in his definition of sacrifice the actual effecting of a change in the subject, and he thought that he could not satisfy this definition unless he pointed to some new change or immolation or destruction on that subject. He did not want to assign this in the Mass to Christ, as being injurious to Him, and so he allotted the change to the bread: this change being, so to speak, a preamble to the other Victim of the Body and Blood of Christ. But Galenus is not consistent here; he loses sight of his cardinal principle, that immolation is not to be sought in the Mass and is not lacking in Christ, but it is simply that immolation which is supplied from the Cross. Kramp (*Die Opferanschauungen der röm. Messliturgie*) resurrected this theory.

published their *Antididagma* in the xvi century.²³

In this work they carefully distinguished that the part played by the bread and wine in our sacrifice is that of sign or symbol, when they say: "The slanderous accusation which Luther in his own evil-minded way, maliciously and perfidiously makes against the Church, as though we placed our hopes of salvation in bread and wine, and wished to work out our salvation in the sacrifices of insensible things, is fraud and sheer sophistry. Has such a thing ever been thought of? IN THE VISIBLE SYMBOLS OF BREAD AND WINE WE OFFER TO God the Father with thanksgiving, THE INVISIBLE MYSTERIES OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST." (fol. LIX). Having delivered this caution the same fathers go on to speak faultlessly of "THAT OUTWARD AND SIGNIFICATIVE SACRIFICE of bread and wine."

Foremost amongst the Scholastics in the explanation of this point of doctrine is Canus (*De locis theologicis*, l, I. c. 12), who transfers from the sacrament to the sacrifice the well-known distinction between *signum tantum* and *res et signum*. He remarks that "JUST AS Catholics speak of the sacrament of the Eucharist in two different ways, so too they

²³ Cologne 1544. In the composition of the *Antididagma*, John Gropper, intrepid champion of the Catholic Faith in his Fatherland, later created Cardinal by Paul V, was very prominent.

speak of the sacrifice of the Eucharist. For there is the *sacramentum tantum*, namely the outward appearances of bread and wine which contains the Body and Blood of Christ. Likewise there is the *res et sacramentum*, namely the Body and Blood of Christ which are contained within, under cover of the species or appearances. SIMILARLY TOO IN OUR OBLATION AND MASS, there is the outward sacrifice of the species of bread and wine . . . ; there is also the inward sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, which especially we offer to God the Father under these species."

If you ask how this duality of the apparent and the real sacrifice is compatible with the unique oneness of the Victim (which is none other than the Body and Blood of Christ) or, how this duality does not militate against the identity of our Victim with the Lamb immolated on the Cross (not under any covering of bread and wine), Vasquez will give you an answer which is both acute and penetrating. Making a distinction between the reality which is offered and the action whereby it is offered, he then applies and restricts the sacrificial role of the bread and wine to the act of offering, and not to the reality offered: "I maintain that the appearances of bread and wine . . . do not pertain essentially to the reality offered . . . but to the offering and the sacrificial action . . . I said that they (the spe-

cies) pertain to the bloodless offering, for since the entire bloodless offering is situate in that signification BY WAY OF ACTION . . . and since the species pertain to this signification, it is necessary therefore that they pertain also to that immolation."²⁴ That is to say, as the species (as will be explained later in this work) coupled with the words, serve to effect the transubstantiation, wherein the offering is made, they certainly take part in the constitution of the offering.

All this can and must be transferred from the Mass to the Supper, so that we believe that under the appearance of bread and wine there was enacted at the Supper, the real offering of the Flesh of the Lord to the slaying, and of His Blood to the shedding (= *the reality and the sign*); and in this undivided sacrifice of the Passion was signified, as *reality only* not only the internal adoration and thanksgiving of Christ, but also as we said above, our own alienation from sin, which in turn was not only signified but also effected.

C. THE OFFERING TO DEATH IN THE SUPPER REQUIRES THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST

In the Supper therefore Christ offered His own death: that is, while

²⁴ Here as usual Vasquez understands immolation in the sense of sacrificial action, or the offering of the thing immolated (Compare disp. 222, c. 8, n. 66 and 67).

He appeared to hold the bread and wine in His hands, He really sacrificed the Body of His torment and the Blood of His Passion.

We may now ask whether the real presence of the Body and Blood was necessary in the constitution of this sacrifice. For once granted that Christ willed to offer Himself to death in the apparent sacrifice of the bread and wine, would not this presence of the bread and wine, as representing symbolically the slaying of the Body and the shedding of the Blood which was to come, be quite sufficient for the constitution of the sacrifice? If so, the presence of the Body and Blood in the *offering* was superfluous, no matter what it may later contribute to the *partaking* of the sacrifice.

This is by no means so. Indeed if the Body and Blood were not present under the species or appearance of bread and wine, it would be impossible to say that Christ's death was offered in the Supper, or that He dedicated Himself to God in the Supper. For seeing that sacrifice is both *reality and sign*, it must on the one hand include something in the nature of a *sign*, as indicative of our interior consecration²⁵ it must include on the other hand a *reality*,

²⁵ Here the sign is MORAL, expressing an affection of the mind; it is not necessarily a MYSTIC sign, that is, typically representing an antitype, as was the case in the ancient sacrifices in respect of the sacrifice of Christ (Compare Suarez *De Incarnatione*, pars 2, in 3 S. 48, 3, commentarius, n. 2).

an actual handing over of the victim²⁶ transferred, so to speak, from my hand into the hand of God, for instance, by being placed on the altar (as substitute for the divinity) or something of that kind. Consequently had Christ in the Supper merely held bread and wine in His hands, there would have been no sacrifice of His death, the flesh and blood of the victim to be immolated would not have been offered; for in that case the victim itself would not have been actually presented, dedicated, and transmitted to God, AT MOST IT WOULD HAVE BEEN OFFERED IN FIGURE.²⁷ This offering in figure could in turn be twofold. It could be a real absolute sacrifice of the bread and wine, relative to the sacrifice of the Cross in the same way as the ancient sacrifices were relative: that is, as type to antitype; or even without the sacrifice of bread and wine, it could be just a manifestation in symbol of the death of the Lord to come. Evidently in this

²⁶ Hence a verbal or written intimation of giving, as happens (especially nowadays) in ordinary contracts, would not suffice; for, as we have said, Sacrifice is primarily an action and not a prayer; the alienation or the handing over of the gift transmitted from myself to God, must be performed by an act of transfer, and not merely enunciated in written or oral words.

²⁷ As the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ was represented in figure by the sacrifice of Melchisedech, and by the sacrifices of the Old Law (even when Christ Himself was present), but was not actually offered.

latter case there would be no sacrifice, but merely a kind of prophetic adumbration of a future offering. In the former case, we have indeed the offering of a banquet, but (as with the Hebrews in the past) a merely figurative offering of the Body to be immolated and of the Blood to be shed; but the reality itself is not presented to God: nor therefore is the death of Christ really offered, though possibly it is represented as to be offered. The victim of the Passion could of course be actually and really offered in a symbol of the Passion, but this would have to be a symbol not merely foreshowing the gift, but showing it actually present. The death of Christ therefore will not be offered in any symbol or sacrament, unless the symbol or sacrament contains the true Body and Blood. Besides, to say that the Body and Blood were given to God for us under the appearance of bread and wine would be vain, if the Body and Blood were not present; it would be vain to say that the covenant was sanctioned in the Blood or in the chalice, unless it were the chalice of the real Blood. Everything would be fictitious, Christ's offering, His propitiation, His covenant with God, Truth itself would not have told the truth—which God forbid . . . Hence every opponent of the Real Presence²⁸ excludes every sacrificial concept whatsoever from

the Supper, reducing the whole Great Action to a mere symbol. Like Jülicher, they say that it merely announces in parable the coming death, or like Spitta, that it is an allegorical anticipation of Messianic joy, or some such thing.²⁹

But with the Catholic Church, placing our faith on the words of Christ, we believe that it is a sacrifice; and hence also we accept the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord. So necessary is this Presence, that apart altogether from the partaking by way of banquet of the Victim, it would still be required essentially and substantially to constitute the sacrifice. Hence it is commonplace with our theologians, both mediaeval, like William of Paris and post-mediaeval, like Vasquez, to teach in reference to the Mass, what we have established in reference to the Supper: namely, that the sacrificial character of the rite requires the Real Presence of Christ, so that once you have established the sacrifice, by that very fact you have proved the Real Presence.

Having recounted the four benefits of the Mass, William of Paris continues: "For it is not true, as some heretics foolishly imagine, that a mere designation, or symbol, or figure of that lifegiving Body and precious Blood, suffices to effect these four benefits; on the contrary

²⁸ See very rare exceptions in K. G. Goetz, *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage*, 2, p. 185 foll.

²⁹ To be discussed in Book II.

these four benefits necessarily require the true reality of the life-giving bread and wine strictly present . . . It is impossible to appease the anger of God by a mere empty designation, or to reconcile an offended God without reality in the sacrifice . . . Were it otherwise, figures or pictures would suffice to procure these benefits, and we would trouble ourselves with the solemnities of the Mass to no purpose, when pictures of altars and of the sacred offerings would be easily sufficient for these four benefits. Such an absurd theory would force them to admit, that a mere picture of the deluge actually submerges the world without the real deluge, that a picture of the fire by which the lower world is consumed is now consuming it, that a picture of bread nourishes, that a picture of wine slakes thirst and inebriates. So glaring therefore is their folly, that they fail to realize the nature and the power of the efficacy which they attribute to symbols and to reality." (*De sacramento eucharistiae*, c. 4. P. 443).

Vasquez similarly: "Nevertheless it must be carefully noted that to constitute a commemorative sacrifice, really and properly so called, a mere symbol of the death of some being, a symbol which in itself contains in no way that real being whose death is represented, does not suffice; for it could not then be said that the real being whose death is

represented is offered in sacrifice; it would not be a real commemorative sacrifice, rather it would be merely A SYMBOL AND A SHADOW OF SACRIFICE . . . ; for instance, if the teaching of the heretics were true that the Body and Blood of Christ is not under the appearance of bread and wine, the death of Christ would indeed be represented, as even the heretics themselves admit, but Christ would not be said TO BE REALLY AND TRULY OFFERED IN SACRIFICE, but merely IN FIGURE. HOW CAN ANYTHING BE SAID TO BE REALLY AND TRULY OFFERED IN SACRIFICE CONCERNING WHICH THE ACTION OF THE OFFERING PRIEST IS NOT REALLY DIRECTED UPON THE THING ITSELF BUT ONLY UPON SOME FIGURE AND IMAGE OF THE THING?" (In 3 S. disp. 222, c. 8, n. 66 and 67). These words of Vasquez on the Mass apply equally to the Supper, in which there cannot be a true sacrificial offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, a true sacrifice of the death of the Lord, unless the VICTIM of the Passion be hidden beneath the symbols of the Passion.

In our time considerable light has been thrown on the question by the collective pronouncement of the English Bishops, in which they defend the condemnation of the Anglican Orders; in the section where they maintain that the true character of the priesthood is bound up with the truth of the sacrifice, and

the truth of the sacrifice with the Real Presence: "Such being our doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, its essential dependence on the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence is manifest. For, if there were no power in the words of consecration to make the true Body and Blood of Christ really and objectively present on the altar, we should not have on our altars THE VICTIM OF CALVARY, and

without ITS VICTIM the sacrifice could not subsist." (*A Vindication of the Bull. Apostolicae Curae*, by the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster, London 1898, n. 12, P. 26).

These words refer primarily to the Supper. They ask: How could the Victim of Calvary be given over to God, were the Victim not present there?

§ 7. The Council of Trent

A. THE HISTORY OF THE DEFINITION

One may appeal to an explicit statement or definition of doctrine made by the supreme authority of the teaching of the Church in two ways. The authority of a Council or Pope may be claimed for a doctrine in question, as explicitly expressed in a conciliar or papal definition (e. g. the Council of Trent defines that "there are seven sacraments of the Church"). Or an appeal may be made to definitions of Council or Pope bearing on the matter in question, but not stating explicitly the disputed doctrine, and by argument from these definitions one may reach a conclusion of greater or less probability. We follow this latter course here, and in appealing to the authority of the Council, our argument is twofold: *first*, from the history of the definition which the Council drew up; *second*, from the tenor of the definition.¹

¹ This is all the more justifiable, seeing that from the history of the Council we know that in the definition it did not desire to settle the more difficult questions centring on the offering of the Supper. Upon this Pallavicini writes: "In respect of the offering of Christ, the fathers only took into consideration generally accepted opinions. Setting aside matters of controversy among Catholics, they merely say what we now have in the definition, that in the Supper our Redeemer offered Himself in sacrifice to the Father under the appearance of bread and wine; the Council did not state by what kind of sacrifice He so offered Himself" (*Hist. Concil. Trid.*, l. 18, c. 5, n. 5).

During the deliberations of the Council, the wording of Chapter I (on the institution of the Mass) in which the Supper is dealt with, was attacked by a considerable number of the bishops, as we see in the *Historia Concilii Tridentini*, I, 18, c. 2 and 9), and *Acta genuina Concilii Tridentini*, as published by Theiner (t. 2, p. 79 foll.) at much greater length.² Amongst these assailants there were three parties. Some desired that there should be no conciliar definition at all in respect of the Supper. Others said that the notion of offering or sacrifice should not be linked in the definition with the Supper. Others would exclude from the definition any idea of a propitiatory offering. The main argument of all of them was the great difficulty that would arise in dealing with the heretics, were another sacrifice attributed to Christ before the sacrifice of the Cross, particularly a sacrifice of propitiation.

The general supposition of all these fathers was that the Supper and the Cross were to be counted as two sacrifices.³ This supposition

² Still later we have a new edition of these *Acta* compiled by S. Ehses, entitled *Concilium Tridentinum, Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatum nova collectio* (tom. 8, 1919, p. 755-788).

³ For had Christ celebrated a propitiatory sacrifice preliminary to the sacrifice of the Cross it could not have been vain or empty or of less value than the Cross (for the same

was common to a number of champions of the Decree issued by the Council. Not all of the fathers however held this view; upon the others, who denied that there were two sacrifices, lay the task of defending the oneness; and thereby finally a safe clear way was prepared for the definition of the Council as it stands. Hence it was their effort particu-

Christ would personally and immediately offer both): therefore man, for whose atonement it was offered, would necessarily have been there and then redeemed (for at the Supper Christ said that His Blood was HERE AND NOW shed for many UNTO THE REMISSION of sins). Hence man would have been redeemed before the sacrifice of the Redemption, which of course no one believes (*Acta Genuina*, 2, p. 82-86). Moreover they realized the great difficulty raised by any such doctrine of a preliminary propitiatory sacrifice, from the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Christ offered once, and that He made propitiation for us only once by way of sacrifice; see the passages cited. There were indeed some who said that a previous propitiation of the sacramental Supper would not be detrimental in any way to the propitiation of the Cross, seeing that all the acts of Christ were equally meritorious even before the Cross. This reply did not satisfy the objectors, and justly so; because a meritorious act and a propitiatory sacrifice are altogether different. By a meritorious act as such, no contract in favour of a third party is entered into between the person who merits and God, but by a sacrifice which is propitiatory for others a contract is entered into. If such a contract is not void (and in the case of the sacrifice of Christ, this would be blasphemous) it must wipe off the debt to the payment of which it was directed. Now the sacrifice of Christ was directed in act, and in the present, TO SATISFY FOR MANY (that is for the multitude in need of expiation) UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.

larly that was responsible for the wording of the Decree. We have two opinions therefore among the fathers, one to all intents and purposes opposed to the wording of the decree, the other favourable. We ask you therefore which of these opinions is more akin to the definition—the opinion of those who wished it framed, or those who opposed it. The answer is surely obvious.

Here are a few examples used by the theologians responsible for the decree in the manner stated.

First of all, Eustace du Bellay, Bishop of Paris, spoke thus: "Christ OFFERED HIMSELF IN THAT SUPPER . . . YET THERE WERE NOT TWO OFFERINGS BUT ONE WITH THAT OF THE CROSS, for He had commenced the Passion in the offering of the Supper and the offering was made continuous with that of the Cross: and it was expiatory, for it was the same as that of the Cross" (*Acta Genuina*, t. 2, p. 82).

Later the Bishop of Fiesole (p. 83) followed him, then the Bishop of Leira added: "There is therefore one Victim and ONE OFFERING, THAT OF THE SUPPER AND THAT OF THE CROSS, and the two are INDIVISIBLE." (p. 84).⁴ The Bishop of Calve said: "The offering of the Supper and

⁴ The Bishop of Leira expressly relied on St Thomas (3 S. 83, 5, 3m) where He counts the Supper as the third of the parts of the Passion. St Thomas in this place had already said: "The sacrifice of the Supper was propitiatory because of the Victim offered on the Cross".

that of the Cross is one and the same." (p. 92). The Bishop of Niochensis ". . . And this (sacrifice offered in the Supper under the appearance of bread and wine) is the same as that of the Cross, which was commenced at that time." (ibid.). Earlier the Bishop of Palermo: "Proves that Christ offered Himself in the Supper . . . And then He commenced His offering, He finished it on the Cross". (p. 79). Meantime the Bishop of Viviers,⁵ Campagna (p. 86-87), Bida,⁶ etc., spoke in the same strain.

⁵ "Christ offered Himself in the Supper in an expiatory manner; for the Victim is one and the same, and the sacrifice one and the same with that of the Cross." (p. 85).

⁶ "Christ offered Himself in the Supper which offering was the same with that of the Cross" (p. 85). Ten years before, between the XIV and XV session, several bishops and theologians had anticipated them. Among the theologians Franciscus Sonnius: "Then Christ began to offer in the Supper, and He finished on the Cross . . . It was one and the same offering which was made in the Supper and on the Cross." (*Acta Genuina*, I, 612). Similarly Jacobus Ferrusius: "The Supper was a true sacrifice in respect of the death which was impending, and which subsequently took place on the Cross." (p. 623). Refuting the Bishop of Bitonto the Bishop of Lodi said words worthy of record: The Bishop of Bitonto had said that "Christ did not offer Himself in the Supper, because otherwise His death would have been in vain, because the sacrifice of the Supper would have sufficed to reconcile us to God." The Bishop of Lodi solves the difficulty in one statement: "The sacrifice of the Supper and of the Cross is the same." (p. 641). From this it does not follow that the death of Christ was superfluous: for the Supper and the Cross were but one sacrifice.

To these theologians we owe in a great measure the first chapter on the institution of the Mass.

Turning to the original form suggested ten years before for the Decree, the grave censure of Adolphus III von Schaumberg, the very learned and intensely Catholic Archbishop of Cologne who replaced the apostate Hermann of Wied in the See, should be remembered. There seem to have been some theologians who attributed to Christ a kind of Aaronic priesthood in the Passion, reserving the Melchisedechian priesthood for the Supper alone. Against them he upheld the one priesthood of Christ, conclusively vindicating this priesthood from the undivided oneness of the sacrifice of the Lord: "Because Christ was priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, He really did retain in the sacrifice the figures of the bread and wine, but nevertheless He changed the things themselves into nobler things, and into a more powerful sacrifice, and offering to the heavenly Father in the Supper, UNDER THESE SPECIES HE OFFERED WITH HIS OWN HANDS THE BODY AND BLOOD IN A SACRIFICE WHICH WOULD BE CONSUMMATED AND COMPLETED ON THE CROSS BY THE HANDS OF OTHERS. . . . Just as the priesthood of Melchisedech adumbrated the most divine priesthood of Christ, so too the edible and visible sacrifice of the same Melchisedech signified the most divine sacrifice of

Christ, which was crushed by torment but was not consumed on the Cross, and is now eaten by us in the sacrament. . . . His hour had come wherein He would be betrayed into the hands of sinners, and pass from this world to the Father. AND SO WHEN THAT HOUR HAD COME, HE OFFERED HIMSELF TO THE FATHER WITH HIS OWN HANDS; the wicked to whom he was handed over, did not cease to strike Him, they tormented, scourged and crucified Him, UNTIL THEY HAD CONSUMMATED ON THE CROSS THE SACRIFICE WHICH WAS OFFERED IN BREAD AND WINE. Holy Scripture and all the Fathers are in accord with this teaching. They do not separate the sacrifice of the Cross from the sacrifice of the Supper, rather they include the Supper with the Cross, in the manner in which it is possible to include it, that is in the bloodless manner; in this manner nevertheless, IT WAS NONE OTHER THAN THAT SELFSAME SACRIFICE WHICH WAS THEN BEING OFFERED . . . UNTIL IT SHOULD BE CONSUMMATED. As this is most TRUE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE, it seems that some few words of the suggested statement of doctrine, WHICH COULD BE CONSTRUED INTO A DIFFERENT OPINION, should be changed." (Le Plat *Monumentorum Concilii Tridentini*, t. 4, p. 408-409. Compare p. 410-412 at greater length in the same sense). The words which displeased the Archbishop in the original draft were: "Christ on the Cross

fulfilled the office of the priesthood of Aaron", etc. After a few days the fathers, heeding the very salutary admonition of their colleague, deleted these words from the Decree.⁷

Hence the teaching on the oneness of the sacrifice of Christ not only had a share in the framing of the Decree, but it also corrected an earlier and faulty form suggested for the Decree.

B. THE TENOR OF THE DECREE

The Council did assert a oneness between the Mass and the Cross in the following words: "For the Victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who once offered Himself on the Cross, the manner of offering alone being different." In other words, although there are as many sacrifices as there are offerings, at the same time there does exist a real oneness between the Mass and the Cross, by reason of the Victim which is offered (i.e. Christ).

Now either (a) the very Victim of the Cross, absolutely as such, is held to be offered to God in the Mass (in the manner to be explained at length below, in later chapters of this work): and then this oneness which the Council maintains is quite plain to understand. Or, (b) Christ is

⁷ Some of the fathers had anticipated the Archbishop in rejecting the order of Aaron in Christ, but none so effectively.

held to be offered in the Mass, as affected by some kind of new real immolation (as a number of modern theologians say). Or finally, (c) Christ is offered in the Mass without any intrinsic condition of immolation whatever, whether of the past or now, as a few (though very able) theologians taught.

In this last case, as we shall show later in this work, the reality of the sacrifice seems to disappear, since there is no true victim, seeing that the Body and Blood of Christ have no condition of immolation whatever, except an extrinsic immolation, in the symbols. In the second case, where a new immolation intervenes, the reality of the sacrifice is certainly not destroyed, indeed it is overstressed; but now it is difficult to see how to keep intact the oneness of the sacrifice of the Cross and of the sacrifice of the Mass, as defined by the Council, which states that in all things they are the same, with one exception: *only the manner of offering being different*.⁸ For it cannot be said that the Mass differs only in the manner of offering, when it differs also in the immolation; since one is presupposed as having already taken place upon the Cross, another now (not only numerically but specifically different) in the Mass.⁹

⁸ How *the manner of offering is different* in both, was already shown.

⁹ Hence it would seem that absolute sacrifice must be excluded from the Mass,—I

We are now justified in arguing from the Mass back to the Supper. For if Christ is offered in the Mass as already immolated on the Cross, He must have been offered in the Supper as to be immolated on the Cross. If we offer the death of Christ as having happened, He must have offered His death as impending (our contention). We cannot teach the one in the Mass without concluding to the other in the Supper. Hence unless you follow this teaching on the Supper, you can scarcely be in accord with Trent on the Mass.¹⁰

mean any teaching which would make it contain in itself, even apart from the Cross, every element of sacrifice; the Mass must be said not only to be a sacrifice relative to the Cross (for all the sacrifices of the Old Law were relative to the Cross, which they represented as to come, while they were themselves absolute sacrifices), but also and as a matter of course **ESSENTIALLY** relative, in the sense that without the Cross it would not be a sacrifice at all. However, we must repeat what we have said already, that our inference from the trend of the Decree has value just in so far as the Synod is taken to use the word *oblatio* in the restricted meaning (compare our remarks in this connection on page 139). If the word *oblatio* be taken there in a wide meaning, our conclusion will not stand. Study for yourself and see whether the less literal exegesis of the words of Trent is safe. However if you refuse to accept the stricter exegesis, be careful later and do not advance it against us.

¹⁰ Cardinal Cienfuegos thought that the numerical oneness of the Supper and the Passion could be inferred from the teaching of the Council in another way: "The priesthood whereby the sacrifice of the Cross was to be offered by Christ the Lord, according to the Council, was of such a character and order that it was not to be ended by His

Two words of St Peter Canisius written shortly before the proclamation of the Decree of the Council, accord perfectly with our teaching: "The sacrifice of the Mass duly weighed in all its aspects, is really the holy and living representation, and at the same time the BLOODLESS and efficacious offering of the PASSION OF THE LORD, AND OF THAT SACRIFICE IN BLOOD which was offered for us on the Cross." (St Peter Canisius, *Opus Catechisticum*, de sacramentis, q. 7). The writer of these words implicitly taught¹¹ that having due regard to the difference of time and circumstances, the Supper was the bloodless offering of the bloody sacrifice which Christ was to consummate in the Passion and on the Cross.¹²

death. *Nevertheless because this priesthood was not to be ended by the death*, etc. But it would be ended according to the order or rite in which He offered in blood," were it other than the priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech in bread and wine (*Vita abscondita*, disp. 6, sect. 2 parag. 1, Rome 1728, p. 450). It would be impossible to deny that there is some force in the appeal to the words of Trent. Still I fear that Cienfuegos strains the logical connection of the sentences too much, and thus the oneness or absolute identity of this priesthood is urged farther than the definition itself requires.

¹¹ We are unable to say whether or not Canisius concluded from this to the unity of the sacrifice of our Lord as we maintain it.

¹² Possibly an objection may be raised from the tenor of the Decree, by quoting the words of the Council, which introduce the teaching on the Mass: "Although

(Christ) by His death was to offer Himself to God and the Father on the altar of the Cross, in order to redeem us there . . . Nevertheless in the Last Supper . . . declaring that He was a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, He offered His Body and Blood to God the Father under the appearance of bread and wine". From which one might argue as follows: The Council places before us a sacrifice to be enacted on the Cross; it opposes to this sacrifice, by the use of the adversative particles *although . . . nevertheless*, that sacrifice which was previously offered in the Supper. Hence it places two sacrifices before us, not one. For if it says that Christ offered the one NOTWITHSTANDING THE OTHER, certainly the two are not one sacrifice. If they were one, neither would be enacted without the other, hence the adversative particles (*although . . . nevertheless*) would be out of place; rather they should be consecutive particles, *since* or *because*: so that, if it held the oneness of the Supper and the Cross the Council should have said something like: *because* He was about to enact the sacrifice of the Cross, he offered sacrifice in the Supper; whereas what it actually said comes to this: *although* he was about to make sacrifice on the Cross, nevertheless He also desired to sacrifice in the Supper. Hence the Council absolutely teaches two sacrifices of Christ.

But against this conclusion, we have first of all the clearest testimonies that the Council had no intention of defining anything in this matter, and furthermore that the principal authors of the Decree thought that the Decree would be best verified if one held to this singular unity of the sacrifice of our Lord.

Secondly, it is easy to show that the oneness by no means makes the adversative particles *although . . . nevertheless* out of place. For although the Supper was one sacrifice with the Cross, nevertheless the Cross could undoubtedly have been a sacrifice without the Supper, namely by the addition of any other liturgical rite whatsoever. *Although* therefore Christ could have enacted the sacrifice of the Cross without the Supper,

nevertheless He desired that through the Supper it should be Melchisedechian.

Thirdly and particularly, we must keep in mind the scope of the Council—to do away with Protestant error. The Protestants, as a base for their attack on the sacrifice of the Eucharist, used the reality of the sacrifice of the Cross, and the oneness of the sacrifice of our Lord, both taken together. The Council answered them by stating two points of faith. First, in respect of the Supper: *although* the Cross is a most true sacrifice (this we all believe), *nevertheless* we must believe that Christ as priest according to the order of Melchisedech, willed that the Supper should be also a sacrifice (The Council did not state whether it is numerically one with the sacrifice of the Cross or not.) Second, in respect of the Mass: by the words *Do this* Christ instituted the bloodless sacrifice, commemorative of His death, and LEFT it to be celebrated by His Church to the end of time. Apart from these two points of faith, to be held necessarily, the Council proposed nothing in the beginning of the first chapter; for these two principles were quite sufficient to refute the error of the heretics.

Some more recent critics after Westcott-Hort (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction, Appendix I, 2 ed., p. 63 and 64) deny the authenticity of the verses 19b-20 of St. Luke: "which is given for you," etc. Hence we must first discuss the question of the text as we have it from experts in palaeography.

(1) Verses 19b-20 are given by all the Greek Codices, with the single exception of the Codex Bezae (D), which is bilingual; and (2) by the following translations, the Peschitto (Syriac), the Latin Vulgate, and c, q and f old Latin versions.

Moreover, these verses are admitted not only by the Greek writers, Eusebius (*Canones Evangeliorum*. P. G. 22, 1280-1281), Basil (*Moralia*, Regula 21, c. 3. P. G. 31, 739), Cyril of Alexandria (in h. l. 1. P. G. 72, 908-912, coll. 905 C, where it is evident that verses 17-18 were not known to Cyril), but also by Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*, l. 4, c. 40. P. L. 2, 461), who draws an argument from them.

Verses 19b-20 are simply omitted by D of the Greek codices, and of the Latin, in addition to d, by ff2 i 1. The Latin codices b and e transpose the verses, omitting 19b-20, and placing verses 17-18 immediately after 19a. The Curetonian Syriac Version omits from verse 19 the word corresponding to the Greek word *didomenon* (given) in verse 19, omits verse 20, and replaces it by verses 17-18, after verse 19.

The Sinaitic Syriac gives the whole verse 19, following on with "in like manner after he had supped" from verse 20, then verse 17, then "this is the chalice the new testament in my blood," then verse 18.

It is from these total or partial omissions of verses 19b-20 that the aforesaid critics argue that the verses were interpolated from *I Cor.*, XI, 24-25.

But against such a conclusion, and arguing strongly that verses 19b-20 are genuine, we maintain:

(1) The omission by many, though not all, of the Versions, is not to be accepted as against all the Greek codices (D alone excepted, where the Greek text is not independent of the Latin).

(2) Suppose the verses genuine, it is easy to explain how they were omitted from some codices; if they are not genuine, it is very difficult to understand how they crept into the other codices.

The genuineness supposed, it is easy to explain the omissions. For they were considered by the translators as an unnecessary reduplication of verses 17-18, as is plain from b, e and the syriacs (cur sin). Hence we see THAT SOME OTHER CODICES, PARTICULARLY THE SYRIAC PESCHITTHO, WHERE 19b-20 ARE RETAINED, HAVE OMITTED VERSES 17-18.

But if it is denied that they are genuine, their presence is difficult of explanation. For in the first place: if they are interpolated from St Paul, why is it that in all the codices, after the consecration of the chalice, the words "this do ye" are wanting? Again why and whence did the phrase "which shall be shed for you" creep into all the codices which give the longer form? Secondly, how to meet the exegetical difficulty (which according to our adversaries arose in the shorter form from the apparent in-

version in the order of the chalice and the bread). How, I say, would it be possible that an interpolation was made with such common agreement by the Greek copyists, an interpolation which would increase rather than diminish the difficulty: by the doubling of the chalice?

(3) If one looks closely into the matter, the longer form seems to be postulated by the order and sequence of the sentences, for two reasons: *firstly*, that just as the couplet 17-18 corresponds to the couplet 15-16, so verse 20 should correspond to verse 19; and *in the second place* that the new and true pasch should be contrasted with the legal and figurative one, as will be explained later.

Hence it is that besides nearly all Catholic exegetes, among whom special mention should be made of Berning (*Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, 1901, p. 24-47), P. Batiffol (*Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive*, 2e série 3, p. 22-28), Libreton (art. *Eucharistie* in *Dictionnaire apologétique*, col. 1553-1554), Ruch (art. *Eucharistie d'après la sainte Ecriture*, in D.T.C. col. 1073-1077): many non-Catholics, even rationalists, uphold the integral text. Thus in France: J. Reville (*Les origines de l'Eucharistie*, 1908, p. 98-102); Goguel (*L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr*, 1910, p. 108-117). In Germany Weizacker (*Des Apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 2, 1892, p. 575 foll.—implicitly); Julicher (*Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsfeier in der ältesten Kirche*, in *Theologischen Abhandlungen C. v. Weizsacker gewidmet*, 1892, p. 325, n. 1: "Still I hold the two verses on both intrinsic and extrinsic grounds to be of Luke genuinely, and their deletion to be a methodical error"); Shultzen (*Das Abendmahl im N.T.*, 1895, p. 18); R. A. Hoffmann (*Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, 1896, p. 9-21: "We must, for all that, decline to accept, as exceedingly precarious, the deletion of 19b and 20 by Westcott-Hort. With this omission it would be quite an unintelligible text; while on the other hand the progression of the verses in the corresponding manuscripts is completely intelligible"); formerly, too, C. Clemen (*Der Ursprung des hl. Abendmahls*, 1898, p. 21-22); Holtzmann

(*Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament, Die Synoptiker*, 3, p. 409); Tischendorf-Gebhardt; Nestle; W. Larfield (*Griechische Synopse der vier neutestamentlichen Evangelien*, 1911); H. von Soden (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2 Teil, 1913, p. 369). In England, Scrivener (*Introduction to Crit. of N. T.*, 1874, p. 579 foll. coll., p. 482), after having discussed the whole text, maintained the *textus receptus*. Plummer today (art. *Lord's Supper*, DB. 3, 146, and *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*, 4, p. 496-497) does not dare to reject the authenticity of the verses, on account of the great weight of external testimonies ("the overwhelming external evidence of almost all MSS. and Versions," *Commentary*, p. 496), but prefers to leave the matter in doubt.

Against the authenticity stand among French writers, Loisy (*L'Évangile et L'Église*, 2, p. 115-116; *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 237-238; *Les évangiles synoptiques*, t. 2, p. 526-538). Outside of France: Brandt (*Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums*, 1893, p. 301); Erich Haupt (*Ueber die ursprüngliche Form und Bedeutung der Abendmahls Worte*, 1805, p. 6-9); B. Weiss (*Die Evangelien des Markus and Lukas*, 1901, p. 634); Zahn (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 2, t. 2, p. 359-360); Andersen (*Das Abendmahl*, 2, p. 37); Franz Debelius (*Das Abendmahl*, 1911, p. 97-101); and lately, having changed his opinion, C. Clemen (*Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum*, 1913, p. 19). Among English writers, Sanday (DB. 2, 636-637) and J. Armitage Robinson (art. *Eucharist*, in Cheyne, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, 2, col. 1418-1419).

The above-mentioned authors have quoted many others in support of their view; I have not been able to consult their works.

We must add finally that Spitta stood against the authenticity of the single verse XXII, 20 (*Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, I, 1893, p. 297-298).

Meanwhile note: even though the text were not genuine, it would be quite justifiable for a theologian to draw from it an argument resting, not on Scripture but on valid tradition.



CHAPTER IV
THE PARTAKING OF THE EUCHARIST
BY CHRIST



CHAPTER IV

§ 1. Scripture, the Fathers and Later Theologians

Did Christ partake of the Eucharist? A number of modern theologians say no; the earlier writers however say with remarkable unanimity that He did partake. We agree with them. For in the first place, in spite of the contrary assertions of Knabenbauer (*In Matth.* t. 2, p. 437 and *In Marc.* p. 378) and Berning (*op. cit.*, p. 87 and 119), we have nothing in the Scriptures to show that Christ did not partake of the Eucharist, as Goguel (*L'Eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr*, p. 80-81) among Protestants admits.¹

Rather it seems that Holy Scripture does suggest the partaking of Christ at the Supper, for two reasons.

First, there was the Jewish custom that the head of the family should taste of the cups before passing them on to others (Goguel, l.c.).

¹ Failure to state a thing is not to deny it. Many things are not expressly asserted, and yet are tacitly admitted. There are also many cases where things are not even implied, and yet are not by that denied.

Secondly, we have the words of Christ after the Supper in *Matth.* XXVI. 29 and *Mark* XIV. 25, in which He says that He will not drink from henceforth from the fruit of the vine, until He drinks it new in the kingdom of God.² These words have an anagogical sense, that is they are to be interpreted in a mystical sense, as referring to the condition of glory in eternal life. As the former chalice, that is the ordinary chalice, prefigured the new Pasch in the Blood of Christ and the kingdom of God to come on earth (*Luke* XXII. 18), so the second—the new chalice of the Eucharistic Supper—was the pledge of

² That the utterance of Christ is here assumed repeated after the Supper in practically the same words as before the Supper, though in a different sense, should give no difficulty, when we remember 1) though the two meanings are different, they are not mutually exclusive: indeed one comes after the other as the antitype follows the type; the repetition helps in a great measure to make this clear; and 2) such repetitions are most fitting to the solemnity and grandeur of the liturgical style—Christ adopts it here, as He does in St John in the discourse after the Supper. The sacerdotal prayer in particular is replete with these duplicated utterances.

the kingdom of God to be consummated in heaven, and of communion with Christ to be enjoyed in glory without the veil of faith or sacrament; when Christ, Head among His brethren, will drink with us too, from the torrents of the joy of God, and will feast on His bounty, in the words of *Luke XXII. 29-30: And I dispose to you, as my Father disposed to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom*, therefore when Christ says that He will not drink from henceforth of the chalice of the Eucharist, He confesses, or at the very least He implies, that He did drink of it with them at the Supper.

Chiefly however we rely on tradition. For, so far as I know, our view has no opposition from the Fathers, while numerous Latin, Greek and Syrian Fathers support it. In the first place we have Irenaeus, who affirms it explicitly: "Christ, coming to the Passion, in order to preach the Gospel of the revelation of His inheritance to Abraham and those with him, after He had given thanks, and taking the chalice HAD DRUNK OF IT, and had given to the disciples, said to them: *Drink ye all of this: This is my blood*" (*Adv. Haeres.*, 5, 33, 1, P. G. 7, 1212).

Hippolytus, disciple of Irenaeus,³

³ The *Chronicon Paschale*, P.G. 92, 80 gives his words: "That Christ did not deceive at the beginning or at the end is evident. For He who had just previously said: *From this*

against the Asiatic or Quartodeciman Catholics, defending the Roman usage, says that the Lord did not partake of the legal lamb on the night of the Supper. At the same time he distinctly says that the Lord "partook of the Supper". Hence the legal supper being excluded, we gather that our Lord partook of the sacramental Supper. Indeed according to Hippolytus our Lord's words in *Luke XXII. 15: With desire I have desired to eat THIS PASCH with you before I suffer*, could refer only to the sacramental Supper. And as a matter of fact, Dionysius Bar Salibi testifies that Hippolytus believed that in this expression Christ did not mean the legal or figurative pasch, but the true Pasch, to be fulfilled in the Passion and partaken of in the Eucharist.⁴ Therefore accord-

time I will not eat the pasch, fittingly (convenienter) partook of the Supper before the Pasch. He did not eat the Pasch, He suffered it. For [the pasch] was not the time of His eating". Suppose it were to be said that here the supper in question is neither the legal supper (excluded positively by Hippolytus), nor the sacramental Supper (as we understand it), but some ordinary supper, then the assertion of Hippolytus does not make sense—that Christ very fittingly partook of the Supper before the Pasch of His death, He did not eat this Pasch, He suffered it. For if it were merely an ordinary supper, there is nothing more fitting in Christ partaking of a last ordinary supper than of a second last, or any previous supper. However, as regards the mind of Hippolytus, the second argument from *Luke XXII. 15* is unanswerable.

⁴ In the *Commentarius ad evangelium Matthaei* and in the work *De feria quinta*

ing to Hippolytus Christ announced that he would eat the Eucharist. Eusebius of Caesarea interprets the desire of Christ in Luke XXII. 15,

majore et de institutione eucharistiae. The words of Hippolytus on Luke XXII. 15 are: "He referred to His Passion, in the likeness of which on the day before He suffered, He took bread and wine and broke, instructing them that they were not to immolate and eat the lamb with the Jews. For He it was who like a lamb was to die for them, on the very day predicted for Him by the prophets." Dionysius Bar Salibi couples two Syrian writers with Hippolytus. They are in favour of the same interpretation (naturally enough he does not agree with them in regard to the omission of the legal lamb: for the Syrian liturgies all agree that Christ celebrated the legal lamb. We may mention before Dionysius' time the Liturgia Dioscori, Liturgia Philoxeni I, Liturgia Philoxeni II, Liturgia Mosis Bar-Kepha. R. 2, 288; 302; 312; 393; compare B. LVIII-LIX).

Joannes Philopones is especially to be linked with Hippolytus in this matter: "In the mystic Supper Christ did not eat the typical or legal pasch of the Old Testament, but the proper and true Pasch of the New Testament." And again: "If that were the pasch of the New Testament which was given to the disciples, it was of this pasch that He said: *With desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer* (*Disputatio de paschate*, ed. B. Corderii S. J. Vindob. 1630, p. 298-299 and 292, compare p. 291). Similarly too, an anonymous Greek writer, mentioned by Photius in his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 115. P.G. 103, 392), excludes the legal lamb, saying that Christ only ate the sacramental Supper in the Cenacle. Miletius, the reputed author of a pseudo-Damascene Epistle, says the same thing. We also find it in a pseudo-Athanasian work *De azymis* (P.G. 26, 1329). On the similarity between these two works, see R.S.R., Oct.-Dec. 1916, p. 472.

There are others who, while not explicitly teaching the Eucharistic partaking of Christ, nevertheless admit it implicitly, when, like

quite as plainly as Hippolytus, as directed to the partaking of the Eucharistic Pasch of the Passion of the Lord: "For these ancient or rather antiquated paschs which He was wont to eat with the Jews, were not desirable, but the new mystery of the New Testament which

the authorities just cited, they say that Christ did not eat the paschal lamb. Therefore they must hold that Christ desired (Luke XXII. 15) to eat the pasch of His own Flesh and Blood. So earlier than Hippolytus and Irenaeus, we have St Claudius Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, implicitly supporting us in a work by himself on the Pasch. His words are quoted in the *Chronicon Paschale* (loc. cit.). After the time of Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria too in his book on the pasch, quoted in the same place (col. 81), speaks in a like sense: "The Lord did not eat the typical pasch immolated by the Jews, as in former years" since "He Himself was the Pasch, the Lamb of God, led like a lamb to the slaughter," . . . "since He was the Pasch immolated by the Jews." Later we have Peter the martyr of Alexandria, quoted in the same place (col. 77). His complete work entitled *De eo quod recte Judaei decimam quartam mensis lunae statuerint* was apparently in the possession of Petavius, (*De doctrina*, 1, 12. c. 15, Antwerp 1703, t. 3, 240-251) in its entirety. After Peter of Alexandria comes another anonymous Greek writer mentioned by Photius in his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 116, col. 393), and the author of the *Chronicon paschale* (loc. cit.), who both followed this teaching; from that time on numerous other Greek writers expressed themselves in a like manner, in their dispute with the Latins on the leavened and unleavened bread: v. g. Peter of Antioch, *Epist. ad Archiep. Gradensem*, n. 13 sq. *Ep. ad Michael. Caerul.* n. 22. P.G. 120, 768 sq.; 813. The opponents of the Armenians held the same, as Isaac *Invectiva I contra Armenos*, c. 7, parag. 3 and *Invectiva II contra Armenos*, c. 10, 3 P.G. 132, 1177-1180, and 1225.

He gave to His disciples, was indeed justly desirable to Him" (*De solemnitate paschali*, 5, P.G. 24, 700).

We must take the words of Chrysostom (to be quoted directly) not as proving the matter in question from necessary principles, but as giving a probable reason for a fact already known otherwise. He writes: "And He also drinks of it. Lest hearing these words they would be perturbed and might say: What then? Do we drink His Blood? Do we eat His Flesh? (For when He had discoursed on this matter on another occasion, many were scandalized with these very words), and so in order that they may not be perturbed now, He Himself partook first, and thus prepared them to partake of the mysteries with a tranquil mind. So therefore He drinks His own Blood." (*In Matth.*, hom 82, n. 1. P.G. 58, 739).

Hesychius too, referring to Christ in type, interprets the verse: *the rest of the blood he poured upon the altar round about* (Levit., VIII. 22-24) thus: "We know that Christ also did this; for He himself drank, and gave to His disciples to drink. He then pours the intelligible blood upon the altar, that is upon His own Body" (P.G. 428).⁵ The Pseudo-Dionysius in the *Ecclesiast-*

tica Hierarchia (c. 3, n. 3. parag. 1. P.G. 3, 428) speaks of Judas as "HE WHO SUPPED OF THE SACRED ELEMENTS TOGETHER WITH THE LORD with an unholy and discordant mind." "These words plainly show the teaching of Dionysius—that our Lord supped with Judas in the sacrament. St. Eutychius of Constantinople (*De paschate et sacrosancta eucharistia* P.G. 83 bis. 393) follows Hippolytus; he writes: "This is the mystic Supper of which the Lord speaks in St Luke: *with desire I have desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer*. Before the Passion therefore He ate the Pasch, that is the mystic Pasch".

Theophylactus (*In Matth.* XXVI. 28-29. P.G. 123, 445) says of the Eucharistic chalice:

"HAVING TAKEN THE CHALICE, Christ thenceforth rejects corporal drink." Euthemius Zigabenus adds the Eucharistic bread also: "And if He partook of the chalice, He certainly also PARTOOK OF THE BREAD" (*In Matth.*, XXVI. 28-29. P. G. 123, 669).

We can also claim the support of the most illustrious of the Syrian theologians. Thus Aphraates, whose words we have cited above: "He ate His own Body, He drank His own Blood." St Ephraem, whose testimony Bar-Salibi cites in his *Expositio Liturgiae*, (c. 12, c.s. c.o. t. 93, p. 74): "Mar Ephrem says: the disciples ate His Body, and

⁵ Compare those other words immediately after the verses 22-26 in the same chapter of *Leviticus*: "THE MYSTIC PASCH which He ate with His disciples . . ."

He ate with them; they drank His Blood, and He drank with them.”⁶

Tertullian heads the list of the Latin Fathers. He demolishes the error of Marcion who drew a distinction between the Creator and the Father, by pointing out that when Christ desired *to eat* the pasch, He consecrated the bread into His own Body; which He did not eat as the property of another but as His own: showing thereby that the Creator of the bread is His Father: “And so He proclaimed that He desired TO EAT the Pasch as His own (for it would be unworthy of God to desire what was alien). He made that bread which He took and distributed to the disciples His own Body, by saying: *This is my body.*” (*Adv. Marcion.*, 40. P.L. 2, 460).⁷

Cyprian comes next: “IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO DRINK THE BLOOD OF CHRIST, IF CHRIST DID NOT FIRST DRINK OF THE CHALICE, in

⁶ Bar Salibi advances from his own Monophysitic sect Jacobus Edissenus (+ 708), Cyriacus Antiochenus (+ 817), Moses Bar Kepha (+ 903), and agrees with them (*ibid.*, and ch. 18, p. 96). Though he quotes the words of St Ephraem and Jacobus Edissenus, Dionysius does not quote the words of Cyriacus or Moses Bar Kepha. Lately however the *Explanatio Mysteriorum* of Moses Bar Kepha has been published and translated into English by R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington (*Two commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy. . . . Texts and English translation*, Oxford, 1913). In this work the actual words of Moses are given, and Cyriacus is mentioned as having said something similar (see p. 53 and 55).

⁷ See p. 75, above.

which He pledged the believers” (*Ep. 63*, n. 7. P.L. 4, 379). How true these words are will be shown later.

Hilary expresses the same view, when he is explaining why he thinks that Judas did not partake of the Eucharist: “He, who was not to drink in the kingdom, COULD NOT HAVE DRUNK WITH THE LORD, for He had promised that all who were now drinking of the fruit of the vine, would drink with Him hereafter.” (*Commentarius in Matthaeum*, cap. 30, n. 2. P.L. 9, 1065). If the others drank “with the Lord,” the Lord also drank: if He did not, the others could not be said to drink with Him. We do not claim the support of St. Jerome with any great confidence,⁸ from the *Epistola* 120, c. 2 (P.L. 22, 986). He is explaining *Matth.*, XXVI. 29, that Our Lord said that henceforth He would not drink of the fruit of the vine, except with us in the kingdom of God: “He who is at the same time our table companion and our banquet, who eats with us and is eaten by us”. I think that these words are not to be understood of Christ partaking with the disciples in the Supper, but rather with us in the Church. Our food is to do the will of the Father, in as much as by keeping His commandments, we partake of the same food as Christ, whose will it is to do the will of the Father, and Christ

⁸ Though the mediaeval theologians usually did, St Thomas for example 3 S. 81, 1. *sed contra.*

Himself partakes through us of the Eucharistic food within the Church.⁹

⁹ The passage runs: "How are we to interpret the saying of Christ in St Matthew: *I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink with you new in the kingdom of my Father.* Some construe the fable of the millennium from this verse; according to this, Christ would reign corporally in the millennium, and would then drink of the wine which from that time on (the time of the Supper), He will not drink until the consummation of the world. But we should know that the bread which the Lord broke and gave to the disciples, is the Body of the Lord our Saviour, for He said to them: *Take ye and eat: this is my body.* And the chalice is that of which He likewise said: *Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new testament, . . . which shall be shed for many . . .* If then the bread which comes down from heaven is the Body of the Lord, and the wine which He gave to His disciples is the Blood of the New Testament, which was shed for many unto the remission of sins, let us cast aside Jewish fables, let us go up with the Lord into the large guest chamber furnished and swept, and there let us receive from Him the chalice of the new testament; and there celebrating the pasch with Him, LET US BE INEBRIATED BY HIM WITH THE WINE OF SOBRIETY: *for the kingdom of God is not food and drink, but justice and joy and peace in the Holy Spirit;* For Moses did not give us true bread but the Lord Jesus, Himself both table companion and banquet, who eats with us and is eaten by us. WE DRINK OF HIS BLOOD, AND WITHOUT HIM WE CANNOT DRINK, and every day in His sacrifice, we tread the blood-red grapes from the fruit of the true vine, and from them we drink the new wine of the kingdom of the Father . . . The patriarch Jacob also desired to eat this bread, saying: *If the Lord shall be with me and shall give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on;* for as many of us as are baptized in Christ, put on Christ and eat the bread of angels, and hear God saying: *My food is to do the will of him that*

This interpretation of the words of St. Jerome will become still plainer when we consider the *Commentarius in Matthaeum* of Origen,¹⁰ whence

sent me, that I may do his work. LET US THEREFORE DO THE WILL OF THE FATHER WHO SENT US, THAT WE MAY DO HIS WORK; AND CHRIST WILL DRINK HIS BLOOD WITH US IN THE KINGDOM OF HIS CHURCH."

¹⁰ Origen's words are: "The kingdom of God is not the food of those who have become worthy of the celestial bread and of the bread of angels, and of the food of which the Saviour says: *My food is to do the will of him that sent me, that I may do his work.* That we shall eat and drink in the kingdom of God is clear from many Scripture sayings, and from this in particular: *Blessed is he who will eat bread in the kingdom of God.* Hence this pasch will be fulfilled in the kingdom of God, Jesus will eat and drink of it with His disciples . . . Jacob too makes known how God gives bread, when he says: *If God shall be with us, and shall give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, of all the things which thou, O Lord wilt give me, I will offer tithes to thee.* Similarly we find in the Gospel of St John *Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.* Now indeed the Pasch is not fulfilled yet, but it will be when we shall be prepared to receive the full Pasch which He came to fulfill, who *came not to destroy the law but to fulfill it;* to fulfill it now *as in a glass darkly* (i.e. obscurely), but to fulfill it then *face to face* (i.e. openly and plainly), when that which is perfect shall have come. If therefore we also desire to receive from Jesus who is wont to give it, the bread of benediction, let us go into the city to the house of a certain man, where Jesus makes the Pasch with His disciples, prepared by those whom He knows, let us ascend to the upper part of the house, large, furnished, and well swept, where taking the chalice from the Father and giving thanks, He gives to those who have gone up with Him, saying: *Drink, for this is my blood of the new testament,* which is drunk and is poured out,

Jerome, though not stating this, derives his own commentary.¹¹

drunk by the disciples, poured out unto the remission of the sins of those for whom it is poured out and by whom it is drunk. Would you know how it is poured out, with these words, compare also those others: *The charity of God is poured out in our hearts*. Now if the blood of the testament is poured out into our hearts unto the remission of sins, when that Blood which we drink is poured into our hearts, all the sins of which we have heretofore been guilty, are remitted and wiped out. Moreover He who having taken the chalice says: *Drink ye all of this*, does not abandon us who drink of it, rather HE DRINKS IT WITH US, SINCE HE IS IN EACH ONE OF US; FOR ALONE AND WITHOUT HIM, WE CAN NEITHER EAT OF THAT BREAD NOR DRINK OF THE FRUIT OF THAT TRUE VINE. And wonder not that He is the bread, and that at the same time He eats the bread with us, that He is the drink of the fruit of the vine, and that at the same time He drinks with us. For the word of God is omnipotent, it is known by various names, and is without number according to the multiplicity of His power". *Origenes in Matthaeum. Juxta seriem veteris interpretationis commentariorum Origenis in Matthaeum*. (n. 86. P.G. 13, 1735-1737).

¹¹ A comparison between Jerome and Origen clearly shows that the passage from Jerome is not to be interpreted in the sense that Knabenbauer (l.c.) following Suarez (*De Eucharistia* in 3 S. 81 1, commentarius, n. 1) thinks probable: "He ate the legal lamb or other foods, and gave Himself to others to be eaten." For Jerome himself gives his own interpretation in his *Commentarius in Evangelium Matthaei*, 1 4, c. 26. P.L. 196) quite in keeping with Origen, where he says ". . . When the Jews arrive at the belief in God the Father, and the Father leads them to the Son, then will the Lord drink of their wine, and according to the similitude of Joseph reigning in Egypt, He will be inebriated with His brethren."

In Gregory Nazianzen we have a similar interpretation embracing the time of the Church on earth and the everlasting age of

Though we cannot confidently state that Jerome explicitly taught our doctrine, still he says that Christ drinking spiritually with us in the Mass, is represented under the guise and image, so to speak, of Christ drinking with the disciples in the upper chamber. This would be at least a suggestive argument that both Jerome and Origen believed that our Lord drank of the Eucharistic chalice with the disciples who supped with Him in the upper chamber.

the heavenly kingdom (*Or. in Sanctum Pascha*, c. 23. P.G. 36, 656). St Ambrose also in the book *De Mysteriis*, 57 (P.L. 15, 408) wrote of the Eucharist: "This is certain THAT IN US HE EATS AND DRINKS". This explanation passed on to several other ecclesiastical writers, for instance, the Latin author of the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 47, placed amongst the works of Chrysostom, P.G. 56, 899; Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeum*, 1, 12. P.L. 120, 895-896, *Lib. de corpore et sanguine Domini*, c. 21, n. 2, col. 1331, and the *Epistola ad Frudegardum*, col. 1358-1359; Bruno of Asti, *Commentarius in Matthaeum*, pars. 4. P.L. 165, 291. Hence last of all we are not surprised to find Honorius of Autun, writing "Christ true priest according to the order of Melchisedech, who had formed His Body in the womb of a Virgin, alone consecrates also this same Body through every Catholic priest, AND HE ALONE PARTAKES IN HIS MEMBERS; He alone too gives it to His own He who ascends into the heavens consummated in His elect. Consequently while no priest, but Christ Himself through the ministry of His priests, is worthy to consecrate His Body, this Body which is also received BY NONE BUT CHRIST ALONE IN HIS FRIENDS, is consecrated no less by the ministry of the most sinful . . . than by that of the most holy." (*Eucharisticon*, c. 6. P.L. 172, 1253).

We could not cite St. Augustine in *De doctrina christiana*, c. 3, n. 4 (P.L. 34, 37) as favouring our teaching with any certainty, because the passage in question shows variant readings. The Latin runs as follows "Sacramento corporis sui PRAEGUSTATO significavit quod voluit" in one reading, while in the other "per gustatum" replaces "praegustato". With the first reading it would run "He signified what He wished by first tasting Himself the sacrament of His Body". The other reading would probably be "He signified what He himself meant by the sacrament of His Body by the sense of taste (*meaning*: when the disciples partook)".¹² More to our purpose perhaps would be another passage from St Augustine, on *Psalm* 68, 22 *And they gave gall for my food* he says: "What they gave was

¹² The Benedictine editor says that the reading 'praegustato' is found in very few codices (P.L. 34, 37), but five other well known codices (among them the *Excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini*, in the revision of Pius Knoell, Sorbonne 1885, excerpt. 253, p. 822) give 'per gustatum,' while three others have 'per gustum'. And as a matter of fact, considering the sequence of the sentences in which are enumerated the various signs whereby God manifested His designs conformably to man's senses (smell, taste, touch, hearing), the reading given in Migne's *Latin Fathers* appears the least probable. Meantime it is interesting to note that Knabenbauer (1. c.) considers that apart from Chrysostom, no patristic authority except that of Jerome and Augustine, favours our Lord's partaking; whereas for us, both Jerome and Augustine are doubtful authorities in this matter.

not food, for it was drink; but they gave it for food; because the Lord had already received food, and gall was put in it. HE HAD ALREADY PARTAKEN OF SWEET FOOD, when He ate the Pasch with His disciples; there He made known the SACRAMENT of His Body. Who are they who put gall into the sweet and delicious unity of Christ recorded by the Apostle: *because one bread, one body, we are many . . .* but those who contradict the Gospel, as though persecutors of Christ . . . What the Jews did then in order to put bitter drink into that food which He had already received, they also do who by their sinful life bring scandal into the Church; venomous heretics do this." Augustine after his fashion has in mind particularly the reality signified and effected by the Eucharist, namely the unity of the Church; but he has this in mind not apart from the reality contained in the Eucharist, and which signifies that union, that is to say the Body of Christ: for he appeals to a supper held with the disciples, and that was the Paschal Supper in which the Body of the Lord was consecrated. Hence Augustine holds that the Lord partook of that Supper, that sweet food, before through the cruelty of the Jews He went up to the Cross.

Coming down to the Middle Ages, we find Rabanus Maurus (*In Ruth*, III. 7. P.L. 108, 1212-1213) distinctly stating that our Lord par-

took of the Body and Blood in the Supper, and that He distributed it to the disciples: *And when Booz had eaten and drunk and was merry, he went to sleep by the heap of sheaves, and she came softly and uncovering his feet, laid herself down.*: "Our Lord ate and drank when He gave the sacrament of His Body and Blood in the mystic Supper to the Apostles; hence it is written: *his sons partook of the body and blood, and he likewise partook of the same. He was made merry, because He was assured of His own Resurrection and of our Redemption*".¹³

Paschasius Radbertus applies our Lord's words: *With desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer* to the Supper of the consecrated bread and wine (*In Matthaeum*, I, 12 P.L. 120, 893). Rupert of Dietz cites with approval the words of Hilary quoted above (*De gloria et honore filii hominis*, I 10. P.L. 168, 1544).¹⁴

From a host of writers, early and

mediaeval, I have found one who is in open opposition to this thesis. Peter Pictavius writes: "He took with His hands only, sacramentally never; He gave to His disciples to partake of sacramentally; and hence He is said to have taken sacramentally, because He took it into His hands to give, not on His lips to eat". (*Sententiarum*, lib. 5, c. 13. P.L. 211, 1254).

This one exception apart, as far as I know, all the leaders of the schools, as Alexander of Hales (*Summa*, pars 4, q. 44, art. 1, memb. 1), Albert the Great (4 D. 12 15), St Bonaventure (4 D. 9, 1, 4), St Thomas (3 S. 81, 1), and all other scholastics who have dealt with the subject, have simply followed the early writers. Hence in his day Vasquez justly says.¹⁵ "All the Catholic writers whom I have read, agree in this matter, and though the holy Doctor says there were some who thought otherwise,¹⁶ he does not mention their names." Luther too in a later age denied it in the book *De abroganda missa privata* (in 3 S. disp. 216, n. 81 sq.).¹⁷

¹³ Walafrid Strabo (*In Ruth* III. 3, P.L. 113, 536) to whom later writers erroneously attributed the words of Rabanus, seems to have implicitly followed this teaching. Compare *In Leviticum* VIII. 14 and 24. P.L. 113, 321-322, where he follows Hesychius, of whom above.

¹⁴ Honorius of Autun (*Eucharisticon*, c. 4. P.L. 172, 1252): "The Body of Christ is eaten by the Body of Christ". He may have meant that Christ in the Last Supper partook of the sacrament. His style is intricate, and it is possible that his meaning may be Christ as eaten by the Church. It must be admitted too that this meaning conforms better to the context.

¹⁵ He was so convinced of this teaching that he does not consider it worth while to quote early authorities.

¹⁶ Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, St Bonaventure, (l.c.), Peter of Tarentasia say the same, but do not mention the names of opponents.

¹⁷ Luther completely denied the sacrifice of the Lord's Supper, necessarily then he denies that our Lord partook of a sacrifice whose existence he denied. After Luther another Protestant, John Faëns, (mentioned

The Coptic, Syrian and Armenian Liturgies all agree with the Fathers and writers of the Church. Three anaphorae written in the Coptic, termed the anaphorae of *St. Basil*, *St. George*, and *St. Cyril*,¹⁸ and the Greek anaphora of St Basil also speak of the chalice of the Blood as *tasted beforehand* by the Lord (R. 1, 15; 31; 47; 67).

In the *Liturgia Jacobi Edisseni* (VI-VII. century) from the Syrian Liturgies, the drinking of the Eucharist is not mentioned, but the *eating* is: "He broke, He ate" (R. 2, 373); in the *Liturgia Dioscori episcopi Insulae Kardu* (XIII. century, cf. B. LVIII): "He broke and after He had communicated, He gave to His twelve" (R. 2, 495); and in the *Liturgia Ignatii Bar Ma'dani*, XIII. century, compare B. *ibid.*: "He broke, He ate" (R. 2, 514). The same Syrians speak of the *drinking*, not the eating in their very old Liturgy of St Basil: "He tasted and distributed to His disciples" (R. 2, 552). And finally in the *Liturgia S. Lucae vel Duodecim Apostolorum* (R. 2, X notes its antiquity), both the eating and the drinking are mentioned: "He broke and ate"; "When He had tasted, He gave" (R. 2, 171).

by Le Brun, *Explic. de la messe*, t. 3, p. 546) wrote a whole treatise on the subject denying our Lord's partaking. The work was entitled *Christus incoenatus*. The Catholics still maintained the opposite opinion.

¹⁸ The earliest liturgies of the Copts are in Greek, for they were before the Monophysite schism.

The Armenians, both Catholic and schismatic (far apart though they are in the use of liturgical books) say that the Lord drank: "He drank and gave" (Le Brun, *op. cit.*, t. 3, p. 203; Max Saxon. *Missa Armenica*, p. 34, b. 437).

In the *Liturgia Nestorii*, of the Nestorians or the Chaldeans, we have eating and drinking "He broke and ate": "He drank and gave" (R. 2, 629, compare Max Saxon, *Missa Chaldaica*, p. 32).

Though we have no example of this mode of expression in the liturgies of the Greeks, it should nevertheless be noted that the Armenian are derived from the Greek Liturgies (Cf. Le Brun, *op. cit.*, t. 3, p. 42): Max Saxon, *Missa Armenica*, p. VI. and the Syrian *Liturgia S. Basilii* (compare B. LVIII).

Apparently however far more ancient than all these liturgies is the Egyptian anaphora published by Dom Cabrol with the assistance of P. de Puniet (in D.A.C. 2, 1892-1893, where we read: "Having taken the chalice, after He blessed and drank, He gave to them, saying etc.")

§ 2. Intrinsic Reason

Having all this cloud of witnesses in favour of the partaking of the Eucharist by our Lord, we now ask *why* or *how* this partaking was appropriate. It is easy to infer the *reason* of this appropriateness from

our remarks on sacrifice in general. We saw that when the offerer partakes of the victim, some kind of consummation of the sacrifice is added. As a matter of fact most of the sacrifices prefiguring the sacrifice of Christ possessed this additional complement — particularly, and above all the others, the paschal sacrifice wherein the lamb, that is the victim, was eaten. In other sacrifices we have the sprinkling of blood round about the altar and on the people who assisted, instead of the eating of the victim. In *Exodus* we see that this was done by Moses. It was fitting therefore for Christ, the one most perfect Priest, offering the most perfect sacrifice of the Redemption, antitype of all the other sacrifices, to do all those things which would perfectly complete the sacrifice and fulfill the figures.¹⁹ And so He desired to eat the Victim of the Passion, the Victim which He had made in the offering of the Passion in the sacrament. Hence when He received the consecrated bread, He was partaker of the Lamb given over to slaughter for the sins of men; when He drank of the chalice He sprinkled Himself and the people also with the blood of the Victim. This is really the thought of those Fathers who like Chrysostom

(l.c.) and Euthymius (l.c.) imply the resemblance between the Old Testament celebration in *Exodus*, and the celebration of the Supper in the New—Hesychius (l.c.) terms it *aspersio*—; it is especially the underlying thought of those Fathers who say that Christ ate the very same Pasch which He suffered.

Thus we have sufficient *reason* for Christ's partaking, now we ask: *How* He could so partake? The matter here now is: the partaking by the offerer of the thing offered. Here the offerer and the thing offered are the same, and thus it would seem that partaking could not have place. For it looks absurd to speak of communion of Christ as Priest with Himself as Victim. Union is of things that are different and there is no difference or diversity in the one Christ discharging the two offices. It is for this reason that some modern writers have said that, considered in the light of dogmatic principles, the sacramental partaking of Christ is unthinkable. (Berning, *op. cit.*, p. 87 following Schegg to whom he refers)²⁰ But what all our

¹⁹ The principle invoked by the Council of Toledo (A.D. 681) is here applicable: It insists on Eucharistic communion for the celebrant: "For what kind of sacrifice will that be, of which the celebrating priest is not a partaker?"

²⁰ "Some will no doubt maintain, quoting Aquinas, that the Lord partook of His own Flesh and Blood under the sacramental species. On dogmatic principles we reject this opinion. Dogmatic principles, as Schegg rightly says, are plainly in conflict with the idea of such communion. The sacred banquet by its aim and essence excludes the feeding on himself of the distributor of the banquet". Compare *ibid.*, p. 241: ". . . a view difficult if not impossible to explain either exegetically or dogmatically."

doctors have taught, what is even commemorated actually within the sacred action in so many languages by the Church herself in her liturgies, should not be unthinkable. Following St Thomas (4 D. 11, 3, 1, 3m) therefore we teach a sounder doctrine: though no union between Christ Victim and Christ Priest WOULD BE EFFECTED, yet the partaking of Christ could have SIGNIFICATIVE VIRTUE, and this in many ways, as discussed above on the partaking of sacrifice in general.

In the first place, it had an anagogic significance, as it is called, in relation to the world to come: and this whether considered in Christ as an individual person, or in Christ as Head of the human race. Considered as an individual person, Christ given to God as Victim, has become (as we have said) the Lamb of God, the bread of God, as it were, the nutriment and food of God Himself, hence a thing divine and heavenly. For seated as Guest of God, He received as it were from God's table, sacred foods, pledges of the good things of heaven, He certainly signified His own future glorification, not as one whose right of entry into possession would be nullified had He not partaken of the Supper, but as anticipating by partaking of the Supper the glorification already pledged to Him by God.²¹ Hence

²¹ I think St Thomas (3 S. 81, 1, 3m) has this in mind when he says that delight came to Christ from the partaking: he had first

after the Supper Christ most opportunely begins to pray, with the words: *Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son* (John XVII. 1). As Head of the human race, the partaking of Christ signified that the approach to the goods of God was thrown open to His members; Irenaeus (l.c.) calls this, the opening of the kingdom. Hence again the fitness of the words in the sacerdotal prayer: *Father, I will that where I am, they also whom thou hast given me may be, that they may see my glory, which thou has given me* (John XVII. 24): for by these words He secures for all His friends the fruit of His communion with the Victim, which is the glory which is to spread from the Head to the members.

In the second place, Christ's partaking signified the sanctification of the present life, and this again in two ways, under His title as individual, and as Head. First, under His title as individual, for by actual partaking of the sacred banquet He was shown as sanctified. Not of course that a new sanctity accrued to Him, but He is graced, so to speak, with

inserted the teaching of Rabanus in the body of the article, and what follows is intimately joined "He rejoiced because He was assured of the Resurrection." The Eucharist is really an eschatological sacrament, as will be shown at length in the third book. Hence by worthy partaking we drink our own glory, by unworthy partaking our damnation. Christ drank of the reward of God which was to come, the joys of the kingdom.

a new title of sanctity, in so far as being Himself feasted with the Flesh of the Victim dedicated to God, He was replete with that sacredness which accompanies the Victim, sacredness derived from its approach to God to whom it has been made over.

Second, under His title as Head, He purchased this sanctification for us, as our Priest and Liturgus, to flow from the Head to the members, to whom under Christ and in Christ it pertained to imbibe that sanctity by partaking of the divine banquet.

In the third place, a final significance of our Lord's partaking, contributes not a little to a more complete comprehension of the influx of Christ as Head upon the members. The Son of God Himself supping with us, and also admitting us throughout the ages to be His table guests, showed thereby that we who eat with Him the bread of God, make with Him one household of God, one family, one stock. Not only did He signify this effect of family relationship, but by signifying it He brought it about. Thus He, the principal Guest of His Father, the Guest by nature, secured for us, His invited fellow-guests, a share with Him of every good signified for Himself by the Supper. For our oneness with *Christ Banquet* (by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ), is not apart from our oneness with *Christ fellow-guest* (in

the fellowship with Christ partaking of the Eucharist);²² but just as the partaking of Christ dedicated ours, so too it invigorates it. The Fathers and Doctors already cited have testified to this. They say that we cannot eat of the bread and drink of the chalice alone, we must partake under Christ and with Christ and in Christ who sups with us and through us in the Church, where He is at the same time our banquet and through us and in us our fellow-guest. So then it was necessary, not only that He should give us this food, whereby we should be vivified, but also that He, who was alone competent to give us the power to partake, should first partake of it Himself in the Supper. And surely it is no surprise that we could not eat of the bread of the children of God, without being initiated into it by Him who is the Son of God, to whom alone it belongs to feast of the table of the Father. By Himself eating and drinking therefore, Christ initiated us to the mysteries of the

²² As fellow-guest, He linked us up with Himself, making us of one flesh and blood with Him, not only in the manner in which fellow-guests and companions are linked, in the East particularly (compare Wellhausen *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, p. 122), as one indivisible mass, so to speak, moulded apart from others, but also in a more special manner whereby the partakers of a sacrificial banquet coalesce into the one family of God (cf. chap. I). As our banquet or food, He incorporates Himself with us in a manner to be explained later.

table of the Eucharist, receiving nothing for Himself, but bestowing on us from Himself the active participation in the banquet, as well as the fruit of the partaking.

Hence it is that the signification of sanctity implied in the sacrificial banquet is VERIFIED in us by the EFFICACY of the sacrament. In other words because the signification was so true in Christ our Head, that because of the oneness of identity there was in the partaker (Christ) the very sanctity of the Victim, just as in the Victim there was the very sanctity of God, so it comes about that in us, the members of Christ, the reality of this signification is shared. Now in us the reality of the signification implies efficacy, because a sanctity which we did not possess previously cannot be truly in us, if it is not actually produced in us.

Therefore the efficacy of the sacrament flows down to us from the perfect reality of its signification in Christ. And so from the Only-Begotten to the brethren, from the Head to the members, there descends, according to the promise of the Gospel, both grace and truth. All this Christ meant in His prayer: *For them do I sanctify myself that they also may be sanctified in truth.* That is, scarcely have I acquired the sanctity of the sacrifice for myself, when I bestow it on my fellow-guests at my Supper.

The words of Rufinus of Aquileia,

though more generally applicable, are particularly to the point here: "Blessings will be upon the head of Joseph and upon the crown of the brethren, whose head he was. All these blessings are fittingly said to be upon the head of Christ, from His head they came down also to the crown of those, over whom He is Head. And the only reason why the Incarnate received these blessings was, that the Father had bestowed them on Him, and He in turn would bestow them on believers; and that He being made mediator between God and man, human nature which, because of its present infirmity, was incapable of receiving the blessings, might receive them because of His mediation, BECAUSE OF HIS PARTAKING AND BESTOWAL OF THEM, as He also says: *For them do I sanctify myself.*" (*De benedictionibus patriarcharum.* 1, 2. bened. Joseph. n. 2. P.L. 21, 321). But is not the greatest of all blessings that sacred *eulogia* in which Christ gave us to partake of what He had received?

Hence the error in the reasoning of Petrus Pictaviensis, when he writes (l.c.): "Where reality is, the sacrament is not necessary. But Christ was the reality abiding in Himself, and by partaking He would not be united to Himself, He was rather the One to whom we should be united by such partaking. He did not need this partaking of the sacra-

ment, nor could He partake of it." Against this contention we maintain that, though it was not necessary for Christ, yet it was necessary for us that Christ should partake, and accordingly it was fitting for Him. Nothing being more fitting than that He Himself, first anointed, should then anoint us with divine sanctity.

Another consideration remains, one which the earlier scholastics discussed: Can Christ's partaking of the Eucharist be said to be sacramental and spiritual or not? Amongst the various answers to this question, that of St Thomas who holds the affirmative against St Bonaventure appeals most to us (In 3 S. 81, 1, 3m; 4 D. 11, 3, 1, 4m).²³ Christ partook

²³ "Some say that the partaking of Christ was spiritual, for they hold that the union there was an act of love, and the effect was not in Himself but in the members: that just as Christ did not merit for Himself but for us, so by virtue of that partaking He merited that the members of His body should be more united to Himself". "(But) if that were true, it would have its effect on one not eating and on one who was sleeping" (Bonaventure, 4 D. 9, 1, 4). We read very much the same in Alexander of Hales (*Summa. pars* 4, q. 44, art. 1, mbr. 1. ed. 1482, tom. 3).

However the objections of Bonaventure and Alexander will not stand. For apart from the fact that there is no question here of merit, but of causal influx, and not of a greater degree of our union with Christ, but of a radical possibility of such union, it by no means follows that the effect of the grace would be found "in one not eating and in one who was sleeping": indeed, although in respect of our Eucharistic sanctification, the partaking of Christ is by way of principal cause of that sanctification,

sacramentally, because not only what He partook of was in itself a sacrament, but He also partook of it after the manner of a sacrament, that is, for a sign.²⁴ He partook spiritually, because in the case of one who receives sacramentally to receive spiritually is to receive with the mind conformable to the symbol, that is not fictitiously. And certainly Christ did not receive fictitiously, inwardly dissenting so to speak, from what He outwardly signified; rather His mind and soul were inwardly conformed to what was signified outwardly. True indeed no effect accrued to Him. But this was not due to any want of efficacy in the rite, but to the condition of the Subject incapable of increase, because He already had all perfection in the highest degree. Hence He profited nothing from the food, because He Himself was the food and the profit. And in this last point is found, as we said, the highest and most perfect reality of signification in the rite itself, as well in the fountain of all the efficacy in our partaking of the sacrament.

still it does not take away the need of the proximate cause, which is our own partaking.

²⁴ The objection runs: "He did not partake of this sacrament, because He would have received in vain." St Thomas replies: "That partaking did not effect spiritual nutriment in Him, but it signified it, for no one is as perfectly refreshed in Himself as He is". (4. D. 11, 1, 3m).

This we have thought necessary to say in respect of that first communion of Christ our Saviour, which was His last also, but which is now consummated in heaven, where the Son of God is feasted in His whole humanity and in all His members, with the glory which He has from the Father, which is proper to Him as the Only-Begotten.

CHAPTER V

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST CONTINUED
IN HEAVEN

CHAPTER V

When Christ died laden with pain and sorrow, was this the end of His sacrifice, or did it in some way continue on? As offering or immolation nothing could be added to it. The Body of our Redeemer, the price of the world's Redemption, was sufficiently offered by the hands of Christ, and was sufficiently immolated by the hands of the Jews; there is now no place for any further offering on the part of the Priest, or immolation of the Victim. But could it not be, as we have shown (chap. I) to occur in other cases, that here too there might accrue to the sacri-

fice completely enacted an added perfection coming from God and consummating the Victim as such, thus crowning the work of man by the divine acceptance? Now the sacrifice of Christ did not lack such a consummation, but is in the eternal enjoyment of it, being consummated by His glorious Resurrection and ascension into heaven, where He lives as Victim abiding forever.

We shall prove this by a threefold consideration of Christ:

First as Victim.

Second as Altar.

Third as Intercessor.

§ 1. Christ as Celestial Victim

A. SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY

I. In the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (IX, 1-24), the priesthood of Christ is exalted above the Aaronic priesthood, in the comparison which is made between the entrance of the pontiff once a year into the holy of holies and the entrance of Christ into His glory. Just as the pontiff bore with him the blood of the sacrifice, through the first portion of the tabernacle into the inner shrine, so too Christ passing through the mortal and corruptible state of His humanity (in which He offered Himself to be immolated to God), into the condition of flesh sanctified by celestial glory, presented the Victim of His sacrifice before God. Hence it is, that Christ, though offered in sacrifice once only, *at the end of ages* (*Heb.* IX. 25-28; X. 11-15; VII. 27), is nevertheless an eternal gift, a ransom, an offering always present in the sight of God (VIII. 3, IX. 24).¹ Moreover in so far as

¹ The remarks of C. H. Huyghe (*op. cit.*, p. 166) on *Hebr.*, VIII. 5, are worthy of note: "The sacrificial slaying did not take place in the holy of holies, BUT AFTER THE SLAYING THE BLOOD WAS OFFERED THERE. So too, speaking of Christ as our Pontiff, St Paul presupposes the sacrificial slaying as having taken place (VII. 27, IX. 12-14, 25-27, X. 12, 14). Between the two cases there is indeed a difference: whereas the RITE OF OFFERING of the blood *in the sanctuary* in the Old Law pertained to the form of the sacrifice, we could not say this of Christ's offering *in heaven*, and indeed our Epistle

He exhibits Himself to God as Victim, just in so far does He fulfil the office of mediator and intercessor, or priest, forever making propitiation to God for us (*ibid.*).

He could not continue to hold this twofold office of Priest and Victim, were it not after He had died, having conquered death, He should remain forever living (VII. 24-25).

II. In the *Apocalypse* Christ is described as:

1) Now standing in heaven before the altar in the condition of victim (V. 6, compare V. 2, V. 12) and at the same time making men priests to God (V. 10, compare I. 5-6).

2) An altar is built before the throne of God (VI. 9, VIII. 3-5, compare XI. 1, XIV. 18), a living

implies such a difference . . . calling the death of Christ both *sacrifice* and *offering*. Hence the offering made in heaven presupposes not only the slaying but also the complete sacrificial offering". This last statement is absolutely true. However, two inferences follow from it: 1) If the "rite of offering" as well as the slaying took place beforehand, where did the rite of offering take place but at the Supper? 2) If the heavenly offering had no part in the constitution of the sacrifice, whence does it derive the great importance assigned to it by the Apostle in such sublime words, unless by the actual transmission and introduction into the celestial temple there is constituted the divine acceptance and appropriation, by which the sacrifice is consummated and brought to the highest point of perfection? With regard to the actual rite of *Leviticus* a more complete treatment will come shortly.

and a speaking altar (XVI. 7, compare IX. 13).

3) A heavenly temple is seen (XI. 19, XIV. 17, XV. 5, compare XI. 1, XIV. 18, XV. 6-8, XVI. 17).

4) It is declared plainly that in the New Jerusalem which is to succeed the Church militant, there would be neither temple nor light, except God and the Lamb.

Under these sacrificial symbols and metaphors we have an indication of some kind of heavenly and eternal worship, consisting in Christ's presentation of Himself in the sight of God, as once slain, and since then abiding, forever distinguished by some immolational quality unto the praise of God and the glory of the saints.

B. THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS

We have seen that the Fathers link the Supper and the Passion together. Now we may examine how they knit together the Supper and the Passion with the Resurrection the Ascension and the glory in heaven, so that the sacrifice, once enacted on earth, continues on in eternal consummation in heaven.

A) THE SACRIFICE AND THE RESURRECTION

This connection may be shown in two ways: 1) directly, by a consid-

eration of the Victim; 2) indirectly, by a study of the Priest.

PART I. THE VICTIM PERFECTED BY THE RESURRECTION

The mind of the Fathers appears *first* in their exposition of the new Pasch. For they see the antitype of the Jewish paschal sacrifice not in the Supper or the Passion alone but with the Resurrection conjoined. St John Chrysostom, setting himself to explain why in the figurative Pasch the Jews did not see the true Pasch save obscurely *in aenigmate*, attributes to the true Pasch three elements: the Supper, the Resurrection and the Ascension with the acquisition of celestial goods to be distributed to us. For us these three elements make one integrally perfect sacrifice, the antitype of the paschal sacrifice of the Jews:

“Let us study the old pasch and the New, and then you will find the excellence of the New Pasch. Because the Jews did indeed celebrate the pasch, but they celebrated it *as in a glass darkly*. For these hidden mysteries of the New Testament never entered their minds, they did not know what these things were, which were foretold by the mysteries of the Old Testament. True, they saw the lamb slain, they saw the blood of the animal and the doors sprinkled with it: but that the Incarnate Son of God WAS TO BE SLAIN, that He would redeem

the whole world, AND THAT HE WOULD GIVE HIS BLOOD TO DRINK to the Greeks and the barbarians, that He would open heaven to all, that He would place the gifts of heaven at the disposition of men, THAT HE WOULD BRING HIS OWN CRUCIFIED FLESH INTO THE HIGHEST HEAVENS, far above the armies of the angels and archangels and all the powers, AND THAT HE WOULD PLACE IT AT THE RIGHT HAND OF THE FATHER, sitting on the royal throne, RESPLENDENT WITH INEFFABLE GLORY: this surely no one of their race foreknew or could have conceived". (*In I. Cor.*, hom. 24, n. 2. P.G. 61, 288).

Clearly Chrysostom considered the celebration of the Eucharist, the death, and the entrance into glory, as the one consummated fulfillment of the one paschal sacrifice.

We have something very similar in the *Epistola heortastica* of Theophilus of Alexandria. He connects immediately the entry of our Lord into the Cenacle with His entry into the Holy of Holies, the sanctuary of eternal redemption. He desires us "to draw aside the veil of words, and thus with unimpeded vision fix our attention on the feast of the passage of the divine Pasch, calling out to Jesus: *Where wilt thou that we prepare the pasch?* The disciples hearing from Him that it was to be celebrated in the Cenacle, were lifted above earthly things, and with the speed of thought eagerly hastened

into the Holy of Holies; where Christ Himself entered for us, and abrogating the figurative function of the high priest, obtained eternal redemption for us, appearing on our behalf before the very face of God" (P.G. 65, 53-56).²

Of the Fathers of the West, Bede is careful to remind us, that in the mystery of the paschal night, not only is the Resurrection commemorated, but the Passion and the Supper with the Resurrection: "The solemnity OF THIS MOST SACRED NIGHT AND OF OUR REDEMPTION which we celebrate, was mystically designated long ago among the ancient people of God . . . The redemption of that people [from the bondage of Egypt] was a type of our own spiritual redemption which was accomplished ON THAT NIGHT by our Lord rising from the dead . . . The immaculate Lamb came

²Here the language of Theophilus is rather involved and requires careful interpretation. I do not think that Cosmas Indicopleustes (*Topographia christiana*, lib. 10. P.G. 88, 417) explains these words rightly when he says: "Theophilus says that the cenacle is the home into which Christ the Lord entered as precursor for us (the type of Christ being the high priest in the tabernacle of Moses), in order to appear for us before the face of God". For Theophilus does not say that the Cenacle was the actual sacred place, entering which, Christ would appear for us before the face of God; rather he says that the Cenacle was an image of that sacred place, and that to the celebration in the Cenacle, there corresponded as end or conclusion, the appearance of the victim in the holy place of heaven,

and deigned to be immolated for us, He gave His own Body and Blood as the price of our salvation: submitting to death for a time, He conquered the sway of death for all time . . . ; HE IS THE LAMB WHO REFRESHES US WITH THE SACRED OFFERING OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, lest we die. Therefore just as on this night in Egypt when the lamb was slain, the houses of the faithful were marked with its blood, and its flesh was eaten, the Lord came suddenly, and punishing those who remained without a share in the heavenly mysteries, He saved those whom He found imbued with the saving sacraments: so too when our Lord and Saviour HAD OFFERED HIS OWN BODY AND BLOOD AS A VICTIM TO THE FATHER FOR US, He overcame the power of the devil, and crushed the pride of his satellites (namely, the unclean spirits); He tore out the bolts of hell, and released the elect who though calm and tranquil were detained there, AND ON THIS VERY NIGHT RISING FROM THE DEAD, He conducted them to the joys of the kingdom of heaven. . . . Not only did He release the just who were in hell, but also, for those still in the flesh whom He knew to be His own, those who, He foresaw, would believe in Him at the end of time, BY HIS DEATH AND RESURRECTION, He procured the remedy of salvation. For us too, even before we were created, HE CONSECRATED THE SPIRITUAL NUTRIMENT WHEREBY WE

WOULD BE RECREATED . . . Justly then on this night, we too being mindful of our Redemption, immolate anew to God the most holy Body and precious Blood of our Lamb by which we have been redeemed from sin." (*Homil.* lib. 2, 1. P.L. 94, 138-139). Note all that the Pasch of the Lord embraces in the mind of Bede: the offering of His Body and Blood made in the Eucharist, the acceptance of death as immolation, the resurrection to glory: while refreshment from the sacred offering is not omitted.

Bede gives the same explanation very concisely elsewhere: the Lord "at the appointed time, eating the desired pasch with His disciples, offers, AT THE MORNING'S DAWN FOR THE FAITHFUL TO PARTAKE OF THE MOST PURE CONSECRATED MYSTERIES OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS, AS THE UNLEAVENED BREAD OF THE LAND OF PROMISE" (*In Luc XXII.* 13. P.L. 92, 595).³ The meaning is: The Eucharist, succeeding to the legal pasch, was enacted in the Supper, it reached the culmination of its sacrificial truth on the Cross, and was finally given to man as heavenly food in the newness of the Resurrection.

The author of the work *De Of-*

³ We have the same in Amalarius (*De officiis ecclesiasticis*, l. 1, c. 12. P.L.L. 105, 1023) and in another place also he has words very similar (*ibid.*, c. 15, col. 1023). We shall quote them later. Compare also Albert the Great, cited above (p. 65).

ficiis, attributed with some doubt to Bede, also tells us that in our celebration of the pasch, we join the Passion and the Resurrection: "Not only do we celebrate the day of the paschal resurrection, because He rose from the dead on that day, but also BECAUSE OF THE OTHER SACRAMENTS WHICH ARE SIGNIFIED BY IT. For as the Apostle said: *He was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification*, the passage from death to life was consecrated in the Passion and the Resurrection of the Lord. (For this reason we use the term *Pasch*, a Hebrew word, meaning passage or *passover*)." (P.L. 94, 536).⁴

⁴ What the early Christians meant by the phrase *annual paschal commemoration* has been a question disputed by scholars. Do the words refer to the Passion, or to the Resurrection, or to the Eucharistic Supper? Some, Emil Schürer, for example (in the learned historical work *De controversiis paschalibus secundo post Christum natum saeculo exortis*, Lipsiae 1869, p. 8-10 and 65 sq.) thought that only the Supper and the Passion were commemorated. Others, like Duchesne, (*La question de la pâque au concile de Nicée*, in *R. D. Q. H.* July 1880, p. 6-8; *Origines du culte chrétien*, 3, 238; *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, t.I., p. 286-287), that along with the Passion the Resurrection alone is celebrated. In what is included both are right, but not in what is excluded. The documentary evidence of each party combined suggests: that it is not the Passion with the Supper only, nor the Passion with the Resurrection only, but the Passion with both the Supper and the Resurrection. So much so that properly speaking our Pasch is a triduum. This is confirmed by Hefele (*Hist. des Concil.* tr. fr. 1907, t.I., p. 146-148). Our arguments in this chapter meet the objections of Emil Schürer: "For if the

Secondly, the mind of the Fathers is still clearer from the comparison which they make between the customary offering to God of the sheaf on the tenth day of the month Nisan (*Levit.*, XXII. 10-14), that is the first fruits of the earth, and Christ

Christians of the West really commemorated the Resurrection of Christ, it is quite impossible to explain—and it has never yet been explained—, why they called this celebration the Pasch" (p. 65). On the contrary the reason is obvious: because they were commemorating the paschal sacrifice of our Lord, offered sacerdotally in the Supper, enacted in blood on the Cross, and divinely consummated in the Resurrection; for in this our Redemption consists, and all admit (*ibid.*) that the Redemption is the reason and the subject of our paschal celebration.

After a careful study of the remarks of Charles Schmidt in Excursus 3 of his edition of the *Epistola Apostolorum* or *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung* etc. Leipzig, 1919 (T. u. U. 43), I find no reason to alter what I have written. Having explained all the latest opinions which interpret the early Christian pasch, either as commemorating the Death or the Resurrection, or the Supper, he then adds: "There will be found already at hand in our *Epistola* a settlement of this dispute among the learned". He refers here to a passage in that very ancient document (A.D. 160-170, *ibid.*, p. 402) where Christ is represented as speaking of the annual pasch of His disciples, commemorating His death (*Epistola*, c. 15, p. 52: "Do ye commemorate the anniversary of my death, the Pasch". We have a French version of this *Epistola* in L. Guerrier, *Le Testament en Galilée de N. S. J. C.*, P. O. 9, 177-232; compare p. 198). We have already given our reasons for dissenting from the conclusions of Schmidt (in so far as it is exclusive, p. 601 foll.). Of the three elements of the Christian Pasch, one never excluded the others. The three are one.

in His Resurrection presenting to God on that same day the first fruits of our redeemed race. Sometimes they interweave this comparison with the comparison of the paschal lamb.⁵

From the many we select Euty-chius, Confessor and Pontiff, who knits together the Supper, the Passion and the Resurrection: "At the beginning of the sixteenth day, which we call the day of the Lord, our Lord rising from the dead OFFERED HIMSELF IN PLACE OF THE SHEAF TO GOD THE FATHER FOR THE SALVATION OF THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE . . . Just as rising from the dead, and offering Himself to the Father for us, He abrogated the type of the sheaf, so too on the morning of the fourteenth day, HE OFFERED HIMSELF MYSTICALLY AND BY ANTICIPATION, and taking the place of the lamb, He became Himself its anti-type. Therefore THE MYSTICAL (i.e. the significative or the symbolic) is here the beginning and the pledge OF THE PRAGMATIC (i.e. the signified

and real). The pragmatic is the consummation according to the words: *I will not eat of it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God my Father.* For this latter had place in His holy Resurrection—for this is the kingdom of God . . . That this is so, see how we die mystically in holy baptism, and afterwards in martyrdom, or even without martyrdom, we die pragmatically. Our mystic death is not different from our pragmatic death, but is consummated by it. THEREFORE THE MYSTIC IS NOT SEPARATED FROM THE PRAGMATIC, THOUGH IT IS CONSUMMATED BY IT. Hence also it is that the Church commemorates the fourteenth day on Holy Thursday, on which day long ago the Lord mystically immolated Himself. She celebrates the consummation and the fulfillment of the MYSTIC feast IN THE HOLY RESURRECTION, which took place at the beginning of the sixteenth day, or the day of the Lord which we now celebrate." (*De paschate et sacrosancta Eucharistia*, n. 4-5, P.G. 86bis, 2396-2397).

⁵ Thomassinus (*De Incarnatione*, 1, 10, c. 13) cites in this connection Epiphanius, *Adv. haer.*, 51, n. 31; Chrysostom, Homil. in *Ascensione Christi*, n. 2; Cyril of Alexandria, *De adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, and *In Joann*, 1, 4, c. 2 (P.G. 41, 945; 50, 445-446; 68, 1092-1096; 73, 568-569).

We may also add Cyril of Alexandria, (*In Lucam* XXII. 14, P.G. 72, 905-908, and in *Glaphyr. in Num.*, P. G 69, 625; Euty-chius, *In Levit.*, XXIII. 9-14. P.G. 87, 775; Rupert of Dietz, *In Levit.*, 1, 2, c. 36-37, P.L. 170, 277; and particularly the words of Euty-chius which we quote directly.

Connect these words with what he had just written: "BEFORE THE PASSION HE ATE THE PASCH, that is THE MYSTIC PASCH. For it would not have been called the pasch without the Passion.⁶ Therefore He mysti-

⁶ Compare *ibid.*, n. 3. col. 2396: "The breaking of the venerable bread signifies death by violence, hence it is called the desirable Pasch." The faulty and portentous etymology which derives the word *pasch*

cally immolated Himself, when, after He had supped, with His own hands He took bread gave thanks and broke it, and became Himself the antitype." (*Ibid.*, p. 2, col. 2393). Thus does Euty chius link the Passion with the Supper and the Resurrection with both, making one whole sacrificial complexus of the three. The Supper commences the sacri-

from a Greek word meaning suffering, was suggested by Philo (*Quis rerum divinarum haeres sit*, parag. 40, Op. omn. ed. P. Wendland, 1898, t. 3. P. 42), as P. Zahn (*Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, II. Theil, 1883, p. 136), remarks. I think too that it was applied implicitly by Irenaeus (*Adv. haeres.*, 4, 10, 1; compare p. 79 above), it was rejected by Gregory Nazianzen (*Or.* 45, n. 10. P.G. 36, 636), though Procopius (*In Exod.*, XII. 2. P.G. 87, 562) gave it later. As the Greek writers could make such an egregious error in etymology, it is no surprise that Latin writers, like Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.*, 10. P.L. 2630) and others, whom Jerome (*In Matth.*, XXVI. 1. P.L. 26, 190) and Augustine (*In Joann.*, Tr. 54, 1. P.L. 35, 1784-1785) take to task, should follow their lead. Clearly then seeing that Augustine rejects the erroneous derivation of the word *pasch*, the seventh of the *Sermones* of Augustine published by Michael Denis, is wrongly attributed to him. For there (P.L. 46, 837), we read: "Pasch is a Hebrew word which means *passage*; but in the Greek *paschin* is to suffer; in the Latin *pascha* is to feast—*pascere*, as we say: *pascam amicos*". Meantime it should be noted that the author of that *Sermo* included within the Christian pasch, the Supper (*pascam*) and the Resurrection (*transitum*) with the Passion (*paschin*). The whole passage should be read. Even after the aspersions of Jerome and Augustine, the author of the work *De officiis* attributed to Bede (l.c.) again resuscitates this false derivation of the word *pasch*.

fice, the Passion fulfils it, the Resurrection consummates it. For the Supper was the beginning and the pledge of what it signified; the Passion delivered up the Victim; the Resurrection, consummating the Pasch, added the final crown to the sacrificial action.

Thirdly, aside from any comparison or figure whatever, the Fathers sometimes dwell on the intimate connection existing between Christ's Resurrection and His sacrifice, in that, He thereby added a certain perfection of immolational dignity to His victim state.

Thus Origen: "It was necessary for my Lord and Saviour not only to be born among men, but also to descend into hell, so that, returning thence, His work accomplished, He might ascend to the Father, and be more fully purified at the heavenly altar there, in order to bestow on the pledge of our flesh which He bore with Him, the gift of eternal purity. This then is the true day of propitiation, when God has been propitiated for men" (*In Levit.*, hom. 9, n. 5. P.G. 12, 514). The purity referred to here is the purity of the Flesh of Christ divested of every similitude of sin, passing into incorruptibility and immortality. This attainment of the divine condition was the ultimate and consummate sanctification of the Victim.

St John Damascene (*In dominicum pascha*, P.G. 96, 841) speaks in a similar fashion: "My Saviour, LIV-

ING AND NOW DEATHLESS VICTIM, while thou didst freely offer thyself to God the Father, RISING FROM THE SEPULCHRE, thou didst raise up our common Father Adam."

Here again the passage from St Augustine already cited, is relevant: "He received from you what He would offer for you, even as a priest receives from you what he is to offer for you, when you are desirous of appeasing the anger of God on account of your sins. That was when it was done, that was how it was done. Our Priest received from us what He was to offer for us: for He took flesh from us, in that flesh He was made Victim, He was made a holocaust, He was made a sacrifice. HE WAS MADE A SACRIFICE IN THE PASSION: THAT WHICH WAS SLAIN HE RESTORED ANEW IN THE RESURRECTION, and gave it to God as your first fruits; and He says—all that is yours has been consecrated to God since such first fruits of you have been given to God." (*In Psalm 129*, n. 7. P.L. 37, 1701.) And further: "This then is the evening sacrifice, the Passion of the Lord, the Cross of the Lord, the offering of the saving Victim, the holocaust accepted by God. IN THE RESURRECTION HE MADE THIS EVENING SACRIFICE A MORNING GIFT." (*In Psalm. 140*, n. 5. P.L. 37, 1818)—that is to say, a gift transformed and beautified by the light of eternal glory. Such was the gift, such the Victim that Christ made over to God.

The words of St Zeno of Verona express this truth most effectively: "He is eternal, because He was slain and yet He lives. He, I say, is THE PERFECT LAMB, BECAUSE IN HIM the great High Priest, included in His Victim by a mystery of love, TODAY (i.e. the day of the Resurrection) MADE DIVINE THE MAN WHOM HE OFFERED IN SACRIFICE." (*Tract. 55*. P.L. 11, 511). The meaning is plain: today is transmitted to the Father in a divine condition, what was dedicated to the Father in a human condition.

The Priesthood Ratified by God in the Resurrection.

Still further light is shed on our theme from the common teaching of the Fathers: that the priesthood of Christ was made manifest most of all in the Resurrection.⁷ This of course does not imply that He was not Priest before the Resurrection, for, as we have said above, He was Priest from the Incarnation, and He exercised this priesthood in the offering of His Body and Blood. Our meaning is that the priesthood which He claimed for Himself in that offering, was now sealed by God as *true and efficacious*, not fictitious or unavailing, in the Resurrection itself. So much so that by the Resurrection Christ was glorified as Priest. His priesthood was

⁷ See Thomassinus, *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, I, 10, c. 11-14.

confirmed and so to speak sealed with authority: *He did not glorify himself that he might be made a high priest, but He was glorified by Him who said to Him: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee* (by raising Him from the dead, see *Acts XIII. 33*, and commentators in h.l. of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* passim) . . . *and being consummated, became to all that obey him, the cause of eternal salvation, called by God a high priest according to the order of Melchisedech* (*Hebr., V. 5-10*).⁸

And in the first place, this glorious dedication of the priesthood is stated by the Fathers.

Athanasius says that Christ was made Pontiff of our confession "when having offered Himself for us, He raised His Body from the grave" (*Or. 2 contra Arianos* n. 7. P.G. 26, 161).⁹ Cyril of Alexandria thinks that both the time of the Resurrection and the time of the priesthood of the Lord are prefigured by that eighth day on which Aaron, succeeding to Moses, fulfilled the office of the priesthood (*Levit., IX*): "For the time of the priesthood of Christ is fittingly understood as that which was after the Law (i.e. of Moses),

⁸ How the connection of the priesthood with the Resurrection in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is explained by others, not "without a certain amount of subtlety" as they admit, see Huyghe, in *Hebr., V. 5*, op. cit., p. 118.

⁹ "When was He made the Pontiff of our confession? Was it not when" etc.

that is the eighth day, the day of the Resurrection" (*De ador. in sp. et ver.*, I, 11. P.G. 68, 768).¹⁰ Procopius on the same words of *Leviticus*: "The new priesthood of Christ began on the eighth day on which Christ rose from the dead." (P.G. 87, 719).

Among the Latin Fathers, Tertullian says that Christ (like Jesus the son of Josedech, *Zach., III. 3-5*) was not clothed with the sacerdotal vestments until the Resurrection: "Clothed in the vesture of a priest after His Resurrection, He is called a priest for ever of God the Father." (*Adv. Judaeos*, 14. P.L. 2, 640; compare Lactantius *Divin. Instit.*, I, 4, c. 14. P.L. 6, 488-490).

The Resurrection may be said to initiate the priesthood in the same sense in which it perfects the sacrifice. For the priesthood is true and absolutely perfect only when it has

¹⁰ It appears to me that he assigns the Resurrection to the eighth day because it took place on the day after the Sabbath or seventh. Just as a little later Hesychius (*In Levit. IX. 1-4*) wrote: ". . . It was on this day that the Saviour rose from the dead, it is believed to be the eighth." Rupert of Dietz (*In Levit., 1, 2, c. 5*. P.L. 187, 691) arrives at the same conclusion by a different line of reasoning: "What Moses means by the words *in seven days the consecration is finished* is evident from many passages of Scripture: because within seven days the whole cycle of the present world is comprised, it is brought to a close on the eighth day, that is the time of the resurrection to come, already fulfilled in Christ the High Priest, we believe firmly that it will also be fulfilled in us in the time to come".

been marked as ratified by God; and it is ratified by God when the sacrifice is accepted by God. For the priest or pontiff as mediator between God and man, endeavours to transmit to God certain tokens of human devotion, so that when these tokens have become divine, man in turn may be rewarded by these same tokens now pledged by God. That priest then is perfect, not void and ineffectual, whose gifts really do pass over to God, really received into the divine ownership. If on the other hand God rejected and refused to make His own these gifts, both the sacrifice and the priesthood would be vain and empty. Now in the Resurrection, Christ's Victim has passed over to God; Christ's Victim is received by God; Christ's Victim, food of God so to speak, is absorbed in the uncreated fire of the divine glory, in a manner far exceeding in excellence the figurative victims which were consumed by fire sent down from heaven or by the flames of the holocaust.¹¹ For the consummation of the victim is the acceptance by God. The acceptance in the consumption of the victim by earthly fire was figurative only. Whereas the glorification of Christ was true acceptance. Hence the Fathers termed this glorification a holocaust, as though that glory by which He was

glorified was a fire which completely devoured the victim and, consuming its corruptibility, translated it into its own incorruptibility.

Thus Origen referring the law of the holocausts (*Levit.*, I. 1-9) to Christ, thus interprets the words: *And when they have flayed the victim . . . the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire on the altar, and they shall pile the wood on the fire* "For the divinity of Christ is from heaven, whither too that fire hastens upwards. It was fitting therefore for a fire from heaven to consume all that had been done by the Saviour in the Body, and to restore all to His divine nature. That fire is kindled under the wood: and the Passion of Christ in the flesh was even unto the wood; but when He was suspended on the wood of the Cross, the dispensation of the flesh came to an end; because rising from the dead He ascended into heaven, whither the fire by its nature pointed the way. Hence too the Apostle said: *although we knew Christ according to the flesh, but now we do not know him.* For the holocaust of His Flesh, offered through the wood of the Cross, joined the earthly to the heavenly, the human to the divine." (*In Levit.* hom. 1, n. 4. P.G., 12 410).

Cyril of Alexandria (l.c.) gives the same reason why the beginnings of the priesthood of the Lord were most manifest in the Resurrection; in the same way as a fire coming out

¹¹ How the sacred fire consuming the victims also consummated them, was explained above (chap. I).

from the Lord while it devoured the sacrifice of Aaron (the ox, the ram, flour), sanctioned and approved the priesthood of Aaron: ". . . Moses declared that the glory of the Lord would be seen on the eighth day (for the Law foretold the time of the coming of the Saviour): *And the glory of the Lord appeared to all the multitude: and behold a fire coming out from the Lord devoured the holocaust, and the fat which was upon the altar (Levit. IX. 23-24)* . . . Hence the glory of the Lord was in very truth seen on the eighth day, that is to say: the Son who is the glory of God, was made manifest . . . He makes us sacred, when in type He is slain in the ox, or as the ram when He was consummated in the odor of spiritual sweetness;¹² He Himself being made Victim of salvation, sanctified us with His own Blood, and as the flour tempered with oil, He presents Himself to God the Father for us in the gladness of a holy life."

Procopius similarly compares the Resurrection of the immolated Christ to the holocaust. He is commenting on the rite (*Exodus XXIX. 12-14*) in which a calf was sacrificed to God at the consecration of the priests; just as the slaying of the

calf prefigured the death of Christ, so the burning of the victim prefigured the Resurrection: "The wondrous resplendent glory of the death of the Lord, is indicated by the fire which consumes the sacrifices. The same fire is a figure of the divinity of Christ, as we also see in the burning bush and in Mount Sinai. Christ dying is raised to ineffable glory, because He endured death; for by the glory of the Resurrection He vanquished the ignominy of the Passion. The corpse of the calf consumed by the fire is a foreshadowing of this." (*Commentarii in Exod.*, P.G. 87, 657-658).¹³ The fire of the divinity comes down, so to speak, on the Body of the immolated Christ, devouring its mortality: such was the glory of the sacrifice of the Lord, to be caught up by the divinity and raised to the sublimity of a heavenly condition.¹⁴

This also we find indicated in St Augustine. Thomassinus (*op. cit.*, I, 10, c. 15. parag. 1-5) has culled a number of beautiful passages, in which Augustine represents the resurrection of our bodies after the

¹³ Compare Cyril of Alexandria, *De adoratione in spirit. et ver.*, (I. II. P.G. 68, 756-757).

¹⁴ We find it again on the verse in *Leviticus VII. 17*: *But whatsoever shall be found on the third day shall be consumed by fire.* "We are here reminded of the third day on which our Saviour who died for us, rose glorious from the dead" (*Commentarii in Leviticum*. P.G. 87, 718).

¹² In the slaying of the ox, Cyril sees in type the passion of Christ; in the sweet-smelling burning of the holocaust of the ram, the Resurrection. Notice the same order in the second part of the sentence: the blood victim, the flour tempered with the oil of gladness.

manner of a fire burning away and eternally consuming our mortality. We shall all pass in holocaust through its flame, borne on to that place where Christ, bearing the first fruits of the Virgin womb, has gone before us (*Ennar. in Psalm 64*, n. 4 and 5. P.L. 36, 775-776). And thus will come to pass that which is written: *death is swallowed in victory*: for "victory is as a divine fire; when it swallows up our death it is a holocaust . . . EVERYTHING IN MORTAL LIFE WILL BE CONSUMED, IN ORDER THAT ETERNAL LIFE MAY BE CONSUMMATED. All these therefore will be holocausts". Of such the Psalmist says: *I will go into thy house with holocausts* (*Ennar. in Psalm 65*, n. 18. P.L. 36, 798). For then indeed "the substance of the body will be changed into a heavenly quality; the fire in the sacrifice signified this, as it were swallowing up death in victory." In this figure of the legal sacrifices Christ was promised (*Contra Faust. Manich*, l. 22, n. 17. P.L. 42, 409): the most true sacrifice,¹⁵ truly consummated in the Resurrection.¹⁶

¹⁵ The death of the faithful, even of the martyrs, is not sacrifice in the strict sense: hence it cannot be said strictly that their sacrifice is consummated by the glory of the resurrection. But the death of Christ is a real sacrifice, and hence it is strictly said to be consummated by the glory of the Resurrection.

¹⁶ Possibly the Pseudo-Augustine, author of the *Liber de quattuor virtutibus caritatis*, has this meaning in the words he addresses to Abraham: "Though thou indeed didst

On the following verse from *Leviticus VI. 30*: *For the victim that is slain for sin, the blood of which is carried into the sanctuary, shall not be eaten, but shall be burnt with fire*: Rupert of Dietz, making a careful distinction between the sacramental species in which Christ is eaten, and His proper species in which He suffered and rose from the dead but is not eaten, writes: "The visible corporal species in which the Son of God, the Victim of the living, was slain for our sins, whose Blood, nay the Flesh of whose Blood, was once borne into the Holy of Holies in heaven, as ransom and propitiation for the sins of the people, that same species, despised in death was not to be eaten, BUT WAS TO BE BURNT IN THE FIRE (THAT IS, IN THE FIRE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT), WAS TO BE FREED BY VIRTUE OF THE RESURRECTION FROM EVERY CORRUPTION OF MORTALITY AND PASSIBILITY, and was to be raised up in heaven." (*In Levit*, l. 1, c. 34. P.L. 167, 780).¹⁷

lead thy son to be immolated freely and voluntarily, believing that he would rise again, thy son will not burn in that sacrifice, because the resurrection is reserved for the Son of God (P.L. 47, 1130). However the author may have been following some other line of thought.

¹⁷ Further on *In Levit.*, l. 2, c. 6, col. 792, he says: "He had no other victim but Himself to offer in holocaust. The fire came down on Him . . . and devoured the holocaust, that is after its own manner of devouring, which we with the Apostle rightly call changing, because: *rising from the dead, he dieth now no more, death hath no more dominion over him.*"

Such is the teaching of the Fathers on the divine consummation of the sacrifice of our Lord.

In the second place, the efficacy of the priesthood of Christ in glory is indicated by the Resurrection.

Because the sacrifice of Christ was consummated by the divinity it is efficacious. This consummation is in the Resurrection. For in the Resurrection our Priest obtained for Himself personally, and for us as Head of the body of which we are the members, the goods of heaven, and the winning of celestial goods was the purpose of the sacrifice. Hence the priesthood of Christ is ratified by reason of its effect, or its fruit, and so rightly and justly, excelling the feeble priesthood of the Law, He is called *the highpriest of good things to come*. It is scarcely worth while to quote the Fathers on this matter; later however it will claim a fuller explanation.

B) THE SACRIFICE AND THE ASCENSION

Benedict XIV (*De sacros. sacrific. missae*, l. 2, c. 11, n. 5, Op. omn., Prati, 1842, t. 8, p. 71) writes: "In the Jewish sacrifices the victim was burnt on the altar of the holocausts, in order that any uncleanness therein might be consumed by the flames, and that the smoke might be wafted up to heaven *in the odor of sweetness*, as Holy Scripture says. In the New Law the Victim was consumed by the Resurrection and

Ascension of Christ. For by the Resurrection *that which was mortal in Christ was swallowed up by life*, as the Apostle says (*II. Cor.*, V. 4), and what was corruptible in Him was consumed; in the Ascension the Victim was accepted by God in the odor of sweetness, and was placed at His right hand."

Just as the Resurrection therefore was likened to the fire of the holocaust, so was the Ascension to the sweet odor of the smoke issuing from the holocaust. For this reason the Fathers interwove both in the sacrifice of Christ. In the Resurrection they see a descent of God on the Victim, in the Ascension the raising of the Victim to God.¹⁸ They considered that then the Victim was accepted and taken into the bosom of God, when the cycle of Christ—entering the world as Priest, returning to the Father as Victim—was completed. With God the sacrifice and the Priesthood of Christ would find rest, having reached their goal: the Victim now changeless remains in the sight of God, the Priest is seated eternally at His right hand. There whither the virtue of His sacrifice has brought Him, He is in the enjoyment of His sacerdotal glory.

¹⁸ Indeed the divine acceptance is given in either way: the descent of God on the Victim, or the taking up of the Victim by God. Hence in the Mass we pray for the acceptance of our sacrifice, which is in the transubstantiation in two ways: by calling on God to descend on the oblata, and by praying that the oblata may be borne to God, as will be seen later.

Epiphanius says that it was because of His Ascension that He was made Pontiff or Priest forever: "As made a priest in His own Body, He offered Himself to the Father for men, fulfilling the priestly office. But ascending glorious and spiritual in the same Body, He sits at the right hand of the Father, made priest forever, having passed into heaven" (*Adv. Haeres.*, haer. 69, parag. 34. P. G. 42, 261).

We have this also in the hymns of St. Ephraem, extolling Christ for having ascended as an oblation, because He ascended and offered: that is, bringing gifts to God, which were first offered on earth by Himself: "THE NEW MYSTIC BREAD ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN ON THAT DAY. THE MYSTERIES WERE UNFOLDED IN THY BODY WHICH ASCENDED AS AN OFFERING. Blessed, O Lord, be thy bread!¹⁹ He comes to us the Lamb of the house of David, Priest sprung from Abraham; the same one is our Lamb and our Priest; His Body is the Victim, His Blood the libation. Blessed be His sacrifice! from heaven He descended as light, from Mary as offspring; He came down from the Cross as fruit; He ascended into heaven as the first fruits. Blessed be His will! . . . Thou art an offering both in heaven and on earth, for thou wast slain, and thou wast

adored; for thou didst come down to earth and wast made a Victim; THOU DIDST GO UP TO HEAVEN AND THOU WAST MADE THE GREAT OFFERING; THOU DIDST ASCEND, O LORD, AND THOU DIDST OFFER". (*Hymni dispersi*, hymn 18, in *Ascensionem*—from the Syrian breviary of the feast of the Ascension—str. 8, 9, 10, 12. ed. Lamy, t. 4, p. 748-750).

Chrysostom rejoices because our Redeemer "ascends with a sacrifice which can appease the Father" (*In Hebr.*, IX. 24, hom 17, n. 1. P. G. 63, 128). Hesychius (*In Levit.*, XVI. 16-18 P. G. 93, 901) says that we eat the victim of the Lord in a holy place (the Church) because the Lord brought the blood of His victim into the holy place, that is into heaven, and offered it to God: "He offered the blood of His own oblation, which was offered in place of our blood, in the Holies (that is in heaven itself), in the sight of His Father. He also commanded this sacrifice to be eaten in the holy place (we call it the Church) unto the remission and the atonement of sins". In the same way the author of the *Historia ecclesiasticae et mysticae contemplationis* (even before the time of Anastasius bibliothecarius, attributed by some to St. Basil, and to St. Germanus of Constantinople with greater probability: compare Brightman J.T.S., p. 248-267 and 387-398 and F. Gayre, D.T.C., art. Germain, col. 1308) interwove the offering of Christ and the Ascension:

¹⁹ Observe how the Ascension is linked with the Eucharist, showing how the one sacrifice runs from its Eucharistic offering to its consummation in heaven.

“The Son of God raised up by the Flesh which He assumed, and the Lamb which He bore on His shoulders . . . beyond every principality and power, and above the domination of the heavenly virtues, and presented it to God the Father . . . Because of the dignity of the offerer and the purity of the oblation, God the Father accepted it as a pleasing sacrifice and oblation on behalf of the human race. The Father also said to the Son: *The Lord said to my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand and he sits at the right hand of the seat of majesty in heaven;* this is Jesus of Nazareth, pontiff of future goods” (Brightman, loc. cit., p. 394).²⁰ And again: “Christ entered into the Holies not made with hands, and appeared in the presence of God the Father, made High Priest for us He entered into heaven. He is also our advocate with the Father and a propitiation for our sins, having prepared His holy Body and precious Blood for us, as redemption for us all” (*Ibid.*, p. 394).

From the Latin Fathers, we quote first Phoebadius. If he wrote the work *De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos*,²¹ he says: “We believe that

²⁰ We find these words of St. Germanus in the treatise of St. Sophronius of Jerusalem, entitled *Sermo complectens totam historiam ecclesiasticam et subtilem expositionem rerum omnium quae in divina liturgia peraguntur* (P.G. 87ter, 3996).

²¹ Durengues assigns the treatise to Phoebadius in his work entitled *La question du De Fide*, Agen, 1909, after the authors of the *Hist. Littér. de la France*, t. 1, partie 2, 1733,

the Son of God died and was buried . . . : that on the third day He rose again . . . that He ascended into heaven, that He offered that Man (the assumed humanity) to His Father, a most pleasing gift” (P. L. 20, 48).

In complete harmony we have St Augustine: “Once therefore in all time, the Lord Jesus Christ our one High Priest, rising from the dead, entered, not into the figurative but into the true Holy of Holies beyond the veils of heaven, OFFERING HIMSELF FOR US.” (*Fragmentum Sèrmonis de kalendis januariis*, inter collectanea Joannis Diaconis in *Lev.*, P. L. 38, 1736).

Here we may also record the words of a discourse of Gregory the Great, written out by the abbot Claudius. Gregory pays a tribute to his acumen, he says that Claudius changed the sense of his words into something “far more useful” (*valde in utilius permutatum*) (*Epist.* I, 12, ep. 24, P. L. 77, 12344)²² Gregory’s

p. 273-279; in opposition to others who attributed this treatise to Gregorius Elibertanus, such as Dom. Morin, *l’Attribution du De Fide à Gregoire d’Elvire*, *Revue Bénédictine*, 1902, p. 229-237, following Quesnell, diss. XIV, *De variis fidei libellis* etc., P.L. 56, 1049-1053.

²² Evidently the words *in utilius* must be kept separate, though the editors have made them one word *inutilius*. For the words *valde inutilius permutatum* fall not short of nonsense. Particularly so when we see that in the *Epistola* from which we quote, Gregory has nothing but praise for the version of Claudius, he shows not the slightest indication of wishing to correct it,

words on *I. Kings*, I. 21-22 as narrated by Claudius, are as follows: "Our Redeemer now triumphing over death, now rising above the darkness of our mortality . . . took up to heaven the flesh which He assumed for our salvation . . . He immolated a great Victim at the moment when He presented Himself to the eternal Father in heaven in the very substance of His glorified Flesh" (*I. Kings*, l. 1, c. 1, n. 40. P. L. 79, 42).

In the Middle Ages Richardus Weddinghusanus²³ in his *Libellus de canone mystici libaminis*, c. 6. P. L. 177, 463, a well known work at that time, comments on the words *a pure victim, a holy victim, an immaculate victim*: "The Lord Jesus Christ was a pure Victim in His Passion, A HOLY VICTIM IN THE RESURRECTION, AN IMMACULATE VICTIM IN THE ASCENSION."²⁴

or to prevent an uncorrected version being circulated. This is what the Benedictine publishers read into it (P.L. 77, 1233 and 79, 9). But all he wanted was to recover possession of his own works, and prevent their promulgation during his lifetime.

²³ Not Joannes Cornubiensis: cf. Hurter, *Nomenclator* 3, col. 95, 3 and 212.

²⁴ Because the place of Christ Priest at the right hand of the Father, was made known only by the mission of the Holy Ghost, to which it was ordained; and because it was then finally that the sanctification of Christ Victim attained its full effect, when the Church was sanctified in the apostles, in the words of our Lord: *For them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth*: Bede assigns the ultimate consummation of our Saviour's paschal sacrifice to the day of Pentecost.

Hence it is quite in keeping with the teaching of the early Fathers, that among recent writers, two men of deep piety, C. de Condren,²⁵ and J. J. Olier,²⁶ speak of the taking up of the Victim to God in the Ascen-

"His Victim was immolated in the time of the pasch, but it was really consumed on the day of Pentecost by the Holy Ghost appearing in fire" (*Super Acta Apostolorum expos.*, c. 2. P.L. 92, 945). So much so that he teaches that the first day of the week was the consecrated day of the Lord, by the descent of the Holy Spirit, and not by the Resurrection (*op. cit.*, c. 2, col. 946). We however say that it was because of both.

Every point of this teaching is included in the celebrated Instruction of Louis Albert Joly de Choin, Bishop of Toulon, delivered on November 15, 1748: "This divine Victim was immolated on the Cross. It was consummated, so to speak, by the Resurrection and by the Ascension of Jesus Christ: for by the Resurrection all that was mortal and corruptible in Jesus Christ was destroyed, and was *swallowed up by the life*. It was then that His Body was clothed with immortality; and by the Ascension this Victim was presented before the face of God, and placed on the right hand of God the Father; finally on the day of Pentecost we find a kind of communion with the Victim; for it was on this day that the faithful were incorporated, so to speak, with Jesus Christ, made partakers of His Spirit, and members of His body as St Paul says" (*Instruction sur le Rituel. Du sacrifice de la Messe*, ed. Bisunt. 1827, p. 302-303). On the connection between Pentecost and the Eucharist we shall have more to say later.

²⁵ *L'idée du sacerdoce et du sacrifice de Jesus Christ*, Paris, 1677. On the Resurrection, part, 2, ch. 8. On the Ascension *ibid.*, ch. 23, p. 103.

²⁶ *Explication des cérémonies*, On the Resurrection, 1, 2, c. 4. Compare Lepin, *L'idée du sacrifice dans la religion chrétienne*, p. 151 and 161-164.

sion, and the consuming of the Victim already spoken of in the Resurrection, as God's communion in the sacrifice of Christ. Without such communion by God, we, when we feed on the Victim, would not really be fellow-guests and table-companions with God.²⁷ So that just as the Passion has an intimate relation to our spiritual nutriment, so also have the Resurrection and the Ascension.

Whether then we consider the communion of God with Christ Victim, or the partaking of Christ (already spoken of)²⁸ in the goods of God, under either aspect both the Resurrection and the Ascension confer on the sacrifice of Christ an excellence beyond the other sacrifices. Owing to the imperfection of these sacrifices, they were incapable of leading the offerer into the fellowship of God, and were powerless to change the offering into the food and banquet of God. Hence the signification of those other sacrifices was false, and their promise deceitful, unless they were referred to the one true sacrifice, which being offered on earth was consummated in

heaven, and being rendered to God in the Passion, was crowned with glory. The sacrifice of Christ was truer than those other sacrifices in so far as it really passed into the celestial condition, and the Victim was truer, crowned with glory beyond all other victims. For the purpose of every victim was that it might pass over to God. This was achieved by our paschal Victim alone, for His passing over to God from life through death, from death through the Resurrection, was perfected in the Ascension. Hence from every point of view, the Resurrection and the Ascension added the crowning perfection to the sacrifice of Christ.

No wonder then that in practically all the liturgies, (see later, Bk. II) after the Supper narrative and the commemoration of the Passion, we find a commemoration or anamnesis either of the Resurrection or of the Ascension or of both.²⁹ For all these mysteries are integral parts of the one mystery, which is

²⁷ Condren, op. cit., part 4, p. 367.

²⁸ Both in this and in the last chapter. The Eucharistic partaking, as we said, signified the future communication of Christ in the goods of God, to be obtained by the Resurrection and the Ascension, and this not only because the Victim would be raised to a celestial condition, but also because the Priest, partaker of the Victim, would be glorified.

²⁹ Such a reference is found in the Mass in our prayer, *Suscipe sancta Trinitas*. Benedict XIV writes: "In this prayer the Greek Church mentions the Incarnation, the Nativity, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension and the descent of the Holy Ghost. If now the Roman Church speaks only of the Passion, the Resurrection and the Ascension, the reason is: that in these three mysteries WHICH ARE THE PRINCIPAL PARTS OF THE SACRIFICE, THE IMMOLATION AND THE CONSUMPTION of the Victim are best represented". (*De sacros. Missae sacrif.*, l. 2, c. 11, n. 6).

the sacrifice of the Redemption offered by Christ and accepted by God.

And again no wonder that just as the Eucharist is the sacrament of the Passion of Christ, so also it is called the commemorative sacrament of the Resurrection of the Lord. And this is so because, although it does not sensibly represent the Resurrection as it does the Passion, it is undoubtedly the commemoration of a sacrifice which is true and not merely tentative, ratified and not void, consummated and not imperfect, celestial and not a faint resemblance of what is heavenly. For just as in the Supper the sacrament not only foretold the Passion but also the Resurrection and the Ascension, so He who offered the sacrifice, being God, was truly believed to have offered Himself through the eternal Spirit, as spotless to God; so that the divine acceptance of Christ Victim was assured, invisibly indeed but nevertheless infallibly. In the certainty of this consummation both Christ and the apostles³⁰ ate and drank—the apostles in the light of faith, Christ in the clearness of vision. Hence in the Supper itself the future eating and drinking of the Lord in the kingdom of God was mentioned by our Lord (*Matth.* XXVI. 29, *Mark* XIV. 25, *Luke* XXII. 29-30), and at the Supper too Christ prayed that we should be

glorified in heaven (*John* XVII. 1 and 5).

The Eternity of the Sacrifice

The sacrifice of Christ was made glorious by the Resurrection, heavenly by the Ascension;³¹ by the immortality of His eternal life it was made perpetual. We have seen that the victimal condition induced by the sacrificial action lasts as long as the victim remains incorrupt. Not only did the Resurrection leave the victimal sanctification of the Flesh of Christ incorrupt and inviolate (*Psalm* XV. 9-10: *My flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell: nor suffer THY HOLY ONE to see corruption*; compare *Acts* II. 26-31); but it also clothed the Flesh of the victim with the incorruptibility of glory, which so far from lessening the victimal condition, rather brings it to the apex of perfection, the divine acceptance confirming and completing the sanctity of the Victim. The sacrifice of Christ is immortal, therefore, for the same reason that it is glorious and heavenly.³²

³¹ Here naturally *sacrifice* is used in the passive sense for the thing offered in sacrifice, not in the active sense, which is the sacrificial action.

³² Indeed had Christ like Lazarus risen mortal and passible, He would no longer have been Victim. For the sanctification which accrued to Him by the sacrifice of Himself consisted in this, that He divested Himself of the likeness of sinful flesh, that is, mortal and passible life, and thence passed

³⁰ Cf. below, later in this work.

The sacrifice of Christ therefore continues: not of course the active sacrifice, for the sacrificial action has passed, it is not repeated, nor is it in continual process of completion (*in fieri*); the passive sacrifice however remains, for the Victim remains in its state of being (*esse*) as accepted Victim.

Nor is this passive sacrifice in heaven merely a sacrifice in the metaphorical sense, implying only an interior affection of Christ, as we are said metaphorically to be immolated to God by devotion. It is a sacrifice in the strict sense, it connotes a distinct outward condition of the humanity of our Lord, namely

into the limitless splendour of justice and divine life. For a thing is sacred in that, separated from profane things, it comes close to God. Hence if He returned to mortal and passible life, it would simply mean that the sanctity of the victim would be corrupted and would vanish. This is confirmed by the Apostle, when he says: *If then he were on earth, he would not be a priest, seeing that there would be others to offer sacrifice according to the law (Hebr., VIII. 4)*. That is to say, if He were on earth, leading an earthly life, He would not have risen to the newness of a heavenly life. Therefore His sacrifice would not have been eternal, and so would be in the number of weak and transient sacrifices. But it was precisely for the offering of these transient sacrifices that the legal priesthood was instituted, and He, not being of the priesthood of Aaron, would not even offer such sacrifices. Therefore He would not have been a priest at all. Hence Chrysostom: "(Paul) proves that He could not be a priest on earth. Why? Because on earth, he says, there was no resurrection." (*In Hebr.* hom. 14, n. 1, P.G. 63, 111).

the glory procured by the sacrifice once and for all time offered by Christ at the Supper and in the Passion, and ratified and sanctioned forever by the Father: in the same way as the ancients called anything duly dedicated to God a sacrifice, as long as the full condition of such dedication persisted.

Furthermore, although it is in the proper sense a celestial sacrifice, still it must not be ranked among *mere* signs or symbols, representing something else. For all such limitations or figures of the truth are foreign to the kingdom of heaven, as in heaven all is truth resplendent in its own light. For in heaven the sacrifice signifies the devotion of the sacrificer, but in such a way that what signifies and what is signified—that is the sign and the thing signified by the sign—are one and the same thing. The reason is that Christ was at one time Priest and Victim, offering to God nothing other than His own self. Hence His was a full sacrifice in which the *sign* was equated with the *thing signified*. Not only is this so now in heaven, but it is manifest that it is so. Hence Guitmund of Aversa, speaking of the celestial and glorious Christ in his famous treatise against Berengarius, says well: "The same Christ therefore is the sacred sign of Himself, that is the sacrament of Himself" (*De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate*, l. 2, P.L. 149, 1460), though now in heaven without any sacramental veils whatever.

Hence flows the efficacy of that sacrifice to sanctify us, not merely in image but in reality, through the sacraments whereby it applies its virtue to us. For these sacraments are not vain empty signs, but as signs of a full sacrifice and instruments of an all-sufficient Victim, they exert an efficacy which in no way falls short of what they signify.³³

We come to the Fathers. Athanasius says that the priestly ministry of Christ is "faithful" because of the eternity of the sacrifice: "He assumed flesh like ours, Himself offering this flesh, He was called Pontiff, and He was made faithful and merciful; merciful, because when He offered Himself for us, He had mercy on us; faithful . . . BECAUSE HE OFFERS A FAITHFUL SACRIFICE, ENDURING NOT CEASING. FOR NOTHING WAS FAITHFUL IN THE LEGAL SACRIFICES, THEY CAME AND PASSED DAY BY DAY, SO THAT A NEW CLEANSING WAS NECESSARY. BUT THE SACRIFICE OF OUR SAVIOUR

³³ For we know that the sacraments of the New Law are, each in its own way, symbols of the sacrifice of our Lord. For from their primary essence they are (commemorative) symbols of a sacred thing (which is the Passion of Christ), in as much as that sacred thing sanctifies men (cf. St Thomas, 3 S. 60, 3 c. and 2m). Moreover in as much as they are applied by our Redeemer, they are instruments of the same sacred thing, and as such they are practical (effective) signs, as well as signs indicative of the effect produced by them, that is of our sanctity (cf. *ibid.*, and 3 S. 62, 5). But we shall have more of this in its proper place in the third book.

once offered accomplished all things, IT WAS MADE FAITHFUL IN THAT IT ENDURES FOREVER." (*Or. 2, contra Arianos*, 9. P.G. 26, 265).

St Gregory Nazianzen points out that God in a manner engrafted the eternal Victim on the weak sacrifices of the Law: "Indeed God did not leave the ancient sacrifices entirely devoid of sanctity, or useless, or merely dripping with the blood of animals; that great Victim who in His divine nature could not be immolated, was mingled, so to speak, with the legal sacrifices: that Victim, not the Victim of a small part of the world, not a transient victim, BUT THE ETERNAL EXPIATION OF THE WHOLE WORLD." (*Or. 45, in S. Pascha*, n. 13. P.G. 36, 640).

Epiphanius states plainly the eternal character of Christ Victim: "He offers a sacerdotal gift to His Father, having taken His share of the flesh of human nature, so as to be a priest for us according to the order of Melchisedech who had had no successor. For He remains ever offering gifts for us who first offered Himself in order to abrogate the victims of the Old Testament, is now offering gifts for us, having sacrificed a more perfect living victim for the whole world: He is Himself the Victim, the Sacrifice, the Priest, the Altar, and God . . . in order to give us the fulness of life, and establish His priesthood immutable forever." (*Haeres.*, 55, n. 4. P.G. 41, 980).

Chrysostom has a passage which at

first sight seems to say that Christ in heaven has neither sacerdotal office nor sacrificial character: "When you hear Him called priest, you must not infer that He is eternally offering sacrifice. He offered once, now He is seated . . . You must not conclude that He stands at the altar and is liturgus in heaven. Just as He was a servant, he was a priest and liturgus; but just as he became but did not remain a servant, so He became but did not remain a liturgus. For a liturgus is not seated, he stands at the altar." (*In Hebr.*, hom. 13, n. 3. P.G. 63, 107.) But the holy Doctor only means this: that now there is no need for Christ to offer any new sacrifice, as if such sacrifice were still needed. That the sacrifice once offered and presented in God's sight is to remain eternally there, he does not at all deny.³⁴ This is clear from the words that follow as well as from the words that come before the quotation. For the holy Doctor immediately subjoins: "Hence we may estimate the grandeur of that sacrifice, because though only one it was sufficient, and though offered once only, it had efficacy far beyond all the other

³⁴ A passage to be considered later from Gregory Nazianzen, has a similar meaning. He says that Christ in heaven is wholly free from the humiliation of supplication; and active sacrifice implies supplication on the part of the sacrifices. But the sacrifice of Christ has penetrated the heavens and abides, in the enjoyment of the glory of God. See later in this work.

sacrifices taken together. There is no other sacrifice, the one alone has cleansed us. After that, fire and hell. It is for this reason that the Apostle stresses it over and over again, saying, one priest, one sacrifice, lest one might think that there were many sacrifices (yet to be celebrated) and recklessly sin." (*ibid.*)

The sacrifice is one therefore, because it is all-sufficient, but Chrysostom had said already that this one all-sufficing sacrifice for us was now maintained in heaven: "For behold in heaven we have a priest, in heaven we have a victim, in heaven we have a sacrifice" (*In Hebr.*, hom. 13, n. 3. P.G. 41, 980). Indeed he says that the priesthood of Christ would not be perfect without the heavenly sacrifice. *For*, says the Apostle, *every priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices, wherefore it is necessary that he should have something to offer*. When it is said that He is seated, you must not think that still to call Him pontiff is without meaning . . . The question has been asked: Why is He said to have died because He is a priest? Since there is no priest without sacrifice, therefore He too must have a sacrifice. But on the other hand, although the Apostle has said He is in heaven, he says also that He is priest, and proves this from the following considerations: from Melchisedech, from the oath, from the fact that He offers sacrifice. Then the Apostle argues: *If he were on earth, he would not*

be a priest, etc. If then He is a priest, as undoubtedly He is, we must not seek Him on earth but in some other place. It is in this way that the Apostle shows that He could not be a priest on earth. Why? Because on earth, he says, there is no resurrection. (*In Hebr.*, hom. 14, n. 1, col. 111.) He is a perfect priest then in that place where He is in the glory of the newness of life. But He is not a priest in heaven in a merely fictitious sense; therefore He must have His sacrifice with Him. Consequently when the Apostle says *Let us draw near in the fullness of faith with a true heart* (*Hebr.*, X. 22), according to Chrysostom he says this because the Victim offered by the eternal priest on the heavenly altar is invisible: "*In the fulness of faith*: that is because there is nothing visible, not priest, not sacrifice, not altar" (*In Hebr.*, hom. 19, n. 1. P.G. 63, 139). Thus Chrysostom.

The divergence then between Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria is merely verbal, when Cyril says that Christ in heaven is priest, hierurgus, liturgus: "He who offers sacrifice to God is not in equal honour with God, and does not obtain for himself the honour due to God only. How is it then that Christ, made our High Priest, is seated at the right hand of God? That He occupies the throne of Majesty in heaven? That He is the liturgus of the saints . . . ? The reason is, that Christ and the Son of God are one;

He is seated on the throne of the divinity because of His divine nature, but by dispensation in the economy of His human nature, He is priest and liturgus" (*De fide recta ad principissas*, P.G. 75, 1397). We have the same question in another place: "If it be true that the priest always stands when offering sacrifice, and is never seated with God to whom he offers sacrifice, and that he is not of like glory, assuredly Christ is a hierurgus of a unique kind, as God He is seated with the divinity, but in His humanity He offers sacrifice" (*De recta fide ad augustas*, 44. P.G. 76, 1397).

In the Middle Ages we have Simon of Thessalonica, a worthy exponent of Eastern tradition, who explains the priesthood of Christ under two heads: first, because He offers the sacrifice through us in the Eucharist, and secondly, because in Himself He is the eternal Victim of the sacrifice offered on the Cross. His words are: "He is *a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech* (namely in bread and wine), never ceasing [to offer through us in the Mass]. But still more He is eternal priest, because He voluntarily sacrificed AND SACRIFICES HIMSELF through the Cross, and He offered AND OFFERS Himself to the Father, AND IS THE EVERLASTING VICTIM OF PROPITIATION FOR US. We have in Him too a *high priest who penetrated the heavens, Jesus the Son of God.*" (*De sacra-*

mentis, cap. 44. P.G. 155, 189). Again “. . . [After the last judgment] there will be oneness of mind, all will be friends, and all will be beloved; and JESUS THE GREAT VICTIM will be in the midst of all His saints, the peace and the unity of all, PRIEST AND VICTIM uniting all and united to all” (*De sacra liturgia, c. 98. P.G. 155, 296*).

The Latin Fathers agree: St Ambrose proves that Christ is our eternal Victim in heaven:

“For the priest must have something to offer, and according to the Law he must enter into the holies, not without blood. Therefore because God rejected the blood of calves and goats it was necessary for this priest, as you have read, penetrating the highest heavens, to enter into the Holy of Holies by His own Blood, IN ORDER TO BECOME AN ETERNAL OFFERING FOR OUR SINS. As it is with the Priest so it is with the Victim.” (*De fide, l. 3, c. 11, n. 87. P.L. 16, 607*).

Gregory the Great commenting on Job, I. 5, *So did Job all his days*: “Job did not cease to offer sacrifice all days; because the Redeemer offers without ceasing a holocaust for us, He unceasingly presents Incarnation [i.e. His assumed flesh] to the Father for us. For His Incarnation [i.e. His assumed flesh] is truly the offering of our cleansing, and seeing that He presents Himself as Man, His presence wipes out the sins of man. AND IN THE MYSTERY OF

HIS HUMANITY HE IMMOLATES AN ETERNAL SACRIFICE, BECAUSE THE THINGS THAT HE CLEANSSES ARE ETERNAL” (*Moral., l. 1, c. 24, n. 32. P.L. 75, 542*).

Gerhoh of Reichersberg in the Middle Ages has the quaint notion that the eternity of the sacrifice of the Lord is denoted in the psalms by the interposition of the word *Sela*. Thus on Psalm XIX. 4: *May he be mindful of all thy sacrifices and may thy whole burnt-offering be made fat* (after this verse in the Hebrew comes *Sela*. This word is often rendered in the Targums to mean “forever”): “This word often inserted in the Psalms signifies eternity . . . here its position is appropriate as JOINED TO THE HOLOCAUST THAT WOULD BURN FOREVER, because its Priest offers it according to the order of Melchisedech, who has not a temporal priesthood like Aaron, but an eternal priesthood like Melchisedech. Hence He is forever able to save men, approaching Himself to God, and always living to make intercession for His own, NAMELY OFFERING THE MAN ASSUMED FOR OUR SALVATION, AS A HOLOCAUST BURNT WHOLLY WITH THE FIRE OF THE DIVINITY; THIS HOLOCAUST IS ALWAYS FAT IN THE SIGHT OF GOD THE FATHER. And thou, O Christ, great Priest, wast made peacemaker in the time of anger, when in the day of tribulation thou didst offer sacrifice and holocaust, concerning which with

thy divine assistance, we have already spoken." (*In Psalm XIX. P.L.* 193, 967).³⁵

Further testimony will be dealt with later, when we treat of the Mass and its connection with the celestial Victim.³⁶

C. THEOLOGICAL PROOF.

We advance two arguments from theology to show the eternity of the sacrifice of Christ in heaven: one based on our justification, the other on the sacrifice of the Mass.

A) OUR JUSTIFICATION IS A PROOF OF THE ETERNITY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

In a striking passage in the *Epistle to the Romans*, St Paul says that

³⁵ Clearly a proof from the word *Sela* alone is senseless. This however does not lessen the value of the argument, rather it shows clearly that Gerhoh was convinced of the eternity of the sacrifice from other sources. Hence the passage is really evidence of a theological tradition, rather than an intrinsic proof. We must bear this in mind also in the interpretation of many citations from the mediaeval writers which either have already been quoted or will be quoted, on this and on other matters.

³⁶ Meantime it should be noted that the eternity of the Victim in glory was spoken of and preached on (without opposition) at the Council of Trent by Francis Sonnius (Theiner, *Acta Genuina*, 1, 612) afterwards Bishop of Antwerp, also by Bartholomaeus Miranda O.P. (*ibid.*, p. 693) who professed that he was submitting the teaching of Cajetan. We shall deal with this teaching and other matters connected with it more opportunely later.

Christ was delivered up for our sins, and that HE ROSE AGAIN FOR OUR JUSTIFICATION.³⁷ The Apostle says plainly here that the cause of our justification is the Resurrection of Christ.³⁸ He further says in the *Epist. I. to the Corinthians* (XV. 17): *If Christ be not risen from the dead, your faith is vain (for) you are still in your sins.* The meaning of this particular verse of the Epistle is not (like verses 14 and 15): you are still in your sins, because your faith is vain in the sense of false (as having no foundation): but, your faith is vain, in the sense of useless and ineffective, because hav-

³⁷ *Who was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification* (*Rom.*, IV. 25).

³⁸ When theologians (St Thomas for example, in 3 S. 56 1 and 2) speak of the Resurrection of Christ as the cause, and particularly as the efficient cause, of our resurrection or justification, they must not be taken to mean the actual rising from the dead in process (*in fieri*). This is a past action, it is over. They are speaking of the Resurrection as accomplished and permanent (*in facto esse*). That is to say they speak of Christ risen from the dead to a life of glory.

Thus Suarez writes: "We must consider two things in the Resurrection of Christ. First there is the Resurrection as a process, an action, or change that is now over. Secondly, there is the terminus or immediate result of the Resurrection, which is Christ as Man now living a glorious and immortal life. When therefore we say that the Resurrection of Christ is the cause of our own resurrection, we must not understand it as happening by reason of the change which occurred in the past, but because of the terminus or result which remains and which can be a cause" (In 3 S. 56, 1 *Commentarius*).

ing no one to justify you, you are still in your sins.³⁹ You are sinners because you have not obtained justification, the sole cause of which would be the resurrection of Christ, who suffered and rose from the dead: remove the cause and you remove the effect; it is of course quite true that we have been saved by the sacrifice of Christ, but this is on the condition that the victim of the sacrifice is the principle of justification for us, in as much as the victim has secured the resurrection to glory.

The Victim of the sacrifice risen to glory from the dead is the source of our justification *in two ways*. *First*, He is the principle of our justification by the removal of a hindrance to that justification, because as propitiatory victim, He is the price paid for our debts. *Secondly*, He is the principle of our justification as efficient cause, for by reason of his sanctifying influence, He communicates to us His own sanctity and grace.

In the first place, considering this victim under the aspect of *propitiation*.⁴⁰ Christ offered to God a gift or a victim in propitiation for our sins: His Body stained with the blood of the Passion unto death.

³⁹ So Chrysostom in his fine exposition in h.l.

⁴⁰ What the Salamenticenses (*De Incarnatione* disp. 31, dub. 4, n. 37) have to say is closely parallel to what we have here set down.

Hence He gave His own Body to God, so that it should become God's thing. Hence at that time Christ entered into a contract. God on His part sanctioned this contract by accepting the victim and taking it to Himself in the abode of His glory.

True, in so far as acceptance is an act formally immanent to God, it is eternal; and hence it was not deferred until the Resurrection. But we are considering here the acceptance in so far as it virtually passes into the thing actually taken up and laid hold of by God. We are dealing with a sacrificial contract and must consider the matter in this way, because it is in the nature of a symbol or sign. Without this divine subscription and ratification of the contract, the sacrifice would secure no propitiation whatever; because no matter how great the compensation offered, were it even condign, until the consent of each party is expressed no contract would result. Christ Victim therefore will not free us from our sins unless God accepts His Victim in payment for our debts. Christ was of sufficient worth to compensate, even before the divine acceptance, but it was only when acceptance had place that He actively and effectively did compensate. Therefore although the work of Christ Himself as Redeemer was completed by His death, still we were indebted to God; and the Resurrection was a necessary addition as a recognition of God's ac-

ceptance of Christ Victim as the price of our salvation. There at last the contract stood completed. But by the contract we were saved. Therefore before Christ's Resurrection our salvation was not constituted.

Furthermore the price of our salvation must necessarily remain eternally with God. For Christ gave Himself to God forever, in order to be forever a propitiation for us.⁴¹ Now what is given into God's keeping He never alienates or destroys, He keeps it forever just as it is in itself. Hence were Christ at any time (I speak as one less wise) to cease to be in the glory of God,

this could only be, were He to withdraw Himself from God; thus He would break the contract and defraud God of what was pledged to Him, and so our sins would remain unatoned for, in the failure of the compensation which the gift presented, for that compensates only so long as it remains as a gift, if withdrawn it has no grace.⁴² But our

⁴¹ Eternal propitiation was necessary for us, because our debt to the justice of God was eternal; eternal on the part of the subject who owed the debt, (that is on the part of man who had sinned), for man of himself was forever incapable of making reparation for the injury (even of a venial sin, apart from grace); eternal also on the part of the object to whom the debt was due (that is on the part of God outraged). For God is all Good, simple, without parts extended in time or space, we cannot partly reject Him and partly love Him. He is either loved eternally or abandoned eternally (for God is His own eternity). Hence a debt contracted against Him is contracted against His eternity, just as against His other attributes (Compare St Augustine, *Ep.* 102, n. 27. P.L. 33, 381; coll. Suarez *De vitiis et peccatis*, disp. 7, sect. 3, n. 5; St Thom., *Cg.* 3, 244, parag. *Naturalis aequitas* et seq.). Hence the debt will run on forever: and no compensation will be adequate unless it covers and equals the whole duration of the debt. Therefore the price paid as compensation for sin must in the nature of things be eternal.

⁴² This must not be taken to imply that our sins are not actually wiped out but merely covered or hidden. They are absolutely blotted out, taken away, destroyed, so much so that were I to sin again, my past sins would not revive. But this of course (in the present economy of our salvation purchased by the sacrifice of Christ) is entirely on the supposition of the eternal and indestructible reparation once made to God for the sin of guilty man, while man by faith is made partaker of the price paid by Christ, and so himself, as it were, pays it through Christ. Therefore just as the cause in *being* of our life or grace is the Victim of the Redemption (as we shall see later), so our ransom in its celestial home is, so to speak, the cause in *being* of our freedom from the guilt of injustice to God. Failing the cause (to make an absurd supposition), the effect would fail (absurd conclusion). Hence St Ambrose: "It behoved Christ to enter into heaven in order to be an eternal offering for our sins". And Gregory still more clearly: "He immolates an ETERNAL sacrifice, because what He cleanses (the sins of man) ARE ETERNAL". Finally we see from this: why Christ entering into His eternal glory is said to HAVE FOUND ETERNAL REDEMPTION for us (*Hebr.*, IX. 12).

It follows from this that of all the damned who at some time of their lives were justified, some do benefit from the celestial sacrifice. In virtue of the eternal redemption they are not punished for sins once forgiven. This is an effect of a twofold cause. First, the Mercy of God who by the merits of Christ condoned the sins of the past; man's

High Priest is faithful, our Victim is faithful, our price is faithful, God will never be defrauded of it, and thus we are secure in the eternal redemption found by Christ.

This is what the Fathers meant when speaking of the price paid by Christ. Once paid, it forever redeemed us in the sight of God; so much so that were it (on an impossible supposition) to disappear from the sight of God, we would not be saved from our sins; failing the victim, the price would be lacking. George Witzel, an acute interpreter of sacred antiquity, used this argument very effectively against Luther: "If therefore the Body and Blood of Christ is not a Victim, our faith is vain and we are still in our sins" (*De Eucharistia*, Cologne, 1549, p. 322-323).⁴³ This is said of the propitiation for us, in which the Victim stands as moral cause.

In the second place, consider the Victim as the efficient cause of our justification, and it is clear that the process of our justification requires

malice cannot make this mercy void (3 S. 88, 1). Secondly, the Fidelity of Christ (faithful pontiff) who never withdraws the price once paid, but remains the eternal payment for the debt now forever extinct. These two causes are interrelated: because the Fidelity of Christ is related to the Mercy of God as to its final cause, while the Mercy of God is disposed to the Fidelity of Christ as to its efficient cause.

⁴³ The author is here defending the contention, that previous to any sacrificial activity of ours in the Mass, Christ in Himself is Victim.

the eternity of the sacrifice. For we are sanctified by partaking of the Victim of the Passion which makes us sharers in its sanctity, in so far as, itself all full of truth, it operates in us what it signifies. But if a victim now exists no longer, there is no longer any influxus of the victim and hence no influxus of the sanctity. For our Victim is not only the cause of the *imparting* of grace to us, but of the *maintaining* of it. If this cause ceases its active influence, the effect will also cease to be maintained and to exist. But the life of Christ in glory is the source and the fountain of our own spiritual life of grace and glory. Thus St Paul says we are quickened according to grace by God with Christ raised from the dead unto glory (*Coloss.*, II. 13; *Ephes.*, II. 5-6). For we are quickened or vivified by the Flesh of the eternal sacrifice giving us spiritual life.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ That all the grace of our sanctification still flows to us from the flesh of the sacrifice is plainly stated by the Alexandrine Fathers on *Leviticus* VI. 27: *Whosoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be sanctified*. Origen, *In Levit.*, hom. 5. n. 7 and 8. P.G. 12, 442-443; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyr in Levit.*, P.G. 69, 549-552. Cf. Procop. Gaz. in h.l. P.G. 87, 715.

Undoubtedly just as it was in the absolute power of God to sanctify us otherwise than by through the humanity of Christ, so it was in the absolute power of Christ to sanctify us by His humanity, even if that humanity were not endowed nor ever to be endowed with glory. Hence Athanasius (*Or. 3 contra Arianos*, n. 40. P.G. 26, 408-409) argues forcefully against the Arians, that before His Resurrection, the Incarnate

St Thomas (3 S. 62, 5 and 6) is in close agreement: in the order of efficiency the sacraments are compared as instruments to the Passion of Christ, whence they derive their virtue, just as the Passion itself is by way of instrument in respect of

Word could have done everything It does now after the Resurrection; nevertheless he admits that Christ "received according to His humanity after the Resurrection . . . the same things which He had even before the Resurrection as Word, with this end that through Him man as freed from all corruption . . . might reign eternally in heaven."

Another passage explains this: "He took unto Himself a mortal body, so THAT THE BODY MIGHT SATISFY FOR ALL, and, BECAUSE OF THE INDWELLING WORD CONTINUE INCORRUPT, and the grace of the Resurrection would for evermore free mankind from all corruption. Hence He offered to death the Body which He assumed as a sacrifice and a victim free from every stain, and by the oblation of Himself for others, there and then saved mankind from death. For the Word of God Who is above all, by offering the temple of His Body for the salvation of all, paid their debt in His death, and united us all by what is common to Himself and to us, THE INCORRUPTIBLE SON OF GOD MOST APPROPRIATELY CLOTHED ALL WITH INCORRUPTIBILITY, giving them the promise of the resurrection. For the corruption of death has no longer sway over man BECAUSE OF THE WORD INDWELLING IN THEM THROUGH THE ONE BODY Cf. I. Cor., X. 17." (*Oratio de Incarnatione Verbi*, 9. P.G. 25, 112). Incorruptibility flows down, so to speak, from the Body of Christ into our body. Omitting for the moment other testimonies of the Fathers (and they are very numerous in this sense), we shall merely remark that later in this work we are to meet statements from many of the Fathers which attribute even more plainly all our vivification to the Body of Christ contained in the sacrament.

the divinity, which is the principal cause (art. 5); and thus previous to the Passion sacramental efficacy was impossible: because "what is not yet in existence does not cause any movement or change" (Art. 6). According to St. Thomas therefore, the Passion "by which Christ initiated the Christian religion, *offering himself as an oblation and a victim to God*, as St Paul. *Ephes.*, V says" (art. 5), intervenes by way of cause as movens motum, between the divine efficacy and the sacraments of the New Law. But what is not actually existing cannot put forth any action, or efficiently produce any change or motion. Therefore Christ's sacrifice must continue, as it does by the continuance of Christ Victim of His Passion. Hence St Thomas already had said opportunely: "the resurrection of Christ has by way of instrument (under God the principal cause), EFFECTIVE POWER, not only in respect of the resurrection of bodies, but also in respect of the resurrection of souls" (3 S. 56, 2). And again: "Divine justice in itself was not bound to cause our resurrection through the Resurrection of Christ; for God could free us otherwise than by the Passion and Resurrection of Christ. Nevertheless because He decreed to free us in this manner, clearly the Resurrection of Christ is the cause of our own resurrection" (In 3 S. 56, 1, 2m).⁴⁵

⁴⁵ St Albert the Great in 4 D. 43, 5, puts the matter very clearly in words full of

If Christ therefore did not rise from the dead we are in our sins, lacking both ransom before God and the begetter of divine grace in us. But if Christ did rise again, in the first place, the price paid to God and eternally accepted in the past, that is, the sacrifice enacted by Christ on earth, and received by the Father into the glory of heaven, eternally remains and is our eternal propitiation; and secondly, the Victim is always at hand, by feeding on which we are always sanctified.

St Paul suggests the benefit of the Resurrection under each of these aspects in *Coloss. II. 12-14* *In whom (Christ) you are risen again by the*

unction: "It is better in this matter to be in absolute accord with the saints, as they are under divine inspiration. And because the saints say that the Resurrection of Christ is the efficient and sacramental cause of our resurrection, I hold the same, and leave their words unchanged." In explanation of this he makes a distinction between the first and equivocal cause, God, and the immediate and univocal cause: which latter cause he further divides into habitual and actual. The univocal habitual cause of our resurrection is the humanity of Christ, by reason of the state of glory purchased by the Resurrection from the dead; the actual univocal cause is the same, as bringing into action, by an act of the will, the power habitually bestowed on it (= "the voluntary cause having in itself the form of what is caused"). In other words the formal principle whereby Christ influences our resurrection, is His Body risen glorious from the dead. The actual work of our resurrection in virtue of that formal principle will be performed when Christ "bearing the insignia of our redemption" will judge the world. Read the whole rather long article.

faith of the operation of God, and you when you were dead in your sins, and the incircumcision of your flesh, He (God) hath quickened together with him. Here we have the benefit of the Resurrection as establishing a oneness of life between Christ in glory and ourselves made acceptable and destined for glory. The Apostle continues: *forgiving you all your offences; blotting out the handwriting of the decree⁴⁶ that was against us, which is contrary to us.*⁴⁷ And here then is the second

⁴⁶ So far certainly the subject of the sentence is God not Christ, as Prat is careful to point out (*Theologie de St Paul*, 2, t. 2, p. 321).

⁴⁷ The Greek word used by the Apostle—*cheirographon*—means handwriting in general, and in particular the handwriting in a deed wherein a person acknowledges that he is indebted to a creditor, here it suggests something else comparable to such writing on a deed. The expression is of course metaphorical, standing for something else. But there is disagreement in what that something else is. (1) All the earlier writers, and first of all St Ephraem (*Hymni dispers*, 22. 8 ed Lamy, 4, 772), *Serapion Thmuitanus* (*Eucologium*, 12, F. D. 2, 170), Chrysostom in h.l. hom. 6, n. 3. P.G. 62, 340; *Homil ad neophytos* apud August., *Contra Julianum* 1, 6, 21, P.L. 44, 658), Augustine (*Confess.* 9, 13, 36. P.L. 32, 778); also the Liturgies, v.g. *Missale Bobbiense*, oratio quarta pro defunctis as found in Mabillon, *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, P.L. 72, 568; the writers of the Middle Ages, e.g. St Thomas, say that the handwriting means our guilt, our consciousness of the debt to the divine justice. But (2) there are modern writers (Padovani, *In S. Pauli epistolas*, 1892, t. 4, 218; Prat, l.c. p. 330) who, having in mind particularly *Coloss. II. 16* and *Ephes., II. 15*, think that the Mosaic Law is meant, in as much as it imposed on man a debt of per-

benefit of the Resurrection: Christ welcomed into the bosom of the Father, or the acceptance of the

forming certain works and enduring certain punishments.

Careful consideration of the whole matter will show that both these explanations can and should be merged into one. We must bear in mind an expression repeatedly used by St Paul: man was made subject to the Law and to the angels because of sin (*Gal.*, III. 19 and 22-23; IV. 1-5; *Tim.*, I. 9). Because man was in debt to an outraged God, and was not yet freed from that debt, God made Him a slave to the Law and to the angels who administered the Law. Christ, by removing the debt of sin, removed at the same time the whole of this obligation, freeing us from the power of the Law and from the dominion of the angels. Hence a double liberation is implied. First and before all else, we must understand this liberation as liberation from the guilt of sin; and consequently in the second place, liberation from the servitude of the Law. The word *handwriting* in this passage of the *Epistle to the Colossians* strictly speaking refers to the guilt of sin, or the debt to God, without omitting however a reference also to our debt to the Law (v. 14) and to the angels (v. 15). The expression of *the decree* definitely suggests this interpretation. And that the Mosaic Law is intended, is plain from the other verses of the context (II. 20 and II. 21 compared with *Ephes.*, II. 15. *Prat. loc. cit.*, p. 332).

But a difficulty lies in explaining the dative case (*dogmasin*) in the Greek. *Prat (ibid.)* mentions some by no means happy suggestions that have been made by way of explanation, adding a suggestion of his own no happier than the rest. The more correct explanation seems to me to lie in making it a dative of advantage or rather disadvantage. The Law held men as its debtors (and the angels held men as their subjects), because men were indebted to the divine justice. The Law therefore was fortified, and, so to speak, armed against us, by this original document of our obliga-

tion to God. When this was torn from its hand, nothing now remained *for it* wherewith to bind us to itself. If the document was destroyed (as it was by Christ on the Cross) it was destroyed TO THE DISADVANTAGE OF THE LAW ITSELF (*tois dogmasin*). Hence the interpretation of this word in the dative (*tois dogmasin*) appears to be: *blotting out the handwriting of the guilt* TO THE DISADVANTAGE OF THE DECREE (that is the Law which possessed it and used it against us), *which was contrary to us, and hath taken the same out of the way* (taken it away as it were from the hands of the Law), *fastening it to the cross*, (where it was blotted out to the disadvantage of the Law). *And despoiling* (of the handwriting of sin which they possessed against us) *the principalities and powers, he hath exposed them confidently in open show, triumphing over them* (deprived of the power of triumphing over man) *in himself* (crucified and returned to God).

Hence St Paul personified both the Law and the angels. He speaks of the Law as the owner or the retainer of the handwriting which is fatal to us, and which God had, so to speak, committed to the hands of the Law; from which the handwriting is then taken away, blotted out, destroyed; that handwriting, that is, of the debt which we owe to God because of our sins. The Vulgate therefore gives the meaning accurately enough in its rendering *the handwriting of the decree*: as if the handwriting were in the possession of the decree or the Law. Because then the Law was in possession of the handwriting, the handwriting was blotted out TO ITS DISADVANTAGE; if my house is burnt, I can say it is burnt to me (i.e. to my disadvantage).

To conclude: sin being wiped out, or the document of sin being destroyed, the binding force of the Law was destroyed: which simply means that in respect of its binding force, the Law is said to be de-

stroyed.

God destroyed the bond of our indebtedness, and thereby pardoned our sins: namely when the Victim of the Cross was accepted by God for our Redemption.

B) THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS IS A PROOF OF THE ETERNITY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

Another argument for the eternity of the sacrifice of our Lord is drawn from our sacrifice of the Mass. Our Mass is a true sacrifice just in so far as Christ is truly a Victim in the Mass: for where there is no victim except in mere outward appearance, there is no sacrifice ex-

stroyed or blotted out. Nevertheless the handwriting here is not the actual Law, it is our own consciousness (whence came the binding force of the Law) of the debt to God for sin, and for sin not yet atoned for by the sacrifice of our Lord. The Apostle does not say that the actual Law itself was affixed to the Cross: as if Christ crucified the Law in punishment for His crucifixion because of the Law, as Prat, agreeable to his own interpretation of the word *handwriting* explains.

Meantime note from what we have said that both *Coloss.*, II. 13-16 and *Ephes.*, II. 5-6 agree and are mutually complementary. Compare R.S.R., Oct.-Dec. 1916, p. 468-471.

cept in mere outward appearance: because sacrifice is the offering of a victim. On the other hand Christ is not made a victim by us in the Mass. This is clear from several considerations. In the first place Christ suffers no change whatever in the Mass, He remains unchanged in the final term or issue of the transubstantiation, as will be fully explained in its proper place; nor could we say (God forbid) that Christ is really slain by us in the Mass, a thing which never could be done without the gravest sin; neither can Christ be slain by a new immolation, nor, if He were so immolated, would such a sacrifice have on the part of the victim, an intrinsic and essential relation to the sacrifice of the Cross. Christ therefore remains Victim in Himself before any sacrifice of ours. We shall deal with this matter at greater length when we come to the sacrifice of the Mass. For the present let this suffice in regard to our Paschal Lamb, who by *dying hath overcome death, and by rising again hath restored our life.*

§ 2. Christ As Eternal Altar

First Comparison. THE ALTAR AND THE VICTIM TO BE SANCTIFIED.

The closest correlation exists between sacrifice and altar. The existence of the one implies the existence of the other. Hence if we prove that Christ is the eternal altar of His sacrifice, we prove thereby that the sacrifice of that altar, the sacrifice of Christ, is eternal. We have seen already that Christ is at the same time priest and victim, we now state that He is also altar—the eternal altar. But does it not look absurd to pile all these offices and all these titles on the one Christ? Absurd to place a man and that man God, on a level with the stone or bronze appointed to receive the victim's blood!

All this notwithstanding, the three following questions have to be examined and placed under the searchlight of Catholic teaching: *First*, is Christ an altar? *Second*, is the risen Christ an altar? *Third*, what relation does this altar which is theandric and heavenly bear to our own altars.

A. IS CHRIST THE ALTAR OF HIS SACRIFICE?

A threefold comparison will supply the answer to this question. The altar is compared with the victim to be sanctified, with the blood of the victim to be received, and finally with the divinity whose place the altar supplies.

In sacrifice it may be assumed, as a principle, that the sanctity of the victim is not greater than the sanctity of the altar. For bearing in mind what we have already said, we must know that the sanctity of the victim has its source in the sanctity of the altar, seeing that the sanctity which the altar has from the contact, so to speak, of the presiding and indwelling divinity placed upon it, it communicates to the victim entrusted to it (as in some sense representing God). Here we have an example of the Philosopher's well known saying: *what produces any perfection in another, has more perfection in itself than that which it produces on the other.* Therefore the victim cannot be holier than the altar. This principle is sanctioned by Christ's own authority. He is rebuking the Scribes and Pharisees: *Ye foolish and blind, for whether is greater, the gift, or the temple that sanctifieth the gift (Matt., XXIII. 17-19) . . . Ye blind, for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift (ibid).* If then there was an altar on which Christ's sacrifice was offered, that altar could not be lesser in greatness than the victim of Christ's sacrifice. Consequently it must have been one with the Victim and with the priest, in other words, one with Christ

Himself. Hence Nicholas Cabasilas, exponent of Eastern theology, says well: "Nothing has the power of interceding and of sanctifying but the Saviour alone. What things, then, have the power of intercession and sanctification? The priest, the victim, and the altar. For the altar sanctifies also, the Lord says: *the altar sanctifieth the gift*. Seeing therefore that it is He alone who sanctifies, it is He alone who is priest and victim and altar." (*Liturgiae expositio*. P.G. 150, 436).

St Augustine, the great Doctor of the West, had written long before: "Seeing that the Lord said: *Whether is the greater, the gold, or the temple which sanctifieth the gold?* and also said: *Whether is the greater, the gift, or the altar which sanctifieth the gift?* We must interpret both temple and altar as Christ Himself" (*Quaestiones Evangeliorum* (lib. 1, c. 24. P.L. 35, 1329).¹

We may look upon the temple and the altar as one. In the passage of St Matthew above, Christ attributes the same sanctifying virtue to the temple and to the altar.² He even

¹ St. Augustine is followed by Beda and Rabanus, in h.l. P.L. 92, 99; 107, 1070.

² Hesychius tersely suggests this same equivalence. Commenting on *Leviticus* V. 9: *and of its blood he shall sprinkle the side of the altar*, he says: "The side of the altar is the Body of Christ, of which Christ Himself said: *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*" (*In Levit.*, l. 1, P.G. 93, 836).

speaks of Himself as a temple, that is a temple of spiritual grace, destined to supplant the material temple of the Jews. He is a consecrated temple for the sacrifice of the true Victim, appointed to take the place of that temple which witnessed only the slaughter of victims that were figurative. Thus St John, II. 19: *Destroy this temple and in three days I will rebuild it*: that is to say, when you have brought about the destruction of *this temple* of Jerusalem,³ until now the house of God,

³ By the temple to be destroyed our Lord meant first of all the actual temple of Jerusalem, the material site of the Jewish worship there before His eyes and the subject of His discourse (*John* II 14-17). By the temple to be built in three days, He meant, as *John* (II. 21) testifies, His own Body to be raised up after His Passion, by whose sacrifice the Old Testament would be ended and the New inaugurated and the Law would be destroyed by the Jews in such manner as to be fulfilled by Christ. For we have two temples here (not by any means opposed one to the other, rather mutually connected in temporal succession as well as in typical relationship) the one in the first part of the sentence, a temple of stone, the other in the second part, a living temple. This we see from the words of the false witnesses, as given in *Mark* (XIV. 58) *I will destroy this temple made with hands, and in three days I will rebuild another* NOT MADE WITH HANDS.

We must carefully distinguish in this allegation where the false testimony is, and where it is not. The false testimony is undoubtedly where our Lord is represented as saying that He Himself would destroy the material temple (*I will destroy*, compare *Matth.* XXVI 61: *I am able to destroy*, and *Matth.* XXVI. 40: *Thou that destroyest*

the seat of Jewish worship, the sanctuary of the Old Testament, the one place of legitimate sacrifice,

and *Acts* VI. 14, shall *destroy*). Christ did not say that He would destroy, He said: *Destroy ye*, as if ALLOWING the Jews to invade the temple and overthrow it, and to abolish the priesthood of Aaron,—all which they would do when they put Christ to death. For Christ, priest according to the order of Melchisedech, was offering Himself as a Victim pleasing to God, a Victim to be received into glory, and to make all other victims void. To the Jews then and not to Christ, the ruin of the temple was to be imputed; only a perjured witness could say that it was attributed to Him. Apparently the false testimony is not to be placed in the contrast between the two temples—the temple *made with hands* and the temple *not made with hands*, as though the false witnesses knew that He spoke of the temple *not made with hands*, and alleged that He spoke of the material temple *made with hands*. For 1) this contrast is too sublime for an ordinary human mind, and 2) the second part of the sentence is implicitly confirmed by St John, he says (II. 21). . . . *he spoke of the temple of his body*, and 3) in meaning and style it is in keeping with the words of Hebr., IX. 11-12: *by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is of this creation; neither by the blood of goats or of calves but by his own blood*, etc.; for here the tabernacle not made with hands (the assumed humanity) is compared, as something greater and more perfect, to a tabernacle made with hands, sufficing for the weak, figurative, sacrifices of goats and calves. Hence if in the second part of the sentence Christ spoke of a temple not made with hands, He *strictly and literally* could only mean his own Body.

The words of L. de Grandmaison (art. Jesus Christ, in *Dictionnaire Apologetique* col. 1511) are appropriate: "The tragic duel of the two spirits, and so to speak of the two religions, is summed up and symbolized in the two temples. To the magnificent

after you have by your crime brought to ruin (= *solvite*, destroy)⁴ its sanctity and election (soon on that account it was to be shattered by the Romans) then *in three days I will rebuild it*, a changed structure, a house which is God's very own, being the sanctuary of the new and eternal testament, the tabernacle of the true sacrifice, a centre of worship never to be profaned, namely my Body *in virtue of the power of an indissoluble life* (VII. 16) a Body raised from the dead, to be a vessel of universal propitiation, an ark and a temple that will remain forever. In this sense He *spoke of the temple of his body* (*John* II. 21). Instead of an earthly and shadowy worship, associated with the material ritual centering upon visible victims, our Lord enigmatically announces a future substitute, having a perfect spiritual worship, resplendent with the beauty and the glory of a celestial Victim.

Scripture therefore points out or at least suggests to us, that just as Christ is Priest and Victim, He is also Altar and Temple.

edifice (what stones those were, and what a structure) where dwelt exclusively for every good Israelite, the glory of God, is to be substituted a broader worship, in spirit and in truth."

⁴ Already made manifest at the time of our Lord's death, when the veil of the temple was rent in two, *from the top even to the bottom* (*Matth* XXVII. 51; cf. *Mark* XV. 38 and *Luke* XXIII. 45).

Second Comparison. THE ALTAR
AS RECEIVING THE BLOOD OF
THE VICTIM.

This complex of titles and offices, and all different, would indeed be absurd in another; but in Christ, it is most appropriate. There is all the difference in the world between worship carried out within the limits of human resources and the compass of human means, and worship which is carried out according to the power of God and transcends the whole order and differentiation of sensible things. In a material or sensible system of worship, just as priest and victim are different, so too the altar that receives the blood of the victim must be a thing distinct, and the shrine that contains the altar different again. But seeing that in spiritual worship the priest and the victim are one,⁵ AN OUTWARD ALTAR on which the blood of the Victim slain is poured by the hands of the Priest IS UNTHINKABLE. The Sacrificer Himself takes the place of the altar, since by symbolic immolation He offers His Body to an immolation in blood, and SACRAMENTALLY BESPRINKLES HIS BODY WITH THAT

⁵ Sacred writers call this worship spiritual for two reasons principally: because it is carried out by the spiritual power of the divinity, and because the divine thing which is offered beneath the sensible symbols is only visible to the eyes of faith. Moreover we should add that the fruits of this great sacrifice are spiritual, not a mere cleansing of the flesh.

BLOOD which shall be really shed in the Passion. HERE THEN IS THE ALTAR BESPRINKLED WITH THE BLOOD OF THE VICTIM⁶ sprinkled by the priest, sprinkled bloodlessly, and yet having reference to a sprinkling of real blood. In the Supper the Body of Christ was the altar on precisely the same ground as it was the Victim: in the sense that it was then given over to the blood-shedding of the Passion by a sacramental aspersion of blood.⁷ In the Passion likewise the Body was the Altar on precisely the same ground as it was the Victim: in as much as it was empurpled with the stream of blood which the chalice of the Supper caused to flow.

St Ephraem expresses this identity in the following words; he is apostrophizing the Supper room: "O happy place, no one ever saw or will see what thou has seen. Thou hast seen the Lord become true altar, priest, bread and chalice of salvation . . . He is Altar and Lamb, Victim and Sacrificer, Priest and Food" (*Hymnus de crucifixione tertius* str. 10, ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 660). In a eulogy of the Melchisedechian priesthood Epiphanius writes of the Supper: "He offered

⁶ Recall what we have said (chap. I) on the part played by the altar as an integral element in the rite of sacrifice, and from primitive times.

⁷ The Body of Christ is sacramentally sprinkled with His Blood, when by the separate consecration of the Body and Blood, the Body besprinkled with the Blood poured out is symbolized.

Himself in order to bring to an end the sacrifices of the Old Testament, sacrificing a more perfect, A LIVING VICTIM for the whole world. He was in that moment Victim, Sacrifice, Priest, and Altar" (*Adv. Heares.*, 55. 4. P.G. 41, 980). Similarly Hesychius: "He shed His intelligible Blood (i.e. intelligible or perceptible only to the eyes of faith) on the altar, that is to say, on His own Body" (*In Levit.* 1, 2. P.G. 93, 883).

"For Christ Himself, by the sprinkling of His own Blood, offered His Passion for us unto our salvation". (col. 885). "For Christ was made the whole of His sacrifice—Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar. He is Himself also *the man made ready* (*Levit.* XVI. 21), made ready for the Passion for us" (*In Levit.*, 1, 5, col. 1001).⁸

What St Ambrose wrote to Simplicianus on the altar of the Passion, sounds exactly the same note: "You told me that you were in doubt about the meaning of the saying that Moses, having offered sacrifice and immolated sacred victims to the Lord, put half of the blood into bowls, and poured the other half out at the altar . . . Now in the Law, above everything else, the coming of Christ is declared, and

His Passion prefigured. Ask yourself then, whether the reference is not to the saving Victim which God the Word offered in Himself, and immolated in His own Body . . . then approaching the altar, He poured out the Blood of His Victim . . . Do you not see that the Blood poured out was His, FROM WHOSE SIDE WATER AND BLOOD FLOWED ON THE ALTAR OF THE PASSION?" (*Epist.* 65. P.L. 16, 1222-1224). Hence according to Ambrose Christ offered the Victim of the Passion sacramentally immolated in His own Body; and "then" approaching to the Passion of His Body, with blood and water He sprinkled that wounded Body, which was the altar of the Passion.⁹

In like manner the eminent mediaeval liturgist, John Belet, wrote: "We believe that the Body of Christ, the true altar, was sprinkled with blood and water on the Cross" (*Rationale divinatorum officiorum*, c. 104. P.L. 202, 109). A contemporary

⁹It would seem that this was a familiar expression of Ambrose, if one may conjecture from the treatise *De Sacramentis*. The compiler of this work is very close to Ambrose in style and substance, and twice he sets down what liturgists of every age have looked upon as an incontrovertible dogma: that our material altars are symbols of the Body of Christ. So we have in this work "The altar is the form of the Body" (l. 4, c. 2, n. 7. P.L. 16, 437). "For what is the altar but the form of the Body of Christ?" (l. 5, c. 2, n. 7, col 447). Hence the true altar, the antitype of our altars, is the Body of Christ.

⁸On this point we could quote indefinitely from Hesychius' *Commentarius in Leviticum*. There is scarcely a page, in the first two books particularly, where he does not give to Christ the praise and the name of Altar.

Syrian writer, Dionysius Bar Salibi in his *Expositio Liturgiae* (S.S.C.O., t. 93, p. 87) notes that "the slain Body of Christ was sprinkled with His Blood, both in the Supper room, when Jesus said: *this is my blood*, and on the Cross, when His side was opened with the lance, and His Body was sprinkled with the Blood and water that flowed from it."¹⁰ Let these gleanings from the tradition of the Church suffice for the present. How ancient and constant this tradition is, will be seen more clearly later.

Third Comparison. THE ALTAR AS REPRESENTING THE DIVINITY.

Thus for the Body of Christ to be the altar of His sacrifice is by no means absurd. The altars of the carnal sacrifices both of the Jews and the Gentiles were merely the abiding places of the absent divinity. But what abiding place is more appropriate to God than the Body of the Word, in which dwells the Divinity by a sanctification absolutely physical and substantial, not merely accidental and secondary. In the Incarnation therefore Christ was anointed both as Priest and as

¹⁰ Dionysius however took this, word for word, from the *Explanatio mysteriorum oblationis* (ninth century) of Moses Bar Kepha, which was edited and translated into English by R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington (*Two commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy*, Oxford, 1913, p. 67).

Altar.¹¹ Both dignities in Christ belong to the humanity but as anointed by the divinity. Furthermore any altar, being in a sense the visible representative of God, was competent to receive victims on His behalf. Hence those who desired to offer sacrifices to God, had to do so necessarily through an altar. But Christ, the Victim of salvation, approached to God through Himself. Hence He was also the altar of His own sacrifice. For us too in like manner, He is the altar of every one of our sacrifices, for we can bring no offering to God except through Christ. However the question of our altar will be dealt with more suitably later in this work. Suffice here to deal more in detail with the altar of Christ.

B. IS THE RISEN CHRIST THE ALTAR OF HIS SACRIFICE?

We have seen that altar and temple are convertible terms in Christ. We must expect to find the perfect realization of altar in His risen Body. He says (*John II.19*) that His Body would rise as a temple. The risen Body therefore stands in an

¹¹ M. J. Scheeben (*Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, vol. 3, Fribourg, 1882, n. 1427, p. 431) notes this fact: "The same divine principle which, as spiritual unction, consecrates Christ in His human soul as most high priest, consecrates Him likewise as most high altar, to carry His Victim". As usual J. Wilhelm and T. B. Scannell (*A Manual of Catholic Theology*, vol. 2, London 1898, p. 203) follow Scheeben.

absolutely true and perfect sense as the altar that at once annuls and fulfils the sanctity of the figurative altars. Moreover the truth thus implied is stated expressly in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* XIII. 10: *We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle.*

In this passage (as will later be explained, when we come to study the Mass), even now Christ is said to be an altar for us. From this altar we are to eat of the sacrifice prepared for us, not the sacrifice of the Mosaic tabernacle, but of the true, heavenly tabernacle, into which *by his own blood* (IX. 12) entered our *high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of majesty in the heavens, a minister of the holies, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man* (VIII. 1-2).

I pass over the altar which is presented to us in the Apocalypse as heavenly (VI. 9; VIII. 3-5; IX. 13. etc.),¹² and SPEAKING (XVI. 7), which I mentioned on page 184.

¹² Of this altar Andrew of Caesarea, commenting on Apoc., VIII. 3 (P.G. 106, 288) says: "The golden altar is Christ in whom resides all sacrificial and sanctifying virtue, and in whom the sacrifices of the martyrs are offered (see Origen below): the altar with the tabernacle shown to Moses on the mountain was a type of this altar". Arethas has something similar on this text (P.G. 106, 613). In agreement among the Latin commentators of the Apocalypse are: the *Glossa Ordinaria* in Apoc. VI. 9, VIII. 3 ("Christ is the altar, who offered Himself . . . the

The character of altar or temple is certainly not less proper to the immolated Body of Christ after the Resurrection than before. For the Victim of the spiritual sacrifice, in passing into the temple of God's glory, does not, in becoming celes-

golden altar . . . according to the humanity, according to which He is the altar of the Trinity") IX. 13. P.L. 114, 722, 725, 728. Anselm of Laon in Apoc. VI. 9 ("The altar is Christ upon whom we offer to God: for whatever we did would be profitless without His mediation, that is without the virtue of His Passion; and here is signified an altar, no longer the object of our senses, by the use of the expression *golden altar*, which is in the Holy of Holies") IX. 13. P.L. 162, 1524, 1530, 1535. Richard of St Victor in Apoc. VI.⁹ VIII. 3 "*Stood before the altar.* Of this altar it is typically written: *you shall make an altar of the earth unto me.* An altar of the earth, the assumed humanity. Just as *to come* was necessary for the assumption of the flesh, so *to stand* belongs to the immutability of the divinity. He therefore who came in the flesh, by His divinity stood before the altar, because by His divinity in which He remained immutable, He was higher and more sublime than by His humanity, which is an altar for us . . . *Upon the golden altar*, that is upon Himself. For He is an altar, because upon Him are offered to the Father all the vows of human justice. Golden, because in Him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge etc." (P.L. 196, 768, 776 sq.). Particularly we should note the words of St Bernard in a sermon dealing expressly with "the heavenly altar under which St John heard the voices of the saints": He writes: The altar of which we are to speak, is, in my opinion, and so far as my understanding goes, nothing else than the very Body of our Lord and Saviour. And I believe that in this matter I understand the meaning aright. (*Sermo in festo omnium Sanctorum* IV. P.L. 183, 472)

tial, lose its inherent character of temple or altar; rather it possesses that character more resplendently from the contact with divine glory. In the ninth book of the work *De adoratione in spiritu et veritate* (P.G. 68, coll. 569-604, 616-625) Cyril of Alexandria discourses at length on this point. He points out that at last in the Resurrection the Body of Christ was an incorruptible temple and a golden altar. The holy Doctor concludes that "He is the altar, he the incense, he the high priest" (compare *ibid.* col. 648 and I, 10, col. 664).

The early Fathers frequently give the name *altar* to the celestial Christ. Thus Ignatius (*Magnes.*, 7, 2. F.P. I, 236) speaking of the Son returned to the Father confers on Christ the titles *altar* and *temple*: "Hasten all to come together as to the one temple of God, as to the one altar, to the one Jesus Christ".¹³

Irenaeus refers to that celestial altar, saying that our eucharistic offerings are directed there: "The Word of God desires that we too should offer a gift AT THE ALTAR frequently and without intermission. THE ALTAR THEREFORE IS IN HEAVEN: FOR THITHER OUR PRAYERS AND OFFERINGS ARE DIRECTED." For they are not earthly but heavenly, being made so by God (*Contra haeres.*, I, 4, c. 18, n. 6. P.G. 7, 1029-1030).¹⁴

¹³ Other passages in a like sense will be cited from Ignatius later.

¹⁴ Irenaeus says in another place: "Priests

Irenaeus makes a syllogism. We offer at the altar by the command of Christ. Thus then: Where our offerings are directed, there the altar is. But our offerings are directed to Heaven. Therefore the altar is in heaven.

Origen has much to say on the subject of the celestial altar. In the first place, he holds that Christ approaches to that heavenly altar to be a propitiation for our sins. It is for this reason that He Himself cannot drink the wine of gladness, until he drinks it new with us His sanctified ones in the kingdom of eternal glory: "How can He who approaches to the altar to make propitiation for me a sinner, be in gladness when the bitter sadness of my sins is always ascending to Him?" (*In Levit.*, hom. 7, 2. P.G. 12478).¹⁵

are all apostles of the Lord who possess neither land nor homes here on earth, but always serve THE ALTAR and God" (*Contra haereses*, 4, 8. P.G. 7, 995). From this passage where Ignatius is speaking of the New Law, and alluding to the Old, we cannot say definitely of what altar he is speaking—the true and the living altar, or the material and the representative. Meantime it seems to me that he is referring to the former, for reasons which will be clear enough from the remarks to be made directly with regard to the style of the early Fathers generally in their writings.

¹⁵ Origen has been taken to task by St. Bernard (*Serm. de div.* 34. P.L. 183, 638 foll.) and far more sharply criticised by Petavius (*De Incarnat.*, l. 12, c. 8, n. 13) and Huetius (*Origeniana*, l. 2, c. 2 q. 3, n. 9) for this imaginary picture of Christ indulging in lamentations, so to speak. From Origen himself we know elsewhere in the 23rd homily *On Numbers*, n. 2 (P.G. 12. 647-648)

Nay it was necessary that Christ "should be purified more fully at the heavenly altar, that the pledge of our faith which He had taken up with Him, might be endowed with perpetual purity" (op. cit., 9, n. 5, col 514).¹⁶ This is the idea set down in § 1. of this chapter.

that these are ordinary every day expressions, more or less figuratively used. Referring to the passage above from Huetius (P.G. 17, 835-836) Fathers C. and V. G. Delarue shrewdly remarked this. We may note too that Origen himself in this very passage of the 7th homily in *Leviticum*, explains the sense in which joy is lacking to Christ in this, that joy is not yet diffused through all the members of which He is the Head. His words are: "As long as I am not subject to the Father, so long He is not subject to the Father. This does not mean that He Himself lacks such subjection before the Father. But He is subject to the Father just as far as concerns me in whom He has not yet finished His work. So we read that we are the body of Christ and members in part . . . He who stands at the altar and bewails my sins, does not drink now, and He will drink afterwards, when all things have been subject to Him. Hence, O Christian, when you depart from this life, you will have joy, if you are holy. Full joy however, will be yours, only when no member is wanting to the body. You will await those others, just as He has awaited you. And if to you who are a member of that body, perfect joy is lacking, with how much greater truth, does our Lord and Saviour, who is the Head and Author of the whole body, say that His joy is not perfect, as long as He sees one of the members wanting to His body?" (col. 479-481).

¹⁶ Compare col. 513, *ibid.*, where Origen speaks of Christ washing His Flesh in His sacrifice in the evening, by which He is cleansed from the likeness of sinful flesh, by which is meant the capacity for suffering and death.

We shall approach to that heavenly altar by martyrdom particularly, becoming thereby victims of propitiation for others: "Consider also, just as the martyrdom of the Saviour cleansed the world, so too the baptism of our martyrdom may be the healing of many who are cleansed by it. For just as those who assisted at the Mosaic altar ministered by the blood of goats and oxen unto the remission of the sins of the people, so the souls of those who because of their witness to Jesus, fell under the axe of the executioner, do not assist at the heavenly altar in vain, they minister unto the remission of the sins of those who pray. Further we know that, as Jesus Christ offered Himself a Victim, so too priests whose High Priest He is, offer themselves as a victim, and hence they are at the altar as at their proper place . . . But who is that sinless priest, the offerer of a sinless victim, but the man who firmly professes his faith and attains to a perfect martyrdom?" (*Exhort. ad Martyr.*, 30. P.G. 11, 601). For by martyrdom we are brothers and kinsfolk of the Lamb whom St John saw lying on the altar. We are worthy in consequence to stand thereat. "In the *Apocalypse* a lamb is seen standing as it were slain . . . to this victim are akin others symbolized by the legal victim. By the other victims akin to this, I mean the holy martyrs who shed their blood, and who

with good reason are seen by John standing at the celestial altar" (*In Joann.*, tom. 6, n. 35-36. P.G. 14, 292-293). Though Origen's life had been spared up to now, he lives in the hope of going up to that altar by martyrdom. "Let each one bear in mind how often we stood in danger of dying an ordinary death, and let us reflect that possibly we have been preserved, so that, washed in our own blood and cleansed from every stain, we may at the celestial altar join the company of those who have similarly striven . . ." (*Exhort. ad mart.*, n. 39. P.G. 11, 616). Finally the perfect joy of the martyrs is in the service of this great altar: "For who can follow the soul of the martyr as she passes beyond the realms of the air and hastens to the altar of heaven? . . . For there under the altar of God the souls of the martyrs are said to abide . . . in this abode they assist at the divine sacrifices . . . Happy then are the souls that follow Christ along the path which He has traced. Because they follow Him, they arrive at the altar of God, where our Lord Jesus Christ Himself is the High Priest of the good things to come" (*In Judic.*, hom. 7 n. 2. P.G. 12, 981).

I admit that, just as in the case of Irenaeus, so too Origen does not state explicitly that Christ is that celestial altar of His sacrifice. Both speak of the altar, and so doing what else can they have in mind than

that thing through which sanctification is won for our gifts (namely by their being changed into the Body of Christ), by which a sanctification of glory is added to Christ once mortal and passible, by which propitiatory virtue, and at the same time a sacrificial and sacerdotal dignity, are bestowed on the sufferings of the martyrs? What else, I repeat, can these Doctors mean than the substantial sanctification of the assumed humanity by the Word itself, that sanctification by which the Son of Man is empowered to change His mortality into immortality, to present to God as a heavenly gift that which leaves our hand as an earthly one, and to make the sharers of His sufferings the sharers of His glory? In other words Christ was and is His own altar, because in the victim which He offers there is no inherent sanctity save that which arises from the Incarnation. There is no sanctity which has not its sufficient origin in the substantial sanctity of His humanity.¹⁷ That this must have been the thought more or less obscurely formulated by Irenaeus and Origen is shown by the analogy that exists between their expressions and clearer patristic sayings, like those of Ignatius and Cyril of Alexandria, and others cited already or to be later cited, proves this to us.

¹⁷ We shall have occasion later to explain how the substantial sanctity of our Lord is the origin of all grace and glory in Christ, and through Christ in us.

A similar line of thought we find in an oration of St. Gregory Nazianzen. He fixes his gaze on an altar from which his enemies cannot drag him, though they expel him from the office of a bishop (*Or.*, 26, 16. P.G. 36, 35, 1248-1249);¹⁸ St. Gregory also exhorts us to immolate ourselves to God on the heavenly altar (*Or.* 45, 23. P.G. 36, 656).¹⁹

From the many testimonies of Hesychius we take the following. Commenting on *Leviticus* I. 5 (P.G. 93, 696-697) "He pours the blood upon the altar, that is upon the Body of the Only-Begotten; for It is truly

¹⁸ "What then? Will they forbid us their altars? Even so, I know of another altar, AND THE ALTARS WHICH WE NOW SEE ARE BUT THE FIGURES OF IT: neither axe nor hand of man has been raised above that altar; neither the clang of steel, nor the sound of tool of carpenter or decorator, has been heard there; all the activities round about that altar are spiritual, one ascends to it by contemplation. At this altar I will stand, upon it I shall make immolations pleasing to God, sacrifices, oblations and holocausts, better than are offered now, just as truth is better than the shadow of truth. The great David seems to be thinking about this altar, when he says: *I will go up into the altar of God, to God who giveth joy to my youth.* No matter who he be, no one shall cast me out from this altar."

¹⁹ "Let us immolate to God a sacrifice of praise, on the altar on high with the heavenly choirs. Let us pass beyond the first veil and approach to the second altar, let us gaze upon the Holy of Holies; nay more, let us immolate ourselves to God in every action of ours, every day of our lives. Let us accept all things for the sake of the Word, let us imitate His Passion by our sufferings, let us give honour to His Blood by our blood, Let us eagerly ascend to the Cross itself."

called an altar . . . Referring to this, Moses said: *You shall make an altar of earth unto me*, for the Body of the Lord is made from our earth, that is from the earthly dough or mass of humanity. Further on the Lord says through Moses: *And if thou make an altar of stone unto me, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones: for if thou lift up a tool upon it, it shall be defiled.* For the Flesh of Christ was neither cut nor hewn by the hand of man." Again: "He commanded that all the rest of the blood of the calf should be poured round the foot of the altar of holocaust, which is in the tabernacle of the testimony. Once more let us understand that the altar of the holocaust is the Body of Christ: for as He is Himself the Priest and the Victim, so too He is the Altar". Finally, *In Leviticum*, VI. 13 (P.G. 93, 848): "The Lord says to Moses: *This is the perpetual fire which shall never go out on the altar.* For God is a spirit, and they that adore Him, must adore Him in spirit and in truth. Hence too the intelligible altar, which is the Body of Christ, has the unquenchable fire of the ministration of the spirit."

We have seen that St Augustine calls Christ an altar. He sets apart the earthly altar at which both the just and the unjust assist. Christ is the one priest of the celestial altar, and yet not alone. It is as the whole Christ, Head and members, that He stands there (*In Psalm.* 25, *Ennar.* 2,

n. 10. P.L. 36, 193.1;²⁰ *Sermo*, 351, n. 7. P.L. 38, 1543. Compare *Contra advers. leg. et prophet.*, 1, 1, c. 19. P.L. 42, 26); if you betake yourself to this altar, you will be taken up in holocaust, and from being mortal you will be made immortal (*In Psalm* 42, n. 5; *In Psalm*. 50, n. 23. P.L. 36, 479, 599).²¹

A number of mediaeval writers will be cited later in this work. One or two will suffice for the present. St. Bruno of Segni (*In Psalm*. 42. P.L. 164, 848) referring to the words *Introibo ad altare Dei* says: "This altar is in heaven. This altar is the humanity of our Saviour."²²

²⁰ "There is also an altar before the eyes of God; the Priest who first offered Himself for us, has entered there. He is the heavenly altar etc."

²¹ We have a compendium of the teaching of St. Augustine in the following words of Gerhoh of Reichersberg: "You have the tabernacle of the present Church, the altar common to the good and the bad . . . There is another altar sublime, invisible, accessible to the good alone, unto which—like the high priest who alone and not without sacrifice enters into the holy of holies—the just man alone enters once only. He does this when he is taken up to God, body and soul as a holocaust, that his youth in every part of his being may be renewed there. He does not go into that altar in sadness, with any interior affliction derived from the old external trappings of His humanity, but all that he is and with all his being, he cleaves to God who rejoices his youth. I shall go in to this altar too, repenting at last of my sins, to God who rejoices my youth". *In Psalm*. 42. P.L. 193, 1530).

²² Similarly on *Exod.* XXX. 10: "For He the Priest, the Victim, the Altar, in His own Blood entered once into the holies

Gerhoh of Reichersberg (*In Psalm*. 25. P.L. 193, 1166) explaining the words *circumdabo altare tuum* writes: "I will encompass the heavenly altar, that is Christ's human nature, which Christ Himself, true Priest, has set up for a title, pouring oil on the top of it."²³ John Belet illustrating, in the manner of a liturgist, the typical relation of our altars to Christ, thus points to the celestial antitype: "For the altar signifies Christ. In the Law God commanded: *You shall fashion an altar of the earth unto me.*"²⁴ The altar of earth is Christ born of a Virgin. Hence it is said: *Truth is sprung out of the earth.* This is the earth which

having obtained eternal redemption . . . The words *It will be most holy to the Lord* should be interpreted of the altar: for the Body of Christ is the Holy of Holies, seeing that all other things are sanctified by it". (P.L. 164, 360).

²³ Compare Augustine *Quaest. in Heptateuch.*, l. 1, c. 84. P.L. 34, 570; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaph. in Genes.*, l. 4, c. 4. P.G. 69, 289.

²⁴ This verse of *Exodus* XX. 24, has been repeatedly interpreted by mediaeval authors as referring to Christ. It is to be found in the commentary on the verse of Psalm 50: *Then shall they lay calves upon thy altar*, found in the *Expositio in septem psalmos poenitentiales* (P.L. 79, 600). Many writers of note have said that this is the work of St. Gregory the Great. This however has been called in question for some time, and it would seem that we must no longer attribute the work to Gregory, since A. Mercati (*Revue Bénédictine*, July 1914, p. 250 foll.) has brought to light a much more probable author for this work in Heribertus, Bishop of Reggio in Emilia, who lived towards the end of the eleventh century.

gave its fruit, sublime fruit, namely Christ, set over the angelic choirs in heaven" (*Rationale divinatorum officiorum*, c. 104. P.L. 202, 109).

Though a number of authorities are reserved until another time, yet it is sufficiently clear that the earlier writers were wont to speak of an eternal altar in heaven, which is Christ. Now the eternity of the altar, together with the eternity of the priesthood, proves also the eternity of the sacrifice.

C. OUR MATERIAL ALTARS AND THE HEAVENLY ALTAR.

We shall compare the heavenly altar 1) with the Church and her members; 2) with the Table of the Supper room and the wood of the Cross; 3) with our material altars.

Seeing that the titles *altar* and *temple* are attributed to the Body of Christ,²⁵ they also extend to the

²⁵ Renz, (op. cit., 239-240) thinks that the Fathers sometimes call God according to the divine nature an altar, as receiving the offered gifts. However the examples he quotes from the Fathers do not prove it, for they all refer rather to the divine unction and the glory of the assumed humanity than to the Godhead. Though we do not admit this contention of Renz in respect of the Fathers, St Thomas does certainly speak of God as an altar, in one place (3 S. 83, 4, 9m). But in another passage he says: "We must admit that in Christ who is our altar, there is according to His humanity the true nature of flesh: which is *to make an altar of earth*" (1-2, 102, 4, 7m). Before St Thomas, Alain de l'Isle, among a few others, had said that in the divinity there was an altar:

Church, which is united to Christ as body to Head, and is one flesh with Him. Hence the Church is called a temple in *Eph.* II. 21, the faithful are spoken of as a temple in *I. Cor.*, III. 16-17 and in *II. Cor.*, VI. 16. The Fathers followed the same mode of expression, as when Ignatius referred to the Ephesians as a temple of the Father, a temple of the Lord, a temple of God (*Ephes.* IX, 1, XV, 3. P. 1, 220, 224), or when Polycarp admonishes widows,²⁶ to comport

"In the temple of Christ, that is in His human nature, there are three altars; the first is the altar of the holocausts, namely His glorified flesh in which our sins are consumed; the second is His soul, for just as in the altar of incense aromatic substances were offered, so the soul of Christ has diverse virtues; the third is THE DIVINITY, in which shines the majesty of divine power" (*Sermo in annuntiatione Beatae Mariae Virginis*, P.L. 210-212). As we have said, it is more correct to say that the dignity of altar is attributed to Christ's humanity and flows from His godhead.

In respect of Christ as temple we may note the words of Heterius and Beatus in their *Epistola ad Elipandum* (1, 1, c. 66. P.L. 96, 936). "He is Priest and Sacrifice. He is also God and Temple. ALONE (of the three Divine Persons) He is Priest, Sacrifice AND TEMPLE, being all these things according to his form or nature of servant; but He alone is not God, for He is God together with the Father and the Holy Ghost." Hence as Man Christ is temple, yet not as Man only but as Man-God.

²⁶ The author of the *Didascalia* honoured widows also with the title of altar, for a special reason (2, 26, 8; 3, 6, 3; 3, 14, 1), compare the corresponding passages in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (2, 26, 8; 3, 6, 3; 3, 14, 1) and the Pseudo Ignatius in the work *Ad Tarsenses* (9, 1, F.P. 2, 102). The reason given by the author of the *Didascalia*

themselves as an altar (thusiasterion) of God (IV. 3. F.P. 1, 300). Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7, 6. P.G. 9, 445) and Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 8, 17. P.G. 1, 1540-1544) both speak of the Christian soul as an altar (bomos) and the appellation was universally adopted by later Christian writers.²⁷

may be found in the last passage mentioned above (compare *ibid.*, 4, 3, 3. F.D. 220), because widows bearing the offerings of the faithful (liturgical offerings and connected with the Eucharistic offering) were looked upon as transmitting to God by their prayers, the votive offerings of the faithful; and so because of this office they were likened to altars. Tertullian (*Ad uxorem*, 1, 7. P.L. 1, 1286) compares a widow of one husband only to a spotless altar of God, but I think for a different reason.

²⁷ Among the earlier Christian writers Lactantius seems to have given the clearer explanation on the Church as the temple of God foretold by the prophets: "All the prophets have plainly foretold of Christ, that being born of human flesh of the family of David, He would set up to God an eternal temple, which is called the Church, and would call all the nations to the true religion of God. This is the faithful house, this is the immortal temple, in which those who do not sacrifice, will not have the reward of eternal life" (*Divin. Instit.*, 1, 4, c. 14. P.L. 6, 487). In the Armenian liturgy the people sing of the Church as the glistening temple of the Eucharist: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of light, holy Catholic mother, rejoice with thy children, O Sion! Adorn and beautify thyself, illustrious spouse, radiant tabernacle, like unto the heavens, because God anointed, Being from Being, is always sanctified in thee. To reconcile us to the Father and for the forgiveness of our sins, He distributes His sacred Body and Blood to us, by which He brings His holy Incarnation to perfection." (Max Saxon. *Missa Armenica*, 14, compare B. 420).

Actually under Christ and in Christ, the Church is her own temple and altar. Because the Church is symbolized by the sacramental Body of Christ, it follows necessarily that when she visibly offers sacrifice, she also immolates herself invisibly (since the offering of a sign must include the offering of what is signified thereby). But in all spiritual sacrifice, as we have said, the priest, victim and altar are one and the same.

In a secondary way there is nothing to prevent us calling either the table of the Supper room or the Cross by the name of altar. For the Cross bore the blood-stained Body and the table the sacramental Body of the Lord. Neither however fulfilled the office of SANCTIFYING THE VICTIM OR RECEIVING THE BLOOD ON BEHALF OF GOD.

To my knowledge the first writer

In our Liturgy for the feast of the *Dedication*, note how vivid is the language which sets before us the Church as a living temple. We could give innumerable quotations from the early Church writers and from writers after them to show how familiar is this interpretation of the heavenly altar as Christ, as the Church, and as the Saints. Some of these we shall quote in different parts of this work, as occasion occurs. We shall here content ourselves by referring to the commentary of Berengaudus (probably of the ninth century) on the Apocalypse (P.L. 17) where we find the following 1) "The altar of God is Christ" (col. 921, in VI 9; 2) "The altar is the Church" (col. 931, 932, 943, in VIII 3 and 5 and IX. 13); 3) The Altar is "the saints and perfect men, who are members of the Church" (col. 950, in *Apoc.* XI. 1).

to refer to the altar of the Supper table was St Ephraem. He exclaims: "O happy place, in thee the bread of the firstlings was broken. Thou wert the first Church of Christ and the first altar" (*op. cit.*, str. 12, p. 660-662). The thought is more definitely expressed in the *Sermo secundus in hebdomadam sanctam* n. 8 Ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 384-386: "The table was His altar and He consecrated it whole. On that paschal eve the cenacle was the Church and the table the sacred altar." In the *Sermo tertius in hebdomadam sanctam* n. 6 and 7, p. 426-428: "This table was an altar and the cenacle a temple . . . Blessed is the table which became an altar for the apostles."

One might easily find traces of the comparison between the Cross and an Altar: 1) In the *Epistle to the Hebrews* XIII. 12-13 where the death of Christ after He HAD BORNE HIS SHAME WITHOUT THE GATE, corresponds to the burning of the bodies of the victims without the camp. 2) In the *First Epistle of St Peter* II. 24: *who his own self bore our Sins in his body upon the tree*: something similar seems to underlie these words. 3) In the *Epistola Barnabae* (6, 3. F.P. 1, 58) this same is to an extent insinuated, seeing that our Lord was crucified "because He himself was going to offer the vessel of the spirit, as a sacrifice for our sins, in order that the type established in Isaac who was offered upon the altar (thusiasterion) might

be fulfilled. 4) Tertullian in *Adversus Judaeos* (10 P.L. 2, 626) says "that Isaac led by his father as a victim and himself carrying the wood" was a prophetic figure "of the death of Christ given as a victim by the Father, and bearing the wood of His Passion". These passages seem at first sight to suggest the thought of the Cross as an altar, but a more diligent consideration will show that the comparison is not so much between the Cross and the altar, as between the Cross and the wood destined to burn up the bodies without the camp, the bodies of the victims offered to God at the altar of the tabernacle (*Hebr.*, *I. Peter* coll. *Levit.*, XVI. 17 and 18); or between the Cross and the wood on which Isaac was to be burned AFTER he had been slain upon the altar. This altar Holy Scripture (*Gen. XXII.9*) expressly distinguishes from the wood (*Barnab. Tertull.*). When the Fathers began to assimilate the Cross to an altar, they did not use the word corresponding to our altar (*altare*), they used another word *ara*. The word *ARA* was used in Latin properly for a lesser altar, on which the incense or other things were burnt . . . We have an example of this mode of expression and the distinction underlying it in the original form of our paschal hymn (incorrectly attributed to St. Ambrose) *Ad regias agni dapes*.

The second strophe ran as follows: "Whose sacred Body a burnt of-

fering on the altar (*ara*) of the Cross, etc.²⁸ In a prayer ascribed to St Ambrose which we are wont to say before Mass, we have the following words: "O Jesus Christ, our great High Priest, who didst offer thyself for us to God the Father, as a pure and spotless victim on the altar (*ara*) of the Cross," etc., (compare Trident., sess. 22, cap. 1. D. 938) The author of the work *Liber de promissionibus et praedicationibus Dei* (pars 1, c. 17. P.L. 51, 747),²⁹ certainly sees a correspondence between the Passion of Christ and the figurative sacrifices of Abraham, in the fact that the Patriarch "hastened for three days to come to the altar (*ara*) of the Cross with an innocent victim". Leo the Great connects both *ara* and *altare* in the Cross when he writes: "He was crucified without the camp, that with the cessation of the rite of the ancient victims, a new victim might be placed on a new altar (*altare*), and that the Cross of Christ might be the altar (*ara*) not of a temple, but of the whole world." (*Sermo* 59, c. 5. P.L. 54, 340, compare *Sermo* 55, c. 2, col. 324). I

²⁸ *Hymnus in Resurrectione Domini ad vespervas*, A. H. 51, 87. Later we shall have more to say about this hymn. Like expressions occur in various other hymns (A. H. 12, 34; 30, 32, etc.). See below how Hincmar and others understood this as of the Eucharistic bread, burnt, so to speak, as an offering on the Cross.

²⁹ Between A.D. 444 and 450, according to P. Schepens, *Un traité à restituer à saint Quodvultdeus. évêque de Carthage. au V. siècle*, in R.S.R., Mai-Sep. 1919, p. 234.

cannot remember having met in the literature of the Church for the first four centuries,³⁰ any example of the designation of the Cross as *altare* or *ara* of Christ. This is all the more remarkable because in that period the Cross is called by other names, some of them very strange. For instance, it is referred to as a *ladder*, Zeno of Verona, tract. l. 2, tr. 14, c. 5. P.L. 11, 433; a *chariot*, Ambrose (*Expos evangel. secund. Lucam*, l. 10, n. 109. P.L. 15, 1831), a *ship*, Ambrose (*In Psalm. 47* n. 13. P.L. 14, 1151) a *wall* and a *shield* (Chrysostom, hom. on the words *Father, if it be possible*, etc. P.G. 31, 45). And these are but few out of the many examples.

Long before the term *altar* was used of the Cross, the name *altar* was attached to the board or slab (*mensa, trapeza*), at first made of wood and afterwards of stone, which was usually set up for the Eucharistic sacrifices. This use is easily enough explained in so far as the *table* so set up and used, according to the laws of the Church, was anointed with holy oil, this anointing being a symbol of the unction of the divinity, which was Christ's by the hypostatic union. Hence the material altar was a symbol of the true altar: Christ Himself. The

³⁰ The *Epistola presbyterorum et diaconorum Achaiae*, of the fifth century at the earliest, has the following rather involved passage: "I offer a victim every day, SACRIFICING the spotless lamb ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS."

erection of such material altars (thusiasteria) in the sacred edifices of the Christians, is mentioned by Origen,³¹ (*In librum Jesu Nave* hom. 2, 1, and hom. 10, 3. P.G. 12, 833 and 881. Compare hom. 3 *in Jud.*, n. 2. P.G. 12, 962) who also speaks of their consecration and adornment. At this time of course they were not shown openly, they were hidden away in the catacombs, etc. Hence Cyprian (*Ad Demetrianum*, 12. P. L. 4, 553. Compare *Ep.* 40, 5; 63, 5; 64, 1; 66, 1 and 2. P.L. 4, col. 336, 377, 389, 398-399) complains that whereas idol worship (in public) is so prevalent, "altars [that is, material altars] of God are non-existent or hidden away". At the same time Tertullian (*De oratione* 19. P.L. 1, 1182)³² was speaking of the "ARA of God"; although Minutius Felix (*Octavius* 32. P.L. 3, 339) had already admitted that the Christians had no "arae", he writes: "You think we hide what we worship because we have no shrines and *arae*". And Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 8, 17. P.L.

11, 1540-1544) later admitted with Minutius that the Christians had "no shrines and *arae*" (that is in the sense that the pagans had). For to Origen the only "*arae*" (*bomoi*) were the souls of the just. In fact the earlier Christian writers made a clear distinction between the *ara* or *bomos* and the *altare* or *thusiasterion*. There were no victims on the *arae*,³³ but the *altare* had its victim³⁴. Long after these earliest Christian writers, Lactantius not only excludes *ara* from Christian worship (*Divin. Instit.* 1, 2, c. 2. P.L. 6, 259), but Arnobius excluded both *ara* and *altare* (*Advers. Gent.*, 6, 1. P.L. 5, 1162). After this time however Doctors of the Church spoke freely and constantly of material altars. Thus, for example, St Hilary (in the *Fragment.* 2, c. 16 of his historical work, P.L. 10 643, compare *Fragment.* 3, c. 9, col. 665) and also St Optatus (*De schismate Donatistarum*, 1, 6. c. 1, P.L. 11, 1063 foll)³⁵

³¹ We have already said that the words of Irenaeus *Contra haeres.*, 4, 8, are not to be taken in this sense. That Ignatius is not speaking of material altars in his epistles, will be clear from what we have to say later on Ignatius.

³² Among the inscriptions discovered in Latin Africa (at Orléansville) we have one which has been published (though its authenticity is open to doubt) as both Christian and very ancient (*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. 8, pars, 2, n. 9704):

ARAM DEO
SANCTO AETERNO.

³³ Compare Dom. Leclercq, D.A.C., t. 1, col. 3155. One may also profitably read what Döllinger has to say about the *ara* and *altare* of the Romans, in *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, 1857, p. 540.

³⁴ Here it may be noted that the Greek word *bomos* (Latin, *ara*) was more commonly reserved in sacred Scripture for the worship of idols (See Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 3, p. 445). Chrysostom follows the same use in his 24th homily in *I. Cor.*, 1 (P.G. 61 200), when speaking in the person of Christ, he contrasts the *bomos* of the idols and *my thusiasterion*, where *bomos* corresponds to *arae* and *thusiasterion* to *altare*.

³⁵ Even after the use of *altare* for material

The truth is that our only true temple and altar is Christ, through whom the true Victim of the true Priest is offered to God. Consequently the august name of altar does not belong to our material structures, only in so far as they are deputed to represent Christ. For just as the ministerial priest represents the High Priest (3 S. 82, 1, 2) and the Melchisedechian appearance of the sacrifice represents the Victim of the Passion, so the living heavenly altar is represented by the table which receives the oblations of the faithful which are to be consecrated to God (though it confers of itself nothing to their consecration). Hence it is not by analogy with the material altars of our churches that we call Christ our altar. Rather our altars are so called by analogy with Him, to whom it belongs primarily to be the altar of our sacrifice, as He was the altar of His own. Naturally the dignity and the name of altar belongs to Him in virtue of a kind of proportional relationship, because He stands in the same relationship to His Victim as the altars in ancient times did to the blood victims of the animal sacrifices. FOR THE BODY OF CHRIST WAS

altar had become common, the Fathers still continue to speak of the "table of sacrifice". (So Hilary, *In Psalm* 68, n. 19. P.L. 9, 482. Compare *In Psalm*. 128, n. 10, col. 700.) See also Leclercq, loc. cit., col. 3157, about the constant use of the word *trapeza* (mensa) in the same connection. We find this same use in the Greek liturgies *passim*.

SPRINKLED WITH THE BLOOD OF THE VICTIM SACRAMENTALLY AT THE SUPPER, AND THEREAFTER REALLY ON THE CROSS; IN HIMSELF AND THROUGH HIMSELF, WITHOUT THE INTERMEDIARY OF ANY HIGHER ABODE OF GOD, HE PRESENTED HIS BLOOD VICTIM TO THE ALMIGHTY. Therefore just as Christ is our one Victim, and our one Priest, He is also our one Altar, on whom the people in union with the priest, subordinate to Christ the great High Priest, offer to God the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. Indeed the Eucharistic consecration makes the altar and the Victim our own: "The Body does not become present without altar or without priest: But Emmanuel is all these—Altar and Body or Victim, and Oblation and Priest, and Offerer" (Dionysius Bar Salibi, *Expositio Liturgiae* C. S. C. O., t. 93p. 99).

Since then it was not the custom of the earlier Fathers to give to other things than Christ the name and the dignity of altar, even if at a later period those other things were called altars, the primitive faith in respect of our Mass sacrifice was not weakened or obscured thereby. Sacrifice certainly does connote an altar; even though as may happen at times, our sacrifices are not offered on an altar made with hands, the principal Altar is never wanting, that is the altar not made with hands, which is Christ. Moreover, as we have said, Christ would not

be the altar of His Victim, nor consequently of ours, if He had not offered in the sacrament. Hence the more the Fathers speak of Christ as the one altar, the more they emphasize the Eucharistic sacrifice. This exactly is what the *Roman Breviary* says for the feast of the *Dedication of the Basilica of the Most Holy Saviour*: "Although even from Apostolic times, places were dedicated to God . . . , where . . . the Christian people . . . went to partake of the Eucharist, still these places did not receive such solemn ritual consecration, nor had it yet become a custom to erect in them a titular altar which, anointed with chrism, would be an express figure of our Lord Jesus Christ, our Altar, Victim and Priest" (*Lesson IV*).³⁶

³⁶ Nicholas Cabasilas (*De vita in Christo*, 5. P.G. 150, 633) has something similar to say on the absence of material altars in the earliest ages of Christianity, when he says: "For the first priests their hands were the altars". We know too that St Lucian of Antioch, priest and martyr, consecrated the Eucharist on his own breast while in prison (if we may trust the Arian historical documents. Compare Batiffol, *La passion de S. Lucien d'Antioche* in *Compte rendu du Congrès Scientifique Internationale des Catholiques*, 1891 seconde sect. p. 184). Theodoretus tells us in his *Religiosa historia seu ascetica republica* C. 20 (P.G. 82, 1429) that he himself celebrated in the cell of an anchorite called Mar "using the hands of deacons for altar". Theodore of Canterbury in his *Poenitentiale* (c. 2. P.L. 99, 927) says that it is generally lawful for a priest "to celebrate Mass in an open field, if a deacon or a priest himself holds the chalice or the oblation in his hands". We infer from all this

Throughout this chapter my intention has been to confirm the eternity of the sacrifice from the

that though, be it understood, under ordinary circumstances in that period Mass could not be celebrated licitly except on a duly consecrated altar, still it seems that this obligation did not extend to cases of necessity, where an altar was not available. The moral theologians of our time (the majority at least), hold a much stricter opinion, that in no circumstances can a priest be excused from the obligation of using an altar for celebrating Mass (though the obligation is merely one of the positive law) NOT EVEN TO GIVE THE VIATICUM TO ONE OF THE FAITHFUL AT THE HOUR OF DEATH. But surely this is a very rigid interpretation of the law. In our time we have seen numbers exposed to immediate danger of death in a battle, the circumstances were such that military chaplains were faced with insuperable difficulties—an altar-stone lost or shattered, for instance, and none other obtainable for the celebration of Mass. Here could we forbid them to celebrate Mass without an altar—or rather its essential constituent, an altar-stone? I wonder if the origin of this severe teaching is not to be found in the teaching of those theologians, well founded and resting on undeniable fact, that in the nature of things an altar is necessary for sacrifice? This is of course true, but we must always keep in mind that our real altar is Christ Himself.

According to Palmieri-Ballerini (*Op. theol-moral*, t. 4, n. 772; compare n. 771), some weighty authorities allow the celebration of Mass in certain cases of necessity—not public necessity (i.e. the necessity for a number at one time), but that of an individual and of transient nature: if a tyrant threatens me with death unless I celebrate. This is a chimerical case, it has not to do with the common good. In one case at least (which I have not seen discussed by casuists) it must be admitted by all that celebration without an altar is licit. Suppose a priest has already consecrated the bread, and the altar is destroyed (as can hap-

eternity of the altar. For the celestial altar is never without the gift once offered. God never ceases to hold as

pen in war time), and the chalice is yet to be consecrated, either by some priest who has already consecrated the bread, or some other who happens to be at hand (say the first priest was slain). Here the divine law which enjoins the completion of the sacrifice prevails over the law of the Church which enjoins that a material consecrated altar must be used for the sacrifice. Note that in the case given, the necessity for consecrating without an altar rather than not consecrating at all, actually arises from REVERENCE FOR THE SACRAMENT. It seems to me that the same thing—the necessity for consecrating without an altar—can also be lawful, because of the spiritual necessity of the faithful especially in these days. Corblet (*Histoire . . . du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, 1885, 2, 61-62) has something which is to the point here: "In 1865, Pope Pius IX authorized the priests deported to Siberia to celebrate Mass in any place whatever, on an ordinary table say, or a slab or the trunk of a tree, in any costume, whenever it might be impossible for them to conform to the prescriptions of the Ritual."

Having duly weighed the matter I willingly give my assent to the opinion (up to now as far as I know, a solitary one) expressed by Zacharias Pasqualigo (+ 1664) in his *De sacrificio Novae Legis* (Rome 1707, tom. 1). He makes two statements to the point. *First* sub. n. 102: "In places in which there is not free exercise of the Catholic

His own, and ratify divinely, the gifts kept on that altar.

religion, in the absence of an altar, the sacrifice may be offered on any kind of altar, set up as best one can" (p. 590). *Second*, sub. not. 703, speaking of places where there is a free exercise of the Catholic religion: "If on the other hand, we speak of the necessity which arises either through the divine or the natural law, as when there is a pressing obligation of the divine law to administer the Eucharist to some one, I would say that this necessity prevails over the positive obligation of offering the sacrifice on a consecrated altar. The reason is because human law cannot prevail in opposition to the divine and natural law" (p. 591). And at this same place he refers to the well known principle: "Necessity makes that lawful which would not be conceded by dispensation" (p. 591) and he gives the reason for this: "because for dispensation there is not required such a necessity as of itself destroys the obligation of the law, or rather of itself prohibits the extension of the law to cover the case in point, but a reasonable cause only is required, and it leaves the obligation of the law in full vigour". Thus Pasqualigo, whose authority as a theologian is high in Rome; the casuists do not seem to have paid enough attention to his words.

One may compare what is said later about the obligation of using unleavened bread for the sacrifice; it has many points in common with the obligation in question here of the use of a duly consecrated altar.

§ 3. Christ as Eternal Intercessor

We ask: 1) Does Christ pray in heaven? 2) Does He adore? 3) Are the insignia of the wounds of His Passion on His Flesh? The bearing which these questions have on the heavenly sacrifice will become plain from our arguments in this chapter.

A. THE PRAYER OF CHRIST IN HEAVEN

Suarez (*De Incarn.* disp. 45, a. 2) and still more Petavius (*De Incarn.*, l. 12, c. 8, parag. 10-16) have culled passages without number wherein the Fathers state that Christ in heaven asks favours for us, petitions, prays and so on. On the other hand, Vasquez (*De Incarn.*, disp. 82, c. 2) opposing Suarez and Thomassinus (*De Incarn.*, l. 9, c. 6) opposing Petavius, have shown at great length that the prayer of Christ in heaven, as usually understood by the Fathers, is not prayer in the proper sense. All these expressions, like petitions, supplications, prayer, as used of the heavenly Christ, are really that meditation or intercession which is the eternal presence of Christ in the sight of God, in that assumed flesh which He offered for us.¹ And this un-

¹ Possibly a passage in Eusebius of Caesarea may be advanced as in conflict with this interpretation. In an *Oratio* over the building of a church in Tyre, he appears to attribute prayer and adoration of the Father in its strict sense to Christ as now in heaven. However as a theologian the authority of

deniably is the proper mode of intercession for a victim whose rôle it is to win for man the mercy of God by the mere presenting of Himself before God. Evidently then the intercession of Christ is closely associated with His eternal state of Victim, for it is none other than the impetrative aspect of His sacrifice.

This is the only manner of intercession by the heavenly Christ that Holy Scripture sets before us. First, in two passages of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Christ's intercession for us, and His presence in heaven on our behalf, are equated: (*Jesus*) always *living to make intercession for us* (VII. 25, compare *Rom.*, VIII 34), and *Jesus entered into heaven itself, that he may appear now in the presence of God for us* (IX. 24); secondly, Christ's function as our advocate with the Father is clearly shown to consist in this, that He is present in heaven as a propitiation for our sins (*I. John* II. 1-2).

St Gregory Nazianzen is the great champion of this interpretation. He rejects all idea of humiliation in prayer by our Advocate with the Father, and places this advocacy solely in His presenting His humanity which suffered in the past: "We have Jesus Christ our Advocate. He

Eusebius is not very weighty on such a matter as the exact definition of the glory proper to the Only-Begotten.

does not humbly prostrate Himself for us at the feet of the Father, nor make Himself abject after the manner of a slave. Such servility is not to be thought of, it is unworthy of the Spirit. The Father could not demand it, the Son could not endure it. To think this of God would be unjust and impious. As the Word and Counsellor of the Father, He persuades Him to bear with me, because of all that as Man He has suffered. This, I think, is what advocacy means here." (*Or.* 30, n. 14. P.G. 36, 121-124).

Theodoretus in the same way says that Christ prays in the fact that He presents to the Father the first fruits of our flesh: "Christ the Lord dies for us, and rising from the dead He sits at the right hand of the Father, and there cares for us unceasingly. He presents to the Father the first fruits which He assumed from us, and through these first fruits secures our salvation." (*In Rom.*, VIII. 34. P.G. 83, 144).

Nicholas Cabasilas faithfully records the teaching of these Greek Fathers, when he writes "For [Christ] is the Mediator through whom we have secured all those goods which have been given, or rather are always being given, to us by God. FOR HAVING ONCE BEEN OUR MEDIATOR AND HAVING GIVEN US ALL THAT HE INTERCEDED FOR, He did not withdraw, rather He is ever interceding, NOT BY SOME FORM OF WORDS AND PRAYERS, as ambassadors

do, BUT BY AN ACT. WHAT IS THIS ACT? He unites Himself to us, and through Himself imparts to us His own graces" (*Liturgiae expositio*, c. 45. P.G. 150, 464). His intercession therefore is His efficacious mediation.

The Latin writers give the same teaching more explicitly. St Ambrose writes: [CHRIST] AS PRIEST THERE OFFERS HIMSELF . . . in reality, WHERE HE INTERVENES AS ADVOCATE FOR US WITH THE FATHER (*De officiis ministrorum*, I, 238. P.L. 16, 94). His intercession is the eternal oblation of Himself.

St Gregory the Great interpreting St Paul and St John, says that the intercession of Christ is the presentation of the assumed humanity which has been taken up to God: "The intercession of the Only-Begotten Son for man, is His presenting Himself as man before the co-eternal Father. His prayer for man is His assumption of the nature of man in the supereminence of the divinity. Therefore the Lord does not intercede for us BY WORD BUT BY MERCY, because that which He did not wish to be damned in His elect He liberated by assuming it" (*Moral.*, l. 22, 17, n. 43, P.L. 75, 542).²

And again: "In this way He speaks to the Father for us, that He presents

² In the XII. century the Venerable Herveus of Burges also inserted these words of Gregory in his commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans* (P.L. 181, 719).

Himself to the Father in our likeness. His words, His petition consists precisely in this: He presents Himself to the Father as Man for mankind. Because interceding for sinners, He presents Himself as the Just Man who merits indulgence for others" (*op. cit.*, l. 23, c. 2, n. 4, col. 289-291, and in particular the passage quoted above from l. 1, c. 24, n. 32. P.L. 75, 542.)

So too in the *Sermo*, on *I. Kings* I. 23, as reported by the Abbot Claudius, Gregory thus spoke: "Because by His Blood we are reconciled to God, He prays that the word may be fulfilled, and in this fulfillment is our salvation, AND HIS PRAYER IS HIS CONTINUED PRESENTING IN THE SIGHT OF GOD THE ETERNAL FATHER OF HIS HUMANITY ASSUMED FOR OUR SALVATION; AND BECAUSE HE OFFERS HIMSELF UNCEASINGLY IN THIS MANNER, this act of His opens the way for our reception into life." (In *I. Kings* l. 1, c. 1, n. 45. P.L. 79, 45). This passage is too abundantly clear to call for explanation.

Paulinus of Aquileia says that the advocacy, the intercession of Christ, is simply His manifestation of Himself before God: "He presents the human nature to the Father in the oneness of the Person of God and Man. FOR THIS IS HIS INTERCESSION WITH GOD THE FATHER FOR US. St John says that He not only makes intercession, but also that He is a propitiation for our sins." (*Contra*

Felicem Urgellitanum, l. 1, c. 23. P.L. 99, 376).

The testimony from the commentaries of Pelagius on the *Epistola ad Romanos*, at one time attributed to St Jerome (P.L. 30, 685) is valuable. The Pseudo-Primasius copied it word for word and made it his own (*In Rom.*, VIII. 34, P.L. 68, 466): "The Arians say that he who intercedes is the lesser. We must reply, the Lord is not forgetful, He does not need to be reminded constantly of those whom He Himself has justified: His intercession is this: that AS TRUE AND ETERNAL PRIEST, HE ALWAYS PRESENTS AND OFFERS TO THE FATHER AS OUR pledge, the GLORIFIED HUMANITY which he assumed".

Like Gregory the Great, Hincmar of Rheims in the *Epistola ad Hincmarum Laudunensem*, c. 1, c. 11 (P.L. 126, 325) writes: "And seated at the right hand of the Father, that is in the glory of the majesty of the Father, he makes intercession, not by word, but by mercy for us."

In the same way Remigius Antisiodorensis on *Hebr.*, VII. 25: "He makes intercession for us in that He assumed a human nature which He ever manifests to the Father for us, in order to bestow mercy on us according to each of His natures." (*Inter opera Haymonis Halberstensis*, P.L. 117, 883).³

³ A century later Adelman of Brescia (*De Eucharistiae sacramento ad Berengarium epistol.* P.L. 143, 1293) writes: "I believe that the words of the Apostle: *who is at the right hand of the Father, who also maketh*

St Bruno the Carthusian commenting on Psalm 109, 4, places the eternal duration of the Melchisedechian priesthood of Christ, even after His Resurrection, in His prayer: "He is called a priest forever in His own person, not because He offers forever the sacrifice of His Body and Blood, for He offered this once only, but because He prays forever for them before the Father. For it is the office of priests, not only to offer sacrifice, but also to pray for the people" (*Expositio in Psalm. 109*, P. L. 152, 1228). But he explains what is meant by Christ praying in heaven, when he says: "The Apostle here extols the act and the manifestation of the sacerdotal function in Christ even now; he disparages by contrast the efficacy of the ancient priesthood, when he says: Jesus can save forever: *himself approaching to God*, not by alien animal victims, but by Himself THE LIVING VICTIM offered on the altar of the Cross. Jesus, I say, *always living to make intercession for us* to the Father, BECAUSE HIS FLESH IS FOREVER IN HEAVEN TO THE END THAT BY ITS MANIFESTATION IT MAY BE AN EVERLASTING APPEAL TO THE FATHER ON OUR BEHALF" (*Expositio in Epist. ad Hebr.*, VII. 25. P.L. 153, 527). Further on, commenting on

intercession for us, can only mean that the intercession is made NOT BY WORD, but by presenting before the Father His obedience and humanity by the commemoration of the Passion [which is made in the Mass]".

IX. 11: "*Christ being come to the Father*, always living to make intercession for us by the presentation of Himself" (col 538), fittingly and completely the Saint explains the intercession of our Lord, as the eternal manifestation of the living Victim before the eyes of God in heaven.

Finally I quote William of St Theodoris, who says: "He intervenes for us as advocate, He who by His nature is able to intervene for us, He presents in a manner before God the Father, the Flesh which He assumed from us and for us." (*De corpore et sanguine Domini*, c. 10. P.L. 180, 358).

St Thomas agrees with the writers quoted where he says: "Christ entered into heaven to make intercession for us, as is said in *Hebr.*, VII. For this representation of Himself, through the human nature which He bore with Him into heaven, is intercession for us." (3. S. 57. 6). It is true that the holy Doctor in another place (*In Hebr.*, VII. lect. 4), having first said "He makes intercession for us, in the first place by presenting His humanity which He assumed for us," went on to add "Likewise by expressing the desire of His most holy Soul for our salvation, with which desire He makes intercession for us". But these words need cause no difficulty. In this last statement St Thomas does not introduce anything external to the intercession in act of the sacrifice, the significance

of which in any case is ever present to God. He merely wishes to point out clearly, that Christ who intercedes for us, by presenting Himself as Victim, is Christ the Victim who desires our salvation and does not conceal this desire but makes it manifest. But there is a very great difference between having this will and making this will known to God—a thing which none of our theologians has ever doubted—and the offering up of prayers and the pouring out of petitions. All this we exclude from Christ in heaven; the ancient writers rejected it, St. Thomas likewise expressly rejects it. *In Rom.*, VIII (lect. 7), he distinguishes and sets apart two things: on the one hand the actual petition of Christ on earth (Viator), and especially of Christ as offering the sacrifice, and on the other the desire of our salvation, which to the exclusion of petition, is now alone in keeping with Christ's state in heaven: "He is said to make intercession for us in two ways. In one way by praying for us, according to John XVII. 20: *Not for them (the apostles) only do I pray, but for them also who their word shall believe in me.* BUT NOW HIS INTERCESSION FOR US IS HIS WILL for our salvation (*John XVII. 24*) *I will that where I am, they also may be with me.* In another way He makes intercession for us by presenting in the sight of His Father THE HUMANITY ASSUMED FOR US, AND

THE MYSTERIES CELEBRATED IN THAT HUMANITY."

This is the teaching of antiquity, it is also the teaching of the Middle Ages. It is no surprise then to find Franciscus Sonnius, in the sixteenth century, criticising very sharply the opposite teaching of some later writers: "The blood sacrifice on the altar of the Cross is over and past, and as blood sacrifice it is no more repeated. BUT THAT REALITY WHICH IS OFFERED, which is Christ, LASTS FOREVER. *He hath an everlasting priesthood, always living to make intercession for us:* this means that He makes intercession BY PRESENTING HIMSELF AS HAVING SUFFERED DEATH IN THE PAST, BUT IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT HE SENDS UP PRAYERS IN HEAVEN TO THE FATHER, AS SOME IMPIOUSLY HOLD" (*Demonstratum religionis christianae*, lib. 2, tr. 3, cap. 14. Paris, 1547, fol. 61).⁴

⁴ A few years earlier, at Louvain, Ruard Tapper "who hated every novelty" (Hutter, 2, 1451) in controversy with the Protestants, had explained the intercession of Christ in a similar manner: "Christ OFFERS HIMSELF UNCEASINGLY TO GOD THE FATHER IN THE CHURCH TRIUMPHANT, ALWAYS LIVING TO MAKE INTERCESSION FOR US" (*Declaratio articulorum a veneranda Facultate Theologiae Lovanensi adversus nostri temporis Haereses, simul et earundem reprobatio*, per eruditissimum virum S. Paginae professorem D. Ruardum Tappaert . . . , Academiae Cancellarium Lugduni, 1554, p. 266).

Eleven years after Sonnius, the great Bartholomew a Medina quite as definitely rejects humble petitions from Christ in heaven, he retains only the efficacy of the Victim: "We say that Christ the Lord makes intercession with the heavenly Father for

In our own day Cardinal Franzelin (*De Verbo Incarnato*, p. 546-549) does indeed reject any and every kind of prayer which appeals to the mercy of God, but at the same time he attributes to Christ in heaven prayer of some kind, based on the merits of the Redemption. The eminent theologian is surely inconsistent. In the matter of merit appeal is made to justice; but appeal to justice is not petition. For the claim for the payment of a debt never will be and never can be called a prayer in the proper sense. For even when prayer is not a petition for mercy on those who deserve punishment, it does at least imply some liberality towards those who have not deserved it, should the petition be granted; because petition is for something freely bestowed, otherwise it is not prayer at all. Hence we must admit, that Christ now in heaven makes intercession with God on the ground of justice (for in heaven now there is no exinanition, no humiliation of the Incarnation, Christ is in glory).

We must even say that He makes intercession in heaven, not as praying, but as making known His will; not as a suppliant before God, but as one using the power of God as

us, not that He now offers humble petitions on bended knees. He makes intercession for us BY HIS VICTIM which is ever in the very presence of the Father, and the Father beholding It pardons our sins and bestows on us all the blessings necessary for salvation" (In 3 s. 57, 6 ed. Venet. 1602, fol. 681).

His own power;⁵ not as imploring mercy, but as bestowing it; not as a petitioner for grace, but as the Lord dispensing glory and pardon. For just as in heaven, He who issues commands with the Father, does not command the Father, so He who is entreated with the Father, does not Himself entreat the Father. Neither does He appeal on our behalf to God the Holy Ghost, whom He together with the Father pours out upon us, for Christ Himself is God. He does all this not only by a natural right as He is God, but also by an acquired right, acquired not only by the Incarnation but also accruing to Him by way of the Passion, by reason of which, as we have seen, Jesus was crowned with honour and glory. When we say therefore that Christ appeals to God for mercy towards man on the ground of justice, we mean that Christ Himself lavishes on us the riches of God's mercy, which have been made His own. "The Lord therefore makes intercession for us, not by word but by mercy" (Gregory the Great). That is to say, God heard the cry of our Victim penetrating the heavens, where Christ being consummated, does not exert Himself, so to speak, to secure our reconciliation, but having found it, imparts it to us. *He*

⁵ Herein lies the principal distinction between the mediation of Christ and the mediation of Mary. She is rightly called "omnipotentia SUPPLEX".

became to all that obey him, the cause of eternal salvation. For in the place of the prayers which our Pontiff offered once by His sacrifice on earth to God, there now remains the blessing of our Pontiff, namely the sending of the Holy Ghost (*Hebr.*, V. 6-10). In a word, the intercession of Christ is the eternal mediation of our Victim, as explained above.

B. DOES CHRIST ADORE IN HEAVEN?

Adoration is necessarily linked to prayer. Whoever must pray must adore. Christ certainly did adore on earth. He was in the form of a servant, through the temporary dispensation or economy by which it was necessary for Him to come in the form of sinful flesh (that is in the flesh subject to suffering and death), in order fitly to carry out the work of the Redemption. During this time the divinity was not yet made manifest, nor was the humanity totally translated into a divine condition, so that by the same miracle by which the uncreated nature was concealed, in His created nature He would be subject to certain obligations, or certain defects of mere humanity. He could, for instance, be afflicted by others, He could be assisted by God, He could be obedient, He could pray, He could adore. For the divine *Esse* which the Man Christ possessed, had not as yet exerted its full efficacy; although It

dwelt in the substance of the assumed humanity, nevertheless It had not yet blossomed into flower, so to speak, in all the branches of the faculties of that human nature. These defects were removed later, when, glory pouring into and sublimating all that was thus inferior in Christ, the Incarnation was crowned with its supreme perfection, and God Himself was made manifest in the very Flesh of Christ.⁶

⁶ In the Incarnation in which He was made Man, the Son of God truly emptied Himself (*exinanivit se* Phil., II. 7). But His exinanition did not consist precisely in His being made Man (in heaven He is now Man, and there is no state of exinanition: for all the Fathers say with St Paul, that the economy of exinanition has now ceased). The exinanition actually consisted in this: that in His human nature He deprived Himself of all that was connaturally due to Him as God. For although the Man Christ was God and Lord of glory, nevertheless He was not found in the glory of God and of the Lord, but in the condition of an ordinary human being, with the status of servant or slave; not reigning with the Father, but subject to Him like other men; subject indeed to God and the representatives of God, but also subject to the Law, which nevertheless *was set because of transgressions . . . being ordained by angels* (Gal., III. 19). Sent into the world *in the likeness of sinful flesh* (Rom., VIII. 3), He took upon Himself all the disgrace of sin (sin only and the concupiscence which is the material element of sin, excepted),—corruptibility, passibility, mortality: SO MUCH SO THAT FOR HIS OWN PROTECTION AND WELFARE, HE WAS IN NEED OF GOD AND THE ASSISTANCE OF GOD (we see this in the sacerdotal prayer particularly, and in the agony in the Garden). For He so humbled Himself, that though all glory and power and domination was due to Him, nevertheless seeing that by this economy of exinanition,

It is in this sense that St Ambrose speaks of Christ: "Then Man according to the flesh, now in all things God" (*De excessu fratris sui*

He deprived Himself of all this, it was possible for Him to merit it, and to pray that it be granted to Him. True, in His very innermost Soul, the seat of the beatific vision, His glory was as the glory of the Only-Begotten; but it was absent from all the inferior activities of the Soul, and still more so from the external and internal senses.

It is the complexus of these activities and powers that make man a social being: because the things that are known by way of the beatific vision alone, are known after the manner of the divine essence, hence they cannot be the subject of thought, after the manner of inferior cognition, which is by way of analogy, and much less can they be expressed after the manner of men, that is uttered into the air. Hence as far as human intercourse is concerned, such things are unknown and unknowable (Mark XIII. 22): unless later by the help of infused knowledge, they are reduced and translated into human concepts. How this is to be done (in the absence of accidental glory), rests with God. Let us suppose then that a person were to be endowed with essential glory only; such a person would in no way transcend the human order or the infirmity of our fallen nature, in matters that pertain to human intercourse and social life. Christ on earth was in this state. Just as He was deprived of the divine perfection of His humanity, subservient to the Father, lower than the angels, and a debtor to the Law, so too He was under obligation to adore, He needed to pray, until the time when He should pass into the state of blessedness, of glory, of incorruptibility, taking His place as Son, that is as Lord, where the Word made Flesh now untarnished by any mark of servitude or humility, inglorious in no part of His humanity, is equal in the effulgence of His glory to God and the Father; so that now His glory is according to the whole man, the glory as of the Only-Begotten, as of God.

Satyri, l. 2, n. 91. P.L. 16, 1341). And Prosper, or if not Prosper some contemporary of his, author of the poem *De divina providentia*: "Up to now, O Jesus, we knew thee in what is ours, from now what is ours has passed into thine own" (vers. 542-543. P.L. 51, 629).

So we see with what good reason St Peter said that Jesus, by ascending into heaven and sitting at the right hand of the Father, was made by God both "Christ" and "Lord": *God has made both Christ and Lord this same Jesus whom you crucified* (*Acts II. 36*). Rightly he says that He was then made Lord, because then the divine condition prevailed over all. Rightly too he says that He was then made Christ, because it was then that the unction or the chrism of the divinity, descended from the crown of the Nazarite,⁷ that is the consecrated one, and, so to speak, ran down to the hem of His garment; the glory of the Only-Begotten being now no longer shrouded or dimmed by the veils of His human Soul or Body.

The teaching of St Paul is an echo of the words of St Peter— He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even unto the death of the Cross, for which cause, after

⁷ Wellhausen (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III, 1, 1887, p. 116-118) and Smend (*Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, 2, 1889, p. 93-96) have written much that is useful on the Nezerim, all of which may be applied to Christ, as under obligation to God, by the most sacred tie of the sacrificial vow.

His death, Jesus was proclaimed "Lord" (*Philip. II. 6-11*).⁸ Thomas-

sinus (*De Incarn. Verbi Dei*, l. 8, c. 11) cites other Scripture pas-

⁸ For the name which is above every name given to Jesus in reward for His obedience and death, would appear to be not the name "Jesus" but the name "Lord," for the following reasons:

First, we find no early writer interpreting St Paul in these words, as of the name *Jesus*. See Chrysostom, Theodoretus, St. Thomas in h.l.

Second, the Son of God had already the name *Jesus* before His death. Hence it was not given to Him after His death, and it was not given to Him because of His death. It might be said that the name was given to Him in the Circumcision in reward for His already foreseen obedience. St Paul however gives no indication of such interpretation, which would be mystic in the extreme, and foreign to the direct simple mentality of the Apostles: it savors of a much later period.

Third, the actual words of the Apostle in the *Epistle to the Philippians* are in St Paul's language, or at least the language which he wrote—the Greek: God gave Him *the* name, not *a* name. Hence the verse should not run: "God gave Him *a* name which is above every name" (as Prat, *Théologie de Saint Paul* translates it), but "God gave him *the* name which is above every name" (Crampon). God therefore did not give Jesus Christ *a* name which eventually would be above every name; He gave Him that name which in itself is above every name. Now except the name of God, there is no such name (and with the Hebrews there was no such name), and St Paul usually gives the name of God to the Father. The only other name was the name of Lord, which St Paul usually gives to Christ.

Fourth, in the Greek, we find the verb corresponding to the English *is* omitted. Translating the Greek word for word, and omitting the *is* to be absolutely exact, the English version would run: Every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father. The preposition corresponding to *to* above is the Greek *eis* = unto or towards, or *for* or *to* denoting

unto, not *en* = in. Hence the translation as given in the Vulgate or Douay version: *Every tongue should confess that the Lord is in the glory of the Father* does not appear to be correct. Let us see then (giving full value to the Greek preposition *eis* not *en*) where the verb *is* should be understood. The Greek idiom would make it strange to omit it rather than express it, before the preposition *eis*. However let us try it so: *Confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is to (or for) the glory of the Father*. Of course this would give sense, but it would be something in the nature of a theological platitude. Put the verb *is* after Lord, and between Lord and Jesus Christ, corresponding to a Greek idiom, in which the verb is so understood, and we have: *Confess that the Lord is Jesus Christ for the glory of God the Father*. This gives complete sense adequate in every way. Hence we take it that *is* must be understood between Lord and Jesus Christ, not elsewhere. Therefore we conclude that this name *Lord* is the name above every other name given to Jesus Christ by the Father, so that when the name of Jesus is uttered, every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord, and this confession would redound to the glory of God the Father. "Yes, indeed, let all say this, and it is the glory of the Father" Thus Chrysostom in h.l. P.G. 62, 234; Theodoretus echoes the words of Chrysostom, in h.l. P.G. 82, 572. And before them Didymus had written in his *Enarratio in Epist. S. Petri*, P. G. 39, 1770: "Let every tongue confess for the glory of God the Father, that Jesus is the Lord".

Fifth, as confirming our interpretation we may consider a parallel instance in *I. Cor., XII. 3*: *No man can say the Lord Jesus but by the Holy Ghost* (so the phrase runs word for word in the Greek). Plainly the meaning is: No man can say Jesus *is* the Lord but in the Holy Ghost. Compare also *II, Cor., IV. 5* where the Lord is used attributively, as also is *servants*: *For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord* (i.e.

sages which were explained in this sense by many of the Fathers.

When we considered the teaching of the Fathers on the sacrifice and the prayer of Christ, we saw that to attribute humiliation, prostration at the feet of the Father, creaturely adoration, to the celestial Christ our Redeemer, was absolutely repugnant to them. For He has entered into His glory, though He still retains His full humanity. Christ our Redeemer "Priest of the eternal sacrifices, eternal Ruler of the eternal kingdom" (Tertullian) is God, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, the single object of vision, glorification and adoration.

C. THE STIGMATA OF THE PASSION.

The scars made in His sacred Body which Christ bore with Him into heaven as marks of the Passion throw a further light on Christ's manifestation of His humanity in heaven, its mode and its intercessory character. For as Thomassinus (*De Incarn.*, 10, 13) writes:

as our Lord) and ourselves your servants (as your servants) through Jesus.

As far as the sense is concerned our interpretation fully accords with the words of Chrysostom (loc. cit.): "Christ humbled Himself to the most abject obedience, hence He received supreme glory. He became a servant: for which cause He is absolute Lord of the angels and of the world." Later we shall have more to say on this subject, when we treat of the filiation of Christ, as receiving in a certain sense an increment in the Resurrection.

"Again from another point of view it will be plain to us, that the priesthood of Christ is not inactive or idle in heaven, rather it is active and never without the exercise of the sacerdotal office, if we observe the scars of His wounds still fresh, as the marks of a victim just immolated, and that the Body marked with these scars has the very form and fashion of an eternal Victim". It is the established teaching of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, that Christ keeps forever the scars of the wounds in His Flesh.⁹ Various special reasons have been assigned for the retention of the wounds. Thus St Ambrose (*In Luc.* XXIV. 35-39. P.L. 15, 1846): "He preferred to bear into heaven the wounds received for us, rather than

⁹ Thomassinus (*ibid.*) in this connection quotes Cyril of Alexandria (*In Joann.*, XX. and *Epist.* 41. P.G. 74, 728-729 and 77, 216), Ambrose, Augustine (*Epist.* 102, n. 7. P.L. 33, 373), Guitmund and Ernardus, while at the same time embellishing their words with excellent comments of his own.

Thomassinus could have headed his list with St Gregory Nazianzen (*Or.* 45 in *S. Pascha*, 25. P.G. 36, 675). Cyril of Alexandria follows him almost literally. Possibly the earliest of all the testimonies is that in the *Epistola Apostolorum* (probably between A.D. 160 and 170) which puts on the lips of the Lord these words: "Until I return to the Father with my wounds" (Guerrier trans. P.O. 9, 199; compare ed. C, Schmidt, T. u. U., 43, 56); this, provided we accept the Ethiopic in preference to the Coptic text of the *Epistola*, in which the words at this place are rather different, and, I think, more suited to the sequence of thought and to the context generally.

remove them: SO THAT HE MIGHT SHOW THEM TO GOD THE FATHER AS THE PRICE OF OUR FREEDOM. This the Father places at His right hand, embracing the trophies of our Redemption."

The teaching of Bede (*In Luc.* XXIV. 40. P.L. 92, 630) on this subject influenced later writers.¹⁰ Christ is in glory with His wounds "so that as a suppliant before the Father for us, He may show for all eternity the kind of death He underwent for the life of man". Thus Bede writes that He supplicates through His wounds: Guitmund of Aversa (*De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate.* 1, 2. P.G. 149, 1460) that by His wounds He intercedes for us: "But even now also interceding for us, even this very day showing His Body with the wounds, He manifests Himself as the One who was born, who died, who rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven for us". Sicard of Cremona (*Mitræle*, 1, 3, c. 6. P.L. 213, 232) very concisely: "Showing the wounds He makes intercession to the Father for us". Meanwhile Ernaldus Bonaevallensis¹¹ in his work

¹⁰ For instance, the author of the *Sacramentarium* (c. 90 P.L. 172, 796) and St. Thomas (3 S. 54, 4) make the words of Bede their own.

¹¹ Guibert de Nogent, as far as I know, appears to be the only one who denied that the "gaping scars" of the wounds remain in Christ in heaven: "Say that the wounds were retained after the Resurrection, and are retained even now, what is the significance? To remind the Father, like a forgetful man, of the dispensation accepted by Christ, for

De cardinalibus operibus Christi (c. 4. P.L. 189, 1631) had written more fully on this subject: "In all things the Father was well pleased with the Son, nor was any trace of the serpent found in Him, and God did not repent of His priesthood, because THE SACRIFICE WHICH HE OFFERED ON THE CROSS IS SO ACCEPTABLE TO THE GOODNESS OF GOD, seeing that its virtue lasts forever, THAT THE OFFERING IS NO LESS ACCEPTABLE IN THE SIGHT OF THE FATHER TODAY, than it was on the day when Blood and water issued from His pierced side, AND THE WOUNDS RETAINED IN THE BODY FOR ALL TIME DEMAND THEIR PRICE, WHICH IS THE SALVATION OF MAN, and demand too the reward of obedience."

Clearly then the teaching on the retention of the scars in the celestial Christ was commonplace with the writers of the Middle Ages. At the same time, we may not think that Christ is formally in the condition

the benefit of mankind? Even admitting the fitness of some reminder, surely the Flesh alone without the wounds, there at His right hand, would remind the Father. He has providential care of other things, has He not of this also? . . . What will the wound in His side, the marks of the nails on His hands, matter to you, when the sign of the Son of Man will appear on the last day? In the throne of glory, why the horror of the five wounds? Do you think that when (after the Resurrection), He distributed food and drink to His disciples with His own hands, there remained in those hands the gaping wounds dripping with blood? It is the height of absurdity." (*De pignoribus sanctorum*, 1, 3, c. 4. P.L. 156, 661).

of Victim, simply by the visible relics of the wounds. No, the condition of Victim is retained by the glory whereby death was swallowed up in victory, as explained above. But as that very glory corresponded to the immolation, so now it sheds

all the more beauty on the wounds of Christ. Hence we say that Christ's state of victimhood is made resplendent by the stigmata; although even without the stigmata, that state would continue substantially the same.

§ 4. Conclusion On Various Teachings Regarding the Heavenly Sacrifice.

We have seen that the Body of Christ, offered at the Supper and immolated in the Passion, retains eternally the character of Victim which accrued to it from the sacrifice and was not abolished by the Resurrection but rather enhanced by the divine ratification and consummation—the Victim being now translated into the sanctuary of heavenly glory, where it obliges God in justice to Christ as Priest, to show mercy to us.

Bearing this in mind, we can now pass judgment on the various teachings bearing upon the celestial sacrifice. We know now that the word *sacrifice* may be taken in two senses: actively, when it signifies the sacrificial action in which the victim is sacrificed, and passively, signifying the victim sacrificed by that action. It seems to us that those authors err *by defect* who fail to realize the eternal continuance of the Victim, as Victim, (that is, of the sacrifice in the *passive* sense); while those err by excess who say that the sacrificial action (the sacrifice in the active sense) is eternal. For the sacrificial action is over, it remains only in effect, in that He who gave the Gift to God is faithful, and does not withdraw His gift from God, as though withdrawing Himself—the Gift—from the sanctuary of God, and so

making it profane. The Victim however (that is the passive sacrifice) continues formally, and furthermore it lasts in the very apex of its perfection. It was given over to God, it was accepted by God, and by His acceptance, God sanctioned and now eternally sanctions the gift contract.

Those therefore err *by defect* who simply overlook the eternal sacrifice, as a number of modern theologians do. More seriously do they err *by defect*, who explicitly reject the eternal sacrifice, so much so that with Lugo (*De mysterio incarnationis*, disp. 28, n. 33), they are naturally driven to the inference, that after the Judgment day, when the sacrifice of the Eucharist shall have ceased on earth, Christ is no longer truly Priest. Those also err *by defect* who, though verbally retaining the eternal sacrifice in heaven, say that the Victim formally as such is not eternal, but that equally with the blessed Christ adores God eternally.¹ Thus J. Grimal (*Le Sacerdoce et le sacrifice de N.S.J.C.*, 2e éd., p. 225-226, 248).²

¹ These erroneously by defect, since they deny to the celestial Christ the victimal condition, but also by excess, when they say that Christ adores. It is proper to Christ in heaven to be adored with the Father, not to adore with us. For the mediation of the consummated Victim precludes that *exinamition* which adoration implies, as we have seen.

² See the end of this chapter.

We now pass on to consider those views that err by excess. (The Socinian heretics admit of no sacrificial action of Christ on earth at all, any and every sacrificial activity must be in heaven. We shall not discuss this view; our concern is with the opinions of Catholic theologians). We may classify them in two schools. One, German especially, the other French. Between them there is this difference: that the German school leans more or less to the teaching that all the sacrificial activity of Christ is internal, at the same time it will not deny that these activities are shown outwardly by some bodily manifestation; the French school on the other hand rather insists on the sensible external condition of our sacrificial action.

Thalhofer (*Das Opfer des alten und des neuen Bundes mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den Hebräerbrief und die Katholische Messopferlehre*. Ratis., 1870, p. 210 foll).³ is the leader of the German school. He states expressly that the internal act of obedience in submitting to death is the sacrificial action. This act of obedience is eternally renewed in heaven (now manifest by the wounds, as by the torments in the past). Thus there is an active

³ Albert Stoeckl (*Das Opfer nach seinem Wesen und nach seiner Geschichte*, Mainz, 1861, p. 448, foll) said that the celestial Christ by some act offers to God His past death, adding some prayers.

continuance in heaven of this sacrifice.⁴ This also is more or less the view of J. T. Franz (*Die eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgien*, 2, p. 61-63, Grenoble 1880).⁵ Now these writers destroy the sacrificial action, precisely in so far as they make it internal. Because sacrificial action in its very substance is in the nature of a sign; but there is no sign unless it has an external *esse*.⁶ Hence the above theologians appear to err not only by excess in respect of the continuation of the sacrifice in heaven, but also and no less harmfully by defect in respect of the sacrificial character of the Redemption itself.

The French school on the other hand maintained that some kind of

⁴ But only until the day of judgment (p. 219). Thalhofer errs by defect in this last restriction, for thus he limits the real eternity of the sacrifice of the Redemption. Estius *In Hebr.*, VII. 17, and VIII. 2, assigned the same duration for the heavenly sacrifice.

⁵ Pell (*Noch ein Lösungsversuch zur Messopferfrage in Theologisch-praktische Monats-Schrift*, XVIII, 655-657) has lately taught the same. Just recently Max Ten Hompel (*Das Opfer als Selbsthingabe und seine ideale Verwirklichung im Opfer Christi*, Frib-i-, Brig., 1920, p. 147-149) has written in a similar strain.

⁶ For it is one thing to say that the oblation act is internal, although it happens to be made outwardly manifest; and quite another to say that the oblation act, as significative, is intrinsically constituted by an internal and external element taken together. These theologians appear to describe the oblation act in the first manner rather than in the second.

external offering of the Body of Christ is made perpetually in heaven. Thus in the compilation *L'idée du Sacerdoce et du Sacrifice de J-C*: (first part, parag. 3, n. 5, p. 37-38) a follower of Père de Condren writes: "What can He have to offer but what He offered once on earth, that is to say, the Victim of His own Body, the offering of which He RENEWS AND CONTINUES in heaven forever? The offering of Jesus Christ has not been so consummated and finished on earth, that it is no longer made in heaven; on the contrary, it only began here below, IN ORDER TO BE CONTINUED IN HEAVEN, where we find the perfection of sacrifice." "[Jesus Christ] only made the first offering of Himself here on earth, in order to make a second of Himself in heaven for the sins of men." (*ibid.* n. 8, p. 43). "Besides the first offering which Jesus Christ made of Himself here on earth unto death, to transfer to Himself and Himself to carry the penalty of our iniquities, we must still admit a second, which was made on the Ascension into heaven, and which He by Himself continues there forever . . . This oblation is, as it were, a commemoration of His death, accompanied by the sacerdotal prayer by which, as Pontiff of the true goods to come and as minister of the heavenly sanctuary, He prays God that satisfaction be imputed to us and applied for the remission of our offences, and for

our reconciliation with Him." (*ibid.*, n. 9, 45-56). A little further on however, the author appears to amend and prune his words (*ibid.*, n. 13, p. 50-52). Dom Olier similarly (*Explications des cérémonies de la grand'messe de paroisse*, Paris, 1858, p. 11-14, Cf. Lepin p. 201) "There is a sacrifice in paradise, which at the same time is offered on earth, since the victim who presents Himself here is borne upon the altar of heaven; and it differs in this ONLY that here he presents Himself under veils and symbols, and there HE IS OFFERED WITHOUT ANY VEIL." More explicitly even than his two patrons Dom Lepin says: "From the Soul of Christ in fact there arises unceasingly to His Father, the infinite homage of His reparative adoration . . . But Jesus Christ does not content Himself with this interior homage. He continues forever in heaven as paying the dues of religion for all creation, and as Mediator for man, to support his interior sentiment of religion on the basis of an OUTWARD AND SENSIBLE OBLATION of His sacred Body." (*L'idée du sacrifice dans la religion chrétienne*, 1897, p. 187).

These same writers either add to this offering, or they identify with it some kind of destruction or annihilation of Christ going on forever in heaven. Thus Lepin (*loc. cit.*): "Doubtless the humanity of the Saviour is no longer annihilated by humiliations and mortality; His

Body is no longer immolated under the blows and the torments of death: the time of actual expiation is no more. But His holy humanity continues to annihilate itself in the devouring fire of the divine glory" (*op. cit.*, p. 187, compare p. 158-159).⁷ Before Lepin, Dom Olier had said: "Not content with being immolated on Calvary and giving up His life there, seeing that there still remained something of the weak nature which He received from His Mother, He willed to consume it whole on the day of His Resurrection. Thus it is that He carries religion to the highest point to which it can go; for He does not sacrifice a portion of Himself only, He offers Himself in a manner so entire and so perfect, that there is nothing of Him left which is not consumed in the glory of His Father, and ANNIHILATED, so to speak, in that devouring fire of which it is said: *Our God is a consuming fire*. Perfect then was the religion of Jesus Christ, who ANNIHILATED HIS WHOLE SELF IN HIS FATHER" (*Traité des saints Ordres*, part. 3 ch. 5. Paris 1856).

Père de Condren himself is even

⁷ As a matter of fact we have seen how the Fathers speak of an annihilation in the celestial glory, not an annihilation of the human nature, but of the mortality of Christ: which mortality was a kind of annihilation (or *κένωσις*) of the Word. Hence by the heavenly glory, the *annihilation* of mortality was itself annihilated. This was the acceptance and the consummation of the sacrifice of Christ by the Father, and in no sense Christ's own sacrificial offering.

more daring. He pictures the celestial Christ to be in some kind of death or immolation, so to speak: "In order to understand how Christ is in a state of death in heaven . . . it must be borne in mind that death is the privation of the present life; that when Jesus Christ rose from the dead, He remained in the PRIVATION of this same mortal and passible life (seeing that He then received another life—immortal, impassible, glorious), and that consequently He is and will be eternally in the privation of the present life, and consequently also in some manner in the state of death" (*op. cit.*, part. 2, n. 26; compare part 3, n. 37, *Perfection de L'IMMOLATION et de l'inflammation dans le ciel*, p. 231-235).

We can see well enough why these writers were led to evolve some kind of destruction. For since they would not allow that that formal oblation which they attributed to Christ should be made in heaven, as ours is made on earth, by some sacrament or sign of immolation already past (seeing that sacraments are excluded from heaven); and since without immolation, there could not be sacrifice (Lepin, *op. cit.*, p. 61-65. Condren, part 2, n. 1 and 2, p. 53-57): they were forced to the conclusion that Christ was offered in heaven by some kind of new immolation or destruction: and this, since destruction of His glory is impossible, had to be

destruction by His glory. In all this, apart from the false notion of a continued formal offering, which we have shown to be untenable, these theologians are deluded in the identity they have invented between the character of immolation (or destruction) and the glorification or consummation of the Victim. For glorification has in no sense the character of immolation, nor consummation the character of destruction; rather it implies the accretion of ultimate perfection to the Victim, and the apex of its vivification. Furthermore the change from corruptible to incorruptible, or the casting off of incorruptibility, which they falsely allege continues still in heaven, is not the work of the priest OFFERING THE SACRIFICE, but the work of God ACCEPTING IT.⁸ Thus

⁸Note how carefully St Maximus of Turin distinguishes between the parts played by God and by the priest in this matter: "For in the mystery of the Incarnation, Mary bore the Priest in her womb as in a sanctuary. For what was to come into this world was wholly from her womb: God, Priest and Victim: GOD OF THE RESURRECTION, PRIEST OF THE OFFERING. We see all this in Christ. For He is God because He returned to the Father; Pontiff because He offered Himself; Victim because He was slain for us". It belongs to His priesthood, then, that Christ offered Himself, as the Victim of the Passion. It belongs to His Godhood, not His Priesthood that He arose from the dead and returned to the Father. Although the Fathers have also taught that His Priesthood was ratified, and His sacrifices consummated, in that He rose to a glorious life, and was taken up to the throne of God by the power of the divinity.

no character of *immolation* or *offering* (which must necessarily proceed from him who offers sacrifice and not from Him to whom it is offered) attaches to this change; it has the character simply of a taking up to God, by which the Incarnation reached its ultimate effect (by virtue of the sacrifice offered). Hence it is said: *This day I have begotten thee*. For this was the day of birth not of death, of increase not of detriment; the day which the Lord hath made, taking the gift to Himself; not the day which the liturgus made, still further destroying the victim.

Thomassinus in a manner may be listed with this school; more than once he overstresses the concept of a heavenly offering: "A permanent not an intermittent victim CHRIST DID NOT OFFER, BUT HE DOES [NOW] OFFER" (*op. cit.*, l. 10, c. 11, n. 10); in the Resurrection he sees a kind of slaying and immolation: "Sacred Scripture has given names to the Resurrection which present to us every appearance of sacrifice. For it is called regeneration. But is it possible for one to be born again and regenerated without the destruction and the slaying of the former substance? EVIDENTLY ONE WHO IS BORN AGAIN BECOMES UNBORN,⁹ ONE WHO IS BORN AGAIN DIES,

⁹In this view, apart from other difficulties, we should note how illusory it is to see in the actual Resurrection of Christ a change of life. (*Becomes unborn, dies*) Three days

ONE WHO RISES AGAIN IS SLAIN . . . Change of any kind is death . . . ; hence the greatest and the most absolute change, such as is wrought by the Resurrection, is likewise the greatest and the most absolute death . . . Sacrifice of any kind is a change of the victim; there are two kinds of change, one of decrease, the other of increase, . . . the fullest possible change of the whole man is made by the Resurrection, a change by which only defectibility decreases, one by which the soul advances, and the body advances to a form or perfection ineffably nobler than the former. By this therefore the sacrifice will be more pleasing and more appropriate to God" (*ibid.*, c. 14, n. 9).¹⁰

The common objection against both these conflicting schools, and it is unanswerable,¹¹ is as follows:

had elapsed since the former life was destroyed by a very real immolation, afterwards the only change that occurs in the Resurrection itself is the change from non-life to the perfection of life.

¹⁰ A few Anglicans maintain the same kind of eternal sacrifice whereby the glorious life of Christ is offered to God. They say that the sacrifice of the Church is the Eucharistic offering, united and subordinate to this. Thus Milligan, *The Heavenly Priesthood*, p. 266, in Hastings, D.B. 4, 347.

¹¹ The teaching of Cardinal Cienfuegos, I fear, only multiplies the difficulties of both schools: "We say that at the end of the world, there will still remain THE TRUE AND ETERNAL SACRIFICE TO BE CELEBRATED IN THE STRICTEST SENSE by OUR High Priest in His proper species . . . This is to be performed by the reproduction of the same internal act of Christ the Lord, or of the sacrificial

either this sacrificial action, which according to both schools continues on forever, is part of the sacrificial work by which Christ proposed to merit our Redemption, or it is separate from it, being another sacrificial offering made by Christ. If it is part of the sacrifice of our Re-

act whereby He now immolates and offers Himself upon an unbloody altar, and whereby He immolated Himself in sacrifice on the Cross, and which particularly constitutes the sacrifice . . . And so we say THAT THIS SACRIFICIAL ACTION WILL COMMAND FOR THAT STATE OF SACRIFICE THE SUSPENSION OF ALL LIFE TO THE PHYSICAL BODY OF CHRIST THE LORD, OR LIFE DEPENDING ON THE BODY IN ANY WAY, THAT IS, OF ALL LIFE WHICH ACTUALLY PREEXISTS (though nevertheless there will not be in any way a suspension of the beatific vision and other independent acts of the Body of Christ). On this condition however, that in the same moment this sacrificial action will command in place of those other acts the production of other corporeal activities, all of which have for their end the divine honour, so that the Soul and the Heart and the Flesh rejoice in the living God, and most sweetly sing His praise etc.

One existing act, however, this command does not sacrifice, although in a manner it depends on the Body; that is to say, His actual power to command (for this is a sacrificial action, it must be that of Christ the Lord as Priest and Man); though this is done on the Cross and on the altar, on which accordingly the sacrifice is not completed, except in the following instant. The reason for the difference arises from the fact that the act in this sacrifice must positively induce outward acts of praise, and for this reason must continue through every instant of the sacrifice" (*Vita abscondita*, disp. 7, sect. 1. parag. 2, n. 9, p. 512-513). Some light will be thrown on these words of Cienfuegos, when we consider what he has to say on the sacrifice of the Mass.

demption, we are faced with the calamitous conclusion that we are not yet redeemed, for the simple reason that our redemption is not yet completed (compare Renz, *op. cit.*, p. 404); if it is separate from it, then notwithstanding the all-sufficiency of the one offering of Christ, so insistently stressed in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, to that one offering we must add another, also made by Christ Himself,—if indeed we must not even substitute this other for it, which is unthinkable.¹² In support of such theories it may not be objected that the Eucharistic offering itself is by all Catholics superadded to the offering of Christ Himself on earth, for, as will be shown later, when Christ offers the Eucharistic sacrifice through us, His oblation is not new. What is new is our own present action, when, in the Mass, as members of Christ, we partake of the offering with which Christ our Head offered once and forever the Victim of His own Body and Blood. Hence there is no parity be-

tween the offering of the Mass and a new heavenly offering on the part of Christ.¹³

¹² Prat (*Théologie de saint Paul*, I, 6, c. 2, parag. 3, Paris, 1908, p. 536): "Or they may see in the two actions, two distinct sacrifices, and without denying the efficacy of the sacrifice of the Cross, they imagine that there is also a heavenly sacrifice different from the other in the manner of offering, somewhat as the Eucharist differs from the sacrifice in blood on Calvary; but this new opinion, suspect for its very novelty, has not the slightest foundation in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*". Indeed the *Epistle* absolutely excludes it.

¹³ Upon this head we have, in the present work, cited a number of passages from the Fathers where they ascribe to Christ in heaven some kind of offering of a victim. They use the words *offering*, *oblation*, and such like. Gregory the Great more than once speaks even of immolation in heaven. But as we have already said, immolation and offering are often used interchangeably. However that virtual oblation which we hold sufficiently covers the passages from the Fathers. Moreover presentation, whereby a thing is made present to God, is very closely akin to oblation or offering. But there is a very real difference between that presentation in which Christ manifests Himself to God, by simply abiding with Him who has already received Him, and the sacrificial offering in which a thing is handed over to God and received by Him. But what the Fathers attributed to the celestial Christ is the presentation of something already offered in the past, and not the offering of something to be made sacred. Generally this is clear from their teaching on the one unique sacrifice of our Lord, and especially from their deliberate exclusion of any liturgical ministrations whatever as performed by Christ in heaven. In a word, to say that Christ offers in heaven is the same as to say that Christ is in heaven, the Victim, the offering (in the passive sense) or the reality offered. This is undoubtedly true, though no oblation is performed in heaven, this action having been performed in the past. Even Vasquez in his *Paraphrasis* on Hebr., IX. 24, has no difficulty in admitting and teaching the presentation of Christ in heaven, understood in the same sense, for he writes: "Christ entering into heaven does not offer sacrifice, He does not pray anew, He merely appears and presents continually to the Father without new prayers the ancient offering of Himself made in this world."

Because of the relation between the type and the antitype, there is something very similar worth noting in the entrance of the pontiff to the holy of holies, *not without*

We therefore reject the teaching of these two schools and follow a middle course. We say that there is no formal continuation or renewal of the active offering of Christ in heaven; but that there is a virtual duration of that active offering, consisting in this: that by virtue of His offering, one in time and valid for eternity—because since Christ gives irrevocably, God accepts eternally—¹⁴ Christ remains forever Theophyte—sacred to God.¹⁵

blood which he offereth for himself and for the people's ignorance (Hebr., IX-7). Here although St. Paul says that the blood is offered within the veil, nevertheless as B. Weiss (*Der Brief an die Hebräer*, p. 215) justly remarked, it is not the carrying of the blood to the propitiatory, or the sprinkling of the blood on it, that constituted the sacrificial offering, but all that was subsequent to the sacrifice, which had already been enacted outside the propitiatory.

¹⁴ St John Chrysostom, I think, has stated this with greater clearness than the other Fathers. For on the one hand, he shows Christ ascending into heaven "with the sacrifice that can appease the Father" that is, with the sacrifice offered on earth; and on the other, he shows the Father taking the sacrifice to Himself with joy: "Therefore He bore the first fruits of our nature to the Father; and the Father was so well pleased with the gift, because of the dignity of the offerer and the purity of what was offered, that receiving the gift from His own hands, and placing it close beside Himself, He said: *Sit thou at my right hand*" (*Sermo in Ascensionem D.N.J. C.*, n. 3. P.G. 49, 464).

The passage is quoted by Leo the Great, writing to the Emperor Leo, together with other testimonies which are collected at the end of the Epistle 165 (P.L. 54, 1183). We priests recite it in the II. Nocturn on Monday within the Octave of the Ascension.

Hence we see how we can offer Christ in the sacrament as our Victim. For in the first place, had not Christ made the active offering of Himself in the past, we could not offer Him now, because our sacerdotal power is simply a participation in, and an instrument of, the priesthood of Christ. Secondly, did not the Body of Christ immolated in the past, and the Blood shed in the past, remain sacred to God, we could not have in the sacrament a true sacrifice, for we would not have a true victim. For we cannot make Christ a victim by the sacra-

¹⁵ Among modern theologians the best explanation of this teaching is given by M. J. Scheeben (*Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, vol. 3, Frib-i-B., 1882, n. 1496, p. 445): "Hence the heavenly offering of the sacrifice of the Cross comprises an exhibition or presentation of the same, in which the sacrifice persists, not indeed as a formal act, but virtually (and this as regards its internal and external constituent). Hence the *victima immolata* (the immolated Christ) persists as that which it has become by the immolation, a holocaust consumed by the divine fire in the odor of sweetness, and this in the most vivid and convincing manner, as though the immolation were just now completed; in which condition too it possesses all the worth and sanctity with which it was clothed in the very instant of the immolation". Hence what the author had said a little previously (*ibid.*, p. 444) "We must rather consider the act of sacrifice which took place on the Cross, that is the willing surrender and immolation of the Victim which took place there, as an act which endures"—must be carefully interpreted in harmony with the passage quoted above, and with the whole of the subsequent number 1499.

ment really, but only symbolically;¹⁶ in spite of the fact that He becomes truly present by the consecration. Thus in that event we should offer in the reality of the Flesh and Blood, present under the species, the likeness of a victim but not a victim. We know however that in the Mass we do offer a victim, and that our sacrificial action is sacramental or representative, in such manner however as to be real. How is this if not because in the sacramental immolation we really offer Christ in a sensible manner (i.e. under the species) as one who (in virtue of His own offering of Himself to the immolation of the Passion) abides as sacred to God for all eternity? This is not to make Christ a victim, but to make of the Victim of our High Priest the Victim of His people,

¹⁶ The reason of course is, as we have repeatedly said, that Christ is not offered to a real immolation (as Christ offered Himself to a real immolation in the Supper) by our symbolical immolation. Therefore take away from Christ His enduring condition of immolation, and you will find in our consecration no element in virtue of which Christ could be called a true victim.

whom Christ has commissioned to be priests to God and the Father; He who is Victim does not need to be made Victim; but He who is His own Victim is made ours, as will be explained in its proper place.¹⁷

¹⁷ J. Grimal in the third edition of his work (mentioned above) forcefully asserts this intrinsic condition of immolation of Christ in heaven (p. 191). Hence I cannot see why he later (p. 242) reduces the whole reality of this condition to something intentional on our part, or juridical, resting on the merits of Christ, neither of which is inherent to Christ as real form. Meantime (p. 192) he maintains that Christ the Lord still adores in heaven, because such adoration is essential to every rational creature, such as undoubtedly is the humanity of Christ. But surely it is the person not the nature that adores, and in this case the person could adore by the dispensation of the Incarnation, as long as on the part of the created nature hypostatically united to it, it was on the way to the proper glory of the Only-Begotten, which it has now in the created nature itself. For the time of annihilation has passed, that time during which Christ was in the condition of servant, clothed with the livery of a servant. Now however He is seated in His entirety at the right hand of God, He is in the proper condition of Lord, now in no point inglorious, passible, or mortal, or *in the likeness of sinful flesh*. "Verily become servant, He did not remain servant" (Chrysostom, cited above).

**THE MYSTERY
OF FAITH**

THE MYSTERY OF FAITH

BOOK II:
THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH

By
Maurice de la Taille, S.J.

LONDON AND NEW YORK
SHEED AND WARD
1950

FIRST PUBLISHED 1950
BY SHEED AND WARD, LTD.
110/111 FLEET STREET
LONDON, E.C.4

NIHIL OBSTAT: EDUARDUS MAHONEY, S.T.D.
CENSOR DEPUTATUS

IMPRIMATUR: E. MORROGH BERNARD
VIC. GEN.

WESTMONASTERII, DIE 13A FEBRUARII, 1950

This translation is by Archpriest Joseph Carroll
assisted by Rev. P. J. Dalton, S.J.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY PURNELL AND SONS, LTD.
PAULTON (SOMERSET) AND LONDON

CONTENTS

BOOK II: THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I

OUR LORD'S INSTITUTION OF OUR SACRIFICIAL OFFERING OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD

	PAGE
§ 1. The Institution of the Rite	3
§ 2. The Institution of the Rite as Sacrificial	23
A. OUR OFFERING OF THE PASSION OF OUR LORD	23
(A) THIS OFFERING PROVED FROM THE WORDS OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE RITE	23
(B) THE SAME OFFERING CONFIRMED BY THE TEACH- ING OF ST. PAUL ON THE SACRIFICES TO IDOLS	26
(C) THE SAME PROVED FROM THE WORDS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS CONCERNING PARTAKING FROM OUR ALTAR	27
B. OUR OFFERING OF THE CELESTIAL VICTIM	32

APPENDIX

*It is most probable that the Apostles were not given the Power of
Celebration during the Three Days of Death.*

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY FATHERS AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL SACRIFICE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST

§ 1. Irenaeus and Origen	44
A. IRENAEUS	44
B. ORIGEN	52
§ 2. Ignatius, Justin, Hippolytus, Tertullian	56
A. IGNATIUS	56
B. JUSTIN	60

	PAGE
C. HIPPOLYTUS	64
D. TERTULLIAN	65
§ 3. The Rest of the Fathers or Writers of the Same Period	70
A. CLEMENT OF ROME	70
B. THE DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES	72
C. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA	74
D. SAYINGS OF SOME OTHER APOLOGISTS	77

APPENDIX A

On John IV, 23.

APPENDIX B

Communion with Christ by Contemplation and by the Eucharist is One and Indivisible

APPENDIX C

Clement on the Partaking of the Blood of the Passion

CHAPTER III

ON THE RELATION OF THE MASS TO THE SACRIFICE
OF OUR LORD

§ 1. The Relation of the Mass to the Passion	96
A. THE PASSION IS OFFERED IN THE MASS	96
B. RECIPIENTS OF THE EUCHARIST PARTAKE OF THE SACRIFICE IN BLOOD	123
§ 2. The Mass in Relation to the Heavenly Sacrifice	139
A. DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN THE SACRI- FICIAL ACTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE VICTIM OF HEAVEN	140
(A) THE FATHERS ASSERT THAT WE OFFER THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE	140
(B) OUR SACRIFICE IS ENACTED ON CHRIST, THE HEAVENLY ALTAR	151
(i) <i>Testimony of the Theologians</i>	151
(ii) <i>Testimony of the Liturgies</i>	154

APPENDIX

The Prayer Supplices te rogamus

B. WE PARTAKE OF THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARISTIC FOOD . . .	PAGE 172
---	-------------

APPENDIX

The Teaching of St. Paul and St. John on Eucharistic Communion Compared

§ 3. The Relation of the Mass to Our Lord's Offering . . .	186
--	-----

CHAPTER IV

THE DIFFERENT OPINIONS AS TO WHAT MAKES THE MASS A TRUE SACRIFICE

§ 1. The True Reality of Our Offering	199
§ 2. The Proper Condition of Our Victim	202
A. ERRORS BY EXCESS	202
B. ERRORS BY DEFECT	216
C. ERRORS BY BOTH EXCESS AND DEFECT	219

CHAPTER V

THE FRUIT OF THE LEGITIMATE SACRIFICE

§ 1. The Opus Operatum of the Sacrifice Defined.	223
§ 2. The Amount of Propitiation Induced by the Mass	228
A. THE INTERVENTION OF THE OFFERERS OF THE MASS IN GENERAL	228
B. THE CHURCH AS OFFERER	233

APPENDIX

The Apostles could not Offer the Sacrifice before the Day of Pentecost

C. SPECIAL OFFERERS	246
(A) THE PRIEST AS OFFERER	246

	PAGE
(B) THE PERSON WHO GIVES A STIPEND AS OFFERER	254
(C) THE CONGREGATION WHO ASSIST AT MASS AS OFFERERS	260
D. COMPUTATION OF THE FRUIT OF THE MASS	269
(A) THE FRUIT OF ONE MASS SAID BY A MANDATE FROM A SINGLE MEMBER OF THE FAITHFUL	269
(B) THE INTRINSIC OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING AS MANY MASSES AS THERE ARE STIPENDS ACCEPTED	272
(i) <i>Several Stipends each Given by a Different Person</i>	272
(ii) <i>A Number of Stipends Given by One Person</i>	277

APPENDIX

Stipends of Concelebrants

§ 3. The Various Kinds of People who Receive the Fruit of the Mass	284
A. THE FAITHFUL BOTH LIVING AND DEAD	284
B. INFIDELS AND OTHERS OUTSIDE THE VISIBLE CHURCH	290
(A) THOSE OUTSIDE THE VISIBLE CHURCH ARE NOT COMPETENT TO SECURE FOR THEMSELVES THE FRUIT OF THE MASS BY GIVING A STIPEND FOR IT	290
(i) <i>Infidels</i>	290
(ii) <i>Heretics and Schismatics</i>	293
(iii) <i>Catechumens</i>	295
(B) NON-CATHOLICS AND THE FRUIT OF THE MASS BY WAY OF SUFFRAGE	298
(i) <i>Living Non-Catholics</i>	298
<i>The Divine Law</i>	
<i>The Law of the Church</i>	
(ii) <i>Dead Non-Catholics</i>	321
<i>Catechumens</i>	
<i>Infidels, Heretics, Schismatics</i>	
(C) REPENTANT EXCOMMUNICATED PERSONS ABSOLVED AFTER DEATH	336

CHAPTER VI

THE MASS OF A PRIEST CUT OFF FROM THE CHURCH
OR DEPRIVED OF HIS OFFICE

	PAGE
§ 1. The Meaning, the Importance, and the Scope of the Question	338
§ 2. Solutions of Catholic Doctors	341
1. ST. CYPRIAN	341
2. ST. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS	345
3. ST. JEROME	347
4. ST. AUGUSTINE	351
5. ST. PROSPER	354
6. ST. LEO THE GREAT	354
7. FAUSTUS OF RIEZ	356
8. ST. FULGENTIUS	356
9. PELAGIUS I	357
10. ST. GREGORY THE GREAT	361
11. ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA	362
12. ST. THEODORE OF STUDIUM	362
13. FLORUS OF LYONS	364
14. ST. PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS	364
15. GUIDO OF AREZZO	365
16. ST. PETER DAMIAN	367
17. ST. GREGORY VII AND HIS CIRCLE	370
(A) THE SACRAMENTS OF THE UNWORTHY	371
(B) THE SACRAMENTS OF SCHISMATICS	374
18. ST. ANSELM OF LUCCA	374
19. CARDINAL DEUSDEDIT	375
20. URBAN II	376
21. BERNOLD OF CONSTANCE	377
22. ALGER	377
23. HONORIUS OF AUTUN	378
24. HUGH OF ST. VICTOR	379
25. ROBERT PULLEN	379
26. RUPERT OF DIETZ	380
27. RADULPHUS FLAVIACENSIS	380
28. HUGH OF AMIENS	380
29. GERHOH OF REICHERSBERG	382

	PAGE
30. EPISTOLA DE SACRAMENTIS HAERETI- CORUM	386
31. GRATIAN	387
32. PETER LOMBARD AND OTHER COMPILERS OF SENTENTIAE	388
33. TRACTATUS DE SCHISMATICIS	389
34. PETER DE LA CELLE	389
35. INNOCENT III	390
36. WILLIAM OF AUXERRE	390
37. WILLIAM OF PARIS	390
38. LEADERS OF THE OLDER SCHOLASTICS	391
39. SCOTUS	392
 § 3. The Theological Solution of the Question	 394

CHAPTER VII

HOW THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS
IS CARRIED OUT

§ 1. The Sufficiency of the Consecration	402
§ 2. How the Consecration is Accomplished	410
A. THE EPICLESIS	411
(A) THE EPICLESIS IS NEITHER EFFICACIOUS NOR NECESSARY	411
(B) THE SUITABILITY OF THE EPICLESIS	419
(i) <i>The Position of the Epiclesis is Appropriate</i>	420
(ii) <i>The Invocation of the Divinity is Appropriate</i>	426

CONCLUSION

B. THE CONTEXT OF WORDS NEEDED FOR THE CONSECRATION	440
(A) THE FORMAL WORDS	440
(B) THE WORDS OF THE NARRATIVE	448
(C) INTERPELLATIVE WORDS, WORDS ADDRESSED TO GOD	464

THESES

- XVI. Christ instituted the Eucharistic rite to be celebrated by us. (Ch. I, §1, p. 3)
- XVII. Christ endowed the Eucharistic rite with the true character of a heavenly sacrifice to be offered by us. (Ch. I §2, p. 23)
- XVIII. The Fathers of the first two centuries knew that we offer to God in our celebration of the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ. (Ch. II, p. 42)
- XIX. The writings of the Fathers and Theologians of a later period prove copiously that we offer the Victim of the Passion in a sacramental commemoration of the Passion. (Ch. III, §1 A, p. 92)
- XX. Consequently, too, the Fathers teach that our eating of the Eucharistic Food is the partaking of the sacrifice in Blood. (Ch. III, §1 B, p. 123)
- XXI. Similarly, too, the Fathers and Doctors of the Church saw clearly that the heavenly sacrifice is offered to God in the Mass. (Ch. III, §2 A, p. 139)
- XXII. Consequently the Fathers understood that in the Eucharistic Communion we partake of the celestial sacrifice. (Ch. III, §2 B, p. 172)
- XXIII. Though Christ is the Priest of all our sacrifices, He does not elicit a new offering for each one of them. (Ch. III, §3, p. 186)
- XXIV. We fail to estimate rightly the Eucharistic sacrifice, if the Communion is included among the constitutive elements of the sacrifice, or if Christ is considered to be affected in our sacrifice with no intrinsic condition of victimhood, or if it is maintained that such a condition is given to Christ by our own sacrificial action. (Ch. IV, p. 197)
- XXV. We explain in what the fruit of the Mass, *ex opere operato*, consists; how it differs from the fruit of the sacraments *ex opere operato*; how it is limited. (Ch. V, §1-§2 A, p. 223)
- XXVI. The Church holds the chief place among the offerers of the Mass, and her devotion is the chief regulative measure of the fruits of the Mass. (Ch. V, §2 B, p. 233)
- XXVII. The celebrant, the person giving a stipend, the faithful assisting, contribute cumulatively to determine the value of the sacrifice. (Ch. V, §2 C, p. 246)

- XXVIII. Hence we see how the fruit of the Mass may be computed, and what must be thought about the obligation of celebrating as many Masses as there are stipends received. (Ch. V, §2 D, p. 269)
- XXIX. The faithful in this life obtain the fruit of the Mass both by way of personal quest and by way of suffrage, the faithful departed by way of suffrage only. (Ch. V, §3 A, p. 284)
- XXX. The sacrifice cannot be offered by infidels or by any others outside the visible society of the Church. (Ch. V, §3 B, (A), p. 290)
- XXXI. Nevertheless the sacrifice can be duly offered for all these while living; by way of suffrage, and can be beneficial to all of them respectively *ex opere operato*. (Ch. V, §3 B, (B) (i), p. 298)
- XXXII. It is lawful to make a special offering of the sacrifice for dead Catechumens, though it may not be so offered for departed non-Catholics, though (under certain conditions) these can be assisted by the offering of the Mass for the Dead in general. It can be offered specially and publicly after death for the repentant excommunicate who has been absolved from excommunication. (Ch. V, §3 B, (B), (ii), p. 321)
- XXXIII. The Mass of a priest cut off from the Church, or unauthorised to offer the sacrifice, is fruitful, not however without the co-operation of the Church. (Ch. VI, p. 337)
- XXXIV. The sacrifice is accomplished by the Consecration alone. The Epiclesis does not effect the Consecration, nor is it necessary for it, though it has been wisely instituted and is appropriately placed in the Liturgy. (Ch. VII, §1-§2 A, p. 401)
- XXXV. St. Thomas rightly and justly held that in the Consecration of the Blood certain words annexed to those which demonstrate the Blood are part of the form. On the other hand, Scotus rightly taught, that apart from the formal words, other narrative words are required, without which the former would not have, on our lips, the true sense. But it is not plain whether, besides the formal words and the narrative, other, interpellative words are or are not necessary. (Ch. VII, §2 B, p. 440)

For list of authorities with abbreviations see p. 475

BOOK II
THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I

OUR LORD'S INSTITUTION OF OUR SACRIFICIAL OFFERING OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD

THESIS XVI

§ 1. The Institution of the Rite

CHRIST not only celebrated the Supper ; He also commanded us to celebrate it. Both Sacred Scripture and the history of the Church make this ritual institution abundantly clear. Indeed up to the present time it has scarcely ever been denied by any heretics apart from a few more or less insignificant ones.¹

The first of these heretics that we meet are the Gnostic *Archontici*, who in the beginning and during the course of the fourth century, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.*, 40. P. G. 41, 680-684), attributed the origin of the Eucharist to a certain Sabaoth, prince or archon of the seventh sphere, God of the Jews and father of the devil. They were followed in the fifth and sixth century by those *Enthusiastae* who were called either *Massiliani*, this title having a semitic origin, or *Euchitae*, from the Greek. These assigned no value to anything spiritual except prayer. According to Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist.*, 1, 4, c. 10. P. G. 82, 1144), they held that there was nothing either harmful or useful in the Eucharist. Akin to these from the seventh to the ninth century, and even later, we find a Manichean group, the *Publiciani*, who said that Christ did not commit to us any celebration of the Eucharist other than the utterance of the words: *Take ye, eat, and*

¹ It is no surprise, therefore, to find, even back as far as the sixteenth century, the learned Matthaeus Galenus Vestcapellius writing in his work *De sacrificio missae commentarium* (c. 13, p. 159): "Judging at least from what I have heard or read, up to the present time, the Gospel (of the Last Supper), as given by the three evangelists and St. Paul, places the divine institution of these mysteries beyond all doubt in the mind of anyone." Suarez, however, writing about the same time, mentions several earlier writers who did deny the divine institution (*De sacramen.*, disp. 39, sect. 1).

drink, unaccompanied by any action on the bread or the chalice. For this we have the combined testimony of Photius (*Contra Manichaeos*, 1, 1, c. 19. P. G. 102, 56), Petrus Siculus (*Historia Manichaeorum*, c. 10. P. G. 104, 1256; *Sermo 3, adv. Manichaeos*, cols. 1348–1349), and Euthymius Zigabenus (*Panoplia*, tit. 24. P. G. 130, 1196). They were followed in the twelfth century by the *Bogomili*, in Greek the *Theophili*, who appeared first in Bulgaria and then spread over the rest of the Empire of Constantinople. According to Euthymius Zigabenus (*Panoplia*, tit. 27. P. G. 130, 1313), they held that the bread of the Supper enjoined on us by Christ was nothing more than the Lord's prayer in which we ask for our daily bread. The chalice was the last discourse of Christ after the Supper, in which our Lord left us His testament, so to speak: the *chalice* being the *new testament*. During the same period in France there flourished the heresy of the *Petrobrusiani*. These were mainly of Manichaean origin,¹ and from the letter of Peter of Cluny, written against them, we learn that they did not actually deny that the Eucharist was celebrated by Christ, though they said that He gave no power whatever to other men to celebrate it.²

All these early heretics, carried away by Manichaean or Gnostic preconceptions which led them to a hatred of the flesh, refused to admit that Christ commanded us to partake of His Flesh and Blood. They distorted the Scriptures as best they could, each one in his own sense. The attitude of modern opponents to the

¹ Shortly before, in the beginning of the eleventh century, the Synod of Arras under Gerard I of Cambrai was convoked against some Manichaeans who lived in northern France. Gerard thus describes their heresy: "They said that the mystery of baptism and the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord were null, and therefore to be rejected, unless administered merely for appearance sake" (*Geraldi epistola*. P. L. 142, 1270).

² The Council of London (A.D. 1382) also condemned the sixth among the ten heretical propositions of Wycliffe: "There is no foundation in the Gospel for the statement that Christ instituted the Mass" (Mansi, *Concil.*, 26, 696). We may note here that Luther, endeavouring to find a *via media* between the teaching of those earlier heretics and the teaching of Catholics, held that Christ did not give a command by the words *Do this*, but merely left it to the will of each one, saying: "as often as you do this, you shall do it in memory of me" (*D. Martin Luthers Werke*, kritische Gesamtausgabe, 6 Bd. Weimar 1888, p. 507, 7–10. *De captivitate babilonica Ecclesiae praeludium*). And again he wrote, in A.D. 1522: "Love is necessary and of strict obligation (*Die liebe ist eyn ding das seyn muss und soll*), but not so the reception of the sacramental species, but man may leave this aside and keep to the exact word of Scripture, for Christ has not ordered us to partake of the sacrament, but has left it free to anyone who wishes so to partake" (*Von beider Gestalt des sakraments zu nehmen*, in the same edition of Luther's works, bd. 10, 2, p. 30, 22–25, with the older form of spelling).

institution of Christ is quite as much vitiated by preconception as was the attitude of the earlier heretics.¹ For while the earlier writers would deny to Christ a human body like ours, the moderns, considering Him a man in the full sense, but denying His divinity, would have it that, since Christ was a mere man, He could not have foreknowledge of His own death and resurrection, and so could not found the Church, or could not endow it, if founded, with a sacramental commemorative rite. A preconceived opinion in each case is in charge, in each case it guides the mind, and in each case it amends the data to its purpose. There is a considerable similarity between some of the present-day interpretations and the imaginary reconstructions of those early times. On this, see Berning, *Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, pp. 7–17; Batiffol, *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie positive*, 2^e Serie, 3, pp. 53–77; Rauschen, *L'Eucharistie et la Pénitence*, French translation, pp. 50–60; Lebreton, *Dictionn. Apol.*, art. *Eucharistie*, 1548–1554; Ruch, D. T. C., art. *L'Eucharistie d'après la sainte Ecriture*, 1024–1031.

The genuine text of the Scripture narrative is not at issue now: for (1) Everyone admits that the command in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* to repeat what Christ did is genuine. (2) Likewise everyone admits the coupling of the bread with the Body and the Blood with the chalice in St. Paul, St. Mark and St. Matthew. (3) Some of our adversaries also admit that the insertion in *St. Luke, XXII*, of 19b–20 discussed at end of Ch. III, vol. I, is genuine.² The question, therefore, is not what the sacred writers have narrated, but what Christ actually did or said. Did He or did He not

¹ True, if we take into account their ability and erudition, it would be foolish to compare the heretical theologians of our time with the earlier authors of these stupid heresies. Modern writers for the greater part are men of high literary attainments, skilled experts in the science of criticism in reference to things merely human. And yet the bad habit of clinging to preconceived opinions, and even more to a bad philosophy, has led those of the critical school so far astray that, though quite contrary, they have opened up a broad and easy way, hardly more wise or more sane than the old Gnostics or Manichaeans. For though the critics of the rationalist school were intent on reaching only sober conclusions, they nevertheless gave origin to a brood far worse than themselves, and these (of the rationalist school) can well find some excuse for their ravings on the very principles laid down by the rationalists.

² While holding that 19b–20 is genuine, some deny the historical fact of the institution, thus Jülicher (below). Others, though denying that these verses are genuine, admit that the institution is historically true, so Eric Haupt (*Ueber die ursprüngliche Form und Bedeutung der Abendmahlsworte*, Halle, 1895, p. 27) and Franz Dibelius (*Das Abendmahl*, 1911, p. 92 and *passim*), as well as many Anglican writers.

command the Supper to be renewed in the Church, and to continue on through the ages until His return from heaven? We are not endeavouring to find out whether the text is genuine, we are asking whether it is historically true.

Among modern writers the leader of those who deny the historical truth or historicity of the texts in question¹ is Adolf Jülicher (*Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsfeier der Alten Kirche*, in *Theologische Abhandlungen C. v. Weizsäcker gewidmet*, 1892, pp. 215–250), who says that the Lord merely enunciated an *ex tempore*² parable³ indicative of His approaching death, which would be of benefit to the disciples.⁴

Spitta holds that Christ did not intend here to announce His death,⁵ that the words welling up suddenly from His Messianic consciousness⁶ were simply intended to predict in obscure symbolical language to His disciples the joys of that banquet, at which those who entered into the delights of salvation and eternal life would, as it were, feast upon Christ.⁷ Recently Harnack

¹ R. A. Hoffman, *Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, 1896, p. 28 *et seq.* compiled a careful account of those of our time who before 1892 denied the historical fact of the precept of the Lord.

² Jülicher, *op. cit.*, p. 287: "Were I obliged to admit any germ of premeditation in the action at the Last Supper, it would lose, to my mind, what is best in it." "Jesus wished here to do nothing whatever for a Church of the future. He gave no injunction, He instituted nothing" (*op. cit.*, pp. 244 245; cf. p. 235).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 240. Though it was from Weizsäcker himself that Jülicher borrowed the word parable, Weizsäcker himself is in nowise to be reckoned amongst those who deny the institution by our Lord of our Supper, for he writes in plain terms as follows: "This celebration rests on the institution of Jesus Himself. . . . Any explanation of it as arising first in the congregation of the disciples, out of the remembrance of their companionship at table with Him, and from the need of a memorial of His death, is excluded. Rather the celebration must have been universal from the beginning" (Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 2, 1892, p. 574). Even Harnack, too, at this time roundly affirmed: "The Lord instituted a memorial of His death" (*Dogmengeschichte* 2, p. 139; in Jülicher, *op. cit.*, p. 236).

⁴ "He was not concerned with a memorial of Himself. He who could say the words of *Matthew*, xxvi, 29 did not reckon on a long enough separation for that. All He did was, that following His habit and attaching the deepest significance to a customary act, in itself insignificant, He took leave of His friends, that He gave them clearly to understand that His death was at hand, and at the same time indicated to them that His death was to be a source of blessings. In this way, too, He also relieved His own heart; He pronounced these words not only for His disciples, but also for Himself" (*op. cit.*, p. 245).

⁵ *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*, Bd. 1, 1893; *Die Urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls*, p. 284; cf. p. 333.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 287: "As these words were not premeditated but welled up spontaneously from the depths of His Messianic consciousness, they were not intended to introduce an institution which Jesus wished to bequeath to His followers."

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 282; cf. p. 338: "I fail to see any institution by Jesus of a celebration of any memorial of His death among the congregation of His followers. . . . Instead

(*Dogmengeschichte* bd. 1, p. 76) all but gave his consent to this interpretation: although he concludes with the words: *It is not quite clear (ibid).*¹

After these comes J. Hoffmann (*Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, 1903), who thought that by the Supper itself Christ merely meant to foreshadow, in the common use by all the disciples of the same bread and the same chalice, a kind of union as of friends and brothers at the same table.² But, when Christ says later on of the bread: *This is my body* (while not saying anything about the Blood over the chalice),³ He signifies that all of them should pass into the one body or social community in which He would hold the central place.⁴ Thus Christ, on the approach

of this, it seems to me that the primitive intention of the words of the institution is indicated by the discourse of Jesus as a foreshadowing of the final Messianic banquet, in which man hoped to feast without limit on the spiritual gifts of the Messiah Himself."

¹ Such an eschatological interpretation, that is as referring to the final condition of man, was also maintained by A. Schweitzer (*Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte des Urchristentums*, 1901, Heft. 1, p. 61), though he, too, united with this a foretelling of death, as a condition previous to future joys: "Jesus spoke to His own, not of His death alone, but of His death and a future reunion with Him not to be long delayed, at the banquet in the new kingdom." In his subsequent works, this author seems to insist more exclusively on the eschatological significance of the words of Christ (*Von Reimarus zu Wrede, Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 1906, p. 377, and *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 1913, pp. 625-626). However, in his opinion, though Christ did not formally command the repetition, He intended it nevertheless; indeed He instituted it at least virtually or implicitly, seeing that He gave His bread and His chalice over to them after the manner of a sacrament, that is the symbol or sacrament of final joy (*Das Abendmahl*, p. 30 *et seq.*; and *Von Reimarus*, p. 377). Strictly speaking, then, Schweitzer is not one of our opponents here.

² *Ibid.*, p. 87.

³ "All the words that are recited in the declaration cannot be primitive, for the mere indication of the wine as blood introduces the notion of death. . . . What is primitive, therefore, is: that the Lord distributed the bread to the disciples with the words: *This is my body*, and that He sent the wine in the chalice round the circle, without attaching any signification to it." Even before J. Hoffmann, W. Brandt, while equating the bread with the Body, had denied, as Hoffmann did, any comparison of the wine with the Blood. He writes as follows (*Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums*, 1893, pp. 292-294): "When dealing with the bread, Jesus had in mind at one and the same time the entire man (the whole Body, both Flesh and Blood); when after that He took the chalice in His hands, it was only to invoke a blessing upon it. The chalice of benediction then at the Last Supper was a last drink, taken in thanksgiving for the meal that had been eaten" (p. 294). He also considers, however, that a social fellowship was signified by Christ in the distribution of the bread: "We can hardly avoid the conclusion that in this very way He made use of the common meal of all together as a sign of a common fellowship, those who eat together of the same bread make up the one family" (pp. 292-295). After J. Hoffmann, Goguel (*L'eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr*, p. 86) also restricted the words of our Lord to the bread alone.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 87-89.

of His separation from the disciples,¹ but thereby all the more conscious of His eschatological, His final victory,² desired in the meantime by this Supper to enter into a kind of pact of inviolable friendship with His faithful disciples.³

Jülicher therefore considers the Supper to be a prediction by way of parable; Spitta takes it to be an eschatological prophecy; to Hoffmann it is a social symbol; in the mind of Goguel (*op. cit.*, pp. 97–101) the signification of death, the consciousness of a final Messianic Victory, and a social bond between friends and companions—passion, kingdom, compact—combine to make up one complex explanation of the Supper, so that Christ at the Supper signified His wish to give to the disciples, even at the loss of His own life, that which is most intimate to Himself, namely His innermost feelings, His mind, His power, that with Himself they should be sharers of the labour and of the kingdom.

Now if the action of Christ at the Last Supper was intended merely to indicate or prophesy something, or to comfort or exhort, there was certainly no reason for enjoining its repetition by way of sacrament. However, the question then arises; if the repetition was not commanded, why was the repetition ever made at all, and made in such a way as if it had been commanded by Christ? To this question various replies have been given.

According to Adolf Jülicher, the repetition of the Supper arose from a kind of inward need (*einem inneren Bedürfniss*, *op. cit.*, p. 245) of the minds and hearts of the disciples, deeply moved by the great signal fact of Christ foretelling His death in the bread and wine.⁴ For when later on all the disciples were gathered together in the same Supper chamber awaiting His return, they would inevitably renew at their daily suppers the memory of all they experienced at that Last Supper of the Lord, and this would be done in no more fitting way than by repeating the same thing

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 93.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 79 and 93.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 93.

⁴ "The ceremony at once made a deep impression on the sympathetic disciples. The paschal solemnity and celebration remained afterwards in the minds of the disciples of Jesus, the most unforgettable moment of their lives in common with Him, it was the sublimest point of this existence of theirs. He had never shown Himself more sublime to them than when, in this reverential manner, in an atmosphere of holy tranquillity, He definitely announced to them His coming death" (*op. cit.*, pp. 245–246). As though there were not countless more striking events in their life with Jesus than a foretelling of His death by way of parable!

which had been done by the Lord.¹ The next development was that by reason of the extraordinary psychological activity of that primitive period—a time prolific in fictitious tales—the Apostles would come to think, and even must have thought,² that they had received a command from Christ to renew the Supper.³

Spitta describes our rite as an elaboration of the supper celebrated by the Christian assembly,⁴ which at first, like the other Jewish bodies, would have its own religious banquets; they could not hold those banquets without at the same time remembering the promise of Christ, that He would be invisibly present with them and would recall to their minds the words which He had uttered at the Last Supper. This being so, quite spontaneously they changed the thanksgiving over the bread and wine into a thanksgiving for the spiritual food of the soul, and for the fruits of the true Vine. As they said those prayers of thanksgiving, the promise of the future coming of the Lord, and also of the banquet in the world to come, was necessarily before their eyes.⁵ But the whole of the evolution of faith and ritual could not stop here; it had to take on more and more the characteristics of a memorial celebration of the death of our Lord.⁶ This evolution, according to Spitta, can be explained as follows: assuming that the Supper was held on the thirteenth day of the month Nisan, and so was

¹ "Each time, therefore, when at their repast the bread would be divided and the chalice passed round and drained by them, they could hardly do otherwise than repeat to themselves what had been said" (*op. cit.*, p. 246). As though the repetition of such a prediction of Christ by way of parable could have any sense unless it rested on some other force and signification of the Last Supper! But what was it, and how did it accrue to the Last Supper? (See Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 63.)

² "Nor would many decades of years be necessary to produce such a development; at times, when the pulse of religious life beats as strongly as it did then, there was a fabulous crop of prophecies, tales and legends springing up quickly in rich abundance" (*op. cit.*, p. 245).

³ "The first Supper had no further aim than to *announce the death of the Lord* (in Greek in Latin text), and this aim was not lost sight of later on. . . . Hence, then, against the wish of Jesus, and without any commission from Him, these daily reunions, at which they commemorated His death, these celebrations so soon stereotyped . . . would certainly be perpetuated. It would be a miracle if very soon the words *Do this in commemoration of me* (Greek in original), or something similar, were not inserted in the account of the first Supper" (*op. cit.*, p. 247). Rather would it be a miracle to find anyone giving credence to such a fairy tale!

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 301: "According to the popular view which reaches back to the early days of Christianity, and was already then firmly held."

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 289.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 290: "It could not stop at such a mere repetition of the first celebration of the Supper. Of necessity NEW ELEMENTS entered into it, elements which instituted a process by which the Supper would become a Christian paschal repast, an announcing of the death of Jesus."

not the paschal supper, the disciples, not having yet held or celebrated any pasch in the month Nisan, were bound by the Law to celebrate it on the fourteenth day of the following month according to *Numbers*, IX, 10 *et seq.* (cf. *II Paralip.*, 30 *et seq.*). At this latter pasch celebrated by them it was impossible for them not to advert to the various similarities between the paschal lamb and Jesus slain on the fourteenth Nisan (for instance no bone being broken), and by His death taking them out of the slavery of Egypt and leading them into the land of promise.¹ It was more than likely, too, because of their visionary state of mind at the time,² that the Apostles imagined they saw Him seated with them eating that pasch.³ Such a pasch would inevitably appear to them as a new institution.⁴ Through the influence of this paschal analogy, once induced in this manner, it came about, in the first place, that the words of our Lord were deflected from their original sense and taken to signify His death; and then later that, just as any head of a family in the Law would say: *This is the pasch which we eat because the Lord passed*, etc., so the Christians persuaded themselves that our Lord's words, *This is my body*, were to be recited to commemorate the sacrifice of Christ slain on the Cross; and this they did by borrowing from another source (the paschal supper) the character and the force of a testament intrinsically bound up with the blood.¹ Thus it came about gradually that the actual Supper of the Lord was presented in a new fashion, conformable to a more highly evolved rite of the Church,² and that the institution of this rite was attributed to Christ Himself.³ J. Hoffmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 94–95) and then Goguel (*op. cit.*, pp. 101–102) offer even a more brilliant suggestion: the supper of the Christians was first introduced without any reference to Christ's Supper, and then later on with the passing of the years,

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 290–292.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 292: "One can easily see everywhere indications of a special disposition towards a visionary state of mind: most of all at their meetings together in the evening."

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 292–293.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 292: "This paschal supper taken all in all and enriched with new import, must have appeared to them in the light of a new institution."

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 292–294.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 295.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 294: "By the interpretation (in accordance with the rite of the paschal supper) of the words used by Jesus at the Last Supper, the whole came to be conceived as an institution of Christ."

the two suppers, paschal and Christian, were fused into one by a kind of process of development of the faith.

Hence two questions arise (J. Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 95): what was the nature of this alleged primitive Christian supper which did not originate in the Last Supper, and how did it later on justify its claim to an origin which it did not possess?

To the first question, what was the original nature of the Christian primitive supper, Goguel (*op. cit.*, p. 131) replies: that supper, namely the breaking of the bread, was the natural result of the communal life of the early Christians—the daily use of a common table. J. Hoffmann's description of those suppers is more vivid (*op. cit.*, p. 108). He sets before us a picture of religious feasts for which each one brought his own contribution (*religiosas symbolas*). These feasts were celebrated after the manner of the Jewish meals, at which, since as a rule they were invested with a religious atmosphere, it was the custom of the head of the family to bless the bread and wine (*op. cit.*, pp. 104–107).

To the second question, as to the linking up of the primitive supper of the Christians with the Last Supper, there are several replies given. J. Hoffmann, for instance, finds in these early Christian suppers a very ardent eschatological faith, a faith which was the bond of Christian community life,¹ and which urged the faithful to partake of the food, as in *Acts, II, 46: with gladness and simplicity of heart, breaking bread from house to house.*² Moreover, so vivid was the expectation of the coming of the Lord (*parousia*), that everyone seemed to feel that Christ living once more was present, though invisibly, at the feast.³ Then, as the *parousia* was delayed, the Passion and death of the Lord came gradually more and more in their minds,⁴ and so inevitably (*necessario*) came to be considered the scope and aim of the whole of Christ's life on earth.⁵ Just as the Scripture declared the death of Christ, so now of necessity THEY MUST BELIEVE⁶ that the Messiah declared it. In this way the Last Supper developed a new signification, for now THEY MUST NECESSARILY CONSIDER IT AS A BANQUET OF LEAVE-TAKING (*abschiedsmahl*), in which, and by which, the death of

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 101.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 107–108.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 107–108.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 112.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 112–113.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 113.

Christ was preannounced.¹ Hence in the descriptions of the Last Supper they began to add to the comparison between the bread and the Body, a like comparison between the wine and the Blood.² As a matter of fact, the very difference which existed between the Last Supper and the daily supper of the faithful influenced them to compare the two and to study the kinship between the one and the other.³ This kinship was now so obvious that it would be very strange if it were not recognised.⁴ For if Christ had announced His death in the breaking of the bread and the distribution of the wine, the Christians would necessarily think of His death whenever they broke the bread and passed round the cup, that is to say at their daily meals.⁵ This remembrance was a kind of "involuntary necessity" (*ein unwillkürliches Bedürfniss*) for the Christian community. Hence there gradually arose the custom of repeating the Supper narrative at the daily table, shortly after the usual prayers at the blessing of the bread and wine.⁶ Later with the development of Christological faith, faith centred on Christ, when the thought now prevailed that the Lord submitted to death for the sins of men, Christ Himself was considered to have announced and promised at the Supper the atoning effect of His death.⁷ The Christians applied this consoling promise to themselves every time they inserted at their own suppers the remembrance of the Supper of the Lord. Hence now it was not involuntarily, so to speak, but of set purpose, that they commemorated the redeeming death of the Lord in joy and gladness.⁸ Still later they commemorated the death, not only of set purpose, but as a duty to be fulfilled in gratitude to Christ.⁹ This consciousness of a duty to commemorate Christ's death begot an

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 114–115.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 115–116: "The very fact that they now saw plainly a significant difference between the two suppers caused them to turn their minds back to the Lord's Supper. The result was that they involuntarily exerted themselves to establish a relationship between the two."

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 116: "This kinship between the two suppers was now so obvious that it would be very strange had they not discovered it."

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 116: "Assuming that Jesus had symbolically announced His death, as He broke the bread and distributed the wine, they could not but have this before their minds whenever they carried out the same actions, namely at each of their daily meals."

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 119–121.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

opinion that Christ had given a command that a commemoration of Himself should be made at the suppers held after the manner of His own Supper.¹ The final stage was yet to come when, under the influence of Paul, the Supper would blossom out into a mystery of communion with God, by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ unto the remission of sins.²

Goguel's view is that the thought of the invisible presence of Christ did not anticipate the commemoration of the Passion, but rather the commemoration of the Passion anticipated the thought of the invisible presence of Christ and led on to it. In other words, as the early Christians came to recall more and more the saving death of Christ and the Last Supper, they spontaneously arrived at the thought that their own supper was a continuation of it and an imitation also, all the more that the risen Christ had appeared before them, and especially at their meals in common. Hence they were easily prone to imagine that they saw Christ as though present in their midst (*op. cit.*, pp. 131-133). It was through the influence of St. Paul that they finally came to look upon the Supper as a means of communion with Christ, and the bread and wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ (*op. cit.*, pp. 187-188, and 289).³

We have seen that there were writers who said that there was no link whatever between the chalice and the Blood in the Last Supper; it still remained for critics to deny that there was any indication of a relationship between the bread and the Body. This the more radical writers have done. Axel Andersen (*Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christus*, 2, p. 35),⁴ Loisy (*Les Evangiles synoptiques*, t. 2, pp. 538-540; cf.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 123-163.

³ Compare what Loisy has to say about the genesis of the Mass, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, 2, p. 227; *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 244; and later more distinctly in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Litt. Relig.*, mai-juin 1914, *L'initiation chrétienne*, pp. 210-213. Meantime we are pleased to note that Protestant critics, even those of the liberal school, have finally admitted a complete consonance between the mind of St. Paul and the constant tradition of the Church concerning the presence of Christ in the sacrament, and not a mere symbolical or virtual presence, but a real presence. In addition to Hoffman and Goguel on this subject, we have also W. Bousset in *I Cor.*, X, 16 *et seq.*, and J. Weiss in *Mark*, XIV, 22-25 (*Schriften des N.T.*, 3, bd. 2, pp. 121-122, and bd. 1, p. 203).

⁴ According to him, the original words of the Lord were: *Take ye and eat: Amen I say to you, that I will not eat of it until, etc. Take and distribute this among you. Amen I say to you, that I will not drink of this fruit of the vine until, etc.*

L'initiation chrétienne, loc. cit., p. 280). By so doing they have equivalently denied that the Scripture account of the Supper of the Lord has any value at all as true history.¹ Very similar to the view of these critics is that of J. Réville (*Les origines de l'Eucharistie*, p. 145), who, while excluding from our Lord's words every reference to the real Body and Blood of Christ, thinks that the words of Christ are merely meant to signify the moral body, or the confederation of Christ and His disciples.

Other critics held even more daring views, saying that the Church's Supper originated in pagan superstitions, for example in the totemistic rites of barbarous tribes, as lately Solomon Reinach (*Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, t. 2, 1906, p. vi; cf. *Orpheus*, 3, p. 126) had the impudence to maintain. He nevertheless holds that there was an historical supper of the Lord, such as Loisy positively asserted; with this Reinach agrees in his more recent work *Orpheus* (1909, pp. 330–331), in which he admits that he has grown rather tired of totemism (*Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, 1908, v. 2, p. 118; cf. Huby, *Christus*, 1912, p. 26).²

¹ For those writers who, during the course of the nineteenth century, and before these critics, denied that the Supper took place, see R. A. Hoffmann, *Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi*, 1896, p. 47.

² Before Reinach, P. Gardner (*The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, 1893) had submitted, not by way of positive statement but tentatively, that the Eucharist might owe its origin partly to the influence of the Eleusinian mysteries. For as Paul had lived close to them at Corinth for eighteen months, possibly this Apostle may have introduced the sacrament of the Eucharist after the manner of these mysteries, as a means of communion with the divinity, and as a pledge of the resurrection (pp. 18–19). Later, however, he rejected this hypothesis, as we learn from Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N. T.*, 1909, p. 188, or Lebreton (*op. cit.*, p. 1551). Clemen afterwards speaks of Butler adopting a similar theory in an article, *The Greek Mysteries and the Gospel Narrative*, in *Nineteenth Century*, 1905, vol. 57, p. 492 *et seq.*

An hypothesis that the oriental mysteries had some influence on the origin of the Eucharist was proposed by A. Dietrich (*Eine Mithrasliturgie* 2, 1910, p. 106 *et seq.*) and Reitzenstein (*Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1910, pp. 50–53 and 204). A refutation of these views may be seen in Schweitzer (*Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung*, 1911, p. 150 *et seq.*)—though Schweitzer should be read with caution—and earlier in Clemen (*op. cit.*, pp. 201–207). But really such an hypothesis could be described not as a “playing with possibilities” in the words of Reitzenstein (*ein Spiel von Möglichkeiten*), but rather, and from every point of view, “a playing with impossibilities” (*ein Spiel von Unmöglichkeiten*).

More recently in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse*, Jan.–Feb. 1913, A. Loisy made the most he could of certain affinities which he saw between the mysteries of Dionysus, the Eleusinian mysteries, those of Attis, Isis, Mithra and the Eucharist, the mystery of the Christian faith. It was a vain task, for, altogether apart from other wide discrepancies, there is one fact that will always be a fatal obstacle to any fundamental comparison between the Eucharist and these mysteries: that in the mysteries of pagan superstitions there is no foundation in history for the

But what is to be said of those who, overstepping the limits of mere foolishness, assert that Jesus never existed? Surely this is the sheerest insanity. They declare that He was some eponymous hero of that social revolution which gave a beginning to the Church, and hence that the Eucharist is nothing else than a transformation and adaptation of banquets in use in the religious mysteries of the pagans: so Kalthoff (*Das Christus-Problem, Grundlinien zu einer Sozialtheologie*, 2, 1903, p. 48); or they say, on no basis at all, that the life of Christ was simply borrowed from the most ancient myths, Babylonian for instance, as Jensen thinks (*Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, bd. 1; *Die Ursprünge der alt-testamentlichen Patriarchen-Propheten und Befreier-Sage und der neutestamentlichen Jesus-Sage*, 1906; and *Hat der Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* 1910). Jensen even places St. Paul amongst the myths (*Moses, Jesus, Paulus*, 2, 1909), and traces the origin of the Eucharist

myth which is represented and commemorated by the rite. Hence even Loisy is compelled to say: "In the sphere of reality the rites come before the myths; the divine fact, the supposed foundation of the faith, never existed; it is the faith itself that conjectures and creates this divine activity, as an explanation of the rites and a satisfaction for itself, etc." (*op. cit.*, p. 14 *et seq.*). In the mystery of the Christian faith on the other hand, the historical fact of the expiatory death of Christ and His glorious resurrection is a reason for the existence of the rite, and not conversely; in other words the historical fact is the exemplary cause, or the exemplar imitated by the rite. Moreover, considering the matter from another point of view, the institution of Christ gives us the reason for our rite, in so far as it is the efficient cause, or actually produced it. In a word we commemorate symbolically the death and the resurrection of Christ, because *as a fact of history* Christ died for *many unto the remission* of sins, and He rose again to the newness of a celestial life, and because *as a fact of history* He willed that we should make the symbolic commemoration of His death and resurrection. No such thing as this is found in the pagan mysteries. In spite of all this, Loisy, at the end of his disquisition, having admitted that the pagan mysteries had no influence on the origin of the Christian Supper, nevertheless maintains that they did influence the interpretation of the Supper (*op. cit.*, Sept.-Dec., 1914, p. 440). "The first Christians did not institute the Supper in imitation of any mystery, but very soon they began to interpret ever more and more the Supper after the manner of the rites of mystic communion among the pagans." The real truth, however, is that the Christians were not influenced at all by the pagan *mysteries*—Eleusinian, Mithraic, or any other—in this matter, there is no trace whatever of any such influence, indeed there are many arguments in the opposite direction. On the contrary, they looked upon the Supper as a sacrificial banquet of the death of Christ, after the manner of the sacrificial banquets in common use with all peoples, Jews and Gentiles. This explains the opposition (implying as such a comparison) which St. Paul made between things sacrificed to idols and the Flesh of Christ sacrificed to God.

There is a still more recent article on the comparison between the pagan mysteries and the Eucharist, written by E. Jacquier, *Mystères païens et saint Paul*, in the *Dict. Apologét.*, t. 3, pp. 1008-1010. What kind of a mystery the Eucharist is we shall say definitely at the end of this work.

back to the sacrifice which Xisuthros after the deluge on the mountain presented to the gods, before being endowed with immortality (*Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, etc., p. 900, and *Moses, Jesus, Paulus*, pp. 46–48), and to the loaves which Xisuthros gave to his nephew Gilgamesch when he awoke from sleep (*Moses, Jesus, Paulus*, pp. 46–48). After these writers we have a succession of others to rival the reputation of these for ingenuity, amongst whom the most notorious is Drews. It is little wonder that he relegated the Eucharist to the world of myths (*Die Christusmythe*, pp. 89–99),¹ seeing that with Jesus (*ibid.* and *Hat Jesus gelebt?* 1910) he also mythologised St. Peter (*Die Petruslegende, Ein Beitrag zur Mythologie des Christentums*, 1910) ! One surely will admit that our makers of myths, in their attempts to explain the origin of the Eucharist, are hardly more successful than the Gnostics and Manichaeans of the past. Solomon Reinach (*Mythes, Cultes et Religions, loc. cit.*) may quite justly claim the title of superdocetist of the Gnostic school of Docetists, and Jensen has no reason to complain if he is listed in kinship and placed on a level with the Manichaean brood of Babylon.

Indeed, the sins of the mythical school against the laws of criticism and logic, though not more grave, are in no way different in kind from those committed by writers who deny the institution of the Eucharist by our Lord. Some of these writers are more unbridled, some more cautious, but in either case the method is the same: there is a constant predilection for subjective invention as against objective testimony. Inevitably such a method issues in a crop of unreal fantasies, varying only according to the special studies and literary bent of the critic.² It can be truly said that

¹ Among others, compare Arthur Böhlingk, *Zur Aufhellung der Christusmythologie*, 1910.

² For example, a critic, influenced by a preconceived opinion, might argue as follows: Christ was not God, hence He could not think of a Church that was to come into existence after His resurrection, and of giving sacraments to that Church, therefore He merely presignified His death. Indeed, seeing that He was just a mere man, and so could not know of His death beforehand, He had in mind something else when He took bread and wine in His hands; for example, the joys of heaven or fraternal charity. Indeed, because now any declaration whatever of the Body and Blood in bread and wine is contradictory (to the same hypothesis that Christ is a mere man), it must be rejected, and so the Last Supper must go by the board. But then we must look to something earlier as the origin of our Eucharistic rite and of the Gospel narrative of the Last Supper. Does it matter whether this is Jewish, Greek or Barbarian? And thus we advance from one error to another, and the first lapse of the critics leads on to the final absurdities of the myths.

the Eucharistic rite of the Christians can no more be derived from such a mutilated and jejune supper, as is attributed to Christ by the modern rationalists and liberal Protestants, than can the Supper itself and the Eucharist be explained by the myths.

For an insuperable obstacle to such an explanation is found in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, XI, 23, where St. Paul refers us to the teaching he had delivered to the Corinthians about five years previously. How could it come about that within twenty years after the death of Christ, not only a complete evolution or transformation would occur, a transformation in which the Supper would evolve from an almost primitive nothingness into a true action on the Body slain for us and the Blood of the New Testament, but also that in that short time a conviction would have developed in the mind of the Christians that Christ Himself had celebrated the Supper in this ritual fashion?¹ Not only is St. Paul a witness to this usage and belief, but he even tells the Corinthians that he has handed it on to them as the teaching or the dogma received from the Lord.²

¹ Besides the Catholic writers cited above, we find even in the liberal camp a vigorous demonstration (*Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu*, 1896, pp. 103–115) of the impossibility of explaining the Eucharist without a precept of the Lord. More recently, too, F. Dibelius (*Das Abendmahl*, 1911, p. 5), after describing the manner of the origin and development of the Eucharist, as delineated by W. Heitmüller (art. *Abendmahl*, in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, bd. 1, 1909, pp. 20–52), and which was little different from the suggestions proposed by others, goes on to say: “One feels at once that most of the propositions advanced are not explanations but merely other settings of the same problem. They are for the greater part simply the same questions that have arisen before, but now changed from the form of queries to that of assertions. Nothing can be gained by this.”

² There is no proof that in this passage St. Paul intended to appeal to the teaching of the Lord as immediately revealed to himself, for here the distinction of mediate or immediate revelation to St. Paul is of little or no importance. His language, however, does appear to make a distinction between the worldly judgments of the Corinthians and the divine faith of the Apostle. He seems to be saying to them: You do such and such a thing (*Do I praise you?*). Is it right, as you seem to think, or is it wrong? I say it is wrong (*In this I do not praise you*); for what appears good to you—wise with the wisdom of the flesh and the world—I, who am taught (whether mediately or immediately it matters not) by God who does not deceive, know that you do this to your own damnation: for you profane the Body and Blood of the Lord when you approach to that supper without fraternal charity; in that Supper nothing else is given to you (the Lord is the witness) than His own Flesh and Blood, the sacrament of our oneness in the Body of Christ slain for us; by this profanation you merit for yourselves your own condemnation, and signs are not wanting in the infirmities sent by the Lord. Condemn *yourselves*, therefore, that is admit you have been wrong, and correct your evil deeds. Compare a little further on in the same Epistle (XV, 3) a similar expression (*For I have delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how, etc.*) used referring to what could not be the object of private revelation to himself, where the saint refers to the apparitions with which he and the other Apostles were favoured. If, however, you think that in the

On the other hand, the transformation of the Supper demanded by the critics is either the invention of St. Paul or it is not. If he did not invent it, it was devised by the whole primitive Church in common. Surely this is beyond credence. Imagine a mighty development *uniform and concordant*, from such a small imperfect seed, and this evolution spread among millions of believers throughout the world, and these believers absolutely diverse in race, condition and culture. What a miracle this would be! Far and away greater than any of the stupendous miracles of the Scriptures! If, on the other hand, you prefer to say that this teaching and that transformation is the invention of St. Paul, the difficulties will be no less formidable. For this was a matter of vast importance in the life of the Church, and how could he make innovations in a matter of such moment? He was not the only Apostle or only Doctor of the Church. How could he who was not present at the Supper persuade the others who were present at it that the Lord had said or done this or that, nay that He had commanded what He had neither commanded, nor said nor done?¹ And even if they were convinced, the twelve Apostles would then be compelled to admit that up to that present time they had celebrated the Supper, or the breaking of bread, in a different rite, in different words and, finally, for a different reason than that which they had now admitted (under the suasion of St. Paul) was shown to them and commanded by our Lord in the past. Did they admit this, they would stultify themselves in the sight of their churches, and undermine all the authority of their testimony.² For you could hardly suggest the only alternative: that St. Paul influenced the twelve Apostles and the other Christians to

eleventh chapter (verse 23) the revelation (*I have received from the Lord*) must be immediate, this does not affect our argument: for in the first place the reasoning we have advanced will remain intact to the letter; secondly, we know for certain that St. Paul compared his teaching (most of all it would seem in what refers to the mystery of the Redemption) with the teaching of Peter, James and John, with which it was found to be conformed in all things (*Gal.*, II, 2-9). All that we have said in this note is directed against those who, like Andersen and Goetz, think that by appealing to an immediate revelation, given to St. Paul himself, they deprive the narrative of its historical value.

¹ Robertson and Plummer, *Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 1901, p. 245: "The authority of St. Paul was quite inadequate to this immense result. Nothing less than the authority of Christ would have sufficed to produce it."

² Ruch, *loc. cit.*, cols. 1086-1087.

accept his rite, by persuading them that all this time they had been celebrating the Supper in a way which they had not been celebrating it. St. Peter might well protest, as he did on another occasion: *these are not drunk, as you suppose* (*Acts*, II, 15). Hence St. Paul did not persuade the Apostles to accept his invention. If this invention did exist, and was not accepted by the Apostles, it is strange that we find no trace whatever of a mighty dissension between him and the Apostles, between the churches founded by St. Paul and the churches founded by the other Apostles, no trace of such a dissension within any of the churches themselves, say at Jerusalem, Ephesus, Antioch, Rome, no dissension between the followers of St. Paul and the followers of St. James, St. John or St. Peter. No such dissension is ever noted either then or later among themselves or between the churches regarding the celebration of the Eucharist. The rite all the world over was identical, a fact which argues for the most perfect harmony in the minds of all, in respect of the teaching and the propagation of it.

Added to the insuperable testimony of St. Paul, we have the no less formidable testimony of St. Luke (XXII, 15–20). We say that the text in question is genuine, not interpolated.¹ We may note here that the narrative according to St. Luke is not just a reflex of the teaching of St. Paul. St. Luke is himself a critic who sifts evidence carefully. His purpose in writing the Gospel is to describe in order things as they happened: *according as they have delivered them to us, who from the beginning weré eyewitnesses and ministers of the word*. This would be especially the case in matters of greater moment. Hence, in this matter of very great moment, St. Luke was critically convinced that his narrative was not only in perfect agreement with the teaching of St. Paul, but also in perfect agreement with the events as they actually occurred at the Last Supper of Christ. Hence we must hold that St. Luke's description of the Last Supper is historically true.

Now the very fact that St. Luke's account is historical demolishes at once a further objection of some of the critics who say that the identity of the primitive supper of the churches (as celebrated

¹ See note at end of Chapter III, Vol 1.

for instance in the Church in Jerusalem) and the supper of the Church at a later period (as in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*) can be positively disproved from the expression *the breaking of bread* which was in general use (*Acts*, II, 42 and 46; XX, 11; cf. *Luke*, XXIV, 35), inferring from this that there was no chalice in the primitive Christian suppers (Goguel, *op. cit.*, pp. 130–131), or at any rate no comparison between the chalice and the Blood (Brandt, *op. cit.*, p. 234).¹ The objection is easily answered as follows: these passages either refer to the primitive supper of the churches or they do not. If they do not (as a few Catholics and quite a number of non-Catholics think), no inference whatever can be drawn from the passages as to the character of the supper of the Church.² If, on the other hand, these passages do refer to the supper of the Church (as most Catholics and some of our adversaries think), then (seeing that the sacred writer of the Gospel and the *Acts* is the same, and while writing the Gospel convinced himself from first-hand evidence that our Lord's Supper and the supper of the Church of a later period were identical, and actually considers this latter as a repetition of the former enjoined by Christ) he surely could not mean by the *breaking of bread* as in the *Acts*, the supper of the Church, unless the breaking of bread were identical with the Gospel exemplar and its copy in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Nor is it difficult to see why St. Luke speaks of it as the breaking of bread and not the distribution of the chalice. For in our ordinary every-day speech the name by which we describe our meetings for eating and drinking is taken rather from the eating than from the drinking, as when we in English speak of our daily meals. St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, where, speaking of a supper (*δειπνον*) in which liquids and solids are consumed (*δς δὲ μεθύει*),

¹ "In the traditional account of the institution, the distributing of the chalice is just as important, and the figurative language accompanying this is even more appropriate, than in the case of the bread. For the Blood of Jesus did actually flow, as the water or the wine in the chalice did; whereas His Body was not broken as the bread was. How then can we explain that the sacred action was never called after the distribution of the chalice (*die Darreichung des Bechers*) or the pouring of the wine (*das Weingiessen*)? Surely because the name of the celebration (*breaking of bread*) remained on from a time when the breaking of bread was not merely half of the whole rite, but much more" (Brandt, *op. cit.*, p. 293).

² In my opinion the breaking of the bread at Emmaus could not be a sacrament. Not so in the *Acts*.

mentions eating alone in two places (verses 20 and 33), and does not speak of drinking. Clearly here *to eat* (φαγεῖν) and *to eat supper* (δειπνον φαγεῖν) is an exact equivalent as far as the sense goes of the other expression *to eat and drink* (ἔσθίειν καὶ πίνειν), which he also uses here incidentally (verse 22). So the word *eating* is often used for both eating and drinking. In other words, viewed as a whole, the feast comprising the different elements was named after its most prominent constituent.

In the third place we find both in St. Luke's and St. Mark's Gospels an implicit inculcation of the command to repeat. For first, the Supper is introduced as the new Pasch. Now the old pasch, once enacted at the time of the liberation of the people under Moses, was from thence on always celebrated each year, and was partaken of by every generation of the people of Israel, as part of the ritual fixed by law. In like manner, therefore, the use of the expression *new Pasch* suggests that this new Pasch is to continue on throughout the ages as part of the law of the New Testament (Berning, *op. cit.*, p. 140). But, furthermore, the reason why the Apostles were commanded to eat and drink of the Eucharist is indicated by the sacred writers clearly enough¹ to be because this would be the partaking of the Body and Blood, or, as we saw, of the Victim given over to death. But if it was necessary for the Apostles to partake of the Victim of the Redemption, it was no less necessary for the others to do so, *for many*, in the words of the narrative (*Matth.*, XXVI, 28; *Mark* XIV, 24), for whom Christ was given over to the death of the Cross. For them, and for us, the reason for eating was the same; hence the sacrificial food must be within our reach, and the repetition of the Supper amply provided this.

Finally, confirmation of our thesis is also found in the Gospel of St. John, though Loisy foolishly wrote once: "It is perhaps worthy of remark that the fourth Gospel displays no knowledge of this institution, and says nothing of a wish of Christ for it" (*Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, 2, 541). For all through the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel Christ insists that no one will obtain life without eating the Body and drinking the Blood. Therefore, according to the intention of Christ, the Eucharist was to be made

¹ Note especially *Matth.*, XXVI, 28 : *for this is my blood*, etc.

available to all men for all time.¹ Moreover, how could the fourth Gospel be opposed to the institution of the Eucharist, seeing that the fourth Gospel was written at a time when the use and the rite of the Eucharist was universally known and accepted? (Lebreton, *op. cit.*, p. 1554).

¹ And so we find even Loisy saying, when speaking of St. John as well as of St. Matthew and St. Mark: "In the Gospels we find the equivalent of the formal precept in Paul" (*L'initiation chrétienne, loc. cit.*, p. 211).

THESIS XVII

§ 2. The Institution of the Rite as Sacrificial

A. OUR OFFERING OF THE PASSION OF OUR LORD

(A) THIS OFFERING PROVED FROM THE WORDS OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE RITE

Christ willed that the rite in bread and wine which He instituted to be celebrated by us should be a sacrificial offering on our part of His Body and Blood. This is at once evident, if one keeps in mind what we have already said about the celebration of the Supper by Christ, from the words added by Christ Himself immediately after He had celebrated the Supper: *Do this for a commemoration of me* (*St. Luke, XXII, 19*) and *as often as you shall drink* (*1 Cor., XI, 24–25*). For, as Christ offered His Body and Blood at the Supper by way of sacrifice, hence we—commanded to do as He did—offer His Body and Blood by way of sacrifice. Just as Christ offered in the Eucharist the Victim of the sacrifice by which He redeemed us, so now we offer in the Eucharist the same Victim of the same sacrifice already completed in the Passion.

Naturally we must make due allowance for the difference of the time of offering and of the persons offering the sacrifice. First, there is the difference of time. When Christ offered sacrifice before the Passion, He offered Himself to be immolated at the Passion, but now, when we offer after the Passion, we give to God a Victim immolated in the long distant past and left eternally a Victim. In other words, we offer the Body and Blood of Christ, not now to become a Victim of the Passion, but having already been made a Victim by the Passion in the past. Our offering, just like the offering of Christ, involves an *immolation* in symbol or representation; but, because of the difference of time, there is a characteristic difference between the symbolical immolation in the one case and the other: for in the Supper it was directed to the

Passion as yet to come, and hence it foretold the Passion, while in the Mass it signifies the Passion as having taken place, and therefore it now commemorates the Passion: (do this) *for a commemoration of me*. The *offering*, however, in the Mass, just as in the Supper is real and present (not represented as past or future only, like the immolation). Very rightly, then, do we say that in the Eucharistic celebration we truly offer to God, in a bloodless representation or sacramental commemoration, the very death in blood of Christ. For it is one and the same thing to offer the Body of Christ as having suffered and died in the Passion, as to offer the Passion and death of the Body; it is the same to offer the Blood as shed, as to offer its shedding; the same to offer Christ as Victim of a past immolation, as to offer that immolation itself.

Secondly, there is the difference in the offerers. In the offering of sacrifice Christ is the principal and universal cause, we are the particular and subordinate causes; for Christ is the one true Priest of the Most High God after whom there is none to follow. We ourselves have no priesthood except such as is derived from His, as the stream is derived from its source and the ray from the sun. Hence it is that we now offer sacrifice by virtue of that one sacrificial act carried out long ago by Christ Himself. Therefore our sacrifices and that of Christ do not exist as members of one and the same genus, in the strict sense, in which the word sacrifice, used of our sacrifices and of His, would be a univocal term, but they are only in the same order by way of analogy, His sacrifice being the principle, and ours being subordinate to it. Hence there is not the slightest reason for fearing that our sacrifices might detract from the sacrifice of Christ; all that they do is to place at our disposal, and, so to speak, put into our hands, the propitiatory and laetific power of His sacrifice to be applied by us, portion by portion (*particulate*) according to our capacity, as will be explained in its own place.

It would be well if Protestants understood this, for then they would cease to accuse the Catholic Church of lowering the dignity of the priesthood of Christ. For the dignity is not lowered, nor is the all-sufficiency of our Lord's priesthood in any way impaired, where the Victim which we offer is none other than the Victim of the Passion, and where our sacrificial action of today claims no

other excellence than that derived from that principal offering of the Supper. Meantime, it must be admitted that a perfectly satisfactory solution of every difficulty is not at hand, unless the oneness of the reality offered in that first sacrifice and in our subsequent sacrifices, as well as the subordination of our active offerings to that of Christ at the Supper, be kept intact. One would not safeguard the oneness of the Victim if one taught that we induce in Christ a condition of victimhood which He previously did not have; nor would the subordination be safeguarded of our own offerings of today to that offering of the Lord by which we are redeemed if one taught that Christ mingles, with each one of our sacrifices, a new, personal sacrificial action of His own. For such a present sacrificial action of Christ, coming by way of increase to that of the past, could not itself be subordinate to that of the past (as a participation from that past action, itself not by participation [*tanquam imparticipatae participata*]) for Christ cannot be either His own chief or His own minister; but certainly it would be co-ordinate with that of the past, it would be commensurate with it, and it would be an addition by way of augment to it. Later we shall see that this intervention has no support from the Fathers or Doctors; meanwhile we note that it does not accord with Sacred Scripture, for Christ says *Do this* (do it, you, not I) *for a commemoration of me*; while the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (IX, 25, 28; X, 14) speaks of Him as having offered once only. The same difficulty confronts those theologians referred to already, Th. V and VI (Vol. 1) as assigning to Christ while He was on earth two sacrificial actions. For, whether they wish it or not, the worth and the virtue of the one would come as an addition to the worth and the virtue of the other, and as not only commensurate with but even equal to it, not only as regards the Victim, but also the active offering of that Victim: thus the sacrificial efficacy of Christ would be multiplied, contrary to the prerogative of the one all-sufficient sacrifice of the Redemption. Therefore, just as Christ on earth absolutely and simply offered only one sacrifice, so the duality which exists between His sacrifice and ours must be such as not to imply any repeated sacrificial offering made by Christ, but such as to subordinate immediately our own sacrificial activity to the offering of sacrifice made by Christ in the past, which

continues forever by its own efficacy. All this will be made clearer (Th. XXIII and XXIV) after we have reviewed the Fathers and Theologians.

(B) THE SAME OFFERING CONFIRMED BY THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL
ON THE SACRIFICES TO IDOLS

St. Paul institutes a comparison between the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, the sacrificial character of the offerings to idols, and the sacrificial character of the Jewish victims (*I Cor.*, X, 16–22). Just as the Jew, by eating the victims of the Law, was considered a partaker of the sacrifice placed upon the Jewish altar, and the Gentile, eating the offerings to idols, was considered a partaker of the sacrifice offered to the demons, so, too, the Christian, by eating of the bread and drinking of the chalice, became a partaker of the Victim consecrated to God, that is of the Body and Blood of Christ.¹ Therefore the Body which we hold in our hands under the appearance of bread, and the Blood in the chalice which we drink, have the same relation to God as the sacrifices of the idols have to the devils. Therefore the Body and Blood of Christ is our sacrificial banquet, in the Eucharist we have Christ as a Theothyte. But it was His Passion that made Him Theothyte. Therefore we receive in food the Victim of the Passion. True the Apostle does not say here explicitly that we offer that Victim, but we know otherwise

¹ We must note very carefully, as we have often said, that we enter into a (spiritual) communion with the divinity to whom the sacrifice is offered by a (corporal) communion with the victim of the sacrifice. Thus, when the pagans partook of the sacrifices to idols, they also communicated with the devils (“though forbidden to communicate with the devils, by partaking of this very victim sacrificed to the idols, you entered into communication with the devils”: Chrysostom, *in Tim.*, IV, 5. P.G. 62, 559). Thus the Christians, partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ given over to God, enter into communion with God whose Victim the Body and Blood is, and so they drink of the chalice of God and recline at the table of the Lord (verses 20–21) as often as they drink of the chalice of the Blood and eat of the Body of Christ (verse 16); so, too, the pagans, eating the sacrificial food of the idols, drank of the chalice of the devils and reclined at the table of the devils. Hence there are two aspects of communion, and these aspects must be very carefully distinguished—communion with the Victim and communion with the divinity. It is because of this communion with the divinity, that the Apostle condemns all partaking of the sacrifices to idols, as involving a spiritual relationship with the devils, repugnant to our fellowship with God. From the other aspect of communion, that is communion with the Victim, we prove the sacrificial condition of the Body and Blood of Christ (cf. Origen, *Contra Cels.*, 1, 8, n. 24, 31, P. G. 11, 1553, 1560, 1562).

that what we receive is what we have offered: hence as we receive that Victim of the Passion, we have offered that same Victim.¹

(C) THE SAME PROVED FROM THE WORDS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS CONCERNING PARTAKING FROM OUR ALTAR

As in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* the Apostle forbade association with the pagan sacrifices, so in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* he stigmatises the observance of the legal meats, and this again by an argument drawn from the Eucharist.

We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle (*Heb.*, XIII, 10). The sense of this verse considered in its context is this: instead of those meats of the legal sacrifices,² of which those who serve the figurative altar partake, we must eat of another meat, a meat which gives strength to the heart, and of which we partake from another altar. From what altar? From Christ, the Altar of the true, not the figurative, sacrifice for sin, from Christ who suffered without the gate, just as with the Jews³ the bodies of the expiatory victims were burnt without the

¹ That St. Paul here considers Christ to be a Theohyte (primarily at least) from the Passion, just as obviously the flesh of the victims was taken to be dedicated to the idols from the immolation, is confirmed from *I Cor.*, V, 7: *Christ our pasch is sacrificed*; and *I Cor.*, XI, 26: *You shall show the death of the Lord*. Hence not inaptly in *Kommentar zum N. T.*, bd. 7, 1905 (Leipzig), in h. l., p. 346, P. Bachmann remarked: "The Body and Blood of Christ are here considered by Paul as the organs of the saving death of Christ."

² So with Vasquez (*Paraphrasis* in h. l.) and Cornelius a Lapide (in h. l.). I think we should interpret *meats* here, against nearly all the ancient interpreters who say that the distinction made here is one between clean and unclean foods. The other interpretation is not satisfactory, because: (1) if it were merely a question of clean and unclean meats, St. Paul should not have forbidden as useless the meats themselves, but rather the abstention from them; (2) the verse would be inconsistent with the passage immediately following on the partaking of the altar and of the sacrifice of Christ. Modern interpreters and a number of non-Catholics agree with us, as B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 5, 1906, in h. l.; B. Weiss, in h. l., 1897, in the commentary published by Meyer; E. Riggensbach, in h. l. in the commentary published by T. Zahn, 1913.

³ St. Paul compares the passion unto death with the burning of the victims and not with the offering of the sacrifice, which of course was not without the camp, but took place previously in the tabernacle. Here, therefore, he certainly is not describing the offering of the sacrifice of our Lord as having been made on Calvary. Indeed he evidently presupposes it as having been made elsewhere, namely within the city. THEREFORE HE DOES NOT REPRESENT THE CROSS AS THE ALTAR ON WHICH THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST WAS OFFERED. So that the words of Emil Dorsch, though written for another reason, are to the point here: "Nowhere in the Epistle to the Hebrews, nor in his whole exposition of the matter, does the Apostle speak of the Cross as an altar" (*Der Opfercharakter der Eucharistie*, Innsbruck, 1909, p. 46).

camp.¹ This being so, in the interpretation of this verse the following two statements are in no wise contradictory, as many recent writers wrongly assert: (1) through the Eucharist we eat of the altar (Catholics for the most part agree to this);² (2) Christ Himself is the Altar (as St. Thomas and others hold, commenting on this passage).³ Indeed these two statements are in complete agreement: for the very Body of Christ is our Altar, as we have already explained; and by the Eucharist we eat of the sacrifice from that Altar: in the words of Dionysius Bar Salibi, the consecration of the Eucharist gives us, with Emmanuel the Priest, both the Altar and the Victim.

It is not surprising then to find early exponents of this text interpreting the word *eating* here as eating of the Eucharist, and *altar* as Christ Himself. Hesychius, for example, among the Greek Fathers: "That Paul understands the intelligible altar to be the Body of Christ, learn from his words: *We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle*, plainly meaning the Body of Christ of which the Jews may not eat" (*In Levit.*, IV, 7. P. G. 93, 824). Among the Latins we find the author of the *Glossa ordinaria* on verses 10 and 11 speaking as follows: "*We have an altar*, that is the Body of Christ. The Apostle proves that the Body of Christ is not to be eaten by those who serve the tabernacle" (P. L. 114, 669). Lanfranc in h. 1. (P. L. 150, 405) likewise: "We must eat the Body of Christ which also in other Scripture places is called altar." St. Bruno the Carthusian in h. 1. (P. L. 153, 564): "*Of which altar*, that is the Body

¹ From this parity between the victims offered for sin in *Levit.*, XVI, 27, and Jesus who suffered on Calvary, the Apostle in his rabbinical manner concludes that it is not permitted to the priests of the Law to eat our sacrifices, for in the sacrifice for sin in the Law no food was reserved for the Aaronic priesthood. This is implied in the word *therefore* (Hebr. XIII, 13) as Vasquez shrewdly remarks in his *Paraphrasis* (in h. 1.). This hindrance, however, does not pass on to us who have nothing to do with the Aaronic priesthood and so eat of our great sacrifice for sin.

² Some Protestants, even of the liberal school, are also of the same mind. See K. G. Goetz (*Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage* 2, pp. 195-197) and others cited by him in the same place.

³ Besides other testimonies to be quoted below, read the commentary wrongly attributed to Oecumenius on the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (in h. 1. P. G. 119, 445): "If He is become Victim for all, how is He not Altar, too?" And indeed, even apart from the fact that in the Apostolic period the Cross is not usually called an altar, it cannot be so meant here, for the Apostle Paul is speaking of an altar here present to us: *We have an altar*. But we certainly have not the Cross here present to us, though here present we have the Body of Christ, the living Altar which it is lawful for us to serve,

of Christ, *they have no power to eat, etc.*” Thomas Vercellensis (*In Cantica Canticorum*, 1, 6. P. L. 206, 400) says *obiter* as of a matter well known: “Christ is also called an altar. Hence the Apostle says: *We have an altar.*”¹

Therefore according to the *Epistle to the Hebrews* we eat by the Eucharist the very Flesh and Blood of the sacrifice of the Passion, as Chrysostom openly says (in h. 1. Hom. 33, n. 3 and 4; cf. n. 1. P. G. 63, 229 and 227). Hence we infer by a process of reasoning, similar to that of the last Article, that just as Christ did in the past so we now offer the very Victim of the Passion in the Eucharist.² Certainly no Catholic may doubt that what we receive from God when we communicate is the same as what we offer to God in our sacrifice. Furthermore, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* the offering of the victim is inculcated even more expressly than in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. For having dealt with the partaking, the Apostle addresses himself to the offering, and by the tenor of his words, as well as by the sequence of the sentences, links up with the preceding verses (10–14) verse 15, which runs: *By him THEREFORE let us offer the sacrifice of praise always to God, that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing to his name.* What is that *sacrifice of praise* to be offered up by Christ, and to be offered up for the very reason that we have an altar of the true sacrifice, which altar is Christ? Would not one naturally expect it to be the offering of that which is proper to this Altar, that is Christ Himself? If this be so, have we not commended to us in this very *Epistle to the Hebrews* our own Eucharistic offering of the Body and Blood of Christ? It may be objected that the *sacrifice of praise* cannot be the Eucharist because it is said to be *the fruit of lips confessing to the name of God*. But as Estius and a number

¹ Other writers may be added in the same sense, among them Peter of Tarantasia (Innocent V) in the *Postilla*, which was published under the name of Peter of Gorham, in h. 1.: “*We have an altar, that is the Body of Christ.*” Cf. Peter Lombard in h. 1. (P. L. 192, 513), etc.

² Among Protestants we find K. G. Goetz in substantial agreement with us (*loc. cit.*): “We . . . know that in the New Testament the Supper is, as a matter of fact, considered by Paul, and other Scripture writers also, to be a sacrifice, and at the same time in a manner as the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, though in a spiritual form. Especially consonant with this view is the fact that the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* certainly indicates Christ as offering His Body once only, while nevertheless he accentuates the fact that His Blood procures for us at all times an entry into heaven and his Body is the living way thereto. For this reason he can quite well have held that the single offering of Christ on earth comes to be spiritually set forth and partaken of ever afterwards by His own at the Supper.”

of other commentators have remarked in reference to this passage, the Apostle seems to have in mind the Greek Septuagint version of *Osee*, XIV, 3, which runs: *We will render the fruit of our lips* (instead of the accepted Hebrew version: *We will render the calves of our lips*), the probable meaning of which is: We will render the victims which we have vowed, we will pay our vows; in which case obviously sacrifices are intended.¹ "This corresponds closely to what we say in our Mass: ". . . who offer up to Thee THIS SACRIFICE OF PRAISE, and pay THEIR VOWS to Thee." And indeed, as will be seen at greater length later, Th. XVIII and XXXV, the early Fathers always spoke of our sacrifice as performed by words of prayer and praise, precisely because it is not by the sword or by fire that we offer the sacrifice, but by word of mouth. Meanwhile we note that this is quite in keeping with the explanation of this verse by Salmeron: (in h. l.) "The words are particularly applicable to the sacrifice of the Mass which was never offered by any priest without the praise of God and the invocation of the divine name."² This *sacrifice of praise*,

¹ ". . . so that the calves of our lips are our promised sacrifices" (Benedictus Justinianus in h. l.).

² Matthaeus Galenus Vestcapellius had written, I think before Salmeron, in his *Commentario in D. Pauli ad Hebraeos epistolam* (Andreas Croquet, Louvain, 1599): "By him let us offer. Here, I think, the Apostle refers to the Mass, which is called in sacred Scripture more than once the sacrifice of praise. . . . But why is the Mass called the sacrifice of praise? Because it was first offered by Christ to God the Father in thanksgiving and praise, and Christ decreed and commanded that we should do the selfsame, saying: *Do this . . . the fruit of lips*. The words seem to be an allusion to the fourteenth chapter of *Osee*, where prayers and thanksgiving are called the calves of lips; the expression being used to preserve the secret [of the Eucharist]. The *sacra* are called fruit of lips, because they are uttered with the lips" (fol. 230-231). After Salmeron we find Ludovicus Tena writing (in h. l.): "I infer that the words here do not point to just any kind of sacrifice; they point particularly to that which is enacted in the Mass." Cornelius a Lapide: "By Him, therefore, namely by Christ our Pontiff and Mediator, who bestowed all these good things on us, and who offers our vows to God, let us offer the sacrifice of praise, because it was first offered by Christ the Lord to God the Father in thanksgiving and praise, and Christ decreed and commanded us to imitate the selfsame, and for this reason it is called the Eucharist, that is thanksgiving. Evidently the Apostle harks back to the Eucharistic altar which he dwelt on in verse 10. . . . Let us offer hymns, psalms and thanksgiving to God with our lips, whereby we confess the name of God. Therefore we should always give honour to God by such hymns and praise, and particularly in the Mass which, as Galenus justly says, is properly the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

We find similar words of the authors of the commentary inserted in the *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, published by Migne, in h. l.: "By the sacrifice of praise we can also well mean the most holy Eucharist which is before all else the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; it is also the *fruit of lips confessing his name*, that is the acts of priestly lips blessing the name of God, and this meaning seems to be required by verse 10; *We have an altar*." Nor are there wanting some among the liberal Protes-

Chrysostom (I think), Damascene (in h. l. P. G. 95, 996) and Theophylactus certainly, understood to be the Eucharist.¹

Taking, then, the *sacrifice of praise* of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* to refer to the Eucharist, it is plain that in this Epistle St. Paul enjoins on us to offer this sacrifice of the Victim of the Passion, as in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* we are said to partake of it. Hence the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* reinforces the conclusion derived from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*: that our

tants of today who admit that this is the true interpretation of the passage. Thus K. G. Goetz: "He certainly speaks in the following verse only of the everlasting offering of the sacrifice of praise to God through Jesus, that is *the fruit of lips which confess his name*, and of the obligation to do good and impart it to others as of a sacrifice well pleasing to God. Here, too, there could well be, as Spitta notes, a reference to the Supper as a sacrifice, since the concept of sacrifice was already before, at the Supper, quite closely bound up with such things as confession of the name of Jesus, praise and thanks, good service and imparting to all" (*op. cit.*, pp. 196-197).

Notice, too, how Augustine explains by reference to our Eucharistic sacrifice the cognate verses 9, 14, 25 in *Psalm 49* in *De Gratia N.T.*: "Announcing that those things which were then offered in figure of the future were to be changed, he says: *I will not take the calves out of thy hand, nor he-goats of the flock.*" And a little further on, pointing to THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, when these things would have been brought to a close: "*Offer to God the sacrifice of praise and pay thy vows to the Most High.* And at the end of this same psalm: *The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way by which I shall show him my salvation*" (*De Gratia N.T.*, *Epist.* 140, n. 46. P. L. 33, 557). A little later, in n. 48, he explains what he means above (n. 46) by the sacrifice of the New Testament, when he says: "There is a great sacrament in the sacrifice of the New Testament, where, when, and how it is offered, you will discover when you are baptised" (col. 558).

Florus Diaconus (P. L. 119, 420) explains *Hebr.*, XIII, 15, by simply referring to these words of Augustine on the sacrifice of praise.

Hesychius in *Psalm 49*, 23: "*The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way by which I shall show him the salvation of God.* For what is this way, and of what kind is it? It is surely the communication of the Body and Blood of the Lord, the way which the Lord Himself first began to show us in Sion" (*In Psalm 49*, 23. P. G. 93, 1197).

We may note how Verecundus, bishop of Junca (546-552), explains a similar saying of Jonas the prophet. He remarks that the words *But I with the voice of praise and confession will sacrifice to thee* (*Jonas*, II, 10) refer to the Mass: "There are numerous sacrifices of various kinds to be presented to the Lord. First, there is the spiritual sacrifice of praise and confession to God. There is also another internal sacrifice to be immolated to God to appease Him. . . . But we must also see here something more profound, for he did not say: but I will sacrifice to Thee in words (*in voce*) of praise and confession, but in keeping with another order of which he had just got a glimpse (*nuper ostenso*): But I will sacrifice to Thee with, to the accompaniment of, words of praise and confession. It is thus that he points to ANOTHER SACRIFICE which was to be offered ACCOMPANIED BY WORDS OF PRAISE AND CONFESSION: doubtless this is the sacrifice of which we partake in THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD, to be offered by us to the accompaniment of hymns and canticles" (*Commentarius super cantica ecclesiastica*, 1, 8, c. 16, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, t. 4, p. 108).

¹ Theophylactus (in h. l. P. G. 125, 396): "*By Him*, or by the pontiff according to the flesh, we offer the sacrifice of praise to the Father, that is the giving of thanks, the Eucharist. . . . This Eucharist then is the fruit of lips confessing, that is, professing His name."

sacrifice and the sacrifice of our Lord are one; one, not only because of the material identity of the Body and Blood, but also because in both cases, and in the most formal sense, the Victim is one, in so far as there is only one immolation by which Christ passed into the condition of Victim of the eternal altar.

B. OUR OFFERING OF THE CELESTIAL VICTIM

We offer then the Victim of the Passion. But this is a Victim that is eternal and celestial, the Victim of the one sacrifice that will never end. For St. Paul writes: *We have an altar*. He did not say we had an altar, or there was an altar for us, but *we have* an altar. Hence Christ is even now FOR US an altar, and so not now an altar of this earth, but of heaven, and so He is the Altar of the heavenly sacrifice; and just as we eat, partake of that sacrifice, so, too, we offer it. Hence we offer the eternal celestial sacrifice.

Some considerable light is thrown on this matter by the words in which St. Paul (*I Cor.*, XI, 26), after he had given the words of institution, indicates what we are to confess by the Eucharist. For we read: *For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come.*¹ Here is plainly set before us an announcement or proclamation, included in the Eucharistic rite itself, an announcement in which Christ is proclaimed, and Christ not merely as dead in the past, but Christ to come to us again, and meanwhile therefore living in heaven. Thus in the Eucharist profession is made of the Resurrection and the Ascension of Him whose death is there commemorated. That is to say, in the Eucharist we symbolically represent the death of Christ in such a way as meanwhile to proclaim Him as now living and glorious.² This does not mean that

¹ It matters little whether the verb in the original Greek text is of the imperative or indicative mood. If the latter (which is more probable), the present tense, (since the reference is plainly universal, to all times of eating, and drinking the sacrament—as often as you shall eat—which are of the future), is not badly translated in the Vulgate by *annuntiabitis*—and then in the Douay version we have, as above, you *shall* show, also future tense. We may note that Funk translates similarly a parallel passage in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (8, 12, 37. F. D. I, 509).

² In the language of the schools, we would say that the death is signified *in recto*, or directly, the Resurrection and the Ascension *in obliquo*, or indirectly. Hence with

in the Mass we offer the Resurrection and the Ascension of Christ as well as His death; we only offer His death. For we offer just what He offered—His death; the Resurrection and the Ascension were not included in the offering of Christ, but in the acceptance of God as signified by them. We give simply what Christ gave, but we give it as now ratified and accepted by God. Hence we see that St. Paul's description of the sacrifice of the Church unites, in a single whole, the elements which we have already seen to pertain, each in its own way, to the sacrifice of the Lord: the representation in symbol of the death in blood, and the condition of life in glory: both of which concur, so that in our Mass we offer the celestial Victim of the Passion.

If the words quoted by us above from the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* were actually spoken by Christ Himself, and were not just the words of the Apostle, our argument would be reinforced, for then they would be not merely an exposition of the matter by St. Paul, but an intimation coming directly from our Lord. It is true that the expression *of the Lord* ("the death of the Lord") is scarcely in our favour. They suggest rather the words of St. Paul about Christ than the words of Christ about Himself. Nevertheless, why may not St. Paul, when speaking of Christ, have changed to the third person what Christ said of Himself in the first person? For example, Christ might have said: *You shall announce my death*, or equivalently: *You shall announce the death of the Son of Man*, which in his account St. Paul might easily change to: *You shall announce the death of the Lord*. This would merely mean a change from the direct to the indirect manner of speech which is quite usual in every-day conversation, and would not be out of place here. For it is plain from verses 27–29 that St. Paul is not so much explaining or commending to the memory of his readers the actual deeds and words of the Supper, as using the account to draw moral conclusions as to how the great sacrament of the Eucharist is to be worthily received.

But not only could St. Paul have done this, but we have a

the death, the Resurrection and the Ascension are co-signified in their own way. "Therefore you are taught (*audis*) that as often as the sacrifice is offered, the death of the Lord, the Resurrection of the Lord, the Ascension of the Lord is signified" (Ps.—Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 5, 4, 25. P. L. 472, 3).

suasive argument that he did so from the extrinsic authority of the most ancient liturgies,¹ of the great majority of them at least,² not to say all. For, in the anaphorae of these liturgies, after the words of consecration, we find words added AS IF SPOKEN BY CHRIST, words by which we are admonished, as often as we partake TO ANNOUNCE HIS DEATH UNTIL HE COME³ (*Constit. Apost.* 8, 12, 37. F. D. 1, 5083), OR TO ANNOUNCE HIS DEATH AND CONFESS HIS RESURRECTION (*Liturgia graeca Sancti Jacobi*, B. 52; cf. *Lit. Syr. S. Jac.*, B. 87;⁴ the Greek anaphora from the Crum Papyri, published in D. A. C., 2, 1892; the Coptic Liturgies of *Sts. Cyril, Basil, Gregory*, R. 1, 47; 15, 31; the Egyptian Mass of the sixth century, edited first by Baumstark and later published by Dom. Cabrol, D. A. C.; 1, 1097; the ancient Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil, B. 328); or TO ANNOUNCE THE DEATH, TO CONFESS THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION (the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark, B. 133; cf. the Greek Alexandrine Liturgies of *St. Basil and St. Gregory*, R. 1, 68 and 104–105);⁵ or simply TO CELEBRATE THE RESURRECTION (*Testament D. N. J. C.*, ed. Rahmani, p. 43).⁶ Consonant with these Eastern witnesses, we have from the West the *Ambrosiana missa canonica*, of the *Sacramentarium Abiaschanum* (in Lejay, D. A. C., 1, 1411);⁷ the Ambrosian Mass *In coena Domini* (in Muratori, *De rebus liturgicis dissertatio*, c. 10. P. L. 74, 944–945; cf. the Pamelian

¹ Relying on five liturgical documents, A. Resch (*Agrapha* 2, 1906, pp. 86–87) does not hesitate to include this precept among the unwritten words of our Lord. Against this, read J. H. Ropes, D. B., Ext., art. *Agrapha*, pp. 344 and 347.

² The exceptions among the liturgies are very few, the most important being the *Anaphora Serapionis*, which has no anamnesis whatever. The *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopicæ* (B. 190) and the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacæ* (F. D. 2, 100) in the *Reliquiae . . . Canonum* (ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 107—the *Apostolika Paradosis of Hippolytus*) and the *Canon Universalis Aethiopicum* (R. I. 517) have an anamnesis, but there is no mention in them of any such precept of our Lord. That in some of the liturgies, even those of the highest authority, there is no injunction to commemorate the mysteries, nor indeed an anamnesis, does not itself prove that there was no precept of the Lord (if it were a precept) to commemorate the death, Resurrection and Ascension. For our Lord did not actually command an oral commemoration, but one that was real or pragmatic, included in the rite itself. The anamnesis is merely the verbal declaration of this active or pragmatic remembrance.

³ “For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you announce (or perhaps, announce—imperative) my death until I come.”

⁴ “For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you announce the death of the Son of Man until he comes.”

⁵ “As often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you announce my death and confess my resurrection and ascension until I come.”

⁶ “As often as you shall do this, you shall celebrate my resurrection.”

⁷ “Commanding also and saying to them: as often as you shall do this, you will do it in memory of me; you shall preach my death; you will announce my resurrection, you will hope for my coming, till I come to you again from heaven.”

text of the Ambrosian Mass in Probst, *op. cit.*, p. 18);¹ and, according to the version of Moelcaich, the Irish text (no later evidently than the ninth century) called the *Stowe Missal* (published later by G. F. Warner, *The Stowe Missal*, Vol. 2, 1915, p. 13).²

From all these documents it would appear that Christ instructs us to preach His death, to announce His resurrection and hope for His coming from heaven. This intimation of our Lord is also attested by that very ancient liturgy to be found in the treatise, *De Sacramentis* (1, 4, c. 6, n. 26. P. L. 16, 445): "As often as you do this, so often will you make a commemoration of me, UNTIL I COME."

Not only do the liturgies of the East and West set forth these words as uttered in the person of our Lord, but in the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*³ it is distinctly taught (*praedicatur*) that the Lord commanded the making of a commemoration of His death; and in the Ambrosian Masses mentioned above, between the words of consecration and the injunction to make the commemoration we find these emphatic words: "Commanding also and saying to them . . ."

A careful study of these weighty and consonant testimonies gives good ground for the opinion that at the supper Christ not only said: *Do this for a commemoration of me* (*I Cor.*, XI, 24), or: *Do this as often as you shall drink for a commemoration of me* (*I Cor.*, XI, 25), but that He also intimated what was to be commemorated, His death; and for how long, until His second coming;

¹ "As often as you do this, you will preach my death, you will announce my resurrection, you will hope for my coming, till I come to you again from heaven."

² "You will preach my Passion, you will announce my resurrection, you will hope for my coming, until I come again to you from heaven."

³ "He Himself having enjoined on us to commemorate His death" (*Const. apost.*, 7, 25, 4. F. D. 1, 412). The Chaldean Liturgy of a later date than this had, and still has, the following words in the offertory: "He was offered for our salvation AND HE COMMANDED US TO SACRIFICE in memory of His Passion, Death and Burial, and Resurrection" (Le Brun, *Explication de la messe*, vol. 3, 1778, p. 482; cf. Max Saxon., *Missa Chaldaica*, p. 18). In what Catholics called the third anaphora, but which schismatics wrongly called the anaphora of Nestorius, we note these words: "In place of this [the legal pasch], He instituted before His death His own Pasch, of which we now make the memorial, AS HE HANDED DOWN TO US, UNTIL HIS RETURN FROM HEAVEN" (Max Saxon, *ibid.*, p. 32). Numerous examples can be added from the Ethiopic liturgy (cf. A. B. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Liturgy*, Milwaukee, 1915, pp. 263-264); especially the anaphora of *S. Gregory the Armenian*: "AND THOU DIDST SAY TO THEM: as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth my death, and believe in my resurrection."

in what state He would exist meanwhile, and be treated by us, as in heaven. The *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, XI, 26, gives us, in indirect speech, in the third person, a contracted form of this injunction, the Liturgies give us another form of it, more explicit, and in direct speech, in the first person. Hence perhaps the mode of speech indicated in the Greek Liturgy of St. James—an intermediate form, so to speak—approaches closer to the original words of Christ. So we conclude that Our Lord probably used some such words as these: “As often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall announce the death of the Son of Man until he comes from heaven.”

Were we quite sure that Christ Himself used these words, further light would be thrown both on the Liturgies and on the theology of the Mass. Concerning the Liturgies, it would be abundantly clear why nearly all of them have had an anamnesis (or commemoration) of those three sacerdotal mysteries of Christ: His Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. For the anamnesis would be a profession of obedience to the command of Christ, the reply to His intimation, saying equivalently, as it were: Amen, Lord, the Mystery is celebrated with that intention and that belief which was commanded by thee. The theologian would see even more clearly in the first place how, from its very nature, the sacrifice is bound up with the Resurrection and Ascension, as we have indicated above, see Th. XII–XV (Vol. 1), and secondly, how essential it is, in the sacrifice of the Church, that we consider and treat Christ, not merely as once dead, but also now living and glorious.¹

¹ This is conveyed to us in the first definition ever given of our Eucharist “The Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father in His love raised from the dead” (Ignat., *Ad Smyrn.*, 7, F. P. 1, 280). Cf. Th. XXII below, where the same link between the Passion and the Resurrection is copiously proved from the Fathers and Doctors. Note meantime the wise words of S. Johnston (*Bishop Bellord's view of sacrifice, Ecclesiastical Review*, Nov. 1, 1905, vol. 33, n. 5, pp. 514–515): “We are said [commonly] . . . to stand on Calvary when we come to the Holy Sacrifice, but we sometimes forget that while it must bring in the Cross and death of Our Lord and Saviour, most beautifully and wonderfully, the Mass means a very great deal more. SELDOM IF EVER DO WE SEE IT POINTED OUT in treatises or books of devotion that the Mass is offered up in memorial of the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord, as well as of His Passion, though we know that the Church insists upon this in the Liturgy and in more places than one.”

APPENDIX

It is most probable that the Apostles were not given the Power of Celebration during the Three Days of Death

Some early theologians and canonists held, for reasons of some cogency, that Christ in the Supper did not entrust to the Apostles the office or confer on them the power (for the power was given by way of the command) of consecrating the Eucharist until after the Resurrection. As Gerson (*Compendium theologiae, De septem sacramentis, De sacramento Eucharistiae, Opera (Omnia)*, Paris, 1606, t. 2, col. 82) merely refers to these, giving no names, one may well consult de Lugo, who enumerates them and leans towards their opinion (Disp. 19, sect. 6, n. 88–90). The main argument of these theologians, taken from John the Teuton (Glossa in caput. *Timorem, De Consecratione, dist. 2, verbo, Cujus—Decretum Gratiani cum Glossis Dni. Johannis Teutonici*, etc., Basle, 1512, fol. 399), is as follows: From the very words of the institution, our Eucharist essentially implies a reference to the Resurrection as past. These are his words: “No one but Christ could consecrate the true Body of Christ before the Resurrection, and so by the addition of the words: *Do this for the commemoration of me*, THE FORM IS SO GIVEN THAT THIS BE SO DONE AFTER THE RESURRECTION. And it is for this reason that the Mass is not offered during the three days of death.” This exegesis is in conformity with that of Cyril of Alexandria (In *Joann.*, 1, 12. P. G. 74, 725): “For the words which He uttered when He Himself fulfilled the type of the mystery, show clearly that the mystic eulogia is a confession of the Resurrection of Christ. For when He had broken the bread, He distributed it, saying: *This is my body which is given for you unto the remission of sins. Do this for a commemoration of me.* HENCE THE PARTAKING OF THE SACRED MYSTERIES IS A TRUE CONFESSION AND COMMEMORATION THAT THE LORD DIED AND CAME TO LIFE AGAIN FOR US AND IN PLACE OF US; apart from the fact that it is by reason of this same death and resurrection that we are filled with the divine benediction.” Hence also St. Augustine (*Contra Faustum*, 20, 21. P. L. 42, 385) says of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord: “What

was offered in the Passion of Christ by truth itself is celebrated by the sacrament of memorial AFTER THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST.”¹

To the scholastics, quoted by de Lugo, we may add Peter of Poitiers. Answering the question as to what would be the result were the consecration attempted during the three days of the death, by his use of the expression “they say” he indicates that it was the ordinary common teaching of his time, which he, too, adopts, that the consecration would be invalid. An objection had been raised against the form of consecration used in the Mass, that, were it effective, it could effect the consecration during the three days of death; but in that event it would be the consecration of the “inanimate Body, and if one were to so partake of the Body of Christ he would partake of it inanimate”, which he considers unseemly.² The difficulty was solved thus: “To this THEY SAY that the bread could not be consecrated into the Body on such a day, nor could it be done by the Apostles until after the Resurrection. Hence also the decree of the Church that Mass is not to be celebrated on such a day. This also is the reason why the blessed Ambrose decreed that the Mass is never to be celebrated in Milan on Good Friday . . .” (*Sententiarum*, lib. 5, cap. 12. P. L. 211, 1249).³

A contemporary of de Lugo, Zacharias Pasqualigo (+1664), a theologian whose authority in Eucharistic theology is quite equal

¹ The whole passage is quoted by us later Th. XIX.

² We deny absolutely that the partaking of the inanimate Body would be unseemly or less effective than partaking of the living Body. Apparently Peter of Poitiers thought otherwise. He was misled very likely by the same false opinion which John the Teuton was to declare later (*loc. cit.*) in the following words: “Were the transubstantiation to take place, then it would pass into a dead and inanimate body, and thus would be fruitlessly partaken of. FOR HOW COULD A DEAD BODY VIVIFY OR CONFER LIFE?” (Thomas Manrriq, Master of the sacred apostolic palace, on August 22nd, 1572, commanded these words to be expunged from all the codices of the Decree, until a new edition augmented with explanatory notes should be published; cf. *Censura in glossas et additiones juris canonici* . . . Rome, 1572, p. 18). Naturally we do not subscribe to this error (cf. *infra*, XXII), though at the same time we retain the testimony of Peter on the usual teaching of his contemporaries in respect of the inability of the Apostles to consecrate during the three days of death. The teaching does not depend on this error, but on the words of the institution properly understood.

³ Besides the testimony of Peter of Poitiers, I think we may add that of Ermen-gaudus, writing against the Waldenses: “The words of Christ *as often as you shall do this, do this for the commemoration of me* indicate that Christ did not desire that this great and most holy sacrament should end there; rather He commanded the Apostles and their successors to consecrate this sacrament forever AFTER HIS PASSION, RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION, in memory of His Passion and in the hope of eternal salvation” (*Opusculum contra haereticos*, c. 11. P. L. 204, 1251).

to that of de Lugo, said in "his most excellent work" (Hurter, *Nomenclator* 2), *De Sacrificio Novae Legis* (quaest. 134, n. 19, Rome, 1707, tom. 1, p. 137), that were the Apostles to attempt to consecrate during the three days of death they would accomplish nothing. "If any of the Apostles had consecrated in the *triduum mortis* he would effect nothing," and for this reason especially "that the principal Priest whose ministers they were was then dead, hence they could not offer the sacrifice in His name or in His person". A reason which surely may not be lightly passed over.¹

Shortly after de Lugo, Paulus Maria Quarti, who, however, had no knowledge (*ignorans*) of either de Lugo or Pasqualigo, defended this teaching very effectively (*Commentaria in Rubricas Missalis, Appendix quaestionum de Sacrificio Missae*, quaest. 1, punct. 7, Ed. Venet., 1717, p. 433).²

Later in the *Vita abscondita*, Cardinal Cienfuegos, S.J. (Disp. 4, sect. 4, parag. 1, Rome, 1728), defended and embellished de Lugo's opinion, through nineteen pages of the work: "At the same time I will not deny, indeed I admit very willingly, that for some considerable time I have had a strong leaning towards the teaching which says that the eternal sacrifice was impossible during the three days of death. . . . This is in accordance with what is actually and in the present providence instituted. . . ." This opinion does not lack external authority,³ which gives it great probability, as we shall show, it is grounded also on solid intrinsic argument (num. 59, p. 306). He concludes thus (num. 79, p. 322): "This was first asserted hesitantly, and cautiously, then advanced step by step, till finally it took wings to itself and now flits abroad with general commendation, so that it can be said of it: '*Parva metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras*'." Hence from the actual institution of Christ it seems clear that the consecration

¹ Pallavicini, in the 113th of the 178 theses which he undertook to defend in the Roman College in 1628 (de Lugo was then in the chair of theology), had defended practically the same thing: "It is probable that to priests was given the power to consecrate only while Christ was living; for they consecrate not as His successors, but as His substitutes and mandatories, through whom, as through His proper organs or instruments, Christ speaks as principal priest" (*De universa theologia a marchione Sfortia Pallavicino post theologiam lauream publice asserta in Collegio Romano Societatis Jesu Libri IX ad Urbanum VIII Pont. Max.*, Rome, 1628, p. 144).

² "Remarkable and most important works" (Hurter, *Nomenclator*, 2).

³ Although I have no recollection of any writers cited by him other than John the Teuton and de Lugo.

could not be validly performed during the three days of death. We find also, I think, an efficacious argument for this opinion in the very scope and purpose of the institution, which was: that we should offer a sacrifice that was not only neither weak nor void, or even not really assured of acceptance, but a sacrifice firm and secure, ratified and crowned with the seal of God in heaven, as already consummated in all respects.

Suarez (disp. 48, sect. 2, n. 12) claims that our opinion is opposed to the "common doctrine approved at the Council of Trent, that in this sacrament the living Body of Christ is not there by virtue of the words, but by concomitance". We do not admit any such repugnance. Our argument is drawn from the institution of Christ, independently of whether the living Body as distinct from the mere Body, is present in virtue of the words of consecration or by concomitance. The weakness of Suarez' argument can be shown by a parallel instance. The Body of Christ, as united hypostatically to the Word, is not present in the sacrament by virtue of the words of consecration, but by concomitance. Yet the Body cannot be consecrated except united to the Word. For no power was given to the Apostles to consecrate except as subordinate to the High Priest Christ, and hence according to the very institution they could not consecrate if that High Priesthood were lacking, as it certainly would be lacking, were the hypostatic union lacking. Hence the Apostles, according to the institution of Christ, could not consecrate the Body not hypostatically united to the Word. Nevertheless the divinity (and hence the hypostatic union) is not in the sacrament by virtue of the words, but by concomitance; for the words of consecration do not formally signify the presence of the divinity, but only of the Body (on which see Suarez himself, disp. 51, sect. 6, n. 4). Hence the fact that the living Body, as distinct from the mere Body, is present by concomitance, and not by the virtue of the words, does not prove that the dead Body could be consecrated, any more than the fact that the Body united to the Word is present only by concomitance could prove (which no one admits) that the Body without the hypostatic union could be consecrated.

Theologians generally, like St. Thomas (3 S. 76, 1, 1m, and 2, c; 3 S. 81, 4; in *Joann.*, 6, lect. 6), teach that if the sacrament

were consecrated during the three days of death the Body of Christ would be present without the Soul, etc. This is quite true, because the form signifies only the presence of the Body; the Body during that time being without the Soul, the Soul could have no title to be present even by concomitance. But such consecration is purely hypothetical, and, as de Lugo shrewdly remarks (*loc. cit.*), by putting such a case, "if it were consecrated", the theologians in nowise settle the question, whether according to the institution of Christ, such an hypothesis could be verified or not.¹

A fortiori we must say that the Apostles had not the power to consecrate the Eucharist during the Passion, that is between the Supper and the death of Christ, because the institution was especially imposed on them to commemorate the death of Christ, which they could not do then, as the death had not yet taken place. What, moreover, would be the condition of the victim of their offering? Not immolated, for Christ was not yet dead. They could not offer Christ to a future immolation, for to do this belonged to Christ alone, High Priest and Redeemer, who alone offered Himself to be immolated.

It follows also from the condition of the institution that priests of the Church will have no power to consecrate after the day of judgment, because it was given to them to commemorate the mysteries of Christ until His second coming only: *until he come.*²

¹ However, we could allow with these theologians that the dead Body of Christ could have been in the Eucharist during the *triduum mortis* in a different hypothesis to theirs, and one which could have certainly been verified. Suppose that a particle of the Eucharist consecrated by Christ remained over during the three days of death from the Supper. In this supposition, in that particle there would be the Body consecrated by Christ, but not now living, but dead, for Christ was now dead. This fits in completely with our teaching, which in no way implies that the living Body of Christ is present in the Eucharist by virtue of the words of consecration, but by concomitance.

² If the sacerdotal character can continue after the resurrection of the body at the last day while the effective power to consecrate would not remain after that date, the question arises whether this same sacerdotal character could not exist in the Apostles for some time during which they would not have the effective power to consecrate, even while on earth, and after the Resurrection. Later (XXVI) we shall have something to say about the opinion that this power of the Apostles was suspended until the day of Pentecost, an opinion merely hinted at in Th. XII (Vol. I).

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY FATHERS AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL SACRIFICE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST

THESIS XVIII

THE FATHERS, not only those of a later age, but even those of the apostolic and sub-apostolic period, undoubtedly held that there is in the Eucharist the essential character of a sacrifice by which we offer to God in a sensible rite the Body and Blood of Christ. Hence it is hard to understand how a present-day theologian, a man brought up among Catholics, could entertain a contrary view: that before Irenaeus the only offering known to the Church was the offering of those prayers or petitions by which the bread and wine was consecrated to become the Body and Blood of Christ, of which we were to partake but which we were in no way to offer to God (Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio*, pp. 25–52):¹ moreover, though Irenaeus and even Origen (Wieland, *op. cit.*, and *Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, pp. 150–151) thought that we offer something other than the Eucharistic prayers, they considered that this was merely the bread and wine itself, first fruits of the earth, in return for which God on His part gave us the Body and Blood of Christ. Only in Cyprian's time came the belief that we offered the Body and Blood of Christ.²

Our theological innovator attempts to prove his point by three arguments.

Firstly. Previous to Cyprian, he says, no Father speaks of an offering of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

¹ On Protestants, who before Wieland held this opinion, see Kattenbusch, *Realencyklopädie f.p. T.u.K.*, art. *Messe*, pp. 676–677. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4, 1, 233, approves of Wieland's pamphlet.

² Against Wieland's view one may consult, among other writers, Johannes Brinktrine, *Der Messopferbegriff in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*, Freiburg, 1918; and H. Lamiroy, *De essentia SS. Missae sacrificii*, Louvain, 1919, pp. 235–315.

Secondly. All these Fathers said that no sacrifice was pleasing to God, or to be offered to Him, except that of the lips or of the heart.

Thirdly. Of these same Fathers, not one, with the exception of Origen—though Irenaeus implicitly agrees with him (Wieland, *op. cit.*, p. 112)—acknowledged any altar other than Christ crucified. Therefore with the exception of these two Fathers no one admitted any sacrificial offering by us of an external gift.¹

The third argument has been already answered: the real and true Altar of the Eucharistic sacrifice is the Victim of the Passion, and therefore the lack of a material altar (should this occur) does not affect our sacrifice. No one, of course, will deny that an altar is necessary for sacrifice, though meanwhile Catholics know that even today the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice can be validly carried out without a material altar. But, in such a case, though a material altar may be lacking, it is quite wrong to say there is no altar, for there is present in such a case the Body of Christ, the true Altar of the true sacrifice offered by the true Priest, and celebrated by the Church.²

The second argument proves too much: for, as we shall see, were it valid it would also prove that no sacrifice whatever of any external thing was allowed by Irenaeus and Origen; and yet Wieland admits that Irenaeus and Origen held that something external was offered, which most of the Fathers after the time of Cyprian said was the very Body and Blood of Christ.

The first argument is based on a false exegesis which we shall now rebut. A much clearer light will be thrown on the controversy if we first show the falsity of the statement that Irenaeus and Origen restricted the offerings to the purely natural substances of the bread and wine to the exclusion of the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ.

¹ Harnack, *op. cit.*, assents to this argument: "From the investigations of Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio*, 1906, it appears that until the end of the second century it is hard to find a priest, and there is yet no altar" (p. 459).

² Wieland writes: "If in Irenaeus the Eucharistic Christ were the sacrifice, He should not have been compared to an altar, but straightway be given the name of sacrifice" (*Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, p. 52). The expressions used by writers of the Church in the many passages cited already by us, Th. XIII (Vol. I) and XVII, which clearly set before us Christ as Victim and Altar both in the Mass and in the Supper, are enough to show how far Wieland has wandered from the truth. Later it will be even clearer when we explain the significance in the Mass of the Canon prayer: *Supplices te in XXI.*

§ 1. Irenaeus and Origen

A. IRENAEUS

In the fourth book, *Adv. Haeres.*, there are three places in particular where Irenaeus speaks of the Eucharistic sacrifice (17, 5; 18, 1; 18, 4).¹

In the first passage (17, 5. P. G. 7, 1023) he has: "Commanding His disciples to offer the first fruits of His creation to God, not that He needed them, but that the disciples might not be fruitless and displeasing to Him, He took from among created things bread, and gave thanks, saying: This is My Body. And the chalice likewise from the creatures of our world, He confessed to be His Blood, and He taught the new offering of the New Testament; which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the world to God who gives nutriment to us, the first-fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament."

In the second (18, 1. P. G. 7, 1024): "Therefore the oblation of the Church which the Lord commanded to be offered throughout the whole world is a pure sacrifice in the sight of God, and is acceptable to Him. . . . It is our duty, therefore, to offer to God the first fruits of His creation."

In the third passage (18, 4. P. G. 7, 1026–1027): "It is our duty, therefore, to make an offering to God and to be found in all things pleasing to God our Maker, offering with a pure intention, with unflinching hope, with fervent charity the first fruits of those creatures which are His. And this pure oblation the Church alone offers to her Maker, offering to Him, with thanksgiving, from His creation."

We learn from these three passages that the bread and wine enter into our sacrifice as the first fruits of the creation. But this certainly does not prove that they enter in such a manner as to exclude the Body and Blood of Christ into which those very elements of the bread and wine are said to be changed by the invocation of God (4, 17, 5; 4, 18, 5; 4, 33, 2; 5, 2, 2–3; cols. 1023, 1028–1029, 1073, 1125–1129). For, as we have said, both

¹ On Irenaeus, see Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio*, pp. 52–53; *Der Vorirenaeische Opferbegriff*, pp. 145–149, and p. xxii.

the apparent sacrifice of bread and wine and the real sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ belong to the Eucharistic sacrifice; in a different manner, however, for the apparent offering of bread and wine enters into the sacrifice as a sign,¹ and the real offering of the Body and Blood of Christ as the reality signified by that sign. Because the Body and Blood of Christ is offered after the manner of a sacrifice of bread and wine; Christ is the reality which we actually offer, but not without respect to the substances of the bread and wine, and He is offered by us, just in so far as He is the terminus of the transubstantiation made by us. Thus it is that if we consider the sacrifice in its outward appearance only it may be called the sacrifice of bread and wine, but if we consider the reality that lies hidden beneath those appearances it must be called the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. Therefore the symbolical consideration of this sacrifice by no means implies a rejection of its real virtue, character and dignity, as Wieland seems to have thought.²

The truth of the matter is that in the Mass we may speak of bread and wine in two ways: in the first way, bread and wine, whether we call this the chalice or the mingled cup or the fruit of the vine, means simply ordinary bread and ordinary wine, each having the full reality of its own essence. In the second way, bread and wine is used by us to mean that earthly visible element which, after the consecration, remains mingled with the celestial and invisible element, the Body and Blood of Christ, and it is this second sense that Irenaeus has in mind when he writes: "The bread, receiving the invocation of God, is not common bread now, it is the Eucharist made up of two things; one heavenly, one earthly" (*Adv. Haeres.*, 4, 18, 5. P. G. 7, 1028-1029).³

Now, if Irenaeus in the quotations given by us above speaks of bread and wine in the first way, simply as ordinary bread and ordinary wine, and means that bread and wine are offered, he simply does what we constantly do. For even in the present-day liturgy the Roman Church does not hesitate to call, in the Secret

¹ Read J. Kramp, S.J., to the contrary, *Die Opferanschauungen der römischen Messliturgie* (Ratisbon, 1920). He thinks that the bread and wine are the subject of immolation in such a way that Christ Himself is not immolated either mystically or really.

² *Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, pp. xxii and 149.

³ See below.

prayers, the proffered gifts of the people, which are to be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, *Sacrifices* (as in the Secret prayer of the seventh Sunday after Pentecost, and of the feast of the Holy Name), or *Victims* (in the Secret of Tuesday in Passion Week, of Trinity Sunday, of St. Peter and St. Paul), *Libations* (Secret of Our Lady of Mount Carmel), *Gifts dedicated to God* (Secret Thursday of Passion Week), *Offerings to be consecrated* (Vigil of St. Andrew). Similarly all the Eastern churches in the epicleses, in reference to bread and wine, even before the transubstantiation, used such words as *sacrifice*, *victim offered to God*, and the like (v.g., *Constit. Apost.*, 8, 12, 38–39. F. D. 1, 510: Greek Liturgy of St. James, B. 53; Greek Liturgy of St. Mark, B. 133), and even today use such expressions (v.g. *Liturgia S. Chrysostomi*, B. 386, *Liturgia S. Basilii*, B. 405). And yet it cannot be doubted that the Church knew then, and knows now, what is common knowledge to Catholics: that our offering is the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. In other words, since the Church offers an apparent sacrifice of bread and wine, she can, if she wishes, accommodate her language to what is merely apparent, while at the same time accommodating her faith to what is hidden beneath those appearances (cf. Th. IX, Vol. I).

If, on the other hand, you choose to think that Irenaeus understood the bread and wine in the second sense in those quotations, as actually consecrated, then it is *a priori* incredible that he should have meant the giving as gifts to God of the mere appearances of earthly things, rather than of the heavenly things underlying those appearances, and so teach that the pure victim was merely those earthly appearances; rather he must have meant what we call the Eucharistic bread and the blest or consecrated chalice.

And this interpretation which we say is *a priori* most probable, is confirmed, *in the first place*, by the fact that he calls what is offered the first fruits of the creation; for, as even Wieland has to admit (*Mensa und Confessio*, pp. 52–53; *Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, pp. 146–147), the first fruits of the creation are properly the Body and Blood of Christ (cf., above, the commentaries of the Fathers on *Levit.*, XXIII, 10–14).¹

¹ We have an example of this mode of expression in reference to Christ in the Eucharist in a much later writer, well aware of the Catholic teaching regarding the

Secondly, the first words of the first passage support our interpretation. Christ is said to have taught us the rite of sacrificing, in that taking bread, He gave thanks saying: *This is my body*, and the chalice likewise He confessed to be His Blood. Therefore He taught us to sacrifice by the consecration. But if there is anything offered in sacrifice by the consecration, it must be the thing which after the consecration is found sacred to God: for to sacrifice is *to make sacred*. Now, as the terminus of the consecration, we have, according to Irenaeus, "the Eucharist . . . which is the Body and Blood of Christ" (5, 2, 3, col. 1127). In the Eucharist, therefore, Christ offered His Body and Blood, and so, too, we offer it.¹

Thirdly, the words which follow the third passage cited above favour our interpretation: "Those who say that the Father is not the Creator of all, and then offer to Him the things which we call creatures of the world we live in, show Him to be covetous and craving what is not His own. And those who say that the things of our world are the fruits of imperfection, ignorance and passion, sin against their own Father, when they offer to Him [what they consider to be] the fruits of disfigurement, ignorance, and passion, insulting Him rather than giving Him thanks. How will they be convinced that the bread in which thanksgiving is

offering of the Body and Blood of Christ: I refer to the *Commentary* attributed to St. Sophronius. Christ the Victim of expiation is here presented to us as arising from the substances of bread and wine, "as the first fruits and the sacrifice chosen from all the fruits". For, says this writer: "As the immaterial God took flesh from a virgin, and was perfect God and perfect Man in the one hypostasis or person, like to us in all things save sin, so too the deacon and priest cut, as it were, with a lance, as we said above, a new body from the womb and the flesh and the blood of a virgin body, that is from pure bread. And thus in a manner peculiarly hypostatic, they consecrate from out of that womb. Therefore first appears the bread of the offering, then appears the Redeemer, having assumed to Himself the whole mass of human nature, offered to God and the Father, as the first fruits and the sacrifice chosen from all the fruits" (*Commentarius liturgicus*, 10. P. G. 87, ter. 3989).

¹ Wieland tries, in a very strange way, to prove that, according to Irenaeus, the Body of Christ is only made present and not offered. His argument is that Irenaeus speaks of the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ in such manner that we must understand it to be made by the consecration, but in the consecration there is not a word to tell us that a gift is offered thereby (*Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, pp. 148–149). His words show that he does not know that the sacrificial offering is not made by a formal enunciation of it, but by an action. It is by the words of consecration that Christ offered Himself to God to be immolated, for then, slaying Himself sacramentally or in symbol, under the appearance of bread and wine, He disposed and presented Himself to be slain really, in order to make atonement to God. Such was His sacrificial action accomplished by the words indicative of the immolation of His Body and Blood.

made is the Body of their Lord, and the chalice is His Blood, if they say that He is not the Son of the Maker of the world, that is the Word of HIM WHO MAKES THE TREE BEAR FRUIT AND THE FOUNTAINS FLOW, and the earth give the grain, then the ear, then the ripe WHEAT in the ear? How again is it that they say that the flesh goes into corruption, and does not receive life, the flesh which is nourished by the Body and Blood of the Lord? Therefore let them either change their teaching or refrain from offering as they do. But our teaching is in harmony with our Eucharist, and again our Eucharist confirms our teaching. FOR WE OFFER TO HIM WHAT IS HIS, CONSISTENTLY, too, with this, teaching communication and union with Him, and confessing the resurrection of the flesh and of the spirit. For just as the bread which is from the earth, on receiving the invocation of God is bread no longer but the Eucharist made up of two things, one earthly, one heavenly, so, too, our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are now no longer corruptible, as they have the hope of the resurrection" (4, 18, 4-5, cols. 1027-1029).

Irenaeus exposes the inconsistency of the heretics in this passage. They said that the bread, wine and water were not created by the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but that these substances were either entirely outside God's creation, or at best that they are disfigurements in the creation of God, and yet they profess that the Body and Blood of the Lord is offered in the consecrated bread and the consecrated chalice. Now in the chalice as well as in the bread of the Eucharist, there is a *complexus* of two things: one of these things is earthly, sensible, subject to conditions of matter—that element which retains the properties of bread and wine; the other is heavenly, invisible, endowed with a spiritual condition—the Body and Blood of Christ. It is by reason of the former earthly element in the Eucharist that these heretics offer a eucharist, either alien to God or at least unworthy of God, as it is in their view the fruit of disfigurement, ignorance and passion. Irenaeus contrasts with this inconsistency the harmony and consistency between what we Catholics offer and the doctrine we profess, whether in relation to the union of the spiritual and material in man as one being, or to the incorruptibility supervening on our corruptibility, and in particular with

regard to the origin of all creation, both spiritual and material, from the one same God. He demonstrates this harmony from the fact that the Eucharist implies two elements, one earthly, the other heavenly. From Irenaeus' line of argument we infer that "what WE OFFER" is the Eucharist itself, "which is the Body and Blood of Christ".¹

¹ There is another interpretation of the words of Irenaeus, according to which by the earthly element (*res terrena*) in the Eucharist he means the Body and Blood of Christ, and by the heavenly element (*res coelestis*) the divinity. This interpretation is derived from D. Massuet, who used it when attacking the Calvinist teaching of a merely virtual presence of Christ in the Eucharist (*In Irenaei libros dissertatio*, 3, n. 84. P. G. 7, 334). Lately some other Catholics have been attracted by this interpretation (P. Batiffol, *Ét. d'Hist. et de Théol. Posit.*, 2^e Série 3, 153-154; Jansen, art. *Eucharistiques* [Accidents] in D. T. C., col. 1371; and later again P. Batiffol, *Eucharistie*, 5, 177-178). This interpretation we reject for the following reasons:

(I.) In the mind of Irenaeus the Body of Christ is just as celestial as the altar on which our offering is presented.

(II.) The very nature of the controversy of Irenaeus with the Gnostics demanded that by the earthly element he would mean something of the nature of bread and wine. For the Gnostics did not admit anything earthly in the body which Christ assumed; in their opinion it was of a nature completely free from matter (cf. *Adv. Haeres.*, 1, 5, 5, and 1, 7, 2). Hence Irenaeus, wishing to convict them of inconsistency (by an argument *ad hominem*), could not call the Body of Christ here an earthly thing, for the obvious reply of the heretics in that case would be that they were not inconsistent, because when they offered the Body of Christ to the heavenly Father their offering was not of anything alien to His creation or disfigured in it, but of a thing absolutely immaterial. However, every such loophole of escape was closed to them, were the earthly thing, in the mind of Irenaeus, the bread and wine, that is the sensible element, interwoven with the celestial thing, the Body and Blood of Christ. Nor can our opponents in fairness invoke against us this other passage of Irenaeus: "What, therefore, is earthly? The plasm (*plasma*). What heavenly? The spirit" (*Adv. Haeres.*, 5, 9, 3, col. 1145). For, *in the first place*, Irenaeus is not speaking of Christ here, he is speaking of the rest of men led from an earthly life, which is according to the plasm of the flesh, into the heavenly life which is according to the Spirit of God; *secondly*, he is speaking of them as on the way to that heavenly life as *viatores*, not yet possessing it as *comprehensores*. Here, therefore, by the word *earthly* Irenaeus could very well mean body, though he certainly could not mean body were his arguments directed against the Gnostics with regard to the Body of Christ; and according to the custom of that period he could not have spoken so under any circumstances, were he speaking of the glorified or the Eucharistic Body of Christ, as we shall see shortly.

(III.) The early Fathers always called the Eucharistic or the glorified Body of Christ spiritual, intelligible, celestial, as in St. Paul (*I Cor.*, XV, 44), but never *earthly*. Of this we have abundant evidence in the many passages to be quoted later from Clement, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, etc.; and there are places without number, in the Greek Fathers especially, where the victim of our sacrifice is called *intelligible*, etc. For the present we shall just give one instance of this style from Didymus, *In Act.*, II, 25. P. G. 39, 1660: "The Flesh restored to life after the resurrection is a spiritual and incorruptible body."

The first and, as far as I know, the only one of the Greeks to call the Body of Christ in the Eucharist in a manner earthly was the Greek Macarius Magnes in the fourth century (*Macarii Magneti quae supersunt ex inedito codice edidit C. Blondel*, Paris, 1876, c. 23, p. 106). He notes, *first*, that both the human body and the bread and wine are from the earth; so that for this reason the human body (of Christ in the Eucharist) could be called earth, and the bread and wine be called the flesh and blood of earth: and thus it happens that bread and wine is not inappropriately termed the

flesh and blood of the human body (seeing that earth and the human body are the same); he notes, *secondly*, that the earth, as the creature of Christ, is the property of Christ. And hence he says Christ could say, not only *this is a human body* and *this is human blood*, but this is *my* flesh, and this is *my* blood; because it is the flesh and blood of the same body which is the property of Christ, namely the earth. Such language could not be fittingly and properly used by one to whom the earth did not belong. Having established these two principles, he introduces Christ addressing us as follows: "The earth is my creature; from the earth spring up alike both the body and this my mass (bread). Therefore signing with the cross the bread and the chalice, I give them to you from the union or complex ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta\varsigma = A$) in which I the Holy One ($\delta\ \text{Ἁγίος}$, = God) have been united with the earthly thing, decreeing them to be my Body and Blood." He then remarks that if the words of the Supper were uttered by any other than the Creator, they would be reprehensible for two reasons: *firstly*, as false and ambitious, for only the Creator, because of His dominion over the earth, could call the bread *His* body; and *secondly*, because the food and the drink would not then be life-giving, "because in this complexus or union ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta = B$) it would not have the living Word, and therefore, seeing that the earthly thing ($\gamma\eta\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu$) would not have been proclaimed (Χρηματῖσαν text has Χρηματίσαν) the Body of God, it would not lead the partakers into eternal life".

Therefore he mentions union or complexus ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta$) twice. In the first, case (*A*) because of the words just preceding, in which he speaks of Christ as sprung from the earth, the more probable interpretation appears to be that the *union* ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta$) here is that of the Incarnation and may be understood of the hypostatic union of the Word with the earthly body, that is sprung from the earth, to which He united Himself ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta$) at the Incarnation. It is less probable, though this could be argued, that the word *union* in the first instance means the Eucharistic union between the *Holy One*, that is the Word, and the *earthly thing*, the manner of which union is clear from the second instance in which union ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta$) is mentioned. For in the second passage (*B*) he is certainly speaking of the Eucharistic union of the Word with that earthly thing—of the nature of bread and wine (*panea et vinea*)—which, for the above reason, is called or is pronounced to be the Body of God. So that in neither passage (*A* or *B*) is the true Body of Christ, such as we believe it to be present in the Eucharist, called earthly; in the first excerpt it is possibly the Body of Christ, but as assumed in the Incarnation long ago; in the second, the bread or wine, not changed, by a mere figure of speech is called by the name of Body and Blood of Christ; representing that Body, so to speak, and exercising its power (not, however, without some immediate influence of the Word). Anyone can see how far this teaching is opposed to Catholic dogma: since: (1) it excludes from the Eucharist everything of the true Body of the Lord born of the Virgin Mary, merely retaining the Body by an extrinsic title of some kind, and that title a frivolous one; and (2) it would only admit some kind of union of the Word with the bread and wine; for though he insists that the bread and wine is not merely in a "figurative sense the Body and Blood, as some have stupidly fancied, but truly the Body and Blood of Christ", the only reason he gives is "because the Body is from the earth, so is the bread and the wine", as Christ the Word implies, when He says *this is my body*, etc.; as if the actual bread (even with the influx of the Word) could really and properly be called the human body, by reason of its origin from the earth, and in turn could really and properly be called the Body of Christ by reason of Christ's dominion over the earth! This is just what he says, and nothing more, softening the expression "eat my flesh and drink my blood" to suit the tender feelings of some at Capharnaum who were horrified at these words of Christ. His words are certainly very ancient, for he represents himself as writing three centuries after Christ and St. Paul. Otherwise we know nothing about him. His words have no bearing on the question under review, and even if they had, as the fruit of fantasy, they may well be left aside. At the same time I must admit that Rev. L. Duchesne (*De Macario Magnete*, Paris, 1876, p. 31 *et seq.*) is more lenient in his judgment of these words of Macarius, misled, I think, by what Magnes has to say on the food of immortality, and by another expression which will be considered later in XXXVIII (Vol. III). Meantime, however, he gives no proof for his more lenient interpretation.

Fourthly, further support comes from Irenaeus, when he says that our offerings are made at the celestial altar: "for thither, he says, our offerings are directed" (4, 18, 6, col. 1029). Now we have seen that we can only offer the Body of Christ on the celestial Altar, which is the Body of Christ.¹

Although Irenaeus was well aware that the primary role in our sacrifice is played by the Body and Blood of Christ, it is no surprise to us to find him dwelling rather on the sensible element, arguing, as he was, from the properties of this sensible element against the Gnostics who held that the world of matter was not made by God the Father, but originated from some demiurge, or at least from some corruption of the works of God.

Meantime, it is interesting to find in Irenaeus the two following statements side by side: firstly, that sacrifices are hateful to God, to whom faith, obedience and justice are alone pleasing; and, secondly, nevertheless the offering of the Church is acceptable as coming from the pure, and not offered to God as if He needed our gifts, but offered by us who need God's praise or approval. (*Adv. Haeres.*, 4, 17 and 18).

Among Western writers, I have no remembrance of having met the expression *earthly or material* of the Flesh of Christ, until I first found it in Gulielmus a Sancto Theodorico (*De Sacram. altar.*, c. 9. P. L. 180, 356).

All this has been said *ad abundantiam*. As far as our controversy with Wieland goes, it matters little which way you interpret Irenaeus. Far otherwise, though, when considering the sacramental efficacy of the Body and Blood of the Lord see below Th. XXII; also XXXVIII (Vol. III).

¹ As a matter of fact, the teaching of Irenaeus on the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ is so plain that Wieland who in his first book had written: "This purely spiritual teaching of the above Fathers on the Christian sacrifice is further amplified by Irenaeus, when he says that a concrete expression of it is our offering to the Creator of THE ELEMENTS OF THE BREAD AND WINE DESTINED FOR THE EUCHARIST, as the first fruits of the whole redeemed creation" (*Mensa und Confessio*, p. 52), was later in his third book compelled to confess "that the Body and Blood of Christ, and indeed in so far as they are the first fruits of the creation to which we belong, are called by Irenaeus gifts offered by us to God, does not need proof" (*Der vorirrenäische Opferbegriff*, p. 146). But misled by his own false opinion that there is no oblation force in the consecration, when he comes to the summing up of his doctrine, this is how he attempts to reconcile his two statements: "Irenaeus did not wish to consider the consecration as the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, as of gifts rendered to God, in any but a symbolic sense" (*Ibid.*, p. xii). That is to say, according to Irenaeus, the Body and Blood of Christ are not really offered to God, but the common elements of bread and wine are offered, and in offering these we appear to be offering the Body and Blood of Christ. In other words, we have a sacrifice of the bread and wine, not an apparent but a real sacrifice, and we have also a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, not real but only apparent. Could one imagine a more forced and perverse interpretation?

B. ORIGEN

Origen is replying to Celsus, who thought that thanksgiving, the offering of the first fruits and prayers, should be paid to the devils, because the devils have control over earthly affairs: "Let Celsus, who knows not God, render sacrifices in thanksgiving to the devils. But we, giving thanks to the founder of the universe, also eat bread, offered with thanksgiving and prayer said over the gifts (τοὺς μετ' ευχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους = *A*), which are made by the prayer (διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν = *B*) a holy body sanctifying those who use it with right disposition" (*Contra Celsum*, 8, 33, P. G. 11, 1565).

Our innovator in theology was the first after Renz (*op. cit.*, bd. 1, p. 206) to hold that in this passage Origen considers the consecration and the offering as two distinct things.¹ Renz proves this separation from the fact that an oblation prayer (*A*) is set before us by Origen as united with thanksgiving, while the consecrative prayer (*B*) is set before us with no mention of thanksgiving. But surely not to affirm a thing is not the same as to deny it. And even if Origen never affirmed it, that is no reason for saying that he denied that thanksgiving is contained in the consecrative prayer. Indeed when in the second part of the sentence he terms the prayer of consecration *the* prayer (τὴν εὐχὴν), by the use of the definite article he seems to designate the same prayer which he introduced in the first clause as oblation. Hence Wieland very rightly changed his opinion later on and wrote in his third work, that in this passage it must be admitted that the offering is made by the consecration (*Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, pp. 150–151). But he now falls back on another passage from Origen and fancies he has discovered that Origen at times leans towards the opposite teaching, that the offering and consecration are distinct. He quotes Origen commenting on *Luke XIX, 24*, "Take the pound away from him, and give it to him that hath ten pounds," where he says: "And in this manner those things which we shall have given to God, He will give back to us,

¹ "Origen makes a strict distinction between *to offer* and *to consecrate*" (Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio*, p. 56).

and with them other things which we did not have before. God asks and requires gifts from us, so to have an occasion of giving to us, to give to the one who gave (*erogavit*) to Him. For the pound is His grace returned in double measure, and more is bestowed on the worthy than they hoped for. Let us therefore rise and pray to God that we may be worthy to offer to Him gifts that He will give back to us, AND IN RETURN FOR WHAT IS EARTHLY BESTOW ON US WHAT IS HEAVENLY, in Christ Jesus, to whom is glory and empire for ever and ever. Amen” (*In Luc.*, hom. 39. P. G. 13, 1900–1902). But what reason have we for saying that Origen, when encouraging liberality towards God, is referring to the gifts which the faithful present when asking the priest to offer the sacrifice, and not to the gifts actually offered by the sacrificing priest? The faithful’s portion of these gifts consecrated into the Body and Blood of Christ is presented to God, and is also given back to them, and so they really do receive heavenly gifts in return for their earthly gifts. This interpretation is most suitable to the above passage, and so we must either adopt it or unreasonably make Origen inconsistent. For elsewhere we find him speaking plainly of the Body and Blood of Christ, as the gifts presented to God. As proof of this, we select three different passages.

Firstly, in *Contra Celsum* (8, 57. P. G. 11, 1601–1604), he says we must not offer sacrifices of thanksgiving to the devils, through whom only evil befalls us, and that we have symbols of gratitude to God our benefactor in the bread which is called the Eucharist; and that the angels do not want sacrifices from us, for they do not aspire after the honour due to God alone: “Celsus would have us grateful to the devils, and thinks that we are bound to offer sacrifices of thanksgiving to them. But we, well knowing what the virtue of gratitude is, deny that we are guilty of ingratitude, when we offer no sacrifice and render no worship to those who, so far from conferring benefits on us, are our enemies. But we do fear to be ungrateful to God, for we are laden with His benefits, we are His work, He provides for us in whatever position He deigns to place us, and in the life to come we are to receive from Him what He has wished us to hope for. And indeed we have a symbol or sign of our gratitude to God—the bread which is called the Eucharist (*Ἔστι δὲ καὶ*

σύμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας ἄτος εὐχαριστία καλοῦμενος).¹ But as we said above the devils have not the administration of the things made for our use. Hence when we use created things which do not belong to them, and refuse to offer sacrifice to them, we do them no injustice. Indeed, even when we know that it is the angels and not the devils who have been given charge of the fruits of the earth and of all living things, while we certainly praise and call blessed those to whom God has given charge of things for our use, we never give them the honour due to God. For God does not wish this, and the angels to whom He has given this charge do not desire it. It is not any offering of ours to them that they would approve of, but rather that we carefully avoid offering sacrifice to them. They have no need of incense sent up to them from the earth.”

The context and the whole tone of the passage clearly show that the Eucharistic bread is the sacrifice offered to God, seeing that it corresponds to the sacrifices (*ευχαριστήρια*)² after which the devils aspire, while the angels do not. “The bread which is called the Eucharist” must mean the Body of Christ, as even Renz admits (*op. cit.*, bd. 1, p. 199), nor can anyone deny it.³

Secondly. He says that in the Eucharistic bread there is the plenitude of propitiatory power, a slight participation of which existed in the figurative loaves of proposition. “According to Scripture, in the twelve loaves a commemoration of the twelve tribes of Israel appears to be made before the Lord, and it is ordered that these twelve loaves should be placed without ceasing in the sight of the Lord, that the memorial of the twelve tribes should be always before Him, so that through these loaves a prayer and a supplication would seem to be made for each of the tribes. But this is intercession on a small and slight scale. . . . But if we compare the loaves to the great mystery, we shall find

¹ That all sacrifice is the visible symbol of our inward homage to God is well known from the common teaching on sacrifice. Hence Origen says very properly that the Eucharist is the symbol of our gratitude. The explanation of this passage given by Renz (*op. cit.*, bd. 1, p. 199) is utterly fantastic. He says that what Origen means is this: that the bread of the Eucharist is not the symbol of our gratitude, but the symbol of the Eucharistic prayer. He thus easily infers that Origen does not consider the Eucharistic bread as our gift offered to God.

² Text has *χαριστήρια*.

³ See hom. 2, in *Psalm 37*, n. 6 (P. G. 12, 1386); Hom. 18, in *Jerem.* n. 13 (P. G. 13, 489); cf. *Contra Celsum*, 8, 22 (P. G. 11, 1552), etc.

that this latter commemoration has an immense propitiatory effect. If you turn to that bread which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world, those loaves of proposition which God Himself presented as a propitiation through faith in His Blood, if you consider that commemoration of which the Lord says: *Do this for a commemoration of me*, you will find that this is the only commemoration that makes God propitious towards men. If you then ponder deeply on the mysteries of the Church, you will find in what is read of in the old Law the image of the truth to come” (*In Levit.*, hom. 13, n. 3. P. G. 12, 547). Now the power of propitiating God towards us is to be understood as residing in the gift as offered by us, and not as bestowed by God on us. Hence the Eucharistic bread has the character of a gift given by us to God.

Thirdly. He says that the rite of propitiation by the blood of a calf gave place to the new rite of propitiation by the Eucharistic Blood. For he writes: “The ancients possessed a rite of propitiation which was made to God, and God gave instructions as to the manner of its celebration. But thou who art come to Christ the true Pontiff, who made propitiation to God for thee with His own Blood and reconciled thee to the Father, do not cleave to the blood of the flesh, but learn rather of the Blood of the Word, and hear Him saying to thee: *This is my blood which shall be shed for you unto the remission of sins*. He who has been imbued with the mysteries, knows the Flesh and Blood of the Word of God. And so let us not dwell any longer on what is familiar to those who know the mysteries, while it must remain obscure to those who do not” (*In Levit.*, hom. 9, n. 10. P. G. 12, 523). This passage clearly shows that, according to Origen, the Eucharistic Body and Blood is the reality that is truly sacrificed or offered by us to God, not only in thanksgiving for the gifts of God, but also in compensation and satisfaction for our own sins. Meantime it is well to note that, like Irenaeus, Origen held that only those sacrifices pertain to the true worship of God which consist in prayer that is constant and in probity of life (*In Levit.*, hom. 9, n. 9. P. G. 12, 521–522; *Contra Celsum*, 7, 1; 8, 21; 8, 62; 8, 64; P. G. 11, 1421, 1449, 1609, 1613). Therefore he knew how to reconcile this teaching regarding the necessity of prayer and

probity of life with the reality of the sacrifice celebrated in the Eucharistic bread and wine.

§ 2. Ignatius, Justin, Hippolytus, Tertullian

We have shown that neither Irenaeus nor Origen considered that the mere natural elements of bread and wine, that is to the exclusion of the Body and Blood of Christ, were what we had to offer in sacrifice to God. We have now to show that the other Fathers before the time of Cyprian did not consider that it was only prayers, to the exclusion of every other thing, that were to be offered in sacrifice to God. For clearness' sake, we shall first examine those Fathers whose teaching is evident.

A. IGNATIUS

For the proper understanding of Ignatius, a few preliminary remarks are necessary.

Firstly. We have at least one passage (*Magnes.*, 7, 2, see below) where Christ is meant by the term *altar*, as was shown above in XIII (Vol. I). Now this acceptance of the word *altar*, as Christ, is so far from being opposed to our Eucharistic teaching that it actually throws a fuller and brighter light on it, as we have already seen, and as will be abundantly shown below.

Secondly. In the *Epistles of Ignatius* (*loc. cit.*, especially), just as in the *Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (32, 2; 41, 2. F. P. 1, 138 and 150), in the *Apocalypse* (*passim*), and also in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, XIII, 10, the term *altar*—whatever sense it has in these passages—usually connotes some temple, and, on occasion, vice versa, temple connotes altar. Moreover, the *temple* or the *altar* in question, or from which a comparison is drawn, is the temple and altar at Jerusalem. In other words, the words *temple* and *altar* either refer to the temple and altar at Jerusalem or, by transference, to something else, whatever that may be, signified by these words (cf. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 3, pp. 457–458).

Thirdly. Possibly in the Septuagint, and probably in the New

Testament, when the subject signified or the term of comparison is the *temple* and *altar* of Jerusalem, sometimes though not very often, the word *altar* is used for the altar and that part of the temple close to the altar considered as one thing, or, if we may describe it so, "the place of sacrifice" (*Sacrificatorium*) that is for the sacrarium or the sanctuary (*I Mach.*, 1, 59; *Eccli.*, 50, 11, *et seq.*; *Apoc.*, XI, 1; XIV, 18), so that the expression without or within the altar is not without meaning. But although the word was used for the sanctuary of the temple of Jerusalem, nevertheless there is not a single example of it referring, to any *material Christian sanctuary*, either before Ignatius or among his contemporaries, or in any other writer during the next two centuries; although, as we have said, this same word is often used for Christian *altars* from the beginning of the third century.¹

Fourthly. Whenever Ignatius speaks of the Eucharist, he adopts that symbolism which is intrinsic to the Eucharist, so that he either means the real Body of Christ, in so far as it is the Sacrament or symbol of the body of the Church, or the body of the Church with reference to the real Body of the Lord in which is its exemplar. Hence our Eucharist, the real Body of Christ, is always in evidence in these passages: whether he has directly in mind the real Body itself, not without respect to what is signified by it—ecclesiastical

¹ The word *Θυσιαστήριον* occurs for the first time in the sense of the Christian sanctuary in the nineteenth canon of the Council of Laodicea (between A.D. 343 and 381), although Dom. H. Leclercq (*Hist. des Conciles*, t. 1, 2nd part, 1907, p. 1010) translates the words *εἰσιέναι εἰς Θυσιαστήριον* "to approach the altar", which is a fairly probable rendering. We then find the same use in Socrates, H. E. 1, 37 (P.G. 67, 176), although Valesius again translates the words *εἰς τὸ Θυσιαστήριον εἰσελθὼν, ὑπὸ τὴν ἱερὰν τράπεζαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ στόμα ἐκκείνας* as follows: "having approached the altar, he prostrated himself with his face to the ground, beneath the sacred table" (*ibid.*, col. 175); this rendering is somewhat favoured by a corresponding passage of Sozomen, H. E. 2, 29 (P. G. 67, 1017): *εἰσὸς ὑπὸ τὸ Θυσιαστήριον*. The third place we find this use is in Procopius, *Monodia in Sanctam Sophiam*. (P. G. 87 ter, 2836); although Combefis understands the altar only to be meant here, and with a certain amount of probability (*ibid.*, 2835). Besides these three passages mentioned by both Sophocles (*Greek Lexicon of the R. and B. period*, 1904, s.v. *Θυσιαστήριον*) and Westcott (*op. cit.*, p. 461), we can now advance another whose meaning is not open to doubt, from the commentary *De Sacra Liturgia*, attributed by Cardinal Pitra to John the Faster (*Spicilegium Solesm.*, t. 4, p. 441): "Ὅλον γὰρ Θυσιαστήριον λέγεται, διὰ τὸ τὰς Θυσιαστηρεῖν λέγεται παρὰ πᾶσι καὶ βῆμα: The whole is called the *thusiastieron*, because it keeps guard over the sacrifices; it is also commonly called the *bema*." Now *bema* is the common word for sanctuary, as can be seen in Sophocles (*op. cit.*, p. 307) and in B., pp. 476, 480, 571, 587, 595, where a few examples of this meaning are found, to which the two following can be added: Nazian., *Or.* 43, n. 52. P. G. 36, 565, A; and *Expositio Officiorum Ecclesiae*, of uncertain authorship, commonly attributed to George of Arbela (see Connolly's translation, C. S. C. O., 91, 91).

unity; or whether he has directly in mind the ecclesiastical body which is related primarily and in itself to the real Body.¹

(1) Ignatius, recommending ecclesiastical unity, from which one withdraws should he dare to perform sacred functions outside the order of the legitimate sacerdotal hierarchy, writes as follows: "Take care, therefore, to use the one Eucharist; for the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ is one, and one is the chalice in the oneness of His Blood, one altar, just as there is one bishop with the priests and the deacons my fellow-servants; so that what you do, you may do according to God" (*Ad Philadelph.*, 2, 4. F. P. 1, 266). Our Eucharist, therefore, or the Flesh and the Blood of Jesus Christ, is a reality which has something in common with the altar. Now what the link is between the altar and the reality is further suggested from his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, where we read: "Let no one err; unless he is within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God" (*Eph.*, 5, 2. F. P. 1, 216). The relation therefore between the altar and the bread is this: the altar, so to speak, underlies the bread, and therefore the bread is there after the manner of something placed on the altar, or offered in sacrifice to God. Although in this place it seems to me that the far more probable interpretation of *altar* is the altar not made with hands,² but the living, celestial, invisible Altar, contained in that Eucharist (*i.e.* the Body and Blood of Christ), it is nevertheless the altar which receives and transmits to God the sanctified oblation. Therefore our Eucharistic rite implies that in place of the ordinary bread and the ordinary chalice we have now the Body and Blood of Christ in the status of a real thing offered to God.

¹ Ignatius stretches this symbolism to its extreme limits. Writing to the *Romans*, IV, 1 (F. P. 1, 256), he says that he is "the wheat of God" and he desires to be made "the pure bread of Christ". We, on the other hand, usually call Christ our bread, and Christ Himself the wheat of God. But the martyrs are most perfectly incorporated with the death of Christ unto the life of glory. In martyrdom therefore especially, the Eucharist has its effect, that we be made the body of Christ and, so to speak, Eucharistic bread. Hence by martyrdom we become the bread and the corn, not indeed of man but of Christ and God, to whom we are immolated and to whom we are presented as holocausts. This has been well explained by an anonymous English Cistercian monk, author of *Distinctiones Monasticae* (xii-xiii century, lib. 2, c. 94, *Spicil Solesm.*, t. 3, p. 466): "Christ is the wheat, and so He says: *Unless the grain of wheat falling on the ground die*, etc. Hence it is plain that they who have risen from that grain are the wheat: therefore conscious of the grace conferred on him, Ignatius says: I am the wheat of God; may I be ground by the teeth of wild beasts, so as to be made pure bread."

² In view of what Ignatius has to say in the *Epistle to the Magnesians*, 7, 2 (below), this acceptance appears to be the more probable. We have already said that in this

(II) Further, Ignatius exhorts the Trallians to be careful lest, presuming TO DO (*agere*) anything without the bishop, the priesthood, and the deacons, they may be found outside the altar; and similarly the Magnesians, that not only must they not *do* anything without the bishop, and the priests, but also that when they come together their prayer (*προσευχή*) and their petition (*δέησις*) should be one, so that they all come together in the one Christ as in one altar. He who is within the altar is clean; but he who is outside the altar is not clean; that is, he who does anything without the bishop, the priesthood, and the deacons, that man is not clean in conscience (*Ad Trallianos*, 7, 2. F. P. 1,

Epistle Christ is plainly meant by the word altar. Moreover, the expression “*within the altar*” would have no sense if he were speaking here of the table of a material altar, or even of our material sanctuary in the usual meaning of the term *Θυσιαστήριον* at a later period. Why should Ignatius want all the Christians to be together in the sanctuary and leave the rest of the sacred edifice empty? Then again the Christians of that time did not profess that they had sanctuaries, any more than they professed to have (material) altars, or temples (*ναός*); the word *Church* even was not yet in use to signify a temple. It was only later on that the use of the words *ναός* and *Θυσιαστήριον* for Christian *temple* and *sanctuary* became common. If we take *altar* here to be the Body of Christ, the interpretation is in every way satisfactory, because it is the sacrament which makes for ecclesiastical unity, and so when we are said to be within it we are accounted members of the ecclesiastical body. The corresponding passage from the *Epistola ad Trallianos*, 7, 2, which we quote directly, strongly suggests the same interpretation. To confirm our view we may accept here an argument from Wieland (M. u. C., p. 41): “If Ignatius had in mind a material altar, when he commended ecclesiastical unity, by way of union with the altar, why did he not write something like this: “Be mindful and do not erect an altar over against the legitimate altar,” as later Cyprian often did? (*Ep.* 40, 3; 65, 3. P. L. 4, 336 and 396; *Ep.* 76, 1. P. L. 3, 1139; *De unitate Ecclesiae*, 17. P. L. 4, 513). His reason was, that he had in mind the altar not made with hand, the living Altar—Christ—and so it would be absurd for him to condemn a conflict of altars, which is possible only where material altars are in question.

Meantime, we must not be disturbed here by the implication that Christ as Altar underlies Christ as Victim. For in the first place, as we have said Th. XIII (Vol. I), in spiritual sacrifice, such as is the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, this mutual relation is not inconsistent; and secondly, there are many passages in which writers of later centuries exhibit this mutual relationship. We have already mentioned some; we shall refer to others later in various places.

If this interpretation of the *Epistola ad Ephesios* is admitted, I think it will easily apply to the *Epistola ad Philadelphenses*, because of the same link between the altar and the banquet. Hence the meaning of the passage will be: Ignatius exhorts the Philadelphians to make use of only one Eucharistic celebration or synaxis (*Let us be careful to use one Eucharist*), giving force to his exhortation by stressing that well-known triple unity (which he does not invent, but merely declares as a fact), namely, the unity of the Victim (the Flesh is one . . . and one is the chalice) OF THE ALTAR (the altar is one), and of the Priesthood in Christ. We have seen, and shall see again, this triple unity inculcated in the same christological sense by Fathers and Doctors without number, most clearly of all by the Eucharistic Doctor, Paschasius Radbertus.

It is not at all unlikely that the term altar, in its christological sense, of Christ the Altar, commonly used by Ignatius, was derived from that very old Ascensional epiclesis, in which the priest prayed that the gifts be carried to the heavenly altar (to Christ) by the fact that they were changed, cf. XXI; so the words of Ignatius would be already intelligible to the faithful.

246–248). “Do nothing without the bishop and the priesthood, and do not presume that anything done apart from them is worthy of praise; but in your assemblies let there be one prayer, one petition, one mind, one hope in charity, in holy joy, which is Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is greater. Do ye all gather together as in the one temple of God, as to the one altar to the one Jesus Christ, who proceeds from the one Father, and was one with Him, and has returned to Him” (*Ad Magnesios*, 7, 1–2. F. P. 1, 236).

Our free-lance theologian Wieland is aware that the action implied by the word *Do* (*Agere*) here consists in the prayer and petition by which the Eucharistic bread is made or consecrated (*conficiatur*). He concludes from this that the consecrative prayer alone is the actual sacrifice offered on that altar which is either Christ or the Church (D. V. O., 51–52). But surely the inference is rather that the word *do* here is to be taken to refer to the sacrificial action itself (*to sacrifice*), and that the consecrative prayer, if it is the *action*, must be taken as the sacrificial action itself, or the offering of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice which is offered? For, as we have said before, we may consider sacrifice from a twofold aspect, the active sacrifice, or sacrificial action, and the passive, or the victim offered in sacrifice. As active sacrifice, the sacrifice of the Eucharist is indeed *the* prayer of the Church to God, as containing the words of Christ. As passive sacrifice, it is that which terminates the sacrificial action: namely the actual sacrificed Body and Blood of Christ. That the consecrative prayer is the sacrificial action therefore in no way militates against, but rather favours, the other part of our teaching, that the Body and Blood of Christ is the sacrifice offered to God. But of this more presently.

B. JUSTIN

In the *Dialogus* Justin declared that the offering of flour—commanded in the Law to those who were cleansed from leprosy—was a figure of the Eucharistic bread which Christ commanded to be consecrated in memory of His Passion, and in thanksgiving for the Creation and the Redemption. Clearly this comparison suggests that as of old the flour was, so now the Eucharistic bread

is, something actually offered to God. He then goes on to state more distinctly that the clean sacrifice, as foretold by Malachias, to be offered throughout the whole world, is none other than the bread and the chalice of the Eucharist. We could not wish for a clearer indication of the nature of the reality offered in the Eucharistic bread and chalice. These are his words: "The offering of flour also, prescribed for those who were cleansed from leprosy, was a figure of the bread of the Eucharist, which the Lord Jesus Christ commanded to be made (*confici*) by us in memory of His Passion, which He sustained for those whose souls are purged from all malice, and that at the same time we might give thanks to God, because He created the world, and everything that is in it, for the sake of man, liberated us from the wickedness in which we were, and completely overthrew the principalities and powers through Him who suffered the Passion according to His will. Hence God spoke, as I have already said, of the sacrifices which you offered at that time, through Malachias, one of the twelve, in these words: *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, and I will not receive gifts at your hands, for, from the rising of the sun until the going down thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord, and you have profaned it.* And so even as far back as that time He predicts those sacrifices, that is OF THE BREAD OF THE EUCHARIST, and likewise of the CHALICE OF THE EUCHARIST, which are OFFERED in every place by us, the Gentiles, adding this also: that His name is glorified by us, but profaned by you" (*Dial.*, 41. P. G. 6, 564). Hence it is the bread and the chalice of the Eucharist that are offered in sacrifice, and not Eucharistic prayers.

Such is the first passage, and its meaning is so clear that it leaves no doubt at all about the meaning of this other: "Long beforehand (*in antecessum*) God declares that all those are pleasing to Him who, through His name, make the sacrifices which Jesus commanded to be made, those which we make in the Eucharist of bread and wine, and which are made by Christians in every place" (*Dial.*, 117. P. G. 6, 745). One might infer, though the inference would not be obvious by any means from the last passage taken alone,¹ that the matter of the sacrifice is not the

¹ What we mean is this: the second excerpt does not say that the sacrifices are *offered* (προσφέρεισθαι), it says they are *made* (γινεσθαι, γινόμενας). The difference

bread or the chalice, but the actual thanksgiving pronounced over the bread and the chalice; a comparison with the first passage, however, shows such an inference to be impossible.

We are now in a position to understand the words of Justin which follow immediately after the last quotation, in which he refutes the Jewish interpretation of the "clean sacrifice" foretold by Malachias, that it was merely the prayers of the dispersed Jews, substituted for the Jewish sacrifices. These are his words: "I, too, say that prayers and thanksgiving made by the worthy are the only sacrifices perfect and acceptable to God. For it is only such prayers that Christians are instructed to make, even in memory of their solid and liquid nutriment, in which a commemoration is also made of the Passion which the Son of God offered for them. But while the prayers and thanksgiving of the Jews are not said throughout the world, there is no race of people among whom in the name of Jesus Christ prayers and thanksgiving are not made to the Father of all things" (*ibid.*, 745-748).¹ To us the plain meaning of the passage is that sacrifices really acceptable to God are not made by the sword or by fire, but by the prayers and thanksgivings of the lips. For among Christians there is no sacrificial action other than the pronouncement of the Eucharistic prayers over the bread and wine, of which Justin writes in another place: "We are taught that that food which is made the Eucharist (*eucharistiata*) by the word of prayer handed down by Him, δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ,² and from which our

between the force of the two expressions is this: when we say a sacrifice is offered, the words are more apt to suggest the thing that is offered in sacrifice; when we say it is made, or carried out or enacted, they apply more aptly to the sacrificial action.

¹ Εὐχαί και εὐχαριστίαι τῷ Πατρὶ και ποιητῇ τῶν δλων γίνονται. It is amazing that a man can be so carried away by his own preconceptions, as to dare to say: prayers and thanksgiving alone are the sacrifices of the Christians, because Justin says "they are offered to the Father and Creator of all things, through the name of Jesus Crucified" (*dargebracht werden*) (M. u. C., p. 51. D. V. O., 129). For Justin does not say *are offered* (προσφέρονται); he says *are made* (γίνονται). The prayers are made, by which is offered "the bread of the Eucharist and likewise the chalice of the Eucharist."

² Quite lately Edmund Bishop (in T. a. S., V. 8, n. 1; *The Moment of Consecration*, p. 158 *et seq.*) has suggested that the Greek of Justin, δι, εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ should be translated *by the prayer of the Word which is from Him* (God and the Father). The probability of this interpretation is so slight that it might well be passed over. Still out of regard for so eminent an authority I submit three remarks: *firstly*, the elegancies of grammar will not justify our referring the word *him* (αὐτοῦ)

flesh and blood are given nutriment by the change,¹ is the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Jesus"; that is to say, the prayers and thanksgiving, which while giving the words of Christ,² make (*conficiunt*) or consecrate the sacrament, constitute the whole sacrificial action in respect of the matter offered in sacrifice, which is the Body and Blood of Christ.

This teaching is not peculiar to Justin, Ignatius (see above) or Origen,³ but it is the common teaching of all Catholics, constantly declared by the other Fathers; for instance, by Tertullian (*Ad Scapulam*, 2. P. L. 1, 700: "We sacrifice . . . by pure prayer"), Cyprian (*De Unitate Ecclesiae*, 17; and *Ep.* 64, 4. P. L. 513 and 392), Firmilianus (*Ep. ad Cyprianum*, 10. P. L. 3, 1165), Lactantius ("for sacrifice must be offered to God by word", *Institut.*, 6, 25. P. L. 6, 730), Jerome (*Ep.* 14, 8. P. L. 22, 352): "they consecrate (*conficiunt*) the Body of Christ by sacred words"; and especially by St. Gregory Nazianzen, either where he writes to Amphilochius: "O holy worshipper of God, hasten to pray and fulfil your office for us, when by your word, you call down the Word, when WITH YOUR TONGUE FOR SWORD, YOU DIVIDE THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD WITH A BLOODLESS CUTTING" (*Eph.*, 171. P. G. 37, 280-281), or when he exhorts the magistracy of his own city to calm the citizens, by "this table to which we all in common

back to the word God (*θεου*), far separated from it, but to the Word of God, or Christ, to whom all the intervening words refer; *secondly*, the parallelism in the mind of Justin is this: as the Incarnation was made by the Word of God, so the making of the Eucharist (*eucharistiatio*) is made by the word of the Word, which word is immediately described as below; and *thirdly*, our interpretation, which is the usual one, is confirmed by a comparison with the mysteries of Mithra, where the imitation of the mysteries of Christ is formed indeed in the bread and the cup, but "with the addition of certain words". However, it matters little for our present purpose which of these two interpretations you adopt.

¹ κατὰ μεταβολήν by the change; cf. above Th. IX (Vol. I).

² Justin indicates fairly well what these words are, where he immediately continues: "For in their commentaries, which are called the Gospels, the Apostles handed down to us that Jesus gave orders to them as follows: namely, that He, having taken the bread, when He had given thanks, said: *Do this for a commemoration of me. This is my body.* And having taken the chalice likewise, and having given thanks, He said: *This is my blood (ibid.).*"

³ See above (Origen) *Contra Celsum*, 8, 33, and *In Matth.*, tom. 11, n. 14, "of the bread sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (P. G. 13, 948), where he alludes to *I Tim.*, IV, 5, just as St. Gregory of Nyssa did later in *Or. Catechet.*, 37. P. G. 45, 97. Edmund Bishop (*op. cit.*, p. 156) proposes his own translation: "By the word of God and prayer" of the words of Origen and Gregory as he had already done for similar words of Justin, as we saw. His reasons for his choice are very weak, and W. J. Tyrer, in *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*, London, 1917, pp. 41-46, 50-52, assailed them in the opposite sense, by far more convincing arguments.

approach, and the pledge (*typos*) of my salvation, which I consecrate WITH THE SAME TONGUE with which I now mediate with you, and the sacred liturgy which lifts us to heaven” (*Or.*, 17, n. 13. P. G. 35, 980), or finally when he writes these poetic words about himself:

“I shall keep my tongue unsullied in the pure sacrifices,
Whereby I conciliate the great King with mortal man.
With guileless tongue and sinless soul I shall transmit the
lifegiving Victim to Him who is pure

The Word knows that I did not loose my tongue in insult,
I did no thing unworthy of our sacrifices”

(*Carmen*, 1, 2, sect. 1, poem. 34, v. 93–96, 181–182. P. G. 37, 1314 and 1320).

Similarly, from all we have said, the meaning of Justin is plain where, in the *Apologia*, 1, 11-13 (cols. 340–345), he says that God does not require material gifts, blood, libations, incense, but all that He desires is that oral prayer and thanksgiving which the Christians make over all that they offer.

C. HIPPOLYTUS

Hippolytus refers the prophecy of *Daniel*, IX, 27, regarding the cessation of the sacrifice to the time of Antichrist, and implicitly linking this sacrifice with the prophecy of *Malachias*, I, 11, declares that the “VICTIM AND LIBATION (*θυσια καὶ σπονδή*),” which is to be swept away at the time, “is now OFFERED (*προσφερομένη*) to God in every place by the Gentiles”.¹ Here the victim

¹ “When Antichrist comes the victim and the libation which is now offered to God in every place shall be swept away” (*auferetur*) (*Fragmenta in Daniele*, n. 22. P. G. 10, 656). In reference to this passage, we have an example of how Renz (*op. cit.*, bd. 1, p. 234) thinks he can escape the admission of an offering in the strict and proper sense of the Body and Blood of Christ, by noting that the offering of which Hippolytus is here speaking is represented in another place in Sacred Scripture (In *Prov.*, IX, 2, a doubtful verse, certainly for his purpose), as the preparation of food. As if it would follow from this that the whole essence of the offering consists precisely in the preparation of food as such! By such a process of reasoning, it would be a very easy matter to prove that Catholics always taught and do teach now the doctrine which Renz defends; for we certainly do hold that the sacrificial action of the Eucharist is at the same time also a preparation of food and drink for us. Recall what we said above, in Thesis I (Vol. I).

and libation can mean nothing other than the Eucharistic bread and chalice itself; hence there is not an offering merely of prayers made to God,¹ but the offering of something which is solid (victim) and something which is liquid (libation), and what precisely it is, of what nature, Hippolytus indicates clearly enough in other places, many of which will be found in Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi*, 1905, pp. 211–215, or d'Alès, *Théologie de Saint Hippolyte*, pp. 147–150.²

D. TERTULLIAN

A classic passage in the *De Oratione* appears to settle beforehand any dispute about Tertullian's teaching on this matter. Criticising those who absented themselves from the Eucharistic assembly to observe the fast, he says: "Similarly, too, there are many who think that we should not assemble FOR THE PRAYERS OF THE SACRIFICES, because the station (that is, the fast) is to be broken BY RECEIVING THE BODY OF THE LORD. Is the Eucharist then a hindrance to the devout worship of God? Rather does it not bring you closer to God? Will not your station be all the more solemn IF YOU STAND AT THE ALTAR OF GOD?"³ "When you have received the Body of the Lord and reserved it, both of your duties are fulfilled, YOU HAVE PARTAKEN OF THE SACRIFICE, and you have discharged your obligation" (*De Oratione*, 19. P. L. 1, 1182–1183). There can be no doubt about the meaning here. The altar is taken in the proper sense, as of that from which the sacrament is to be taken, and by the reception of the sacrament we are considered to partake of the sacrifice itself. Hence it is plain that the Eucharist was the Victim of the sacrifice offered to God through the prayers, by which it is consecrated, of the sacrifices.

¹ Even Wieland admits this (*Die Schrift M. u. C.; u. P.*, Em. Dorsch, p. 102), after supporting the opposite teaching in his first work (*M. u. C.*, p. 51); for the nonce his memory failed him (*M. u. C.*, p. 115).

² Our conclusion is true as to the mind of Hippolytus, even if we pass over, as of doubtful authority, this brief commentary on *Prov.*, IX, 5: "Come eat of my bread and drink the wine which I have mingled for you: He gave us His Flesh and Blood to be eaten and drunk unto the remission of sins" (P. G. 89, 593).

³ Tertullian seems here to indulge in a little play of wit, on account of the ambiguous sense attached to the expression "if you stand at the altar of God", for animals awaiting immolation were usually said to stand at the altar.

We may well note here the parity observed by Tertullian between the sacraments of Christ and of Mithra: "Mithra also celebrates the offering of bread" (*De Praescriptionibus*, 40. P. L. 2, 55).

Consistent with this is what Tertullian has to say in a passage of his *De Pudicitia*. He will not admit that the prodigal son is a Christian who has been impure, or guilty of a more serious sin, for instance apostasy, but rather the pagan converted to the faith and the grace of Christ, and he sharply attacks the former interpretation in these words: "And so the apostate will recover his former robe, the vesture of the Holy Spirit, and again receive the ring, the seal of baptism, AND CHRIST WILL BE SLAIN FOR HIM ANEW!" He then constructs his own interpretation: "It is the pagan when converted who receives the pristine robe, that is, the state which Adam had lost by his sin; and then for the first time does he receive the ring with which, after he has been interrogated, he seals the pact of faith, and after that FEASTS OF THE RICHNESS OF THE BODY OF THE LORD, that is, the Eucharist" (*De Pudicitia*, 9. P. L. 2, 997-998). Here the parallelism of the two passages as well as the analogy with the language of the Gospel parable, shows clearly that the expression "Christ will be slain for him anew" must be understood of the Eucharist: so much so that, according to Tertullian, the celebration of the Eucharist is something in the manner of a re-enacted slaying of Christ.¹ No words could express more effectively the sacrificial action of the Body of the Lord, of whose richness the Christian then feasts.

We can now have no doubt as to the meaning of such expressions as "to offer the sacrifice", or simply "to offer" often occurring in the works of Tertullian. We have an example in the book *De cultu feminarum*. He is warning Christian women against elaborate adornment of the body, for, says he, they have no reason for going out except for reasons that have nothing to do with worldly pomp or display: "You must not go out except for some worthy reason—to visit one of the weaker brethren, to

¹ Note what we have said repeatedly: at times, perhaps too often, the word immolation or mactation is used for the sacrificial action, or the offering of the victim, either offered to immolation, or by immolation, or offered immolated, and this especially when speaking of the image of immolation, as happens in the Eucharist.

OFFER THE SACRIFICE, or to hear the word of God" (*De cultu feminarum*, 11. P. L. 1, 1330). Again in *De Virginibus velandis*: "A woman may not speak in the Church, nor teach, nor baptise, nor offer, nor claim for herself the offices that fall to men, still less the priestly office" (*De Virginibus velandis*, 9. P. L. 2, 902). Finally in the *De Exhortatione castitatis*, where Tertullian, having become Montanist, and claiming the priesthood for the laity, imposes monogamy, one marriage only, on those who practise that priesthood: "Are not we of the laity priests also? It is written: *He hath made us a kingdom and priests to God and his Father* (*Apoc.*, 1, 6). It is the authority of the Church, and the honour sanctified by the assembly of those with order, that establishes the difference between those with order and the people; so that where there is not an assembly of those with ecclesiastical order, YOU OFFER, you baptise, and you are a priest for yourself. But where there are three together, there is the Church, though they be laymen. For each one lives by his own faith, and there is no distinction of persons with God, because *not the hearers of the law, but the doers are justified by God*, according to the saying of the Apostle. If then you have in yourself the right of the priest where it is necessary, you must also have the rule of life of the priest, where of necessity you have the right of the priest. Do you, though twice married (*digamus*), baptize? Do you, though twice married, OFFER? Is it not far more sinful for a layman, when married a second time, to act as priest, seeing that a priest himself, when married a second time, is not allowed to act as priest?" (*De exhortatione castitatis*, 7. P. L. 2, 922-923).¹

¹ The authority of Petavius may be quoted against our interpretation of this passage, for he interprets the words "*You offer*" differently in his treatise *De potestate consecrandi et sacrificandi* (caps. 1 and 2, ed. Barr. Duc., t. 8, p. 7 *et seq.*). He is of opinion there was a custom at that time that after the Eucharist had been consecrated and offered in sacrifice by a priest there would be private assemblies of the Christians, at which, as no priest was available, there was a merely ceremonial offering of the Eucharist, carried out by any layman, or even woman. However, this conjecture is not supported by any historical fact, there is no proof whatever of it in literature, and the Liturgies show no trace of it. We have even contrary indications in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (can. 181 in the Appendix to Duchesne's *Orig. du culte chrétien*, 3, 537; cf. parallel passages from other decrees of the Apostles, in Dom. P. Cagin, *L'Eucharistie*, pp. 264-267), where we read that even at the distribution of the ordinary bread of the exorcism, at the commencement of the agape, not even the semblance of a liturgical action was permitted to the laity, and this, too, even when no priest or deacon was present. Hence the conjecture of Petavius is gratuitous, and even incredible in itself. It is still more incredible that Tertullian is alluding here to any such custom, for his aim is to prove by as forceful an

Though we admit that there are passages (*Apologet.*, 30;¹ *De*

argument as he can command that the distinction between the priest and the layman rests merely on the law of the Church, to the total exclusion of the divine law (cf. d'Alès, *Théologie de Tertullien*, 493). His argument would be futile if, according to the divine law, there was as great a difference between the efficacy of the layman and the prerogative of the priest, as exists between a merely ceremonial action and a sacrificial action properly so called.

In another treatise, *De poenitentia et reconciliatione* (c. 3, t. 8, p. 683), Petavius urges the objection, that Tertullian could not, when a Montanist, have favoured teaching that he condemned, when a Catholic, in the heretics (*De praescriptione*, c. 41). This argument is of little value, for we know that Tertullian changed his teaching in very many matters. However, even if one could admit the interpretation of Petavius, on his own confession it could not stand without the presupposition of a true sacrificial offering of the Body of Christ.

To my mind Tertullian's claim that the laity had the power to consecrate is opposed not only to the faith we hold, but to the faith of all the Catholics of his time. Against this it might be objected with Hugo Grotius (*In Petav.*, *De potestate cons. et sacr.*, p. 10), that Tertullian, when a Montanist and in conflict with Catholics, could not prove the obligation of only one marriage from the sacrificial power of the laity, unless the Catholics admitted the laity had this power, seeing that "an argument with others based on what is not believed by them is futile". The answer is simple: he could not argue from the sacrificial power as simply assumed; he could, however, argue from that power as proved, as he thought, by the testimony of *Apoc.*, I, 6.

So much for the passage under review.

However, we find also another place of some interest in the work *De exhortatione castitatis*, where the expression "for you will offer for two wives" occurs. Here it is plain that Tertullian refers to those offerings which the layfolk make for the celebration of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and at the same time for the sustenance of the poor. In virtue of this offering (somewhat similar to the present-day stipend), the laity have a just claim to be considered offerers of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Not only have they the title of offerers which is common to every member of the Church, but they have also a very special title, which makes the sacrifice to be very intimately their own, as will be seen in the course of this work, Th. XXVII. These are the words of Tertullian—"In the second marriage two wives stand beside the same husband; one in the spirit, the other in the flesh: for you cannot have ill-will towards the former; indeed you will entertain a more religious affection for her, as already welcomed by God; you pray for her spirit; you make annual OFFERINGS for her. Will you stand before God with as many wives as those for whom you pray? Will you OFFER for the two? Will you recommend them both THROUGH A PRIEST ordained after only one marriage, or even consecrated from virginity, surrounded by virgins and by wives of one man, and WILL YOUR SACRIFICE HAVE THE IMPUDENCE to ascend up before God?" (*De exhortatione castitatis*, 11. P. L. 2, 926-927).

We must give a similar interpretation to the expression "SHE OFFERS" in *De monogamia*, 10. P. L. 2, 942: "The wife prays for his soul [the departed husband's], and meantime begs respite for him, and for reunion in the first resurrection, and she OFFERS on the anniversary of his death."

¹ "I offer Him a richer and a greater VICTIM, the victim He Himself demands, PRAYER from pure flesh, from an innocent soul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, not grains of incense to the value of one *as*, or the sap dripping like tears from an Arabian tree, or the blood of a wretched ox, already wishing for death, and then, after all this filth, an unclean conscience; so much so that I often wonder, when your vile priests pass for approval the victims for your sacrifices, that it is not the entrails of the sacrifice rather than of the victims that are examined by you. And so let nails pierce us whose hands are outstretched to God; let us be hung on the cross, let fires lick our flesh, let the sword sever our heads from our bodies, let beasts make sport on us, the Christian with the habit of prayer is ready for any torture." Though

Oratione, 27–28;¹ *Adv. Marcionem*, 3, 22;² and 4, 9.³ P. L. 1, 444–445 and 1194–1195; 2, 353 and 376) in which Tertullian says that the only victim or the only sacrifice offered to God and worthy of God is prayer, still he should be considered to be speaking figuratively here (as ascetic writers today do constantly), as even Wieland (*Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff*, p. 143) admits: “The symbolism is evident.” In so far as in these passages he is alluding to the Eucharistic prayer, as sacrificial, the figure is one of metonymy.⁴ This seems plain from an example in the work *Ad Scapulam*, where he does not say “We sacrifice, or offer in sacrifice, prayers”, but using the proper mode of speech, devoid of figure: “WE SACRIFICE . . . as God commanded, BY PURE PRAYER” (*Ad Scapulam*, 2. P.L. 1, 700).

The fact that in other places Tertullian (*Adv. Judaeos*, 5–6. P. L. 2, 607–609),⁵ rejecting the carnal and earthly sacrifices of the

not referring to the Eucharist, these words inculcate merely what the other Fathers have over and over again stressed—that the visible sacrifice avails nothing without the invisible sacrifice, and the whole efficacy of the invisible sacrifice is found in prayer and the adoration of the devout soul.

¹ Here desiring us to offer to God “a full prayer as our best victim”, he writes as follows: “For this is the spiritual victim which abolished the ancient sacrifices. . . . We are true adorers and true priests; we pray in spirit, in spirit WE MAKE SACRIFICE OF PRAYER proper to God and acceptable to Him, namely the prayer which He asked from us, which He provided for Himself [this may be the Eucharistic prayer, but it is more likely the Lord’s prayer, as Tertullian undertook to explain this in the beginning of the book, c. 1–8, as the ‘new form of prayer of the New Testament’]. We should BRING TO THE ALTAR OF GOD this prayer, full of all our heart’s devotion, nourished with faith, tended with truth, undefiled in innocence, clean with chastity, crowned with the agape, with the glory of good works, with hymns and psalms, the prayer which will obtain all things from God for us.”

² In the sect of Marcion, opposed to the God of the Old Testament, there is retained, together with the sign of the Cross, the clean sacrifice foretold by the prophet of the Old Testament, “THE GIVING OF GLORY, AND BLESSING AND PRAISE AND HYMNS. Seeing that you, too, have all these things, and the sign on your forehead, the sacraments of the Church, and THE CLEANNESSE OF THE SACRIFICES, YOU, TOO, should cry out and proclaim that the Spirit of the Creator has spoken in prophecy of His Christ”. Quite possibly we have here a vague reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice (cf. *Adv. Marcion.*, 1, col. 362).

³ The offering prescribed in the Law from those cleansed from leprosy presignified “that man, once a sinner, now cleansed by the word of God, must OFFER HIS GIFT TO GOD in the temple of God, NAMELY, THE PRAYER AND THANKSGIVING IN THE CHURCH, through Jesus Christ, who is for all men in the world (*catholicum*), the Priest of the Father.” This prayer and thanksgiving appear to indicate the Eucharist; this interpretation is all the more feasible, seeing that in the first book of this same work Tertullian describes the Eucharist celebrated by a Marcionite, in these words: “He discharges the office of thanksgiving over an alien bread to another God” (*Adv. Marcion.*, 1, 23. P. L. 2, 274).

⁴ Just as when we say, as others have before us, the Eucharist for the Body of Christ.

⁵ “. . . It is spiritual not earthly sacrifices that we must offer to God, for thus we read in the Scriptures: a humble and contrite heart is a victim to God. And in

Jews, admits only spiritual sacrifices, by no means implies that he excludes the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ as offered by us, but that he lays special emphasis either on the spiritual aspect of the sacrificial action which is the praise of God coming from a pure heart, or at times the spirituality of the invisible and celestial Victim, hidden beneath the sacrament.¹ Do we not find, at a much later period, Ambrose using the same kind of language in the *De Mysteriis*: "Christ is in that sacrament, because IT IS THE BODY OF CHRIST: IT IS NOT THEREFORE CORPORAL BUT SPIRITUAL FOOD" (*De Mysteriis*, 58. P. L. 16, 408).

§ 3. The Rest of the Fathers or Writers of the Same Period

We now come to those writers whose words, merely taken by themselves, are not sufficiently definite to settle the question whether what is offered to God is the prayer itself, or what is effected by the prayer.

A. CLEMENT OF ROME

Clement of Rome, in his *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 44. (F. P., 1, 156), describes bishops as those who offer gifts: "for our sin will not be light, if we cast out from the episcopacy those who have offered gifts devoutly and without blame". True, he does not say of what kind are the gifts which bishops are competent to offer; but at the same time there is no suggestion whatever that these gifts are words. Indeed no prudent reader could say that the word *gifts* (τὰ δῶρα), standing here by itself, without

another place: Sacrifice to God a sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows to the Most High. . . . We must ask ourselves whether we are still to wait for the giver of the new law, the heir of the New Testament and priest of the new sacrifices, the purifier of the new circumcision, the observer of an eternal sabbath, who is to restrict the old, and found the New Testament. . . . We must ask whether the Giver of the New Law, the observer of the spiritual sabbath, the pontiff of the eternal sacrifices, the eternal Ruler of the eternal kingdom, has already come or not."

¹ *Adv. Jud.*, 14, cols. 640-641: "The second goat offered for sin, and given as food to the priests of the temple only, marked a further signification, according to which the *priests of the spiritual temple*, that is of the Church, freed from all sin, should share as food (*visceratione*) IN THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE GRACE OF THE LORD, while others fasted from the boon of salvation" (Compare *Adv. Marcion.*, 3, 7, P. L. 2, 331).

any explanatory words, means prayers.¹ Wieland therefore justly reconsiders his earlier teaching (M. u. C., p. 26), and admits that the word gifts (*δῶρα*) must here be understood as “real concrete gifts” (*Die Schrift M. u. C., und P. Emil Dorsch*, p. 79). But it is altogether too absurd for him to go on to say that here it is not a question of gifts to be offered to God, but of gifts to be set before the assembled faithful—namely, the gifts of the agape, to be distributed among the poor. To prove his point, he refers us to Justin, who says (*Apol.*, 1, 13, P. G. 6, 345), first, that we “offer for ourselves and for the poor (*ἑαυτοῖς καὶ δεομένοις προσφέρεται*),” and, secondly (*Apol.* 1, 65 and 67, cols, 428–429), that the bread with the wine and the water is handed to the president (65: *προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι*), who then makes the Eucharist. From these examples of Justin he infers that the word *offer* (*προσφέρειν*) in the passage from Clement has no other meaning than *vorlegen*, to hand to [the people], or *to place before them*, or *to set before them as food* to be eaten by them (meaning: to furnish a table with food, so to speak).

To all this we answer that in the first passage of Justin² the words *for ourselves and for the poor* (*ἑαυτοῖς καὶ δεομένοις*) are datives of advantage, so that Justin’s words do not mean that the offering is made *to* ourselves and *to* the poor (!) but simply that the offering is made in such a way as to redound to our advantage and to the advantage of the poor. Not only is this especially appropriate to the Eucharistic rite, but it is also declared by the whole tone of the passage in Justin, where the difference between the usual pagan rite of the sacrifices and our own manner of offering is explained. For the plain meaning of the words of Justin is, that we do not offer sacrifice to God as though He wished to grow rich through our gifts, but rather wishes

¹ See Emil Dorsch, *Der Opfercharakter der Eucharistie*, Innsbruck, 1909, p. 230, on an old reading of this passage, more in our favour, which runs: “. . . if we blame those who offer the gifts of the episcopate.”

² “. . . We are not atheists, we worship the creator of this world, and while we hold, as we have been taught, that He does not require blood, libations, and incense, as far as we are able we praise Him in words of praise and thanksgiving (FOR IT IS HANDED DOWN TO US THAT THIS IS THE ONLY HONOUR WORTHY OF GOD: NOT TO DESTROY BY FIRE WHAT HE CREATED FOR NUTRIMENT, BUT TO OFFER IT FOR OUR OWN ADVANTAGE AND FOR THE ADVANTAGE OF THE POOR, and to show Him too the gratitude of our souls with our lips, in processions and hymns) for creation, for all the safeguards of our health, for all kinds of creatures, for the change of the seasons and sending up prayer to Him, that by faith we may rise to incorruptibility. . . .”

to enrich us with His. We do however offer to Him, though not to any advantage of His. Nor can the sense of the *Apologia* here be: we are not atheists, for though we do not offer to God, we do offer to ourselves. Could anything be more absurd!

In the second example from Justin, to which Wieland refers, although we can fitly retain the simple sense of handing over the gifts by the deacons to the bishop to whom they minister,¹ it is clearly impossible to transfer this sense to the Epistle of Clement, for three reasons. In the first place, the bishop is said to offer gifts, and there is no suggestion, no insinuation whatever of any person to whom they are offered in the passage of Clement. Secondly, the word *προσφέρειν*, which we translate *to offer*, is not aptly translated *to hand over*, except in the case where the inferior hands to the superior—the minister to his Lord. When the superior gives to the inferior, as when the bishop gives to the faithful, Clement would more naturally have used the word *παραδιδόναι* or *διαδιδόναι* (cf. *Luke.*, XVIII, 22 and XII, 32, and *Xenophon, Cyrop.*, 1, 3). Thirdly, Clement plainly tells us that the bishop *offering gifts* was typified in the Old Law by the man whom God chose through Moses “to offer sacrifice and to minister TO HIM” (*I Cor.* 43, 4. F. P., 1, 154).²

B. THE DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

In the fourteenth chapter of the *Doctrina* (F. P. 1, 32) the word *θυσία* is used twice when an order is given that on the Lord's Day thanksgiving should be made in the breaking of bread. Moreover, the allusion to *Matthew*, V, 23–24, shows that the rite is sacrificial: “Assembling on the Lord's day, break bread and give thanks, having confessed your sins that your sacrifice may

¹ Though we might well find in these words a reference to the ordinary offerings made to the president by the faithful at the offertory of the Mass, in which case what could we say of the bread or the wine, but that they were offered, and not in the sense certainly of their being set before the president to eat (*vorlegen*)—which rather would correspond to the word *προτίθεσθαι* used clearly in that sense by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 1, 10, P. L. 8, 744, when speaking of the last supper: “The Saviour taking bread, first spoke and blessed it; then breaking the bread, He handed it to them (*προέθηκεν*), of course that we may eat it.”

² Hence an Anglican writer justly said: “When Clement of Rome speaks of the oblations and gifts, which it is the presbyter's office to present . . . he doubtless includes among them . . . THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS AND ELEMENTS” (H. B. Swete, *Eucharistic Belief in the II and III Centuries*, J. T. S., v. 3, p. 163).

be clean, any one who hath enmity with his friend, let him not come with you, until he is reconciled, that your sacrifice may be clean. For let no one who has a dispute with his friend come to your assembly, before they have been reconciled, lest your sacrifice be defiled. For thus hath the Lord spoken: *In every place a clean oblation is offered to me, for I am the great king, saith the Lord, and my name is great among the gentiles.* We can hardly say that the word *θυσία* (sacrifice) here is the actual Body of Christ offered to God. For the faithful are commanded to prepare themselves by the confession of their sins, and by reconciliation with their enemies, so that their sacrifice may be clean and undefiled. Now the Body of Christ cannot become defiled nor made unclean, no matter how lax Christians may be in these two observances. Hence we are convinced that by sacrifice here we must understand, not the reality offered in sacrifice, but the sacrificial action itself.¹ The meaning, therefore, is that thanksgiving over the bread in the passage is the sacrificial action. This does not affect our position, for we hold that the sacrificial action is the Eucharistic or thanksgiving prayer, in as much as it contains the words of Christ, and this, too, is the teaching of the other writers and Fathers of the period. Hence we infer from the *Doctrina*, too, that the sacrificial action is the Eucharistic prayer.

But it does not follow by any means from these words that the Eucharistic prayer is the actual reality offered to God. Indeed it rather suggests the contrary. For if the giving of thanks is here to offer sacrifice, evidently that over which thanks is given is offered in sacrifice. Hence we conclude, naturally, that what is consecrated by the thanksgiving is offered in sacrifice. Even Wieland does not deny that in the mind of the early Christians the consecrated bread was the Body of Christ. Hence we conclude that the Body of Christ is offered. Meantime, let us not forget how we have already shown that in the Eucharistic consecration of the bread and wine is implied the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, who actually suffered unto death for us.

¹ The author of *De Aleatoribus* (c. 4. P. L. 4, 830), quoting the *Doctrina*, supports our interpretation in the words “. . . let not your PRAYER be defiled”. However, we shall find examples of a later period, see XXXIII, where even saints called the Eucharistic Body and Blood of an illegitimate celebration heretical bread, or some such name.

C. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Clement vehemently and repeatedly condemned all the customary sacrifices offered by the pagans to their gods, *Stromata*, 5, 11; 7, 3; 7, 6 (P. G. 9, 113; 417-420; 444). And in these passages his chief intention seems to be to insist that no earthly gift of ours can enrich God, so to speak, or give Him pleasure or honour. He does not, however, deny, indeed he distinctly affirms, that in place of such sacrifices we honour God in a reasonable manner "by prayer (*δι' ευχῆς*)."¹ By *prayer*, or by *the prayer*, he most probably means the Eucharistic celebration, "which excellent and most holy sacrifice we offer up with justice, paying honour to the most just Word,¹ through whom we receive knowledge,

¹ Δι' ευχῆς τιυῶνεν τὸν θεόν καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυσίαν ἀρίστην καὶ ἀγνωστάτην μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἀναπεμπομεν τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ Λόγῳ γεραίροντες δι' οὗ παραλαμβάνομεν τὴν γνῶσιν, διὰ τοῦτου δοξαζόντες ἃ μεμαθήκαμεν (7, 6).

Wieland gives a different translation to this passage: "We honour God by prayers, and this is the most excellent and most holy sacrifice, which we send up in justice, with most just speech making Him an honourable gift" (*M. u. C.*, p. 49; *Die Schrift M. u. C.*, p. 90). We cannot accept this translation, for: (1) The prayers are the words of consecration, as Wieland admits, so one finds it difficult to see why they should be called *most just speech* (*justissimo sermone*), omitting the definite article *the* (omitted by Wieland in the translation), which surely has significance. (2) By *λόγῳ* here it would certainly appear that the Word of God, the divine Word is meant, not simply speech or words of some kind (hence in the Greek text we have given *Λόγῳ* with a capital). For this is suggested by the explanatory words which follow *δι' οἱ* = per quem, and *διὰ τοῦτου* = per illum (you will find a very feeble attempt to escape from this argument in Wieland, *D. V. O.* 132-133), as also by the use of the word *γεραίροντες*. It is evident that the phrase should be translated *making honourable gift to the most just Word*, especially if we take into consideration the words which follow: *through whom*, etc., as also because of the use of the word *γεα ραίροντες* (honouring). For this word meant, primarily and in its origin, not merely giving some sign of honour, but one of a properly sacrificial kind. So in Athens the fourteen priestesses, called *γεραραί* or *γεραιραί*, offered up funeral sacrifices once a year, on the third day of Anthisteria, at fourteen altars in honour of Dionysus torn by the Titans into fourteen different pieces. So they were said to give an honourable offering to Dionysus. Hence Clement chooses this word most aptly in reference to an offering "giving honour" to the most just Word; in memory of His death, the sacrificial offering made by prayer. Such a description suits our Eucharistic offering at all points. Hence we think it necessary to consider that the dative *τῷ Λόγῳ* is governed by the verb participle *γεραίρω* = showing honour to. Whether one might consider that this dative is also dependent on the word *ἀναπέμπωμεν* = offer up, so that we should be said to offer up to the Word, as we likewise are said to give honour to the Word, is by no means evident. The word *ἀναπέμπω* does usually take the dative of destination (cf. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon*, s.v.), and we have, moreover, an example of such use from Justin: he sends up (or offers up) praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost (*Apologia*, 1, 65. P. G. 6, 428). But the word *ἀναπέμπω* can also be used without any dative signifying the destination. Hence we translate here: we send up sacrifice, honouring the Word. This minor difficulty, however, has no bearing on the present question.

through Him glorifying those things which we have learned [for instance, the secrets of the Most Holy Trinity]. The altar, therefore, which is with us here on earth, is the congregation of those who are devoted to prayer, having one voice and one mind, so to speak. . . . For the sacrifice of the Church is the prayer which is breathed by holy souls, when sacrifice, and at the same time our whole mind, is exhibited to God.” The meaning is this: Clement, omitting the consideration of the celestial Altar, which is Christ, and dwelling only on the second altar which is the Church, rightly, though in an intricate way, lays down that the characteristic of the Eucharistic sacrifice is situated (1) in the oral sacrificial action; (2) in the internal sanctity of the Church offering the sacrifice; and (3) consequently in the simultaneous presentation of interior and exterior sacrifice.

Any obscurity inherent in these passages is cleared up to a great extent by a previous note, inserted in the first book of the *Stromata*, 1, 19. (P. G. 8, 813).¹ It appears from this note (1) that the word *offering*, strictly in the sense of active offering, was in general use for the Eucharistic celebration; and (2) that this offering consisted in the thanksgiving² in the bread and wine (*eucharistiatione panis et vini*).³ Hence we gather that the giving in thanks (*eucharistiatio*) had the nature of an offering of what was given in thanks—the Body and Blood of Christ. We read something closely allied to this in a commentary on St. Luke, XV (P. G. 9, 760–761), attributed with a certain amount of probability to Clement, in which there is mentioned, as immolated (be it in blood or sacramentally), “the calf, elsewhere called the lamb”, which is “flesh and bread”. We then find the following words, not in reference to the prodigal son, but to the Christians partaking of the Eucharist, “therefore to the children who approach, the Father gives the calf, and it is sacrificed and eaten”. Surely

¹ “*Stolen waters are sweetest, and hidden bread is more pleasant (Prov., IX, 27)*. Here, by referring to (hidden) bread and (stolen) water, Scripture clearly brands those heresies which in the offering use bread and water otherwise than the canons of the Church enjoin; for there are some who make their thanksgiving of water only.”

² “We may not deny,” says Wieland, “that the word *offering* can be referred especially to the giving of thanks, so that in this case the giving of thanks (*eucharistiatio*) actually means offering to God. Here then we should have the first trace of the sacrificial concept, gradually gaining ground in the east” (D. V. O., p. 120).

³ *Stromata*, 4, 25. P. G. 8, 1369.

it would be going too far to maintain¹ that the connexion between these two actions—one of sacrificing (*θύεται*) and one of eating (*τρῶγεται*), both spoken of together in the present tense—is merely causal, such as obtains between our communion and the sacrifice of the Passion, rather than a connection by continuity of time, such as exists between our recent sacrificial action and our present partaking of the Eucharist.

It is certainly true that Clement tells us the calf is “He who is led like a lamb to the slaughter, a victim full of marrow, all of whose fat passes into the possession of God, in accordance with the holy law: for he is wholly consecrated and dedicated to the Lord, so well nourished and so tall, that he reaches out to and suffices for all things, and satiates all who eat and enjoy his flesh”, etc. But what follows from this? Does Clement’s assertion of the one sacrificial action of the Lord in the past exclude necessarily any act of sacrifice on our part? Rather is not the oft-repeated conclusion forced upon us, that the one sacrificial action of our Lord in the past is so pre-eminent over ours that, unless it is presupposed, our sacrificial actions cannot take place; that Christ is a Victim from His own sacrifice of Himself; that He abides forever a Victim before God, in whose sight He ever lives, to whose worship He has been dedicated: the selfsame who is now offered in sacrifice by us, as He is also eaten by us.

And Clement enunciates this relation of our sacrificial action to the past immolation in blood in two passages which are undoubtedly genuine. In the first passage (*Strom.*, 5, 10. P. G. 9, 101),² having declared that the contemplation of God is purchased for us by the eating of the Flesh of Christ and the drinking of His Blood, he adds that it was FOR THIS REASON that in the teaching of Plato there was truly need of a great and not a trivial victim for us, namely, Christ the Paschal Lamb, who was immolated for us, certainly in the Passion. In the second passage (*Paedagog.*, 2, 2. P. G. 8, 409),³ Christ the Word is described as the great grape cluster which WAS PRESSED for us (obviously in the Passion), the blood of which grape is now to be DRUNK by us.

¹ As Wieland did, D. V. O., 113.

² See Appendix B.

³ See Appendix C.

D. SAYINGS OF SOME OTHER APOLOGISTS

Like Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian, other early apologists dwelt on the abolition of the sacrifices.

Thus in his *Apologia* Aristides declares: "God does not require victims or libations, or any visible thing" (c. 1; cf. c. 13, T. u. U., 4, 3, pp. 6 and 32).

Athenagoras, writing about the "Prohibition of sacrifice" in his *Legatio pro Christianis*, c. 13. (P. G. 6, 916), says that the knowledge of God, and pure hands lifted up to Him, is the only sacrifice acceptable to Him, who needs nothing, and whose victim must be bloodless and spiritual adoration.¹

St. Apollonius of Rome, martyred under the Emperor Commodus, speaks similarly, as we read in the *Acta S. Apollonii*, paragraph 8. T. u. U., 15, 2, p. 98: "I and all Christians send up a bloodless and clean sacrifice to Almighty God, who rules over heaven and earth and every spirit: a sacrifice which is made, especially by prayers, on behalf of the rational and intellectual images of God, ordained in the providence of God to govern the earth (i.e. the emperors)." He is referring to the sacrifice which is offered by himself and by the Christian community. In these words we have an echo of the well-known early Christian liturgy *for kings and all who are in high places* (*I Tim.*, II, 2, with which should be compared the intercession which is preserved in a much later compilation, *Constitutiones Apostolicae*, 8, 12 and 13. F. D. 1, 510-512 and 514). In the passage one should note that he does not say that prayers are offered, but that sacrifice is offered "by prayers".

In another place indeed he does speak about offering prayers (parag. 44, p. 126). Here, however, he does not say that he is speaking of any Christian rite, but merely exhorting his judge (who certainly had not received instruction about the Eucharist) to offer a bloodless sacrifice of prayers and good works, which was the only kind of sacrifice, in a metaphorical not proper sense,

¹ Emil Dorsch (*op. cit.*, pp. 236-239) has some useful remarks regarding Athenagoras.

that he could urge on such a man, though it should be noted that, even so, he does not recommend it to the exclusion of every other kind: "I had hopes that holy thoughts would possess you, that the eyes of your soul would be opened to my plea, that your heart would bear fruit and worship God, the maker of all things, and that each day by your alms and humane mode of life and prayers it would send up [a bloodless and clean sacrifice] to the one God."

The author of the *Epistola ad Diognetem* (III, 3-5, F. P. 1, 394) says that the things that God in His bounty has given to us who need them should not be returned to Him, as though He needed them.

In the same way, Minucius Felix asks ironically: "Shall I offer to God as victims and sacrifices what He gave for my own use? Shall I cast His own gift back at Him?" Rather he decides that the victim that may be offered to Him is: good disposition, a pure mind and upright conscience, justice and mercy (*Octav.*, 32. P. L. 3, 339-340).

In this manner of speech, not only do these writers agree with their contemporaries, whom we have already considered, but also with the Fathers and theologians of earlier and later times.

As examples of this style of speech even among the Fathers of a later period, when the teaching of the Church's sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ was taught by all quite finally and definitely, we may quote, in the West, St. Hilary, in *Ps.* 62, n. 8 (P. L. 9, 405); Zeno of Verona (*lib.* 1, *tractatus* 15, c. 5. P. L. 11, 364-365);¹ from the East St. Basil, *Ep.* 115 (P. G. 32, 528) and (?) *In Isaiam*, I, 24-27 (P. G. 30, 165-172); St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 45, n. 12, 14, 23 (P. G. 36, cols. 640, 641-644, 656); *Carmin. lib.* 2, sect. 2, poem 3, vers. 255-258 (P. G. 37, 1498); Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 66, n. 71 (P. G. 42, 141-144). Indeed Theodoret in his *Graecarum affectionum therapeutica* (*Sermo* 7. P. G.

¹ Zeno, however, at once goes on, at the end of Chapter 6, to speak of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, forbidding that the divine sacraments should be contaminated, that is, profaned, and adds: "Let each one then see to it, how he partakes of or how he offers the sacrifice, for just as it is sacrilege to offer unworthily, so it is mortal to partake unworthily" (col. 369; cf. *lib.* 1, *tractatus*, 5, c. 8, col. 309). We thought it advisable to mention this here, because some Protestants, whom the brothers Ballerini mention and quote in their notes on St. Zeno, have said that Zeno did not approve of any sacrifice other than an inward affection of the soul. Here we have an example of the evil effects of a preconceived opinion: for what could we imagine more improbable than that a man who was in his prime after the middle of the fourth century could teach what they say? No argument could obscure the plain meaning of the other Fathers whom we have quoted above.

83, 992–1005) devotes a complete discourse on the offering of sacrifices to the censure and condemnation of all offerings of sacrifice, and meantime has not one word to say about the sacrifice of the Eucharist, commending only prayers and acts of virtue instead of sacrifices. And yet there is nothing so clear as the faith of that time, and the faith of those very Fathers on the offering of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ by the Church.

Even before the early Fathers and Doctors, the author of the *Epistola Barnabae* (2, 6. F. P. 1, 42), while insisting on the abolition of sacrifices, has something to say, nevertheless, on the character of the new offering: “God therefore abolished these [Jewish] sacrifices, so that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is not under the yoke of necessity, SHOULD HAVE AN OFFERING WHICH IS NOT MADE BY MAN.” The New Law therefore has its own offering, and this is not made by man but by God. It is as though the writer were to say *ἵνα μὴ ἀνθρωποποίητον, ἀλλὰ θεοποίητον, ἔχη τὴν προσφορὰν* as we should say, so that the New Law should have an offering not of man’s making, but of God’s.

But, even before the author of the *Epistola Barnabae*, St. Paul had written practically the same words to the Athenians: “*God, who made the world and all things therein, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is he served with men’s hands, as though he needed anything, seeing that it is he who giveth to all life and breath and all things*” (*Acts*, XVII, 24–25).

Indeed, everything that the Fathers have to say on the rejection of the sacrifices may be reduced to a few heads of doctrine, for in every sacrifice there are four aspects to be considered: to whom the sacrifice is offered, what is offered, how the sacrifice is offered, and by whom it is offered.

Under the first aspect, if we consider to whom sacrifice is offered, the Fathers excluded all sacrifices offered to God, *as needing such*. For the pagans, and at times even the Jews, foolishly imagined that we conferred a benefit on God by sacrifice (see Aristides, Athenagoras, *Epist. ad Diognet.*, Minucius Felix, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria). But in real truth God does not need our sacrifice of the Eucharist; it is we who need it. He is not pleased, so to speak, as one receiving the fruit of sacrifice, but as granting to us to secure, by sacrifice, the fruit of salvation.

Secondly, as regards what is offered. The Fathers excluded the offerings of the products of the earth, or offerings of things procured or fashioned by the art of man, such as it was a common custom among men to place upon the altar (cf. *Ep. Barnabae*, Justin, Tertullian, etc.).¹ For our Victim is not an earthly victim, it is not alone a rational and an immaculate (spotless) victim, but it is also a celestial Victim, in no way subject to the condition of corporeal things, but given to the world in a sacrificial state by the divine omnipotence alone.²

Thirdly, considering the manner of offering. In the first place, the Fathers excluded any and every kind of real immolation or slaying from our sacrifices, hence they often said that in our worship there is no *θύσια* (Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria; cf. Gregory Nazianzen, Theodoretus). For words which are used to signify indiscriminately, at one time sacrificing or the offering of an immolated victim, at another time immolation or mactation, would naturally, according to the subject matter, be admitted at one time and rejected at another, according to the different point of view in each case; the true meaning could only be known by a full consideration of the context and occasion of utterance. For example, the Body of Christ is truly sacrificed by us when we offer it in our Mass in the state of perpetual Victim, into which it passed by the former real immolation of the Passion; but it is not here and now really immolated, or slain by us, and so, as it is subject to no recent immolation, it has been called in the Mass—in the Greek *ἀθύτον ἱερεῖον* (Damascenus, *In dominicum pascha*. P. G. 96, 841)—an expression translated into Latin as “*non-immolata victima*”; in English, “a victim not really immolated or slain by us” (here and now at Mass); or it is said to be *ἀθύτως θυόμενον* by Gelasius of Cyzicus (*Historia Concilii Nicaeni*, 1, 2, c. 30. P. G. 85, 1317) that is, sacrificed without (true) immolation here and now in the Mass,³ and he attributes this expression

¹ Thereby showing clearly that the early Christians did not consider that the natural substances of bread and wine were offered, but the Body and Blood of Christ into which they were really changed.

² The author of the *Consultationes Zacchaei Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi* (l. 2, c. 7. P. L. 20, 1120), somewhat after the middle of the fourth century (cf. A. Reatz, *Das theologische System der Consult. Zacch. et Apollon.*, Freiburg in Breisgau, 1920, p. 149), speaks in this sense of the “spiritual sacrifice”.

³ Dom Leclercq has some useful remarks on Gelasius of Cyzicus in the *Hist. des Conciles*, t. 1, p. 392.

to the Nicene Fathers;¹ and the *Liturgia Chaldaeorum* rightly chants: "We offer the living and reasonable sacrifice of our first fruits, and the VICTIM NOT IMMOLATED [i.e. not really immolated here and now], and yet acceptable, the Son of our race, which . . . the priests HAVE IMMOLATED i.e. [mystically, symbolically] . . . on holy altars" (Max. Saxoniae, *Missa Chaldaica*, p. 26).

Or again, still considering the manner of offering, the Fathers excluded every kind of material rite, such as the real offering of material things, they only retained a rite that was spiritual and intelligible; not perceptible to the senses, perceptible only to the intellect of believers by means of sensible symbols; not consisting in any mere material or mechanical action, but in the intelligible virtue of the words uttered by the Lord and directed to God, words not of one directly declaring the action, but performing it, while symbolically he sheds from the Body of Christ its atoning Blood; by which action there is made in the apparent offering of the bread and wine, the real offering of Christ who suffered for us in the past.²

Fourthly, considering those who offer the sacrifice. The Fathers insisted especially on probity of life, on adoration in spirit and in truth, in which the invisible sacrifice consists; for unless the visible sacrifice is a symbol of this invisible sacrifice, it is not acceptable (thus practically all the Fathers, Zeno of Verona particularly).³

APPENDIX A

On John, IV, 23

We have just given above the four main reasons why the Fathers said that our sacrifice was a spiritual sacrifice. But even

¹ The same expression ἀθύρως θυόμενον is found in Theodorus Andidensis, *Brevis commentatio*, c. 28. P. G. 140, 456.

² Nicholas Cabasilas, the distinguished Greek liturgist of the fourteenth century, is, among others, very lucid on this point, where he says in his *Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 51 P. G. 150, 485: "For this reason the priest calls the sacrifice oral worship, because it does not include any external work [*opus*—such, e.g., as would be killing an animal], but he offers this oblation by simply uttering the consecrative words. . . . Although the Victim is truly the result of a completed action in the past (*opus et factum*), nevertheless, as he does nothing to it (*circa ipsam*), but only uses words, he says rightly that he is offering not an active but a verbal worship."

³ The summary of the whole teaching contained under these heads will be found in Cyril of Alexandria, in the ninth and tenth books of the work *Contra Julianum* P. G. 76, 968–1049.

before the Fathers, does not our Lord Himself allude to this spiritual character? In *John*, IV, 23, He says: *The hour cometh and now is, when true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth.*

For, in the *first* place, the word *adore* in this passage appears to refer to sacrificial worship. This is suggested both by the subject matter and by comparison with other Scriptural passages.

Firstly, in regard to the subject matter. As an answer to the question put by the Samaritan woman, it must naturally be understood, or interpreted in accordance with the sense of that question. The question concerned the dispute between the Jews and the Samaritans as to where sacrifice should be offered (verse 20). Should it be in the temple of Jerusalem, or in the shrines of Mount Garizim, where, according to the Pentateuch of the Samaritans (*Deut.*, XXVII, 4), the people had been commanded by God to offer sacrifice, after they had crossed the Jordan, and blessings were undoubtedly bestowed on those who observed the law (*Deut.*, XI. 27 and XXVII, 12). Therefore when the woman asks Him where men must adore, we must understand her to mean where men must sacrifice, all the more because she had already said: *Our fathers adored on this mountain*; that is, offered sacrifice.

We arrive at the same conclusion when we compare the word used with its use in other Scripture passages. In *John*, XII, 20, probably in the *Acts*, VIII, 27, and certainly in the *Septuagint*, *Gen.*, XXII, 5, this word, translated *adorare* in the Vulgate, and *adore* in the Douay Version, signifies sacrificial worship, which, as all know, is adoration in the most perfect and proper sense.

Secondly, Christ seems to stress here the spirituality and the reality of the new worship, by reason of the excellence of our Eucharistic sacrifice as compared with the carnal and figurative sacrifices of the ancients. For He contrasts the locally circumscribed observance of the legal sacrifice with the ubiquitous Messianic sacrifice, when He says: (verse 21): *The hour cometh when you shall neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, adore the Father.* And then he gives the reason for this ubiquity of the Messianic sacrifice (verse 23): *The hour cometh, and now is, when true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth.* The

sacrifice will be universal because it will be spiritual and true sacrifice. For the Father will not be adored with carnal nor figurative sacrifices,¹ but with the spiritual sacrifice which is the fulfilment of the figures, namely, by the sacrifice of the one perfect Victim, of the rational and immaculate Victim, offered to God under the covering of symbols according to an immaterial rite. Hence neither the Victim nor the offering of the Victim will be tied to the limits of any place.

This interpretation was already given long ago by Eusebius (*Demonstr. Evangel.*, I, 1, c. 6. P. G. 22, 57 *et seq.*) where he links up this passage in St. John on the change of altar and sacrifice with the prophecy of *Malachias*, I, 11-12. Theodoretus explains the words of our Lord in a similar manner: "The priestly worship which was restricted to one place has ceased, and every place has been declared meet for the worship of God; the slaughter of irrational animals has come to an end, and only the immaculate Lamb who taketh away the sin of the world is sacrificed" (*In Malach.*, I, 11. P. G. 81, 1968).

Rupert likewise among the Latin Fathers: "For Jerusalem is not the only place where I must be adored, but in every place true adorers will adore the Father in spirit and in truth, and to my name they will offer a clean oblation, the oblation of bread and wine, the sacrament of the Body and Blood of their Redeemer" (*In Malach.*, c. 1. P. L. 168, 821).

APPENDIX B

The Fathers, Clement in particular, consider that Communion with Christ by Contemplation and by the Eucharist is One and Indivisible

Clement writes: "If therefore milk is for little ones (*I Cor.*, III, 1-3), and solid food is said by the Apostle to be the nutriment of the perfect, milk will be understood by us as instruction (*catechesis*) as the first nutriment of the soul; and food as the contemplation of those fully initiated in the mysteries (*epoptica contemplatio*): the very Flesh, I mean, and Blood of the Word; that is, knowledge of the divine power and essence. . . . *Taste and see, for Christ is the Lord.* FOR IT IS THUS THAT HE IMPARTS HIMSELF TO THOSE WHO

¹ Cf. Bellarmine, *De Missa*, I, 1, c. 11.

ARE MORE SPIRITUALLY PARTAKERS OF THIS FOOD: namely when the soul nourishes herself, as Plato, the friend of truth, says” [According to Clement, therefore, Christ does not give Himself to be contemplated to all whosoever partake of this food, that is of His Flesh and Blood, but to those only who are spiritual partakers, that is those who are nourished by the Eucharist, not only according to the body, but also according to the soul] “for the food and drink of the divine Word is knowledge of the divine essence” [namely in as much as the sacramental eating is the sacrament effective of the spiritual eating]. “For this reason Plato says in the second book of the *Republic*: only when we have sacrificed not a pig, but some great and rare victim, should we seek favours from God. But the Apostle writes: *Christ our Pasch is sacrificed*: in Christ indeed we have the rare Victim who is sacrificed for us” (*Strom.*, 5, 10. P. G. 9, 101).

There are some who say that this passage does not refer to the Eucharist, even indirectly. Thus Batiffol (*Eucharistie*, 3, p. 181. Again *Eucharistie* 5, p. 254; against A. Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie nach den schriftlichen Quellen der vornizäischen Zeit*, 1905, p. 136–138). That Clement does refer to the Eucharist here seems to me far the more probable opinion, both for the reasons which I have interpolated in square brackets in the text, and also because of the connection asserted, by the words *for this reason*, between the sacrifice and the food and drink of the Word.

Here I would make the following remark which is of general application. That the Fathers often understand by the expression *the bread and wine*, and even *the Body and Blood of Christ*, either the knowledge of faith, the contemplation of the Word, the study of Holy Scripture, or some such thing, does not by any means affect the Eucharistic interpretation of the sixth chapter of St. John. For the whole discourse (*John.*, VI, 27–59) conveys the idea, which is commonplace with the Fathers (cf. also *Council of Trent*, sess. 13, c. 8, D. 881, and read carefully Toletus on St. John, VI, 52, Cologne, 1589, cols. 593–594), that the Eucharistic eating is the sacrament or symbol of the spiritual eating which is done by a living faith (characteristic of which is loving contemplation of the Word, and devout meditation on

the truth revealed in the Scriptures). Hence we are not surprised to find the Fathers saying, quite freely, that the bread and the drink, or the Flesh and the Blood, is the faith itself, the contemplation, the teaching, of which the former (bread, wine, Flesh, Blood) is the sacrament or the symbol, or vice versa: in as much as the one is linked up with the other by way of causality and signification or similitude. "From the similitude they bear to the things they signify, very often symbols or sacraments take the names of those things," as St. Augustine reminds us in the *Epistola ad Bonifacium episcopum* (*Ep.* 98, n. 9. P. L. 33, 364).

This teaching is so far from excluding the Eucharistic interpretation, that it even implies it: seeing that the one interpenetrates the other. Hence the early Fathers repeatedly interweave these two interpretations. We give a few brief examples to illustrate this.

Thus Eusebius of Caesarea (*De Solemnitate paschali*, n. 2. P. G. 24, 696) speaks as follows of contemplation through the Eucharist: "We therefore, BEING NOURISHED BY THE INTELLECTUAL FLESH (*intellectualibus carnibus*) of this VICTIM, that is of our Saviour, who saved the human race by His Blood, that is to say BY DOCTRINES AND INSTRUCTIONS telling us of the Kingdom of Heaven, in fitting fashion feast on divine banquets." And in the same work he writes a little later (n. 7, col. 701), speaking this time explicitly of the Body and Blood of the Eucharist: "The followers of Moses immolated the paschal lamb once a year on the fourteenth day of the first month at eventide. We of the New Testament, fulfilling our Pasch every Lord's day, are always sated with the Body of the Saviour; we always partake of the Blood of the Lamb."

Athanasius also represents as offered to us in the invitation to the Paschal Supper, the food of Christian faith (*Epistola heortastica*, 28. P. G. 26, 1433): "So that He might be made Victim for all, and we BEING NOURISHED BY THE TEACHINGS OF TRUTH, and PARTAKERS OF HIS DIVINE DOCTRINE, may be able, with the saints, to attain to the joys of heaven. For thither indeed THE WORD CALLS US, AS HE CALLED THE DISCIPLES TO THE SUPPER, WITH THEM HE SUMMONS US TO THE DIVINE AND TRULY INCORRUPTIBLE BANQUET: here indeed having suffered for us; and there preparing celestial tabernacles for all who with a prompt mind have been

obedient to His call, and with firm purpose have followed Him to receive the reward of their heavenly vocation; where gladness and an imperishable crown awaits THOSE WHO COME TO THE SUPPER, and manfully do battle against their enemies.” Another example of the spiritual supper interwoven with the sacramental may be seen in *Epistola heortastica*, 61, col. 1383. And on the other hand the *Epistolae heortasticae* of Athanasius present numerous examples of his teaching on the sacramental banquet, at which the Flesh and Blood of the Word, the very Lamb, the Word itself, is eaten (*Epistolae heortasticae*, 2, 3; 4, 4; 5, 1; 5, 5; 9, 9–10; 13, 7. P. G. 26, 1368, 1379, 1379–1380, 1382–1383, 1395–1396, 1418).¹

Language of this kind was not confined to this period only, it was quite ordinary even during the Middle Ages. So, for example, we find William of St. Theodoric, at the time when writers were mainly concerned with defending the real presence in the sacrament, discoursing in most explicit terms about the spiritual eating as procured by the sacramental, interweaving the one with the other as freely as ever did Clement or Origen (*In Num.*, hom. 16, 9. In *Matth., Com. Ser.*, 85, etc., P. G. 12, 701–702; 13, 1734–1735): “When therefore He gives us so much reason to love that Flesh of His [wounded, that is, in the Passion], He imparts to our souls the great wonder-working nutriment of life. This Flesh we eagerly consume, when we sweetly recall and hide in the bosom of memory all that Christ has done and suffered for us. And this is our banquet of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus, communicating with WHOM we have life abiding in us. Then indeed we communicate, when, IN ARDENT FAITH THAT WORKETH BY CHARITY, WE GIVE BACK TO THE TABLE OF THE LORD WHAT WE HAVE RECEIVED THEREFROM; that is to say, that just as He, constrained by no necessity, gave Himself for our salvation, so we,

¹ There is a resemblance in the saying of Theophilus Alexandrinus, in the *Epistola heortastica* of the year 401 (n. 17) disputing against Origen: “We do not call corporal substance mere vanity, as he does, thus falling into the heresy of Manichaeus: let us not attribute vanity to the BODY OF CHRIST, FEASTING ON WHICH, EVERY DAY, WE DAILY PONDER ON HIS WORDS: *Unless one eats of my flesh, and drinks of my blood, he shall not have part with me*” (P. L. 22, 787). But it would be much more reasonable to conclude that Theophilus speaks here of this ruminating on the words of Our Lord just to indicate the efficacy of Christ’s words which preclude any “emptiness” in the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Hence we have here a theological argument of Theophilus for the sacramental reception of the true Body in the Eucharist, rather than for union with Christ by contemplation.

who have need of salvation, give ourselves completely to Him in faith and love. The one who partakes of this banquet, cannot eat his bread in idleness, but industriously, like the valiant woman, rises from the night of this time to the light of the word of God, that he may eat the work of his hands, that he may be blessed, and that he may prosper, etc. This then is to eat that Flesh of which Jesus says: *He that eateth my flesh, abideth in me, and I in him.*" By way of preface to this exposition, he had written the following words which show clearly that in the excerpt quoted above he was speaking of the sacramental Body of Christ: "We must consider that this food [that is, the very Body of Christ; cf. c. 2-4] is so necessary to attain to true life, that without it true life cannot be obtained. . . . And so to secure that He [that is Christ] be loved by us . . . for that very purpose this food [that is, the Eucharist] must nourish us" (*De Sacramento altaris*, c. 5. P. L. 180, 351, 352-353). Note the fact (rather amusing under the circumstances) that William of St. Theodoric himself complained about the obscurity of some passages of the Fathers on the subject of the Eucharist (*op. cit.*, c. 11. P. L. 180, 359).

See also the *Epistola ad fratres de Monte Dei*, c. 10, n. 30 (P. L. 184, 327), attributed with a certain amount of probability by Massuetus to Hugh the Carthusian, where the "reality" of the sacrament, that is the spiritual fruit, is said, not of course without reference to the sacrament itself, to be eaten, drunk, partaken of, received, in holy meditation on the Passion of the Lord.

We have still further support for our interpretation of the sixth chapter of St. John in many passages where the Fathers place before us, not as above promiscuously, but side by side, so to speak, both elements of the Eucharist, the significative or sacramental, and what is signified or the spiritual. Thus Origen (*In Num.*, hom. 16, 9. P. G. 12, 701-702) writes, when explaining *John*, VI, 54: "We are said to drink of the Blood of Christ, not by the rite of the sacraments alone, but also when we receive His word, in which life consists." And again (*In Exodum*, hom. 13, n. 3. P. G. 12, 391): "You, who are wont to assist at the divine mysteries, know that when you receive you are most reverent and careful lest any small particle of the Sacrament (*ex eo*) fall to the ground. If then you observe the utmost care for the conservation

of His most sacred Body, and rightly so, how can you think that it is a less grave sin to have shown neglect in regard to the word of God than it is to have been negligent in regard to His Body?"

Similarly Didymus: "How shall we interpret the words: *Man ate the bread of angels?* Understand by my bread the whole solid PRECEPTS of God, and by the wine the KNOWLEDGE of God by contemplation of divine things. But likewise understand by these words His divine Body and precious Blood" (*In Prov.*, IX, 5. P. G. 39, 1633).

These words are echoed by the commentary on *Prov.*, IX, 2, attributed though with only slight probability to Hippolytus: "*She hath set forth her table*, that is to say the promised KNOWLEDGE of the holy Trinity, and also His most adorable and holy Body and Blood, which are daily consecrated (*perficientur*) and offered in sacrifice at the secret (*arcana*) and divine table" (P. G. 10, 628).

In the eleventh letter of the first book of *Epistulae*, attributed to St. Nilus, we read: "Moses tells the people in prophecy: *You shall eat flesh*, meaning by flesh the divine Body which the faithful eat in the Church, and also the most blessed KNOWLEDGE of Christians, higher than any other knowledge" (P. G. 79, 125).

Of the Latin Fathers, St. Jerome speaks in a similar fashion: "When He says: *Except you eat of my flesh, and drink of my blood*, although it can also be understood of the mystery (*in mysterio*), nevertheless truly the Body of Christ and His Blood is the word of Scripture, divine teaching. When we come to the mystery (the faithful understand), should we let a particle fall, we are in danger of sin (*periclitamur*). If when we listen to the word of God, and both the word of God and the Flesh of Christ are poured into our ears, and nevertheless we think of other things, in what grave danger of sin do we not place ourselves?" (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. 3, pars. 2, p. 301, *Tract sive hom.*, in *Psalm* 147). And again: "This is the only good we have in this world of ours, if we eat the Flesh of God and drink of His Blood, not only in the mystery but also in the reading of the Scriptures" (*In Ecclesiasten*, III, 12-13. P. L. 23, 1039).

Who does not know that the author of the *Imitation* (IV, 11) speaks in this manner when he writes of the two tables set for

man in the Church? Christ is upon each table, to be partaken of in a different manner from each. So true is this, “that the food of life is one, consisting both of the Word Incarnate as teaching, and of the Word Incarnate as the Victim, who justifies us” (Nicholas of Cusa, *Exercitationes*, lib. 4, Opera, Basle, 1565, p. 444).

Hence the teaching of the Fathers on union with Christ by the Eucharist and by contemplation as one and indivisible may be summed up as follows. As we have already said, and as will be made clearer later on, Th. XLIX (Vol. III), just as the Eucharist is the sacrament of that incorporation with Christ given by living faith, so lively faith is a spiritual eating of the Eucharist. Hence these two things are closely interwoven, as sign and what is signified by that sign, as sacrament or sign of a reality (*sacramentum rei*), and as reality signified by that sacrament or sign (*res sacramenti*); and so, in the nature of things, and according to common usage, in the language of the Fathers, the names and predicates of the one were transferred to the other. Let us admit that Origen led the way in this, but Origen was influenced to speak as he did by the very nature of things; and the same may be said of Ignatius, whom the ecclesiastical symbolism of the Eucharist (for the Church, as the body of the faithful, incorporated with Christ through the Eucharist, is the *res sacramenti*, the ultimate reality signified by the Eucharist, as its sign) led to speak of the Church in Eucharistic language.

APPENDIX C

Clement on the Partaking of the Blood of the Passion of the Lord in the Eucharist

We find such partaking of the Blood of the Passion asserted by Clement in a rather involved passage in which he makes a distinction as of a twofold Blood of Christ: “For one is carnal whereby we have been preserved from destruction, the other spiritual whereby we have been anointed [$\bar{\omega}$ κερχρίσμεθα, meaning perhaps: we have been initiated in Christ].” It appears to me that Clement distinguishes here a twofold Blood, much in the same way as the Fathers distinguished a twofold Flesh and Blood of our Lord. We may give two examples of this, St. Jerome

In Ephes., I, (7. P. L. 26, 481): "The Flesh and Blood of Christ is understood in two ways: there is that flesh, spiritual and divine, of which He says: *My flesh is meat*: or there is that Flesh and Blood which was crucified, and which the lance of the soldier caused to flow"; and St. Augustine, *En. in Psalm 98*, n. 9. (P. L. 37, 1265): "It is not this Body which you see, that you will eat, nor will you drink that Blood which my crucifiers will shed" (cf. Hesych., *In Levit.*, 8, 22–29. P. G. 93, 883). For by reason of the different conditions (or manner of presence) in the two cases, we can distinguish between the sensible Flesh of Christ, the object of the senses, and the intelligible or spiritual Flesh of Christ, the object of intellect or faith alone (cf. Billot, *De Ecclesiae sacramentis*, 4, 1. P. 392). The one is spoken of in the Passion, the other in the Eucharist. Now his very subject matter led Clement, quite naturally, to refer to this distinction. For he is urging the Christian, when taking his ordinary food, to mix water with his wine, and his whole discourse turns on this point. After a few other considerations he sets before them the example of Christ, the great grape cluster of the true vine, who willed that with His Blood, or the blood of the grape, water should be mixed (just as His Blood is mingled with the grace of salvation). We know that in the case of Christ this was done in two ways: one way was when the grape was pressed in the Passion, and blood mixed with water flowed therefrom; the other, the more spiritual way, was in the Supper (the Blood of which leads us into the incorruptibility of the spiritual life). For in the Supper itself, in the more spiritual way, there was not merely one mingling, but two. There was first a mingling in the sensible element given the Apostles to drink, namely of WINE and WATER. Then there is a second mingling, whereby a purely spiritual element is mingled WITH MAN WHO DRINKS (for the uncreated Spirit of the Word may be considered as related to the Word, as the invigorating blood is related to the flesh, because the vigour of the Word is the Spirit of the Word. Now consider the Spirit of the Word as the Blood, then man, become one or mingled with the Spirit of the Word by drinking, is considered as the water. Hence then at the Eucharistic Supper there is a second mingling, as of water and wine, that is of man and of the Spirit).

Of these two Eucharistic minglings (wine and water, Spirit and man), we find that the former begets faith in the latter (it is the symbol of it); and the latter begets incorruptibility in man. And now from both these two there plainly arises a third mingling; namely of the sensible element, that is the drink, and of the spiritual element, that is the Word.

And, finally, this mixture of the Word and of drink, as one complexus, is called the Eucharist. The Word here is the Word Incarnate, as the excerpt will show. The passage runs: "The sacred vine put forth (*germinavit*) the grape cluster foretold by the prophets. For this is the sign given to all who have been led from the error of paganism into the peace of Christianity, the great grape cluster, the Word, pressed for us, when the blood of the grape, or of the Word, willed to be mingled with water (just as His Blood also is mingled with our salvation). Because the Blood of the Lord is twofold: for one is carnal whereby we are saved from destruction; the other spiritual whereby we are anointed. And to drink the Blood of Jesus is to be made partaker of the incorruptibility of the Lord. Now the vigour of the Word is the Spirit, just as blood is the vigour of the flesh. Similarly, then, wine is mingled with water, the Spirit with man; and the former mingling, of the wine and water, nourishes our faith; the latter mingling, that is of man and of the Spirit, leads us into immortality. Again the mingling of both, that is of the drink and of the Word, is called the Eucharist, which means grace worthy of praise and beautiful in God's sight (*gratia laudabilis et pulchra*), and those who are partakers of the Eucharist by faith are sanctified in body and soul: seeing that the divine will unites what is mingled with the divine (*misturam divinam*), that is man, to the Spirit and to the Word mystically. For now in truth the Spirit is united with the soul, which is begotten from it (*ab eo fertur*); while the Word is united with the Flesh, because of which the Word was made flesh" (*Paedagog.*, 2, 2. P. G. 8, 409–412).

There is no doubt, then, that in the above passage the expression, *to drink the Blood of Jesus* refers to the Eucharistic drinking. Meantime this Blood is likewise the blood of the grape, pressed for us in the past, in the Passion.

CHAPTER III

ON THE RELATION OF THE MASS TO THE SACRIFICE OF OUR LORD

THESIS XIX

THE FATHERS unanimously teach that not only sacrifice and the representation of the Passion are included in our Eucharistic celebration, but that the sacrificial character of our celebration depends upon the fact that in our celebration there is an image, or representation of the PASSION, a symbolic immolation.¹

This teaching is so clear and well known, even to those who have merely glanced at the pages of the Fathers, that it would be simply waste of time to pile up the evidence here.

But, though this is certainly true, we are at once faced by a question of some subtlety. How does the character of a true sacrifice accrue to our sacramental representation of the sacrifice of the Cross? How can that sacrifice be real if it lacks true immolation, if it shows merely a similitude of real immolation, a representative, sacramental immolation, or (as the Greek theologians say) a mystic or symbolic immolation? For such is indeed an imitation of real immolation, but it is not the real thing of which it is an image.²

¹ It is one thing to base to a certain extent the sacrificial character of our celebration on the sacramental representation in it of true sacrifice; it is quite another thing to say that the concept of representation and the concept of sacrifice are in this case so interchangeable that the Eucharist should be called a sacrifice *only in the sense* that it is the image of a sacrifice. Although this last view appealed to Renz (*passim*, bd. 2, pp. 484-485), it is neither safe nor true. For the Eucharist is not a sacrifice by a mere figure of speech; it is a sacrifice in the true and proper sense.

² I beg the student to bear in mind once for all (one cannot be constantly making these distinctions) that in excluding all present immolation from the Mass I mean to exclude real immolation and not what is merely representative. So far are we from excluding present representative immolation, that we do not believe that a Catholic could deny that representative immolation is repeated as often as Mass is said. Nay, more, our offering of the Victim of the Passion (which we shall prove to be present and real) consists simply and solely in that symbolic immolation: which symbolical immolation, as we have said, in dealing with the Last Supper Th. III (Vol. I), is the offering of a real immolation in blood.

Though the Fathers did not deal *ex professo* with this question, nevertheless they have left us in no doubt as to their teaching in this regard: that representation or image of sacrifice passes into sacrifice itself because in that representation and by it there is offered that of which it is a representation: in other words, the death of Christ in blood is offered in the bloodless image of His death. One should here recall and keep in mind what we have said in Thesis III (Vol. I), in respect of such points of doctrine as the Fathers did not deal with specifically, because the necessity for defending those points of doctrine did not arise. And especially, and in particular, they would find still less necessity, we might presume, for making definitions and distinctions regarding such things as were quite familiar through constant use to all Christians, and so especially well known: of such things the sacrifice of the Church was a pre-eminent example. Wherefore the Fathers insisted on practical instruction on the Eucharist rather than on dogmatic teaching. Hence we must not expect the rigorous analysis and completeness of treatment which the necessities of the case forced upon the Fathers in their controversies on the Trinity, the Incarnation and grace. Hence often enough in Eucharistic matters the testimonies of the Fathers will not be conclusive, though they will at least be suasive, while again at times we shall find them absolutely conclusive. And, taken in itself, a collection of probable testimonies, all suggesting the same conclusion, is a very powerful argument. It becomes still more so, when, as in the case here, it is supported by clearer evidence in certain passages of the Fathers. These latter throw a brilliant light on the remaining probable testimonies, so that finally the whole mass of evidence points consistently to a clear definite teaching. The strength of this collective testimony is reinforced if we consider the lack of any authority among the Fathers for certain novel opinions, which we shall have to criticise when we have shown the mind of the Fathers.

Meantime, I should like to take as my patron that most painstaking and learned student of patristic theology, and brilliant ornament of the Society of Jesus, St. Peter Canisius. His Catechism was a most effective defence of the faith of the Fathers against the assaults of the innovators, not only in Germany and

France, but indeed in practically every quarter of the globe. He asks (*Opus catechisticum, De Sacramentis*, q. 7): "What are we to BELIEVE about the sacrifice of the altar?" And after a few preliminary paragraphs he replies: "The sacrifice of the Mass, carefully considered in all its bearings, is the holy and living representation, and at the same time the BLOODLESS and effective OFFERING of the Passion of our Lord, and OF THE BLOODY SACRIFICE which was offered for us on the Cross."

In this reply he clearly distinguishes and links together the two elements which we find constantly mentioned by the Fathers, representation and offering, both of the one thing, the Passion. For as we shall see in the elucidations which follow, the teaching of the Fathers consists in this, that the death of Christ is offered by the fact that it is represented. The representative rite itself is oblation of, or such that it offers, the reality represented by it. We give to God the Body and Blood of Christ crucified, as an offering of thanksgiving and propitiation (*ευχαριστήριον* and *ἰλαστήριον*) in so far as by the separation of the species by which He is clothed He is represented, for the purpose of propitiation, as dead, who by His death entered into the true state of Victim, a state which (through His resurrection) persists for ever. Just as in the sacrament of His death Christ gave Himself to God unto death, so we, too, in the same sacrament offer the same death, repeating what He did. For when we, united to our Head by faith, are made sharers with Him in the rite which He employed, we are also rightly appointed sharers in the giving of the gift (*donationis*) which came from His hand and which God, by His acceptance of it, sanctioned with eternal glory.

Hence we shall find that the Fathers in their teaching, taken all in all, insist on three things, complementary to each other, and mutually necessary.

The *first*: that the Passion is offered by us in the representation of it.

The *second*: that the celestial Victim of the eternal sacrifice is offered by us.

The *third*: that Christ does not intervene in the Mass personally by a new act of offering of His own; the only new act of offering

is on the part of the Church, offering in each Mass, in subordination to Christ, her Head.

Hence, in the first paragraph we shall consider the relation of the Mass to the Passion; in the second, the relation of the Mass to the celestial sacrifice; in the third, the relation of the Mass to the actual offering of our Lord Himself.

§ 1. The Relation of the Mass to the Passion

The Fathers have illustrated the relation of the Mass to the Passion in two ways: first of all explicitly, when they say that the Passion is offered in the Mass; and in the second place implicitly, when they teach that the eating of the Eucharist is a participation of the bloody sacrifice.

A. THE PASSION IS OFFERED IN THE MASS

Cyprian here leads the way and leaves no doubt whatever as to his teaching. For he makes two assertions which put the matter beyond all doubt. The first is that the Eucharistic sacrifice is an imitation of the Passion, for he declares: "The sacrifice of the Lord is not celebrated with a legitimate sanctification unless our offering and our sacrifice correspond to the Passion" (*Ep.* 63, n. 9. P. L. 4, 381). Secondly, and most significantly, he says that the Passion of Christ is what is offered in the Eucharistic sacrifice: "FOR THE PASSION OF THE LORD is the sacrifice WHICH WE OFFER" (n. 17, col. 387). Hence it follows, according to Cyprian, that the Eucharistic sacrifice consists in this, that the immolation of Christ slain in the Passion is truly offered to God in a representation of itself.¹ Now if Christ is held to be present in the Eucharist simply

¹ Cyprian, who says that the Passion is offered in our Eucharistic sacrifice, often says also that the Eucharistic sacrifice consists in this, that the Body and Blood of Christ is offered. For he not only says that Christ offered His Body and Blood in the Supper (n. 4, col. 376), but he also holds that the priest who truly officiates in the place of Christ is the one "who imitates what Christ did" (n. 14, col. 386); and he openly teaches that "the Blood of Christ is offered" by us (n. 9, col. 381). Here, then, we find expressions which, besides implying death, as we have often said, are used by Cyprian as synonymous with that other expression of his in which the offering of the Passion in our Eucharistic sacrifice is asserted.

Accustomed as we are to the words of the catechism from our infancy, we easily fail to appreciate the true meaning and the full force of the words *the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ*. But imagine the feelings of those who were the first to hear them, and for the first time. What else could they mean to them but the sacrifice in which the death of Christ was offered? And so the Latin Fathers use the expression *the sacrifice of the Body and Blood* indiscriminately for our bloodless sacrifice and for the bloody sacrifice of the Lord (which ended on Calvary). We notice the same thing among the Greek Fathers—Eusebius (*Dem. evangel.*, 1, 1, c. 10), for example, for whom the following two statements have absolutely the same meaning: "to celebrate the memorial OF THE BODY AND BLOOD

and solely as the Victim of the Passion, we readily understand how appropriately the Eucharist is termed by those early writers "the very sacrament of the Passion of our Lord and of the Redemption" (n. 14, col. 385); that is to say, not an empty sacrament, but a full one, containing both the Victim of the Passion and the price of our Redemption.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechesis* 23, *mystagogica* 5, n. 10. P. G. 33, 1117), among the Greek Fathers, teaches us that in the Mass "we offer Christ slain for our sins" (in the Passion, of course).¹

Hence we readily understand the words of Cyril earlier in the same work: "After having completed the spiritual sacrifice, the

OF CHRIST"; "to offer the memorial of the SACRIFICE" enacted in the Passion (cols. 89 and 92).

He also holds that this offering stands for us "as a sacrificial action" (*pro sacrificacione*); not, however, in the sense that our offering is empty of sacrifice, but that it is our sacrificial action in such a way that in it are carried out "the august sacrifices of the table of Christ". Hence he concludes: "Therefore we sacrifice to the Most High God a sacrifice of praise, we sacrifice a full, adorable and sacrosanct sacrifice. We offer sacrifice in a new manner according to the New Testament; we offer a clean sacrifice" (col. 92). Hence a true victim is sacrificed by us, by an action or rite in which nevertheless we do nothing else than make a commemoration of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ once fulfilled (*peracti*) on the Cross. Hence here and now there is carried out no present immolation, and yet an immolated victim is offered. From these expressions of Eusebius, I am not inferring, though his words are quite consistent with such a view, that Eusebius held that in the sacramental commemoration of the Passion, we offer that very Victim, the memorial of which is made; that is to say, the Body and Blood of Christ slain. However, the words of Eusebius found later on in the same work (*Dem. evangel.*, 5, 3, col. 365) strongly suggest this interpretation: "Our Saviour Jesus, the Christ of God, according to the order of Melchisedech carries on even now amongst men His sacerdotal office, through His own ministers. For just as Melchisedech the priest of the gentiles DID NOT OFFER CORPORAL SACRIFICES, blessing Abraham in bread and wine alone, so, too, our Lord and Saviour, Himself first, and after Him all priests throughout the whole world, carrying out according to the statutes of the Church THE SPIRITUAL FUNCTION OF THE PRIESTHOOD, REPRESENT [that is, carry out by acts of meaning obscure to all but the initiated] THE MYSTERIES OF HIS SAVING BODY AND BLOOD in bread and wine." That is, now we have in place of the sacrifice in blood the sacramental memorial of the Body and Blood of Christ, or the representation of the Passion, which far excels the legal worship in which it was necessary "to worship God in a corporal rite, by the victims and blood of irrational animals" (*ibid.*).

¹ I take the words "for our sins" ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀμαρτημάτων as modifying, directly, the slaying (ἐσφαγιασμένον), not the offering (προσφέρομεν). For, in the first place, it is Cyril's thesis and the argument of his discourse that the end and scope of our sacrificial offering is wider than the advantage only of OURSELVES (the living), and extends to the dead also. Secondly, he indicates this in the words which immediately follow: "making propitiation to God who loved men on behalf of them (the dead) and ourselves". Now, if we connect "for our sins" with "slain" (that is, with the Passion of Christ), then "for our sins" (that is, sins of us who are men) is "for the sins of all men". But if it is connected with "we offer" (that is, with *our* active offering), "*our* sins" should have the same restricted sense, "the sins of us who offer"—which is certainly unsuitable.

bloodless worship on that Victim of propitiation, we invoke God in prayer for the peace of the Church in common, for the good condition of the world, for kings, etc." (*ibid.*, n. 8, col. 1115).¹ A bloodless worship, therefore, is offered over the Victim of the blood sacrifice, over the Victim of propitiation whereby we are redeemed, over the Victim slain in the Passion.²

¹ This punctuation seems to us far more probable than that which leaves out the comma between "propitiation" and "we invoke" and places it between "worship" and "on". Because those are in error who think that in this passage Cyril refers to the epiclesis, or invocation of God on the sacrifice. For (1) in that case, he would not have used, after the preposition, the genitive case, but the accusative. (2) Because the epiclesis is never said to be made for the Church, for the world and kings. (3) Because in a former chapter he had already dealt with what pertained to the epiclesis; so that clearly here in the tenth chapter his words presuppose ("after") that the sacrifice is complete, so that now there is place for intercession (that is, the prayer on behalf of the Church, etc). It would be erroneous, too, to say that Cyril intended the prayer to be made over the victim as though suspended in air over it, to God, for the Church, etc. We have no example of such a sense among ancient writers; and, besides, I scarcely think that it would be in accordance with good grammar to take these two propositions, as here, depending on the one verb. Hence the sentence should be translated: "after having completed the sacrifice", as above.

² According to Basil (that is, if Basil is the author of the commentaries on Isaias), while God disdains the Jewish sprinkling of blood round about the altar, He rejects the blood of animals, but not the Blood of Christ, poured out in these latter days for the unique redemption of the world, and as the unique expiation for sin; Christ by His own Blood is become the one Victim, the true Lamb whose sacrifice is offered by us every day, whose Flesh is our food. Hence the mind of the author seems to be as follows: just as the Jews made a true offering of the blood poured out at the altar, so, too, a true offering is to be made by us of the Blood shed in the Passion, and this is done in our Eucharistic sacrifice. "I do not demand [says God] that the blood of goats or bulls be poured round about the altar. . . . Take note that He did not say that He does not demand any blood. For He would not have said that He did not wish for THE BLOOD WHICH IS POURED OUT IN THESE LATTER DAYS [when we celebrate the Eucharist] UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS, and which cries louder than the blood of Abel; but He exchanges these victims for something spiritual: because there is also to be a change in the priesthood. The Aaronic stock, therefore, is excluded in order to make way for a priest according to the order of Melchisedech. No longer is there a constant succession of victims; no longer are there those victims which were offered on the day of propitiation; no longer are there ashes of a heifer for the cleansing of the defiled. For there is one Victim, Christ, and the mortification of the saints in His image. One aspersion, the laver of regeneration. ONE EXPIATION FOR SIN, THE BLOOD SHED FOR THE SALVATION OF THE WORLD [that is, shed by the Jews of old in the Passion]" (*In Isaiam*, c. 1, n. 26. P. G. 30, 169). ". . . In the fulfilment of time, Christ the true Lamb is offered in sacrifice [by us Christians], whose Flesh is food indeed" (*ibid.*, n. 27, col. 172). Here the indication of our teaching is slight, I must admit, but there it is.

In addition to the passage quoted in Thesis. III (Vol. I), on the close connection between Christ's Supper and His Passion, St. Gregory Nazianzen also indicates in another place that the Passion of Christ is bound up with and contained in our Eucharistic sacrifice, where he sets before us the staff of the Hebrews who partook of the paschal lamb, as presignifying the firm faith of Christians: "The law prescribes a supporting staff for you, lest you waver in mind when you hear of the BLOOD AND OF THE PASSION AND OF THE DEATH OF GOD. . . . Rather you must eat of the Body without shame and without doubt, drink of the Blood if you wish to attain to life, not throwing away your faith while you talk of the flesh, nor bringing damnation to yourselves while you discuss THE PASSION" (*Or.*, 45, in *S. Pascha*, 19, P. G. 36, 649). Here the

Chrysostom (*In Hebraeos*, hom. 17, 3. P. G. 63, 130–131) inculcates most forcefully that Christ as Victim is formally one and the same in every one of our sacrifices, as well as in His own sacrifice in blood: “This Victim is one, says St. Paul, while the other victims were many; and plainly they were weak, because they were many. For why, I ask you, were many needed, if one would suffice? For the very fact that they were many and were always being offered, shows that the Jews were never cleansed by them. . . . But then you will say: Do we not offer every day? YES, INDEED¹ WE DO, BUT BY MAKING A MEMORIAL OF HIS DEATH: AND THIS VICTIM IS ONE, NOT MANY. How is it one and not many? BECAUSE IT WAS OFFERED ONCE, like that other in the Holy of Holies. This [which we do] is the image of that [which Christ offered], as the latter is like the other [which was offered in the Holy of Holies]. Because we always offer the same, not one lamb today and another tomorrow, but the same always, so that there is only one Victim. But would not this mean, you ask, as Christ is offered in many places, that there are many Christs also? Not at all, but there is the one Christ everywhere, here, whole and entire, there likewise, one Body. SINCE THEN He who is offered is one Body, and NOT MANY BODIES; so, too, there is ONE VICTIM. OUR HIGH PRIEST IS HE WHO HAS OFFERED THE VICTIM WHICH “CLEANSES US. NOW TOO WE OFFER THAT VICTIM WHICH WAS OFFERED THEN,

blood which we are told we must drink seems to be the Blood of the Passion (we shall have more to say in XX on this kind of argument). In his earlier *Invectiva Contra Julianum* he is more explicit, plainly teaching that by our sacrifices we are made sharers of the Passion to which Christ submitted in order to make us sharers of His divinity. “Julian washes his hands lest they be defiled by the bloodless SACRIFICE, by which with Christ we are sharers both OF HIS SUFFERINGS AND HIS DIVINITY” (*Or.*, 4, 52. P. G. 35, 576). And again in his hymns he tells us that by the offering of our sacrifice we are made sharers of the sufferings of the Incarnate God: “Our offerings mean this: partnership in the Incarnation of God and in the sufferings of God” (*Carmen*, 1, 1, sect. 2. poem 34, v. 238–239. P. G. 37, 962–964). “And, when stricken with illness, he complains that he can no longer take his part in (*misceri*) the sufferings of Christ by the sacrifice: ‘No longer do I lift up my hands to the holy sacrifices, Taking my part in (*admixtus*) the dread sufferings of Christ’” (*Carmen*, 1, 2, sect. 1, poem 50, v. 49–50. P. G. 37, 1389).

This realistic language of Gregory helps us not a little to understand his mind in this matter, which seems to be this: that we take part in the Passion of Christ by our Eucharistic offering, because we hold in our hands the slain Body and Blood of the Incarnate Word, offering it to God as our victim, by a slaying in symbol, while “with a bloodless cutting we separate the Body and Blood of the Lord” (*Ep.* 171. P. G. 37, 280, 281).

¹ The repetition of *offerimus* here means simply “yes”, according to common later (and *Greek*) idiom—therefore, “Yes, indeed we do.”

AND WHICH IS INCORRUPTIBLE. What we do is done as a memorial of that which was done then. Do this, He says, for a commemoration of me. We do not offer another sacrifice as the High Priest did, but we always offer the same; OR RATHER WE MAKE A COMMEMORATION OF THE SACRIFICE."¹

Here the two facts stand out crystal clear: firstly, that we make only a representation of the sacrifice of our Lord, doing nothing to make Christ a victim; second, that nevertheless we make an offering of that very same Victim, of the offering of which by Christ we make a commemoration. This Victim is the Victim of His death, it has been transmitted to the shrine of heavenly glory, incorruptible and eternal (and hence always at our disposition).

More specifically, however, we may infer from Chrysostom:

Firstly, that our sacrifice and the sacrifice of Christ in blood is one because of the oneness of what is offered, so much so indeed that not only do we offer the same Victim, but we also offer the one and the same sacrifice. In other words, not only do we offer the same Christ, but we also offer Him as the subject of the same sacrificial action, which was that of Christ, Chief Priest and principal offerer of our sacrifices.²

Secondly, we may infer from Chrysostom that, because there is no real immolation in the Mass, where there is merely a symbolical immolation, this sacrifice of ours, though it is a true sacrifice in so far as it is one with the sacrifice of Christ, nevertheless in a secondary sense it might more fittingly be said to be the representation of a sacrifice rather than a sacrifice. For it has in itself the representation or image of immolation, but no real immolation at all, because in our sacrifice there is no actual repetition of that by which real immolation came to Christ in His sacrifice.

We find a kindred passage in Chrysostom, where, confronting the heretics, he proves the reality of the bloody sacrifice from

¹ These words of Chrysostom, wrongly attributed to Ambrose, are to be found and quoted in testimony of Catholic teaching by practically every mediaeval writer.

² Chrysostom does not say that the oneness of the Victim consists formally in the material oneness of the Body, but rather proves the formal oneness of the Victim, by an argument *a pari*, on the same principle whereby the oneness of the Body is safeguarded, arguing as follows: the continued repetition of the sacrifice no more militates against the oneness of the Victim, than does the simultaneous multiplication of the sacrifice in different places militate against the material oneness of the Body.

the Eucharistic mystery, saying quite plainly that our sacrifice could not exist without the bloody sacrifice, of which it is the symbol: "He [Christ] has bound up the memorial of the benefit with the mystery, thus, too, curbing the mouths of the heretics. For when they ask: How are we sure that Christ was immolated? apart from many other proofs which we might adduce, we can bridle their tongues by pointing also to these mysteries. For had CHRIST NOT DIED, OF WHAT WOULD THE ACTIONS THERE PERFORMED BE THE SYMBOLS? See how ardent was His desire that we should keep always in mind, that He died for us" (hom. 82, in *Matth.*, 1, 2. P. G. 57, 739). In the forty-first homily on *I Cor.* (P. G. 61, 361), Chrysostom clearly has the same thing in mind; he is explaining why prayers are said in the Mass *for the whole world* and also *for all who died in Christ*, and advances the following argument: "Let us not hesitate to offer prayers for them, for before us lies THE COMMON EXPIATION OF THE WHOLE WORLD." Reasoning in such way, he plainly teaches that Christ in the Eucharist lies as the Victim of the Passion whereby the whole human race was redeemed. He gives expression to this same thought perhaps even more forcefully when, pointing to Christ on the altar subject to the immolation by which He reconciled heaven and earth, he indignantly remonstrates with the Christian who will not forgive his enemy, in the following words: "Give up your enmity, that you may obtain healing from the table. You approach that Victim before whom we all must stand in awe (*tremendam*), that holy Victim (*θυσία*), and so show respect for what that offering teaches you. Christ lies slain there. And for what reason was he slain? Why? To reconcile heaven and earth, to make you a friend even of the angels" (Hom. 1, *De Proditione Judae*, n. 6. and hom. 2, *De Proditione Judae*, n. 5. P. G. 49, 381-390). This passage is cited by St. John Damascene, in *Sacr. Parall.*, A. 11. (P. G. 95, 1145). Cf. a lengthy discussion on the same argument in *Homilia de coemeterio et de cruce*, n. 3. (P. G. 49, 397-398).

Cyril of Alexandria so closely links up our sacrifice with our Lord's one sacrifice of the Supper and of the Passion by reason of the one Altar which is Christ, as to teach that the victim of our altar, just as much as the victim of the altar of the Lord, saves

the human race from destruction. Hence from two points of view he teaches that our Victim is the Victim of the Redemption, the Victim of the very Passion of the Lord: because it is the victim of the same altar, and because it is of the same efficacy. Call to mind the commentary on *II Kings*, XXIV, 15–25, quoted in Thesis III (Vol. 1).

The words of Cyril are in keeping with those of Ps. Sophronius, where he says that the very Blood which the lance caused to flow from the pierced side of Christ is daily offered in sacrifice by the priest for the people: “Let us now speak of the Body that is offered in sacrifice by the priests. Our Lord Jesus Christ is daily offered in sacrifice for the life and the salvation of the world, as crucified on Calvary, so at the sacred offering (*prothesi*) by the priest; with a lance, too, lest we forget that HIS PURE SIDE WAS PIERCED WITH A LANCE IN THE SACRED PASSION when straightway there issued BLOOD and water for the incorruptibility and restoration of the world: THE PRIEST OFFERS FOR THE PEOPLE THIS SAME BLOOD AND WATER IN SACRIFICE” (*Commentarius liturgicus*, 8. P. G. 87 ter, 3988–3989). Therefore Ps. Sophronius says that the Blood of the wounds is offered.

Nicholas Cabasilas discusses at length the question: How is our everyday offering of a true sacrifice reconciled with the apostolic teaching that Christ was sacrificed once and once only? He meets the apparent contradiction by assigning to Christ the formal condition of victim continuing from the Passion up to the present time. He says: “This sacrifice is not the image and the figure of a sacrifice, it is a real sacrifice; it is not the bread that is offered in sacrifice, it is the very Body of Christ. And, moreover, the sacrifice of the Lamb is one; it is enacted once only.” He then goes on to explain: “As this sacrifice is carried out, not by the Lamb being slain, here and now, but by the bread being changed into the Lamb already slain, clearly there is a change, but quite as clearly there is no immolation here and now; and thus that which is changed [the bread] is many, and it is changed repeatedly; yet there is nothing in this to prevent that into which it is changed being in each case one and the same: INDEED, JUST AS THERE IS THE ONE BODY, SO THERE IS THE ONE SLAYING OF THE BODY” (*Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 32. P. G. 150, 440–441). He had already

written in the same sense, referring to the time in the Liturgy after the consecration had been accomplished: "The whole sacrificial action is finished and consummated, the gifts have been consecrated, the sacrifice completed, the great Victim slain for the world is lying on the altar . . . that most sacred Body of the Lord which suffered all those things, abuse, contumely, scourging: the Body which was crucified, which was slain . . . the very Blood which gushed from the slain body" (*ibid.*, c. 27, col. 426).

We return to the Latin Fathers. St. Ambrose, in book 2, *De excessu fratris sui Satyri* (P. L. 16, 1327), has this saying: "The world was redeemed by the death of one. . . . And thus His death is the life of all. We are signed with His death; praying, we announce His death; OFFERING, WE PROCLAIM HIS DEATH (*mortem eius offerentes praedicamus*); His death is victory; His death is a sacrament; His death is the annual festivity of the world." The probable meaning is: the same death which we commemorate or proclaim in our offering is offered by us when we commemorate or proclaim it. "Offering, we proclaim His death"; i.e. offering his death we proclaim it.¹

According to Gaudens of Brescia, the sufferings of the Passion of the Lord are set before God in the Eucharist: "For we present [the *more trustworthy codices* have: WE OFFER] THE SUFFERINGS OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST . . . in symbols of his Body and Blood for the salvation of all, and with lips of those who know, we bear testimony to the abounding sweetness of the mysteries: *Taste and see how sweet the Lord is*" (*Sermo* 19. P. L. 20, 989).

In book 20, *Contra Faustum* (18 and 21. P. L. 42, 382 and 385-386), St. Augustine embraces the whole matter at issue, teaching clearly: (1) The commemoration or representation of the sacrifice enacted in the Passion is celebrated "in the offering and in the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ". (2) That true reality

¹ Were offering used here intransitively, meaning when we offer, or make the offering, our interpretation would halt. But I think that in this clause, if we are to take one of the verbs as intransitive, it would be *proclaim* rather than *offer*. For *proclaiming* (Latin, *praedicantes*) might well be taken to refer to the recital of the Canon, where the verb is used intransitively, as in the *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, t. 1, pp. 126-127: "He ordained seven deacons to accompany the bishop as he proclaimed—*praedicantem*—the Canon [while he recited the Canon]." "He has shared the Passion with them in the proclaiming—*praedicatione*—of the priests [in the Canon] whenever Mass is celebrated." There are other passages from Ambrose to be quoted later, Thesis XXI.

of the sacrifice which was promised in the figures, and which Christ gave to God in the Passion, is offered by us in our sacrificial action. His words are: "That true sacrifice, which is due to the one true God, and which Christ alone fulfilled on His altar, the demons arrogantly claim for themselves, imitating it in victims of animals. . . . The Hebrews, on the other hand, in the victims of cattle which they offered to God, celebrated the prophecy of the victim to come, which Christ offered. And so now the Christians, in the sacrosanct offering and participation of the Body and Blood of Christ, celebrate the memorial of that same sacrifice already carried out [by Christ]. . . . We read in the *Psalms: A sacrifice of praise will glorify me*. Before the coming of Christ, the Flesh and Blood of this sacrifice was promised THROUGH THE FIGURATIVE VICTIMS; in the Passion of Christ it was given IN VERY TRUTH; after the Ascension of Christ, it is celebrated BY THE SACRAMENT OF MEMORY . . . [The sacrifices of the Hebrews were immolated] to the one true God, so that a SIMILITUDE or figure promising the truth of sacrifice should be offered to Him, to Whom WAS TO BE OFFERED [by us in that sacramental commemoration] THE VERY TRUTH ITSELF GIVEN [by Christ] IN THE PASSION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST."¹ That is to say, the Passion of the Body and Blood in which consisted the truth of the sacrifice promised in the ancient figures, and finally given by Christ to God the Father, is now offered by us in the sacramental commemoration of it.

Let us listen to St. Augustine again, where he puts this question to himself: from where did Christ entrust to us the Eucharistic sacrifice of His Body and Blood? He replies in the words of the Apostle: "*He humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross*, so that from the Cross was entrusted to us THE FLESH AND BLOOD OF THE LORD, THE NEW

¹ St. Augustine says here that the reality promised in the olden figures was "given" or rendered (*redditam*) by Christ in the Passion, just as St. Jerome says that the same reality was "given" in the Last Supper. To such an extent do the Passion and the Supper fuse into one sacrifice, that in the Supper the bloody immolation of the Passion was bloodlessly given, offered into God's hand (*redditam*). That is to say, just as in the figures of old it was pledged to God, so in the sacrament it is given over into His dominion, in the sacrament which contains the Flesh and Blood which it signifies. The words of Jerome are: "Desiring to put an end to the carnal festival of the pasch, and with the fading of the figures, TO GIVE THE REAL PASCH, He said: *With desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer*. For Christ our pasch is sacrificed" (*In Matth.*, XXVI, P. L. 26, 190).

SACRIFICE” (*Enarr. in Psalm. 33, 5-6. P. L. 36, 303-304*). Thus we are given to understand that Christ is the Victim of our sacrifice, in so far as He has been made victim by His death on the Cross. He further says in the same sense (*Ep. 102, q. 3, n. 21. P. L. 33, 379*) that we Christians offer a sacrifice appropriate to the manifestation of the New Testament “which is administered FROM THE TRUE VICTIM OF THE ONE PRIEST, THAT IS FROM THE BLOOD SHED ON THE CROSS”.

It is no wonder, then, that Augustine calls the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Church “the sacrifice of our ransom”, because in it we offer, in subordination to Christ, the very Victim by which we have been ransomed—the Victim of the Cross. So he speaks of himself at his mother’s funeral: “Not even in the midst of those prayers which we poured forth to Thee, WHEN THE SACRIFICE OF OUR RANSOM was being offered for her, when her body had been laid beside the grave, before it was buried, as is usual in those parts, not even during those prayers did I shed a tear” (*Confess., 9. 12, 32. P. L. 32, 777*).

Though Augustine says in another place (*Civit. Dei, 1, 10, c. 20. P. L. 41, 298*) that our sacrifice is the sacrament or symbol of a sacrifice (“Christ Jesus . . . in the form of a servant . . . preferred TO BE THE SACRIFICE, rather than to take it to Himself [in the form of God]. . . . He desired the daily sacrament [or symbol] of this reality TO BE THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH”), he simply means by this what we have already learnt from Chrysostom, that our sacrifice is only an image or symbol of sacrifice as far as concerns immolation, though as far as the sensible offering on our part, and the true victimal status of what is offered goes, it must be considered simply a real and true sacrifice.

That what we offer is not the real Body of Christ, but only the spiritual body, the Church, is not to be inferred¹ either from what St. Augustine says immediately afterwards: “the Church, as she is the body of that Head, learns to offer herself through Him” (*loc. cit.*), or from words that he had already written (c. 6, col. 284); “It certainly follows (*profecto efficitur*) that the whole redeemed community (*civitas redempta*), that is, the congregation and assembly of the saints, is offered as a univer-

¹ As it was by Renz, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 259-260.

sal sacrifice to God. . . . This is the sacrifice of the Christians of whom it is said: *we, though many, are one body in Christ*. The Church celebrates this also in the sacrament of the altar, well known to the faithful." For Augustine means nothing more here than what we have already stated repeatedly: that the consecration or the dedication of the whole Church is the second *reality* signified by this sacrifice, what it ultimately signifies. Augustine himself states this in the words immediately following: "where *it is shown to her* [that is, in the sacrifice of the Church] it is made plain to her THAT IN THE VERY THING SHE OFFERS [that is the actual Body and Blood of Christ] SHE IS HERSELF OFFERED", as the invisible in the visible sacrifice. Without prejudice, therefore, to the sacrificial action proper, which has to do with the Body and Blood of Christ, Augustine pointed out its mystic significance, in the representation of the sacrifice of the Cross, and its moral significance, as a sign of the internal surrender of ourselves.

St. Maximus of Turin (*Sermo* 77. P. L. 57, 690) tells us why it is becoming that the bodies of the martyrs should rest beneath the Eucharistic altar. It is fitting that those who suffered because of the death of the Lord should rest "where the members of the SLAIN BODY OF THE LORD are placed". Hence he says in other words that we have, in the Eucharist, the Body of Christ who suffered, was immolated, slain; we have the real members of the slain Body of the Lord, the true Theotype of the Cross: "Appropriately, therefore, and in fellowship, so to speak, it was decreed that the tomb of the martyr should be there where the death of the Lord is daily celebrated . . . so that they who died because He died should repose in the mystery of His sacrament. Not without merit, I say, and as it were in fellowship the slain martyr's tomb¹ is assigned to the place (*illic ubi*) where THE SLAIN MEMBERS OF THE LORD are placed: so that the hallowed sanctity of one place should join to Christ those whom the cause of the one Passion had knit to Christ."

Faustus of Riez, or whoever is the author of the *Homiliae de Corpore et Sanguine Christi* (n. 1), inserted in the edition of the

¹ *Velut consortio quodam illic occisi [or occisis] est tumulus constitutus, ubi occisiones membra, etc.* The reading *occisis* brings out more easily the parallelism between this passage *illic occisis . . . ubi*, and the former one *ibi martyribus . . . ubi*; and so we adopt it.

works of St. Jerome (P. L. 30, 271–272), says that the Body and Blood of Christ once in the past offered in ransom unto death, from which it rose an eternal Victim, is now worshipped by us in the sacrament in such a way that we have a perpetual offering of the Redemption: “Seeing therefore that by the transgression of Adam we became by our origin subject to death, God looking down from heaven . . . purchased for us (*reparavit*) the gift of the Redemption, in such a way that He offered, to replace the death which was due from us, [His own] death which was not of obligation. . . . Therefore He assumed matter from our mortality, so that life could die for the dead. And because He was about to remove the assumed Body from our sight and place it among the stars, it was necessary that He should consecrate the sacrament of His Body and Blood for us on this day, so that what was once offered in ransom for us should be perpetually adored through the perpetual mystery, and that as the saving redemption of man was tirelessly proceeding day by day, THERE SHOULD ALSO BE A PERPETUAL OFFERING OF THE REDEMPTION, AND THAT ETERNAL VICTIM should live in memorial, and should BE ALWAYS PRESENT in grace; a true, unique, and perfect Victim, to be measured by faith and not by appearances, not to be estimated by the outward vision of man, but by interior devotion. Justly, then, the divine Author says: *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*”

St. Gregory the Great says in so many words that when we imitate the Passion in the sacrament we offer the Victim of the Passion (“we offer to Him the Victim of His Passion”). These are his words: “Let us send an embassy to Him [God]. . . . Let us slay expiatory victims on His altar. As we have said, let us send our embassy to Him . . . by offering sacred victims. For the Victim of the holy altar, offered in tears and with a generous heart, pleads pardon for us in a singular way: because He who, rising from the dead, *dieth now no more*, suffers for us again even now, through His Victim in His mystery. FOR AS OFTEN AS WE OFFER TO HIM THE VICTIM OF HIS PASSION, so often do we renew (*reparamus*) that Passion to obtain our pardon” (*Hom. 37, in Evangelia, n. 7. P. L. 76, 1278–1279*). In another passage and in more solemn language he says something similar: “For this Victim saves the

soul from perdition in marvellous ways, for us it renews through the mystery the death of the Only-Begotten, who, *though rising from the dead, dieth now no more, death hath no more dominion over him*, nevertheless, while immortally and incorruptibly living in Himself, He is immolated again for us in the mystery of the sacred offering. . . . Hence let us weigh well what this sacrifice means to us, which is constantly imitating the Passion of the Only-Begotten Son for our Salvation” (*Dial.*, 4, 58. P. L. 77, 425). The Mass so imitates the Passion, so renews it, that we offer the Victim of the Passion by which the soul is saved from eternal perdition.

Similarly Ps. Primasius says that the Victim of the Church consists in the Blood of the Passion of Christ: “The celebrations of the Church, made today in the very truth [replacing the figures], are cleansed by better victims . . . : NAMELY BY THE BLOOD OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST” (*In Hebr.*, IX, 23. P. L. 68, 745, cf. *In Hebr.*, X, 26, col. 753). Hence it would seem that what he wrote on *Hebr.*, X, 2, following in the steps of Chrysostom, should be interpreted in the same sense as we interpreted Chrysostom above: “And are not our priests doing this same thing every day, by continually offering the sacrifice? They do indeed offer, but this offering is a memorial of His death; and because we fall into sin every day and every day need cleansing, because He dieth now no more, He gave us this sacrament of His Body and Blood, so that just as His Passion was the redemption and the atonement of the whole world, this oblation of ours may also be the redemption and the cleansing for all those offering in true faith and with good intention” (P. L. 68, 748).

St. Isidore (who comes before the probable date of the Ps. Primasius) combines the three following statements:

First, Christ offered to God the one Victim of His Passion (*Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum, In Leviticum*, c. 1. P. L. 83, 321).

Second, He offered in the Eucharistic Supper as priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech (*De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 1, 1, c. 18, n. 1 and 2. P. L. 83, 754).

Third, the same “is done by us as He Himself did for us” (*ibid.*, n. 2).

These three statements show that when we consecrate the Eucharist we offer the Victim of the Passion (cf. *Etymologiae* lib. 6, c. 19, n. 38. P. L. 82, 255). His language is quite explicit, where, speaking of the sacrifice of Gedeon, as a type of the Eucharistic sacrifice,¹ he says: "He slew the bullock deputed by his father to the idols, and he then immolated to God another bullock of seven years: he revealed very clearly in this fact that, after the coming of the Lord, all the sacrifices of the Gentiles were to be abolished, AND THAT ONLY THE SACRIFICE OF THE LORD WAS TO BE OFFERED BY THE NATIONS, in reverence to God for our Redemption" (*Quaest. in Vet. Testam., In lib. Jud., c. 3, n. 4. P. L. 83, 382*).

Florus the Deacon sums up this doctrine in a few expressive words: "THE DEVOTION OF THE FAITHFUL THEREFORE OFFERS THIS SACRIFICE OF PRAISE, that is, THE OBLATION OF THE PASSION OF THE LORD for themselves and for all their own . . . namely, both the living and the dead" (*De Expositione missae, c. 53. P. L. 119, 48*). What, therefore, is the sacrifice of the Mass? It is the offering of the Passion of the Lord.²

From this time onwards, owing to the controversies which arose between St. Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus as to the identity between the Eucharistic and the historical Body of Christ, and later owing to the necessity of meeting the Berengarian heresy respecting the real presence of Christ, the theologians came to pay much more attention to the explanation of the Sacrament than of the sacrifice. Hence most of the theologians of this mediaeval period teach scarcely anything explicitly about the Eucharistic sacrifice, except that in it the sacrifice of the Passion is commemorated. That the Passion itself is offered is taught less explicitly by them, as a rule.

It seems to me, however, that the words of Radulphus Ardens (*Homilia de Sanctis, 25. P. L. 155, 1589-1590*) hark back to the teaching of Florus: "We, the priests of the Gospel, do not, like the priests of the Law, OFFER ALIEN VICTIMS, but every day

¹ The words are slightly altered in a passage of Ambrose (*De Spiritu Sancto, 1, 1, Prolog., n. 4. P. L. 16, 704*).

² Hence Florus justly remarks later (*ibid., col. 70*), following Etherius and Beatus (*ad Elipand. P. L. 96, 1010*): "Nevertheless a victim could not have been offered by us had not Christ been made a Victim for us,"

we renew in the sacrament THE VICTIM OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST, obedient to His command *Do this for a commemoration of me. . . .* Because . . . we fall every day, WE RENEW THE VICTIM OF THE PASSION OF CHRIST IN THE SACRAMENT, in order that His daily sacrament may be a cleansing of our daily sins.”

Meantime some words of Rupert (*In Ezech.*, 1, 2, c. 27. P. L. 167, 1488), take us back to Cyprian: “Indeed the whole sacrament of the altar of Christ comes from the wood of the lifegiving Cross, BECAUSE THE WHOLE SACRIFICE [which is offered in the sacrament] IS THE PASSION OF HIM who offered Himself in sacrifice on the wood of the Cross.” Likewise Stephen of Autun states that we offer to God the chalice of the very same sacrifice whereby we were redeemed on the Cross: “Our redemption was wrought once by the death of Christ on the Cross. For we are redeemed and freed from the power of the devil by the Passion of Christ. Frail men as we are, we fall every day into sin; from this fall we rise again and are renewed by the repeated immolation which is made at the altar. The immolation is repeated: CHRIST IS NOT SLAIN, but HIS PASSION IS REPRESENTED BY HIS PRESENCE. . . . WE OFFER TO GOD THE CHALICE OF HIS SAVING SACRIFICE, by which we are liberated and saved, having the blessed hope of rising with the salvation of our souls and the incorruptibility of our bodies” (*Tractatus de sacramento altaris*, c. 13. P. L. 172, 1290).¹

In the treatise *Contra Petrobrusianos* Peter of Cluny is clearer still: “The sins of the whole world are taken away by His death. . . . THIS IS OUR SACRIFICE . . . which was THEN ONCE OFFERED TO GOD ON THE CROSS by the Son of God and man, and which He commanded and instituted TO BE ALWAYS OFFERED by His people

¹ Of Alger it is to be noted that not only does he praise, with very many writers of that period (*De sacr. corp. et sang. Dmni.*, 1. 16. P. L. 180, 786-787), the words of Chrysostom (*In Hebr.*, hom. 17, 3), cited above, but he also stresses the oneness of our sacrifice and the sacrifice of the redemption, to such an extent that he seems clearly to teach the oneness of the victimal condition once imposed on Christ by the Passion and repeatedly offered by us in the Mass. These are his words: “With the coming of His own real sacrifice, our loving Lord not only dispelled the shadows of the olden figures as superfluous, but also by His one sacrifice he did away with the multiplicity of sacrifice among the ancients. He lessened the external observances, but multiplied the grace of His benefits for us, REDEEMING US AND BRINGING US FORGIVENESS BY HIS ONE UNIQUE SACRIFICE, and by progress in faith and other virtues leading us on to eternal life. . . . In His sacrifice, therefore, God provides for us a wondrous and most excellent sacrament in which He conceals His true Body and Blood hidden under the appearances of bread and wine” (*De sacr. corp. et sang. Dmni.*, 2, 3. P. L. 180, 818-819).

ON THE ALTAR. For what is offered now is not a different thing from what was offered then, but what, as Scripture says, CHRIST OFFERED ONCE, THAT HE LEFT TO HIS CHURCH TO BE ALWAYS OFFERED" (P. L. 189, 797-798). In the Mass, therefore, we offer the death of Christ.

William of Paris says the same thing: "The Mass is the offering of HIS MOST FRAGRANT SACRIFICE, BY THE ODOUR OF WHOSE SWEETNESS THE WORLD WAS RECONCILED TO GOD, and all its foulness cleansed" (*De Sacra Eucharistia, op.*, t. 1, p. 447). No words could be plainer than these. For what was the sacrifice that reconciled the world to God? Certainly it was the sacrifice of the Passion and death of the Lord. But William says that the Mass is the offering, on our part, of that sacrifice. What then do we offer in the Mass but the Passion and death of the Lord?

Even more striking is the language of Albert the Great. In order to grasp its full import it should be known that by immolation Albert means, first of all and directly, slaying or killing, and in a secondary manner, still not improperly as he says, the offering of the thing slain, or killed, or put to death; he usually understands by the word sacrifice the same offering, but as fruitful or propitiatory for the offerer. This presupposed, to the question (in 4 D. 13, art. 23): whether Christ is or is not immolated in every sacrifice; he replies as follows: "Every day, when sacrifice is offered to God the Father, Christ is most truly immolated. . . . For, in respect of what is offered, THE THING OFFERED (*oblatio*)¹ ALWAYS REMAINS OFFERED FOR US, AND TO BE OFFERED, we always immolate and we always sacrifice. . . . But our immolation is not a representation only, it is real immolation, that is, THE OFFERING by the hands of the priest OF THE THING IMMOLATED. Hence it implies two things, namely: THE THING SLAIN, AND THE OFFERING OF IT, because immolation is properly THE OFFERING OF THE SLAIN THING to the worship of God; AND IN RESPECT OF THE OFFERING, IT IS NOT REPRESENTATION ONLY, IT

¹ Here evidently the word *oblatio* means the thing offered, not the act of offering. Hence Albert says: (1) Christ, who was once offered, remains always offered; and (2) that He also remains to be offered. That He remains always offered implies that He is an eternal Victim. That He remains to be offered, naturally by us, implies that this eternal Victim is made ours, to be offered in sacrifice as our very own. Albert's words are vigorous and powerful.

IS A REAL ACT OF OFFERING. But it is not so with the slaying and the crucifixion.”¹

Albert in these words clearly teaches: that by virtue of His own offering unto death Christ is a real and not an intermittent victim; it is in our power to offer this Victim to God, not by the addition of any new immolation,² but by the effect of that one immolation of the past, always represented and always offered: hence our sacrifice is the daily offering of Christ once immolated. The importance of this pronouncement cannot be too strongly insisted upon.

It must be admitted that St. Thomas did not explain the Eucharist under its sacrificial aspect as copiously as he explained it as a sacrament.

But, even so, he clearly distinguishes and co-ordinates the component elements of our sacrifice.

In the first place, he distinguishes between the elements of offering and of representation, and says that both are necessary constituents of the sacrifice of the Eucharist. “This sacrament,” he says, “is at the same time a sacrifice and a sacrament; it is a sacrifice IN AS MUCH AS IT IS OFFERED” (3 S. 79, 5 c.). Here we have the oblation element. The representative element follows: “This sacrament is not only a sacrament, but it is also a sacrifice. For in as much as in this sacrament THE PASSION OF CHRIST IS REPRESENTED, in which Christ *offered himself a sacrifice to God*, as is said in *Ephes.*, V, it is a sacrifice” (3 S. 79, 7, c.; cf. 3 S. 74, 1).

Secondly, he states that in this bloodless representation of the sacrifice in blood a real victim is offered, because Christ is contained in the Eucharist as the very Victim of the Passion: “This sacrament is called a victim in as much as it contains Christ Himself WHO IS THE VICTIM OF SALVATION, as is said in *Ephes.*, V” (3 S. 73, 4, 3 m). Note carefully here that St. Thomas does not say that the sacrament is a victim because Christ *is made* a victim in it, but because *He is* a Victim in it: already a Victim, that is, from another cause, the Passion,³

¹ “For this entails . . . the sinful act of the Jews, or the Passion as inflicted by them: thus it was not to be repeated.”

² This, of course, in our sense of the term, where immolation does not *directly* mean offering.

³ Quite in agreement with this are the words of St. Thomas a little later on: “The Eucharist is the perfect sacrament of the Passion of the Lord, as containing CHRIST HIMSELF WHO HAS SUFFERED” (3 S. 73, 5, 2 m),

to which the verse of the *Epistle to the Ephesians* refers (not only considered in itself, but also according to St. Thomas' own interpretation, both here and in the passage cited above) (3 S. 79, 7).

We know, therefore, from St. Thomas,¹ and also from Albert the Great, that in the sacrifice of the Mass the immolation is mystic only, or representative; that the offering is not representative only, but that it is actual; finally that in this sacramental offering the very Victim of the Passion is offered, as such.

It is of interest to link with the angelic prince of theologians the admirable master of mystic theology, Blessed John Ruysbroeck (†1381), who in his *Speculum aeternae salutis* (ch. 113) has these words on the Mass: "In every one of her daily sacrifices the Catholic Church must offer to the Lord God the Lamb of all of us, Christ Jesus, and HIS PASSION AND MOST HOLY DEATH. For without these we could not ever please God" (Latin version of Laurentius Surius, Cologne 1609, p. 243).

Shortly afterwards in the heat of the controversy on the sacrifice of the Mass—with the followers of Wycliffe and Huss first, then with the Protestants—Catholics were compelled to refurbish their arms.

Thus in his famous work called *Sacramentalia*, against the Wycliffites, Thomas of Walden (†1430) hurls deadly missiles at the heretics. His arguments are not derived from Augustine, as he says, but from some other source. So he writes: "Christ is Himself the Priest and the Sacrifice, and at His daily intercession for us from the altar God the Father accepts WITH THE PASSION THE CONSECRATED VICTIM OF THE PASSION" (*Sacramentalia*, tit. 4, c. 39, Paris, 1523, fol. 93, in his explanation of the prayer *Supplices te rogamus*). In the treatise *De Sacramentis* he had already written as from himself: "The unique and superexcellent sacrifice of the altar . . ., is FORMALLY and only the very sacrament OF THE FLESH OFFERED IN THE UNIQUE SACRIFICE for our salvation" (*Doctrinale*, t. 2, *De Sacramentis*, c. 31, *incun.*, fol. 52). The daily sacrifice, therefore, is that Flesh which was once offered in the Passion, and by the Passion consecrated a Victim, the Flesh

¹ Consult here also the passage from 4 D. 12, on the Last Supper, in so far as it refers to the Mass, cited above, Th. III (Vol. I).

which exists formally as the Flesh of the unique sacrifice of the Cross.¹

Thus, too, and practically at the commencement of the Lutheran heresy, James Latomus of Louvain (*De questionum generibus quibus Ecclesia certat intus et foris*, A.D. 1525), maintaining that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is in a state of immolation derived from the Cross. "Do you [Luther] seek for a living offering? The true body of Christ is living. DO YOU SEEK THE BODY THAT WAS SLAIN IN THE PAST? SUCH IS THE BODY OF CHRIST ON THE ALTAR" (fol. a. 7). And it was in this sense that he added: "The priest celebrating Mass OFFERS to God the Father Christ Himself, THAT TRUE AND UNIQUE SACRIFICE OFFERED TO GOD on the altar of the Cross" (fol. b. 1).

Nicholas Stagefyr or Herbornus, O.M., theologian of Cologne, wrote more definitely in his *Confutatio Lutheranismi Danici anno 1530 conscripta*, (tertius congressus, art. 19, Ed. L. Schmitt, S.J., Quaracchi, 1902): "This unique sacrifice of the Mass truly, and in a living fashion, represents, exhibits and OFFERS to God the Father THE OFFERING (*oblationem*) OF THE CROSS" (p. 205). And again: "It is, I say, a representation and an imitation of the Passion of the Lord. . . . And this WITH A NEW OFFERING OF THAT OLD OBLATION MADE ON THE CROSS, and a present exhibition of the same Victim then offered" (p. 206). He then goes on to lay down his own definition which anticipated that of Canisius: "The Mass, therefore, is . . . the representation and the new offering OF THAT ANCIENT OFFERING MADE ON THE CROSS" (p. 206). That is, the Mass is a new though bloodless offering of that bloody sacrifice formerly enacted on the Cross.

Seven years later Thomas Herenthalinus, O.M., in his *Speculum vite christianae*, written in Flemish first (Antwerp, 1537), later translated into Latin by Nicholas Zegerus, a Minorite (Cologne, 1555), proves that the Mass is a sacrifice in this way: "Hence this divine mystery is very properly called a sacrifice, because it is truly, of all offerings, the most sacred. For when the Catholic Church obeying the command of Christ, by her daily commemora-

¹In the above quotation it is evident that the word *sacrament* means the *res et signum*—the thing signified by the sacrament as well as the sacrament or symbol, just as the first word *sacrifice* means what is offered and not the sacrificial action.

tion in this sacrament, in her faith rehearses (*resumit*) and renews [symbolically] the death of Christ, at the same time, too, in her faith, she renews the offering of Christ, and this by the priest as by her minister, who in the person of the Church OFFERS TO GOD THE PASSION AND DEATH OF CHRIST unto the remission of sins and the bestowal of divine favours” (*pars 2. De septem orthodoxae Ecclesiae sacramentis*, fol. 201).

Finally, only a few years before Canisius, John Gropper, a theologian no less (*vix minus*) worthy of praise, in his “very fine work” (Hurter, *Nomenclator*, 3, 2, 1421), entitled *Antididagma* (1544),¹ wrote in words of gold: “In the Mass (which is the most sacred action of all the holy ceremonies) Christ the Lord (who once offered Himself in His mortal Body a bloody sacrifice to God the Father in heaven for the sins of the world) is again offered in the name of the whole Church in a bloodless manner, in spiritual representation and commemoration of His most sacred Passion. This very thing is done, when the Church places before or represents to God the Father Christ and His true Body and true Blood, with thanksgiving and earnest (*attenta*) prayer, for her members’ sins and for those of the world. FOR ALTHOUGH IN THAT FORM IN WHICH IT WAS OFFERED ON THE CROSS, this sacrifice was only once offered, and the Blood was only once shed, so that it cannot be repeated and again offered, AT THE SAME TIME IT STILL IS AND STILL REMAINS THE SAME SACRIFICE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD, accepted forever in its power and efficacy, SO THAT THIS SACRIFICE ONCE OFFERED ON THE CROSS is today no less efficacious and full of power (*vigens*) in the sight of the Father than it was on that day when blood and water flowed from His wounded side. . . . For this reason, as the ravages inflicted on our own body wounded by sin (*cum vulnerati corporis nostri plagae*) are always in need of THE RANSOM OF REDEMPTION, the Church again sets before God the Father (spiritually and figuratively, however) in true faith and devotion THAT RANSOM unto the remission of sins. . . . In accordance with this teaching, the holy Fathers sometimes call the Body and Blood of Christ present on the altar, the satisfaction

¹ This book, as we have already said IX, (Vol. I), was published in the name and with the authority of the Chapter of Cologne against a pamphlet of the heretical Archbishop Hermann de Wied, inscribed *Consultatio quomodo Reformatio aliqua . . . sit instituenda* (1543).

for our sins and for the sins of the whole world, and sometimes they call it the price of our Redemption” (fol. LXIIIb–LXIVa). Consequently, then, he says later on: “Just as in the true and BLOODY sacrifice of the Cross Christ was Priest and Victim, so in this representative sacrifice, BECAUSE THAT SACRIFICE IS AGAIN SET BEFORE GOD (*proponitur*), the Church stands before us, offering it through the temporal priest her minister” (fol. LXXa). There can be no question that in their defence of the faith John Gropper and the Canons of Cologne were convinced that the Mass is a sacrifice, precisely because in the Mass Christ is exhibited, placed before, or offered to God, as the existent Victim of His sacrifice. Hence it is well said that the bloody sacrifice of the Cross is offered or placed before God in our bloodless rite.¹

In Italy we already find Jerome Fossanus, O.S.A., in close agreement with the theologians of Belgium and Germany, defining

¹ Another “strenuous apologist for the Catholic faith . . . against the heretics” (Hurter, *Nomenclator*, 2) was John Fabri, O.P., of Heilbronn, and, in perfect agreement with the Cologne canons, he wrote (*Missa Evangelica*, Paris, 1558): “Therefore by the ministry of his priests at the altar we OFFER to God the Father THAT VERY BODY WHICH HE GAVE FOR US, AND THE BLOOD WHICH HE SHED FOR OUR SALVATION, with the power and the efficacy OF THAT SACRIFICE ENACTED ON the Cross . . . and we beg of the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation to grant that THIS BLOODY VICTIM OF THE CROSS MAY BENEFIT US, wretched and abandoned sinners that we are . . . BY EXHIBITING TO GOD THE BODY OF CHRIST NAILED TO THE CROSS FOR US, AND HIS BLOOD SHED THERE FOR US, WE BEG HIM TO GRANT (*velit*) THAT THEY BENEFIT US” (fol. 38). And later: “We take the CHALICE OF SALVATION, THAT IS THE PASSION OF CHRIST, OF THE WORK OF REDEMPTION, and by command of Christ who said: *Do this for a commemoration of me*, WE PRESENT IN THE SIGHT OF GOD THAT BY WHICH He makes us partakers of that unique Victim offered on the Cross” (fol. 148). What, therefore, do we present in the sight of God? What do we exhibit or offer to God? The Passion of the Lord, the Body and Blood of the Crucified, the unique Victim of the sacrifice in blood. . . . And so it is effected, that by the sacrifice of the altar we take hold of the effect of the sacrifice of the Cross: because in a bloodless manner we transmit (*admovemus*) to God the Victim of the bloody sacrifice. “By this bloodless offering, first made (*inchoatam*) by Christ in the Supper and commanded to be done after His example according to the order of Melchisedech, we make ourselves partakers of the bloody sacrifice once offered on the Cross, not because the Victim of the Cross is insufficient, but that we may be made partakers of that satisfaction accomplished and secured for us, through the Body and Blood of Christ which Christ Himself left to us, and which we set before and offer to God the Father as the Victim of the Cross to be commemorated by us with thanksgiving; . . . seeing that in the Body and Blood of Christ offered for us on the Cross, and really present on the altar, we have no doubt that there lies the efficacy and the efficiency of our redemption and salvation” (fol. 41). Why should we doubt it “since what we now offer is that same Blood formerly shed on the Cross, and the efficacy of that Blood?” (fol. 44). Here we have truly expressed the oneness of our sacrifice with the sacrifice of the Redemption, both in respect of the victim and in respect of the fruit of the sacrifice. These men were in daily conflict and at close quarters with the enemies of the faith and they considered it necessary to prove conclusively this oneness from the documents of the Catholic faith, in order to combat the arguments of the reformers in the most effective manner possible.

the Mass in his *De admirando mysterio* (lib. 3, *de Sacrificio*, Turin, 1554, fol. 133), as follows: "The Mass is that BLOODLESS OFFERING and repeated commemoration OF THE PASSION AND DEATH OF CHRIST, which Christ commanded to be made, and gave only the Apostles and priests the power of making¹ and the use of which He desired to last to the end of time." For this reason he had written before: "If we prove that what was done by Christ and what is celebrated in the Mass is one unique sacrifice, and that what Christ did is not one thing, and what the priest celebrates is another, I think that Egyptian frogs [the heretics] will cease their croaking."²

From Spain, Cano (*De locis theologicis*, 1, 12, c. 12) gives us the unsullied teaching of antiquity: "Let us grant to our adversaries what they bring forth in argument (what we also believe pertains to the perfect immolation of an animal), that if Christ is truly sacrificed, He must be destroyed, HE MUST BE KILLED . . . But although the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is living, and the Blood is in the Body, we do not offer the Body because it is living, and the Blood because it is in the Body, but we offer the Body BECAUSE IT WAS SLAIN, the Blood BECAUSE IT WAS SHED ON THE CROSS. For although that offering made by Christ in the past and the visible slaying is over, it is still so acceptable to God, so everlasting in its power, that it is just as effective in the sight of the Father today as it was on the day when the Blood gushed from the pierced side: HENCE WE OFFER NOW, AND TRULY OFFER WITH CHRIST, THE SAME VICTIM OF THE CROSS. . . . In very truth this sacramental image and exemplar in no way prevents OUR OFFERING HERE AND NOW (*modo*) THAT SAME BLOOD OF THE CROSS, JUST AS IF IT WERE NOW SHED IN OUR PRESENCE."

The words of Matthaeus Galenus Vestcapellius are well worthy of consideration, where he clearly states, in his *De sacrosancto missae sacrificio commentario* (1574), whence there accrues to Christ in the Mass the true victimal condition which is essential

¹ Note how evidently he assigns to Christ at the Supper the offering of His death, since Christ gave no other command, and entrusted no other power, but that of doing what He Himself did. *Do this*.

² The words of Cardinal Gaspari Contareni in his treatise *De Sacramentis* have more or less the same meaning (*Opera*, Paris, 1571, p. 350): "The sacrament is one, made up of two parts, that is bread and wine, in which Christ JUST AS HE SUFFERED IS CONTAINED and is signified to us."

to true sacrifice: "Therefore CHRIST JESUS CRUCIFIED . . . IS PRESENT on the Catholic altar . . . set before us by the mysterious words of the priest, and, as Chrysostom says, called down from heaven. And yet this same Christ, endowed though He is with a glorified Body and glorified to the utmost, is truly and really present, though clothed in the vesture and teguments of symbols (for such is the name given by the Areopagite to the Catholic species), nevertheless He is no other than the very same Christ Jesus who in the past WAS IMMOLATED AS A VICTIM BY THE JEWS, and poured forth His own divine Blood with His life. AND SO IN HIMSELF HE GAVE US A TRUE SACRIFICE. When therefore that first victim [of bread and wine] passes into THIS VICTIM, and so is finally placed before God and the Father, HOW CAN WE DENY THAT THE VICTIM OF THE MASS IS EFFICACIOUS? There is, of course, a difference between the Jewish sacrifices and OUR SACRIFICES, for in OURS, when the victim is offered, THE SLAYING IS NOT REPEATED, but IN THEIR SACRIFICES A SLAYING TOOK PLACE BEFORE EACH OFFERING. The difference in our sacrifice is derived from the dignity, the excellence and the efficacy of the Victim. For if the blood of goats and bulls which used to be offered in the Old Law had paid a price which, once offered, would be sufficient, there would have been no need to repeat the slaying, and ceasing to repeat the slaying would undoubtedly have commended the value of the victim. . . . From this also it is quite clear that we do not by any means teach that the highest act of Christian worship, or the worship of God, terminates in mere (*nudo*) bread and wine, but we place it in the transubstantiation of the bread and wine ritually mingled, or in the consecration, or IN THIS THAT CHRIST, IMMOLATED IN THE PAST, EXISTS UNDER THE TWOFOLD SYMBOL, in a manner wondrously sudden" (*op. cit.*, c. 7, pp. 110–111). Having posited all this, Galenus goes on to lay down his great axiom: "ITS IMMOLATION IS SUPPLIED TO THE MASS FROM THE CROSS (*Missae sua e cruce suppeditat immolatio*)" (*ibid.* p. 117).¹

¹ Meanwhile he had demolished in the following way an objection raised from St. Gregory of Nyssa: "Some object that the words of Gregory of Nyssa present a serious difficulty, where he says that Christ could not be received by communicants before being immolated, as if he meant by this that a new, distinct and proper immolation should have preceded in each case before our communion. But we must understand the Father here to refer to the merely mystic slaying which takes place at the moment of the consecration, not the real slaying which occurred in the

Throughout all that period, then,¹ we find the theologians and apologists of all the religious orders—the Augustinians, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits, as well as the secular clergy—in agreement as to the nature of the Mass, and after what manner it is a sacrifice.² But also, apart from any controversy whatever with the Reformers, the same teaching that was spread all over Germany by Canisius was given by the French Episcopacy in catechetical instructions to their people. We know this from the work of Louis Albert Joly de Choin, Bishop of Toulon, published in 1748, and entitled *Instructions sur le Rituel (Du sacrifice de la messe. Excellence du sacrifice. Ed. Besançon. 1827, p. 266)*.³ “The Eucharist includes His Passion,

past in truth and reality on the Cross” (*ibid.*, p. 112). Here he means that in the Mass there is only a symbol of real immolation, that is of the immolation which truly occurred before on the Cross, and by which Christ passed into the condition of victim. Later on he draws up the following definition of the Mass, to be understood in accordance with his earlier exposition: “The Mass is a sacrifice in which, the bread and wine mingled with water being changed by transubstantiation into the Body and Blood of the Lord, HIS OWN SON CRUCIFIED AND IMMOLATED ON THE CROSS IN THE PAST is offered to God and the Father, both in memory of His sufferings and for those who are living as well as for those who have died in the Catholic faith.”

In his fine treatise *De la sainte Messe* (1. 3, t. 1, p. 325), written against the innovators in his native tongue, Louis Richeome, S. J., expresses the true and genuine concept of the Eucharistic sacrifice as follows: “We say that THE OBLATION OF THIS CRUCIFIED BODY IS REPEATED, as an offering always pleasing to God.” In his wisdom he does not teach any (effective) immolation of what is offered except the sufferings on the Cross; and in our mystic immolation he sees no force but one of offering; by our mystic immolation we offer the Victim.

¹ That is to say, before theologians began racking their brains to answer the ill-conceived question: after what manner is the victim destroyed or impaired in the sacrifice of the Mass? They would never have put this question had they first dealt fully with the Supper, and if they had not considered the Supper apart from the Passion with which it is closely knit.

² I would not advance the testimony of a layman—Florimundus Raymundus—but for the fact that it is of great utility as giving us the convictions of the Catholics of his time in this matter: “To say Mass is nothing else than to take bread, give thanks, consecrate and convert the substance of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, by virtue of the sacramental words. The same Mass is a sacrifice and a sacred action in which the cause of the people is pleaded before God, by the intervention of prayers and the OFFERING of the Body and of the DEATH of our Saviour.” (In the Latin version published at Cologne, A.D. 1655, under the title: *Floremundi Raymundi, v. Cl., olim consilarii regis Galliarum, ex calviniano catholici, Synopsis omnium hujus temporis controversiarum . . . sive Historia memorabilis . . . aucta et illustrata ex scriptis R. D. Gaspari Ulenbergii, Lippensis, ex lutherano catholici, lib. 7, cap. 14, parag. 2, Pars. 2, p. 261.*)

³ This work, which for the clergy became a classic work and an ecclesiastical library to all intents and purposes, is the result of a wide reading of pious books, of the Fathers, Doctors and casuists” (*Biographie Universelle* (Michaud), Paris, 1880, s.v. Choin). Another previous work in catechetical form was *Institutiones Catholicae ad formam catechismi* (tertia pars, sect. 2, c. 6, parag. 9, Venice, 1769, t. 2, p. 648) by F. A. Pouget.

and we announce His death in it, only BECAUSE HE HIMSELF OFFERS HIS PREVIOUS DEATH ON OUR ALTARS: and it is true to say with St. Cyprian that the sacrifice which we offer is the very Passion of our Saviour.”¹

The sacred Liturgies agree with the Fathers and Doctors. In the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, for example, the Secret of Palm Sunday reads: “May this offering,² which reconciled enemies through thy Son, commend the faithful to thy majesty, O Lord” (P. L. 74, 1093; ed. Wilson, p. 60).³ Now what offering was it that reconciled enemies to God through Christ if not the Passion itself? The Passion, therefore, is the offering which we set before God in the sacrament. In the *Stowe Missal* (newly published by G. F. Warner, Vol. 2, 1915, p. 17) we read (in the rescript of Moelcaich) between the doxology of the Canon and the Lord’s Prayer the following (which was already in the *Gothic Missal*, P. L. 72, 314): “We believe, O Lord, we believe, THAT WE ARE REDEEMED IN THIS BREAKING OF THE BODY AND SHEDDING OF THE BLOOD.” So that the sacrifice of the Mass does not differ from the sacrifice of the Supper, and in both the Victim of the Redemption is offered in sacrifice to God.

¹ On the same argument compare our remarks below, Thesis XXI, from François Babin, Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Angers. Meantime Basil Balthasar may be consulted, *Mysterium Mysteriorum in augustissimo altaris sacramento*, Pars. IV. *De sacrosancto missae sacrificio in seipso*. The title of Punct. IV is: “The sacrifice of the Cross is offered.” And the conclusion of it is: “Therefore the sacrifice which was once enacted on the Cross is the same as the sacrifice which is daily immolated in the sacrament” (St. Gall, 1770, pp. 300–311). Nevertheless during that period, due I think to the prevailing authority of the great theologians of the sixteenth century, a concise and clear declaration on this point is rarely to be found, except amongst the Jansenists. Because of their heresy I omit them purposely. It is a surprise, however, to find in the meantime the anonymous work of the Jansenist Francis Plowden, *Traité du sacrifice du Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1778), causing great commotion and dissension among the sectaries themselves. Michaud in *Biographie Universelle* tells us (under the name Plowden) that they attacked as a doctrine new and unheard of by them, the teaching which the author champions throughout the whole work (particularly t. 1, pp. 378–381): that no real immolation underlies the Mass except that derived from Calvary; while, nevertheless, it was the definite teaching of a number of bishops who were favourably disposed towards the sectaries, such as Rastignac (*Instruction pastorale de M. l’Archevêque de Tours, sur la justice chrétienne par rapport aux sacrements de pénitence et d’eucharistie*, 22 Feb. 1749); Caylus (*Mandement de M. l’Evêque d’Auxerre portant permission de manger des oeufs pendant le carême de la présente, année 1750*); and also the well-known theologian, L. Habert (*Theologia dogmatica et moralis, De Eucharistia ut sacrificium est*, cap. 6, ed. Venice, 1717, t. 5, pp. 643–646).

² Clearly in the passive sense, meaning what is offered.

³ In our *Roman Missal* the Secret of the *Missa de s. cruce* (which was already found in the *Liber Sacramentorum* of Alcuin, c. 6. P. L. 101, 454) expresses the same idea: “We beseech thee, O Lord, that this offering may cleanse us from all our sins, EVEN as it took away the sin of the whole world on the altar of the Cross.”

The *post-pridie* prayer in the Mozarabic Mass for the Wednesday after Easter, has the same meaning: "We beseech thee, O Lord, that THE BLOOD OF THE JUST ONE and the humility of our Lord may reconcile thee to sinners. THIS IS THE VICTIM WHICH HUNG ON THE WOOD, this is the Flesh which has risen from the grave. WHAT OUR PRIEST OFFERED FOR US, THIS WE OFFER IN COMMON in the sweetness of the bread and wine: We pray thee, O Omnipotent God, RECOGNIZE (*cognosce*) THE VICTIM BY WHOSE INTERCESSION THOU ART APPEASED" (P. L. 85, 502). We have the same again in the *post-pridie* prayer of the fifth Sunday after Easter: "O God our Father, THIS IS the loving and saving VICTIM BY WHICH THE WORLD IS RECONCILED TO THEE. This is that Body which hung on the Cross. This also is the Blood which flowed from the sacred side" (P. L. 85, 597). See how our Victim is presented to God as the very Victim of the Passion itself!

There certainly can be no other interpretation of the prayer for Thursday in the third week in Lent, in which, commemorating Sts. Cosmas and Damian, we pray: "In the precious death of thy just, O Lord, WE OFFER THAT SACRIFICE, FROM WHICH ALL MARTYRDOM TOOK ITS BEGINNING." "That sacrifice" was undoubtedly the Passion. It is the Passion, therefore, that "we offer". We find the same thing clearly expressed in the post-communion prayer for the feast of the *Lance and Nails*: "O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst offer thyself ON THE CROSS, an immaculate and voluntary holocaust to God the Father, we beseech thee, that THE VENERABLE OFFERING OF THE SAME SACRIFICE may obtain pardon and eternal glory for us." We offer the same sacrifice that Christ offered on the Cross, that is, the sacrifice of His death. So, too, in the Secret of the same Mass, Christ is said to have offered on the Cross the very same sacrifice which we offer: "We pray thee, O Lord, THAT WE MAY BE SANCTIFIED BY THIS holy immaculate evening SACRIFICE, which thy Only-Begotten Son OFFERED ON THE CROSS for the salvation of the world." The same sense is given when, in the Mass of the *Five Wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ*, we are said to offer to God in the Eucharist the very wounds of Christ by which we are redeemed: "O Lord, we beseech thy majesty, that the gifts in which WE OFFER TO THEE THE VERY WOUNDS OF THY ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, the price of our

freedom, may be acceptable to Thee.” These words clearly show that even now in the Mass we offer Christ as the Victim of His Passion.

The Eastern Liturgies furnish us with innumerable prayers of this kind, for example: “(*The priest elevates the chalice with the Host, saying*): Desirable SACRIFICE WHICH IS OFFERED FOR US; VICTIM OF CONCILIATION WHO OFFERED His own Person to the Father; Lamb who IN THE ONE PERSON WAS MADE HIGH PRIEST: He it is who offers. . . . Father of truth, BEHOLD THY SON, A VICTIM PLEASING TO THEE ! Take Him to thy bosom, WHO DIED FOR ME, and through Him be propitious ! . . . BEHOLD THE BLOOD SHED ON GOLGOTHA for my redemption, and because of it receive my prayer ! . . . Look upon my sins, but at the same time look upon THE SACRIFICE WHICH IS OFFERED FOR THEM; for far greater than the guilt is the sacrifice and the victim. Thy beloved endured the nails and the lance for the sins which I have committed; LET HIS SUFFERINGS SUFFICE TO APPEASE THEE, and that through them I may live !” etc. (Anaphora of the order of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, in the *Missa Syro-Maronitica*, published by Max. Saxon, pp. 47–48). Does not all this mean the same thing: that we offer the very Passion of the Lord, that Christ is victim for us only in so far as He is the Victim of His Passion, that the chalice which we drink is none other than “the chalice of redemption” (*ibid.*, p. 32) ?

THESIS XX

B. RECIPIENTS OF THE EUCHARIST PARTAKE OF THE SACRIFICE IN BLOOD

We have often repeated that it was the custom of the ancients, did circumstances permit, to partake of the victim after the sacrifice had been concluded. What had been offered to God was then received by the faithful. If then at our Sacrifice by the institution of Christ we eat of the Victim of that blood sacrifice, we must of necessity in that sacrifice of ours offer that Victim and no other; this we have already proved when comparing the Eucharist with the sacrifices to idols. The Fathers at once saw and insisted on the connection between our eating of the Body and Blood of Christ and the sacrifice of the Passion.

Hence in the earliest days we find Ignatius bitterly reproaching those who “absent themselves from the Eucharist and the prayer, because they do not admit that THE EUCHARIST IS THE FLESH of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His Goodness raised FROM THE DEAD. Therefore they who speak against ‘THE GIFT of God’,” etc. (*Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν. Οἱ οὖν ἀντιλέγοντες τῇ δωρεᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ κτλ. Smyrn., 7, 1. F. P. 1, 280*). He plainly says here that the Eucharist is the gift of God to man, in no way precluding thereby the previous offering of it already made by man to God, but just as the pagans looked on the flesh of the victims, as given to man by the divinity after it had been made sacred to the divinity by the sacrifice. He also says that the Flesh which we receive from God is the same Flesh which suffered unto death and returned to life.

We have already seen (XVIII) how Clement of Alexandria describes the Blood of the Eucharistic chalice, as the blood of the grape trodden in the Passion for us, and the Flesh and Blood

of the Eucharistic banquet as the partaking of the great Victim immolated for us long ago on the day of the pasch.

In that early time, too, we find Cyprian of the Latin Fathers saying: "We could not drink of the Blood of Christ had not Christ first been trodden on and pressed" (*Ep.* 63, n. 7. P. L. 4, 379). Do we not see then that in the Eucharist we are given to drink the Blood of the Passion?

St. Augustine speaks constantly of drinking our *ransom* (*pretium*), the Blood of Christ flowing from the Cross for our Redemption. He speaks in praise of the martyrs who gave back their blood to Christ in return for the Blood which they drank from the Cross: "For Christ made the great purchase ON THE CROSS where the PURSE OF OUR RANSOM WAS OPENED when the soldier's lance pierced His side: FROM THENCE THE PRICE OF THE WHOLE WORLD FLOWED. THE MARTYRS WERE PURCHASED, THEY GAVE BACK WHAT WAS PAID OUT FOR THEM. . . . It is written: *When thou hast seated thyself at a great table, consider diligently what is set before thee, since such things too thou must prepare* (*Prov.*, XXIII, 1-2). Great indeed is the table at which we feast on the Lord of the table Himself. No one feasts his guests of himself: but Christ the Lord did, He is the host, the food and the drink. THE MARTYRS KNEW WHAT THEY ATE AND DRANK, AND SO THEY GAVE BACK TO GOD LIKE THINGS" (*Sermo* 329, n. 1. P. L. 39, 1454-1455; cf. *Sermo* 336, c. 4, n. 4 and *Sermo* 213, c. 8, n. 8, cols. 1473 and 1064), namely, their own sufferings. He has similar words about people "recognising and DRINKING THEIR RANSOM in holy humility" (*Trin.*, 4, 13. P. L. 42, 900); he is speaking of all the faithful in Christ, to each of whom the following words are addressed: "You already know YOUR RANSOM, you know to what you approach, you know WHAT YOU EAT, WHAT YOU DRINK, nay whom you eat, whom you drink" (*Sermo* 9, c. 10, n. 14. P. L. 38, 85).¹

¹ Likewise he has the following *Ad infantes*, or the recently baptised, in the third of the *Sermones* published by Michael Denis (n. 3. P. L. 46, 827): "Do not look upon yourselves as of little worth; drink your ransom." Shortly before he had said: "Confess this in the bread, that it hung on the Cross; this in the chalice, that it flowed from His side." The best of recent critics consider these *Sermones* to be genuine works of Augustine, and this third one in particular (cf. Portalié, art. *Augustin* in D. T. C., 2306). The authentic character of these discourses appears to be confirmed by the *Epistola ad Frudegardum* (P. L. 120, 1352), of St. Paschasius Radbertus, in which he writes: "Otherwise the great and holy Augustine would be

He exhorts a schismatic to seek communion with the Church as follows: "Behold Christ has suffered, the merchant has displayed his wares, see the PRICE which He paid, HIS BLOOD SHED. In the purse He had OUR RANSOM, He was pierced with a lance, the purse was torn open and the ransom of the whole world poured forth. . . . Even still HE WILL SATIATE YOU" (*In Psalm 21*, n. 28. P. L. 36, 178-179). He said of himself finally: "Because I meditate on MY RANSOM, I EAT IT, I DRINK IT, I DISTRIBUTE IT (*erogo*), and I who am poor desire to be filled with it, in the company of those who eat and are filled" (*Confess.*, 10, 43, 70. P. L. 32, 810). Hence he calls the Eucharist simply "the cup of our ransom" (*ibid.*, 7, 21, 27, col. 748).

He has the same thing in mind when He says the price paid for us on the Cross and the pledge given to the Church in the sacrament are one and the same: "For that Blood is RANSOM FOR THE SLAVES, PLEDGE FOR THE SPOUSE [of Christ]" (*In Psalm 122*, n. 5. P. L. 37, 1634). It is well worth noting that for Augustine the pledge is indifferently either the Eucharist or the death of Christ: "Desire and seek earnestly for the life of Christ

inconsistent, when, as I remember, he says in his discourses to the neophytes: Receive in the bread that which hung on the Cross; and of the chalice he says: Receive in the chalice that which flowed from His side." It is true that J. Turmel (*Histoire de la théologie positive depuis l'origine jusqu' au concile de Trente*, 2nd ed., p. 436) remarks on this passage of St. Paschasius: "Unfortunately, on this matter of the highest importance, the erudition of the Abbot of Corbie is at fault. The *Sermo ad Neophytos* was the work of an unknown writer of the eighth or ninth century who had adopted the formulæ of the Mozarabic liturgy." Such are his words, but he advances no argument and no authority for his statement, nor does he give any reference to any passage whatever, augustinian or pseudo-augustinian, except to the *Epistola ad Frudegardum* of Paschasius. That there were many sayings of this kind in the *Missale Mozarabicum* is common knowledge. For instance, in the Mass for Holy Saturday we have: "We beseech thee, that in the bread may gleam forth that which hung on the Cross, and in the chalice that may sparkle which flowed from His side" (P. L. 85, 517). But this does not by any means prove that the words in the discourse *Ad Infantes* are interpolated (I take it that the discourse which Paschasius terms *Ad Neophytos* is the *Ad Infantes* which we are referring to), nor does it prove that the whole discourse is spurious. Turmel's assertion has been repeated by writers of the highest literary culture, like Batiffol (*Ét. d'Histoire de la théologie positive*, second series, 3rd ed., pp. 367-368) and F. Vernet (art. *Eucharistie du ix siècle à la fin du xi siècle*, in D. T. C. 1230), though they give no authority for their assertion than that of Turmel himself. Actually it would not be surprising if this discourse had at times escaped the knowledge or at least the close attention of the critics, for the Denis collection of the *Sermones* which was edited after the whole Benedictine edition of the works of St. Augustine is not to be found in the *Patrologia* of Migne until the end of Vol. 46, after the general index.

The ninth of the *Sermones inediti*, published lately by G. Morin (Munich, 1917, *De secunda feria Paschae*, n. 2, p. 31), can now be added to the Denis collection, and in this we find the words: "Drink what you have shed."

bestowed on you, and until you finally attain it cling to THE PLEDGE, THE DEATH OF CHRIST. For when He promised that He would live with us, HE COULD GIVE NO GREATER PLEDGE to us, than TO DIE for us. . . . He promised, He gave us His bond, HE GAVE A PLEDGE, and do you dare to doubt? He gave the promise when He lived on earth with us, He gave us His bond when He gave the Gospel. TO HIS PLEDGE you daily say *Amen*. YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE PLEDGE, it is DISPENSED to you daily. Do not you despair, YOU WHO HAVE LIFE FROM THE PLEDGE” (*Sermo* 335, n. 2. P. L. 39, 1470).

Quite consistently, therefore, he writes: that from our altar “is dispensed to us the holy VICTIM WHEREBY WAS BLOTTED OUT THE HANDWRITING which was contrary to us, by which the ENEMY computing our sins HAS BEEN CONQUERED” (*Confess.*, 9, 13, 36. P. L. 32, 778). Who could doubt that the victimal condition attributed to Christ in these words is the very condition which was induced by the Passion?

In this same strict sense, too, commenting on the words of John, XXI, 9–13: *They saw hot coals lying, and a fish laid thereon and bread . . . and Jesus cometh and taketh the bread, and giveth to them, and the fish in like manner*, the saint wrote: “The roasted fish IS CHRIST SLAIN (*Piscis assus Christus est passus*). He is also the BREAD which is come down from heaven. WITH HIM the Church is incorporated unto the participation in eternal happiness. Hence He said: *Bring hither the fishes which you have now caught*, so that all of us who have this hope may know how to partake in common (*communicare*) of this great sacrament, and share in the same happiness” (*In Joann.*, tract. 123, n. 2. P. L. 35, 1966).

He evidently wrote also in this formal sense, when speaking of our approaching to receive the Body of Christ: “*Come ye to him and be enlightened* (*Psalm* 33. 6). Let us come to him to be enlightened, not like the Jews who came to Him to enter into darkness, for they came to Him in order to crucify Him; let us come to Him in order to receive His Body and Blood. They THROUGH THE CRUCIFIED WERE PLUNGED INTO DARKNESS; WE, BY EATING AND DRINKING OF HIM CRUCIFIED, ENTER INTO LIGHT” (*Ennar. in Psalm* 33, *Sermo* 2., n. 10. P. L. 36, 313). In like

manner he speaks of the repentant Jews: "On the descent of the Holy Spirit after the Ascension, they were converted to Him whom they crucified, and, believing in the sacrament, they HAVE DRUNK OF HIS BLOOD WHICH in their fury THEY HAVE SHED" (*Sermo* 87, c. 11, n. 14. P. L. 38, 638).

He reveals his mind to us most clearly, however, when he asks the question: why the Hebrews were forbidden to partake of the blood of the legal sacrifices "if these sacrifices signified this ONE SACRIFICE [that is, of the Cross] IN WHICH WAS THE TRUE REMISSION OF SINS, seeing that, nevertheless, not only was no one forbidden to PARTAKE IN NUTRIMENT OF THE BLOOD OF THIS SACRIFICE, but rather all who desire to have life are exhorted to drink of it" (*Quaest. in Heptat.*, 1, 3, 57. P. L. 34, 704). Therefore, according to Augustine, the Eucharistic Blood is the very Blood of the sacrifice of the Cross, just as the Body is food for us from the Cross: "WE ARE FED FROM THE CROSS OF THE LORD, because we eat His Body" (*In Psalm.* 100, n. 9. P. L. 37, 1290). And therefore, as we eat, so we offer nothing other than the very Body and Blood of Christ the Theotype, or Victim to God and accepted by Him, as we have said.¹

St. Gaudens of Brescia unfolds the same doctrine to the neophytes fresh from the baptismal font: "In the shadow or figure (*umbra*) of the legal pasch, not merely one lamb but many were slain; a lamb was slain for each house, since one could not suffice for all, the pasch was the figure, NOT THE TRUTH (*proprietas*) OF THE PASSION OF THE LORD. For a figure is not the real thing but an imitation of it. . . . In this truth—not figure—in which we live (*in hac veritate qua sumus*) ONE HAS DIED FOR ALL, AND THAT SAME ONE, IMMOLATED IN EVERY CHURCH IN THE WORLD IN THE MYSTERY OF THE BREAD AND WINE, GIVES US STRENGTH. He gives us life as we believe in Him (*vivificat creditus*), and, being consecrated, He sanctifies the consecrators. THIS IS THE FLESH, THIS IS THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB" (*Sermo* 2. P. L. 20, 854–855). This one Lamb, therefore, once slain, suffices for all the houses of the churches in the world, because in that one Lamb abides the true reality of the Passion of the Lord, concealed in the sacrament,

¹ On this point Karl Adam (*Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin*, 1908, p. 75) says: "Hence by predilection Augustine describes communion AS AN EATING FROM THE CROSS, OR SIMPLY AS AN EATING OF THE CRUCIFIED."

it is true, but at the same time made known to us “by means of the image of His true Passion” (*ibid.*).¹

One interpretation only can be given to those words of Gaudens: that in our Eucharistic refreshment Christ is eaten by us just in that condition of victim of His sacrifice which He has from His Passion.

And what other meaning does St. Leo the Great convey when he sets before us the devil as caught in his own devices in the matter of the Passion of the Lord, in which “he [he here is the devil] shed the just blood which would be both the price and the cup for the reconciliation of the world” ? (*Sermo 62, De Passione*, 11, c. 3. P. L. 54, 351.) Here the Blood of the Lord is our drink just as it is also our ransom, because by the malice of the devil it was shed on the Cross.

Verecundus of Junca speaks similarly in a neatly turned comment on the grape which Moses (*Deuteron.*, XXXII, 14) says was given by God to His people: “The blood of the grape is the blood of martyrs, or certainly THE VERY BLOOD OF THE PASSION OF THE LORD, THE BLOOD BY WHICH WE ARE DAILY FEASTED FROM THE SACRED ALTARS” (In *Canticum Deuteronomii*, c. 14. Spicileg. Solesm., t. 4, 18).

Amalarius gives the following reason for the abolition of the sacrifices of the Church during Holy Week: “The proper order of things is for us to wait until our Lord CONSECRATES THE SACRAMENTS OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD ON THE CROSS, and makes them new by His Resurrection and SO FINALLY FOR US TO EAT AND DRINK that most saving sacrament” (*De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 1, 1, c. 15. P. L. 105, 1032). That is, we do not offer the holy sacrifice between Holy Thursday and the night of the Resurrection, in order to appear, as it were, waiting until Christ bestows on His Body and Blood of the Eucharist the condition of true Victim immolated on the Cross, after which it still remains for the condition of Christ to become new by the Resurrection, from corruptible being made incorruptible, that so we may partake of a perfect Victim, fully sanctified and fully sanctifying (cf. *ibid.*, c. 12, col. 1023, quoted above, Th. XII, Vol. I).

¹ “He wished souls to be sanctified by His own precious Blood BY MEANS OF THE IMAGE OF HIS TRUE PASSION” (*ibid.*).

St. Paschasius Radbertus gives a full exposition of the doctrine in question, when he asks himself why the Eucharistic Supper took place at the TIME (*in articulo*) OF THE PASSION: "It was more fitting, he says, to give this sacrament AT THE TIME OF HIS PASSION, rather than after the Resurrection, because THIS IS WHY THE LAMB WAS IMMOLATED, THAT WE SHOULD EAT HIS FLESH . . . IN HIS DEATH WE RECEIVE THOSE THINGS (*ista percipimus*) SO THAT WE MAY BE FEASTED OF THEM UNTIL THE END OF TIME, and nevertheless that what was sown, rising again should remain incorruptible . . . FOR THIS REASON as often as we eat those things (*ista*) we announce the death of the Lord, BECAUSE FROM THAT DEATH WE HAVE MERITED THOSE IMMORTAL THINGS" (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Dmni*, c. 18. P. L. 120, 1326).

Quite the same sense is conveyed in the *Expositio missae*, erroneously attributed to St. Isidore, by the paraphrase of the words of the Canon *calicem salutis perpetuae*: "Thou didst desire us to drink of Thy Blood through THE CHALICE OF THE PASSION" (n. 28. P. L. 83, 1150). We may now return to a contemporary of St. Augustine, the writer of the work *Liber de promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, probably St. Quodvultdeus, Bishop of Carthage.¹ His words are at first sight quite amazing where he represents the Eucharistic food in the Passion as given to us from the Cross where it is killed and cooked! These are his words: "The people are bidden to take bread in the morning and flesh in the evening (*Exod.*, XVI, 8). But that flesh is a figure of what is given to us. For first the people received that bread to be eaten which came down from heaven, later they received THE FLESH OF CHRIST KILLED (*confectam*) IN THE PASSION, it is of this that the Lord says: *Unless you eat,*" etc. (pars 1, c. 39, n. 56. P. L. 51, 765). "That the ravens by divine command ministered to the same Elias in the desert, bread in the morning and flesh in the evening (*III Kings*, XVII, 6), is shown to be a figure of the whole Body of the Lord, when, in accordance with the command, the Jews, like crows, first ministered bread to the Gentiles, then the FLESH OF THE PASSION OF THE LORD, like ravens of sombre hue, raucous voice, fetid odour and horrid aspect, for when preparing

¹(1) Cf. Prosper Schepens, *Un traité à restituer à saint Quodvultdeus évêque de Carthage au v siècle*, in R.S.R., May-September, 1919, p. 230 f.

THE FLESH MADE READY AS THOUGH BY COOKING (*carnem . . . decoctam*) FROM THE WOOD OF THE CROSS for the Gentiles, like the ravens, the Jews cried out with one croaking voice to Pilate: *Crucify, crucify!* Those eat this Flesh who hearken to the words: *Unless you eat,*" etc. (pars 2, c. 18, n. 62. P. L. 51, 802).

Four hundred years later, Hincmar speaks of the bread of the Eucharist as the Body of the crucified roasted¹ as it were on the altar of the Cross, and of the chalice of the Eucharist as the chalice of the Blood dripping from the wounds. In the eyes of Hincmar, the Church "partakes of the Body of the crucified, roasted on the altar of the Cross (*in ara crucis torridum*), as well as the red Blood pouring from the side of the crucified" (*De cavendis vitiis et virtutibus exercendis*, c. 9. P. L. 125, 928).²

The expression "baked", "roasted" (*torridus*) is not peculiar to Hincmar's time only; indeed it was quite commonly used. Thus, in a medieval *Tropus ad Graduale* for the Mass of the Resurrection (from a French hymnal Ms. of the thirteenth century, A. H. 49, 227), the Eucharistic bread is described as the dish of food baked or roasted (*torrefactum*) on the altar of the Cross, and at the same time enriched with the Blood of which we drink:

"O BANQUET DISH how sweet it is (*O quam dulce ferculum*)
BAKED ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS,
Whence full of flavour streams
The Blood, a drink
For us."

So, too, in an expressly Eucharistic *Prosa de corpore Christi* (from a prayer book in Ms. of Champagne, 1462, A. H. 31, 105) we find:

¹ Of the Body baked or roasted (*torridum*) on the altar of the Cross, bear in mind our remarks above, Th. XIII (Vol. I).

² Hincmar also gives poetic expression to the same doctrine in his *Ferculum Salomonis* (P. L. 125, 1202):

"For on the Cross His Body's fixed, His Blood is also shed,
His Blood which on the Supper night Christ gave unto his friends.
The story we unworthy sinners tell at His command,
While He, Redeemer, makes our gift the price of us redeemed."

Not only does he link up the Supper with the Cross in such manner that the eating of the sacrament by the disciples at the Last Supper was a tasting beforehand of the blood victim, but, moreover, after the manner of St. Augustine, he describes the Victim of our sacrifice as the very price of our Redemption. Cf. the *Explanatio in Ferculum Salomonis*. P. L. 125, 832.

“Hail to thee, rich Flesh of Christ (*Ave caro Christi crassa*)

ROASTED HOT IN PASSION’S FIRE

ON THE CROSS’S GRID ;

Savour it but once in tasting,

Palate of the soul, then spurn

Every other dish.”¹

It was also preached to the faithful from the pulpit. For example, we have Cardinal James de Vitriaco (†before A.D. 1245), Bishop of Tusculum, in his *Sermo 2 in coena Domini*, speaking as follows: “THE TRUE BODY OF CHRIST WHICH IS CONTAINED UNDER THE SPECIES OF BREAD was formed by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin, AND COOKED (*decoctum*) IN THE FIRE OF THE PASSION ON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS, IN ORDER TO BE SUITABLE FOR EATING” (*Sermones in Epistolas et Evangelia dominicalia totius anni*, Antwerp, 1575, p. 336). Again in *Sermo 2 feriae sextae parasceves* (*op. cit.*, p. 355): “The Flesh of Christ on the Cross was roasted (*assata*) in the fire of the Passion in order to be suited for eating.” The exegetes, too, give the same explanation. For instance, Rupert (*In Joann.*, VI, 27. P. L. 169, 457): “This bread will be cooked (*coquetur*) in the fire of the Passion.”²

The language of William of St. Theodoric, though not strictly

¹ All these expressions apparently come to us from the very ancient *Hymnus in Resurrectione Domini*. In this hymn the Blood of Christ is said to flow to us, that we may drink of it from the roasted Body of Christ (A. H. 51, 87. It is found in countless Hymnaries, Rituals, Breviaries, in German, French, English, Italian, Irish and Spanish manuscripts of the eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. Cf. J. Mearns, *Early Latin Hymnaries. An Index of hymns in Hymnaries before 1100*, Cambridge, 913, p. 1):

“ Equipped FOR SUPPER of the Lamb (*Ad coenam agni providi*)
 And clothed in robes of white,
 The crossing of the red sea past,
 We sing to Christ, our King.
 HIS SACRED BODY, see, is there,
 HOT BAKED ON ALTAR OF THE CROSS: (*in ara crucis torridum*)
 We taste the red Blood streaming thence
 And tasting live to God.”

² With regard to the antiquity of this hymn, which is much earlier than the eighth century, see A. H. 51, 90. Perhaps H. A. Daniel is not far wrong (*Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, Halle, 1841, tom. 1, p. 89) in suspecting that “the hymn *Ad coenam Agni* used to be sung in the early Church after the baptised catechumens were being strengthened according to rite with the Body and Blood of the Lord in communion.”

² Other examples of this description of the Eucharistic bread as baked or cooked (*cocti*) on the wood of the Cross will be found at the end of this § I.

proper, is not deserving of positive censure,¹ when he says that the Flesh of the Lord as food proceeded from the Flesh of the Lord suffering the Passion. Making a distinction between the Flesh of the Lord in the Passion and the intelligible Flesh of the Lord in the Eucharist, he writes: "This other Flesh comes from that former Flesh which was crucified. . . . And just as the Gospel calls the Body of the Lord which suffered death the grain of corn falling on the earth, so in the Psalm (103), the fat of the corn is that mystic Flesh, which Flesh the Lord exhorted the disciples to eat, when He said: *Unless you eat of my flesh and drink of my blood, you shall not have life in you*" (*De sacramento altaris*, c. 6. P. L. 180, 353).

In a sermon of uncertain authorship, but published among the works of St. Bernard, *De excellentia SS. Sacramenti*, Christ is represented as speaking so: "This liquid which you see is no longer wine, IT IS MY BLOOD WHICH I SHED FOR YOUR RANSOM RESERVING THE CUP ON THE ALTAR FOR YOU. I, the grape cluster of the flesh, was led TO THE WINE-PRESS OF THE CROSS, for your salvation: THENCE WAS DRAINED THE NEW WINE OF YOUR REDEMPTION. *My blood is drink indeed*" (c. 11. P. L. 184, 988). Hugh of Amiens says that just as Christ suffering on the Cross is our Redemption, so, too, He is our nutriment: "In that hour [of the Supper] the Body of Christ was eaten, on the morrow it suffered on the Cross for the redemption of the world. In that hour the Blood of Christ was drunk, on the morrow that same Blood was poured out for the redemption of the world ON THE CROSS: SUFFERING ON WHICH FOR US, He is both the price of our redemption and IS CONSUMED AS THE FOOD OF LIFE by us who are redeemed" (Hugh of Amiens, Archbishop of Rouen, *Dialogorum*, 1, 5, c. 14. P. L. 192, 1209).

Robert Pullen says that the Blood of the Cross is our drink: "The Jews nailed the wounded Christ to the Cross: as type of this we read that the rock (which according to the Apostle is Christ) was struck by Moses with a rod. The rod, however, shed water, WHILE BLOOD TO BE THE DRINK OF THE FAITHFUL FLOWED

¹ Not deserving of positive censure (*non damnandum*), I say, because there are other places where William clearly taught the absolute numerical identity of the Body which suffered and rose to glory and the Eucharistic Body; indeed he forcefully championed it. See his controversy with Rupert below, Th. XXIV.

FROM THE WOUNDS OF Christ" (*Sententiarum*, lib. 8, c. 1. P. L. 186, 959-960).

Gerhoh of Reichersberg writes vividly: "If the unworthy approaches to eat of the Body of Christ and to drink of His Blood, as he is putting new wine into old vessels the wine pours out of the vessel and the vessel is destroyed. The wine pours out, but does not perish. For how could He be lost who *came to save that which was lost*? How could the Body and Blood perish of Him who is everywhere? NEVERTHELESS THEY WHO PUT THIS BLOOD OF THE GRAPE TRODDEN IN THE WINE-PRESS OF THE CROSS into old vessels have become guilty of His Blood, because that which does not perish did not remain in them" (*In Psalm 22*, 5. P. L. 193, 1055; cf. *In Psalm 140*, 1. P. L. 194, 934).

Finally, St. Martin of Liège (*Sermo 26 in resurrect. Domini*. P. L. 208, 966): "THE CROSS OF CHRIST PREPARED HEAVENLY FOOD FOR US, that is, Christ who is truly the bread of angels and men."¹

Just as other writers said with St. Augustine, so, too, our poets, and with them the faithful, sang that we are feasted from the Cross (*Psalterium sanctae crucis*, A. H. 35, 22-23). So we read, in a London codex Ms., thirteenth-fourteenth century:

"Hail Cross, to those who fear the Lord, (*Salve Crux, timentibus*)

Thou GIVEST SACRED FOOD,
The immolated Flesh of Christ
Hanging on thy beam."²

¹ We could continue indefinitely giving examples—slighter testimonies of our doctrine—of this kind. One such occurs in a will, attributed by Flodoardus to St. Remigius. In this will he bequeathed a chalice wrought from a lump of gold, presented to himself "by the most Christian king" Clovis, on which was the following inscription:

"Let men drink (*hauriat*) life FROM SACRED BLOOD herein,
Caught up from WOUND of ever living Christ."

(*In Flodoardum, Historia Ecclesiae Remensis*, lib. 1, c. 10 and 18. P.L. 135, 44 and 62.) But such language is, I fear, a little too eloquent.

² Our feasting from the death of Christ is finely described in the *Responsorium in festo corporis Christi*:

"The grain is driven from the chaff,
It falls to earth and dies;
But from it springs the harvest wheat
From which the bread is made,
On which from Altar's threshing floor,
The Christian people feast."

(A. H. 5, 31, *ex. cod. Praedicatt. Vindobon. signo anni 1462.*)

Our fainting souls are fired with new life from the Cross (*Prosa in die corporis Christi*. A. H. 34, 47. *Ex Graduali ms. Coloniensi*, fifteenth century):

“The soul of him who *drinks
Fed with rich BLOOD from CROSS of Christ,
Is sweetness all within,
Exults in joy divine.”

Again we read (*Psalterium sanctae crucis*, A. H. 35, 22):

“Hail, CROSS, the mystic press art thou
From which is trod the wine
Filling the altar chalice now
WITH BLOOD OF CHRIST DIVINE.”¹

We drink the Blood of the Passion (*Hymnus Mozarabicus*, IV Sunday of Lent, A. H. 27, 83, *ex cod. ms. saec. x*):

“Word of the Father, Word made Flesh to us revealed,
Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world
To thee we come with bended head in awe to drink
Thy glorious Blood, thy LOVING PASSION’S gift to us.”²

¹ Peter the Venerable in the same sense (*Rythmus in laude Salvatoris*, A. H. 48, 244; cf. the text, not amended as below, in P. L. 189, 1012):

“From the free of death
The Blood is shed
Which in faith we take
From the Body of Christ,” etc.

² We could go on indefinitely quoting hymns of this kind. For example we have this one in which both food and drink together are set before us as derived from the Cross (*Hymnus de corpore Christi*, by Joannes a Jenstein, Archbishop of Prague, fourteenth century, A. H. 48, 431):

“Flesh of the CRUCIFIED
Cruelly wrung,
In death of Cross so dire,
Grant us joys of light.
“Blood of Christ that dripped
In shower of sacred dew,
Within, without, us cleanse
And join to choirs of love.”

The same more briefly in (*Hymnus de corpore Christi*, *ex Antiphonario ms. Vilarientiensi saec. xiii*, A. H. 12, 33):

“Thy Flesh is meat indeed,
Thy Blood is drink indeed,
Victim of Redemption,
Pasture of thy sheep,” etc.

Of the Fathers of the East, Ephraem may have had this in mind when he wrote: "On the evening of this pasch He gave the command to His Church to commemorate the Lamb, the Son of our God, who, BEFORE BEING SLAIN FOR US, gave us His own Body and Blood. . . . On that evening when the Jews ate unleavened bread, Jesus made the Church in the world the HEIR OF HIS BLOOD"; that is, of His death (*Sermo 3 in hebdom. sanct.*, n. 7, ed. Lamy, t. 1, p. 426-428).

Athanasius likewise: "The Resurrection took place at the time of the Passion, in which our Lord died for us and *Christ our Pasch was sacrificed*. BECAUSE HE WAS IMMOLATED, THEREFORE, EACH OF US WILL EAT OF HIM, and partake of this nutriment joyfully and constantly" (*Epist. heortast.*, 11, n. 14. P. G. 26, 1412).

Chrysostom apparently refers to this when, among many other expressions of the same tenor, he exhorts the Christian to forgive his enemy:¹ "Your enemy has not yet crucified you, as the Jews did to Christ, and yet HE GAVE THE VERY SAME BLOOD WHICH HE SHED, FOR THE SALVATION OF THOSE WHO CAUSED IT TO FLOW." In other words, He gave the Blood of the Passion (*Hom. 1, de prodicione Judae*, n. 6. P. G. 49, 381).

Sophronius of Jerusalem seems to indicate the same, addressing the Cross as follows: "Hence we glory in Thee with our whole heart because . . . ON THEE WAS SHED flowing from God Himself, that BLOOD of the Son and Word of the invisible Father, OF WHICH whosoever TODAY PARTAKE they are reconciled again with our God who gives life" (*Or. 5, de festo sanctae Crucis*. P. G. 8, ter. 3313). Therefore it is the Blood of the Cross of which we are partakers.²

Cyril of Alexandria surely conveys the same idea in his commentary on *Deuteronomy*, XV, 13-14: "And when thou sendest him out free, thou shalt not let him go away empty. But thou shalt give him for his way: out of thy flocks and out of thy barn-floor

¹ See also hom. 63, n. 3 and 4, quoted above.

² We can have no certainty that Procopius meant the same thing when he wrote: "He desires TO GIVE UP HIS BODY TO US TO BE OUR FOOD (*suum corpus nobis cedere in alimenta*). FOR THIS REASON HE PERMITS THE BLOOD TO FLOW. The participation by which we partake of Christ now contains the confession of His Passion" (*In Exodum*, XII, 8, P. G. 87, 568-569). For in view of the context it would appear that the words might be taken in another sense: since Christ wished to give us His Flesh in food and it could be food for those only who were cleansed, it was necessary that His Blood should be shed, that, washed in it, we should be cleansed. If this is the meaning, the passage has no bearing on the present matter.

and thy wine-press. You see the virtue of the mystery of Christ shining forth crystal clear in these words. For we have been redeemed, and gratuitously the Saviour of the world sent us out free. . . . And when He had sent us out free, that is, when He had freed us from sin, and had embellished us with the grace of adoption, He gave us, in addition, Himself as rich provision for our journey, LED AS AN IMMACULATE VICTIM AND AS A LAMB TO THE SLAUGHTER BECAUSE OF US, AND GENEROUSLY MAKING US PARTAKERS OF THE LIFEGIVING EULOGIA, THAT IS, OF HIS HOLY BODY AND BLOOD. This, I think, is the viaticum or provision for the journey to be given from out of the flocks, and out of the barn floor and out of the wine-press, to those who in the seventh age, that is in the spiritual Sabbath, are called to liberty by the goodness of the Lord” (*De adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, 1, 7. P. G. 68, 501).

In so explaining the provision made for us for life’s journey, does not Cyril remind us that our Eucharistic participation is of the Body of the slain Christ ?

The commentary of Hesychius on the verse from *Leviticus: the flour shall be tempered with oil, and fried in a frying-pan*, leaves no room whatever for doubt: “THE FRYING-PAN must be interpreted THE CROSS OF THE LORD: for it was the Cross also that gave back THE FLESH PLACED THEREON MADE FOOD for men. For had not the Flesh hung on the Cross, we could never have mystically partaken of the Body of the Lord” (Hesychius, *In Leviticum*, VI, 21. P. G. 93, 852).

St. John Damascene has many examples of this argument, as, for instance, when he sings of the Blood flowing from the sepulchre of Christ (*In Dominicum Pascha*, str. 4. P. G. 96, 840): “Come let us drink of the new DRAUGHT, not now that drawn by miracle from the sterile rock, but that from which gushes for us like rain (*pluente*) a spring of incorruptibility FROM THE SEPULCHRE OF CHRIST.” Or, when he speaks of a multiplication, as it were, of the crucified Body, as food for the faithful, comparing the multiplication of the loaves with the food dispensed through the Cross: “Five thousand, and again seven thousand are fed under the one symbol OF THE CROSS. Where, therefore, are the fragments of the food ? How is it that I who was not there will receive fragments

of the food of those who were there? Of the fragments twelve baskets remained. Grace supplies the answer. CHRIST WAS CRUCIFIED AND WE ARE ALWAYS NOURISHED: and when we have been sated, again we ask for more; and though we receive the food again we still seek it, and there is still more remaining over for us. For grace does not allow of any lessening" (*Sermo in sanct. parascev., et in cruce*, n. l. P. G. 96, 589). Hence we understand clearly his meaning when he wrote: "Let us approach with a burning desire; having composed our hands in the form of a cross, LET US PARTAKE OF THE BODY OF THE CRUCIFIED" (*De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13. P. G. 94, 1149). It is then the Body of the crucified which, after the manner of the loaves, the Lord multiplied to be set before men as food for all time.

What we have said is confirmed by a statement attributed by St. John Damascene to Chrysostom, that the Victim of the Blood of Christ has come to us as the fruit of the Cross: "The soldier opened His side and pierced the wall of the holy temple, and I found the treasure [that is, the Blood], and took the riches to myself. This happened, too, in the case of the Lamb. The Jews slew (*ἔσφαζον*) the Lamb, and I plucked the Victim (*καὶ γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν ἐκαρπώσαμην*), THE BLOOD AND WATER, FROM HIS SIDE. Just as a mother nourishes her child with her blood and her milk, so, too, Christ ever nourishes His own children with His own Blood" (*Parallela Sacra Theta*, tit. 4. P. G. 96, 17).

Symeon of Thessalonica is no mean exponent of Eastern tradition in this matter: "The aim or purpose of the whole mystery is this, that we should partake of the Flesh and Blood of Christ Himself. It was for this that He was crucified and that He shed His Blood for us, that we should partake of Him in communion; and before the Cross He gave the sacraments by His priestly action (*hierurgiam*), so that He would be with us, and that we might partake of Him now and for all time, and that we might be sharers in all His benefits" (*De sacramentis*, 58. P. G. 155, 233). And again: "The communicant should make a cross with his hands, in symbol of his service and confession of the Crucified" (*De sacra liturgia*, c. 99. P. G. 155, 301).

Turning to the Liturgies, we first select the prayer which used to be said in the *post-sanctus* of the Mozarabic Mass which was

said on the Wednesday after Palm Sunday: "Therefore we immolate [to the Son of God] today a humiliated heart in the sacrifice of praise: beseeching Him that today, tomorrow, and all the days of our lives, freed from sin, we may be worthy to drink THE CHALICE OF HIS PASSION" (P. L. 85, 405). Again in a post-communion prayer: "Sipping THE CHALICE OF THE PASSION OF THE LORD, and tasting the sweetness of His most sacred Body, we give thanks and praise to Him, walking in His house with joy and gladness" (P. L. 85, 568). The chalice which we drink is the chalice of the Passion; therefore we offered in our sacrifice the chalice of the Passion. The Supper, too, which we eat is the Supper of the Passion: "Let us approach with confidence TO THE MOST SACRED SUPPER OF THE PASSION" (*Post-pridie* prayer on Palm Sunday, col. 400).

Another prayer *Post-pridie Missae votivae singularis* is: "May this bread which THE WOOD OF THE CROSS BAKED (*coxit*), and this chalice WHICH THE WINE-PRESS OF THE PASSION PRESSED . . . afford true consolation to the partakers" (P. L. 85, 993).¹

The ancient Liturgies abound with prayers and attestations like the following: "With a devout mind, we pray thee, O Eternal Majesty, that we may receive the bread, changed into thy Flesh, and the chalice changed into thy Blood by thine omnipotent power, that very Blood in the chalice which flowed from thy side on the Cross" (*Missale Gothicum*, *Missa Dominicalis*, *Post-Secreta*, in Mabillon, *Liturgia Gallicana*, 1, 3, c, 80. P. L. 72, 317). "WE EAT THY BODY CRUCIFIED FOR US, and we drink thy holy Blood shed for us" (*ibid.*, *post orationem dominicam*, col. 318; cf. ed. Bannister, p. 140 *et seq.*).

In the Eastern Liturgies, the deacon in the Syro-Maronic Mass, inviting the faithful to communion, exclaims: "Behold the chalice which our Lord mingled AT THE HEAD OF THE CROSS: approach, mortals, and drink of it unto the remission of sins" (Maximil. Saxon., *Missa Syro-Maronica*, p. 56. Compare the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites, B. 104). Our Eucharist, therefore, is the Blood of the Passion: and this, first offered by us in the Mass, is what we receive from God when we communicate.

¹ Cf. Heterius and Beatus, *Ad Elipandum epist.*, 1, 1, c. 68. P.L. 96, 936-937: "The wood of the Cross baked (*coxit*) that bread, which is the Body of Christ." Cf. Hincmar, cited above.

THESIS XXI

§ 2. The Mass in Relation to the Heavenly Sacrifice.

There still remains for us to show from the authoritative teaching of the Fathers and Doctors¹ that we offer the actual heavenly Flesh of the eternal sacrifice.² It will be seen that the doctrine is implicitly taught by all those Fathers who have combined the following two statements:

- (1) That Christ is the eternal Victim of His sacrifice: cf. Theses XII–XV, (Vol. I).
- (2) That the Victim of our Lord's one sacrifice is offered by us, as such: cf. Theses XVII, XIX–XX.

For the obvious conclusion from these two statements is: that what we offer is the celestial sacrifice.³ But, apart from such implicit teaching, our masters in the faith have at times more expressly declared the same, and in two ways: first, *directly*, when they say that our sacrificial action is performed on the Victim of heaven, or that it takes place on the heavenly Altar; and, second, *indirectly*, when they say that when eating the Eucharistic food we partake of the heavenly sacrifice.

¹ See above Thesis XVII, the conclusion drawn from Scripture.

² We necessarily use the word sacrifice here in its passive sense, for THAT WHICH was handed over and assigned to God, and which is permanent, not for the sacrificial action, which is transient.

³ Following Scheeben (*Handbuch d. kath. Dogm.*, 3, n. 1459–1508), as is their wont, J. Wilhelm and T. B. Scannell (*A Manual of Catholic Theology*, vol. 2, London 1898, pp. 204–205) touched on this point in their discussion of Christ the Redeemer, although later, in their explanation of the Mass (possibly because here they lacked the guidance of their master), they derive nothing useful or helpful from this consideration. Thus Wilhelm and Scannell (*loc. cit.*): “In the whole-burnt offerings of the Old Testament the smell of the victim is said to ascend to God as an odour of sweetness, which expression is also applied to the sacrifice of Christ. THE ODOUR OF SWEETNESS OF THE SAVIOUR IS HIS GLORIFIED SELF ASCENDING INTO HEAVEN, and as the Lamb slain, standing in the midst of the throne before God, AS AN ETERNAL SACRIFICE OF ADORATION AND THANKSGIVING. From His heavenly throne Christ, through His ministers on earth, continually sacrifices and consecrates in His Church, MAKING HIMSELF THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH . . . HE THUS BRINGS DOWN TO EARTH THE PERENNIAL SACRIFICE OF HEAVEN, in order to apply its merits to mankind, and at the same time enables the Church to offer with Him and through Him a perfect sacrifice of adoration and thanksgiving.”

A. DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN THE SACRIFICIAL ACTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE VICTIM OF HEAVEN

(A) THE FATHERS ASSERT THAT WE OFFER THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE

Of the Fathers, St. Ambrose says: "The shadow was in the Law, THE IMAGE is in the Gospel now, THE TRUE REALITY IS IN HEAVEN. Formerly a lamb was offered and a calf; now Christ is offered: but He is offered as Man, as subject to the Passion; AND HE OFFERS HIMSELF AS PRIEST, in order to free us from our sins: HERE IN IMAGE, THERE IN TRUE REALITY, WHERE, AS ADVOCATE, HE MAKES INTERCESSION WITH THE FATHER FOR US" (*De officiis ministrorum*, 1, 238. P. L. 16, 94). At greater length in another passage: "In the beginning then the shadow went before, the image followed, the true reality is to come. The shadow was in the Law, THE IMAGE IS NOW IN THE GOSPEL, THE TRUE REALITY IS IN HEAVEN. THEREFORE THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE CELEBRATED IN THE CHURCH NOW were foreshadowed in the language of the prophets. WE SEE NOW THE good things BY WAY OF THE IMAGE, and we hold the good things of the image. We saw the Prince of priests coming to us, we SAW and WE HEARD¹ HIM offering His own Blood for us; we priests follow, as we can, to offer the sacrifice for the people; though weak in merit, we are ennobled by the sacrifice; because although Christ is not seen offering now, none the less He is Himself offered on earth, when the Body of Christ is offered: nay He Himself, whose word sanctifies the sacrifice which is offered, is manifested as offering through us. And He Himself STANDS BEFORE THE FATHER AS OUR ADVOCATE. We do not see Him now, but we shall see Him then, WHEN THE IMAGE SHALL HAVE PASSED, AND THE REALITY SHALL HAVE COME. . . . Go up, therefore, into heaven, O man, and there you will see THOSE THINGS of which here was the shadow and THE IMAGE. . . .

¹ The words "we heard" indicate that the offering of the Blood was made at the Supper: for it was only at the Supper that Christ offered in words, that is, in the words of the consecration. True, the offering was not directly indicated in these words, but still by them was enacted the sacramental immolation in which the pragmatic offering of the Victim to the immolation in Blood actually consisted.

YOU WILL SEE the true light, the eternal and PERPETUAL PRIEST” (*In Psalm 38*, n. 25–26. P. L. 14, 1051–1052).

The meaning of each passage is quite clear—we sacrifice Christ in image; but, let it be understood well, the image is that of a true existent reality. For St. Ambrose places the true reality of the sacrifice in the Passion (which He *resumes*, so to speak, that is, He takes it to Himself once more in similitude), but in such a way that it is at the same time permanently preserved in the celestial life of Christ which is one of immolation, in so far that in heaven He is an eternal Victim for us, just as He is forever in heaven our Priest (*He offers Himself*). When we priests offer to God in image the Victim of that Priest, we do in truth offer sacrifice, offering as we do to God the Victim of the Passion, now in glory. Hence Ambrose justly remarks: “Let there be no figure of a lamb in sacrifice now, but the reality of the Body of Christ. Let not the shadow of the Law restrict our vision, but, clearly manifested, LET THE GRACE¹ OF THE PASSION OF THE LORD AND THE SPLENDOUR OF THE RESURRECTION SHED THE GLORY OF ITS BRILLIANCE ON THE SOUL” (*De Cain et Abel*, 1, 2, c. 6, n. 19. P. L. 14, 350). The truth, the reality foreshadowed in the figures of the Law, is here with us now; we hold in our hands now that very thing which will be revealed in the life to come: I mean the true Victim which was bathed in its own blood in the Passion and glorified in the Resurrection.

The contemporary author of the *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* (1, 3, c. 7. P. L. 20, 1120) puts it in a nutshell: “The heavenly gift of the faithful is celebrated by the pure oblation.” From the writers of the Middle Ages we have already quoted, Th. IX (Vol. I), Isaac de Stella who says that in the Mass after the consecration has been performed by the pronouncement of the words of the Lord, “the priest, no longer the Melchisedech of old, no longer flesh born of flesh, but the new Melchisedech, Jesus born of the breath of the Holy Spirit, from the divine gifts and presents,

¹ We must interpret the word *grace* here as opposed to *shadow*, as it connotes the *saving reality* foretold by the shadow of the figurative sacrifices, in much the same way as Christ is said by St. John to be full of *grace and truth*, that is, full of the *saving reality* which the Law promised but did not possess. Hence we must not construe the words as if *grace* here designated the effect of the Passion; the genitive here (*grace of the Passion*) is explanatory: the grace which is the Passion of the Lord, that is, the saving reality of the Passion of the Lord.

OFFERS FROM HEAVEN THE CELESTIAL VICTIM OF FLESH AND BLOOD," etc., while, meantime, the visible priest prays that "in the very truth of the Flesh and Blood, from the second altar beyond the veil in heaven, he may obtain grace and benediction" (*Epist. de officio missae*. P. L. 194, 1894-1895).¹

At this same time, as we have already mentioned, the *Libellus de canone mystici libaminis* of Ricardus Weddinghusanus was very well known in the schools. In this work we find the following comment on the part of the Canon immediately following the consecration: "Our petitions are now made known to the Father, IN THE PRESENCE OF THE MOST HIGH AND TRUE PRIEST; in the presence OF THE MOST HIGH AND TRUE VICTIM, we now pause for a little while longer. Then a memorial of the great things He did is made, so that through Him, and through the things which He did, the clemency of the Father may be prayed for and obtained. We therefore make five crosses, not in order to sanctify Him, the Holy of Holies who is present here, but in order to obtain, *by His presence and by the efficacy of the Cross, a five-fold grace whereby we may worthily offer and partake of the saving Victim, and, conformed to Him, we may merit admission into the company of the saints. THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WAS A PURE VICTIM IN HIS PASSION, IN HIS RESURRECTION A HOLY VICTIM, IN HIS ASCENSION AN IMMACULATE VICTIM, THE BREAD OF ETERNAL LIFE to those who hunger, THE CHALICE OF ETERNAL SALVATION to those who thirst after justice. We therefore who approach to OFFER Him should become like to Him, and be conformed to Him*" (*Libellus de canone mystici libaminis*, c. 6. P. L. 177, 463). Notice how Christ is already presupposed as both Victim and Priest when our own action occurs; how the heavenly Victim is at hand to be offered by us through the consecration.²

This teaching is taken for granted in the following question put by William of Paris: "It may be asked why THE HIGH PRIEST

¹ The first altar was on earth whence Christ bore His victim to the second altar, to the Holy of Holies, according to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, where the sense is: that from an earthly and passible condition the victim of our Priest passed into a heavenly and incorruptible state.

² Among the spurious works assigned to St. Thomas is an *Expositio missae* of which P. Mandonnet says nothing in his disquisition *Des écrits authentiques de saint Thomas d' Aquin*, 2, c. 11, *Des écrits apocryphes*. On reading it, one sees at once that it is a compilation of passages from the *Libellus de canone mystici libaminis* (Parma, 1864, t. 17, p. 334) with here and there words interpolated or slightly changed.

AND VICTIM, Christ the Lord, SHOULD DESCEND on to the altar into the hands of the priest, when ALL THIS SACERDOTAL OFFICE could be fulfilled laudably and sufficiently before God the Father in His home in heaven” (*De sacramento Eucharistiae*, c. 5, op. t. 1, p. 447). According to William of Paris, then, we do not make Christ Victim, but He, already pre-existent as Victim, comes down to the altar; although without any ministrations of ours, He could fulfil sufficiently in heaven the office of Victim, just as well as that of Priest. Hence plainly, according to William, our Victim is the victim of that celestial sacrifice, of which Christ is the eternal Priest.

We have seen already, Th. XIX, that this is the teaching of St. Thomas. We may add here also the testimony cited in Th. III (Vol. I), on the perpetuity of the victim of our Lord’s sacrifice. Precisely because He continues forever in His office of Victim, our daily offering of this Victim is our daily sacrifice (4 d. 12; cf. *In Hebr.*, 5, lect. 1, cited in Th. V: Vol. I).

Cajetan, a disciple of St. Thomas and an acute interpreter of his teaching, finding it necessary to safeguard and preserve intact the truth of our sacrifice against the onslaught of the Protestants, did not fail to advance this argument resting on the eternal state of victimhood in Christ. He propounded it in the treatise *De sacrificio missae*, written against Luther in A.D. 1531, “a work which is both erudite and sound, IN WHICH HE EXPOUNDS THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, CC. 7-10” (Hurter, *Nomenclator* 2, 2, 1207). He states there that the permanent condition of immolation in Christ is an absolutely necessary condition for the reconciliation, and compounding of our sacrifice with the one sacrifice of Christ which is never to be repeated. So much so that the mystic immolation which we make contributes nothing to the condition of immolation in Christ; it merely serves to introduce and repeat an outward similitude or representation of the real immolation, by means of which representation of real immolation we offer the heavenly Victim of the Passion.

Cajetan propounds the question as follows: “Lutherans agree that the Mass may be called a sacrifice of commemoration, in so far as the true Body and true Blood of Christ is consecrated,

adored, and partaken of, in memorial of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross, in accordance with the words of our Lord: *Do this for a commemoration of me*. However, they deny two things: firstly, that the Body and Blood of Christ is offered to God; for though they say that the true Body of Christ is present on the altar, nevertheless they deny that this true Body of Christ is offered to God; and, secondly, they deny that there is on the altar a victim or a sacrifice of atonement for sin, either for the living or for the dead. They defend their position by appealing to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, where it is shown clearly that one sole offering of the Body of Christ made once on the Cross is all-sufficient for the sins of the world” (c. 2). In their argumentation the Lutherans quote at large the *Epistle to the Hebrews* from chapters VII to X inclusive. Cajetan answers them as follows: “They advance three kinds of argument against the daily offering of the Eucharist. First, they argue from the number of priests. . . . Secondly, from the repetition of the offering. . . . Thirdly, from the actual thing which is offered: . . . *by his own blood he offered himself once*; hence they conclude that it is quite incongruous that Christ who was once offered all-sufficiently by Himself should be offered by us under the teguments of bread and wine. Against our teaching that the Eucharist is a victim for sins, they argue . . . in the first place, from the repetition: because the repetition of the victim unto the forgiveness of sins is attributed in the same Epistle to the infirmity of the victims of the Old Testament. . . . Secondly, from the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, because Christ offering Himself by His one oblation on the Cross, perfected all approaching to Him, etc. Hence it is an insult to the all-sufficiency of Christ as Victim for the sins of the whole world to add in the New Testament another victim for sins” (c. 5).

Having enumerated these five objections of the Protestants, he gives the principle by which they are solved in the following words: “In the Eucharist, through the daily repetition of the institution of Christ, there is the unique Victim once offered on the Cross, AND PERSISTING IN THE STATE OF IMMOLATION” (c. 6). He then applies this principle to the five objections.

To the first: “It is one thing to say that different victims require

a succession of priests; it is another to say that THE PERPETUITY OF THE VICTIM OFFERED ON THE CROSS requires a succession of ministers." To the second: "The sacrifice or offering¹ is not repeated, but THE UNIQUE SACRIFICE, once offered, PERSEVERES IN THE STATE OF IMMOLATION, and REPETITION INTERVENES in the mode of continuance, NOT IN THE REAL THING OFFERED, AND EVEN THE MODE ITSELF OF CONTINUANCE WHICH IS REPEATED [in the Mass] DOES NOT PERTAIN TO THE SACRIFICE BECAUSE OF THE SACRIFICE ITSELF, but in order that the offering of the Cross be commemorated in a bloodless manner." To the third: "The fact that Christ once shed His own Blood all-sufficiently and super-abundantly on the Cross is quite consistent with this, that in the Eucharist the unique and all-sufficing shedding of His Blood on the Cross continues in the condition of immolation." To the fourth: "To the inference that in the New Testament it is wrong to speak of a victim for sin which must be repeated, WE COMPLETELY AGREE, if the words are used in their proper sense, because the Victim is not repeated in the Mass; rather in every Mass the commemoration is made OF THAT VERY VICTIM WHICH WAS IMMOLATED ON THE CROSS, AND WHICH CONTINUES IN THE CONDITION OF IMMOLATION." To the fifth: "Just as Christ by His own Blood entered into heaven, and remains Priest forever to make intercession for us (as is written in the same *Epistle*), so, too, by the Eucharist, He remains with us in a state of immolation, making intercession for us. For just as the all-sufficiency and infinite efficacy of the sacrifice on the altar of the Cross does not exclude the continuance of Christ in heaven in the office of making intercession for us, so it does not exclude the continuance of the same Christ with us in the condition of immolation to make intercession for us. FOR JUST AS THE CONTINUED INTERCESSION OF CHRIST IN HEAVEN FOR US DOES NOT DETRACT FROM THE UNIQUE INTERCESSION OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST, SO, AND EVEN MORE SO, THE CONTINUANCE OF CHRIST DOES NOT DETRACT FROM THE SAME INTERCESSION WHEN HE COMES TO US IN THE CONDITION OF IMMOLATION, to make intercession for us, that we may be partakers of the remission of sins made on the altar of the Cross, WHEN THAT INTERCESSION IS MADE THROUGH THE MYSTERY, UNDER THE

¹ Cajetan does not here make a strict distinction between offering and immolation.

APPEARANCE OF BREAD AND WINE; but the intercession in heaven by Christ is made in His own very form in which He was crucified" (c. 6).

Shortly after Cajetan, the author of the *Antididagma*, John Gropper, wrote and signed with his name a book entitled *Von warer, wesentlicher, und bleibender Gegenwartigkeit des Leybs und Bluts Christi* (1548), and in the Latin translation of this work by F. Laurentius Surius (Cologne, 1560) we find the following words: "Chrysostom affirms that everywhere there is only one Christ, who once brought Himself as an offering into the Holy of Holies (*obtulerit se in Sancta*), AND FOR THIS REASON THAT ONE OFFERING DOES NOT CEASE, AND NEVER CAN CEASE OR COME TO AN END (*consumi*); AND THAT OUR VICTIM IS THE SAME BODY OF CHRIST, which He, our one High Priest, MAKES AVAILABLE FOR US (*nobis praestet*) and offers through us" (p. 179).¹ We can see how necessary it was, against the objections of the Protestants, to renew the integral, undiluted teaching of the early Fathers!

The following year, George Witzel (*De Eucharistia*, Cologne, 1549),² also engaged in the task of refuting the Protestants, argued thus: "Is the true Body and the true Blood of Christ under the sacramental species on the altar? If you are a Catholic you must say: Yes. AGAIN, IS THE BODY OF CHRIST AND HIS BLOOD ALSO a sacrifice or VICTIM? Here you are face to face with the real difficulty [that is, raised by the Lutherans]. But I will solve it. IF THEN THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IS NOT A VICTIM, OUR FAITH IS VAIN AND WE ARE STILL IN OUR SINS. If, on the other hand, His Body and Blood is a VICTIM, THE SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY AND FOREVER, WHY SAY THAT HE IS NOT A VICTIM IN THE SACRAMENT? . . . Just, therefore, as you cannot separate Christ from the sacrament, SO YOU CANNOT SEPARATE THE SACRAMENT FROM THE VICTIM" (pp. 322-323). See how from the state of enduring Victim, which is inseparable from Christ, he goes on to prove that He is Victim in the sacrament. Here indeed he used a true, unanswerable argument, ready at his hand, and most effective to silence his Protestant opponents.

¹ Call to mind, furthermore, some words in the same sense already quoted in Th. XIX, from the *Antididagma*: "This sacrifice is, and remains, in the sight of God," etc.

² A German edition of this work was printed earlier.

Conrad Cling, the “Ecclesiastes of Erfurt”, applied the same argument at Cologne in the year 1552, in these words: “The Church teaches that the Mass is a true sacrifice on this ground, that CHRIST IS THE PERPETUAL SACRIFICE FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD, just as He is also Priest forever. Wherever, therefore, Christ is with His Flesh and Blood, there is also a true sacrifice [that is, in the passive sense]. And this is the same sacrifice once offered to the Father on the Cross” (*Loci communes theologici*, 1, 4, c. 29, Paris, 1565).

We may now quote a fourth German theologian, Joannes Fabri of Heilbronn (*Missa Evangelica*, Paris, 1558), to whom we have already referred. He teaches that in the sacrament we offer to God the one Victim of the Cross abiding in heaven: “JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF SEATED AT THE RIGHT HAND OF THE FATHER, making intercession for us, UNCEASINGLY OFFERS HIMSELF TO GOD, in order that His Passion may be effective in us” (fol. 42a). “WE OFFER NO OTHER VICTIM ON THE ALTAR than that which was immolated by Christ on the Cross in His mortal Body, whereby He superabundantly satisfied for our sins. THE SAME VICTIM, I say, we sacrifice, and sacrifice today, THE SAME, BUT IMPASSIBLE AND GLORIFIED. . . . We have . . . Christ invisible and impassible in the Sacrament of the altar, and Him we offer daily to the Father. For since we have nothing else worthy to give back to God for all the gifts He has given to us, WE TAKE THE CHALICE OF SALVATION, THAT IS, THE PASSION OF CHRIST, or the work of the Redemption, and that, according to the command of Christ who said: *Do this for a commemoration of me*, we PLACE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD, that by it He may make us partakers of that unique Victim sacrificed on the Cross” (fol. 148).

To these four German theologians let us add a fifth, Joannes a Via, who, like his fellow Catholic Germans, and especially those of the Church of Cologne, used this same defence as an impregnable bulwark against the Protestant assault on the Mass. In his learned work, giving us the very pith and marrow of the matter, entitled *Jugis Ecclesiae Catholicae Sacrificii . . . Defensio et Assertio . . . contra calumnias et cavillationes Jacobi Andreae Smidelini* (Cologne, 1570), he sets out to defend the following thesis (p. 445): “The Body and Blood of Christ [that is, wherever

they are now after the Resurrection and Ascension, either in their proper form or under an alien species] are always a sacrifice [that is, in the passive sense, as Victim of a sacrifice]; they are not made anew" [that is, made anew as Victim of a sacrifice, for example, by us].

He proceeds, *firstly*, to state the objection of Smidelinus against the sacrifice of the Mass: "The priest, says Smidelinus, according to Catholics, makes the sacrifice of reconciliation from the Body and Blood of Christ: this is opposed to all sacred Scripture which attests that Christ with His unique sacrifice is our reconciliation, and merited eternal life for us by the same" (p. 446). *Secondly*, he solves the objection in this way: "I reply: first, we do assert that the priest OFFERS THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST for the redemption of our souls, for the hope of salvation and safe keeping, and, finally, that it may be propitious both for the offerer and for those on whose behalf it is offered. But we deny that he ATTEMPTS (*intentet*) HERE AND NOW TO MAKE THEM [the Body and Blood] THAT SACRIFICE [that is, the Victim of the sacrifice];¹ nor can it be proved by any true testimony that the priest has any such intention. For this is neither the intention of the Church nor of her sacrificing minister. For wherever the Body and Blood of Christ is, we know that there, too, is the sacrifice [that is, the Victim] of the same, SO THAT THERE IS NO NECESSITY FOR THAT TO BEGIN ONLY NOW TO BE, WHICH BEFORE NOW EXISTS ALWAYS AND EVERYWHERE EITHER IN ITS OWN PROPER FORM, OR IN AN ALIEN FORM. This is confirmed not only by the testimony of St. John (*I John, II, 1-2*): *We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just. And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only but for those of the whole world*, but most of all by the oath of the Father in *Psalms CIX*. For there the Father decrees that the very same One whom He wishes to sit at His right hand until He make His enemies His footstool is His Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, not for a time, but forever. IF THEN THE PRIEST IS ETERNAL, THE SACRIFICE MUST BE ALSO ETERNAL,

¹ He means: we deny that it is the intention of the priest to give to the Body and Blood of our Lord the condition of victim, as if the Body and Blood of our Lord were here and now at Mass made a victim, whereas they were not a victim before. We deny, therefore, that in the Mass Christ passes from the state of non-victim into that of victim.

not in effect only, but in FUNCTION also, although in a different manner in heaven and on earth: in heaven in His own proper form, here on earth on the altar, in an alien form, through a secret operation. In the words of the Apostle . . . the same Christ who suffered without the gate now sits (*assistat*) as the Pontiff of the good things to come . . . [who] by His own blood entered once into the holies, not made with hands, but into heaven itself, that He may now appear before the face of God for us. And why would He appear were it not TO OFFER THE SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY FOR SIN, which St. Paul describes as the office of every pontiff? And so JUST AS CHRIST IN HEAVEN does not offer A NEW propitiatory sacrifice of reconciliation, but AS ETERNAL PRIEST DAILY PRESENTS IN THE SIGHT OF HIS FATHER THAT WHICH ONCE LONG AGO WAS MADE SUCH A SACRIFICE: so, too, in this Church militant of ours (*hac*) HE DOES NOT BY THE MINISTRY OF THE PRIEST MAKE HIMSELF TO BE A NEW SACRIFICE (*novum se facit sacrificium*), but WHAT HE ONCE MADE SUCH, THAT HE EVER OFFERS; so that He is Himself the sacrifice and the sacrificer forever, one and the same everywhere, the one mediator between God and man, the Man, Christ Jesus. AND IT IS TRUE AND CONSISTENTLY TRUE FOREVER (*ac perpetuo sibi constet*) THAT BY THE ONE OFFERING He found eternal redemption. The sacrificing priest (*sacrificans*) then does not make a new sacrifice of propitiation or reconciliation from the Body and Blood of the Lord, but, as minister of the eternal Priest (as we said in the preceding article from Chrysostom), offers that eternal sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ (which works eternal redemption) to the God of all, for the redemption of all believers" (pp. 445–447; cf. pp. 466–467). Here, I think, everyone will admit that our Cologne theologian gives us a most apt and effective vindication and exposition of the Catholic teaching.

At Louvain, in the name and with the authority of the whole University, Ruardus Tapper, "hostile to every kind of innovation" (Hurter, *Nomenclator* 2, 1451), reasserted against the Protestants that "just as Christ in the Church triumphant offers Himself unceasingly for us to God the Father, so, too, we continually offer the same Christ" (*Declaratio articulorum a veneranda Facultate Theol. Lov. adv. nostri temporis Haereses*, etc., Lyons, 1554, p. 266): that is the same Christ who is the celestial oblation.

Coming down to a later period, Francis Babin,¹ Dean of the Theological Faculty at Angers, an eminent theologian, in a work entitled *Conférences Ecclésiastiques du Diocèse d'Angers sur le Sacrement de l'Eucharistie et le Sacrifice de la Messe, tenues en l'année, 1716, rédigées par M. Babin, doyen de la Faculté de Théologie d'Angers* (ed. Angers, 1755, p. 239), expresses the faith of the Church as follows: "In the Catholic Church we believe that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same in substance as the sacrifice of the Cross; we admit only ONE SOLE OBLATION, ONE UNIQUE SACRIFICE, BY WHICH THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD WAS IMMOLATED AND DIED ONCE FOR US, AND WHICH HE OFFERS AT THE PRESENT MOMENT (*actuellement*) IN HEAVEN, WHILE ON EARTH WE CONTINUE TO OFFER IT BY THE MINISTRY OF PRIESTS."

The teaching of the Church in France was also declared to his people by L. A. Joly de Choin, Bishop of Toulon, to whom we have already referred, in the following words: "He also offers Himself [in the Mass] as at the Resurrection, since there [in the Mass], too, He offers His Body immortal and glorious; He offers Himself as at the Ascension, since He again ascends from the altar on earth to *the sublime altar* in heaven, in the words of the Canon, in order to go and live there and make intercession for us, THUS ALWAYS OFFERING ONE SAME VICTIM. . . . Thus the sacrifice of the Mass is a holocaust where Jesus Christ offers Himself wholly to God His Father, as he offered Himself on the Cross, and AS HE OFFERS HIMSELF IN HEAVEN" (*Instructions sur le Rituel. Du Sacrifice de la Messe*, ed. Besançon, 1827, pp. 226–227).

The Liturgies abound with attestations of this kind: "For this is THE LAMB OF GOD, Thy only-begotten Son, who taketh away the sins of the world; who never ceases OFFERING HIMSELF FOR US, and protects us by His perpetual intercession IN THY PRESENCE: BECAUSE He never dies, though immolated [that is, in the mystery], but always lives though slain [that is, in the Passion]." (Attestation in the third paschal Mass in the *Missale*

¹ "First and chief editor of a much esteemed and widely read course of theology, entitled *Conférences Ecclésiastiques du Diocèse d'Angers*. In the eighteen volumes which came from his pen we see admirably displayed the varied signs of a special talent for teaching, profound and exact knowledge, etc. These different qualities, the fruit of a long and brilliant period of teaching, attracted to the new publication the attention of the French clergy, who, on the death of the author, requested its continuation. . . . The whole work offers the advantages of a *Summa Theologica* of real worth" (D. T. C., 2, 4, s.v. *Babin*).

Bobienſe, or the *Gallican Sacramentary* of Mabillon, according to the pseudo-Muratorian edition. P. L. 72, 511).¹

More concisely in the Mozarabic Mass of the Nativity of our Lord: “And the Victim immolated [in the Passion] lives, and living is continually immolated [in the sacrament]” (*Oratio post-nomina*. P. L. 85, 187).

So we see that the sacrificial intercession of Christ is one and the same, of old in the Passion, eternal in heaven, daily in the Mass. The Victim of the Passion lives in heaven appeasing the Father; and, while He is sacramentally immolated by us, the sacrifice of the Mass is offered.

(B) OUR SACRIFICE IS ENACTED ON CHRIST, THE HEAVENLY ALTAR

(i) *Testimony of the Theologians.*

We have already seen that Christ is the celestial Altar of His own eternal sacrifice. That He is also the Altar of our sacrifice was indicated, when occasion arose, by Ignatius (XIII (Vol. I) and XVIII), Irenaeus (XIII), Cyril of Alexandria (XIV Vol. I), Hesychius, Andrew of Caesarea, the author of the *Glossa ordinaria*, Lanfranc, Bruno the Carthusian, Thomas of Vercellae, Peter Lombard, Innocent III, Peter of Tarantasia, etc.² Meantime, from the Greeks, we must add to these³ the Ps. Dionysius, who says that Christ is a permanent Altar, whereon the things that are sanctified by the consecration are placed: “Jesus is our most divine Altar . . . let us look with supra-mundane eyes on that most divine Altar on which those things whose consecration is made are consecrated and sanctified” (*De Ecclesiastic. Hierarch.*, c. 4, 12. P. G. parag. 3, 484–485). Compare the paraphrase of Pachymera, cols. 497–500.

Among the Syrians, Dionysius Bar Salibi in his *Expositio Liturgiae* (C. S. C. O., t. 93, translated by Labourt, p. 99) sums up the Eucharistic teaching as follows: “The Body is not

¹We find the same, word for word, in the *Vetus Missale Gallicanum* (29) published by Mabillon, *De liturgia Gallicana*, 1, 3. P. L. 72, 374.

²Quoted in Theses XIII (Vol. I) and XVII especially.

³We might also mention that St. Jerome (*In Oseam*, 8, 11. P. L. 25, 888) treats the trilogy of the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, IV, 5: *One Lord, one faith, one baptism*, as equivalent to this other: “The Apostle teaches that there is one altar, one faith, one baptism.” Here he plainly substitutes *altar* for *Lord*.

consecrated (*perficitur*) without the Altar, neither is the Body consecrated without the priest. Emmanuel is all these things: Altar, and Body or Victim, and what is offered (*oblatio*), and Priest, and offerer." Hence the consecration gives us, with the Victim and the Priest, the Altar also of our sacrifice—Christ.

We have St. Paschasius Radbertus from the Latin Fathers, commenting on the verse of Jeremias (*Thren.*, II, 7), *The Lord hath cast off his altar*: "The allegorical meaning seems unsuitable here, for it would mean that the Lord hath cast off His altar from the Church, in which we believe CHRIST TO BE THE ALTAR, the Victim, and the sacrifice, the Pontiff and the Priest. FOR IT WOULD NOT BE RIGHT TO SAY THAT THERE WAS TO BE AN ALTAR OF THE CHURCH OTHER THAN THIS ONE ALTAR, ON WHICH THE VOWS AND SACRIFICES OF ALL THE FAITHFUL ARE OFFERED" (*Expositiones in Lamentationes Jeremiae*, 1, 2. P. L. 120, 1118).

After Paschasius (and Ratherius, Serm. 3, n. 5. P. L. 136, 718), Honorius of Autun may well be quoted, where, commenting on the words of the Canon, he says: "The sublime altar of God in the sight of God is Christ, UPON THIS ALTAR THE CHURCH IMMOLATES SPIRITUAL VICTIMS, and on this altar God receives the vows of the faithful and the sacrifice of justice" (*Gemmae animae*, 1, 1, c. 106. P. L. 172, 579).

Again in the *Speculum Ecclesiae* (*In Coena Domini*. P. L. 172, 928) he says: "Tomorrow the altar is stripped . . . BECAUSE CHRIST, THE TRUE ALTAR ON WHOM THE VOWS OF THE FAITHFUL ARE SANCTIFIED TO GOD THE FATHER, was stripped of His garments on that day by the impious Jews beside the Cross."¹

Similarly Sicard of Cremona: "*Command these gifts to be brought by the hands of the holy angel to thy sublime Altar. This*

¹ Even those whose knowledge of liturgical usage is only slight are aware that here the word *vows* (*vota*) means sacrifices offered to God at the request of the faithful. Hence the words of the Canon: ". . . who pay their vows to thee, the living and true God." Hence, too, the very name and rite of *votive* Masses. Suffice the following specimen from the *Missale Bobiense*: "O Lord, to whom Abel offered gifts, to whom Abraham decreed to offer a holocaust, TO WHOM JACOB VOWED A SACRIFICE (*votum vovit*) AND OFFERED IT, have mercy on thy servant N., who in honour of Saints N.N. OFFERS THE GIFTS OF SACRIFICES (*votorum*) with the intercession of the prayers of thy saints. . . . For thou, O Lord, who willest that none should be lost to Thee, but to all givest great things for small, dost give life for death, glory for punishment, dost render eternal rewards for the SERVICE OF SACRIFICES (*votorum*) through Christ our Lord" (*Contestatio missae votivae tertiae*. P. L. 72, 542-543. See also three other *Missae votivae singulares* in the same place; cf. also the *Missa votiva singularis mozarabica*, with the one which follows *pro itinerantibus*. P. L. 85, 991-997).

is the Angel of the great Council, the Counsellor at whose counsel the Father created and re-created (*recreavit*) the world. The SUBLIME ALTAR of God in the sight of God is CHRIST CRUCIFIED, SEATED AT THE RIGHT HAND OF THE FATHER” (*Mitræle*, 1, 3, c. 6. P. L. 213, 132).

Between these two liturgists we have Radulphus of Tongres (*In Leviticum*, 1, 1, c. 1, Cologne, 1636, p. 2), a noted Scripture exponent, who writes: “Christ the Lord is our TRUE ALTAR, BECAUSE WE PLACE OUR OFFERINGS ON HIM.”

Similarly Gerhoh of Reichersberg on verse 4, *Psalms* LXXXIII: *Thy altars, O Lord of hosts*: “The altars of God are the human Flesh and the rational Soul of Christ upon which the sacrifices of the faithful are daily offered” (P. L. 194, 514).

Moreover, this teaching has the support of ecclesiastical authority, where the *Pontificale Romanum* warns those who are being ordained to the subdiaconate: “The altar of Holy Church is Christ Himself . . . ON WHOM (*in quo*) and by whom THE OFFERINGS OF THE FAITHFUL ARE CONSECRATED to God the Father. . . .”

The bishop explains what these offerings are: “The offerings which come upon the altar are called the loaves of proposition [the bread offered].”¹

This teaching, deeply rooted in the tradition of the Church, is a further proof that in our sacrifice we hold in our hands no other victim than the heavenly Victim which is eternally offered to God for us in heaven, by Christ once slain on earth. Because, as we have seen, it is the same thing for Christ to be Victim and to be Altar, just as for Him it is the same thing to act as Priest and to fulfil the function of Victim or Altar; in Him, Priest, Victim, and Altar are inseparable. Since then we use no other altar but that of the heavenly sacrifice, we offer no Victim but that of the heavenly sacrifice.

¹ The belief that Christ was our Altar was so well known and commonplace even as late as the sixteenth century that there were men of letters who applied it by way of doxology, as did Henricus Stephanus. We have, for example, “*Bernonis Abbatus Libellus de officio missæ quem edidit Romæ, editus denuo per Jacobum Fabrum apud Henricum Stephanum Parisiis*,” 1518. And at the end of the book we read—here translating the Latin: “From the printing house of Henricus Stephanus in the year of Christ our SAVIOUR WHO IS OUR ALTAR, VICTIM AND SACRIFICE, MOST BLESSED (*superbenedictus*) FOR EVER AND EVER, Amen.”

(ii) *Testimony of the Liturgies.*

From all we have said, little doubt should remain as to the meaning of the prayer *Supplices te rogamus*, said in the Mass after the narration of the institution of the Eucharist (which includes the consecration) and the commemoration of the Death, the Resurrection and the Ascension of our Saviour. We ask God in this prayer that the gifts which have been offered be taken to the sublime Altar of God: "We humbly beseech thee, O almighty God, command these gifts to be carried by thy holy Angel to thine Altar on high in the presence of thy divine majesty." For only the one true Victim, who is Christ, can lie upon the sublime (celestial) Altar of God, which is Christ; and again this true Victim must always lie on the Altar of God on high; for it is one and the same thing to be on that Altar and to be that Victim. When, therefore, we are praying for the heavenly gifts to be transferred onto the heavenly Altar, we are actually praying that they may be changed into the heavenly Victim of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Hence it seems beyond doubt that we have here a Roman epiclesis, corresponding in position and in meaning, though not in form, to the epicleses of the Eastern liturgies.¹

We would be quite justified in inferring this conclusion from our previous argument; but it is useful to give documentary evidence for it, which evidence will again in turn confirm the teaching of theology regarding our heavenly Altar and Victim.

Our argument will be twofold: firstly, from a comparison with other Liturgies; and, secondly, from the authority of ancient exponents of the Liturgy.

Our comparison with other Liturgies can be made in two ways: firstly, by comparison with petitions made previous to the consecration; and, secondly, by a comparison with a similar prayer after the consecration.

¹ Among recent authorities who see in this prayer an epiclesis are L. A. Hoppe, *Die Epiclesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen und der römische Consekrationsskanon*, 1864, p. 121 *et seq.*, where most of the authorities to be quoted below are to be found; Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, 3, pp. 181–182; Cabrol, D. A. C., art. *Anamnèse*, col. 1885; "In spite of all opinions to the contrary, this *Supplices te* represents the ancient Roman epiclesis" (although later, unfortunately, in t. 2, col. 1893, the eminent liturgist had changed his opinion); Salaville, D. T. C., art. *Épiclèse*, cols. 219–220.

In the first place, our prayer can be compared with formulae of the same trend which are found in the Eastern liturgies before the Supper narrative, either at the beginning of the anaphora (Greek Liturgy of *St. Mark*, B. 129), or before the anaphora at the Offertory (Greek Liturgy of *St. Basil*, B. 319; cf. the present-day Liturgy of *St. Basil*, B. 401), or before the Offertory at the Great Entrance (Greek Liturgy of *St. James*, B. 41); or even before the Entrance, in the preamble of the Mass at the prothesis (*Liturgia Armenorum*, B. 419; ancient Liturgy of *St. Basil*, B. 309; cf. present-day Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, B. 360). Now in these places it is scarcely possible for a prayer said over the simple bread and wine to mean anything else than a petition for the change by God of the gifts which are proffered into the Victim of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Here is the formula in the Liturgy of *St. James* (identical with the prayer in the Armenian Liturgy, and with the prayer said in the Liturgy of *St. Basil* at the prothesis): "O God, our God . . . do thou thyself bless this oblation set before thee, and take it UNTO THY SUPERCELESTIAL ALTAR."¹

The offertory in the Mass of *St. Basil* runs as follows: "May we be made worthy to offer to Thee this rational and bloodless Victim, for our own sins and for the misdeeds of the people; and when Thou hast taken it UNTO THY HOLY, SUPERCELESTIAL AND INTELLIGIBLE ALTAR in the odour of sweetness, do Thou send to us in turn the grace of thy Holy Spirit." And here, finally, is the text of the Liturgy of *St. Mark*: "O God, take (*suscipe*) what we offer (*offertorium*), our Victims, oblations, sacrifices, TO THY HOLY AND SUPERCELESTIAL AND INTELLIGIBLE ALTAR, to the topmost heavens, through the ministry of the archangels (*per archangelicam liturgiam*)."

The meaning of these prayers, clear enough in itself, considering the circumstances and the subject matter, will become still clearer if we compare the prayer at the prothesis cited above from the ancient Liturgy of *St. Basil* with the corresponding prayer at

¹ The prayer within the offertory in the Greek Liturgy of *St. James* is: "Grant us, O Lord, to offer thee, in fear and with a pure conscience, this spiritual and bloodless Victim, and when it is taken unto thy HOLY, SUPERCELESTIAL AND INTELLIGIBLE ALTAR, in the odour of sweetness, do thou in turn send upon us the grace of the Holy Spirit" (B. 47).

the prothesis in the parallel ancient Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, which is: "O Lord, our God . . . look on this bread and this chalice, and make them thy immaculate Body and thy precious Blood" (B. 309).¹

But the sense is made most clear and evident, if we compare with these prayers the word which, in the Greek Liturgy of *St. James*, the deacon addresses in a clear voice to the people while the priest meanwhile prays to God, after the narration of the institution and the epiclesis. The deacon says: "Over the gifts which have been offered and sanctified, precious, supercelestial, ineffable, spotless, glorious, revered, awe-inspiring, let us pray to God our Lord for divine gifts; that our Lord God, who has TAKEN (*suscepit*) THEM to His holy, supercelestial, intelligible and spiritual ALTAR, in the odour of sweetness, may in turn pour out His divine grace and the gift of the Holy Spirit" (B. 58-59). Meanwhile the priest is praying in these words: "O God, Father of our Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . THOU HAST TAKEN TO THYSELF (*suscepisti*) the gifts, presents and sacrifices, and hast deigned to sanctify and CONSECRATE them BY THE DESCENT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: sanctify also, O Lord, our souls and bodies and minds" (*ibid*).

A study of these parallel utterances shows very clearly that when the deacon asserts that the gifts have been taken up unto the altar he understands by this the change, or the sanctification and consecration which meanwhile the priest says has been accomplished by the descent of the Holy Spirit. Hence what is now declared as accomplished is that very thing for which a petition was being made when this taking up unto the altar was being prayed for. Now if transubstantiation was prayed for in this petition, the natural inference is that in our prayer *Supplices te rogamus*, which is similar in form, we pray also for the transubstantiation.

There are some, however, who, in spite of what we have already advanced, find a difficulty in the fact that our prayer is said after the recitation of the words of institution by which the consecration is effected. So they seek for a different explanation of it. This,

¹ In the present Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom* (B. 360) the Basilian prayer has taken the place of the above invocation: by which interchange the equivalence of the formulæ is shown once more,

however, is quite unnecessary, as we shall see from the second comparison we shall now make, with similar prayers said *after* the consecration.

Secondly, therefore, let us compare our prayer with a practically identical petition found in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and here, be it noted, after the consecration: "Again the deacon will say in a clear voice for all to hear (*praedicet*): Again and again let us pray (*adoremus*) to God through His Christ, for the gift which has been offered to the Lord our God; let us pray that God, who is good, may, through the mediation of His Christ, receive it on to HIS HEAVENLY ALTAR, in the odour of sweetness." Now we know with certainty that the deacon is here telling the faithful to pray to God to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. For at this place the Liturgy of the *Constitutions* proceeds in the following manner: after the words of the institution have been recited, and the *anamnesis* said, the bishop makes several petitions to God, in this order: (1) that God, looking down on the proposed gifts, would send the Holy Spirit to change them into the Body and Blood of Christ: "We beseech thee, to look down in mercy on these gifts placed in thy sight, that thou who dost not need anything may take pleasure in them in honour of thy Christ, and may send the Holy Spirit on this sacrifice, witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, to make this bread the Body of thy Christ, and this chalice the Blood of thy Christ" (F. D. 1, 510; B. 21)—this is an epiclesis; (2) that it may be beneficial to the Church; (3) that it may be beneficial to the whole episcopacy; (4) that it may be beneficial to himself and to all the clergy; (5) that it may be beneficial to the king and to those in high places; and (6) that it may be beneficial to all the saints and martyrs, etc.

The series of prayers enjoined by the deacon on the people, and the prayers offered to God by the bishop, are evidently concordant. Now the first injunction of the deacon to the faithful was that related above: prayers were to be offered that the proposed gifts which have been offered may be transferred to the Altar of God. Hence this petition, the first to be made by the people, corresponded to the first petition of the bishop in which transmutation was prayed for, or to the epiclesis. Hence we

must conclude that what the priest is praying for, that the Holy Spirit may descend to effect the transmutation, is the same as what the people are asking for, that the gifts may be taken up to the celestial Altar by transmutation.¹ We have here two kinds of epiclesis: one directed to praying for the descent of the Holy Spirit, the other for the taking up of the *oblata*;² the two prayers exhibit simply two aspects of the one same divine operation which gives us Christ under the sacramental teguments as Victim and as Altar: as Victim, in so far as Christ, Victim of the Passion, is the resultant of the change of the gifts offered by us; as Altar, for the Altar of God, which is Christ, receives the offering which has been placed thereon.³

But the Greek theologian Nicholas Cabasilas had already in the fourteenth century directed attention to the real identity between our Roman epiclesis and the epicleses of the East:⁴ "The Latins do not petition for the sanctification and the change into the Body and Blood of the Lord, but they use other words with the same bearing, words which have exactly the same

¹ This dual epiclesis—one by the priest, the other by the people—would be meaningless if, as the Schismatics say, the epiclesis supervening on the Supper narrative had the power of consecration (as if then and there, by the epiclesis, the virtue of the words of the Lord was applied to the *oblata*, and so the Consecration was not effected until the epiclesis was said): for the priest consecrates, not the people. The difficulty vanishes, however, if, as Catholics know well, the virtue of the epiclesis, and the reason for its existence, is to petition for things which are known to have been already effected: because the Church sees fit throughout the succeeding parts of the Mass to dwell on and to develop various phases and aspects of the one indivisible Great Action which has taken place at the very moment of the utterance of the words used by our Lord, as will be explained later, Th. XXXIV. There is no reason whatever why the priest may not say or the people may not say, or be instructed to say, any prayer of this kind which is by no means consecrative; cf. J. Sarug., *op. cit.*, p. 452.

² *A propos* Duchesne, *loc. cit.*: "It is not really the Holy Spirit who comes down on the offering, but the offering which is borne up to heaven by the angel of God. But in the one case, as in the other, it is after its conjunction, its communication with the divine power, that we speak of the oblation as the Body and Blood of Christ."

³ Perhaps Irenaeus indicates such a twofold liturgical use when in one and the same chapter of his work he speaks of the direction of the *oblata* to the celestial Altar (*Adv. Haeres.*, 1, 4, c. 18, parag. 6. P. G. 7, 1029), and of the invocation (*ibid.*, parag. 5, where the common reading *ἐκκλησιῶν* should more probably be *ἐπικλήσιων*; cf. 1, 1, c. 13, parag. 2, col. 580: *τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως*; see F. D. 2, 175, not. 15) of God on to the *oblata*.

⁴ The holy and learned Cardinal Orsi passes the following judgment on his argument: "I willingly admit that the sense conveyed by our prayer (*Jube haec perferri*) and by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, which is usual with the Greeks, is the same, and Cabasilas has proved this by arguments which cannot be lightly set aside all through that chapter" (*De invocatione Spiritus Sancti in liturgiis Graec. et Or.*, Milan, 1731, t. 1, p. 122).

meaning. What prayer have I in mind? Command these gifts to be borne by the hands of the Angel to thy supercelestial Altar . . . The Saviour Himself alone comprises everything that has the power of intercession and all that sanctifies. What, then, are those things which have the power of intercession and which give sanctification? The Priest, the Victim, the Altar. For the altar sanctifies, as the Lord tells us: *For it is the altar that sanctifies the gift*. Hence, since it is He alone who sanctifies, He alone must be Priest, and Victim and Altar. . . . The [Latin] priest prays that the gifts be taken up to this supercelestial Altar, that is be sanctified, be changed into the very supercelestial body of Christ. . . . For since it is the altar that sanctifies the gifts placed upon it, it is the same to pray that the gifts be sanctified, as to pray that they may be placed upon the altar. (For what is the sanctification with which the altar sanctifies the superimposed gifts? It is that with which the Priest Himself sanctified Himself: namely in that He has been offered to God and sanctified.) For since the Priest and the Altar and the Victim is the same, it is the same to be sacrificed by the Priest, to be changed into that Victim, and to be placed and dedicated upon that supercelestial Altar. For this reason when you have prayed for any one of these three separately, you have prayed for all of them" (*Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 30. P. G. 150, 433–437). Compare Cabasilas' explanation of the prayer said by the Greeks at the offering of the gifts before the consecration (*op. cit.*, c. 25, col. 421). The fact that Cabasilas erred in thinking that the consecration did not take place until, after the utterance of our Lord's words, the epiclesis was made, does not affect in any way the truth of the comparison which he made between the Greek epiclesis and the Latin prayer; it remains most true as a principle of Christian and evangelical theology, that the bearing of our gifts to the altar of God means the same thing as their sanctification or consecration because the sacrifice derives its sanctity from the altar.

But long before the time of Cabasilas, St. Paschasius of the Latin Fathers had given an exposition of the words of the Canon in this same sense: "The Flesh of Christ is never rightly received, except from His hand and from the sublime altar where Christ, the Pontiff of future goods, stands for us all. Hence when the

priest begins to immolate these things, along with other words he says: *Command these gifts to be borne by the hands of thy holy angel unto thy sublime altar, in the sight of thy divine majesty.* And do you think, O man, to receive it otherwise than from THE ALTAR WHERE, TRANSLATED ON HIGH, IT IS CONSECRATED ?” (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Christi*, c. 8, n. 1. P. L. 120, 1286). Paschasius teaches, therefore, that the consecration is given to us in that translation to the sublime Altar. He says again: “Do you think that THERE IS ANY OTHER ALTAR where Christ the Pontiff stands, THAN HIS BODY by which and ON WHICH HE OFFERS to God the Father the sacrifices of the faithful and the faith of believers? And if you truly believe THAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IS THAT HEAVENLY ALTAR, then you will hold that you receive the Flesh and Blood not OTHERWISE than from the Body of Christ Himself” (*ibid.*, n. 2, cols. 1286–1287). Further on we read: “By the Hebrew altar, set within the holy of holies, is signified that intelligible altar, where the prayers of all and the sacrifices of each are offered by the High Priest, Christ the Lord. . . . The votive gifts of the sacraments ARE OFFERED FOR US ON THAT ALTAR. . . . And we pray that these things may be gloriously carried thither to God the Father by the hands of the angel” (*ibid.*, n. 6, col. 1290). Our Eucharist, therefore, is offered on that celestial Altar. Even more fully: “In this mystery it is believed that BY THE SAME POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT THROUGH THE WORD OF CHRIST HIS OWN FLESH AND BLOOD IS MADE PRESENT (*efficitur*) by an invisible action. HENCE THE PRIEST ALSO SAYS: *Command that these gifts be borne by the hands of thy holy angel unto thy sublime altar, in the sight of thy divine majesty.* Why pray that these things be borne thither, unless it means THAT THIS IS DONE IN THE EXERCISE OF HIS PRIESTHOOD . . . (*in eius sacerdotio*) . . .” That which is properly His is not rightly taken to Himself by any other than by Him, the High Priest Himself (*ibid.*, c. 12, n. 1. cols. 1310–1311).¹

¹ The unknown author of the compilation attributed to the venerable Hildebert of Tours makes the words of Paschasius his own. In his comment on these words of the Canon, he says: “The Body of Christ is not made [to be in the sacrament]—*efficitur*—by the merit of the consecrating priest, but by the word of the Creator, and by the power of the Holy Spirit. For just as it is God who baptises, so it is God Himself who MAKES this bread HIS OWN FLESH, and MAKES this wine HIS OWN BLOOD. For WHY does the priest pray for those things to be carried into the sight of the divine majesty, IF HE DOES NOT MEAN THAT THESE THINGS ARE DONE IN THE EXERCISE OF THAT PRIESTHOOD ?” (*De Expositione Missae*, P. L. 171, 1168). He teaches quite as clearly

So true is it that the Body of Christ is the proper Altar of Christ, that our sacrifice cannot be effected on that Altar by any other than Christ the Priest. And so Paschasius proves that the consecration is effected by Christ, from this very petition for the taking of the gifts on to the celestial Altar. Finally: "THE POURING BACK OF OUR GIFT ON THE ALTAR, which occurs when we say: *Command that these things be borne*, so occurs in order that the Blood of Christ MAY BE RECEIVED THENCE BY US AS THE PRICE OF OUR REDEMPTION for the forgiveness of our daily sins" (*ibid.*, c. 21, n. 2, col. 1334).¹ By the consecration the Blood, the price of our redemption, is as it were poured back on to the Body of Christ, the celestial Altar, that it may be received thence by us. In these documents Paschasius gives his full teaching regarding our sacrifice of the Mass: BY THE CONSECRATION THERE IS PRESENT TO US THE CELESTIAL ALTAR OF THE DIVINE SACRIFICE THE BODY OF CHRIST, ON WHICH WE ARE PERMITTED TO OFFER, UNDER CHRIST TO THE PRIEST, THE EVER PERSISTENT VICTIM OF OUR REDEMPTION, THE BLOOD OF THE PASSION.

Gezo is in perfect harmony with Paschasius where he applies the words of St. Gregory the Great, to be found in 1, 4 *Dialog.*, c. 58, to the present matter in his *Liber de corpore et sanguine Christi*, c. 70. P. L. 137, 406:² "For we most truly and firmly

as do those to be cited later by us that a prayer for transubstantiation is implied by these words.

It might be noted, however, that, like Paschasius, he sees an equivalence between the action of the Holy Spirit and the bearing of the sacrifice to the altar of God. He thus confirms our remarks above on the equivalence of the ascensional and descensional epiclesis, i.e. the prayer for the taking up of the gift to the altar, and that for the descent upon it of the Holy Spirit. We also find something similar to those words of Paschasius in the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the *Decretum de consecr.*, 2, 72, Rome, 1584, t. 2, p. 1814, cited there under the name of Augustine. Later we shall quote another passage from the same *Glossa*. Meantime compare the following prayer in the *Liber Ordinum* (ed. Férotin, col. 269): "May He who commanded us to offer [that is, Christ] CARRY THE SACRIFICE TO THEE."

¹ We may mention here a truly extraordinary teaching of an uncertain author, a teaching never heard of before. This writer holds against Paschasius some kind of duality between the historical and the Eucharistic Body of Christ. He thinks that the Eucharistic Body is consecrated at the words of our Lord *This is my body*, and later "at the petition of the priest" transferred "into the Body of the Lord born of the Virgin": joined to and made one with it by the divinity of the Word: whence it comes to us again from the hand of Christ! (Read the *Epistola ad Egilem Prumiensem*, wrongly ascribed to Rabanus Maurus, n. 3, 4; 7. P. L. 112, 1513-1514, 1517, 1518). We shall see more of this in Thesis L. (Vol. III). Meantime, compare this strange view with that other of Odo of Cambrai, to be cited directly.

² The words of St. Gregory, most familiar to everyone in the Middle Ages, are: "For can any one of the faithful doubt that in the very moment of the immolation,

believe that in the very moment of the immolation, at the prayer of the priest, the heavens are opened, and by the ministry of angels, that sacrifice IS CARRIED TO THE SUBLIME ALTAR, WHICH IS CHRIST HIMSELF, WHO IS BOTH PRIEST AND VICTIM, and by contact with it (*contactu illius*) are made one with Him." We find the same word for word almost in the work *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (P. L. 139, 187) of Heriger.

Hugo of Langres quotes Paschasius Radbertus in the same sense: "We walk by faith and not by sight. In no other way do we come to the ALTAR which is BOTH PRIEST AND SACRIFICE. FOR ALL THESE ARE IN CHRIST. For He is the sublime Altar of the Father, as has been written [by Paschasius]: Do you think there is another altar where Christ the Pontiff assists than His own Body, by which and on which the sacrifices of the faithful and the faith of believers are offered to God the Father?" (*Tractatus de corpore et sanguine christi contra Berengarium*. P. L. 142, 1322).

Guibert of Nogent says that apart from that celestial Altar, which is the Body of Christ, no victim can exist: "The oblations will be borne on to the sublime ALTAR of God by the hands of the angel, which is none other than THE BODY OF CHRIST APART FROM WHICH THERE IS NO VICTIM" (*Epistola de bucella Judae data et de veritate dominici corporis*, c. 3. P. L. 156, 531). If apart from the celestial altar there is no victim, it must follow that the consecration places our sacrifice on the celestial altar. Hence when we pray for the carrying of the oblation to the sublime altar, we pray for its consecration.

Alger finally, second only to Paschasius in Eucharistic matters, sums up all the heads of our teaching in a few sentences: Christ in heaven is not only Priest, but also He is Victim and Altar, and our gifts cannot be changed into the celestial Victim except in so far as they are placed on the celestial Altar: "The priest, when, taking the place of Christ, he consecrates the Body of the Lord at the earthly altar, attributes nothing to his own merits, but everything to divine power and grace, and prays to God the Father in the Canon, saying: Command these offerings made to thee to be

at the words of the priest, the heavens are opened, the choirs of angels assist at the mystery of Jesus Christ, earth is joined to heaven, infinity to nothingness, the visible and the invisible become one?" (*loc. cit.* P. L. 77, 428).

BORNE, by the hands and by the power of thy Son, thine Angel, who is the Angel of great Counsel, not on to this lowly and visible altar, which is here now, BUT ON TO THY SUBLIME ALTAR, THAT IS THY SON, whom thou hast raised aloft to thy right hand in the sight of thy divine majesty; THAT IT MAY BE MADE FOR US THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THY BELOVED SON: thus showing that the Son is offering IN HEAVEN at the command of the Father, and that He is THE VICTIM and THAT ON WHICH IT IS OFFERED, because we absolutely rely on our faith in Him and on His grace, and we believe that the earthly elements are changed into Christ, and that He, sitting at the right hand of His Father, makes intercession for us, and that He is consecrated and is in the sacrament of the altar” (*De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici*, 1, 1, c. 14. P. L. 180, 781).

Besides those theologians we may quote Remigius of Auxerre. For though he does not teach that the celestial altar is to be understood as the Body of Christ, he does say, nevertheless, that what we petition for in the prayer *Supplices te rogamus* is the consecration: “Hence, too, in that oblation something ineffable is done, so that by the angelic ministry IT IS OFFERED to the divine majesty AS FROM THE SUBLIME ALTAR, WHEN CHRIST, assisted by heavenly ministers, IS TO BE BELIEVED PRESENT TO CONSECRATE THE OBLATA” (*De celebratione missae et ejus significatione*. P. L. 101, 1263).¹

¹ Odo of Cambrai says something similar, but in language which is, to say the least, unguarded, where he speaks as of a union made between the Eucharistic Flesh and God: “In the same place that which was bread is made the Flesh of the Word: nevertheless IT IS TRANSFERRED FROM THE ALTAR to heaven, because IT IS TRANSFERRED FROM BREAD TO GOD. But seeing that God is everywhere, it is not by change of place that the FLESH made from bread IS JOINED TO GOD” (*Expositio in canonem missae*, dist. 3a, on the words of the Canon *Supplices te . . . divinae majestatis tuae*. P. L. 160, 1067).

Still another writer, author of the little work *De sacrificio missae*, attributed, I think wrongly, to Alger, introduces some kind of union between the bread and the Body of our Lord: “The priest meanwhile is suppliantly praying to the Lord, to command these gifts to be borne by the hands of the holy angel unto His sublime altar, that in this instant the sacrament may be manifest: that is, that the BREAD here IS UNITED TO THE BODY OF THE LORD, and joined to It by the communion of one substance” (*De sacrificio missae*. P. L. 180, 856).

Better, possibly, is the interpretation of Isaac de Stella, that in these words (of the *Supplices te*) a petition is made for a union between the Melchisedechian species and the Body of Christ: “He commemorates . . . the offering of Melchisedech the priest who showed forth [that is, typically foretold] the select species in bread and wine. . . . He prays that by the hands of the angel HIS SACRIFICE MAY BE BORNE THITHER [that is, “to that most high sublime altar in the sight of the divine majesty, where the eternal High Priest stands in the sight of the Father”]. AND BE UNITED TO THE BODY OF CHRIST IN HEAVEN” (*Epistola de officio missae*. P. L. 194, 1894–1895).

Gerhoh of Reichersberg (*Liber de Gloria et Honore Filii Hominis*, c. 14, n. 3. P. L. 194, 1122), Peter Lombard (*Sententiarum*, lib. 4, dist. 13. P. L. 192, 868), Magister Bandinus (*Sententiarum*, 1, 4, dist. 13. P. L. 192, 1097), Peter of Poitiers (*Sententiarum*, 1, 5, c. 13. P. L. 211, 1257), the anonymous author of the *Tractatus de Schismaticis* (*Libelli de lite*, t. 3, pp. 112–113), not only recognise here a prayer for the transubstantiation, but trace their interpretation back to St. Augustine, citing the following words from a pseudo-Augustinian discourse *De corpore Domini*: “For it is called the *Mass* [*Missa*—sending] because the heavenly messenger (*missus*) comes to consecrate the lifegiving Body according to the words of the priest who says: Omnipotent God, command these gifts to be borne by thy holy angel on to the sublime altar,” etc. (so writes Gerhoh, and the others speak similarly). The *Glossa ordinaria Decreti* also (*De consecr.*, 2, 72, Rome, 1584, tom. 2, p. 1813), independently without quoting any such spurious authority, points out that transubstantiation is asked for in that prayer: “*Command (jube)*, that is, bring it about, *that these things be borne (perferri)*, that is, be transubstantiated; or *be borne (perferri)*, that is, be borne on high, that is, be converted, changed (*converti*) into thy holy altar, exalted above the choirs of angels.”¹ This explanation did not escape the notice of Durandus of Mende, Summarist of the *Glossae*, though he (*Rationale*, 1, 4, c. 44), influenced by the authority of Innocent III (*De S. Alt. Myst.*, 5, 5. P. L. 217), gives preference to another meaning, which with Innocent he calls “simpler and safer”: namely, that in this prayer we make a petition that our prayers be carried to heaven. The older interpretation is merely permitted by Bernardus de Parantinis (about A.D. 1330), where he writes: “It can be expounded so: Omnipotent God, command these gifts, that is the bread and wine, to be translated, that is, to be changed into thy

¹ About the same time Helinandus, after having used the prayer *Jube haec perferri* to prove the multilocal presence of the Body of the Lord, in as much as by it the dwelling of Christ in heaven is and must be reconciled with our eating Christ on earth, goes on to say: “For these words are not to be interpreted merely, AS SOME HAVE WRONGLY UNDERSTOOD IT, as representing the devout aspirations of the faithful, but also to refer directly to the actual Flesh of Him who said: *Doth this scandalise you?*” (*Sermo* 3. P. L. 212, 509). These words “as some have wrongly understood it” are explained by the fact that at this time the tradition of the Fathers regarding our heavenly sacrifice was gradually beginning to be obscured, as will be seen directly.

sublime Altar, that is, into the Body and Blood of Christ thy Son, who is called an Altar” (*Lilium, sive Elucidarium difficultatum circa sacrificium missae*, incun., fol. 91D).

Later on the ancient doctrine was restated vigorously by Thomas of Walden when defending the Catholic faith against the heresy of Wycliffe (*Sacramentalia*, tit. 4, c. 39, fol. 94). For he first quotes from Bede (*De Tabernaculo*, 1, 3, c. 12. P. L. 91, 494) the words: “To what better than to this Altar [Christ] are suitably applied what we read: *It will be holy of holies to the Lord*; concerning whom when He was to be born into the world the archangel said to His Virgin Mother . . . The Holy One which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God?” and then goes on to say: “Christ therefore in His humanity *in persona humana (sic)*—is Altar. The Body of Christ is Victim. Christ Himself is eternal Priest. The temporal priest, therefore, appropriately transmits to Him by his ministering angel (*per ejus vernaculum angelum*) the Body and Blood of Christ on to His sublime Altar.”

Our apologists also relied on this interpretation later on in controversy with the Protestants. Joannes à Via, for instance, whom we have quoted above, thus defends this part of the Canon, which Smidelinus had branded as impious: “I ask our ancestors to tell me, what and where is the *altar*; they answer all with one voice, that Christ is the Altar on whom and through whom we offer the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips. NOR IS IT PERMITTED TO US TO CALL ANYTHING BUT THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST THIS ALTAR” (*Jugis Ecclesiae Catholicae Sacrificii . . . defensio*, etc., p. 349). He quotes only St. Bernard, but he had read and, I think, understood the Fathers and Doctors.¹

When the sixteenth century was ending and the seventeenth

¹ Meantime, Gerardus Lorchus Hadamarius (*De missa publica proroganda racemationum libri tres*, 1536, lib. 2, fol. M. 5–6), a writer of lesser note and prudence, still a well-read Catholic, makes two remarks on this subject. He first quotes the Glossator of the *Decretum* with approval, and continues then in his own name: “This prayer of the Canon is odious to the heretics, particularly for the reason that they do not believe in the transubstantiation. . . . But the Church which does believe in the transubstantiation . . . guards jealously this prayer also. . . . This prayer is almost the pivot of the whole sacrifice. . . . The sense of these words is so well known that only one who is a malevolent person, who through his perversity wishes to rage against Catholics, could take the slightest offence at it. . . . For in this prayer the Church in suppliant manner asks the Holy Trinity to deign to send the heavenly messenger on the victim to consecrate it.” Hence this prayer was assailed by Protestants and defended by Catholics as declarative of the transubstantiation.

beginning, James Gordon Huntley, S.J. (*Controversiarum christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos epitome, Controv.*, 9, Cologne, 1620, pp. 330–331), strongly insisted that between ourselves and God there must be no mediator, either as victim, or altar, or priest, other than Christ Himself. “Protestants object that after the consecration the priest prays to God, to command the Body and Blood of Christ to be borne by the hands of His holy Angel in the sight of His divine majesty. Let them remember here that THIS ANGEL is none other than Christ Himself, if they understand these words as referring to the very Body and Blood of Christ. For Christ is the most true Angel of the testament, whom we desire, according to the prophet Malachias. Moreover, what we have in this same prayer about the sublime ALTAR which is in the sight of the divine majesty, is taken from the Apocalypse of St. John. All this must be mystically understood OF CHRIST HIMSELF OUR MEDIATOR: for Christ Himself is the Priest who offers, the sacrifice which is offered, and the golden Altar on which the sacrifice is offered.”

Even towards the close of the seventeenth century there were those who followed the now less well-worn path of tradition. Thus Herissonius in his *Manuductio sacerdotis ad primum ejus ac praecipuum officium* (Lyons, 1691, p. 303) has these words: “You ask, in the third place, what is that *sublime altar* of which the rubric speaks here. I answer from Durandus first, that it is the BODY AND BLOOD of the Son of God exalted above the choirs of angels. Secondly, I answer from the holy Alger, that it is THE SON OF GOD, whom the Father raised to His right hand in the sight of His majesty: who is consequently said, and rightly so, to be the offerer, OR PRIEST, and VICTIM, and ALTAR upon which the sacrifice is offered.”

Later in the eighteenth century, Joly de Choin, already often quoted by us: “It can also be said that this angel . . . is Christ Himself . . . HE IS THE ALTAR, the sacrificer, the mediator and the Victim” (*op. cit.*, p. 324).¹

We have, therefore, the testimony of the Fathers and Doctors, and of the sacred Liturgy, considered in itself as well as in the

¹ Meantime, Dom Leonard de Massiot, O.S.B. (*Traité du sacerdoce et du sacrifice de Jésus-Christ*, Poitiers, 1708, p. 603), had revived the rather abstruse interpretation of Odo of Cambrai.

light of the interpretation of the earlier commentators: that the altar of our sacrifice is not earthly, not made with hand, but celestial and living, the glorified Body of Christ. Now if the Altar is celestial, must not the sacrifice placed upon it be celestial also? For the sacrifice is imbued with that sanctity which the Altar possesses. Hence we offer to God in sacrifice that Victim which of itself, apart from any ministry of ours, exists in heaven as the eternal sacrifice to God.

APPENDIX

The Antiquity and Integrity of the Prayer Supplices te rogamus.

When Dom F. Cabrol (D. A. C., 1, 1885) first attributed to the prayer *Supplices te rogamus* the character of an epiclesis, he wrote: "Notwithstanding all opinions to the contrary, the *Supplices te rogamus* represents the ancient Roman Epiclesis WHOSE FORM HAS BEEN SLIGHTLY MODIFIED TO AVOID ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION TO WHICH THE EPICLESIS HAS GIVEN RISE IN CERTAIN LITURGIES." We are in agreement with the first part of this statement, but do not admit the second part in which the eminent liturgist makes two claims: (1) that a change was introduced into the form of the epiclesis; and (2) that the purpose of the change was theological. We would rather say that the formula as we have it, that is, a formula such as this, is of the highest antiquity, for five reasons.

Firstly, it is plain that a Roman epiclesis, of the same tenor as *Supplices te*, was in use for many centuries before even the slightest signs appeared, either in the West or in the East, of a wrong opinion as to how the epicleses should be interpreted.

Secondly, we learn from the fifth book of Ps.-Ambrosius, *De Sacramentis* (c. 5 and 6. P. L. 16, 443-446), that already in the fourth century either the very same word formula, or at any rate one which was an exact equivalent, was customary and familiar to all.

Thirdly, the diction of the formula, where it keeps so closely to the primitive teaching regarding the sublime altar, reveals the great antiquity of the formula, so much so that one would rightly conclude that the formula should be referred back to sub-apostolic

times when the faithful, when reading the epistles of Ignatius or the Epistle to the Hebrews, would find no difficulty at all with such an expression, as strangers to the faith might do, but, as those of the household of the faith, would find nothing at all disturbing in it.

Fourthly, the phrase *by the hands of thy angel* suggests that the formula is very ancient. For by the use here of the word *angel* (cf. *Apocal.*, VIII, 4) the Church seems, while having in mind the ministry of the angels (Ambros., *Expos. Ev. sec. Luc.*, 1, 1, c. 28. P. L. 15, 1545; Ps-Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 1, 4, c. 26. n. 27. P. L. 16, 445; Gregory the Great, *Dialog.*, 1, 4, c. 58. P. L. 77, 428), and especially perhaps that of St. Michael Archangel (Greek Liturgy of *St. Mark*, B. 129; also cf. Dom Leclercq, D. A. C., art. *Alexandrie*, col. 1192), to have meant us to understand first and foremost the Word of God Himself,¹ the *angel of the testament* (*Mal.*, III, 1), that is, of the new and eternal testament, and the *angel of great counsel* of our Redemption (Septuagint, *Isaias*, IX, 6), for whom in the theophanies angels often stood; upon whom also the angels are said, in *John*, I, 51, to be ascending and descending, as Jacob also saw the angels ascending and descending on the ladder set over a stone, which *rising he set up for a title, pouring oil and wine on the top of it* (*Gen.*, XXVIII, 11–18), and so consecrated the first altar in type of Christ, cf. Th. XIII (Vol. I). Now it is in the Eucharistic mystery that we find the great and wondrous theophany of the New Testament: “to show forth this bread to be the Body of thy Christ, and this drink to be the Blood of thy Christ” *ὅπως ἀποφήγη τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου* (*Constit. Apost.*, 1, 8, c. 12. F. D. 1, 510): until at last the final and tremendous theophany of the Judge shall arrive, when He will come from the heavens *in the glory of his Father with his angels* (*Matth.*, XVI, 27; cf. *Mark*, VIII, 38), indeed *in his majesty, and that of his Father and of the holy angels* (*Luke*. IX. 26). It is most appropriate, then, that in the Eucharistic theophany of the present time we should find, together with our Priest, who by nature is messenger between God and man, the thronging of the angels

¹ That here under the name of *angel* Christ was really meant we shall see at length later in Th. XXXIV.

and, if I may say so, their go-and-come between heaven and earth. Moreover, if one weighs the matter impartially one will see that to envisage such a companionship of Christ and the angels was particularly easy and natural to the faithful in those earliest days of Christianity, when Justin could say as a matter of course: "We worship God the Father and the Son . . . and the army of other good angels (who follow Him and are assimilated to Him), and the prophetic Spirit" (*Apol.*, 1, 6. P. G. 6, 336).

Fifthly, if the translation (sanctification) is to be made by the hands, that is, by the operation of Christ Himself, it is clear enough that in this epiclesis we invoke the divine power not as of the Holy Spirit, but as of the Word. Now epicleses directed to the WORD petitioning for DESCENT upon the gifts to be changed are quite as ancient as epicleses directed to the Holy Spirit, cf. Th. XXXIV: and so, it would appear to me, that we may rightly presume great antiquity for those other epicleses of the divine Word where the petition is made that the Word should ASCEND to unite the gifts with the altar.

From every point of view, then, the supposition of Dom Cabrol seems to us quite improbable: that we have not in *Supplices te* the original form of the Roman epiclesis, but a modification of it made for a theological reason.

Nor does another hypothesis, that of Dom Probst (*Die abendländische Messe vom fünften bis zum achten Jahrhundert*, pp. 177-180), appeal to us. He maintains that there is no epiclesis at all in the present form of our prayer. He thinks that immediately after the words *in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae* and before the words *ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione* there was formerly some other expression invoking the descent of the Holy Spirit to effect the change of the gifts. We think rather that in our *Supplices te* we have the formula in its original integrity, and this for three reasons:

Firstly, what we have already said shows clearly that this opinion is based on a false supposition, namely: that there is no epiclesis in the present form of our prayer.

Secondly, the inconsistency, which he thinks that he has discovered¹ in the present form, does not exist. He seems to think

¹ In this, following Buchwald, Fortescue agrees with him, *The Mass*, 1914, p. 352.

that there in our prayer two mutually conflicting altars are mentioned, one celestial—*sublime altare tuum*, thy sublime altar; the other earthly—*hac altaris participatione*, by participation of this altar. This we do not admit. For in our prayer there is only one altar, the celestial Altar which is the Body of Christ. For what we really do pray for is: that, our offering having been placed upon the celestial Altar by the transubstantiation, we may now, having been made partakers of the same Altar by communion, obtain the grace of sanctification. Indeed at the very moment at which we have the celestial Victim present in the sacrament, in that same moment we have the celestial Altar present in the sacrament. Hence not only may we speak, as the *Roman Missal* does speak, of the *participation of the [celestial] altar*, but we may also speak of *the [celestial] altar of sanctification*, an expression which we find in the corresponding prayer in numerous manuscripts and old editions of the *Ambrosian Missal* (cf. Lejay, D. A. C. t. 1, 1408 and 1412–1413), and in the *Stowe Missal* (p. 13) and the *Missale Francorum* (P. L. 72, 340). Indeed, in the *post-pridie* prayer of the Mozarabic Mass for Monday after Easter (P. L. 85, 491), which occupies a parallel position to our *Supplices te*, we find the expression: “May the odour of sweetness ascend in the sight of thy divine majesty from THIS THY SUBLIME ALTAR.”¹ Both the words and the context of this prayer show clearly that the *sublime* Altar of God is here present on earth with us, and therefore that it is none other than the Body of Christ made present to us here and now by the consecration. When therefore we of the Roman rite pray that the offering be borne to the sublime altar of God, we must conclude that we pray for nothing else than that the bread be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the consecration; when we pray to obtain sanctification *from this sanctification of the altar*, we pray that sanctity may be bestowed on us from the same celestial Altar, through the sacred banquet.

Thirdly, the fact that in the above Mozarabic *post-pridie* prayer, immediately after the mention of the altar, a petition is made to the Holy Spirit to descend, does not prove by any means Dom

¹ “May the odour of sweetness ascend in the sight of thy divine majesty from this thy sublime Altar by the hands of thy angel; and may there descend on these solemnities thy Holy Spirit, to sanctify the offerings and the sacrifices of the faithful who assist, and of the faithful who offer.”

Probst's hypothesis. For in this *post-pridie* prayer the petition was not for the offering to be borne on to the altar, but for the odour of sweetness to ascend from the altar: hence we have not here an example of one single Latin prayer, asking both that the gifts be carried on to the altar, and that the Holy Spirit descend on the *oblata*. Hence no valid argument can be drawn from this prayer, that some words signifying descent of the divine power have been deleted from our *Supplices te rogamus*.

A reasonable supposition is that in the early Roman Mass, as in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* from which we have already quoted, there were two parallel epicleses, one (perhaps proclaimed by the deacon)¹ in which a petition was made for the taking up of the gifts to the altar, the other (in which there was a petition made by the bishop) for the descent of the Holy Spirit:² and that later on, when Mass began to be said without a deacon, in various places, either one or the other of these two epicleses alone remained; and sometimes perhaps there may have arisen a mixture or amalgam of the two.³

¹ We may note here the distinction drawn by St. Augustine (*Ep.* 55, c. 18, n. 34. P. L. 33, 221), between the prayer said by the bishop and the proclaiming by the deacon of the prayer to be said in common by the faithful.

² Some words of Gelasius suggest that at one time the invocation of the Holy Spirit was customary in Rome: "How will the Holy Spirit come WHEN INVOKED, when he who prays for His presence is a reprobate loaded with sin?" (*Elpidio Episcopo*. P. L. 59, 143). There is still clearer indication of this in the Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις of Hippolytus, even though it is not certain that it contains the authentic Liturgy of the Roman Church. Nor should I be surprised if at times the Roman epiclesis to the Holy Spirit had a form more or less resembling what we find in the *post-secret* prayer of the Mass in *Circumcisione Domini* in the *Missale Gothicum* (P. L. 72, 237; ed. Bannister, p. 18). It would be an appropriate explanation of the origin, as the conclusion of a prayer, of the words in our Roman Canon: *Per quem haec omnia, Domine, semper bona creas*, etc., now separated from the epiclesis (or *Supplices te*), and even coming after the *Nobis quoque*: "We suppliantly pray that thou wouldst deign to accept and bless and sanctify this sacrifice, that it may become for us a legitimate Eucharist, in thy name and in the name of thy Son and of the Holy Spirit, to be transformed into the Body (*in transformationem Corporis*, etc.) and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Only-Begotten. By whom thou dost create all things, dost bless them when created, dost sanctify them when blessed, dost bestow them when sanctified, O God, who in perfect Trinity livest and reignest for ever and ever" (cf. Dom Cagin, *Eucharistia*, 1912, 57-61).

³ It is quite well known that in many of the ancient Masses, which if not Roman are at least Latin, we find epicleses very similar both in form and position to the epicleses of the East, which petition for the descent of the Holy Spirit. Some of them will be indicated later in Th. XXXIV. Meantime, see the *post-secreta* prayer in the *Missae tertiae monensi* (P. L. 138, 869).

THESIS XXII

B. WE PARTAKE OF THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARISTIC FOOD

(I) We have already seen this teaching clearly indicated by St. Paschasius Radbertus, particularly in the first, second and fifth passages quoted in the last section, where he says that the Eucharistic Blood must be dispensed to us from the celestial altar. The Latin Church enunciates the same teaching in the concluding words of the prayer *Supplices te rogamus: that as many of us as by partaking from this [sublime] altar shall receive the most holy Body and Blood of thy Son. . . .* The Greek Liturgy of *St. James* also has the same sense: “O God, who hast deigned to make us partakers of thy supercelestial table” (B. 65). Indeed, all those must admit the same who understand that it is precisely because we receive the Eucharist from the celestial Altar which is Christ, that we are favoured above those *who serve the tabernacle* (*Heb. XIII, 10*). For it is only the flesh of the celestial sacrifice that can be eaten from the celestial Altar. Which again is a proof that in the Mass we have offered the celestial Victim, for we eat only of what we have offered.¹

(II) However, even independently of the testimony of the Fathers and the Scriptures, the same doctrine could be gathered from our remarks on the partaking of sacrifice in general in Th. I, (Vol. I), For we eat of the sacrificial Victim just in so far as it has been made the property of God, and has been dispensed to us as His own by God. Hence as the Victim of Christ was accepted by God as Victim in the Resurrection, we receive from God the sacred banquet of that Victim formally as celestial. And it is as a celestial

¹ Here, just as in Thesis XXI, we must understand celestial *sacrifice* in the passive sense. Hence no one would be justified in inferring from a comparison of the titles of this and the last Thesis, with the titles of Theses XIX and XX (on our offering and partaking of the blood sacrifice): “Therefore the celestial sacrifice is a blood sacrifice !!!” Such inference would be sheer blasphemy, suggesting that some kind of a rite in blood has place in heaven. Meantime, however, one must remember that the (passive) sacrifice of heaven *was* a blood sacrifice on earth, which is very true, just as the same is true of the Victim or the passive sacrifice in our Mass.

banquet that it sanctifies us: for the Victim when eaten by us is a pledge of our future sharing in the good things of God, or induces in us present sanctity, just in so far as the victim is understood to be filled with the sanctity of the divinity, whose food, as it were, it has become. Hence Christ the Victim in us is the pledge of future glory for us, and the cause and source of grace for us, just in so far as, or precisely because Christ the Victim has been taken by the Resurrection and the Ascension into the sanctuary of God. Therefore the Victim sanctifies in as much as it is celestial, the Eucharistic Christ sanctifies in as much as He has been translated from death to glory; and in very truth, as Paschasius says, our Eucharist is the Flesh of Christ as it is *from the Resurrection*: “THE FLESH OF CHRIST IS MADE THE EUCHARIST FROM THE RESURRECTION” (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, 5, 1. P. L. 120, 1280).

(III) Quite in keeping with this teaching, the Fathers proclaim that the beneficent virtue of the Eucharist is derived from Christ in glory. Thus Ignatius (*Smyrn.*, 7, 1. F. P. 1, 280) tells us that “THE GIFT OF GOD” in the Eucharist is “the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and WHICH THE FATHER in His love RAISED FROM THE DEAD” (cf. *Ephes.*, 20, 1–2, and *Magnes.*, 7, 2. F. P. 1, 228–230 and 236). Irenaeus also (*Adv. Haeres.*, 4, 18, 5. P. G. 7, 1029): “our bodies partaking of the Eucharist are now no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection” because “the Eucharist is composed of two things, the earthly [that is, the visible element], and the heavenly [that is, the glorified Flesh of Christ].¹ Hence again, in the *Consultationes Zacchaei Christiani* and *Apollonii Philosophi* (1, 2, praef. P. L. 20, 1109), the neophyte is said to be “made a partaker of the eternal SACRIFICE, nay, by partaking of God, part of God Himself.” Indeed, for the same reason it would appear that “by eating of the sacred Body he is made a sharer in the eternal inheritance” (1, 2, c. 18, col. 1143).

Our Liturgies abound in expressions like the following: “filled (or satiated) WITH THE VIRTUE OF THE HEAVENLY TABLE” (*Missale Romanum*, Post-communion fifth Sunday after Easter). Quite plainly, then, our ancestors, considering the lifegiving effect

¹ See Th. XIX, above.

which is peculiar to the Eucharist, derived that effect from the celestial condition of the Flesh of our Lord.¹

In this they followed St. Paul, who in many places attributes all our vivification to Christ triumphing over death in His Resurrection, by which He *the last Adam was made into a quickening spirit* (*I Cor.*, XV, 45; cf. *ibid.*, XV. 42–46; *Rom.* IV, 25; *I Cor.*, XV, 17; *II Cor.*, IV, 14, etc. See Prat, *Théologie de saint Paul*, t. 2, p. 301). In other words, in as much as by His glorious resurrection He has attained to a spiritual condition of the Body, He vivifies, by His own Flesh, both our souls and bodies. It is in this spiritual condition, therefore, as spiritual and lifegiving, and formally as such, that He must be given to us in the Eucharist, in which He is our Life Giver above all else. Hence the teaching of mediaeval theologians according to Peter of Poitiers (*Sententiarum*, lib. 5, c. 13. P. L. 211, 1253): “We are taught that THE BODY OF CHRIST EFFECTS IN THE PARTAKERS THAT WHICH HE HIMSELF HAS.” It is because He possesses the eternal life of glory that He instils it into us, first sending the grace from which the glory will spring.²

(IV) No valid argument can be advanced against our thesis from the fact that quite a considerable number of the Fathers, particularly those of Alexandria, attributed the lifegiving virtue of the Eucharist, immediately and adequately, to the hypostatic union of the Flesh with the Word, as a result of which the Flesh of life is lifegiving to those who partake of it, a view, moreover, which has the sanction of the eleventh *Anathema* of Cyril (D. 123) which was accepted by the whole Church in the fifth Oecumenical Council (Canon 13, D. 226): “If anyone does not confess that the Flesh of the Lord is lifegiving . . . because it is the proper Flesh of the Word which prevails to vivify all things. A.S.” This, however, in no way militates against our thesis, for, in the first place, the Fathers did not at all intend here to set up any opposition between the Incarnation and the glory in heaven,

¹ Here we are not attempting to prove that the Eucharist begets immortality, though this will be proved by many arguments in the proper place in XXXVIII, (Vol. III). We are simply showing here that the Fathers, looking for the cause of the lifegiving efficacy of the Eucharist, as presupposed, found it in the glory of the celestial Victim imparted to us.

² This is clearly expressed by St. Thomas in the office of the *Feast of Corpus Christi*: “LIVING bread and bread lifegiving” (*panis vivus te vitalis*), and by the Church: “Living bread that givest life to man (*panis vivus vitam praestans homini*).” It is indeed lifegiving, it gives life, precisely because it is living.

but merely to exclude the Nestorian heresy which claimed that the union between the divinity of the Word and the Flesh of Christ was purely moral, in accordance with which heresy the Word would vivify us in the Eucharist by a flesh which was not its own, that is, not the proper flesh of the Word. Secondly, it was only at the Resurrection that the personal union of uncreated life with the assumed humanity put forth its ultimate effects;¹ so much so that it was precisely then that the Incarnation as it were reached its climax, its crowning completeness,² as St. Paul says: "*This same [promise] God hath fulfilled to our children, raising up Jesus, as in the second Psalm it is written: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*" (Acts, XIII, 33).³

It must be remembered also that when the Fathers attributed the lifegiving influence of the Body of Christ to the Incarnation they were here considering the Incarnation adequately, either as

¹ For in the order of efficient causality the Resurrection was an effect of the Incarnation, as Cyril maintains times without number, teaching that the Word raised up the Body, which it had assumed as its own, by the divinity by which It had assumed that Body.

² Practically all the Fathers proclaimed with one voice that the Incarnation reached its climax in the Resurrection in which the Son of God and Man now in every sense passed from a human into a divine condition, without destruction of the humanity, without being assumed anew or further assumed, but by this, that the uncreated light of divine glory now finally irradiated the humanity with all its active and passive powers, whereas until then it had rested hidden, so to speak, in the innermost substance of the humanity, only bursting forth through the mind at its highest point to arouse the beatific vision (though by its divinity it sustained all the time the whole fabric of the Soul and Body). These testimonies have been collected by Thomassinus, *De incarn., Verbi Dei*, 1, 8, c. 11. See, too, our remarks above in XIV (Vol. I), on Christ's promotion, as it were, to His dignity and condition of Lord (κυριότητα). Though all this is true, we do not by any means deny that the Flesh of Christ, did Christ will it so, could be vivifying even independently of His Resurrection. On the contrary, by virtue of the Incarnation alone (apart from the Resurrection proper), it could most certainly give life to us both in soul and body, and none the less than it does now, and will do in the life to come. But it could not do this, AS THE FLESH OF THE SACRIFICE, independently of the Resurrection: because it is only by the Resurrection that the Flesh of Christ as Victim is sanctified or made sanctifying, is consummated or accepted by God to be given to us. Furthermore, it was decreed in the free counsel of God that Christ should vivify us only by way of the sacrifice, given to death for the life of the world, and given back by God to men as the bread of life.

³ Cf. this with *Rom.*, 1, 3: *Who was definitely established* [that is, plainly exhibited for all to see, definitely constituted as such, in distinction to all others] *as Son of God in power* [that is, in that power of majesty or glory of which we read in *Matt.*, XXIV, 30, and *Luke*, XXI, 27] *according to the spirit of sanctity, by His Resurrection from the dead*. That is to say: by the Resurrection the place proper to the Son of God is finally settled, marked out and defined within all its limits. Not without reason does St. Paul call the Spirit from which this exaltation is derived the spirit of sanctity, because it was in His vivification (after His death) and glorification that Christ received the divine consummation of His immolative sanctification, His sanctification as a victim.

having already attained to its full increment, if it were a question of Christ in heaven, or at least as soon destined to attain it, if they were speaking of Christ still on earth.

Thus Cyril himself, while deriving our vivification from the Flesh of Christ united to us by the Eucharist (*In Lucam*, XXII, 19. P. G. 72, 908–909), goes on to ask himself how the exercise of the vivifying power is given to that Flesh, and his answer is, by the Resurrection: “We receive within us the Word of God the Father, made man (*humanatum*) for us, which is life and gives life. Now then, let us study carefully the inward reason of this our mystery. It was necessary for mortal flesh to be made sharer of the vivifying power of God. Now the vivifying power of God the Father is the Only-Begotten Word. The Father sent the Word to us to be our Saviour and Redeemer; and the Word was made flesh . . . born of woman according to the flesh, and assuming His own Body from her, THAT HE MIGHT UNITE HIMSELF INSEPARABLY WITH US, and show us forth (*ἀποφήνη*) as victors over death and corruption. For He clothed Himself with our flesh, IN ORDER THAT, RAISING IT FROM THE DEAD, HE MIGHT THEREBY throw open a way of return to immortality for the flesh fallen in death, as St. Paul says: *For by a man came death, and by a man came the resurrection of the dead: and as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive.* When therefore the Word (who is God and life) had united to Himself the flesh which was subject to death, HE DROVE OUT FROM IT CORRUPTION [that is, by the Resurrection], AND SHOWED IT ALSO (*ἀπέφηνε*) AS LIFEGIVING.” Again: “The dead are changed, the corruptible puts on incorruptibility, when the Only-Begotten has been made like unto us, has conveyed mortality into immortality and transformed corruption into incorruptibility, and first of all in Himself, FOR IT WAS EVEN THUS THAT HE HAS BEEN MADE THE WAY UNTO LIFE TO OURSELVES” (*De recta fide ad principissas*, P. G. 76, 1281–1284; cf. *ibid.*, col. 1273).

Hence by the Resurrection Christ made His Flesh vivifying. Cyril then goes on to say the same thing is done by the Ascension; and do not blame him here for inconsistency, because both the Resurrection and the Ascension, as one whole, consummate the sacrifice of Christ. Commenting on the words; *Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the Son of Man ascend up*

where he was before, he says: "And if my Flesh transcending its nature should ascend to heaven, what is to prevent it from giving life? Because He who [by the Ascension] EXHIBITED (*ἀποδείξας*) AS CELESTIAL WHAT IS FROM THE EARTH, WILL ALSO MAKE IT VIVI-FYING, though by its nature it is subject to corruption" (in h. 1. P. G. 73, 601).

A little before (*In Joann.*, VI, 54. P. G. 73, 577-580), he had spoken of our Lord's present immortality as the cause of our vivification. For, having shown how, by the touch of His Flesh, Christ, while on earth, raised some from death to temporal life, he goes on to infer how we shall derive the gift of life which shall never fall back into corruption, from the now immortal Flesh of Christ: "If what is corruptible is given life by the touch of His holy Flesh, will not this lifegiving Eucharist be far more beneficial to us, when we shall actually taste of it? It will completely transform all who partake of it INTO ITS OWN GOOD STATE, that is, INTO IMMORTALITY."

Athanasius, before Cyril, had written commenting on the same passage of *John*, VI, 62-63 (*Ep. 4, ad Serap.*, 19: P. G. 26, 665-668): "The reason why He mentions the ascension of the Son of Man into heaven is to divert them from thoughts of material things, and they might learn from this THAT THE FLESH OF WHICH HE HAD SPOKEN is given by Him to them AS CELESTIAL FOOD FROM ABOVE, and spiritual nutriment." His words in the *Epistula heortastica*, 11, 14. (P. G. 26, 1411), are especially to the point here, where he says: "Truly we have here a cause for joy. I mean IN THE TRIUMPHANT VICTORY OVER DEATH AND AT THE SAME TIME OUR OWN INCORRUPTIBILITY THROUGH THE BODY OF THE LORD, because now that He has risen, so, too, will come our own resurrection: AND SINCE HIS BODY HAS BECOME IMMUNE FROM CORRUPTION, WITHOUT ANY DOUBT IT HAS BEEN MADE THE CAUSE OF OUR OWN INCORRUPTIBILITY." Again in the *Epistula heortastica*, 28. (P. G. 26, 1433): "Let us be partakers of the immortal food, so that we may live forever immortal in heaven."

Saint Asterius of Amasea speaks well to the point: "One grain was sown and the whole world WAS NOURISHED. As Man He was slain, and as God HE WAS VIVIFIED AND HAS VIVIFIED THE WORLD" (*Hom.*, 19. P. G. 40, 436).

After the time of Cyril, Leontius of Byzantium, a worthy exponent of the Alexandrine teaching, asserts that the Body risen from the dead is, in the Eucharist, the real cause of our own resurrection. "Since Christ MADE HIS OWN BODY FROM THE RESURRECTION (τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἐξ ἀναστάσεως = His risen Body) spiritually dead (νεκρὸν πνευματικόν = sacramentally immolated in the Eucharistic sacrifice), and since He gives it to us in food, in order through it to instil the virtue which effects the resurrection from the dead, He is without doubt the author in us of the spiritual nature which is to be ours in the life to come" (*Adversus eos qui duas affirmant Christi personas, nullam in ipso conjunctionem confitentur*, 1, 5, c. 22. P. G. 86, 1744-1745).

In the West later on we find St. Bernard teaching the same (*In vigil. nativit. Dmni., Sermo. 1, n. 6. P. L. 183, 89*): ". . . Receive that bread which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world, that is the Body of the Lord Jesus, in order that THAT NEW FLESH OF THE RESURRECTION may restore and sustain the aged vessel of thy body."

His contemporary, Peter of Cluny, also says that we are vivified by Christ "leading men BY MEANS OF HIS NOW IMMORTAL BODY TO THE SAME immortality" (*Tract. contra Petrobrusianos*, P. L. 189, 814).

But especially noteworthy is the magnificent expression given in our own time to this doctrine by Leo XIII:¹ "That divine VICTIM begets in us the future resurrection; FOR THE IMMORTAL BODY OF CHRIST sows in us the seed of immortality" (*Encyc. Mirae Caritatis*).²

¹ Meantime, see how Cardinal Franzelin (*De SS. Eucharistia*, 1868, pp. 286-288) also, in explaining the sacramental efficacy of the Eucharist to vivify our bodies, appeals to the state of glory in Christ: "The mystic union of our own flesh with the Flesh of Christ receives its fuller consummation and its sacramental consecration, so to speak, through THE CONJUNCTION OF HIS GLORIFIED BODY AND BLOOD with our own bodies, in which conjunction are celebrated the nuptials of the Lamb with His spouse the Church, still a pilgrim in each one of her members. . . . Thus therefore from this sacramental conjunction arises that singular affinity whereby Christ the Bridegroom regards the flesh of those worthily eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood, as His own Flesh by a special title. AND FOR THIS REASON He makes our flesh like to His own glorious and incorruptible Flesh, here in exile it is true . . . to be conformed to our Model Himself in the glory of the resurrection."

² The teaching of the Church today, therefore, is the continuation of the very same teaching found in the oldest documents of the Christian faith, as, for example, we find in the exhortation of Fabricius Maternus to pagans: "For us who spurn the Eleusinian banquets, there is another food, a food that bestows life and salvation; . . . a food which enriches the dying with the emblems of eternal immortality."

It was thus possible, nay incumbent on the early Fathers, to speak of the lifegiving virtue of the Eucharist, as the effect of the Incarnation, without thereby precluding the effect of the state of glory, which was the culmination and the perfection of the Incarnation. But because the glorification of the assumed nature could be only by way of the sacrifice, in the divine economy, for: *Thus it behoved Christ to suffer and so to enter into his glory (Luke XXIV, 26)*, so it is that the vivifying power not only can, but must, be attributed to the Passion and death also: for His death gives life to us, as the prophet *Isaias (LIII, 10)* says: *If he shall lay down his life for sin, he shall see a long lived seed*. In other words, in the divine economy it is the glory of Christ that illuminates us; it is His incorruptible life that gives and will give us life; but this glory is itself simply the consummation of the sacrifice in which Christ gave Himself over to death, although it is also due to Christ by the title of the Incarnation of which it is but a kind of natural expansion, and blossoming if the word can here be excused. Hence our Eucharistic vivification can and must be regarded as an extension of the Incarnation, in so far as it introduces us into the fellowship and communion of the Only-Begotten; and also as the fruit of the Passion, whereby the Victim was prepared for us; and as the influx of glory by which free and unimpeded power is given to the consummated Victim to sanctify men incorporated with Itself.¹

Seek after the bread of Christ, seek after the cup of Christ, that man's substance, scorning its earthly frailty, may be feasted WITH THE FOOD OF IMMORTALITY. . . . Seek the grace of this saving food, and drink THE CUP OF IMMORTALITY. Christ in His banquets welcomes us back to the light, He gives new life to the joints which are rotting with deadly poison, and to our torpid limbs. Restore lost man WITH THE FOOD OF HEAVEN, so that whatever in you is already dead may, by the divine bounty, be born again" (*De errore profanarum religionum*, c. 19. P. L. 12, 1022-1025).

¹ Practically all this which was common knowledge with the Fathers was embodied in a sermon *De Nativitate Domini* by an unknown author, wrongly attributed to St. Augustine. The author lays down three principles: (1) The Eucharist is the Supper of the nuptials of Christ and the Church which were initiated in the Incarnation. (2) The food and drink of this Supper was prepared in the Passion, being the Body and Blood of the Lamb that was slain. (3) Christ finally completed His nuptials when He sealed by the Resurrection and the Ascension the nuptial bond with an eternal impress. "For today He has come forth from the sacred bridal chamber, that is, from the hidden and spotless recess of a virgin womb. He came forth thence the Son of a virgin, the Spouse of a virgin: The Son of Mary, the Spouse of the Church. For when the Apostle said: *I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ*, he spoke to the whole Church. To these nuptials, to such nuptials . . . the great multitude of men of every race has been invited; this multitude has filled the Church, from the table of the Lord,

(V) In this we have a confirmation of what we have already said (XVII) regarding the teaching of St. Paul: that the command of the Lord to repeat the Supper, formally implied that this repetition would have to do with the risen Christ, now in heaven, until His second coming. So that just as our Mass is, from its very institution, a commemoration of the Passion, so too it is a confession of the Resurrection, as Cyril of Alexandria says in the passage quoted above (*In Joann.* 1, 12. P. G. 74, 725).¹

Hilary had already said before him: "For the sacrament of the celestial bread is received in the faith of the Resurrection" (*In Matthaeum*, c. 9, n. 3. P. L. 9, 963; cf. the excellent note of Constant). And before Hilary, Cyprian (*Ep.* 63, c. 16 and 17. P. L. 4, 387) had noted this difference between the Supper and the Mass; that although the Passion of the Lord is offered ("for the Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer"), still the Resurrection is celebrated ("WE CELEBRATE THE RESURRECTION OF THE LORD in the morning"), and so the Mass should be celebrated in the morning, although the Supper took place in the evening ("in order that even the hour of the sacrifice might point to the decline or setting—*occasum*—and the evening of the world"). Of course in the Last Supper the Resurrection could not be celebrated as having already taken place, because then the Lord offered Himself to the death which was to take place the next day. On the other hand, it is essential to the Mass, according to Cyprian, that the Resurrection be celebrated as having taken place.

In the Middle Ages we find Rabanus Maurus (*De clericorum*

they have received no common food, no ordinary drink; but rather THEY HAVE TASTED THE VERY FLESH OF THE PASTOR HIMSELF, CHRIST SLAIN. THE INNOCENT LAMB WAS SLAIN FOR HIS OWN NUPTIALS, AND WHOMSOEVER HE INVITED HE FED WITH HIS OWN FLESH. SLAIN HE PREPARED THE BANQUET. RISING FROM THE DEAD HE CELEBRATED THE NUPTIALS. Submitting to the Passion of His own free will He was slain: RISING FROM THE DEAD HE TOOK TO HIMSELF HIS BETROTHED BRIDE. In the womb of a virgin He took human flesh, as a pledge of the betrothal. On the Cross He shed His own Blood, as a priceless dowry; IN THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION HE SEALED THE BOND OF HIS ETERNAL ESPOUSALS" (*Inter opera Augustini, Sermo 372*, c. 2. P. L. 39, 1662). Here we have the causes of the Eucharistic espousals in the Incarnation, the Passion, and the Resurrection. Whoever the author may be, he certainly does say: that just as the Eucharist is the climax of the Incarnation, so it is the fruit of the Passion and the gift of the Resurrection, namely, the divine Victim, slain in the past, now in glory and from glory refreshing man.

¹ See also many other passages from Cyril: "The partaking of the mystic eulogia is a declaration of the death and the RESURRECTION of Christ" (*Glaphyr. in Leviticum*. P. G. 69, 576). "Declaring His death, as I have said, AND INDEED HIS RESURRECTION ALSO, we accomplish the adorable mystery" (*Glaphyr. in Deuteron*. P. G. 69, 649).

institutione, 1, 1, c. 31) coupling the Passion with the Resurrection at the table of the Lord “where the immaculate spotless Lamb is slain, and where the ADORABLE MYSTERIES OF HIS PASSION AND RESURRECTION are celebrated by the faithful” (P. L. 107, 319). And Rupert of Dietz says that in the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord “under the appearance of bread and wine is CONCEALED THE EFFICACY OF HIS DEATH AND RESURRECTION” (*De victoria Verbi Dei*, c. 12, P. L. 169, 1472).¹

St. Martin of Liège gives a complete definition of the Eucharist as a sacrament in these two words—Passion and Resurrection: “THE SACRAMENT OF THE PASSION AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE LORD” (*Sermo 26, in resurrect. Dom.* P. L. 208, 946). It is precisely through the merit of the Passion and the virtue of the Resurrection, that these sacraments free us from the bonds of sin, and enliven us spiritually; hence it follows from the very nature of the Eucharist, that we treat Christ in the Eucharist at all times, and in the Eucharist partake of Christ as He is in heaven, celestial.

(VI) It may be objected against our thesis, and especially against the argument drawn from the nature of the Eucharist, that it would make the reception of communion by the Apostles at the Last Supper nugatory. In the Last Supper the Flesh of Christ was not glorified yet; therefore, if our thesis and argument stand, the Flesh of Christ conferred no benefit on those who partook of it at the time. But this is contrary to Catholic sentiment, as declared by Innocent III: “He gave what He had at the time, namely, what was mortal and passible. NEVERTHELESS IT HAS NO GREATER EFFICACY NOW, JUST AS IT HAS NO GREATER POWER” (*De sacro Altaris Mysterio*, 1, 4, c. 12. P. L. 217, 864).²

¹ The whole passage has been already quoted in Th. VII, (Vol. I).

² There were a few early writers who said that Christ gave His immortal and incorruptible Body to the Apostles. Thus the author of the *Glossa ordinaria* (*In Matth.*, XXVI, 2, P. L. 114, 143); Manegoldus (*Contra Wolfelnum*, 18. P. L. 155, 166); Anselm of Laon (*In Matth.*, XXVI, 26. P. L. 162, 1470); Alger (*De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici*, 1, 1, c. 9. P. L. 180, 768); and Hugo of St. Victor (*De Sacramentis christianae fidei*, 1, 2, pars. 8, c. 3. P. L. 176, 462–464). Strange to say, Thomassinus (*In carn.*, 1, 10, c. 31) revived this long antiquated opinion. The argument of those early theologians was not drawn from the vivifying efficacy of the sacrament, but in most cases from the fact that the Flesh remained entire, in no way affected by the teeth of the partakers. Following Ivo of Chartres (*Ep.* 287, P. L. 172) and Cardinal Robert Pullen (*Sententiarum*, 1, 8, c. 4. P. L. 186, 964), Innocent III answered them quite sufficiently: “In my judgment it is incredible that He should be at the same time both mortal and immortal according to the same nature”; hence he concludes: “It is safely held according to faith, that what He had He gave, namely, a body that was mortal and passible. Not a body that could suffer

I reply: *de facto* the natural and legal order of the sacrifices was inverted in the Supper, in so far as the eating had taken place before the death (in which was the immolation) and the Resurrection (where we have the divine acceptance): for the Flesh of Christ was given as the banquet of the sacrifice to the Apostles, at a time when the Flesh had not yet suffered, though by the sacramental immolation it was already deputed to, and was *under obligation* to, death in blood.¹ Similarly, too, though the Flesh was not yet glorified, it was given, nevertheless, as the flesh of the sacrifice, ratified and accepted by God, and thus the *Resurrection* and the taking up into glory of that Flesh offered by the true Priest *was of obligation* from God. Therefore what was not yet actually effected was even then strictly due to Christ by right of His sacrifice; indeed it was also pledged by God, in so far as the transubstantiation was accomplished by the divine power, and accordingly the sacrificial offering of our Lord was not made without the divine approval and even a sign (*omine*) of it:² for what is offered to God *by the eternal Spirit* is necessarily acceptable to God. Thus even then (at the Last Supper) the three mysteries—the Supper, the death, and the Resurrection—were morally linked together in a bond of juridical union. And in virtue of this moral link, even at the Supper the Eucharist could signify the fruit of the death and Resurrection, and hence cause it.³

in the sacrament [that is, by the tearing of the species which did not affect the Body] but a body that was capable of suffering under the sacrament [as itself still possible]” (*De sacramenti altaris mysterio*, 1, 4, c. 12. P. L. 217, 864; cf. Alanus de Podio *De fide catholica contra haereticos*, 1, 1, c. 58. P. L. 210, 632). Later in the *Summa*, St. Thomas (3 S. 81, 3) gave this solution more fully and more forcefully.

Thomassinus plainly taught that the state of glory was necessary in that flesh which was to beget immortality in the partakers: “Was mortal flesh the seed of immortality? Was the Flesh which had not yet attained to the Resurrection a suitable pledge of the promised resurrection? Rather all the hope of attaining to immortality would have been rendered nugatory [for the Apostles at the Supper] if Christ had only been able to give them there a pledge and sanction of it with His mortal Body” (*loc. cit.*). How absurd, however, it is to conceive that the Flesh of Christ can at the same time be differently affected in the Eucharist and outside of it will be abundantly shown by us later, Thesis L (Vol. III) when we deal with the transubstantiation.

¹ Call to mind, among others, the early author of the work *De solemnitatibus*, quoted above Thesis IV, (Vol. I).

² Cf. I and V (Vol. I) above with XXXIV, on the acceptance of our sacrifice in the transubstantiation.

³ We must always keep in mind the ever valid principle of sacramental theology: the sacraments cause what they signify, see XLVIII (Vol. III). If, therefore, the Eucharist at the Supper—and so before the death and the Resurrection—could signify our vivification, it could effect it also.

Rightly and properly, therefore, just as the death was anticipated in the Supper partaking, so, too, was the Resurrection. Nor could it be otherwise, for He was our Priest; and because of the perfection and authority of His priesthood He, too, was to partake of His own sacrifice, cf. XI (Vol. I): which he could do only as a *Viator*, a pilgrim still on the earth, seeing that the participation of sacrifice pertains only to the order of symbols (and symbols are not for the blessed, the *comprehensores*), and before all else the signification of partaking is anagogic—mystic, reminding us of and preparing for the life of glory in heaven (which is especially proper to those still on earth and on the way to future glory). And so it was that “the eating of the true Lamb” should proceed “NOT ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF THE LAW OR OF NATURE” when “the VICTIM STILL LIVING and SOON TO DIE” was given to the Apostles”¹ as Baldwin of Canterbury says in the work *de Sacramento Altaris*. (P. L. 204, 660).²

Because at the Supper the Eucharist anticipated the Resurrection, it was right and proper that the disciples should receive the Eucharist in the faith of the Resurrection, and that our Lord Himself should partake of it as a pledge of the same. Hence it was that at the Supper itself Christ not alone strengthened the faith of the Apostles in His Resurrection and future life by repeated and prolonged discourse, as when He gave the command of the commemoration of His death and future coming (*I Cor.*, XI, 26), or foretold the kingdom of His Father and the celestial table (*Matth.*, XXVI, 29; *Mark*, XIV, 25; *Luke*, XXII, 30); or promised them that they would see Him in glory (*John.*, XIII, 32; XIV, 2–3 *et seq.*; XVII, 24; cf. *John*, VI, 63); while He also prayed to the Father for Himself, for that glory that was due to Him because of His sacrifice: *I have glorified thee on earth, I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.*

¹ Cardinal James Vitriaco († about 1241) is lost in admiration at this inversion of order: “Although after His Passion and Resurrection He is eaten by the faithful every day in the Church, and remains whole and entire in an ineffable manner, He showed a far greater miracle on the night of the Supper, WHEN, NOT YET BAKED ON THE FIRE OF THE CROSS, SO TO BE PREPARED AS FOOD FOR US (*ut esset esibilis*) AND, NOT YET MADE IMPASSIBLE AND IMMORTAL, He gave His own Body, such as it then was, that is, passible and mortal” (*Sermones in Epistolas et Evangelia dominicalia totius anni, Sermo III. In coena Domini*, Antwerp, 1575, p. 344).

² We infer from this that the vivifying efficacy of the sacrament would be no less if, reserved from the Supper, it were consumed by a follower of Christ, during the *triduum mortis*.

And now glorify me O Father, with thyself, with the glory which I had before the world was with thee (John, XVII, 4-5), but, drinking the chalice, He drank the Resurrection; and, drinking it first Himself, He likewise gave it to them to be drunk—cf. Th. XI, (Vol. I).¹

APPENDIX

The Teaching of St. Paul and St. John on Eucharistic Communion Compared.

Some time ago Rev. P. Batiffol in his book on the Eucharist (*Eucharistie*, 3) wrote: "St. Paul's idea of partaking of the sacrifice is destined to remain always obscure for Christian piety, which will be attracted rather by the concept of St. John: that communion is a partaking of the divine life: *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life*. Christian piety, strengthened by experience, in clinging to the idea of St. John, will have the intuition of a more tangible reality than that which the idea of communion in the sacrifice represents" (p. 52). In this passage we note two things. *In the first place*, the concept of LIFEGIVING FOOD is contrasted with the concept of SACRIFICIAL BANQUET. *Secondly*, the one concept is assigned to St. Paul as properly his, the other concept is assigned as properly his to St. John.

¹ Now that we have dealt in detail with the positive doctrine of the Church regarding what we offer and what we partake of in the Eucharist, it seems opportune to point to an *a priori* reason, why it would be unseemly on our part to present to God or to partake of any victim other than the eternal and indefectible Theohyte of the Cross. Once that great Victim was presented to God by the great High Priest, there was no further room for the offering of any other atoning gift whatever. For this would imply either that the price paid by Christ was insufficient, or the blasphemous supposition that in addition to the all-sufficient and superabundant payment of our debts, God was grasping after the usurer's gain or unearned interest. For in very truth there is nothing further owing from us but that we offer to God that ransom complete to the last farthing and procured for us by Christ, with a mind, of course, free from any ferment of hypocrisy. Such is the mental attitude that should accompany any protestation of internal sentiment, so that as the azym of sincerity and truth, it may merit to be associated with the sacrament of our Redemption. Nay more, if God were to wish (an irrational supposition) for something more from us by way of propitiatory gift (which the Greeks call *ιλαστήριον*), this—be it what it may—could never add anything to the supreme gift of immolative satisfaction—see XLI (Vol. III) whereby Christ reconciled the world to God. Hence although before the death of Christ many libations, gifts, sacrifices, imitations, and, so to speak, sketchy outlines of that great Theohyte, were possible, after the completion of the work of the Redemption, when the truth now disperses the shadow, perfection replaces defect, plenitude removes all possibility of further increase, there remains only one Victim to be offered in sacrifice, which can never more be offered, except by way of the liturgical offering which is contained in the mystic or symbolic immolation of our daily sacrifices.

Two remarks are called for.

In the first place, it is plain that we cannot in any strict sense appropriate the one and the other concept to St. Paul and St. John respectively. For St. John also considered the Eucharist as a sacrificial banquet, as will be seen if one links up¹ the remaining verses of St. John's sixth chapter with verse 51 (Vulgate 52): *The bread which I shall give, is my flesh for the life of the world* (and apart from this, as we have said in Thesis VII (Vol. I), the discourse after the Supper is wholly Eucharistic and wholly sacrificial in its reference); while St. Paul clearly enough indicates the lifegiving character of the Eucharistic food, where, as we have said above, he represents us as partaking of the Flesh of the risen Christ, who is the lifegiving spirit.

Secondly, the implication that one of these concepts is clearer, the other not so clear, seems to call for a distinction. If there is a question of that uncultivated elementary understanding of our mystery, such as is necessary in every adult for the right reception of the sacrament, it is quite true that the lifegiving character of the Eucharist is more easily grasped by the untutored intellect than its sacrificial character, as the Victim of the sacrifice. It is different, however, where there is a question of more cultivated intelligence, when we seek to know, not only *whether* the bread is lifegiving, but *for what reason* it is life-giving. It cannot then be said that one concept is clearer than or not so clear as the other; for the one supposes the other, and both are only completely understood in their mutual correlation. Just as it is not lifegiving food, except in so far as it is the sacrificial banquet, so it is not the sacrificial banquet, except in so far as it is lifegiving food. The Victim offered to God and accepted by Him is given back to us as life-giving food.

Hence later on in the same work (*Eucharistie*, 5) P. Batiffol, not admitting any real contradiction between St. Paul and St. John, but coming to the root of the matter, wisely says: "These two teachings [of St. Paul and St. John], though in different language, reveal to us and sound the depths of the same one mystery, which is expressed in the formula: This is my Body, this is my Blood" (p. 159). A most true, and most just conclusion.

¹ Cf. Th. VI (Vol. I).

THESIS XXIII

§ 3. The Relation of the Mass to Our Lord's Offering

The Fathers and Liturgies constantly declare that Christ as Priest offers our Eucharistic sacrifices. We have already quoted many testimonies of this kind, and we could add to them almost indefinitely. All repeat the teaching expressed by the words of the *Great Entrance* in the ancient Liturgy of *St. Basil*: "Thou art both the offerer and the offering (*ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος*)" (B. 318; cf. the present-day Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, B. 378). To these testimonies the Council of Trent (sess. 22, cap. 2) has added its authority: "And the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross" (D. 940).

The question therefore arises: after what manner is Christ the offerer of each of our sacrifices? Does He offer by a new formal act of offering? Or does He offer by the causal virtue of the one oblation of the past, never to be repeated?

For as every Mass is a new sacrifice added to those of the past, and as in every new sacrifice some new act of offering necessarily intervenes, the question inevitably arises whether this new act of offering is an act of Christ, or only a new act of the priests of the Church subordinate to Christ? In other words, does Christ intervene as Priest by a new sacrificial action, or is He content, as offerer of each of our sacrifices, with the true and proper sacrificial action which He once performed on earth in a duly sensible manner, to present eternally to God the Victim eternally accepted?

Clearly we must attribute a new oblation act to Christ in each Mass, if we hold that in the Mass He is affected by us with a new state of victimhood, or in any way clothed with a new condition of immolation, which He had not before, so that through us He passes from the state of non-victim to that of victim. For the oneness of our priesthood with the Priesthood of our Lord postulates that Christ Himself, High Priest of all our sacrifices, should be the offerer in respect of any new condition of victim-

hood which may exist; and the offerer of a new condition of victimhood can only be such by a new oblation act. Hence a number of theologians in recent times have attributed to Christ such a new act in our Masses;¹ and from it, they thought, was derived that value of the Mass, which we call its value *ex opere operato*,² and which we shall deal with later on, in Th. XXV.

If, on the other hand, in our Masses no new victimal condition is induced, and we only offer a new sacrifice in so far as we are new offerers of the eternal Victim, offerers admitted to share in Christ's sacerdotal offering of the past, then we must say that Christ offers here and now, in so much as my offering proceeds VIRTUALLY from His. It proceeds virtually, in so far as His offering lasting through the ages is supereminent to all our offerings, which offerings it incorporates with itself, imparting to them the power of presenting the Body and Blood of Christ to God as our Victim. For Christ is one with the Church of which He is the Head. And Christ the Head communicates to the body that power which He put forth at that very moment when He gave Himself over to death for the life of the world. Hence it is that we offer the Body of Christ which died and was taken up into the glory of God. Therefore, just as His sacerdotal power by which He was ordained, in the things that pertain to God, to offer gifts, is the principal cause of our power, so, too, on the exercise of that same power, which He put forth only once, depends our sacerdotal activity in every Mass. The offering of Christ is the principal and universal cause in its own order; our offering is the subordinate and particular cause. Thus it is that Christ offers through us, when we offer, without offering anew in His own person. All that is new is from the Church, while all the power is from Christ.³

¹ The Salmanticenses, *De Eucharistiae Sacramento*, disp. 13, dub. 3, n. 49 and 50: "But the question arises whether Christ Himself immediately offers, by a new special elicited act, in each one of the sacrifices which we offer. . . . We think that by far the truer and more general opinion is . . . the opinion which holds that just as Christ in His humanity concurs instrumentally in each and every individual conversion or transubstantiation which is made in the Church, so, too, He thinks of EACH AND EVERY INDIVIDUAL SACRIFICE, He wishes them, AND OFFERS THEM TO GOD; and for this reason in His special character of Priest HE IS THE IMMEDIATE OFFERER BY A FORMAL, ACTIVE, AND ELICITED OFFERING" (cf. Suarez, disp. 77, sect. 1, n. 6).

² Salmanticenses, *ibid.*, dub. 6, n. 111 and 116.

³ Cano explained this clearly against the Lutherans: "We should note very carefully that offering is not to be understood here simply and in one way only. For

The Fathers rarely dealt with this question in definite terms.¹ But, *in the first place*, the solution is implied in the general teaching regarding the sacrifice of Christ, handed down to us by the Fathers, and mainly derived from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, as we have already shown. *Secondly*, when explaining Christ's offering in respect of the Mass, it was usual for them to do this by ascribing to Christ some causal influence on our own offering. Thus in the passage quoted earlier by us, after Eusebius of Caesarea had said: "Even now Christ carries on the work of His priesthood THROUGH HIS MINISTERS," he explains this by saying that our priesthood, derived from His, is exercised by us when we offer, according to the exemplar of His Priesthood, the sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the mystery of the bread and wine (*Demonstrat. Evangel.*, 5, 3. P. G. 22, 365). Here we meet with two causes operative, one efficient (our priesthood is derived from that of Christ as its efficient cause), the other exemplary (the original sacrifice of Christ is the prototype of our sacrifice, or its exemplary cause).

St. Ambrose likewise reduces the offering by our Lord in our sacrifice to this: "The word of the Lord sanctifies the sacrifice which is offered" (*In Psalm 38*, n. 25. P. L. 14, 1052).² So, too, St. Augustine holds that the Melchisedechian sacrifice of Christ, that is in bread and wine, is (ever since the Last Supper) enacted in the Church, in so far as the Eucharist is offered "BY CHRISTIANS", "by the priesthood [that is, by the priests] of Christ", "UNDER CHRIST AS PRIEST".³ The pseudo-Primasius is in agreement, remarking that Christ, having once offered His own sacrifice while on

there is a universal offering and a particular one. . . . The one general or universal offering of Christ was not only the adequate cause of human redemption, but it was also at all points perfect and absolute in itself, so that in its own order nothing can be added to or taken away from it. But there are many particular offerings by which the universal efficacy of that offering is canalised, to produce particular effects. . . . In this last way we offer in order THAT WE MAY HAVE A PART IN CHRIST'S OFFERING" (*De locis theologicis*, 1, 12, c. 12, Cologne, 1585, pp. 421-422).

¹ Anyone can see that this question is closely akin to that other regarding the intercession of Christ, dealt with in XIV (Vol. I): and so to be consistent we must hold that the objections advanced there against any prayer properly so-called of Christ in heaven have equal force against any new offering of sacrifice on the part of our Lord. To the authorities quoted there, add Rupert, *De divinis officiis*, 9, 3. P. L. 170, 243-245, a passage which we omitted inadvertently.

² The whole passage is quoted in Th. XXI.

³ He says when treating of the meeting of Melchisedech with Abraham: "That was the first appearance of the sacrifice WHICH IS NOW OFFERED TO GOD by Christians throughout the world, and SO FULFILLING that about which, long after this event, the prophet spoke when he addressed TO CHRIST, who was yet to come in the flesh,

earth, must be considered now also to offer sacrifice to the Father unceasingly, simply by the fact that the Church offers the Eucharist; that is to say, that while we, who are His, are offering, He is to be regarded as offering: "Our High Priest offered a clean victim to God the Father for us. The same Priest, still existing, and still sacrificing, also offers THROUGH HIS CHURCH a sacrifice acceptable to God the Father. THEREFORE WHILE WE OFFER THE SACRAMENTS OF HIS BODY, HE HIMSELF OFFERS" (*In Hebr.*, VIII, 3. P. L. 68, 734). That is to say, His offering consists in this, that the Church offers: Christ's Church, I say, offering by the virtue or power of Christ Himself.¹

St. Thomas has little to say on this subject. Nevertheless, when occasion arises, he notes that Christ is the Priest of our sacrifices, "because, for the same reason [namely, that the celebration of this sacrament is the image representative of the Passion], the priest also BEARS THE IMAGE OF CHRIST, IN WHOSE PERSON AND BY WHOSE POWER he pronounces the words TO EFFECT THE CONSECRATION. And so IN A MANNER the priest and the victim is the same" (3 S. 83, 1, 3m). Though Suarez thinks that more than this should be attributed to Christ, he sees, nevertheless, that St. Thomas attributes no more to Christ in the Mass than the part of exemplary and virtually efficient cause: "The priest consecrates in the person of Christ, acting as His representative and His delegate: and IN THIS St. Thomas seems to place THIS OFFERING OF CHRIST" (disp. 77, sect. 1, n. 6).

these words: *Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.*" (*Civitat., Dei*, 16, 22. P. L. 41, 500). Afterwards discussing the change of the priesthood from Aaronic to Melchisedechian: "Seeing that now in every place, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, we see this sacrifice (foretold by Malachias) offered to God THROUGH THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST according to the order of Melchisedech (and they cannot deny that the sacrifice of the Jews has ceased), why do they still await another Christ?" (*ibid.*, 18, 35, 3. P. L. 41, 594). But meantime in the same work he had already said: "The Psalmist continues: *Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech*; now from the fact that no longer anywhere, is there now any priesthood and sacrifice according to the order of Aaron, and everywhere is offered under Christ the PRIEST, what Melchisedech brought forth when he blessed Abraham, can any one doubt of whom these things were said?" (*ibid.*, 17, 17. P. L. 41, 551. Compare *De diversis quaestionibus*, 83, quaest. 61, n. 2. P. L. 40, col. 45-50).

¹ The following saying of William of Paris somewhat suggests the same: "Christ were not OFFERED daily in His Church AND BY THE SAME CHURCH, He would not in Himself fulfil IN HER THE OFFICE OF PRIEST" (*De sacramento Eucharistiae*, c. 2, t. 1, p. 436). In other words, Christ's priesthood, ever present with us, does not mean that He Himself offers in His own person, but that He is offered by us in whom, as we are His (His mystic Body), He exercises the priestly office.

In the third place, at least some of the Fathers explicitly exclude from the Mass any new offering made by Christ Himself. In fact Theodoret writes: "Christ now fulfils the office of the priesthood, NOT BY OFFERING ANYTHING HIMSELF, BUT BY CONTINUING TO EXIST AS THE HEAD OF THOSE WHO OFFER. For He calls the Church His body and as Man THROUGH HER He fulfils the office of the priesthood, while as God He receives those things which are offered. But IT IS THE CHURCH THAT OFFERS the sacraments of the Body and Blood" (*In Psalm 109*, 4. P. G. 80, 1773). In these words, Theodoret not only excludes what we exclude, but he also maintains what we maintain, namely, that Christ can only be said to offer in each Mass virtually, in so far as the Church, His body of which He is the Head, offers at each Mass, in virtue of the power He has given to her so to offer. Before Theodoret Chrysostom had already taught that Christ was not now "A priest or *liturgus*" actively offering, just as St. Gregory Nazianzen had said that He was not now an active suppliant, see XIV (Vol. I).

Among the Latin Fathers, St. Bruno the Carthusian, in his *Expositio in Psalm. 109.* (P. L. 152, 1228), is equally clear: "*Thou art, I say, a priest according to the order of Melchisedech, and this forever, so that thy priesthood, established in place of the Levitical priesthood now made void, continues forever IN THEE AND IN THINE. IN HIS OWN PERSON He is said to be priest forever, not that HE OFFERS THE SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD FOREVER, FOR THIS HE DID ONCE ONLY, but because He prays forever before the Father for His children. For it belongs to priests not only to offer but also to pray for the people. IN HIS OWN he is Priest forever both BY THE OFFERING WHICH THEY MAKE FOREVER, THAT IS, ALWAYS UNTIL THE END OF THE WORLD, and also by prayer, for His priests daily make the offering of His Body and Blood, and send up prayer for the people.*"

Hence rightly does Scotus in *Quodlibet XX* take care to warn us that Himself, Christ, does not offer now in His own person: "Although Christ, as contained in the sacrifice, is offered here, nevertheless He does not here immediately offer sacrifice as we see from *Hebrews, IX: Nor yet that he should offer himself often. And again: Christ was offered only once, understand, by himself offering.*" However, this passage and the context of Scotus will

be considered later, when we are estimating the value of the sacrifice of the Mass.

Vasquez has an interesting passage where he condemns as novel the opinions opposed to our teaching: "I hold that in the other life Christ does not merit for us, because having completed in His mortal life the work of our redemption, now in heaven He no longer prays for us, He no longer offers anything to God for us. . . . In view of this doctrine I consider that some RECENT theologians ARE IN SERIOUS ERROR, when they teach that Christ actually merits now . . .¹ in the sacrifice of the Mass, since they consider the sacrifice of the Mass AS THE ACTION OF CHRIST HIMSELF, because He is said to offer Himself. . . . But when we say that Christ offers Himself in the Eucharist, we do not mean that the offering of His Body which the ministers of Christ make to God each day, is also AN ACTION OF CHRIST ELICITED BY HIMSELF, here and now, and so to be accounted meritorious. Our real meaning is this: seeing that the offering is made in the name of Christ, for that reason we say that Christ Himself offers in it" (In 3 S. 19, 4, disp. 76, cap. 1. n. 6).

After Vasquez,² Hickey should be read in his *Quaestio VI* on

¹ When Vasquez speaks of the opinions of His adversaries, he uses the word *merit* not in the strict and proper sense, but in a broader sense, for all and every propitiatory activity.

² Jesuit theologians who agreed with Vasquez were his contemporaries, Henricus Henriquez (*Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 1, 9, *De vero missae sacrificio* c. 19, n. 6) and Azorius (*Inst. Mor.*, 1, 10, c. 18); and later Becanus (*Summa Theologiae Scholasticae*, tract. de sacramentis, c. 25, q. 9, Lyons, 1679, p. 863) and Franciscus Amicus (*De Sacramentis*, disp. 33, 94 *et seq.*) whom we cite below. Thus Henricus: "We say that Christ offers now through the celebrating priests ONLY IN THIS WAY that by His institution He authorised priests to offer sacrifice in the name of Christ, and gave them the capacity and efficacious power of applying in this way or that (*conferendi*) the effect which the sacrifice has *ex opere operato*."

Azorius: "He now offers Himself daily to the Father, IN SO FAR AS priests offer every day according to the command, the institution, authority, and in the name of Christ the Lord Himself. He, therefore, is the principal priest, but the other true priests are His ministers or agents for the carrying out and offering of the sacrifice, consecrated and empowered for this by the authority of the Church" (Lyons, 1602, col. 1117).

Becanus lessens the part played by Christ even more, and in my opinion too much so, when he says: "We do not say that Christ is the principal offerer in the sacrifice, precisely because through His humanity, as through a divine instrument, He concurs physically in the sacrificial action. Because in the first place there are many who deny this physical concurrence, and it is very difficult to defend it. . . . We say that Christ is the principal offerer in the sacrifice of the Mass, because the minister offers in the person of Christ. For in this mystery the minister acts like the legate of a prince, he takes His place and represents His person." It is quite true to say that Christ does not offer by a new act, through His active concurrence in effecting the consecration; at the same time, however, I do not think that the active concurrence of the humanity of Christ in effecting the Consecration is to be denied. Because the

the commentary of Scotus in IV D. 13, 2, conclusion 4 (Lyons, 1639, p. 831 *et seq.*).¹

The question is by no means an idle one, as a little consideration will show that conclusions of vital importance depend upon it. Once admit that Christ Himself personally intervenes by a new sacrificial action in each one of our Masses, and every argument that we have hitherto so carefully advanced, to safeguard the unique sacrificial action of our Lord, falls to the ground (V (Vol. I), etc.). For on such a supposition innumerable sacrificial actions of Christ Himself would be added to the first sacrificial Action of our Redeemer; and each of these, too, equal in dignity and worth to that pristine sacrificial Action: thus the all-sufficiency of the Cross is made void, contrary to the teaching of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*.² Wherefore Scotus rightly adds the following to his words above quoted: "Otherwise it would seem that the celebration of one Mass would be equivalent to the Passion of Christ, if the immediate offerer and what is offered were the same. But it is certain that a Mass is not equivalent to the Passion of Christ." Likewise on this supposition the oneness of the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of the Supper and the Passion would fall to the ground. This oneness is kept intact only if my present offering is subordinate to that past offering of our Lord, in so far as I, as minister of Christ, by my offering participate in the chief and principal offering of Christ Himself. For Christ is not subordinate to Himself, and so no later proper offering of His can be related to the first by way of participation and ministry of it; but any second offering of the Lord would of necessity be

humanity does really intervene in the consecration, under the first uncreated cause, as instrument, an *instrumentum conjunctum*, an instrument united with the first cause, acting as a real, efficient, instrumental cause. Nevertheless (as will be explained later), no present offering of our Lord added to that of the past can be inferred from this.

¹ Cf. in the same sense Antonius Ruteus O. Minim., *De fructu et applicatione sacrificii missae*, lib. 1, disp. 4, quaest. 1, dub. 1, Antwerp, 1634, p. 70. *et seq.* Similarly Raphael Aversa a Sanseverino, Theat., *De eucharistiae sacramento et sacrificio*, q. xi, sect. 8, etc. may be read with profit.

² Amicus (*loc. cit.*, n. 97): "If Christ together with the priest were TO OFFER THE SACRIFICE ACTIVELY . . . this sacrifice, not only as it was offered by Christ in the Last Supper and on the Cross, but also as it is now offered, would be of infinite worth and merit. The consequence is false, therefore the antecedent is false" (*loc. cit.*, n. 97, in *Cursu theologico*, tom. 7, Douay, 1640, p. 440). He then goes on to develop this argument part by part, and to confound the arguments advanced by his opponents.

co-ordinated and co-numerated with that first offering of His, as perfectly equal to it.¹

Hence whatever is new IN THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS in relation to the sacrifice of the Cross COMES ONLY FROM THE CHURCH, which now makes its own the offering made by Christ in the past, making it new only in so far as the power and the act of sacrificing passes from the Head to the body.

Sacrifices of the Mass, like the actual consecrations or eucharistiations of the bread and wine, are distinguished from one another in two ways. *Firstly*, by the very fact of there being different celebrants; for the celebration by one is not the celebration by another, except perhaps in the case of concelebration, where a number of priests, under a bishop—as at an ordination Mass—concur to effect one consecration. For then, most probably,² there are not as many offerers as there are co-celebrants; morally there is only one offerer, just as there is only one consecrator; that is to say, the group of priests acting as one body. *Secondly*, when one priest performs successive consecrations,

¹Matthaeus Galenus Vestcapellius, no mean authority, saw clearly the inconvenient inferences to be drawn from the supposition we have just rejected, for he issued the following warning to some Catholic apologists who were not sufficiently cautious in their explanation of the words *Christ offers in the Mass*: “We find very many,” he says, “making use of this expression, but very rarely do we see it properly explained and interpreted. . . . There are some PRESENT-DAY teachers of the faith who interpret the words very narrowly, almost as though they imagined Christ standing at the altar as priest. They say that even now at our Masses He would Himself do everything through the priest. He would petition, give thanks, offer, while meantime the sacrificing priest would be absolutely idle, merely lending his person, shape, appearance, and so on, to Christ, for the purpose of the rite. We find theologians of repute taking refuge in this view TO SAFEGUARD WHAT THEY IMAGINE IS THE INFINITE WORTH (the expression is their own) OF THE MASS. For since, say they, the Fathers tell us that it is Christ Himself who offers Himself . . . who may deny that His action is of infinite worth and efficacy? AS IF THIS REPETITION IN HIS OWN PERSON . . . WERE NOT AN ABSOLUTE CONTRADICTION OF HIS UNIQUE OFFERING, and as if SUPPLICATION were now proper to Him FOR WHOM ALL THINGS ARE ALREADY ACCOMPLISHED. For these theologians, ill-informed and not quite circumspect in this matter, do not shrink from imagining that Christ in heaven is even now a suppliant before the Father . . . because St. Paul says He makes intercession, and St. John says that He is an advocate with the Father. . . . The Greek liturgical interpreters have followed more carefully in the footsteps of their own holy Fathers. They hold that all this is to be referred back to the superabundant merits and the infinite ransom of the Cross, and that it is IMPIOUS to twist the words of St. Paul and St. John to any other sense. For it is precisely because there already exists the most ample price and ransom (*ἀντιλυτρον*) of the Redemption, once paid out and ever sufficient, and the most copious merit, that rightly and according to custom Christ is said to merit, to ask, or petition for, nay to obtain in His own right, whatever is received or asked for on those grounds (*ideo*)” (*De sacrificio missae Commentarius*, 1574, c. 13. pp. 160–161).

² See below XXVIII.

which imply necessarily a number of offerings, because it is by the consecration that the immolation by similitude is effected, which involves the offering of our Victim.

It may be objected: the offering is involved in the consecration; but the constant teaching of the Fathers and Doctors is that the consecration is effected by Christ, therefore it is Christ that offers.

I reply, *in the first place*: the Fathers also teach that the consecration is effected by the divine omnipotence; yet we do not say that the Trinity offers the sacrifice to Itself. Moreover, as a matter of fact, the consecration is effected in the first place by Christ in His divine nature, for the transubstantiation is an effect proper to the divine nature, as we shall see later; the priest operates in the actual transubstantiation of the bread and wine, only as the medium or the instrument of the divinity acting here and now. Hence the fact that Christ consecrates at each Mass, as remote agent, acting through the priest, in nowise proves that He here and now offers.¹

But, *secondly*, and more strictly to the point, I reply: the consecration is also effected by Christ and by Christ as possessed of His human nature. In His human nature He is the High Priest who was the first to consecrate, who by imprinting the character of the priesthood gave men the power to consecrate, and now actually conveys through us the virtue of the first cause to consecrate the material elements.

Regarding this conveyance of the divine power, two things must be kept in mind: *In the first place* this conveyance does unquestionably imply in the humanity of Christ some instrumental activity, here and now exerted in reference to the sacramental effect. But it is one thing to assert such fresh activity of the humanity of Christ, and that of course conscious and voluntary, and another to invent for Christ a kind of formal, liturgical, and, so to speak, completely new act of consecration. The real reason for this instrumental causality of the assumed humanity, is effectively to make us (through our sacramental character)

¹ Even Suarez approves of this solution where he says: "One of the requisites for the sacerdotal offering in this sacrifice is, that he who offers the sacrifice concurs in the sacrificial action: nevertheless this does not of itself suffice, FOR THE EFFICIENT CAUSE AND THE OFFERER ARE RELATED TO THE SACRIFICE IN DIFFERENT WAYS; for God effects the same [sacrificial] action and yet He does not offer the sacrifice" (disp. 77, s. 1, n. 6).

sharers in the consecrative act elicited by Christ, once and for all in the past, over the bread and wine of the Supper. For it is necessary that each daily consecration of ours be made in virtue of this act of Christ in the past.

For when Christ said in the Supper: *This is my body*, these words of Christ who by the eternal Spirit offered Himself to God (*Hebr.*, IX, 14; see Th. V (Vol. I)), had, by the addition of the injunction *Do this* an eternal and eternally availing power. This power ever pervades our own utterances of the words of our Lord, in order that Christ, the Church's Victim, may yet again in our hands be mystically immolated and really offered; and it is in this sense that the Doctors of the Church have often said that the very words of the Lord are operative through our lips:¹ a pronouncement, so to speak, of a prince, promulgated through his minister. A comparison may make this clearer. When we administer the sacrament of baptism, it is Christ who baptises through us. Not that He is here and now in the act of baptising, as if besides my

¹ Thus first of all Chrysostom in a very famous passage: "Christ is there present; it was He who prepared the table in the past; it is He who prepares this table now. For it is not man, it is Christ Himself who was crucified for us, who changes what is set on the table into the Body and Blood of Christ. Fulfilling the figure, the priest stands uttering these words; but the power and the grace is of God. *This is my body*, he says. These words transform what is set on the altar. And just in the same way as the words *Increase and multiply and fill the earth*, though uttered only once, confer on our nature for all time the power to procreate the race; so, too, THESE WORDS, UTTERED ONLY ONCE, ENACT, in the Churches, at every altar (*mensa*) FROM THAT TIME UNTIL NOW, AND UNTO HIS SECOND COMING, the perfect sacrifice" (*De proditione Judae*, hom. 1, n. 6. P. G. 49, 380; cf. hom. 2, n. 6, cols. 389-390).

Similarly St. John Damascene (*De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13. P. G. 94, 1140-1141) and Samonas Gazensis (*Disceptatio cum Achmed Saraceno*. P. G. 120, 829).

It is true that later on Nicholas Cabasilas (*Liturgiae Expositio*, 29. P. G. 150, 428-433) and Symeon of Thessalonica (*Expositio de div. Templo*, c. 88. P. G. 155, 737) interpreted this comparison in a perverse manner, considering that the words of our Lord were effective, not by way of our utterance of the same words, but by way of the epiclesis. But by so rejecting the principle laid down by the early Fathers, in their eagerness to defend their own peculiar view regarding the epiclesis, Cabasilas and Symeon merely condemned themselves as holding a view contrary to the common Catholic teaching. St. Thomas clearly vindicates this principal causality of the words of our Lord where he writes: "From the utterance of Christ Himself these words have acquired a consecrative power, by whatever priest they are said, just as if Christ uttered them present at each Mass (*ea praesentialiter proferret*)" (3 S. 78, 5.c). Thomas of Walden (*op. cit.*, tit. 4, c. 38, fol. 92) expresses the relationship between our utterance of the words and our Lord's utterance of the same words, in a striking manner, when he says: "These words of divine and heavenly authority are set before us to be promulgated, with the deepest devotion of the soul. The pronouncement of Christ: *This is my body*, IS PROMULGATED AND ALWAYS EFFECTIVE." That our words of consecration are a promulgation of the ever effective words of Christ is confirmed by the fact that in the Canon we say *taking also THIS excellent chalice into his holy and venerable hands*, so suggesting that when Christ consecrated He spoke, demonstratively, of *this* bread and *this* chalice of ours.

baptism there were another coming from Christ. The act of baptising is only one, performed by me, according to the institution of Christ, and subordinate to Christ who actively communicates to me the divine power. So, likewise, I consecrate in the name of, and in the power of, and, as St. Paschasius said, in the very priesthood of, Christ, though nevertheless Christ does not consecrate by any new liturgical action of His own. It is precisely by this comparison between baptism and the Eucharist that our Doctors explained how it is that Christ consecrates His own Body and Blood, through the ministry of even the most abandoned priest, just as He also baptises through the ministry of a pagan (among others read Alger, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici*, 1-3, c. 2-10. P. L. 180, 833-834). This parity, far from favouring the objection urged above, as some think, rather completely answers it, and is a positive argument against it.

Secondly, this instrumental causality of the assumed humanity, no matter how active it be here and now, does not at all imply that Christ is here and now the actual or formal offerer. All that it implies is that He offers in this sense that the consecration of the past, to which in the present moment He associates us, was His own offering, and that offering of His in the past gives virtue and meaning to all of our offerings, while not being itself repeated. Hence no new offering of our Lord is added to our Lord's offering of the past; but that is, and remains everywhere, virtually operative, and by reason of it Christ is the virtual offerer, we the formal offerers.

We might add, too, that he alone formally offers sacrifice who offers visibly. Christ, however, does not act visibly now, but only invisibly, and so from this point of view He could not be the formal offerer of the sacrifice of the Mass.

One who has carefully weighed all we have said should not find it difficult to understand why we say that although Christ actively co-operates in every consecration of ours, nevertheless He only offers our sacrifices virtually.

Finally, what we shall have to say regarding the fruit of the Mass, as affected by the offering of the Church, in (XXVI), and particularly regarding the causality of the sacraments, as implying a divine influence Th. XLVIII (Vol. III), will make this matter abundantly clear.

CHAPTER IV

THE DIFFERENT OPINIONS AS TO WHAT MAKES THE MASS A TRUE SACRIFICE

THESIS XXIV

THOUGH the sacrifice of the Mass does not consist formally in a mere commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, nevertheless apart from the commemoration of that sacrifice nothing is induced in the Mass whereby Christ is in any way changed in Himself from not being to being our Victim. The commemoration becomes a true sacrifice in this way that, *in the first place*, in the sacrament wherein the image or the commemoration of the Passion is exhibited, Christ Himself is contained, left from His Passion in the true state of a victim consummated by glory; and, *secondly*, that in this sacramental immolation repeated by us there is involved and enacted our real offering of the Victim so exhibited. For a true sacrifice is a true and sensible offering of a truly immolated victim. Hence our Mass is a true sacrifice, although no true immolation, that is, immolation in blood, is found in it apart from that which is presupposed as already enacted by the deicide Jews, and the result of which was that Christ was left in the condition of Victim offered to God and accepted by Him, a true Theohyte. Hence there is no change effected by us in the Victim of our sacrifice except an extrinsic one consisting in this: that by the power of the sacramental symbol, from being Christ's Victim only, it becomes also our Victim. He becomes our Victim in as much as we, being members of Christ, by the power received from Him, renew, under Christ our Head, the Eucharistic mystery by which the Victim of the Passion, the Body and Blood of Christ, is offered to God under the appearances of bread and wine.¹

¹ Our teaching has at least the partial support of Christian Pesch, an eminent theologian of the present day. He writes: "How the Mass is a true sacrifice is easily explained. *The victim is there present*, Christ Himself. *There is present*

What we have just said will indicate why and to what extent we disagree with the views of a number of theologians of the present day or of an earlier date, both as regards THE TRUE

*also the physical destruction of the victim, carried out once on the Cross; in the physical order this is long since passed, but in the MORAL ORDER it is inseparable from the sacrifice of the Mass. We have also the sensible offering, because when by virtue of the words we have the Body of Christ under the one species, and the Blood of Christ under the other, we have the mystic slaying WHEREBY THE PHYSICAL SHEDDING OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST ENACTED ON THE CROSS is sensibly represented and OFFERED to give worship and to make atonement to God. Therefore nothing indispensable for a true sacrifice is wanting" (Praelationes dogmaticae, 1896, t. 6, n. 914). This explanation we accept as in every way complete, except perhaps that it leaves us in doubt as to the ground of this connection which is said to be moral only, between the offering of the Mass and the immolation of the Passion: is it the real and true continuance of a sacrificial state, originating in the Passion and lasting forever (the author does not say a word about this); or is it rather a mere relation of an image or a memorial to the exemplar enacted and perfected in the past? If so, the author's teaching does not really differ from that of the others which we are to review, and which fail to explain the existence of a true victim in the Mass. Some further remarks of the author do not minimise our doubt, rather they increase it: "In this way, too, we can solve this other objection: that it is not clear how Christ is on the altar in the condition of victim. For He is in the condition of victim in as much as the physical slaying of the Cross is made MORALLY PRESENT and is offered to God for the salvation of man" (*ibid.*, n. 915).*

To me, these words appear to point not to a real permanence of a true sacrificial condition, but to a mere intentional one. This certainly does not suffice to give us a true offering here and now of what is here and now a true victim. But although we do not quite agree with him in this, it must be acknowledged that the author approaches more closely to the genuine teaching of antiquity than most theologians of our time. Indeed, though his words leave us in doubt, it is not certain in my mind that he would exclude the permanent condition of immolation which we maintain. The moral nexus which he advocates could be understood in this way.

But this favourable interpretation cannot be very well applied to the words of W. J. Kelly, *The Veiled Majesty*, London, 1903, p. 291: "The one immolation made on Calvary still continues as an element of sacrifice in the Mass. . . . To constitute a sacrifice it is not necessary that the thing offered in sacrifice should be there and then put to death, but it is sufficient that there should be an oblation to God of the thing which is about to be immolated or which already had been immolated. There is no need of actual co-existence, but ONLY OF A MORAL UNION between the offering and the immolation, and this moral union DEPENDS UPON THE INTENTION OF THE PRIEST who offers the sacrifice." Unfortunately such a moral union as the author suggests could not be interpreted as safeguarding the present reality of the condition of immolation, seeing that it is said to depend on my intention. Besides, he had already said: "The sacrifice of Calvary was effected once only, and the Victim of that sacrifice SOON CEASED TO BE A VICTIM" (*ibid.* p. 243). Against this we hold most emphatically that Christ is an eternal Theophyte as a result of His sacrifice.

Cardinal Manning, to my mind, fully realised this truth when he wrote: "Christ is Altar, Victim and Priest, by an eternal consecration of Himself. . . . One sacrifice has forever redeemed the world, and is offered continually in heaven and on earth; in heaven by the only Priest before the Eternal Altar; on earth by the multitude and succession of priests who are one with Him as partakers of His priesthood. . . . This is the argument of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*" (*The Eternal Priesthood*, 17, c. 1, n. 2, p. 4).

On my return from the war, I found that the most distinguished Alexis Maria Lépiciér, Prior General of the Order of Servites B.V.M. (*De sacrosancto sacrificio eucharistico*, Rome, 1916, pp. 109-115), has come close to expressing our teaching, in so far as he maintains that we offer Christ slain in the Passion. However, I do not clearly see what is the nature of the influence (and that physical) of the Cross on the Mass, or what is the nature of the derivation of the sacrificial form in the Mass from

REALITY OF OUR OFFERING AND THE PROPER CHARACTER OF OUR VICTIM.

§ 1. The True Reality of Our Offering

They surely undermine the reality of our offering who, like Renz (*op. cit.*, 2, 499–503 and *passim*), say that WE MAKE NO OFFERING WHATEVER OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD,¹ and maintain that the Mass formally consists solely in the preparation and setting before man of a banquet of the Body and Blood of Christ crucified, present in the guise of immolation, or, what is the same thing, in the giving to us of the Victim of the Cross in the condition of food. The Council of Trent clearly condemns any such teaching, where it says: “Should any one say that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, or that the offering is nothing other than the giving of Christ to us in food, let him be anathema” (D. 10, 948).

Some theologians, such as Dominic Soto² and his followers, Cano³ and Bellarmine,⁴ though absolutely opposed to this error condemned by Trent, for they insisted firmly on the offering, nevertheless do not appear to grasp the precise nature of the relation between the offering and the holy communion. For while they certainly do not say that the communion is the whole sacrifice, nevertheless they looked upon the communion as a constitutive element of the sacrifice if not even

the Cross that he constantly asserts, over and beyond the never-failing perseverance of Christ's state of immolation.

Much of what he had written was anticipated by the Rev. A. A. Paquet, Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Quebec, in the Laval University (*Disputationes Theologicae seu Commentaria in Summam Theologicam Divi Thomae, De Sacramentis*, disp. 8, q. 1, a. 4, Quebec, 1900, pp. 458–460).

¹ Cano rightly assumed as a fixed principle, when setting out to dispute with the Protestants on the sacrifice of the Mass: “Then only is there sacrifice when some sacred thing is offered to God, for where there is no oblation there can never be sacrifice” (*De locis theologicis*, 1, 12, c. 12, Cologne, 1585, fol. 407b).

² “The death of Christ is not represented in the consecration; on the contrary, the consecration has place in order to the immolation which is in the partaking, for the partaking is the image of the death and burial of Christ. And in the drinking of the Blood the image of its shedding is given” (4 D. 13, q. 2, a. 1).

³ Strange to say, Cano considered that the breaking of the Host as well as the communion pertained essentially to the constitution of the sacrifice of the Mass (*op. cit.*, fol. 426a). Of this we shall speak later (XXXIV).

⁴ “That the communion of the priest is an essential part of the Mass is proved from this: that in the whole action of the Mass, as we shall show directly, there is no other REAL DESTRUCTION. But when we established the definition of sacrifice, we proved that real destruction is required” (*De Missa*, 1, 1, c. 27).

a chief element, in so far as the communion causes either the symbolic (Soto, Cano) or the real destruction of the victim (Bellarmine).

Cardinal de Lugo is closely allied to these theologians in so far as he teaches that to a kind of real destruction¹ already effected in Christ by the consecration, the actual communion is added as a (symbolic?) complement of that destruction.² The Salmanticenses, however, have a far stronger title to be included with them, for they admit of no condition of immolation in Christ in the Mass apart from the destruction of the sacramental presence affected by the communion.³

The teaching of each of these theologians regarding the relation of the communion to the sacrifice raises many difficulties, but a fatal objection to all of them is this: that the Body of Christ is neither offered nor immolated by the communion. *In the first place*, it is not offered by the communion, but, having been offered to God already by the consecration, it is now at communion received back from the hands of God as our food and for our sanctification. Hence St. Thomas⁴ holds expressly that not only is the sacrifice completed before the communion, but he also observes that our communion can have no effect *ex opere operato* for the salvation or for the benefit of another,⁵ because all this effect is included in the fruit of the sacrament, which belongs to the recipient of the sacrament and no other. The reason is plain. Compensation can be made for another by our offerings, and we can impetrate favours for him by our prayers; but the reception of the divine gift is in itself neither an offering nor a prayer, just as giving something or asking for something is not the same as, but quite different to, receiving something.⁶

¹ Of which below.

² *De venerabili eucharistiae sacramento*, disp. 19, sect. 5, n. 68.

³ *De sanctissimo eucharistiae sacramento*, disp. 13, dub. 2, parag. 3, n. 29-39. See also Gabriel a S. Vincentio of the same order of Discalced Carmelites (*Tract. de sacramentis*, pars 2, *De sacros. missae sacrif.*, q. 4, ed. 1656, p. 579 *et seq.*), according to whom the communion integrates the whole sacrifice, to such an extent that the offering of the victim consists (1) in the communion, exclusive of the consecration (p. 579 *et seq.*); and (2) hence the Mass of the presanctified is a true sacrifice (p. 583).

⁴ 3 S. 83, 4; cf. 3 S. 83, 6, 6m.

⁵ 3 S. 79, 7, 3m.

⁶ *In Joann.* 6, lect. 6: "Nevertheless if a layman receives this sacrament, it is not beneficial to others *ex opere operato*. . . . Hence it is clear that the laity who receive the Eucharist for the souls in purgatory are in error" (cf. Suarez, *De sacramentis in genere*, disp. 1, sect. 1, n. 6, and *De Eucharistia*, disp. 79, sect. 1, n. 4,

Neither, *in the second place*, is Christ immolated by communion. It would be wrong to say: we admit that Christ is not offered to God by the communion, but by the communion He is certainly immolated, having been already offered to God; He is undoubtedly offered by the consecration, but offered to be immolated by the communion. Such a position is untenable; for in this view Christ would be considered to be immolated by the communion either really in Himself, or symbolically in the species. But Christ could only be immolated really in Himself, if either His very existence in heaven were to be destroyed (which is obviously absurd), or if some other existence of His produced by the transubstantiation were destroyed. But it will be proved later, in L (Vol. III), that there is no such other existence produced by the transubstantiation. You might choose to say that He is immolated symbolically in the species in so far as their corruption would terminate their function of designating and containing Christ. But such destruction of the species, not in any way really affecting Christ, can never

and *Commentarius*, in 3 S. 79, 7). Though Cardinal Billot (*De Ecclesiae Sacramentis*, 4, t. 1, p. 539) seems at first sight in the kindness of his heart to soften these words of St. Thomas, he plainly corroborates them, where he writes (*ibid.*, p. 604): "Of course what is consumed by us is not offered in the very act of consuming and vice versa."

The venerable authors of the *Antididagma* under the leadership of John Gropper held the same opinion in their day against the Lutherans: "In respect of the sacrament Blessed John Chrysostom says, commenting on the 15th Chapter of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, that just as one person cannot be baptised for another, especially if the other is dead, so, too, no one can receive the Body and Blood of Christ for another, especially if the other is dead" (hom. 40, n. 1. P. G. 61, 347). The passage of Chrysostom is, however, of doubtful authenticity. ". . . This perhaps is all that can be said . . . that between all the members of Christ (that is to say, among all the saints and believers who were from the beginning of the world, who now are and will be to the end of time), there exists a communication which has an analogy to the communication between the members of the body, each member sharing in the well-being of the other members, and so any good that accrues to one member becomes common to every other member of the body" (fol. LVIIb).

Théophile Raynaud, S. J., *De communione pro mortuis* (a treatise approved by the Sacred Congregation of the Index) says much the same (*similiter legendus est*), *Opera omnia*, Lyons, 1665, t. 6, pp. 633-652; and *Heteroclitia Spiritualia*, sect. 2, punct. 1, t. 15, pp. 393-394.

Nevertheless, though the reception of communion by a member of the faithful cannot have effect *ex opere operato* for another, the desire of the faithful to assist their neighbour by holy communion should be encouraged. Because by receiving the Eucharist we atone for our sins, and thus become less deserving of punishment (which good state of ours is beneficial also to others still living, in as much as by reason of our social oneness my debt of punishment can be extended to the social body of which I am a member), and in particular we become better disposed to pray for favours (this will benefit others, even the dead, on whom we are endeavouring to invoke blessings). Moreover, by communion we can gain indulgences which may be applied to the dead. Nevertheless of itself, my communion does not benefit others directly in the same manner as my Mass does or my alms or my prayer.

be called true immolation; it is merely an image or representation of it. And indeed symbolical immolation through the species has already preceded the communion by the consecration under the two separate species. Hence the immolation of the sacrifice cannot be placed in the communion, but immolation already being presupposed, communion is simply the partaking of the Victim.

Moreover, so to link up the communion, as immolation, with the sacerdotal offering enacted in the consecration, would give as many immolations as there are communions received, either by the priest or the laity (both within and without the Mass): because immolation in itself, when separate from the offering, may just as well be performed by a layman as by a priest. So the immolations of the Mass would be multiplied indefinitely.

§ 2. The Proper Condition of Our Victim

Error in this regard may occur *by excess*, by unduly exaggerating the victimal condition in Christ; or *by defect*, by denying to Him the real intrinsic properties of Victim.

A. ERRORS BY EXCESS

De Lugo (*De venerabili eucharistiae sacramento*, disp. 19, sect. 5, n. 67–68) and his contemporary, Raynaud (*Candelabrum sanctum septilustre divinae mensae illucens*, sect. 3, c. 5, n. 19–23),¹ and afterwards a few others,² latterly Cardinal Franzelin (*De SS. Eucharistiae sacramento et sacrificio*, 1868, pp. 265, 379–380, 384, 391), would seem to err by excess, when they teach that by the consecration Christ is placed in a lower status—*in statu decliviori*—(thus de Lugo, Franzelin), in other words, He is subjected, not indeed to a new immolation in blood but still to some kind of real lessening, or deprivation and destruction not of the substance itself, but of the proximate capacity to exercise acts of the sensitive life. For so Cardinal Franzelin writes: “Formally as He is constituted under the species, EVERY ACT CEASES WHICH IS CONNATURAL

¹ It is not easy to determine which of the two first propounded this doctrine. It seems probable that each wrote independently of the other.

² Gonetus, *Clypeus*, pars 2, tract. 11, disp. 3, art. 3, n. 17, ed. 6, Lyons, 1681, t. 4, p. 377. Although in the *Manuale* he wrote otherwise as below.

TO CORPORAL LIFE AND DEPENDING ON THE SENSES; SO THAT IN HIS BODY HE CAN DO NOTHING CONNATURALLY” (*loc. cit.*, p. 380. In the third edition, p. 403 coll., p. 398–399 and 404). Again: “He is constituted there AFTER THE MANNER OF AN INANIMATE THING, as far as regards any act connatural to the sensitive life, which state, in comparison with the connatural state, is a kind of exinanition” (*ibid.*, p. 383). Again: “THIS EXINANITION is not only rightly (*satis*) understood as TRULY AND PROPERLY SACRIFICIAL but also, with the exception of the sacrifice in blood on the Cross, we cannot conceive any more sublime and more profound manner of true and proper sacrifice” (*ibid.*, 380, ed. 3, p. 403).

If we ask what would hinder the vital action of the senses of Christ, we receive the reply: “To understand this clearly it must be borne in mind that the Body of Christ has REALLY two distinct modes of existence, one connatural in heaven, the other sacramental which He assumes under the species of bread and wine. As formally constituted in the sacrament, that is, not only as regards our perception, but REALLY AND IN HIMSELF, HE EXISTS THERE IN AN UNEXTENDED CONDITION, and is thus BEREFT of the acts connatural to corporal life, bereft also of the connatural capacity (*facultatem*) for such acts” (p. 382).

The following words of Cardinal de Lugo give the teaching in a nutshell: “Although the Body of Christ is not substantially destroyed in the act of consecration, STILL IT IS DESTROYED IN A HUMAN MANNER, in as much as it is given a lower status, and such that IT IS RENDERED USELESS FOR THE HUMAN SERVICES OF THE HUMAN BODY” (*loc. cit.*, n. 67).

Renaud did not hesitate to push the principle to its ultimate conclusions: “In the Eucharist (what a humiliation!) Christ so humbled Himself and chose a state so abject that, apart from a singular miracle, He is like a dead trunk or a log, HE CAN NO LONGER OBTAIN KNOWLEDGE THROUGH ACQUIRED IMAGES, NOR ANY LONGER CAN HE, IN THE LIGHT OF THAT KNOWLEDGE, MAKE ACTS OF THE WILL, likewise He has no more power to feel or move in any way whatever than He would have if He possessed no faculty of reason, sense, or motion. . . . This is true (*probo*) because the extension of the body is necessary for it to effect any bodily action. The same is true of all bodily activities whatsoever, whether these

be immanent or transient, as well as of all spiritual activities of the soul, while it is united to the body, such as those acts which the intellect can elicit by making use of the acquired species or images, or the will when acting in the light of such knowledge provided by the intellect. For there is a common characteristic of all these actions. I have, however, restricted my remarks to the knowledge which is acquired immediately from acquired images . . . for such knowledge is wholly bound up with fantasy which of its very nature demands extension, being material and corporeal. . . .¹ Could anything be added to the supreme humiliation of Christ in the Eucharist, since He lies there like a dead trunk or a log, a state not realised even on the Cross? For there, in the midst of His torments, His senses still exerted their con-natural function. . . . Hence this state of Christ is by far the most wretched, a greater humiliation than even His abject condition on the Cross" (*loc. cit.*, Avignon, 1645, pp. 225–228). Raynaud draws no inference that does not follow naturally from the principles held by him in common with de Lugo.² But would it not follow from this that we are worse than the deicide Jews? . . . And yet we must admit that this opinion is scattered here and there in numerous books and sermons.³

¹ Though Suarez (disp. 53, sect. 3, n. 4) and Vasquez (disp. 191, c. 3, n. 28) undoubtedly held this same view as regards the condition of Christ existing in the Eucharist, they did not place the victimation in this.

² In some respects J. de Ulloa (*Theologia Scholastica*, t. 4, disp. 8, n. 8 and 9, Augsburg and Gratz, 1719, pp. 290–291) goes even further than Raynaud, asserting that by the transubstantiation considered in itself, not only the life but the very Body and Blood are virtually destroyed: "As often as the whole Body of Christ and the whole Blood are placed in relation to each other in one point of space, each is so affected . . . THAT WHILE THIS CONDITION REMAINS, THE CONTINUANCE OF THE LIFE AND OF THE BODY AND OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST BECOMES IMPOSSIBLE. Because whoever should try to restrict that whole Body and Blood of Christ within a much lesser space than is naturally due to them, even though that is larger than one point of space, would destroy, in so far as in him lay, all these THREE. But whenever a Catholic priest consecrates, in that consecration he places in relation to each other the whole Body and the whole Blood of Christ . . . within one point of space. . . . Therefore whenever a priest consecrates, etc. . . . Therefore, seeing that the whole present difficulty is centred on this: that of its very nature sacrifice demands the destruction of the victim . . . and since this destruction is found sufficiently in the consecration itself alone . . . because by virtue of the consecration as instituted by God the whole Body and the whole Blood of Christ is placed in such a condition of compression (*in statu et coarctatione*) that while that persists (*in sensu composito*) the continuance of natural life is impossible . . . Hence it is that in the consecration alone we have the whole manner (*ratio*) and essence of this bloodless sacrifice." According to him, therefore, the consecration is a production which is (virtually) destructive of what is produced.

³ This is the foundation of the very singular structure of the sacrifice as built up by Cardinal Cienfuegos (*Vita abscondita*, disp. 5, sect. 3, parag. 1, Rome, 1728,

We have no need to point out that such indignity inflicted on Christ by us, more ignoble even than the degradation inflicted by the Jews, is absolutely inconsistent with Christian piety. Any such thought was far from the mind of our ancestors, and as far as I know there is no trace of it among the early writers, except in Rupert of Dietz, and immediately his teaching became known it was severely censured. Rupert was dealing with an objection raised against the true presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist: "But the adversary says: Christ, God and Man, is living, sensible and mobile in His Body. BUT THE BODY OF THE SACRIFICE HAS NOT LIFE, IT HAS NOT SENSE, IT IS NOT MOBILE. This being assumed, our adversary concludes: Therefore the Body of Christ is not present, Christ is not present [in the Eucharist]." Rupert thought to solve the difficulty by making a distinction: "I ask you: what do you look for in the Body of the Lord? For there is the animal life and the spiritual life. THE ANIMAL LIFE HAS THE USE OF (*fungitur*) FIVE SENSES, sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch. This is the animal life, it is the carnal life, it is the flesh. But the Lord says: *The flesh profiteth nothing*. . . . Animal life therefore because it is the flesh, were it to be present in the Body of the Lord, would profit us nothing, AND FOR THIS REASON IT WOULD BE SUPERFLUOUS TO REQUIRE IT" (*De divinis officiis*, 1, 2, c. 9. P. L. 41, 170).

This answer does indeed appear to concede to the adversary, that the Eucharistic Body of Christ is without the vital motion of its senses.¹

p. 359): It is this: after the words of consecration are pronounced, Christ in the Eucharist is first living (miraculously, indeed) with actual sensitive life. Then "after He has elicited under the species some acts of the life of the body" Christ Himself "as High Priest IMMOLATES alone and OFFERS at the same time" this His actual life; "in so far as by the command of His human will He suspends or removes the vital acts so far miraculously produced, and decrees to elicit no such further act . . . until as if by a resurrection . . . visibly represented and effected in an imitation of it, in the mingling of the Body and Blood He resumes His actual life." But he does not tell us what would follow, if the priest should chance to omit this mingling. Meantime this is his explanation of the epiclesis: "Why then is the descent petitioned for in devout and heartfelt supplication? For no other end than for the restoration of the actual life of Christ sacrificed by the aforesaid immolation: since the Holy Spirit is the true and proper life giver."

¹ However, another possible interpretation of this passage has been proposed in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. 11, p. 555 (cf. P. L. 170, 784): that Christ is bereft of the sensitive life, not in Himself, but in relation to us: "Rupert has no doubt whatever that the Body of Christ is living in the Eucharist, but it is not living in a manner which is sensible to us." In this there would be nothing contrary to Catholic belief.

William of Theodoric at once indignantly rebuked Rupert for this monstrous suggestion: "What you call the Body of the sacrifice, I understand to be that Body and no other which died and rose again: but we do not speak of it as the Body of the sacrifice, we call it what it really is: the Body of the Lord. And you sometimes call what you here call the Body of the sacrifice, the Body of the Lord. But, if you will forgive me for saying so, you draw an inference regarding what you call the Body of the sacrifice, which certainly does not hold of the Body of the Lord. For no one but the *fool who hath said in his heart: there is no God* will deny that the Body of the Lord, yea in very truth the Lord Jesus IN HIS OWN BODY, IN THAT VERY BODY IN WHICH HE IS PRESENT BEFORE YOU ON THE ALTAR (which is no other than that which is seated at the right hand of the Father), has MOVEMENT and FEELING and everything which is natural to us, though of another glory" (P. L. 180, 342).¹

Three centuries later this opinion of Rupert was urged against the presence in the Eucharist of the true Body of Christ by Wycliffe, who, however, attributed the opinion to Ambrose. Thomas of Walden not only proved that it was not the teaching of Ambrose, but that the Saint simply and absolutely rejected it as heretical (*Doctrinale*, t. 2; *De Sacramentis*, c. 31 and 47, fols. 52 and 81).

Let us now hear what Raynaud has to say about the opinion of Rupert (*loc. cit.*, n. 21, p. 226): "Nevertheless the teaching of Rupert seems to be quite true, provided we understand him to speak of life in complete activity (*in actu secundo*), as we do. For we may not deny to Christ in His Eucharistic life, even sensitive and vegetative life, though without its connatural activity (*in actu primo*), seeing that this is simply the existence of the soul in the body. . . . Speaking, therefore, only of that fullest vegetative, sensitive and rational life, such as we can bring into play through acquired images, I admit with Rupert that it is not in Christ in the Eucharist."

Probably it was for this reason that Cardinal Franzelin does not include Raynaud among the supporters of his own teaching (*op. cit.*, p. 378).

¹ Certainly of course Christ in the Eucharist has, precisely because of that Eucharistic presence, no local motion, but He has in the Eucharist every vital movement of His faculties, exactly the same as He has in heaven. Cf. L (Vol. III).

Possibly we may bracket with Rupert a theologian and friend of Rupert himself, whom Guibert of Nogent mentions without giving his name, and who held that the death and the crucifixion of Christ is repeated as often as Mass is offered (*De pignoribus sanctorum*, 1, 2, c. 6, parag. 1. P. L. 156, 645).

Apart, then, from one or two exceptions, all our great Doctors of theology (*omnes doctores nostri*) taught unanimously that Christ is in no way injured or lowered by the consecration of the sacrament. Call to mind the many Fathers cited above (XIX), particularly St. John Chrysostom and St. Thomas. Call to mind, too, what the Fathers have to say (XVIII) regarding the *non-immolated victim sacrificed without immolation by the priests*.

Let us now consider the unimpeachable authority of the Eucharistic Doctor, St. Paschasius Radbertus. It is true that at first sight he sometimes appears to exaggerate our sacrificial action beyond the limit of truth, as when he says: "How is this sacrament called a victim if Christ is not immolated in it? For in the strict sense of the word we do not rightly speak of immolation UNLESS SLAYING OF THE VICTIM accompanies it. Nevertheless the priest is rightly said to immolate in this bread and wine, since therein Christ, so to speak (*ut ita fateor*), in this oblation, after the manner of (*ac si*) a victim for our sins, or in the food of our salvation, IS IMMOLATED (*victimatur*) to God the Father" (*Expositio in Matthaeum*, 1, 12, c. 26. P. L. 120, 894). But do not the expressions *so to speak, after the manner of*, so qualify his words as to convey the suggestion of a figure of speech, Paschasius introducing these modifications to indicate that no immolation or victimation is asserted, but one that is merely symbolical? Moreover, other excerpts from his works demand this interpretation. For in his book *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (c. 4, n. 1. P. L. 120, 1278) he distinctly points out where in the Eucharist there is true reality and where there is figure. The true reality, he says, is found in the actual presence of the Body of Christ; but THE FIGURE is found IN THIS, THAT—while the priest is, according to external appearance, doing (*gerente*) something else as it were (*quasi aliud*) in commemoration of the sacred Passion—every day at the altar THE LAMB IS IMMOLATED, a thing which was really done once only (*quod semel gestum est*). Therefore the immolation, once only

really enacted in the Passion, is each day figuratively re-enacted in the sacrament. Again, in the course of the same work, he definitely says that Christ is immolated in the mystery (that is, in the symbol) of the Passion, that Passion which, enacted once only, must be daily commemorated.¹ Finally, any lingering doubt as to the teaching of Paschasius is removed by a study of the *Epistola de corpore et sanguine Domini ad Frudegardum* (particularly cols. 1353–1355). In this epistle he makes use of all those expressions of Augustine which bespeak real things, to assert the presence of our Lord, and all that denotes symbolism in the same author, to explain the immolation which we make. Hence it was most unjust for whoever was the author of the *Epistola ad Egilem Prumiensem* (P. L. 112, 1512)—putatively for some centuries assigned to Rabanus—to accuse Paschasius of teaching the error that Christ suffers as often as Mass is celebrated. Heriger, in the treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (c. 8, *inter opera Silvestri*, II. P. L. 139, 187), had no difficulty in defending him from such a charge.²

When the Berengarian heresy arose, Guitmund of Aversa in the clearest of terms explained the sense in which at that time the Eucharistic immolation was understood:

“When we say that in the celebration of the Body of the Lord
CHRIST IS IMMOLATED, NO ONE MUST INTERPRET THESE WORDS

¹ “This offering is daily repeated, though Christ, suffering once only in the flesh, redeemed the world by that same Passion unto death; and the same Christ rising again from the dead dies no more, *death shall no more have dominion over him*; in very truth we do make the daily offering because the wisdom of God the Father made this provision, which for many reasons was necessary. . . . It is just because we fall into sin every day, that Christ is mystically immolated for us every day, and THE PASSION OF CHRIST IS GIVEN TO US IN THE MYSTERY. . . . His Body is not slain, nor is His Blood shed at the hands of infidels to their own destruction, if it is received on the lips of the faithful for their own salvation. In the Law the paschal lamb was a perfect figure of this. Once it freed the people from the servitude of Egypt, and it had the power, by its immolation every year, in commemoration of that liberation, to sanctify the same people until He Himself should come, to whom that lamb gave testimony, and He, after the paschal lamb had been offered (*oblato agno*), being Himself offered to the Father for us as a victim in the odour of sweetness, SHOULD TRANSFER THE MYSTERY OF HIS PASSION TO OTHER CREATURES, BREAD AND WINE (*in creaturam panis vini que transferret*), being made a *priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, by Himself approaching to make intercession for us*. And so our Redeemer even until today carries on (*peragit*) through the daily and blessed commemoration of that same Passion, all that which He did once only at the time of the Passion, this I consider above all else the chief reason (*imprimis praeipiam*) why we repeat the commemoration of His holy death, immolating every day without fail (*assidue*) on the altars which we have erected (*super altaris aram*), the Body and Blood of Christ” (*ibid.*, c. 9, n. 1–2, cols. 1293–1295).

² Moreover, Paschasius rebutted this charge in his *Expositio in Matthaem*, 1, 12. P. L. 120, 891.

LITERALLY IN A CARNAL SENSE. For Christ, having once died, *dieth now no more, death hath no more dominion over him*. But when we MAKE THE COMMEMORATION OF HIS PASSION in the celebration of Mass, HIS DEATH FOR US in the past IS SIGNIFIED” (*De corporis et sanguinis Domini veritate*, 1, 2. P. L. 149, 1455).

No less than Guitmund, Alger rejects any notion of lessening of status in the Eucharistic Christ. Commenting on the words of Chrysostom, which at that time were wrongly attributed to Ambrose, he writes: “We must now see why Ambrose, having said a short time before that in Christ there was once offered a victim all powerful for salvation, puts a question which would seem to imply that our daily offering was not true, coming after that true offering made once only, or was superfluous, after that one, all powerful and sufficient for our salvation: What then do we do, do we not offer every day? But it must be plain to us that if OUR DAILY OBLATION WERE OTHER THAN THAT ONCE OFFERED IN CHRIST, IT WOULD NOT BE TRUE, but would be SUPERFLUOUS. For since that oblation once offered in Christ is really true, because truly it is eternal life, and since of itself alone it is sufficient to confer that life on us, if there were another offering, what other life could it promise or confer? For another offering would need to confer another salvation; or, to confer the same salvation which the single oblation of Christ was sufficient to confer, which would be superfluous and vain. Hence as another salvation is an impossibility, THAT OBLATION OF CHRIST ONCE MADE, AND OUR DAILY OBLATION MUST BE THE SAME: SO THAT THIS SAME OFFERING IS NOT SUPERFLUOUS TO ITSELF, but is ever sufficient and ever necessary. . . . Ambrose, answering as it were his own question, says: we offer, but in commemoration of His death; and there is only one victim, not many, BECAUSE CHRIST WAS OFFERED ONCE ONLY, our sacrifice is the image of His (*hoc autem exemplum est illius*): the very same, always the very same. . . . THERE IN THE REALITY OF THE PASSION IN WHICH HE WAS KILLED FOR US, HERE IN THE FIGURE AND IMITATION OF THAT PASSION, in which Christ does not suffer again really, but the memorial of His actual true [reading ‘*verae*’ not ‘*vere*’] Passion is daily repeated for us. . . . Although the offering of Christ in the past was real, and our daily offering on the altar IS FIGURATIVE, nevertheless here, as

well as there, we have absolutely the same grace of our salvation” (*De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici*, 1, 1, c. 16. P. L. 180, 786–787). In the passage, as he clearly uses the word *oblation* as meaning *immolation*, or to use the word of Paschasius *victimation*, he reduces all that we do to Christ to the symbolic, or, as he says, to the figurative immolation: this being perfectly consistent with his own principle already laid down in chapter 12: “We receive the Body of Christ in the sacrament, such as He is in Himself after the Resurrection” (*ibid.*, col. 781).

We may not lightly pass over this clear and emphatic teaching of Alger on the Body and Blood of Christ. Comparing him with his predecessors, Lanfranc and Guitmund, Peter of Cluny, a most competent judge, writes as follows: “The first of these theologians treated of the true reality of the Body and Blood of Christ, hidden under the sacramental veils, well, fully, perfectly; the second, better, more fully, more perfectly; the last, best, most fully, most perfectly; so much so that nothing is left to be desired even by the most exacting student” (*Tract. contra Petrobrusianos*. P. L. 189, 788). This same sense is conveyed in the words of a theologian who followed immediately after Alger, Hugh of Amiens, Archbishop of Rouen (*Contra Haereticos*, 1, 1, c. 14. P. L. 192, 1272): “Made a saving victim for us . . . offered to God the Father on the Cross, He redeemed His faithful from sin . . . and so, seated at the right hand of His Father, He gives Himself on the altar of the Cross through the ministry of priests, WITHOUT SUFFERING ANY DETRIMENT, ANY LESSENING WHATEVER . . . This is the living victim which the Lord Jesus Christ Himself offered to God the Father for us, and commanded us to offer in due manner: Do this, etc., He says.”¹

The Scholastic Doctors who followed did not depart from the principles of Paschasius, Guitmund and Alger. Thus Peter Lombard, their leader: “It is asked: is sacrifice or immolation the proper term for what the priest does, and is Christ immolated

¹ “He gives Himself today, just as He did at the Paschal Supper, He ordered that this should be done till the end of the world; this is A TRUE SACRIFICE” (Hugh of Amiens, *Tractatus de memoria*, 1, 1, c. 14. P. L. 192, 1305). Although there is no detriment whatever in Christ in the Eucharist, nevertheless the sacrifice of the Eucharist is true, because the sacrifice or the victim is from the Cross to which He offered Himself, from which we have received Him. Cf. the words from Hugh above, (XX).

each day, or was He immolated once only? Our answer is briefly this: what is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and an oblation, BECAUSE IT IS THE MEMORIAL AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE HOLY IMMOLATION made on the altar of the Cross. And Christ died on the Cross once, and in Himself He was immolated there; but He is daily immolated in the sacrament, because in the sacrament was made the memorial of what was done once" (*Sentent.*, 1, 4, dist. 12, n. 7. P. L. 192, 866).¹

Bandinus, more clearly distinguishing the words *sacrifice* and *immolation*, gives the same teaching (*Sententiarum*, lib. 4, dist. 12. P. L. 192, 1097): "This sacrifice is called the immolation of Christ. For Christ IS IMMOLATED DAILY, NOT IN THE ESSENCE OF HIMSELF, because He died once only, and dieth now no more, BUT IN THE SACRAMENTAL REPRESENTATION."

Peter of Poitiers speaks in the same sense (*Sententiarum*. lib. 5, c. 13. P. L. 211, 1256), but in words of greater vigour and penetration: "We are asked, is what the priest carries out every day on the altar true immolation, and whether Christ is immolated daily, killed every day, and so the one death of Christ is insufficient? To this it must be said that Christ is immolated in the sacrament, and this immolation is called immolation FOR NO OTHER REASON THAN THAT IT REPRESENTS THE TRUE IMMOLATION which was once made of Him with hands extended on the Cross. JUST AS A PICTURE represents that of which it is a likeness, and we are accustomed to give to the image the name of that which it portrays, as the image of Achilles is said to be Achilles, so this immolation takes its name from the true immolation which was effected once only."

All these theologians rightly understood what Augustine had to say in his letter to Boniface the bishop: "On this Sunday we say, *Christ rose from the dead today*, though many years have elapsed since the day of the Resurrection itself. Why is it that

¹ To understand aright the terminology of that time and to avoid equivocation, it is important to note how Peter speaks of the breaking of the Host: "This breaking and this dividing can be said to be made not in the substance of the Body, but sacramentally in the form of the bread; so that the true breaking and dividing is there only; IT IS NOT MADE IN THE SUBSTANCE OF THE BODY, BUT IN THE SACRAMENT, THAT IS, IN THE SPECIES" (*ibid.*, n. 5, col. 865). This, then, is what is meant by the words *in the sacrament* as distinct from *in Himself*. On the breaking of the Host, compare what Bandinus has to say of the breaking (col. 1096) just before the passage we quote.

no one is so foolish as to say that we are lying when we use this manner of speech? Is it not because we habitually give a name to certain days from their likeness to others in which the events actually took place? We call a day such, though in reality it is not the actual day itself, but such as the other by the revolution of time. Similarly, because of the celebration of the sacrament, we say that on such and such a day something was done, which actually was not done on that day, but took place in the past. Was not Christ immolated in Himself only once in the past, and yet He is immolated in the sacrament for the people, not only every paschal day, but every succeeding day, and certainly a man does not lie, when, on being asked whether Christ is so immolated, he answers: Yes. For if the sacraments did not have a likeness to those things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all, and so quite commonly we name them after those things of which they are an image or similitude" (*Ep.* 98, n. 9. P. L. 33, 363-364).

It is certainly true that Christ, who once submitted to real immolation, is daily immolated only in a sign or a symbol or a sacrament of immolation. Nevertheless our sacrifice is a true sacrifice, not a fictitious one: for immolation is not the same thing as sacrifice. The sacrifice is the offering of the immolated Flesh. Now the Flesh of Christ was immolated in the Passion, and, living as the Victim of the eternal sacrifice, He is offered by us who do the same thing as Christ Himself did, when He sacramentally at the Last Supper shed the life blood of His Flesh. St. Thomas therefore introduced nothing new, but simply stated the tradition of the Schools, when he said: "But the celebration of this sacrament is an image representative of the Passion of Christ, which is His true immolation. *And for this reason* the celebration of this sacrament is called the immolation of Christ" (3 S. 83, 1; cf. XIX above). Such is the real tradition of the Church, rejecting in the Mass not only any real blood-shedding in Christ, but any detrition or lessening or lowering of any kind, any change whatever, even bloodless, in Christ, retaining nothing but the symbolical imitation of the past slaying.

To conceive any other immolation or lessening of status in Christ is not only contrary to the teaching of the saints, but in

direct opposition to the doctrine of the incorruptibility of Christ, to the divinely revealed prerogative of the Victim, which is subject to one victimation only, but to such a victimation or real immolation as is all-sufficient for atonement, throughout all generations for all time. We have insisted frequently on this principle, which we now repeat: that the necessary intrinsic oneness of the Mass with the sacrifice of the Cross is destroyed if anything is done in the Mass considered in itself, whereby it would subsist as a true sacrifice, even apart from the Cross. Certainly we may say that the Mass is *intrinsically* and *absolutely* a sacrifice, but only if we use the words *intrinsically* and *absolutely* to exclude every teaching that the Mass is a mere effigy or a mere commemoration of sacrifice, a mere convivial partaking, a mere extrinsic commemoration of sacrifice. But it would not be *intrinsically* and *absolutely* a sacrifice without the previous sacrifice of the Passion, whence the Victim which we offer is made available to us. Hence, from this point of view, we must say that the Mass is ESSENTIALLY a relative sacrifice, relative, I say, to the sacrifice of the Cross.¹

Finally, against the teaching of any lessening or degradation of Christ in the Eucharist, I most firmly hold and confidently assert with Cardinal Billot (whose teaching is otherwise in direct opposition to mine) a principle which we shall establish elsewhere: that not only is no lower state induced in Christ by the transubstantiation, but, furthermore, He cannot be affected by any change whatever, indeed He persists simply and absolutely immutable, not only in substance, but also in everything inherent to Him in any way, which of course includes His dimensions or stature.²

¹ It is not surprising that, when considered under different aspects, the Mass can be said to be either an essentially relative sacrifice or an absolute sacrifice. For in a similar fashion my *being* is absolute, in as much as I am not part of another *being*, I subsist in myself, nevertheless my *being* is essentially relative to the subsistent *Being* (God), for it receives all that belongs to it as *being* from a many-sided and intrinsic relation to that subsistent *Being*.

² In the work *De sacrificio missae commentarius*, c. 7 Galenus Vestcapellius gave a compendium of all these restrictions: "If we impute to Christ now glorious and immortal a new, daily and almost continuous change (*tantum non assiduam*), we must appear to approve of the error of those who attribute to the sacrifice of the Mass a value peculiar to itself, in no way derived from the sacrifice of the Cross. For just as such change of existence in Christ Himself triumphant, equal in omnipotence to the Father, and in all other aspects of glory and beatitude, would constitute for us a sacrifice distinct from the sacrifice of the Cross, so it would necessarily possess an efficacy of its own, distinct and different from that of the sacrifice of the Cross. . . . What reply will these theologians make to the heretics who, up to the present at least, teach and maintain with the Catholic Church that the Cross is

But someone may object: one cannot deny that in the sacrament Christ has degraded Himself in a new and unspeakable manner, for He has concealed not only His divinity, but also His humanity, and so has descended to a point beneath the level of His assumed mortality, down even to the condition of a lifeless and irrational thing, corporal food and drink. I reply that all these things are true, but they concern the appearances merely and not the reality; that is, they apply only to the teguments or the species under which Christ is; they do not affect Christ Himself in any way. They are of the same order as the symbolic immolation, of which they are the logical consequence. That is to say, just as Christ is represented to us by means of the species as slain, so consequently by means of the species or appearances He is set before us as food and drink to be corporally partaken of. For Christ, however truly partaken of under the species of food and drink, is not Himself something eatable and drinkable, in the condition of our corporal food and drink, this condition being restricted to the symbolical teguments of Christ, the species. Hence by His presence in the sacrament under the appearances of food and drink Christ is not affected by any real intrinsic condition of immolation, but in appearance only.¹ Hence anyone who would be contented

the power of God, and that by its one "foolishness" it pleased Him to save the world which had rushed to ruin by its own wisdom? What reply will they make to St. Paul, who says repeatedly that all grace, redemption and salvation is obtained from the one offering of Christ and the sacrifice of the Cross? . . . What is left now of the principle laid down by all the early interpreters who declare: that the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with the Cross, and in no way another sacrifice with it, as it derives all its virtue from the same source . . .? Again, how are these theologians going to prove that the constant celebration of Mass does not conflict with the one fully completed immolation of Christ? Finally, it is for them to show how a change in Christ, who exists in beatitude and glory, does not imply some kind of humiliation, or, at the very least, something inglorious" (pp. 116-117). Vestcapellius well appreciated the difficulty of defending the faith, if we admit in the sacrifice of the Mass such conditions and qualifications.

¹ Will you urge that Christ has said: *My flesh is meat INDEED, and my blood is drink INDEED*? Referring to these words, J. B. Sasse (*De Eucharistia*, 1897, tom. 1, p. 542) writes: "It is of faith that the Body and Blood of Christ IS TRULY AND REALLY constituted by the consecration in the status of food and drink." This is unquestionably most true, provided it is understood reasonably. For it is only in the species that Christ is corporal food and drink. In His true reality He is spiritual nutriment. The true Body and true Blood of Christ, really present in the Eucharist, is the true food and true drink of the soul, appearing to our eyes through the species, as though it were corporal food. If the Flesh of Christ in the Eucharist were real corporal food, there would be real true intrinsic exinanition of Christ in the Eucharist. But to be the food of the soul requires no exinanition in Christ, since the divinity itself is the true pabulum of the soul, especially of the blessed. By reason, therefore, of the food condition, Christ is in a state of exinanition only in appearance, as far as the species is concerned, but by no means in Himself.

with such a condition of immolation in our Victim, that He is in the condition of food and drink, seeing that this condition is found, not in Christ Himself but in the species, would rightly be considered to err, not now by excess, but by defect, like the other theologians whom we shall consider in the next section. For we are here seeking whence Christ has a real intrinsic victimal condition, not a condition which is extrinsic, and to that extent fictitious, found only in an image of real immolation, in the alien species. And it is just such real immolation that those Doctors, too, are seeking, with whom we are concerned in this section. Thus they are not satisfied with this explanation either (see Franzelin in the passages considered above), and so assign to Christ a lower intrinsic condition, such as we have been discussing in this section.

It should be remembered, moreover, that the condition of Christ as food for us, follows logically, as we have frequently said, on the condition of Christ as Victim to God, just as the sacred banquet follows from the sacrifice. The sacrifice is presupposed before the banquet, hence the former cannot be formally constituted by the latter.

Indeed it would be quite absurd to suppose that a sacrifice would be *formally* constituted by the fact that a banquet was prepared for ourselves; since every sacrifice must consist in the giving of something by us to God, not in some favour redeemed by us. The sacred food is as it were returned to us by God, and proposed to us for our consumption, only in so far as it is already presupposed that it has been made sacred to God by the sacrifice. The sacrifice must come first, then our sacrificial food as a consequent. In other words, something is a sacrifice in so far as it is offered to God; but this offering to God is not found in the deputation by us of this something to our use; but it is deputed to our use by God, in so far as it has been offered by us to God and accepted by Him, and God then grants us, as His commensals, a participation of the sacred banquet.

Furthermore, such a notion of sacrifice would make the sacrifice in the Eucharist absolute, of such a nature that it could exist even without the Passion, in flat contradiction to the teaching on the Eucharist which we have so often quoted from the Fathers.

Besides, where the Fathers have been cited as favouring the opinion we have just rejected (see Franzelin, ed. 3, p. 298 *et seq.*) it will be found that they really say nothing but what is (or should be) common to all theologians: namely, (1) that Christ is our food just in so far as He has been (sacramentally) immolated—so the vast majority of those cited; (2) the fact that He is our food implies in Him a real victimal condition, because, had not Christ died for us, He would not be our food in the Mass—so, among others, the Fathers cited in Thesis XX; just as He would not have been food for the Apostles at the Supper—thus Gregory of Nyssa, mentioned in III (Vol. I), thus Ephraem, also quoted above from III to VII (Vol. I). But apart from what we have already said, we shall see that this theory is implicitly refuted in our critical analysis of the teachings to be reviewed in the next two Sections, B and C.

B. ERRORS BY DEFECT

They err by defect who, avoiding the true and permanent victimal condition of Christ in heaven, restrict to the sacramental appearance or species whatever there is of immolation in the Eucharistic Christ.¹ Thus Vasquez (in 3 S., d. 222, c. 7 and 8, particularly n. 68) apparently thought that the sacramental species, precisely because of their commemorative character, bestow on Christ, whose presence they indicate, a real sacrificial condition; while Cardinal Billot (*De Ecclesiae sacramentis*, 4, t. 1, pp. 611, 616; cf. pp. 568–572) holds that the species, even apart from their commemorative character, have the power to constitute a true sacrifice and that absolute, because they fittingly represent the internal and invisible dedication of the offerers themselves to the praise and worship of God.

Against the position of these theologians, unless they would be ready to admit (which I greatly doubt) a further element, which we shall indicate later, stands the fact that a sign empty of reality cannot be equated with reality; and so neither a commemoration nor a symbol of sacrifice can be considered a sacrifice when a

¹ Needless to say, these theologians, though restricting the immolative condition to the species, do not restrict the presence of Christ to the mere species, as though He were not really present. Indeed, it is only in the supposition of the real presence of Christ that they maintain that figurative immolation without true immolation constitutes the true sacrifice.

victim in the true and proper sense, with the true and intrinsic condition of victim, is lacking therein. For all sacrifice consists in the offering of a true victim. There is no true sacrifice, if truth is lacking either in the offering or in the victim. But there is no true victim if the immolation of the subject is only apparent, external and alien, and not proper and intrinsic to that subject. Such a symbol of immolation does not take away the necessity of a real true immolation; on the contrary, it demands it. For take away the reality and the sign is deceptive, as suggesting a condition which does not exist; that is to say, there is not here and now a real condition of immolation of which the sign is given, nor does it come with the giving of the sign, nor after the sign has been given. What, then, have we but a fiction? You pretend there is an immolation, where in reality there is no immolation. You simulate a sacrifice where there is no sacrifice. Whether you make this simulation to commemorate a past reality or not is of no account in view of the deficiency of a present true reality. There is no present true reality, but only a mere ghost of reality.

We now come to consider in particular the teaching of Billot: that the Mass is a true sacrifice because the representative immolation of itself alone suffices as a sign of our own internal immolation, which is proper to sacrifice. This argument, however subtle in conception, is ineffective, since the mere shadow of a sacrificial action cannot convey the aforesaid signification BY WAY OF TRUE SACRIFICE.¹ For in every true sacrifice, as we have already said, two things are to be considered; one is the *reality and sign* (*res et signum*), the other *the reality only* (*res tantum*). The *reality only* is our internal immolation. The *reality and sign* is our giving over to God, by an action apparent to the senses, of a victim either

¹ It is sufficiently obvious that our internal dedication can be signified in many other ways besides that of sacrifice. For instance, I may say by way of oral intimation: My God, I consecrate myself to Thee. My internal dedication is then indeed signified, but still there is no true sacrifice, because in true sacrifice this signification is made by way of action, not by word only. Again, this signification may even be made by way of action without sacrifice, as when I genuflect before an image of Christ, imitating the feudal homage given to earthly kings. Here again there is no sacrifice because in sacrifice the aforesaid signification may not be exhibited by any action whatsoever indiscriminately, but only by an action whereby a true victim is placed before God; because sacrifice is first of all the offering of a victim, with, secondly, the intention, also essential to sacrifice, of signifying thereby the internal offering of ourselves. A real victim, therefore, is the very foundation of sacrifice, be the signification what it may,

already immolated, or of a victim actually now submitted to immolation, or to be immolated in the future. This external giving is a *sign* in as much as our internal dedication is denoted by it; it is a true *reality* in as much as in itself it is a real genuine handing over and dedication of some external gift. If there is no condition of immolation in the external thing offered, there is no sacrifice; for no external thing is either immolated or to be immolated, no matter what laetitic sign may be alleged or may be present. Moreover, as we remarked in reference to our Lord's Supper, there is also something in the Eucharistic sacrifice by way of *sign only* (*signum tantum*), the symbol of immolation to be found in the species (which have been given by the consecration the virtue of signifying, separately, the Body and Blood of Christ). But that sign of immolation would be without a corresponding reality, as we said, did not the actual condition of immolation underlie it. (Surely it will never be seriously maintained that what is simply a *sign only* will at any time bestow on the Body and Blood of Christ, however truly present, the true reality of a thing immolated or changed in any way whatever?) It is absolutely essential, then, for the reality of the sacrifice, that there should be some condition of immolation in the very Body and Blood of Christ intimately bound up with our offering, so that the Flesh of Christ, though not now offered to death, should at least be offered, here and now present, as a Victim to God through His death. We adopted a similar line of argument in our treatment of the Supper in III (Vol. I), though in inverse order. We said then that we must consider Christ in the Supper as offering Himself to His death in Blood, for a sacrifice cannot consist of mere representation. We now say that as Christ is no longer offered to an immolation in the future, hence He must be offered as a victim already immolated.

From all this we infer that we have no right whatever to claim that any kind of external signification of our own internal immolation to God suffices to give the true essence of sacrifice, but only such a signification, with a true state of immolation in the external thing offered, so giving us both the *reality and the sign*. Hence a thing is not sacrificed from the fact that a sign professedly sacrificial is employed in connection with it; rather the laetitic signification proper to sacrifice arises from and has its foundation in this: that

an offering is made of an external thing truly immolated. The implication in the sacrificial sign is that it designates us as given over to God by the medium of a victim. The immolative reality, therefore, is not to be proved by the sign, but, on the contrary, the sign is to be regarded as dependent on the immolative reality, as presupposed and underlying that sign. Hence immolation must exist in its own right and in itself. Whatever attempt we make to explain sacrifice in contravention of this principle will lead us, not to an explanation of sacrifice, but to the fabrication of something quite different, void of the very essence of sacrifice.

Further, this teaching, equally with that of de Lugo, is untenable for another reason. It would make the sacrifice of the Mass absolute, in the sense that it could still exist in its own right, even if there were no sacrifice of the Cross. Hence there would be no intrinsic oneness between our sacrifice and the sacrifice of our Lord.

Finally the admission of this opinion raises a difficulty of no small moment, as it would leave nothing of propitiatory value to the Mass,¹ which (propitiatory value) is to be found in the intrinsic elements of the sacrifice, but at the most, something coming to it from another source, attached to it, as it were, and borrowed from without. In my mind this would be contrary to the teaching of the Fathers,² and the universal belief among the faithful: that the Mass has in its intrinsic essence a propitiatory force, not merely one of impetration.

C. ERRORS BY BOTH EXCESS AND DEFECT

Some authors steering an unsatisfactory course between the two extremes with which we have dealt meet with all the inconveniences of both. Such are those theologians mentioned by Bellarmine (*loc. cit.*, prop. 8a, parag. *Alii volunt*), without giving

¹ We mean here propitiation properly so called; that is, actual compensation for sin, not merely propitiation in the broad sense in which one sometimes finds the word used, for the mere impetration of pardon for sin, already prepared for us by another sacrifice (of the Cross), which was truly propitiatory in the proper sense. Cardinal Billot (*op. cit.*, pp. 616-617) in a very skilful argument claims for the Mass this propitiation improperly so called. We, on the other hand, while not claiming for the Mass any propitiation other than that of the Passion, nevertheless maintain that the element of propitiation is intrinsic to the Mass, because therein is offered to God the everliving Victim of the Passion.

² For evidence of this truth, see below (XXV).

their names, who hold with Lessius (*De perfectionibus divinis*, 1, 12, c. 13, n. 97), Pasqualigo (*De Sacrific. Nov. Leg.*, q. 43, n. 2, t. 1, p. 44; cf. q. 49, n. 4, p. 54), Gonetus¹ (*Manuale Thomistarum*, in 3 S., tract. 4, c. 12, parag. 2, n. 11 and 12), Billuart (*De almo euchar. sacramen.*, diss. 8, a. 2, *Dico* 30), etc., that a sacrifice is implied in the consecration, in as much as the consecration effects here and now a CONDITIONAL slaying of Christ, for, they say, by their inherent power the words of consecration would separate the Body and Blood of Christ, did not something else—the present incorruptibility of Christ—prevent it. These authors, I say, impinge on the rocks both of excess and defect. For in the *first place*, with de Lugo and his school, they fail to observe that the formal concept of transubstantiation does not imply, indeed it rather excludes any change, and hence any deterioration of Christ.² *Secondly*, since separation of the Body and Blood or killing does not really follow from this, as it were, ineffectual attempt of the consecration, but only would have taken place were it not prevented, the state of victim is not actually induced in

¹ With whom E. Hugon, O.P., agrees in his admirable book, *La Sainte Eucharistie*, (Paris, 1916, pp. 324–328).

² These theologians seem to be considerably misled by the expression that *vi verborum* (by virtue of the words) THE BODY ALONE is present under the species of bread, and THE BLOOD ALONE under the species of wine. For this does not mean that the words of the form as uttered by us (while Christ is living) would be effective to make present the Body by itself alone (that is, without the Blood or the Soul), were not this power impeded by some kind of superior influence; on the contrary, the form, from its own signification, has the power to make the Body present JUST AS IT HAPPENS TO EXIST. If, therefore, the Body is actuated and informed by the Soul, the words then possess the power of making the Soul present. If the Body exists through the EXISTENCE of the Word, the words of consecration have the power of making the Word present, as actuating the Body in respect of its existence. The genuine meaning of the expression, quite alien to such exclusion as these authors understand it, is simply this: that the power of the words is not such as to make present UNCONDITIONALLY, anything besides the Body in the one case, the Blood in the other. Hence the consecration formula has not unconditionally the power to effect the presence of the Soul: for, if Christ were dead, the Body made present then in the Eucharist by the consecration formula would not be the Body informed by the Soul. Similarly, were the hypostatic union dissolved, the same Body in the Eucharist would cease to be actuated in its existence by the Word. But it by no means follows from this proper sober understanding of these expressions that the words of consecration would have any power (no matter how much they were left to themselves) of inducing a separation of the Body and Blood, but only, if such separation existed before the words were pronounced, of not abolishing that separation; and should the separation supervene after the pronouncement of the words, of not impeding that. Hence there is no ground whatever in the teaching of the *vis verborum* for the sacrificial theory in question. Briefly, *vi verborum* (by the virtue of the words) that practically is made present which the words formally convey. But in themselves the words do not strictly or formally convey a lifeless rather than a living victim. Cf. below, Thesis, L, (Vol. III).

Christ, but only would have been induced, were the attempt effective. Hence in this theory, as in the others discussed in Section B above, Christ lacks the true condition of victim; hence there is no true sacrifice, for a true sacrifice necessarily implies a true victim. When the condition for the existence of anything is unreal, what is subject for its existence to that condition must also be unreal.¹ Hence we reject this middle view of Lessius, Billuart and others, which has all the inconveniences of the two extremes, and follow the lines laid down by the early Doctors of the Church. So, it seems to us, we can avoid the reefs on this side and that, while still safeguarding any elements of truth to be found in the other teachings, and even bringing them into clearer relief. With Cardinal Billot we hold that we make no real immolation in Christ; with Cardinal Franzelin, that to be a sacrifice in the true sense our sacrifice must have a really immolated victim.² But, meanwhile, we retain the true reality of the sacrifice, by insisting that we have persisting and that there still persists in Christ, from the Lord's own sacrifice, the proper and intrinsic status

¹ The same objection of unreality may be urged against Cardinal Franzelin (*op. cit.*, pp. 387-388) and Raynaud (*loc. cit.*, p. 228). For they hold that the vital activity of the senses, impeded by virtue of the sacramental state, is restored, nevertheless, in the sacramental Christ by a new miracle. Thus they run counter to their own principle (which we also maintain with them): that in the Eucharistic Christ there must be a true victimal condition. For on the one hand they maintain that this state of Christ is a lowered status, and on the other they do away with this lowered status by a miracle. Hence they have to meet the objection urged by their leader, De Lugo (disp. 19, s. 4, n. 61), against Lessius: "If in a sacrifice a sheep were struck with a sword, and yet by a miracle of God the sword were to pass through the throat of the animal, in such a way that no cutting or wounding would result, the sheep could not be said to be truly sacrificed, for though of itself the blow would suffice to slay, in actual fact slaying did not follow. It is the same also in the present matter." Moreover, anyone can see that it is quite repugnant that Christ, if unextended, should have the use of any organic faculty. Even by a miracle God could not do what in itself is absurd. He cannot, for instance, make Himself or make an angel (both pure spirits) have sensation.

² "The identity of what we offer with what was offered elsewhere in true sacrifice contributes nothing to make our present action a true sacrifice UNLESS A TRUE STATE OF VICTIM IS HERE AND NOW INDUCED, which is certainly not induced by a sacrificial action elsewhere enacted. Suppose, for instance, that Jephthe and his daughter were to return to life, and were to give in honour of God a dramatic representation of the sacrifice offered long ago, such a representation, as Cardinal de Lugo rightly observes, would contain none of the characteristics of a true sacrifice" (Franzelin, *op. cit.*, p. 369). If for the phrase "a true state of victimhood is here and now induced" we substitute "a true state of victimhood here and now present", this passage would have our unconditional approval, because on the one hand it is now impossible to induce a state of victimhood in Christ, and on the other it is sufficient that the condition induced in Him in the past continues. Therefore, since that condition is present here and now in Christ, we may offer as Victim Him who is here and now invested with the full reality of victimhood induced in Him long ago, and ever persisting.

of a consummated victim; which victim we are authorised and have the power to offer to God, by the consecration, as we have already said.

We have often dwelt on the nature of our offering. It is involved in the symbolical or mystic immolation which Christ first made, and which we renew every day, and consists in the twofold consecration of the bread into His Body and the wine into His Blood; so that thereby Christ appears as given over through death to God, in so far as He is clothed with a sacramental separation of the Body and Blood. As we said when speaking of the Last Supper, this mystic separation alone is suited and has the power to constitute a proper active offering of the true immolation in blood, of which it is the image; an offering which is not merely internal or invisible, but external and sensible, not merely verbal, but real or pragmatic. Hence, though we exclude from the Mass, all real immolation, induced here and now in Christ, we strongly maintain a symbolic immolation of Christ. Hence, if anyone should exclude from the Mass, not only real but also mystical immolation, so far would he be from thinking with the Fathers and with us that, we say this without hesitation, his teaching would be repugnant to the truth handed on to us by tradition, and to Catholic sense. The unavoidable defect of such a teaching is that anyone who maintained it could never, however much he tried, safeguard the true and real offering of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and so would be forced to void the whole sacrifice from its very foundation upward. All that would be left for him would be to see a mere vestige of the sacrifice, in that the bread and wine undergoes some kind of immolation, being destroyed in its substance, when subjected to transubstantiation, while that which hung on the Cross could not have in the Mass the status of a true Victim, but only that of an apparent victim, according to the mere external appearances given by the species. But what we seek and what is required in the Mass is a true Victim truly offered, which will ever elude our search, if we look for it outside of the immolation of the Lamb once slain of old, now living, and meanwhile persisting as a Theohyte, true Victim, truly offered to God, and accepted by Him.

CHAPTER V

THE FRUIT OF THE LEGITIMATE SACRIFICE

THESIS XXV

IN THIS chapter we deal only with the Mass of a priest in peace and full communion with the Church, leaving to the next chapter the consideration of the Mass of a priest either suspended or excommunicated by the Church.

§ 1. The Opus Operatum of the Sacrifice Defined

By the Mass here we mean the essence of the sacrifice apart from the accidental variations of rite; that is, the one sacrificial offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. We have already seen (I) that the efficacy of sacrifice, as such, is by way of impetration and propitiation. The impetratory efficacy of the sacrifice belongs to it in so far as it is laitreutic and eucharistic, an act of supreme divine worship and thanksgiving; the propitiatory efficacy of the sacrifice belongs to it in so far as it is expiatory, an action which appeases the offended God. Now propitiation essentially implies compensation for wrongdoing, atoning for and remitting the guilt, and paying the penalty. In so far as it atones for the guilt, so as it were restoring the balance of commutative justice, it placates the person injured or offended, and for this reason is called propitiation, in the strictest sense, reconciliation;¹ in so far

¹ The effect of *propitiation properly so called* is distinctly enunciated by Cyprian in *De lapsis* (c. 16. P. L. 4, 479). He severely censures those who, after a lapse and before they have done fitting penance, dare to touch the Body of Christ (at that time the priest placed the host on the upturned palms of the faithful who then placed it on their tongues). "Before purifying THEIR CONSCIENCE BY THE SACRIFICE, and by the hand of the priest, before PLACATING AN ANGRY and threatening LORD for THEIR OFFENCE, they offer violence to the Body and Blood, and now they sin more against the Lord with hands and mouth than when they denied the Lord." In the *Anaphora* of Serapion of Thmuis: "O God of truth, we pray thee TO BE APPEASED AND TO BE RECONCILED WITH ALL OF US (καταλλάγηθι πᾶσιν ἡμῖν καὶ ἰλάσθητι)"

as it supplies for the penalty, satisfying the claims of vindictive justice, it stays the hand of the judge or avenger, and hence is properly called satisfaction. And since propitiation implies impetration as well as supreme worship, see Th. I (Vol. I) and thanksgiving, for the sake of brevity it suffices to place the fruit of the sacrifice in the propitiatory effect.¹

(F. D., 2, 174). In the *Anaphora ordinis Ecclesiae sanctae catholicae romanae* of the present-day Maronites, the deacon arouses the attention of the faithful in these words: "The living and Holy Spirit hovers and descends and moves over THIS EUCHARIST, which is placed in the home of the sanctuary FOR OUR RECONCILIATION." And again, after the commemoration of the living and the dead, the deacon says, turning to the priest: "Bless us, O Lord, again and again by this pure and holy sacrifice, BY THIS VICTIM OF RECONCILIATION WHICH IS PRESENTED TO GOD THE FATHER, sanctified and fulfilled and perfected, and on which the holy living Spirit descends." Finally the priest himself says: "O God, LOOK UPON OUR CRIMES, BUT AT THE SAME TIME LOOK UPON THE SACRIFICE WHICH IS OFFERED FOR THEM, because much greater is the sacrifice and the Victim than the guilt" (Max. Saxon., *Missa Syro-Maronitica*, pp. 39, 45, 48). The *Roman Missal* abounds in such examples: "May this Victim . . . wash away our sins" (*Secret* of third Sunday after Epiph.). "May this Victim purge our frailty from all evil" (*Secret* of fourth Sunday after Epiph.). "Receive . . . the sacrifice by the immolation of which thou hast vouchsafed to be appeased . . . that we being cleansed by its operation," etc. (*Secret* of Saturday before first Sunday in Lent). "By this holy intercourse, loosen the bonds of our sins" (*Secret* of Wednesday after second Sunday in Lent). "By these sacrifices may our sins be cleansed" (*Secret* of Wednesday after the fourth Sunday of Lent). "Be appeased by our offerings . . . which thou hast accepted" (*Secret* of Saturday before Passion Sunday). "May these gifts break the bonds of our iniquity" (*Secret* of Passion Sunday). "From all our sins mercifully free us, whom thou hast deigned to make partakers of the great mystery" (*Secret* of Saturday before Palm Sunday), etc. etc.

Note the distinction made by Hugo of Amiens, Bishop of Rouen, between the "remission of sins" given to the faithful who are not yet absolved and the "expiation of punishment" given to those who are already absolved from sin: "The one Jesus Christ, God and Man, made like unto us in all things save sin, the Victim of salvation for us, the universal reconciliation, being offered to God the Father on the Cross, redeemed from sin all His faithful living and dead alike, PURGED THEM FROM GUILT, GRACIOUSLY ABSOLVED THEM FROM PUNISHMENT. And so seated at the right hand of God the Father . . . He gives Himself on the altar by the ministry of the priest UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS in those of His faithful who are living; UNTO THE EXPIATION OF PUNISHMENT for the holy dead, who are freed from sin within the Church" (*Contra haereticos sui temporis, sive De Ecclesia et ejus ministris*, 1, 1, c. 14. P. L. 192, 172). Innocent III speaks indiscriminately (not making distinction between the classes of sinners) of the remission of sins: "By the immolation of the Victim of salvation, our sins being remitted, we are reconciled to the Most High" (*De sacr. alt. myst.*, 6, 5. P. L. 217, 909). The Council of Trent strongly favours this teaching: "In truth the Lord IS APPEASED by the offering of the sacrifice, granting grace and the gift of penitence, and even FORGIVING VERY GREAT CRIMES AND SINS."

Clearly, then, those many theologians fail to appreciate the power of this great sacrifice who hold that apart from impetration its only virtue is to make satisfaction for the punishment still due for sin already remitted as to its guilt, and to remit venial sins. It is true that the sacrifice of the Mass does not justify as an efficient cause, but, nevertheless it does undoubtedly propitiate even for very grave sins not yet forgiven, APPEASING GOD that He may condone these by the infusion of penance and by the grace conferred by the power of the sacraments.

¹ One must be careful not to make too sharp a division between these various fruits, as though they could be materially, and, so to speak, mechanically cut off

When dealing then with the fruit of the Mass, we have nothing to do with the question of merit properly so called of grace and glory, such as must regularly accompany the oblation action as an act informed by charity, as the action of one in such and such a grade of divine charity, or as the work in this sense of such and such a one, or, as we say in our theology, *ex opere operantis*. This merit will later be increased by the subsequent sacramental communion, and then, too, by the virtue of the sacrament itself, or, as again in our theology we say *ex opere operato*, through *the work done*, not by the sacrifice, however,¹ but by the sacrament itself. The only question we ask ourselves is this: to what extent has the Mass itself the power to make propitiation to God for man?

Nor again do we ask: what propitiatory power the Mass may

and separated one from another. Suppose, for example, that two sacrifices were offered, each one equal to the other in every respect: one offered for a person capable of obtaining benefits by impetration but without any need of satisfaction, the other for a person requiring both benefits. There are theologians who say that both will obtain equal benefits by way of impetration, but while one receives in addition benefits by way of satisfaction, the other will not, thus eventually the sacrifice will be a greater boon for one than for the other, indeed more beneficial to the less deserving than to the more deserving. They fail to realise that all these variations of the fruit of the sacrifice are part of, and come to us by virtue of, the bounteous generosity which corresponds to the love with which Christ gave Himself to the Father for us, cf. I and II (Vol. I). This love of our Priest was the one primary source and fount from which relief of every possible need flowed, whether it be the need of paying the debt due to divine justice or to divine vengeance, or the need of some good thing which we lack and have not merited. If the fruit of the sacrifice is not so necessary by way of propitiation in the strict sense, or by way of satisfaction, then it will be all the greater by way of impetration; the sacrificial love of Christ—as far as we are capable of receiving it—directs its whole stream through the one single channel, so to speak, of impetration. So, too, on the other hand, where the need of satisfaction is greater, and of impetration less, as in the Mass for the holy souls, the active virtue of our sacrifice, and the whole of it, will be by that one way of satisfying compensation.

This organic way of considering the sacrificial fruit is neither mechanical nor artificial, for it is founded on the very nature of the Mass. Against this view one may read the learned dissertation of Galtier, *La Messe en seconde intention* (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Feb. 1907, pp. 86–87). But meantime it should be noted that the fruit of the Mass must not be confounded with the source of that fruit. Thanksgiving and adoration being given by man to God is not the fruit of the Mass; and yet it is a necessary condition for the fruit: for the Mass is fruitful just in so far as it presents to God, as from us, supreme worship and thanksgiving; whereupon, through the generosity of God, it becomes for us a source of benefits. But that benefit, as far as we are concerned, is all confined in the threefold boon of propitiation, satisfaction, and impetration. And for this reason Christ, as Himself the fount of benefits, did not personally acquire fruit by way of the sacrifice, though He certainly did in His own name give thanks and adore; all the fruit of the sacrifice itself of Christ was for us.

¹ Here, of course, we use the word *sacrifice* in the active sense—our own offering of the victim, for if the word sacrifice were used in the passive sense for the victim offered it could not be separated from the sacrament.

have, precisely as the action of the offerers, and from that point of view alone, considered in so far as it is a human action, and even one performed under the impulse and guidance of the Holy Spirit; we simply ask ourselves this: what is the atoning power inherent in the Mass itself, by its own virtue, or *ex opere operato*?

We are now in a position to mark an important distinction between the *work done* by the sacraments or the *opus operatum* of the sacraments and the *opus operatum* of the sacrifice. The sacrifice does not consist in the receipt of a boon from God, but in the offering of a gift to God, whereas in the sacraments we do not offer, but receive. We are active as regards the sacrifice, passive as regards the sacraments. God acts in us in the sacrament; we act towards God in the sacrifice. Hence arises a difference in the fruit coming from each *ex opere operato*. For the fruit of the sacrament, derived from the beneficent action of the sacrament itself, or *ex opere operato*, consists in a sanctification effected in us by God; the fruit of the sacrifice, on the other hand, as we have said repeatedly, consists in atonement to God and in reconciliation with Him. This fruit of the sacrifice, though immediately arising from the work done, or *ex opere operato*, does not of itself imply the immediate infusion in us of grace or other divine gift, or the production of anything whatever by way of efficient causation; but the sacrifice intervenes merely as a moral cause, in so far that, when by way of sacrifice we give praise to God, or offer Him just compensation, THE WAY IS OPENED FOR THE MERCY OF GOD TOWARDS US, either to justify us or to keep us good and make us better. In a word, whatever fruit there be of the sacrifice itself, or *ex opere operato*, can only consist in this: that in view of our sacrifice, over and above the mere consideration of the intensity of our devotion, God is PREPARED and in a manner BOUND to bestow His mercy on us in a way suitable to our own individual state and condition.¹ Hence the Apostle wrote: *He died for our sins* (to make propitiation for them), *and he arose for our justification* (to effect it).

¹ This fruit, this immense boon, so obviously transcends all possible effect of ANY WORK OF ANY MERE INDIVIDUAL AGENT (*opus operantis individui*), for example, the priest celebrating, or even of THE WORK OF ANY COLLECTIVE AGENT (*opus operantis collectivi*), that is the whole Church offering, that most fittingly we say the effect is due to the work in itself, or *ex opere operato*.

From what we have said it is clear that some recent theologians (v.g. Suarez, disp. 79, sect. 2, n. 6 *et seq.*) quite unjustly maintain that sacrificial impetration is outside the scope of the *sacrificial action* as such; as though apart from the propitiation or satisfaction no other fruit is derived from the work done in the Mass, or *ex opere operato*. For in real truth the Mass works impetration (securing favours by petition) in exactly the same way as it works propitiation (appeasing God). For of itself all sacrifice is a pragmatic impetration, or impetration by way of action, see Th. I (Vol. I). The sacrifice of Christ, therefore, was a pragmatic impetration of unmerited benefits, not indeed for Himself, but for us whom He bore in Himself. Moreover, the sacrificial impetration of Christ (as revealed in His sacerdotal prayer) was effective with God. For by raising Him from the dead God made known that He accepted the offering made by Christ. In other words, at that moment God ratified on His side the contract in virtue of which the Victim of Christ would be efficacious for the end to which it was offered. And now, when we offer under Him Christ's Victim, WE MAKE THIS EFFECTIVE IMPETRATION OF CHRIST OUR OWN; and so it is that, OVER AND ABOVE ANY PRAYER OF OURS, the impetration of our High Priest, now ratified and heard by God because of His reverence, goes up to heaven BY OUR HANDS, and there obtains infallibly for us every good gift impetrated by Christ for us in the past when He laid down His life for us on Calvary. And the sacrificial impetration made by the Mass is said to be effective, by virtue of the *work done*, or *ex opere operato*, just in so far as it contains in itself and applies to us that impetration of our Lord—a charter, as it were, sealed by the eternal impress of divine glory. Therefore we have just as much right to say that the Mass, in view of the *work done*, or *ex opere operato*, is impetratory, as to say that it is propitiatory *ex opere operato*, because it makes the intercession of Christ our own in the same way as it makes the propitiation of Christ our own; and, finally, propitiation, no more than impetration, avails of itself to produce in us any positive effect by way of efficient causation.¹

¹ This Suarez admits. For, speaking of the remission of punishment due to sins already absolved, which he holds to be the sole effect *ex opere operato* of the sacrifice, he writes: "The effect is not positive and physical, but moral, because it does not consist in the inflowing of any quality or physical entity, but is merely a moral

Hence all that we have to say in speaking of the fruit of the Mass as a work done, or *ex opere operato*, must be taken as equally true of propitiation and impetration: though, for the reason we have given, for convenience we only speak of propitiation. It now remains for us to answer two questions: the *first*, how great is this benefit of the Mass; the *second*, to whom is it beneficial.

The first question then bears on the quantity of the fruit: to what extent does one particular sacrifice of the Mass avail in making amends for sin, or in acquiring other benefits?

The second question centres on the kinds of people who receive the fruit: for whom does the offering of the sacrifice make propitiation?

Regarding the first question, we shall examine how the fruit of the Mass is restricted in general; and we shall find that it is limited by the devotion of the offerers, whoever they are. Later we shall speak of the intervention of various offerers specifically.

§ 2. The Amount of Propitiation Induced by the Mass

From the nature of the Mass, as explained by us, it should already be clear that its value or fruit, though it would be infinite if we merely had to take into consideration the infinite worth of what is offered in the Mass, is limited, nevertheless, by our offering. This fruit is limited primarily by the devotion of the Church offering in common; it is also limited in a secondary manner and cumulatively by the devotion of the individual offerers.

A. THE INTERVENTION OF THE OFFERERS OF THE MASS IN GENERAL

In the first place we note that the sacrifice of the Mass avails more to make propitiation to God than does our own oblation

condonation of a debt, which moral condonation can only be morally caused; nevertheless in its own order it will be said to be conferred, *EX OPERE OPERATO*, IF BY VIRTUE OF THE SACRIFICE APART FROM ANY MERIT AND SATISFACTION OF THE AGENT IT IS INFALLIBLY CONFERRED ON A PERSON NOT PLACING AN OBSTACLE TO IT" (disp. 79, sect. 1, n. 3; cf. sect. 6, n. 1).

action, from its very nature and condition, considered namely in its own intrinsic atoning and impetratory character. For certainly the offering of the sacrifice does not avail to produce this immense fruit merely as the action of these or those men, *ex opere operantis*, but undoubtedly and above all does it avail in view of what is offered, Christ the Victim of the Passion. Hence we say that the fruit arises from the Mass, *ex opere operato*, as we have already explained. For though, as we shall see, an act of the offerer is required, still the immensity of the fruit is not by any means just equivalent in value to that act, rather it exceeds it in a wondrous degree: for, what is offered, the Victim of the Passion, of infinite propitiatory power, contributes its own value to the sacrifice. So priceless is the Victim that it can compensate for every crime, and is equivalent in value to every possible gift of God—for being offered once by Christ, in whose active offering we participate, it was ratified and accepted for evermore by God, and accepted as having all the value and worth of the gift and of the giver: Christ our Redeemer. Hence we must say that our sacrifice is in itself infinite in value on the side of that which is offered. If any curtailment of the value to us of the fruit of the Mass does occur it must originate elsewhere than in the precious Victim we offer.

First, then, we ask: is there a limit to the fruit received by us from the Mass? and if so, we ask in the *second place*: whence does this limitation arise? Is it due to a positive act of the divine will, taxing, so to speak, the value of the Mass, or is it intrinsic to the Mass itself? If there is no positive divine intervention limiting the value for us, what element intrinsic to the Mass has this limiting power?

To the first question, whether the fruit of the Mass offered by these or those of the faithful is limited, all seem to agree that it is. It is true that some theologians mentioned by Suarez (disp. 79, s. 11, n. 1), have been cited as seeming to favour the opposite opinion, that the Mass as offered by these or those of the faithful has infinite efficacy to propitiate God and make satisfaction. No such conclusion, however, can fairly be drawn from the writings of these theologians, as we shall see later in regard to Cajetan in particular. And, indeed, any such view would be out

of keeping with the custom of the Church to celebrate a number of Masses in satisfaction for even a single sin (cf. 4 D. 45, q. 2, a. 4, q. 3, ad 2m).

To the second question: whence comes the limitation of the fruit? some have answered that the fruit is limited by a divine decree taxing once and for all, and so lessening the effect of the offering. Suarez (disp. 79, s. 11, n. 5) apparently is in favour of this opinion.¹ This, however, is not only a gratuitous assertion, but has unseemly implications. For God does not grudge His good gifts to anyone, and so it would be inconsistent with the divine wisdom were God Himself to curtail and assign a limit to the value of work done in praise of Him and for our benefit.² Hence the limitation of the fruits of the Mass must be imposed by the intrinsic elements of our sacrifice, and we agree with St. Thomas, who teaches (as Suarez himself also testifies, *ibid.*, n. 2) that the actual value to us of the fruit of the sacrifice is not indeed equated, but is proportioned to the fervour of the offerers. The reason is that "in satisfaction the devotion of the offerer is considered rather than the magnitude of the offering" (that is to say, of the thing offered); and so "although this offering [that is to say, the thing offered], in view of its great worth, suffices to satisfy for all penalties, nevertheless it obtains satisfaction for those on whose behalf it is offered, and for the offerers also, according to the intensity of their devotion, and not for the whole penalty" (3 S. 79, 5, c; cf. 4 D. 12, 2, 2, 3).³ Therefore with very good reason

¹ In this he is consistent: for once admit the repetition at every Mass by our Lord of His offering by an elicited act, as Suarez (XXIII) does, then not only must the Mass be devoid of limit in respect of what is offered, but it is also without limit in respect of the offerer. Hence, failing an intrinsic basis for the restriction of the fruit, there only remains that the limit be imposed from without by divine decree.

² Moreover, in all the works of God, however finite they may be, there is never a limit as from God, for, as pure activity He simply pours forth activity. Hence whatever limit there is must come from the side of the potentiality which receives the act. To God the creation of a potentiality is nothing other than the diffusion of act; for instance, it is the same to God to make an essence or quiddity as to make it exist, or to give it existence, actuality. The words of our venerable Father Lancicius (*De meditationibus rerum divinarum recte peragendis praesertim in recollectione octiduana*, cap 6, ed. Cracow, 1883, p. 86) are much to the point here, where he quotes with approval from the Commentary *De Divinis moribus*, wrongly attributed to St. Thomas, but worthy of the highest praise: "God communicates to His creatures whatever is communicable to them, and whatever they are capable of receiving. Even at every moment He communicates, when He finds receptivity" (*Vide inter opuscula S. Thomae, Ed. Parma, opusc.*, 55, tom. 17, p. 286).

³ Hence St. Thomas in another place (*In Psalm 19*), speaking quite in general, says: "The more devoutly a person offers a sacrifice, the more acceptable it is, however

do we pray to God that our sacrifices may be acceptable to God, and pray thus even though the Body and Blood of the Lord is offered in them, even praying that they may be acceptable to Him, just as the sacrifices of the ancients in cattle and the first fruits were acceptable to Him, because of the intense devotion of the offerers, as St. Thomas himself (3 S. 83, 4, 8m and 9m) says.

Scotus is in perfect agreement with this. For in Number XX of his *Quodlibeta*, making a distinction between the efficacy of the Mass, as the action of the sacrificing priest (*ex opere operantis*), and the efficacy of the Mass as work done by the sacrifice itself (*ex opere operato*), which he calls the efficacy or value *by virtue* of the sacrifice, and assessing the magnitude or the measure of this latter, he asks: "To what merit does the benefit given us by virtue of the sacrifice correspond?" And he replies: "It can be said that it does not correspond precisely to the good contained in the Eucharist, for that good is exactly the same when the Eucharist is reserved in the pyx, and nevertheless it is not of the same efficacy for the Church as when it is offered in the Mass. . . . Hence, besides the good contained in the Eucharist, THERE IS REQUIRED THE OFFERING of the Eucharist. THIS OFFERING, HOWEVER, IS NOT ACCEPTABLE UNLESS IT IS THAT OF AN ACCEPTABLE OFFERER. . . . Clearly then, just as the Eucharist is NOT FULLY ACCEPTABLE PRECISELY BY REASON OF WHAT IS CONTAINED THEREIN, but it must be also offered, so, too, the offering is not fully acceptable, except by reason of the GOOD WILL OF SOME OFFERER." Thus Scotus.

It is plain then that the Mass, because of what is really contained and offered in the Eucharist, is far higher in value than the goodness and worth proper to our own oblation, but never-

great the sacrifice may be." Bellarmine puts the whole matter very clearly: "Although good disposition on the part of the offering priest is not necessary for the sacrifice of the Mass, nevertheless some good disposition on the part of some offerer is of necessity demanded. . . . That what is offered in the sacrifice of the Mass is in itself most pleasing to God is not inconsistent with this conclusion. For strictly it is not what is offered but the offering of it that is a sacrifice; because sacrifice is an action, not a permanent object. Furthermore, ALTHOUGH IN ITSELF THE THING OFFERED BE PLEASING, NEVERTHELESS THE OFFERING OF THAT THING IS NOT PLEASING, IF THE OFFERER IS NOT PLEASING, AND PLEASING TO GOD IN PARTICULAR WHO NEEDS NOTHING. . . . Still, other things being equal, the offering of the nobler thing is the more pleasing, and hence the offering of the Body of the Lord, the noblest of all things, is the most pleasing" (Bellarmine, *De Missa*, 1, 2, c. 4). Cf. with Irenaeus, to be cited later.

theless its value to us is adjusted in due proportion to that goodness and worth, just as the sacraments sanctify us *ex opere operato* indeed, that is by the virtue of the sacrament itself, but still with a due proportion to our dispositions. The Victim of the Passion is there as an inexhaustible fount of benefit, from which gushes forth propitiation, which each one according to his capacity may take for himself to exhibit to God as his own.

The fruit of the Mass, therefore, is proportioned to and restricted by the devotion of the offerers. Hence we must now see by the devotion of what offerers the value of the Mass is determined and limited, or who are the offerers who so determine the fruit. They are many and diverse. The whole Church, as we have often said and shall at once prove, offers. The priest, the legitimate minister of the Church, offers. Those of the faithful also offer who make contributions to provide for the materials which are consecrated in the sacrifice, and for the sustenance of the priests and others who rightly live by the altar. Finally, the faithful who assist offer the sacrifice. The devotion and fervour of all these contribute to limit and determine the fruit of the Mass, not, however, in the same manner or degree.¹

¹ Bellarmine: "It must be noted that the whole Church offers all the sacrifices that are offered by all priests, but not in the same way. For there are some members of the Church who offer by an habitual intention only, that is to say, those who are absent from the Mass and do not even think of the sacrifice, but their constant state or habit of mind is such that they wish it to be offered; some offer actually, those who are present at the sacrifice and offer it with an actual present intention; many, too, offer in a causal way, in so far as they are the cause of the sacrifice being offered. . . . Finally, the minister himself offers, but as a true priest and officially." The rest of the theologians speak similarly.

THESIS XXVI

B. THE CHURCH AS OFFERER

First let us note that those who assist at a particular Mass might have no devotion, or there might be nobody present; those who have the Mass offered and even the celebrant may have no devotion (consider especially, for instance, the case where the priest offers in the state of sin, and the requisites for the sacrifice are provided by himself, not by others): even in such an extreme case there still remains the devotion of the Church which holds the chief place in the offering of Mass and wins without fail acceptance for the *offering* of the victim.¹ For properly we are said to present to God the Victim of the Body and Blood of Christ, only in so far as, since we are members of His body, when we offer, our Lord incorporates His own offering with ours, or, in other words, were we not united with our Head we could not place His gift before God as our own. But he who offers as a member of the body of Christ does not offer a Victim as exclusively his own, but the common Victim of the whole body of the Church. Hence it is that no sacrifice is ever presented to God except on the part of the whole Church. There is never then such a thing as a private sacrifice of the priest, it is always the public sacrifice of the Church of whom the priest is the lawfully designated minister (Trent. sess. 22, c. 6, D. 944); so that the Pasch of our salvation is “to

¹ When we say here that the Church is the chief offerer, this must be understood in the light of the conclusions we reached regarding the relation of Christ to our individual offerings (XXIII). Christ is undoubtedly the principal offerer in His own pre-eminent way, by virtue of His one offering never to be repeated; what we mean and only mean here is that, among all those who OFFER ANEW, the Church holds the principal place. Now it is only of these new offerers that we speak here, where we investigate the limits of the fruit of the Mass and their cause, as is evident from Thesis XXV. Later on, when we come to speak of the priest as minister of the Church, this will certainly not be to the exclusion of the other consideration that he is the minister of Christ also. But the ministry of the priest in respect of Christ is by virtue of the instrumental power derived from Christ's one offering. In respect of the Church, on the other hand, the ministry of the priest is that of one empowered and commissioned as her representative to offer constantly suppliant prayers and sacrifice. Hence, (consequent on the principles established in XXIV and XXV) when we consider the measure which limits the fruit of the Mass we have in mind only this second ministry of the priest.

be immolated BY THE CHURCH through priests" (*ibid.*, c. 1, D. 938).

You might perhaps object: on the one hand, the priest does not consecrate as deputy of the Church, but as deputy of God; on the other hand, the consecration and the offering are not two actions, but one, because the consecration is truly oblativè, and the offering consecrative, so much so that, should anyone wish to consecrate, and ABSOLUTELY refuse to offer sacrifice, he would effect nothing,¹ having no intention of doing what the Church does and what was instituted by Christ.² Hence it would seem to follow that as the priest does not consecrate as deputy of the Church so neither does he offer as deputy of the Church and so the Church does not offer through the priest. To this objection we answer that, although the consecration and the offering are one action of the priest, nevertheless they are in concept two actions (Suarez, disp. 76, sect. 3, n. 7), for, if God had so willed, He could have instituted the consecration as non-oblativè, and the offering as non-consecrative. Hence it is that this one action may be spoken of in two ways, corresponding to its twofold aspect or relation, both as to its origination and its results: by the consecration God changes the bread into the Body of Christ, by the offering men (the Church) present the Body of Christ to God as Victim.³ And thus the priest consecrates in the name and in the power of the omnipotent God; yet he makes the offering in his own name and in the name of all the faithful. He consecrates

¹ Such a mental attitude, as Suarez remarks (disp. 76, sect. 3, n. 7), might be found in the case of priests tainted with the Lutheran heresy which says that our Lord is present in the sacrament, while it denies the sacrificial action of the Church.

² Suarez implicitly admits this principle when he says: "The consecration and the offering of the sacrifice are so necessarily linked together by the institution of Christ that, if one be given, it is impossible for the minister by his will or intention to take away the other" (disp. 76, sect. 3, n. 7). The Salmanticenses state it explicitly and rightly, too, following de Lugo (disp. 19, n. 103): "Should he refuse to act according to the intention of the Church, but wish to stop at the sole consecration of the matter, in no way acting sacrificially or offering sacrifice, in that event, just as he refuses to act sacrificially or to offer sacrifice, so, too, he would not consecrate; for the consecration of this sacrament is essentially the sacrificial action or the offering of the sacrifice . . . : hence one who simply does not wish to offer sacrifice is convicted of not wishing to consecrate: hence he effects neither of the two" (disp. 13, dub. 2, parag. 2, n. 28). The Theatine, Raphael Aversa a Sanseverino (*De Eucharistiae sacramento et sacrificio*, q. 11, sect. 1, Bologna, 1642, pp. 229-230) writes in the same sense. Cf., too, our remarks below (XXXIII and XXXV).

³ This helps to explain the view of many theologians that in the celebration of one Mass by many priests there is one consecration and multiple offering. We think it more correct to say that in this case the offering is formally one, as the collective offering of a body of men, though it is virtually and equivalently multiple.

as the minister of God, but he offers as the deputy of the Church, as William of Paris says: "The cause of the whole Church is pleaded in the Mass, namely, before God the Father, by the priest as her deputy" (*De Sacram. Euchar.*, c. 2, t. 1, p. 435). Thus we see how it is that the Church truly offers through the priest, as William of Paris says in another place: "The priest at the altar acts as minister and agent of the affairs of another, that is to say, of the affairs of the Church herself; he also assumes the person and the voice or words of the Church: But IT IS THE ONE IN WHOSE NAME THE BUSINESS [of the Mass] IS CARRIED OUT THAT REALLY TRANSACTS THAT BUSINESS (*ille autem agit negotium, cujus nomine agitur*)" (*De Sacram. Ordinis*, c. 5, t. 1, p. 538).

Hardly any of the early writers who expounded the Mass have failed to insist on this. Thus Remigius of Auxerre (*De divinis officiis*. P. L. 101, 1258): "We must consider in the light of faith (*fideliter considerandum*) that the whole Church offers this sacrifice of praise to God." But among them all St. Peter Damian gives perhaps the clearest and fullest exposition of this doctrine. The following quotation will suffice: "Hence when we celebrate Mass we address these words to the Lord: *Remember, O Lord, thy servants and handmaids*, and then a little later: *For whom we offer, or who offer up to thee, this sacrifice of praise*. In these words it is plainly indicated that THIS SACRIFICE OF PRAISE IS OFFERED UP BY ALL THE FAITHFUL, NOT ONLY MEN BUT ALSO WOMEN, though it is seen to be offered in a special manner by one man, the priest; because the whole multitude of the faithful, with the intense devotion of their minds, commits to him what he holds in his hands, to offer it up to God. The same thing is affirmed also in the words: *this oblation therefore of our service, and of thy whole family, we beseech thee to accept*. In the light of these words it is very clear that the sacrifice offered by the priest on the holy altar, IS OFFERED IN GENERAL BY THE WHOLE FAMILY OF GOD" (*Liber qui appellatur Dominus vobiscum*, c. 8. P. L. 145, 237-238). All this is still more evident in the words "We offer to thee, together with thy servant our Pope and our bishop, AND WITH ALL ORTHODOX BELIEVERS OF THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC FAITH."

As far as this common and general offering is concerned the whole Church is sacerdotal, *a kingly priesthood* (*I Pet. II, 9*), that

is to say, all of us whom Christ *hath made a kingdom and priests to God* (*Apoc.*, I, 6 and V, 10). For the baptismal character is a participation in the sacerdotal power wherewith Christ dedicated Himself as a Victim to God; and each one of the faithful, united to Christ in the Church, has at least the habitual desire of being conformed to Christ in offering to God the unique Victim of our salvation; outside of whose adoration of God no fount of propitiation flows for us.¹ It is for this reason that we pray as follows in one of the secret prayers of the Mass: "We beseech thee, O Lord, that the soul of thy handmaid may be liberated from every sin, BY THESE SACRIFICES WITHOUT WHICH NO ONE IS FREE FROM BLAME". (*Missale Romanum* 6, *pro una defuncta* among the *orationes diversa pro defunctis*). Hence again let us quote Remigius of Auxerre speaking of the relation of the offering of all the faithful to that of the priest: "For what is fulfilled by the ministry of priests in their proper office is done in general by the faith and by the devotion of all." And Innocent III: "It is not only the priests who offer, each one of the faithful offers also. For what is accomplished by the ministry of priests in their special office is done in general by the desire and intention (*votum*) of the faithful" (*De Sacr. alt. myst.*, 1, 3, c. 6. P. L. 217, 845).² One must not think,

¹ The passage from Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, in book 4, 8, 3, if genuine, must be interpreted in this sense: "For all the just have the priestly order." So also the saying of St. Jerome (*Dial. contra Luciferianos*, c. 4. P. L. 23, 158): "The priesthood of the laity, that is baptism." But the saying of St. Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, 20, 10. P. L. 41, 676) particularly: "We say that all Christians are priests, seeing that they are the members of the one Priest."

Similarly among the Greek Fathers, St. John Chrysostom in *Homil.* 3, in *II Cor.* (P. G. 61, 417): "Thou wert made a priest in baptism." As to how we are made priests in baptism according to Chrysostom, because then we offer ourselves in sacrifice with Christ immolated, see below, Thesis. XLVI, (Vol. III) where the whole passage is quoted.

² In this sense is to be understood what de Lugo has to say on the impetratory value of the sacrifice by the ministry of the priest considered as a representative of the faithful: "The faithful . . . by the same will wherewith they wish to become members of the Church and to be obedient to her laws, wish also implicitly to ratify whatever has been done by the prelates of the Church for the common utility, and consequently they ratify the appointment of official spokesmen (*oratorum*) and ministers made to plead the cause of all with God. God therefore can accept these prayers as the prayers of each of the faithful now living and offering them to God through their official spokesman (*oratorem*)" (Disp. 19, s. 9, n. 127). Note the fine expression of de Lugo—the priest is the official spokesman (*oratorem*) of the faithful. Gerardus Loricus Hadamarius in the sixteenth century, though elsewhere a rather careless writer, expresses this at least very well: "To hear Mass is to show one's agreement with the priest who is sacrificing, that is, offering to God the desires of the Church. . . . Because when the priest as THE MOUTH OF THE CHURCH, representing all those present, gives thanks to God for the death of Christ, then, too, he commends

however, that this *desire* or *intention* (*votum*) of the faithful implies that their common offering is merely internal, in which case it would not even be the beginning of a true sacrifice, properly so called. On the contrary, the proper offering of the faithful is external or outward by a double title: *in the first place*, and fundamentally (*principaliter*), by reason of the public initiation made in baptism, whereby each one of the faithful is ordained to offer the sacrifice of the Church by the ministry of priests; and by reason of the sacerdotal ordination whereby every priest is publicly deputed to present the sacrifice on behalf of all the faithful; *secondly*, by reason of the liturgical formulae of the Mass which give open expression to this community of offering. By the aforesaid desire or intention, which is perfect when made with charity, imperfect when made in faith not informed by charity, every one of the faithful consents to this office and duty of his; and this common desire or consent simply ratifies what is essentially implied in the public profession of Christian worship. The internal desire adds nothing to the public profession, except to render it sincere; just as the intention of the minister conferring the sacraments gives to the external rite sincerity, without which the external rite lacks efficacy. Hence, in accordance with this desire or intention, the faithful are truly offerers of every sacrifice.

The intervention of the whole Church can be proved in another way. Invisible sacrifice in general is shown or indicated by visible sacrifice, hence by the Victim of the Body of Christ is designated the invisible offering of the members of Christ on earth, that is, of the Church militant (to whom it belongs still actually to offer the sacrifice). For just as the whole Church body is the true *reality*

to God the desires of the faithful" (*De missa publica proroganda racemationum libritres*, 1536, 1, 1, c. 5, fol. F 2; cf. F 5, "he is the mouth of the people").

The ancient Syrians of whatever persuasion, Jacobite or Nestorian, were wont to make practically the same comparison between the sacrificing priest and the tongue of the body of the Church. Thus in the fifth century, Narsai, disciple of Iba of Edessa and founder of the Nisibene school, says in his *Mysteriorum expositio*, translated by R. H. Connolly (*The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, p. 12): "The bright robed priest, THE TONGUE OF THE CHURCH, opens his MOUTH (!) and speaks in secret with God as a familiar." Similarly, Gregory, Bishop of the Arabians (+ 724), "a most learned writer conversant with literature of every kind" (Hurter), in his *Mysteriorum expositio*, edited by R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington (*Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy*, Oxford, 1913, pp. 16-17), uses the same metaphor, though rather more consistently: "THE PRIEST . . . IS THE TONGUE WHICH IS IN THE HEAD OF THE BODY OF THE CHURCH." Later (ninth century), Moses Bar Kepha repeated it in his *Explanatio Mysteriorum Oblationis* (*ibid.*, p. 35).

of which the sacrament of the Eucharist is the external *symbol* or *sign*, so the offering or the dedication to God of the same body of the Church is the true *reality* of which the sacrifice of the Eucharist is the external *symbol*. But only the whole Church is competent to offer the whole Church to God. Hence there will not be a true and sincere sacrifice, unless the Church offers and dedicates herself, her whole self, in it. Every sacrificial activity, therefore, must be in the name and on behalf of the whole Church.¹ St. Augustine teaches this truth in many passages (see XIX), to which we add here a passage from a letter *Ad Paulinum* (*Ep.* 149, c. 16), where he explains the word *προσευχάς* (prayers) of the Apostle (*I Tim.*, II, 1) as referring to the Canon of the Mass: "This word has a proper and special reference to the prayer which we make in pursuance of our vow (*πρὸς εὐχὴν*). Everything that is offered to God, particularly the OFFERING OF THE HOLY MASS, is vowed or dedicated to God. IN THIS SACRAMENT THAT GREATEST DEDICATION OF OURS IS PROCLAIMED, IN WHICH WE DEDICATE OURSELVES TO REMAIN IN CHRIST, THAT IS (*utique*), WITHIN THE STRUCTURE (*compagne*) OF THE BODY OF CHRIST. The sacrament or *symbol* of this underlying *reality* is that *we, though many, are one bread, one body.*"

For this reason, even though the devotion of any particular person or persons be lacking, there always remains in each one of our sacrifices the general devotion of the whole Church, by which the offering of the sacrifice is always commended, and its acceptability safeguarded. Indeed the influence of this general devotion on the offering, as it is more universal, so is it paramount; for all other offerers (as ministers or assistants) are regarded as organs or members of the whole Church. Thus it is that even the sacrifice of the most abandoned priest is acceptable with God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bridegroom of the Church, espoused to whom the spotless Church offers a spotless Victim, the Body of her Head (the Church), and the Head of her body (Christ Himself). Irenaeus seems to have had this in mind when he wrote: "It is not sacrifices that sanctify man . . . but

¹ A priest, therefore, who deliberately excludes the intention of offering on behalf of the Church, does not validly consecrate, for he thereby implicitly excludes the intention of offering sacrifice, and without the intention of offering sacrifice there is no consecration, as we have already said.

the conscience, when it is pure, of him who offers, that sanctifies the sacrifice, and makes it acceptable to God as from a friend. *The sinner*, says the Lord, *who slays an ox to me in sacrifice is as one who brains a dog* (Isa., LXVI, 3). Therefore SINCE THE CHURCH OFFERS IN SINCERITY, HER GIFT IS JUSTLY REGARDED AS A PURE SACRIFICE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD" (*Adv. Haeres.*, 4, 18, 3-4. P. G. 7, 1026). Hence, too, Scotus, having excluded from the Mass any repeated offering on the part of our Lord, very rightly added: "So then it is clear that as the offering of the Eucharist is not acceptable by reason of the good will of Christ immediately offering it, it is acceptable by reason of the good will of the whole Church, the merit of which is finite" (*loc cit.*).¹ Thus, therefore, every Mass, as it is offered on the part of the Church, is actively propitiatory, *ex opere operato*, its fruit, however, having a due proportion to the habitual devotion of the Catholic Church at the moment of offering.

The habitual devotion of the Church is susceptible of increase and decrease. It will never wholly disappear, for the Spirit of sanctity which the Church has received will abide with her forever; but at one time it may be greater, at another time less. The greater it is the more acceptable will be the offering of the Church, and the fruit of the sacrifice *ex opere operato* will increase with the

¹ Gabriel Biel, a distinguished disciple of Scotus, expressed this teaching very clearly: "For though the priest be very sinful, and have nothing in himself to make his sacrifice pleasing to God, and accepted by Him so that spiritual benefits be conferred, yet because the priest is the spokesman (*nuncius*) and deputy of the Church, beloved of God in this offering, which is incumbent on him in virtue of his office, God looks upon the Church, the principal offerer and the principal suppliant, notwithstanding the unworthiness of her deputy who offers. In the impossible event of not one soul within the whole Church militant being pleasing to God, the supplication of this sacrifice would as an oblation impetrate nothing from God: because then there would be in the Church no offerer or no suppliant pleasing to Him so that thereby that offering could be dear, pleasing and accepted by Him; for the offering of the sacrifice has efficacy through the merit of the Church offering it" (Gabriel Biel, *Sacri canonis missae tum mystica tum literalis expositio*, apud Johannem Clein, s. 1. s. a. lect. 27, fol. 38). Earlier, however, in the same work in lect. 26a (fol. 36), the same author, making with Scotus a distinction between the offering of the sacrifice as such and the consecration of the sacrament as such, while teaching that the devotion of the Church measures or limits the fruit of the offering of the sacrifice, he at the same time assigns an absolute value of its own to the consecration of the sacrament from the institution of Christ. If this value is taken to be, as I think the author intended, that which the Eucharist has to sanctify those who receive it in communion, nothing can be said against it. If, however, it were taken to mean a sacrificial efficacy, for example of propitiation or impetration, it would make the author inconsistent both with himself and Scotus, who assigned no such sacrificial value to the consecration of the sacrament as such, but reserved it all to the sacrifice, and measured it by the devotion of the Church.

increasing sanctity and, as William of Paris (*De sacramento ordinis*, c. 5, t. 1, p. 535) says, “graciousness or charm” (*gratiositate*) of the Church in the sight of God.¹ It is then of the greatest importance that there should be in the Church many holy, many very holy persons. Devout people, men and women, should be urged by every means to higher sanctity, so that through them the value of our Masses may be increased, and the tireless voice of the Blood of Christ crying from the earth may ring with greater clearness and insistency in the ears of God. His Blood cries on the altars of the Church, but since it cries through us, since our lips and hearts are its organs of expression, it follows that the warmer the heart, the purer the lips, the more clearly will its cry be heard at the throne of God. Would you wish to know why for many years after the first Pentecost the Gospel was so marvellously propagated; why there was so much sanctity among the Christian people; why such purity in heart and mind, such charity, the sum itself of all perfections? You will find the answer when you recall, that in these times the Mother of God was still on earth giving her precious aid in all the Masses celebrated by the Church; and you will cease to wonder that never since has there been such expansion of Christianity, and such spiritual progress. For, apart from the first grace, which in respect of the Church corresponded to the descent of the Holy Spirit, all other graces have, so to speak, to be purchased from God through its aid. These graces the Church earned then; these graces the Church earns now—in a smaller measure indeed, yet always in a measure worthy of God

¹ Biel elucidates this point also: “And from this it may appear to one that the Mass is more efficacious and more acceptable to God at one time than at another. And it may be taken as a rule that the Mass of a holy priest (whose personal merit is a portion of the total merit of the Church) is better, than if the priest were without grace.” He then proves each of these conclusions, because “the merit of the Church is not something standing by itself, like a universal platonic ‘idea’, nor is it a merit abstracted and now existing in itself outside and apart from individual men, but it is the merit of the persons and the members who constitute the Church” (*Canonis missae expositio*, lect. 26, fol. 36).

Among the Jesuit theologians, Fagundez has, we think, given the best expression to the same idea: “The fruit of the Mass *ex opere operato*, corresponding as it does to the work of the whole Church offering, increases or decreases accidentally with the greater or lesser number offering sacrifice in the Church militant in different periods of time, and with their greater or lesser sanctity: for this fruit increases accidentally with the better disposition of the whole sacrificing Church” (*Tractatus in quinque Ecclesiae precepta*, praecept. 1, 1, 3, c. 6, n. 20, Lyons, 1632, p. 149). Later (*ibid.*, n. 14) he explains lucidly how this variability in no wise precludes the derivation of the fruit *ex opere operato*. We shall explain this further in Th. XXVII.

and sufficient for the elect. Its daily increase in worth and efficiency should be our earnest endeavour.¹ May the offering of the Church, by increase in sanctity of her members, every day increase in worth and efficacy!

APPENDIX

The Apostles could not Offer the Sacrifice before the Day of Pentecost.

The necessary intervention of the Church as offerer suggests, moreover, that the Apostles could not offer the sacrifice before the day of Pentecost.² For on earth Christ did indeed found the Church as far as its institution went, and the conferring on it of doctrinal, disciplinary and sacramental power, a power, however, only to be exercised, when by the descent of the Holy Ghost the Church became a living organism. And she does not live or exist in full perfection, except as animated by the Holy Spirit which descended upon her at Pentecost, and remains with her ever thenceforward as the spirit and the soul and, so to speak, the very heart of the Church (3. S. 8, 1, 3m). The social body or the society of the faithful was indeed formed before the day of Pentecost, but as it were an inanimate body, as its faith was still incomplete, as was plainly seen in the case of all the Apostles after the Passion, and in the case of St. Thomas even after the Lord manifested Himself to the other Apostles and had given the power to forgive sins.³ Especially was there lacking a true understanding

¹ Archbishop Sheehan's translation of this striking passage.

² Recall what we have said above regarding the three days of our Lord's death, Th. XVII. The arguments advanced there to prove that the sacrifice could not be offered during this triduum prove equally that the Apostles could not offer the sacrifice before the Ascension, when Christ *entered into holies*, so to attain to the perfection of His own sacrifice and priesthood, and to purchase for us the gift of the Holy Spirit with the price of eternal redemption found by Him for us. Because in the *first* place, what was enjoined on us was: the celebration of the sacrifice when and only when it was already ratified and efficacious; and, *secondly*, because the commemoration of the Ascension as well as the Resurrection is intrinsic to the Mass, as is shown by the words of St. Paul, *You shall show the death of the Lord UNTIL HE COME* (from heaven), and is shown also by the interpretation of our Lord's command in the Liturgics.

³ It is true that the Blessed Virgin was then on earth at that intermediate time also, and her sanctity excelled all the sanctity of all the ages of the Church. But then, great though that sanctity was, it was still the individual sanctity of the Blessed Virgin, it was not the social and collective dowry of any organic body. Such a compact body formed from the multitude of the faithful the Church was to be. (And to this body alone the sacrifice of the Eucharist was to be entrusted.) Hence

of what was to be believed, as is shown by the question put to our Lord just before His Ascension, whether He was now going to restore the kingdom of Israel? (*Acts*, I, 6). But eventually on the day of Pentecost the Church was to receive the Spirit of truth, sanctity and fortitude. Then the Lord, as it were breathing into her face the breath of life, that is, of indefectible faith, hope and charity, the ecclesiastical body of Christ stood forth, made one living organism by the internal power of the Holy Spirit. Thence onward it was in the power of every priest to offer the sacrifice on behalf of the now fully constituted Church, and so offer validly (because, as we have said, no consecration is valid unless the offering is on behalf of the whole Church) on behalf of the Church sanctified, and so fruitfully (for only a member or organ of the Church can, by his own devotion, affect or modify the value to the faithful of the offering of the Eucharist). The power of the priesthood was given at the Supper, as we have already indicated, but it was conferred then for now, that is, for the time when the Victim, now having been received into heaven by God, and the Church on earth having received life from God, nothing of those things required was further wanting for the fulfilment of the Mystery instituted by Christ, either on the side of the Victim or the Church; both of these—what is offered, and the offerer—being perfected. The sacerdotal character was undoubtedly impressed at the Supper; but just as there can be no consecration of the Body of Christ after the final resurrection of us all, though the sacerdotal character will still remain, because by the institution of Christ such consecration was to be made only until the coming of Christ at the last day; so neither could the consecration be made before the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost; because by the institution of Christ such consecration was only to be made *in the kingdom of God*.¹ Hence one may judge what there is of

the measure or the amount of sanctity was not wanting, whilst the Blessed Virgin was on earth even before Pentecost; what was lacking still was the diffusion of sanctity throughout the Church; until a Society made up of priest and people, indefectibly united in faith and charity, would be confirmed by the Spirit of truth and strength.

¹ We must take it as certain that the *kingdom of God* foretold so often and so solemnly by the prophets, and of which Christ Himself spoke to the Apostles (*Acts* 1, 3) *appearing to them for forty days*, was not fully established on earth until the day of Pentecost. The same may be said of the New Covenant or the New Testament, as Cyril of Jerusalem rightly teaches in his *Catechesis*, 17, c. 29. P. G. 33, 1000, that

truth or falsehood in these words of Nicholas Cabasilas: "He Himself said: *This is my body: this is my blood.* He also commanded the Apostles, and through them the whole Church, to do this: *Do this,* He said, *in remembrance of me.* But He would not command them to do it were He not going to give them the power with which they could do it. What is the power? The Holy Spirit, the power which, coming down from on high, armed the Apostles with that power as the Lord had told them: *Stay you here in the city of Jerusalem, until you be endued with power from on high*" (*Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 28. P. G. 150, 425-428). If by the word *power* (*δύναμιν*) Cabasilas meant the sacrificial power of order, he would be teaching that that was not conferred in the Supper, and would be in error, his teaching then being liable to the condemnation of the Council of Trent (sess. 22, canon. 2 D., 949) promulgated after he wrote; if, however, he only meant that there could be no exercise of the power of order already conferred before the descent of the Holy Spirit, empowering them, fully equipping them by its power (*δύναμιν*) to say Mass, he would say nothing contrary to Catholic faith. And indeed, long before Cabasilas, Paschasius Radbertus had taught the same in a full Catholic sense. "FROM THE TIME WHEN THE HOLY APOSTLES WERE MADE NEW BY THE COMING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT FROM HEAVEN, and were inebriated by the wine of charity, FROM THAT TIME WE FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT THIS CHALICE WAS CONSECRATED IN THE CHURCH, because that Spirit of truth in whom from what was old they were made new, had led them into all truth, and had confirmed them in the perfect plenitude of doctrine. And so in the Church (*ubi*) now (after the descent of the Holy Spirit—*jam*), just as it was consecrated by Christ, so TOO IT IS CONSECRATED BY THEM, AND THENCEFORWARD IT IS CONSECRATED IN THE NEWNESS OF THE SPIRIT" (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Dmni.*, 21, 2. P. L. 120, 1335).¹

in His coming the Holy Spirit "established in the Catholic Church the New Testament, in agreement with the Father and the Son."

¹ Shortly before this passage Paschasius (c. 12, n. 1, cols. 1310-1311) had written that we consecrate *in the priesthood* of Christ (XXI); now he writes that we consecrate *in the newness of the Spirit* come down from Heaven on the day of Pentecost. In the former statement he is safeguarding the necessity of the conferring of the sacrificial power by Christ on the Apostles in the Supper; now he is upholding the necessity of the Church being fitted to begin the offering of the sacrifice.

We have already seen in Th. XII (Vol. I) how, before Paschasius, Bede declared that the sacrifice of our Lord was only finally consummated on the day of Pentecost. Even earlier Chrysostom had laid down principles from which the conclusion of Cabasilas (interpreted in a Catholic sense) might be inferred.¹ For Chrysostom, having proved from various sources that the Holy Spirit, having once descended on the Apostles, abides in the Church, draws a final argument from the sacrifice of the Eucharist (*De S. Pentecoste*, hom. 1, n. 4. P. G. 49, 458–459): “The priest does not take into his hands the proposed gifts until he has prayed to the Lord for grace for you, and you have answered: *And with thy Spirit*; by which answer you recall to memory that the man standing at the altar supplies nothing, that it is not by human nature that the proposed gifts are made propitious, but that the grace of the Holy Spirit, present and hovering over all those who fulfil the priestly office . . . consecrates the mystic sacrifice. . . . UNLESS THE SPIRIT WERE PRESENT, THE CHURCH WOULD NOT EXIST: but if THE CHURCH DOES EXIST, THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THE SPIRIT IS PRESENT.” Further on (n. 6, col. 64): “We show that the Holy Spirit is present, from the remission of sins . . . from the ordinations, from the mystic sacrifice.” Hence, arguing from the principles laid down by Chrysostom, if the Eucharistic Sacrifice presupposes that the Holy Spirit, sent from God, has persevered with us, plainly we could not offer that sacrifice before Pentecost; at which time the Church did not yet “exist”. Hence we are not surprised to find St. Thomas (in the second nocturn of the office for Friday after the Octave of Corpus Christi) telling us that the solemnity has been assigned to Thursday after the Octave of Pentecost, “so that the institution of the Eucharist may be recalled by us especially at the time when the Holy Spirit instructed the hearts of the disciples in the fuller knowledge of the mysteries of this sacrament. For it was at the same time, too, that this sacrament began to be solemnised by the faithful.”

That the sacrifice was not offered by the Apostles before the day of Pentecost, is the argument of Théophile Raynaud, S.J.,

¹ Hesychius also, it seems to me (*In Levit.*, IX, 1–6 and XXIII, 9–14. P. G. 93, 889–891 and 1083–1087), had implicitly taught the same.

throughout his whole treatise, *De prima missa et praerogativis christianae Pentecostes* (*Opera omnia*, t. 6, pp. 523–622). Very recently Dom. Cagin (*Eucharistia*, p. 70), having proved the same thing to his own satisfaction from the epicleses of the earlier Liturgies, goes on to say: “The sacramental action of the Apostles only began with the descent of the Holy Spirit. The foundations of the Redemption, of the new sacrifice, of sanctification, had been laid on the day of the Passion. . . . It was for the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit to ratify and confirm their accomplishment, to signify their ratification, at the same time as their dispensation was inaugurated” (cf. p. 208 also). These words appear to me to contain the kernel of the ancient dogma (cf. what we have said above, Th. XII in Vol. I).

THESIS XXVII

C. SPECIAL OFFERERS

* (A) THE PRIEST AS OFFERER

From what we have already said it should be plain how a Mass is good even when said by a bad priest; nevertheless it will be better if the priest himself is good, and better in proportion to the devotion of the celebrant.

For it must be remembered that the priest is a member of the Church; and hence his devotion augments the total devotion of the whole Church. Moreover, he is not an ordinary member, but just as his dignity is the highest, so, too, and indeed particularly in the matter of the offering of the Eucharist, his union with her is closest and most intimate. For in this matter he is the chosen organ of the Church; in him alone is the power to effect by his action the symbolic immolation in which the general public offering is made; on this title the sacrifice is imputed to him especially, over and above the other individual members of the faithful (as man's sight though belonging to the whole man is assigned especially to his eye). We must consider the celebrant, then, as contributing far and away beyond the rest to the increase in value of this his sacrifice; but, nevertheless, the whole body is more potent than the individual member, and the body, indefectibly holy, more potent than the corrupt member: so that the Church may still obtain propitiation for herself by the agency of her minister, no matter how greatly he personally provokes the anger of God.¹ The unworthiness or the malice of the minister does not take anything away from the efficacy or the fruit corresponding to the general devotion of the Church, as has been said, although the present sanctity of the minister does add to it.

Hence it is that the two statements hereunder are perfectly

¹ Hence the anecdote of St. Peter Damian in his work, *De bono suffragiorum*, c. 6 and 7, must be taken with a grain of salt. He is giving an illustration of his own opinion that *alms given to the poor is more fruitful than the Mass celebrated by a carnal priest* (P. L. 145, 568-569).

compatible one with the other. The *first*, the common opinion of all Catholics,¹ that the sacrifice is not made corrupt or void by the badness of the priest,² because “this is the clean sacrifice which cannot be defiled by the unworthiness or the malice of the offerers” (*Trid.*, sess. 22, c. 1, D. 934); the *second*: “the holier priests are, the more beneficial to the faithful are their sacrifices,” by which words Suarez (disp. 79, s. 8, n. 10), though opposed to us in the point at issue (Thesis XXV), rightly interprets³ the

¹ In reading the Fathers and Church writers, we must distinguish between the case of heretical priests (with whom by Church law are grouped priests who are simoniacs), or priests who are schismatical, excommunicated, or at least degraded or repudiated by the Church (of whom later), and the case of simply bad priests. We must also distinguish the question of the validity of the consecration from the other question of the efficacy of the sacrifice. Speaking of bad priests only, none of our theologians deny that they can consecrate the Body of Christ. This is true even of Origen, in spite of what he says in his *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Romanos*, 9, 42. P. G. 14, 1249, for there he is plainly speaking of the sanctification of UNCLEAN FOODS *by the word of God and by prayer*—*I Tim.*, IV, 5 (to the contrary, see Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le catholicisme*, 1909, p. 370). It is true also of Etherius and Beatus, who say in the treatise *Adversus Elipandum* (1, 1, c. 67. P. L. 96, 936): “This sacrifice cannot be offered by just any priest whatsoever, but only by the just and holy priest.” For the context shows that they are speaking of Christ the High Priest only: “Who therefore so just and so holy a priest as the only Son of God” “who offered the sacrifice of His mortal Body for us” “on whose behalf He offered”, “for the cleansing of our sins” whence the Victim is present for us not only “to be partaken of lovingly (*amabiliter*)”, but also to be offered acceptably (*grate*): “What can be so acceptably offered and so lovingly received as the Flesh of our sacrifice, the perfect Body of Christ our Priest?” (*ibid.*, c. 67 and 68); to the contrary see Baluze, *Notae in Cyprianum* (P. L. 3, 1023). Of course, it is undeniably true that indefectible acceptability with God for the Victim of our sacrifices was purchased first of all by the offering of our High Priest. Cyprian in the *Epistola de Basilide et Martiale*, n. 2 and 3. P. L. 3, 1022–1023 (cf. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, pp. 453–454), at first sight docs indeed appear to deny the efficacy of the sacrifice in the case of bad priests. However, he may very well have regarded the *libellatici* (priests who, to avoid persecution, bought a certificate that they had sacrificed to the gods), of whom there was question here, as apostates or deserters from the faith, and so heretics, notorious heretics, too, who had made shipwreck of their faith. For it was not one dogma but the whole fabric of the Christian faith that was assailed by such a *libellaticus*: so here Cyprian would have in mind, not the want of probity, but the deficiency of their faith publicly known, notorious, in the case of the *libellatici*. Even apart from such a view which Cyprian might well have taken of them, they had, as a matter of fact, been repudiated by the Church law as priests. This being so, there was question here not merely of personal unworthiness, but also of the loss of legitimate status and alienation from the Church. This last question however will recur later in Th. XXXIII.

² And in this sense are to be understood the words of St. Jerome, in *Sophon*, 3. P. L. 25, 1375: “Priests also who serve the Eucharist and distribute the Blood of the Lord to His people act impiously against the law of Christ when they think that the words, and not the life of him who prays, make the Eucharistic sacrifice (*εὐχαριστῶν facere*), that only the customary prayer is required, and not the merits of the priest.” For Jerome himself immediately adds: “Although they act thus . . . nevertheless the Lord is merciful and just. Merciful because He will not abandon His Church: just because He renders to everyone according to his merits.”

³ Although in the same place he endeavours to adapt that interpretation to his way of thinking.

chapter *Ipsi sacerdotes* (*Decret.* 2, 1, q. 1, c. 91) from the second Epistle of the pseudo-Alexander (P. G. 5, 1069),¹ where we read: "The priests themselves make intercession for the people, and they eat up the sins of the people, because by their prayers and offerings they destroy and consume them. The more worthy they are, the more readily are they heard for the need of those for whom they supplicate."

Here, however, we must note carefully that, however great the sanctity of the celebrant may be, it does not affect in any way the propitiatory value of the Victim considered in itself, the efficacy of which Victim to propitiate is, as we have said, infinite. The homily of St. Chrysostom, which is often quoted against us by our adversaries, simply expresses this truth: "I wish to add something really stupendous; but do not wonder or be perturbed. What is this? Whoever the offerer is, be he Peter or Paul, the offering is the same; WHAT CHRIST GAVE TO THE DISCIPLES and what the priests now consecrate (*faciunt*) is the same; this is no less than that, for it is not men who sanctify this, but HE HIMSELF WHO ALSO SANCTIFIED THAT. For just as the words which God spoke are the same which the priest now utters, so is this offering the same, just as also is the baptism which He gave. . . . This, therefore, is the Body of Christ as well as that: he who thinks that this is less than that does not know that Christ is present and offering now also" (*In II Tim.*, hom. 2, n. 4. P. G. 62, 612).² Here, evidently, the word *offering* (*ἡ προσφορά*) refers not to the active but to the passive sacrifice, the thing offered, or the actual Victim, because it is said to be the same as that which was consecrated and distributed by Christ to the disciples at the Supper.³ In other words, what is consecrated has not only the

¹ The Epistle of the pseudo-Alexander, as the work of an unknown author, has really no authority save in so far as it was accepted long ago by our forefathers, who accordingly did not detect in it anything contrary to faith.

² Cf. in the same sense a very beautiful passage inserted in the *Decretum Gratiani* from some unknown author (pars 2, Caus. 1, q. 1, c. 84. P. L. 187, 516).

³ Cf. the ancient Liturgy of St. Basil, where, among other fervent and lengthy petitions to God, we find the following: "Remember also, O Lord, in the richness of thy mercies, my own unworthiness; forgive every deliberate sin of mine (*omne delictum voluntarium*), and do not, because of my crimes, turn away the grace of thy Holy Spirit from the gifts here offered to thee" (*μη̄ διᾱ τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμαρτίας κωλύσης τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου σου πνεύματος ἀπὸ τῶν προκειμένων δώρων*) (B. 336). Such a prayer said after the consecration indicates that the priest, though full of trust in God, is anxious for the perseverance of what Chrysostom calls the "really stupendous" miracle, lest anything should weaken the sanctifying virtue of his Eucharist. This

same personal worth but the same propitiatory value, no matter who consecrates.¹ But from this it does not follow that the active offering of the same Body and Blood of Christ is of the same efficacy, no matter who offers.

Nor again is this Victim affected by the sanctity (and much less by the badness) of the celebrant, in so far as it is a sacrament, considered in reference to those who partake of it. This is still more evident, seeing that he who communicates is not made thereby a direct partaker of the sacrificial offering, but of the Victim offered in sacrifice, the very Victim of the Passion, sacred to God forever and sanctifying men. "It is not men who sanctify this, but He Himself who sanctified that" when He said of old: *This is my body*, when He also prayed: *For them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth*. Hence Nicholas Cabasilas, after discoursing at length in the same sense as Chrysostom above, very beautifully concludes the argument as follows: "These gifts sanctify all the faithful, and at all times, for, they are always acceptable to God" (*Πάντας τοὺς πιστοὺς ἀγιάζει τὰυτὰ τὰ δῶρα, καὶ πάντοτε, πάντοτε ὄντα δεκτὰ τῷ θεῷ*) (*Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 46. P. G. 150, 469).² If these preliminary remarks are kept well in mind, it will be found that St. Thomas is not against us in 3 S. 82, art. 6, and ad. 1m, where he strictly limits the equality of a Mass said by a bad priest and one said by a good priest to the actual sacrament which is consecrated in the Mass. It must indeed be admitted that previously (4 D. 13, 1, 1, 5) he contrasted "that which is essential [in the Mass], namely, the Body of Christ", and that which "is annexed to the sacrament, as it were secondary", namely, our oblation, ascribing no "efficacy *ex opere operato*" except to the former member ("the Body of Christ", the "sacrament"). Hence possibly some one might urge against us: therefore, according to St. Thomas, the Mass of a good priest and the Mass of a bad

is secured by the grace of God, so that no more fruit is obtained by communicating at the sacrifice of the holiest priest than at that of the most abandoned. This is surely something worthy of note, a stupendous fact for our contemplation!

¹ Cf. Thesis XLV (Vol. III).

² There were, it would appear, in days long past some bishops who thought that their own Eucharist was better than the Eucharist of the ordinary priest, since they disliked partaking of the latter. The very early author of the *Epistola de VII Ordinibus Ecclesiae* (c. 6), published among the works of St. Jerome (P. L. 30, 155-156), censures them severely.

priest, as far as their efficacy *ex opere operato* goes, have the same value. Such a literal interpretation of St. Thomas would, however, result in a denial of all propitiatory value in the sacrifice itself as a work done, or *ex opere operato*; for the sacrifice, as St. Thomas himself agrees (3 S. 79, 5, c and 7, 3m), is not what is offered (“the Body of Christ”, “the sacrament”), but the offering of it (our oblation action).

This interpretation we must reject, as it would be contrary to the teaching not only of St. Thomas himself, but also of all Catholics who today profess that there is a propitiatory value in the sacrifice of the Mass, *ex opere operato*. The fact is, that since St. Thomas' time the terminology has changed, not the teaching. St. Thomas and the writers of that time were not accustomed to the use of the term *ex opere operato* in reference to the value of the act of offering, but only in reference to the Victim offered which is infinite and always the same. Scotus, too, used similar language. Indeed all these earlier writers assigned the virtue of the offering to the virtue of the prayer, that is, the sacrificial prayer. This was quite reasonable, because intrinsically all sacrifice is impetrative, it is really pragmatic prayer, and our own sacrifice is enacted by certain words of Eucharistic prayer. Later on, the expression *opus operatum* or *work done*, first used for the work done by the sacrament, was then transferred to the work done by the ritual offering of it, and appropriately, too, by analogy. For just as the sacrament in itself (*ex opere operato*) has effects incomparably excelling any effect which could be due to the devotion of the individual receiving it (*ex opere operantis*), so, too, the fruit of the sacrificial offering incomparably excels the devotion of the individual who offers, and even the devotion of the Church offering as a body, since that which is offered, the Victim in the sacrament, affects by its own worth the value of the active offering of it.¹ Our inter-

¹ In the matter of the sacrifice the expression *ex opere operato* savoured of novelty even at the time of the Council of Trent. This is evident from the *Judicium* (pronouncement at the Council) of Josse Ravestyn of Tielt (Tiletanus), *ad articulos I [Lutheri] et IX [Calvini] de sacrificio missae propositos* (Le Plat, *Monumentorum . . . Concilii Tridentini*, tom, 4, Louvain, 1784, p. 352): “This is what the Catholics teach regarding the value and the virtue of the sacrifice of the Mass: . . . the offering of the Mass made on behalf of others avails them for the remission of sins, both as to guilt and punishment, and this value and virtue is in the sacrifice of the Mass, not from the dignity, condition and quality of the person who performs the action

pretation of St. Thomas has the powerful support of the Father of the Salamanca school, Francis a Victoria, "a theologian of the highest rank" (Hurter), in the *Summa sacramentorum Ecclesiae*, published under the supervision and care of Thomas a Chaves: "The question is asked; is the Mass of a bad priest as beneficial to others as the Mass of a good priest? St. Thomas says that in the Mass two things are to be considered—the sacrament itself, and the prayers which are to be said in the Mass and THE OFFERING OF THE SACRIFICE." Having first stated that in each case the sacrament is equal, the author continues: "AS FAR AS THE PRAYERS AND THE ACTUAL OFFERING ARE CONSIDERED, the better the priest the more acceptable will the offering be: for a good priest more readily and more often and more fully receives an answer to his prayer than a bad priest" (Antwerp, 1594, fols. 47–48).

Indeed the teaching of St. Thomas on this matter appears to me to be the same as that indicated by Scotus in two contrasted statements: "The Mass of the better priest will be better, and nevertheless in both cases the sacrament is equal" (4 D. 13, q. 2, ad 3m, n. 19). For as far as propitiation is concerned, "God has not, IN RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE, to give to anyone in the Church, nor to the whole Church, the same compensation for one Mass [of a bad priest] and for the other [of a good priest]" (*ibid.*).

The reason he gives is that we must not consider the Mass in so far as it is propitiatory in the abstract, as satisfying its definition, in that it is the offering of the Eucharist, but we must consider it in the concrete, where the mode or manner in which it proceeds from the offerer is taken into account. It does not proceed in the same way from the living member as from the dead member.¹

The elucidation of this point was of the highest importance

(*operantis*), in celebrating the sacrament, but from the quality, condition and nature of that which is offered. This being Christ Himself . . . wins the grace of the Father for those on whose behalf it is offered, unless they show themselves unworthy of the mercy and clemency of the Father: and SOME RECENT THEOLOGIANS, DESIRING TO EXPLAIN THIS, HAVE SAID THAT THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS BENEFITS OTHERS, not *ex opere operantis* BUT *EX OPERE OPERATO*, not indeed without good motions on the part of these [those who receive the benefit], but when they are disposed and prepared by motions of faith and repentance, as we shall explain more at length directly." Then, finding no fault with this terminology, he finally accepts it.

¹ It is true that Hickey (Lyons, 1639, tom. 8, p. 849), commenting on this passage, says that the subtle Doctor is not concerned here with what we call the value *ex opere operato*. The contrary, however, is evident, as Suarez admits (disp. 79, s. 8, n. 10).

in the controversy with the Protestants, as appears from the *Antididagma* of the Canons of Cologne, against the renegade Archbishop Hermann, where we read: “*Another calumny of the heretics against the Church. Many make difficulties for themselves AT THE PRESENT TIME, and even dare to assert that hitherto the Church taught that the sacrifice of a priest was fruitful ex opere operato before God, without any good motion on the part of the person who offers. They also call the work of the priest, in the Mass, whatever be its character, apart from any consideration of the thoughts in his mind, opus operatum (the work done). Here again great injury and harm is inflicted on the Church of Christ. For Innocent III in 1, 3, De sacro altaris mysterio, AND ALL SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGIANs HERE UNDERSTAND BY OPUS OPERATUM (the work done) THE SACRIFICE OF THE ALTAR, not the outward actions of the priest, but THE WORK OF GOD IN THE CONSECRATION and sanctification OF THE SACRAMENT, which depends on the power of Christ, not on the merits of the priest. . . . They say that this, being the work of God alone and Christ, NOT CONSISTING IN THE OFFERING, but in the consecration and sanctification of the sacrament, is always pure and holy*” (fol. LXXI b).

Galenus Vestcapellius in like manner censures contemporary writers who held the opposite teaching, distinguishing in the following argument the twofold effect of the consecration. *In the first place*: “that by which Christ becomes present for us, which is the sacrament; we profess with mother Church, with her victorious leaders and heralds, John Chrysostom and Nicholas Cabasilas, that neither the badness, nor even the goodness of her minister, has any influence on this effect.” *Secondly*: “that which is proper to the sacrifice and given to others (present or absent, living or dead), by the imparting to them of the virtue and the grace of the Cross of Christ”. “Will anyone dare assert that this effect is the one and the same, or equal, no matter who the minister is?” (*De sacrificio missae commentarius*, c. 19, p. 242).¹

¹ I admit that this writer went too far when, carried away by his zeal for priestly sanctity, he maintained that the sacrifice of the Mass offered by a Catholic priest, though validly offered, was in no way fruitful or beneficial if that priest were in sin and offered the sacrifice alone, that is, where no good person either had the Mass said, or was present at it, or served at it: “Even then [that is, though the priest is in sin] we must believe that if he celebrates with the Catholic rites there will be a

Among later theologians we may not pass over Henriquez and Fagundez of the Society of Jesus. Henriquez says: "The fruit of satisfaction which is imparted *ex opere operato* to another person in the state of grace, on whose behalf the sacrifice of the Mass is offered, is more abundant *ex opere operato* in proportion to the devotion of the offerer" (*Summa theologiae moralis*, 1, 1, *De sacramentis in genere*, c. 14, n. 4). And again: "The offering of the Mass consists in an action, and the merit of the suppliant consists in his vital and free action, hence both fruits of the Mass [of propitiation and impetration] increase *ex opere operato* for another person in the state of grace, according to the better disposition and devotion of the offerer; just as the effect of baptism increases *ex opere operato* with the better disposition of the recipient adult. . . . Hence we must seek out good priests, to treat the holy things in a holy manner, so that by the greater devotion of their offering they may apply to others, whole and entire, a more abundant fruit of the Mass", etc. (*ibid.*, 1, 9, *de missa*, c. 18, n. 5). Fagundez speaks similarly: "Everything considered, therefore, the Mass of a good priest avails more than the Mass of a bad priest . . . : because from his side, in so far as he is a public minister of the Church, the fruit increases accidentally *ex opere operato*" (*Tractatus in quinque Ecclesiae praecepta. Primum Ecclesiae praeceptum*, 1, 3, c. 6, n. 22). Outside the Society, Zacharias Pasqualigo (*De sacrificio novae legis*, q. 102, n. 6 and q. 103, n. 5, Rome, 1707, tom. 1, pp. 103 and 104) undertook *ex professo* the defence of the following thesis: "It must be said that the substantial fruit of the Mass increases accidentally *ex opere operato* with the greater DEVOTION [that is, actual devotion] of the celebrating priest." And again: "It must be said that the fruit of the Mass *ex opere operato*, both of propitiation and of satisfaction and impetration, increases accidentally in proportion to the greater SANCTITY [that is, habitual sanctity

true sacrifice of the Mass, but we deny absolutely that it will benefit anyone, particularly if he does this alone, and no devout persons unaware of his sacrilege are present" (*De sacrificio missae*, c. 19, p. 245). The origin of the error was that this austere man did not think that the unworthiness of the minister could be outweighed by the sanctity of the whole Church, which, he says, "is not of such great power as to secure anything from God by prayer, through just any person" (*ibid.*, p. 243). While rejecting the overstatement of the case by Galenus, we retain what is correct in his teaching.

through habitual grace, sanctifying grace] of the celebrating priest." Since then the priest, though in a degree subordinate to the general influence of the Church, plays a very large part in determining the measure of the fruit of the sacrifice, is it any wonder that practically all through the Mass he is praying to God for the grace to be worthy to offer an acceptable sacrifice to Him ?¹

(B) THE PERSON WHO GIVES A STIPEND AS OFFERER

Besides the priest, as such, that is, the public minister of the Church in the sacrificial action, those also intervene as offerers, on whose part in a special way the sacrifice is offered through the priest, in as much as they have furnished the Eucharistic table with the material requisites for the sacrifice of the Church.

For the Mass is not only the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, but also that sacrifice offered under the Melchisedechian appearances of bread and wine; and although the appearances do not enter into that which is really offered, they unquestionably enter into the offering of it. Because it is only by the mediation of the complexus of the sensible elements, wherein the symbolic immolation is effected, that the sacrifice of the Victim of the Lord can be made ours; and this complexus includes not only the words proceeding from the priest, but the species or the appearances drawn from the bread and wine.² In view of this

¹ V.g. *In a humble spirit and contrite heart, may we be received by thee, O Lord, and may our sacrifice so be offered up in thy sight, that it may be pleasing to thee, O Lord God.*

May my worship and bounden duty be pleasing to thee, O Holy Trinity; and grant that the sacrifice I have offered all unworthily in the sight of thy divine majesty may be received by thee, and win forgiveness from thy mercy for me, and for all those for whom I have offered it up.

Note, too, how the people pray for the priest: "*May the Lord receive the sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of His own name, to our benefit and to that of all His holy Church.*"

In the Eastern Liturgies we find numberless prayers of the priest for himself, as officially offering the sacrifice; v.g. in the ancient Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, B. 316-320.

² The priest therefore gives the formal element to the symbolic immolation, the person who proffers the stipend supplies the material element, and it is only from the combination of both of these that there arises what we have said to be the *symbol only* of the sacrifice, by reason of which symbol men make the sacrifice of our Lord their own. It should be noted, however, that the appearances of bread and wine do not become sacramental except through the priest, who therefore alone is competent to confer on the elements the character of sign or symbol. Hence from this point of view the priest himself is the author of the sacramental material.

element the sacrament undoubtedly belongs to those whose gifts, presents, sacrifices (*sacrificia*—that is, the material elements for the sacrifice), are to be consecrated by the priest; for on the one hand, as the unknown author of the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (c. 46. P. L. 35, 2246) rightly says: “that person is always said to offer, whose oblations the priest places upon the altar . . . for the offering is imputed to him whose gifts are offered”; and, on the other, these gifts are entrusted to the priest simply and solely “in order that they may serve the purpose for which they were offered” (Walafr. Strabo, *De ecclesiasticarum rerum exordiis et incrementis*, c. 22. P. L. 114, 948), namely, that they may be changed into the Flesh and Blood of the Victim, and that their outward guise may serve for the carrying out of the symbolic immolation.¹ There is, moreover, the divine appointment that they who serve the altar shall live by the altar (*I Cor.*, IX, 13–14). It is fitting, therefore, that the one who presents the sacrifice to God should receive sustenance from the offerings of him who provided the materials for the sacrifice. Hence in the eyes of God one will not be considered to have prepared the Eucharistic table, unless he has provided sufficient, not only that the sacrament may be duly consecrated, but also that those may be given sustenance to whom it is due from the altar.²

¹ Hence St. Martin of Leon well says: “For the oblations are not offered to the priest only, but also to Jesus Christ the High Priest” (*Sermo 24, in resurrect. Dom.* P. L. 208, 922).

² *In the first place*, these are, by a title of imperfect justice, or religious debt, not only the priests, but also the inferior clergy who serve the priest in the mysteries; *secondly*, by a title of mercy or pious liberality, the poor who are the care of the Church. Strictly, therefore, sustenance for the clergy suffices for the offering; but at the same time, sustenance for the poor, if this be added, is in no sense outside the scope of the offering in question; rather such sustenance of the poor is itself in a sense liturgical (cf. *Canones Hippolyti*, 159–185 and 214–216, in Duchesne, *Origins du cult chrét.*, 3rd ed., 536–539; also the prayers in the Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentaries collected by Dom Leclercq, D. A. C., 1, 834–835), so much so that the poor, loaded as it were with the offerings of the faithful, were in the past often called the altars of the Church (cf. XIII, Vol. I). This liturgical comparison may explain the language, suggestive of liturgical reference, in which St. Paul speaks of the alms of the churches to be sent to Jerusalem, for the support of the poor, and to be distributed there in the Eucharistic agape: *Because the administration of this office doth not only supply the want of the saints, but aboundeth also for many Eucharists to the Lord*, etc. (ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης οὐ μόνον ἐστὶν προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἀγίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ, κτλ) (*II Cor.*, IX, 12–15). Hence even where the offering is more than strictly sufficient for the sustenance of the clergy, still, because what is over and above is in no way considered apart from the rest, the whole offering assumes the character and the virtue not merely of ordinary alms, but also of true and proper latria, or divine worship. Still, however, seeing that only what justice

In our time, persons who give what is termed an adequate alms or stipend for a mass do this, the stipend corresponding to the gifts offered of old.¹ That those who give alms, gifts or stipends in this way, are in their own manner true offerers of the sacrifice, is attested by the Fathers, Councils and Liturgies.

Turning first to the Fathers, and omitting two passages from Tertullian (*De exhort. Cast.*, 11, and *De Monogamia*, 10. P. L. 2, 926–927 and 942) sufficiently dealt with already (XVIII), we find Cyprian rebuking as follows a woman who through avarice desists from giving her offering: “You are rich and affluent and think that you are celebrating the mystery of the Lord . . . you come to it without a sacrifice of your own, and take your share OF THE SACRIFICE WHICH ONE WHO IS POOR HAS OFFERED” (*De opere et eleemosyn.*, c. 15. P. L. 4, 612–613). She took a part of the sacrifice, that is to say, she went to communion at it. But the sacrifice, a part of which she took, had been provided for by the gift offered at the hands of a poor person. So this poor person was looked upon as the one who offered the sacrifice.² Caesarius of Arles, urging the faithful to offer in this way, speaks similarly: “Bring your offerings to have them consecrated upon the altar. One who has the means to do it SHOULD BE ASHAMED TO COMMUNICATE OF ANOTHER’S OFFERING” (in the appendix to the sermons of St. Augustine, *Sermo* 265, n. 2. P. L. 39, 2238).³ Hence St.

strictly requires is to be demanded, hence, even if what is necessary for the sustenance of the poor is lacking in the gift, nevertheless that must be accepted which suffices for the sustenance of the clergy alone; so much so that should anyone by compact give a stipend sufficient for the sustenance of the clergy alone, he must be considered in so far to be the author of the whole sacrifice, and thus a priest may not, putting two stipends together, offer one sacrifice for the two stipends, as will be seen later in our discussions against Cajetan.

¹ Martène, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, c. 4, art. 6, n. 6, indicates the time round about which money began more or less to take the place of gifts of food, given by the faithful for the offering of a Mass.

² cf., St. Augustine (*Epist.* 111, 8. P. L. 33, 426): “For they [Christian women captured by the barbarians], in the land of their captivity, are in the same condition as the Hebrew captives in that land where they could not offer their customary sacrifices to the Lord: so, too, neither can they bring the offering to the altar of God, nor find a priest through whom they may offer to God.”

³ Clearly the offerings spoken of here by Caesarius, and Cyprian, and repeatedly by many of the Fathers, must be understood to be not strictly individual offerings, like the stipends usual at the present time. They were, according to the custom of the time, collective offerings made by a number at the same time, just as would be the case today were all present at Mass, or the greater number, to unite in giving one stipend.

Gregory the Great speaks quite simply of a man "for whom his wife was wont to offer the sacrifice on fixed days" (*Dial.*, 1, 4, c. 57. P. L. 77, 424. cf. *Hom.* 38 in *Evangel.*, n. 8. P. L. 76, 1279).

The faithful were not deprived of this faculty to offer except by a sort of minor excommunication, a noted example of which is mentioned in the eleventh canon of the Council of Nice: "With regard to those who have lapsed . . . under the tyranny of Licinius . . . not under the pressure of necessity (*praeter necessitatem*), it has pleased the Council to deal leniently, undeserving of sympathy though they be. Let all those, therefore, who do penance for three years, be among the faithful as hearers [*audientes*, that is, hearers of the Mass of the catechumens only, and from the porch], and for seven years let them be among the prostrators [*substratos*—who heard the Mass of the catechumens inside the church door and prostrated before leaving]; moreover, let them for two years communicate with the faithful in the prayer without offering (*χωρίς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν*)" (*Mansi Concilia*, 2, 673, coll. 680; cf. Dom Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, tom. 1, p. 590). On this subject Petavius makes the following just remark: "This was the PERFECT COMMUNION to which penitents and those expelled from the sacred mysteries aspired, and to which they arrived after a long period of intense sorrow and public penance, in order TO REGAIN THE RIGHT OF OFFERING, which they call (in Greek) *κοινωνίαν μετὰ προσφορᾶς*, which, without doubt, is the same as having a part in the offering (*communicare cum oblatione*), that is, having the right of offering" (*De potestate consecr. et sacrif.*, cap. 1, t. 8, pp. 8–9).¹ Hence we can easily understand the words of St. Ambrose when writing to Theodosius, guilty of the slaughter at Thessalonica: "Then only will you offer, WHEN YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE FACULTY TO SACRIFICE

¹ Petavius mentions also other instances not so striking as this of the Nicene Council of the restriction of offering. But we can give other clear examples as well. In the *Epistola ad Hincmarum Rhemensem*, Nicholas I imposes a penance on a man who had murdered a monk who was a priest. Among other things we read: "During the remaining space of seven years, HE MAY RECEIVE THE COMMUNION OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD on the greater feast days, BUT ON NO ACCOUNT MAKING OFFERINGS" (P. L. 119, 1122–1123). *A fortiori* the following is true: "Those to whom sacramental communion was denied were never permitted to offer" (Martène, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, 1, 1, c. 4, art. 6, n. 5).

(*sacrificandi facultatem*), when your victim has become acceptable to God” (*Ep.* 51, n. 15. P. L. 16, 1163).¹

Similarly the best-known Liturgies speak of all those who have presented gifts for the Eucharistic sacrifice as offerers of it. First, the Roman Liturgy, after the commendation of the gifts, commends to God all those who have given them in these words: “WHO OFFER UP to thee this sacrifice of praise for them and theirs, for the redeeming of their souls, for the hope of salvation and safety, and who offer their vows to thee, God everlasting, living and true.” Here undoubtedly the sacrifice of praise offered to God for the redemption of our souls is the very sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ.² Similarly the *Liturgy of St. Mark*: “Receive, O God, the victims, oblations, and thank-offerings (τὰς θυσίας, τὰς προσφοράς, τὰ εὐχαριστήρια) OF THOSE WHO OFFER THEM TO THEE” (B. 129). In the anaphora of Serapion, after the recital of our Lord’s words and the epiclesis, we have the following prayer: “Receive also the thank-offering of thy people (τὴν εὐχαριστιαν τοῦ λαοῦ), and bless those WHO HAVE OFFERED OBLATIONS and thanksgivings (τα πρόσφορα καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστίας)” (F. D. 2, 176). In the *Liturgy of St. James* similarly: “Remember, O Lord, those who have offered these oblations on thy holy altar, and those for whom each one has offered” (B. 56). Of those offering the sacrifice or “victim” in this way, Innocent I wrote in his *Epistola ad Decentium Eugubinum*: a document of the highest authority in the Middle Ages with liturgists (v.g. Remigius of Autun, *De celebratione missae et ejus significatione*. P. L. 101, 1258) and jurists (*De consecratione*, dist. 1, c. 73): “Regarding the recital of the names of the offerers by the priest before saying the Canon

¹ From Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, 1, 5, c. 17. P. G. 82, 1236) it is evident that the “faculty to sacrifice” is here that power of offering the sacrifice through the priest, which was exercised in particular by presenting the gifts to the sacred table. For he is telling us how first the Emperor, after having completed his penance, fulfilled such an office of bringing gifts for the sacrifice. He is not speaking of that mode of offering which is common to all assisting by their presence at the sacrifice, but rather of the mode of offering which is proper to those who give a stipend.

² In this connection the *Sacramentarium Bobiense* has four votive Masses worthy of consideration, the following *Secret* from the third votive Mass in particular: “All powerful and all merciful God, to whom vows are rendered in Jerusalem, hear the prayers of thy servant; be mindful of his sacrifice, may his holocausts be rich” (P. L. 72, 542). Again in the Mozarabic *Missa votiva singularis* we find the following blessing before the communion: “May your vows (*vota*) and sacrifices bountifully receive the grace of the merciful God” (P. L. 85, 994). Cf. our remarks above (XXI) on the vows (*vota*) of the sacrifices.

(*precem*) and commending to God by his prayer the offerings of those whose names are to be recited, you in your wisdom know how superfluous this is, so to insert, though nothing is unknown to God, the name of the one WHOSE VICTIM you are not yet offering to God. First, therefore, the offerings are to be commended to God, then the names of those of whom they are the offerings are to be declared: so that these names may be mentioned within the sacred mysteries and not among the other things which we place before the mysteries" (*Ep.* 25, c. 2. P. L. 20, 553-554).

Hence we see that those who have offered gifts, or give a stipend, seeing that it is they who have provided for the sacrifice in this way, are properly and intimately connected with it, in a more special way, than others who have not done so; hence, too, the sacrifice is more affected by their offering, and their devotion and fervour is more efficacious than that of those who do not so contribute to secure abundant fruit from the sacrifice.

For every sacrifice is a gift, and it is plain that the person to whom the gift is presented is more beholden to one who contributes more to the gift than to one who contributes less. Say, for instance, that a gift is given in the name of all France to some highly esteemed man, while at the same time it is the good will and the liberality of a number of private individuals who are in the main responsible for it. The recipient will be grateful to all for the gift, but especially to these generous contributors, and his gratitude will be the greater the greater their goodwill towards him. Similarly, the one who gives an alms for a Mass plays a greater part than those who do not so provide for the Mass in the offering of the sacrifice and the apportioning of its fruit.

Meanwhile, it must not be forgotten that the priest, while presenting the gifts of those who offer, is obliged, as their representative, to conform his own intention to theirs;¹ and since he always offers in every case by the commission of the whole Church, he commends their gifts and transmits their offering also in the

¹ However, he conforms his intention to theirs BY THE VERY FACT that he presents the sacrifice, AS PROMOTED in the first instance by them, by giving the priest a stipend to say the Mass for their intention. For in the nature of things the declared intention of the author, in this sense, of the sacrifice is included in the sacrifice. No further action, prayer or wish of the priest is required to comply with this intention. Indeed, no matter what the priest may desire, he cannot substitute any other intention than mine when offering my sacrifice. He cannot, for instance, transfer to my friend or any other the fruit of my sacrifice for my brother.

name and with the devotion of the whole Church. "For the Doctors of the Church have seen quite clearly (*providerunt*) that whatever IS REVERENTLY OFFERED BY ANY MEMBER OF THE CHURCH IS ALSO PRESENTED BY THE FAITH AND DEVOTION OF ALL. For the Spirit of the Church is one, whereby is vivified her one body, preserved by Christ who is her Head. The whole Church then consists of a combination of diverse members, but still she is in very truth one body, founded in the solidity of one faith, perfused with one power of the life-giving Spirit. Hence the Apostle says: *One body, one spirit, as you are called in the hope of your calling* (*Ephes.*, IV, 4).

"In the sacred mysteries, then, it is proper THAT WHATEVER IS ESPECIALLY DONE BY ANY OF THE FAITHFUL SHOULD BE ALSO CONSIDERED AS DONE BY THE WHOLE CHURCH in the unity of faith and the love of charity" (St. Peter Damian, *Liber qui vocatur Dominus Vobiscum*, c. 7. P. L. 145, 237).

(C) THE CONGREGATION WHO ASSIST AT MASS, AS OFFERERS

Next after those who give a stipend come, as offerers, those who assist at Mass. For those who assist exert, in a greater degree than those who are not present, their native power to offer as members of the ecclesiastical body, in so far as they are more intimately united with the sacrifice by this outward expression of actual devotion. By their presence they indicate that they ratify, as far as in them lies, the offering which is made in their name, and hence by a special title they make it their own and offer it.¹

For it is not without reason that the congregation, having been first invited by the priest to render to God the thanks which are meet and just, Eucharistic praise, afterwards, at the conclusion of the sacerdotal prayer, answer, or one or more in their place answers: *Amen*. For undoubtedly *Amen* is said at this point to give outward expression to the common assent of those assisting, to what has been done by one for all.²

¹ The teaching of the later school of theologians in regard to the offering of the Mass by the faithful may be found in Suarez (disp. 79, s. 8, n. 5), Vasquez (disp. 226, c. 2) and de Lugo, who writes: "It cannot be doubted that those persons [who assist at Mass] offer the sacrifice in a certain sense, mediately at least, and the sacrifice is not merely offered for them" (disp. 19, 11, n. 230).

² "It is the priest or the bishop who invites the people to recollection; the people respond and become attentive. The pontiff then takes up a formula of prayers,

This was always the custom. For, as regards the invitation, or *invitatorium*, in the first place, in every one of the most ancient Liturgies, the anaphora commences with a dialogue, similar to what, from the very earliest times, was considered the commencement of the Roman Canon (cf. Cabrol, art. *Canon*, D. A. C., t. 2, 1849: "One must affirm, even if one pushes the investigation back to a date anterior to that of the formation of the Roman Canon . . . that the Eucharistic prayer, by whatever name it is called, must be introduced by the dialogue of the preface"): *Let us give thanks to God.—It is meet and just.* We find it in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (F. D. 1, 496) and in the *Greek Liturgy of St. Mark* (B. 125) to which also may be added the Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις of Hippolytus (*Canonum qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum reliquiae*, ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 106), the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopicae* (B. 189; cf. *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae*, F. D. 2, 99), the *Canones Hippolyti* (n. 21, et seq. ap. Duchesne, *Orig. du culte chrétien*, 3, p. 526), and the *Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (ed. Rahmani, 1899, p. 39).¹ Indeed, in the *Greek Liturgy of St. James* (B. 49–50) the dialogue is even longer and more expressive. *The Priest*: "Peace be to all." *The people*: "And with thy spirit." *The Archdeacon*: "Let us assist devoutly, let us assist prudently, let us assist with the fear of God and with compunction. LET US BE CAREFUL TO OFFER TO GOD IN PEACE BY THE HOLY ANAPHORA." *The people*: "THE PROPITIATION OF PEACE (ἔλεον),² THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE". *The Priest*: "May the charity of God the Father, the grace of the Lord and the Son, the communication and the gift of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." *The people*: "And with thy spirit." *The Priest*: "Let us lift up our minds and hearts." *The people*: "We have lifted them up to the Lord." *The Priest*: "Let us give thanks to God." *The people*: "It is meet and just."

while the faithful listen devoutly . . . the whole prayer ends with a doxology to the glory of the Father by the Son, in the unity of the Spirit, as in the Roman Canon: *By Him . . . is to thee, God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory for ever and ever.* And to this doxology the people reply, as we do today: *Amen*, thus associating themselves with the whole sacrifice and the prayer of the Canon" (Dom. Cabrol, art. *Amen* in D. A. C., 1, 1558; cf. t. 2, 1851 and 1899).

¹ The Anaphora Serapionis does not actually give the dialogue but appears to presuppose it, as it begins with the words: "It is meet and just, etc. . . ." (F. D. 2, 172).

² Unless we should read here *olive branch* of peace (ἔλαιον εἰρήνης) as the older editions have (P. G. 63, 915).

Apart from the unanimous consent of the Liturgies, we have Cyprian also (*Lib. de orat. Dom.*, c. 31. P. L. 4, 539) in the West, and Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cateches.*, 23, n. 4 and 5. P. G. 33, 1112–1113) in the East, bearing witness to this ancient custom.

The significance of the custom is explained quite clearly and definitely by St. John Chrysostom: "THE PRAYER WHEREIN THANKSGIVING (τὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας) IS MADE TO GOD IS COMMON TO BOTH [that is, the priest and the people], it is not the priest alone, but the whole of the people, too, who give thanks to God. FOR IT IS ONLY WHEN HE HAS TAKEN UP THEIR WORDS, BY WHICH THEY HAVE AGREED THAT IT IS MEETLY AND JUSTLY DONE, THAT HE BEGINS THE ACTION OF THANKSGIVING or Eucharist. . . . All this I have said, so that each one, even those of you who are of lower grade [the laity], may be vigilant and attentive; and that we may understand this, that we are all the one body, differing one from another only as member from member; therefore let us not throw everything back on to the priests at the sacrifice; rather let us also have a care for the whole Church, as for our common body. Because thus we secure greater confidence and obtain more abundant fruit" (*In II Cor.*, Homil. 18, n. 3. P. G. 61, 527).¹

So much for the invitation to the Eucharistic prayer. Coming now to consider the *Amen* at the very end of the Canon or anaphora, said aloud by the people in reply to the celebrating priest, we find its antiquity assented to even more certainly, as reaching back to the very beginnings of our Mass.²

¹ Similarly James of Edessa, a Monophysite writer of the seventh century, explaining the Syrian Liturgy in the *Epistola ad Thomam presbyterum* (in Dionysius Bar Salibi, *Expos. Liturg.*, Labourt's translation, p. 38), writes: "The priest says to the people: *Let your hearts be lifted up*; they respond: *We have lifted them up to the Lord*. Then once more he says aloud to them: *Let us give thanks to the Lord*; they reply: *What you have said is meet and just*. And since by those first three things which we have already mentioned, that is, by this that he gave them the peace, and that he signed them with the sign of the Cross, and that they suitably answered him; furthermore by these two last, namely, that he gave them an injunction, and THAT THEY ASSENTED TO IT, and pronounced what he said to be just; when BY THESE, I say, THEY WITH HIM AND HE WITH THEM HAVE BEEN MADE ONE BODY OF CHRIST AND ONE MIND, then the priest turns to God immediately, commencing with THE WORDS TO WHICH THEY HAVE GIVEN THEIR ASSENT AND IN ACCORD WITH THE MIND OF THE PEOPLE, directs his words to God the Father, to whom the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Only-Begotten is offered in propitiation for the souls of the faithful." Call to mind here our previous remarks on the expression "the tongue of the Church" as found in the Syrian documents.

² It is true that later on the *Amen* crept into other parts also of the anaphora in all the Liturgies. Still we have abundant evidence for the earlier custom, where the

Apart from the Liturgies, this is attested to, if not by St. Paul's words in *I Cor.*, XIV, 16, where this sense is not quite evident, and where the language is very similar to that of the *Didache* XVI, 6 (F. P. 1, 24), at any rate by the positive statement of St. Justin (*Apol.* 1, 65 and 67),¹ and by the letter of Dionysius of Alexander to Xystus of Rome (in Eusebius, *H.E.*, 7, 9. P. G. 20, 656) on the question of one who without true baptism, but still in good faith, "has frequently heard the thanksgiving [Eucharistic] prayer, and has answered with the rest: *Amen*; who has stood at the sacred table, and has stretched out his hands to receive the sacred food, and who has received it, and has a long time been a partaker of the Body and Blood of our Lord".²

That the little word *Amen* expresses assent is very well known. "In the *Epistle to the Corinthians* St. Paul tells us that it expresses the ASSENT of the hearer, and the seal set to what is accepted as true: *Else if thou bless with the spirit, how shall he that holdeth the place of the unlearned, say amen to thy blessing: because he*

Amen came only at the end, as, for example, in the *Anaphora Serapionis* (F. D. 2, 176), *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopicæ* (B. 189-190), *Liturgia Constitutionem Apostolicarum* (F. D. 1, 514), and the Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις of Hippolytus (ed. op. cit., p. 107), the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacæ* (F. D. 2, 99-100), *Canonum . . . reliquiae* (ed. Hauler, p. 107), and the *Testamentum D.N. Jesu Christi* (Ed. Rahmani, 1899, pp. 39-45). Rahmani writes apropos of the Liturgy of the *Testamentum* (p. xlvi): "The Liturgy seems to harmonise perfectly with the description of St. Justin Martyr. . . . The whole Liturgy properly so called is one Eucharistic prayer, long drawn out, but uninterrupted, and it is only at the end of the Eucharistic prayer that the people cry out *Amen*."

¹ "The bread and the cup of wine and water are brought to the president of the brethren: and he, having received them, gives praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and at some length gives thanks for the graciousness whereby we have received these things from Him. And after he has concluded the prayers and the giving of thanks [Eucharistic prayer], all the people cry aloud: *Amen*. Now *Amen* in the Hebrew has the same sense as the Latin *fiat, so be it*. When the president has finished the prayers, and all the people have acclaimed them, those who are called among us deacons distribute the wine and water over which the Eucharistic prayer has been said, to each one of those present, to be partaken of by them" (P. G. 6, 428). "The bread, wine and water are brought, and with the greatest possible devotion, the president offers up the prayers and the thanksgivings [Eucharistic prayer], and the people signify their approval by crying aloud (*acclamat*): *Amen*; there is a distribution and a communication of those things over which the Eucharistic prayer was said, to each one present" (col. 429).

² It is very doubtful whether the *Amen* of which Tertullian speaks in his *De Spectaculis*, c. 25, is applicable to the offering of the sacrifice, or to the communion: "For, what a thing is this . . . to signify your approval of a gladiator with the same lips with which you have said *Amen* to the *Sanctum* [the Holy Thing—the Sacrament?]." Though some kind of a comparison with the doxology of the Canon may well be suggested by the words which follow after: "Do you say (Εἰς αἰῶνας ἀπ' αἰῶνος), *per omnia saecula saeculorum* to any other but Christ God?" (P. L. 1, 657).

knoweth not what thou sayest? (I Cor., XIV, 16). He shows here that the unlearned cannot answer that what is said is true, unless he understands what he is taught" (Jerome, *Commentariorum in Epist. ad Galat.*, 1, 3, c. 6. P. L. 26, 438). Hence, too, St. Augustine looks upon the *Amen* of the faithful which comes after the doxology of the Canon as an expression of assent by the congregation to what has been done and said by the priest: "When you have heard the priest say: *Lift up your hearts* you reply: *We have lifted them up to the Lord.* Take pains to answer truthfully, because you are answering in the presence of the action of God. Let it be so, as you say it is; do not allow your tongue to give utterance to what your heart tells you is not true. And since it is by God's gift and not by your own unaided powers that you have so lifted up your heart, after you have said that you have lifted up your hearts to the Lord . . . comes the invitation: *Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.* For why do we give thanks? Because our hearts are now lifted up, and had God not raised them up [by His power] we would still lie grovelling on the earth (*in terra jaceremus*). And now comes what is done IN THE HOLY PRAYERS which YOU ARE ABOUT TO HEAR, that when the word is uttered, the Body and Blood of Christ is there. For take away the word, there is [only] bread and wine; add the word and now it is something else. What is this other thing? The Body of Christ and the Blood of Christ. Therefore take away the word and there is only bread and wine, add the word and it will become the sacrament. TO THIS YOU SAY: *Amen.* TO SAY *Amen* IS TO SUBSCRIBE TO THE TRUTH. In Latin *Amen* means *It is true.* THEN [after you have said *Amen*] the Lord's prayer is said; this you have been taught already and you have repeated it. Why is it said BEFORE you receive the Body and Blood of Christ? Because, etc." (Sixth, amongst the sermons published by Michael Denis, n. 3. P. L. 46, 836).¹ Moreover, since "to say *Amen* is to subscribe to the truth", Augustine desired the celebrants in the mysteries to speak clearly and distinctly "so that the faithful may say *Amen*

¹ Theodoret seems to have this in mind when commenting on *II Cor.*, I, 20: "Through the Son Himself we offer the Eucharistic hymn to God. And not without cause did the Epistle add *Amen* here: to teach us that it is not the celebrating priest alone who offers the hymn, but that he, too, who says *Amen* is a sharer in the offering of praise" (P. G. 82, 384).

to what they plainly understand" (*De catechizandis rudibus*, c. 9, n. 13. P. L. 40, 320).¹

Mediaeval writers interpreted in just the same way as Augustine the *Amen* that is said at the end of our doxology, *Through Him*

¹ Hence also Justinian (123. P. L. 72, 1026) censures as a novelty the custom already then creeping in of reciting the Canon in a low voice: "We command all bishops and priests alike to make the sacred offering and to say the usual prayers in holy baptism, not silently to themselves (*tacito modo*) but in a clear voice, so as to be heard by the faithful, thus urging them on to greater devotion in singing the praises of the Lord God. For this is the teaching of the Apostle in the Epistle to the Corinthians: Else if thou bless only with the spirit, how shall he that holdeth the place of the unlearned say *Amen* to thy thanksgiving to God, because he knoweth not what thou sayest," and we certainly have unquestionable evidence from the words of Justin and Dionysius, already quoted by us, that of old in Rome and Alexandria the Canon was said in a loud clear voice, in spite of what Le Brun says to the contrary (*Explication de la messe*, t. 8, Paris, 1778, vol. 3). Indeed it could hardly be otherwise as long as the Liturgy had not yet been reduced to set formulae such as we are familiar with today (cf. A. Fortescue, *The Mass, a Study of the Roman Liturgy*, 1914, pp. 113-115). Much was left to the choice and devotion of the celebrant, even in the Canon, and so the only way of making it known to the faithful was for them to hear it. How could the congregation give assent to the prayer if they did not know what the prayer was that had just been said? But when the formulae had become well defined, the faithful could then ratify the prayer by their assent without hearing it; as, for example, if they were instructed by those who knew the prayer, for instance the deacon, who in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions explained to them the invocation and the intercession. So a stage was reached finally when public recitations of the mystery were no longer necessary, indeed, hardly possible, were the deacon meantime to intervene with his explanation. Hence the pristine custom could fall into disuse. It was asserted by Remigius of Auxerre (*De celebratione missae et ejus significatione*. P. L. 101, 1256, though the passage may not be by Remigius, but a later interpolation), and after him by Belet (*Rationale divinorum officiorum*, c. 44 and 46. P. L. 202, 52-54), that the silent recital was introduced "lest such sacred words pertaining to the great mystery should be cheapened, when, as nearly every one knew them by constant usage, they might be sung in the highways and byways, and in other most unsuitable places" (Rem. of Aux.), both these authors alleging in confirmation of their view a tale narrated by Joannes Moschus in *Prato Spirituali* (c. 196. P. G. 87 ter., 3080-3084, and P. L. 74, 225-226). But this assertion is quite frivolous, based on no certain foundation whatever (cf. Le Brun, *loc. cit.*, pp. 105-108 and 158-173). The conjecture of Edmund Bishop (*Silent recitals in the Mass*, in T. a. S., vol. 8, n. 1, 1909, p. 124) also rests on a very weak foundation and need not detain us. He says that the recital in a low voice was probably of Syrian origin, since Narsai tells us that in his time, towards the end of the fifth century, the Canon used to be recited in secret in his own Church (of Nisibis). This fact in itself, however, could not prove any influence of the East on the West in this matter, for the same causes, liturgical, as above, and psychological (as would easily occur to anyone who gave the matter a thought) could easily lead the East and the West independently, now here, now there, to the recital of the Canon in a low voice.

While we are on this subject it is interesting to note that in the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae*, according to the Coptic version (G. H. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*, or *Canones Ecclesiastici*, London, 1904, p. 309), which in the judgment of R. H. Connolly (*The So-Called Egyptian Order and derived documents* in T. a. S., vol. 8, n. 4, Cambridge, 1916, p. 65) presents the truer reading of the text, the bishop is not bound to say the Eucharistic prayer from memory, but if he is capable, he may extemporise: "Now (*de*) the bishop shall give thanks (*eukhariston*) according to things which we said before. It is not altogether (*ou pantos*) necessary for him to recite the same words which we said before, as if learning to say them by heart in his thanksgiving (*eu.*) to God; but according to the ability of each one he is to pray" (Horner, *op. cit.*, p. 309).

and with Him and in Him . . . which concludes the Eucharistic prayer before the priest begins to say the Lord's prayer.

So Florus of Lyons: "The *Amen*, which is answered by the whole Church, means *it is true*, not everywhere and in everything, but in the mystic religious sense. This response then the faithful give TO THE CONSECRATION OF THIS GREAT MYSTERY, just as they do in every legitimate prayer, AND BY SO REPLYING SUBSCRIBE TO ITS TRUTH" (*De expositione missae*, n. 74. P. L. 119, 65).

Similarly Remigius of Auxerre: "The *Amen*, which is answered by the whole Church, means *it is true*. The faithful therefore give this reply TO THIS GREAT MYSTERY, as they do in all legitimate prayer, AND THEY AS IT WERE SUBSCRIBE TO ITS TRUTH BY SO REPLYING" (*De celebratione missae et ejus significatione*. P. L. 101, 1265; cf. Rabanus Maurus, *De Cleric. Institut.*, 1, 1, c. 33. P. L. 107, 323; the uncertain author of the *Micrologus*, c. 7. P. L. 151, 981).

Something similar can be gathered from the kiss of peace which in olden times was given by all the faithful to one another within the Mass. Whether it occurred, as in the Eastern Liturgies and also in the Gallican and Mozarabic, at the Offertory, or at the Communion as in Rome at least after the second century,¹ it certainly seems that among the reasons that can be given for the kiss of peace or the *pax* is that assigned to it by Innocent I in the *Epistola ad Decentium Eugubinum* (c. 1, n. 4. P. L. 20, 553): "You state, therefore, that some command the people to give the *pax* before the mysteries are carried out, or the priests to give it among themselves, because after all these things which I need not disclose it is necessary that the *pax* be enjoined, that by this *pax* it is made clear THAT THE FAITHFUL HAVE ASSENTED IN COMMON TO ALL THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE DONE IN THE MYSTERIES AND CELEBRATED IN THE CHURCH."² Evidently, then, the faithful who assist take a greater and more intimate part in the sacrificial offering as compared with those who are not present. Hence St. Leo the Great does not hesitate to say that the sacrifice is offered by them. For so he writes in the *Epistola 9, ad Dioscurum Alexandrinum*, c. 2, *De iterando missae sacrificio ut plebi inter-*

¹ Cf. Dom Cabrol, art. *Baiser*, D. A. C., 2, pp. 118-127.

² Mediaeval writers, Liturgists, like Innocent III (*De sacr. alt. myst.*, 6, 5, P. L. 217, 909), or Canonists, like Gratian (*De consecrat.*, dist. 2, c. 9), accepted this explanation of the *pax*.

venienti satisfiat (supplying more than one Mass that all the faithful may be able to assist): “Necessarily some of the faithful would be deprived of their devotion if, by keeping the custom of supplying only one Mass, ONLY THOSE WOULD BE ABLE TO OFFER THE SACRIFICE who were present in the early part of the day” (P. L. 54, 627).¹ This being so, it is not surprising that the deacon, as the leader or spokesman of the faithful, so to speak, says with the priest: “We OFFER to thee the chalice of salvation . . . for our own salvation and that of the world”; or that the priest himself turning to the people says: “Pray, brethren, THAT MY SACRIFICE AND YOURS may be acceptable to God the Father almighty”;² and then turning to God he says: “We beseech thee, O Lord, graciously to accept this OBLATION of our [that is, *nostrae* of my] servitude, BUT ALSO OF THY WHOLE FAMILY” (that is, the faithful);³ and again also, after the consecration, similar language is used: “We thy

¹ The saintly Abbot Gueric goes too far, then, when he writes in the fifth sermon, *De purificatione Beatae Mariae* (n. 16. P. L. 185, 87): “It is not the priest alone who offers sacrifice (*sacrificat*), it is not he alone who consecrates, but the whole congregation of the faithful who are present consecrate with him, offer sacrifice (*sacrificat*) with him.” At the same time these words of the saintly Catholic writer should not be taken too literally, as he certainly knew that priests alone have received the power to consecrate the Eucharist. Hence we must infer that he does not use the word *consecrate* in a technical but in a wide sense, meaning to set apart, or present or offer, or at the very least that the words *consecrate* and *offer sacrifice* must be taken together as an hendiadys, the two together simply meaning that the sacrifice which is enacted by the consecration is offered. The faithful do indeed offer the sacrifice with the priest, but in such manner that they offer it through the priest. For the priest and the faithful do not offer independently, in a parallel fashion; neither are the two offerings distinguished by a greater and a less power or oblation activity in the one and the other respectively, but by this that they differ in the manner or the mode of offering: the priest offers in one way, the faithful in another. For the priest himself, as we have said, is the one and only organ of the active oblation. No matter how the faithful intervene, they offer only through that organ, in so far as with him they constitute the one organic body. Nevertheless they do offer through him, in such manner that the sacrifice is rightly imputed to them, and hence its fruit is enhanced by their devotion.

² Hence Bossuet writes, in his *Manière de bien entendre la messe*, on the *Orate fratres*: “This part of the Mass is most important . . . the priest, on the point of entering upon the action of the sacrifice, turns round to tell the congregation that he is about to offer in their name, he also asks them to join their prayers with his in the sacrifice WHICH THEY MUST OFFER WITH HIM” (cf. also his remarks on the Offertory in this same work: “It must be remembered that the priest offers in the name of the whole Church, and that IN HIM AND BY HIM all those who assist must offer to God THEIR SACRIFICE”). The fact that these words, and other like expressions, are introduced as centring upon the gifts which the celebrant as well as the faithful will offer for consecration (Batiffol, *Leçons sur la messe*, p. 23), in no way militates against interpreting them, as well as other prayers of similar style, in reference to our true and unique sacrifice which is really that of the Body and Blood of Christ, though it appears to be that of the bread and wine.

³ Apropos, Le Brun writes (*Explication . . . de la messe*, vol. 1, 1777, pp. 441–442): “Quite a number of old missals make it clear that these words of *our servitude* refer to the priest, and the expression *thy whole family* to the faithful who make up the

servants [that is, I] and also THY HOLY PEOPLE [that is, the congregation] . . . OFFER unto thy most excellent majesty of thy gifts and presents a pure VICTIM, a holy Victim, a spotless Victim, the holy BREAD of eternal life and the CHALICE of eternal salvation.”

The offering proper to the congregation was in the olden days proclaimed in the diptychs of the living, such as are still preserved for us in the Mozarabic *Missa cottidiana*: “Our priests, the Roman pope and the rest (*papa romensis et reliqui*), offer the oblation for themselves and for all the clergy and the faithful committed to their care, and for the whole fraternity. All the priests, deacons, clergy AND THE PEOPLE ASSISTING, offer it likewise in honour of the saints, for themselves and for their own. They offer for themselves and for the whole fraternity” (P. L. 85, 541–543).

In the *post-pridie* prayer for Tuesday after Easter, a clear distinction is made between “offerers” (who give a stipend) and “those who assist” (who do not give a stipend); and yet the sacrifices which are dedicated and offered are said to be proper to both classes indiscriminately: “May thy Holy Spirit be brought down on these solemnities, and may He sanctify alike the vows and the offerings of the faithful who assist, and the faithful who offer” (P. L. 85, 491).

Hence, since the sacrifice which is being carried out at Mass is the sacrifice of those who assist, there is no doubt whatever that the value to them of the sacrificial offering which ascends to God at the Mass, its fruit for the effect which is intended by them in their offering, increases proportionately to the increase of the devotion of those who assist.

family or the assembly during the Mass, of which the priest is regarded as the father or the president. In some of these old Masses in which the prayer *Hanc igitur* is at times more lengthy, the priest specially stresses at this place more distinctly his own particular offering, saying: *this oblation of my humility*, or: *this oblation which thy servant offers to thee* (*Hanc oblationem humilitatis meae*, *Missal Illyr. Hanc igitur oblationem quam tibi offero ego famulus tuus hodie*, *Cod. sacram. Thom.*). And so, when he says: *our servitude*, our means *my*, as for several centuries writers have remarked (*Servitutis nostrae, id est: meae*, *Durandus*, 1, 4, c. 39, n. 1). We find in these Masses just as distinctly the explanation of the other words *and of thy whole family*, as signifying the actual assembly of those assisting. For example, in the Mass for the dedication of a church, the priest in the prayer *Hanc igitur* adds: *all thy family earnestly gathered together in this holy place of prayer* (*Cunctam familiam tuam ad aulae huius suffragia concurrentem*, *In Dedicat. Basil. Cod. Sacram. Thom.*) . . . We are also confirmed in interpreting *thy whole family* as referring to the priest and those assisting, rather than to the whole Church, by the fact that they pray to God that their oblation be favourably received, in consideration of the universal Church to which they are united”, etc. (cf. *ibid.*, p. 491). The expression *of our servitude* (*servitutis nostrae*), with the plural pronoun, originally signified a number of concelebrants.

THESIS XXVIII

D. COMPUTATION OF THE FRUIT OF THE MASS

We can compute the fruit of one Mass corresponding to one stipend; we can then compare the fruit of one Mass with the obligation which arises from several stipends. These two cases are separate and we shall deal with them in order.

The fruit of the Mass and the obligation towards a number of persons giving a stipend.

The fruit of the Mass and a number of stipends from one person—Concelebration.

(A) THE FRUIT OF ONE MASS SAID BY A MANDATE FROM A SINGLE MEMBER OF THE FAITHFUL

It should be now quite clear how a measure or limit is set to the value of one Mass offered by these or those members of the faithful: the infinite price of the Victim is paid out in a measure proportioned to the devotion of the offerers. First and primarily in proportion to the general devotion of the Church; secondarily and cumulatively, in proportion to the devotion of the celebrant, of the person giving the stipend, and finally of those present at the Mass (amongst whom the servers at the altar are pre-eminent). The greater the devotion with which the universal Church appropriates to herself the offering made by our Lord at the Last Supper, in virtue of which oblation of His she herself now offers the sacrifice, the greater the devotion with which the priest and the offerers above enumerated appropriate the same offering to themselves, by so much greater will be the value in God's sight of our sacrifice, as it will, in proportion to this greater devotion, appropriate more and dispense to us more from the heavenly fountain overflowing with divine satisfaction, once rendered to God by our divine Lord in the Passion, and now offered to Him by us in the Mass.

Meanwhile one should note that the person giving the stipend may also assist at the Mass and so offer under a double title; and since the devotion with which the stipend is given is different from the devotion with which the Mass is heard, one fruit may be garnered in virtue of the former title, another in virtue of the latter. The same may be said of the priest who, besides acting as minister of the whole Church, and also offering the gifts of the person who gives the stipend, can also at the same time offer the sacrifice as a member of the faithful. This is indicated in the Canon of the Mass by the words of the commemoration either of the living or of the dead.¹

Again, just as each one of these could offer the Mass under different titles, but for the same intention, so also any one of them could offer the Mass under one title for this intention, under another for that. For example, the same person could direct his intention, as giving the stipend, toward one end, and as assisting at the Mass toward another end. Or the priest could have one intention as presenting the offered gifts of the person giving the stipend, and this would naturally be the principal intention, as the stipend provides the material for the sacrifice and so initiates its existence, while he could also have another intention as assisting at the Mass.

Hence we conclude:

(I) The greater number of titles under which one Mass is offered by a member of the faithful for one and the same person, the more fruitful is the Mass for that person.

(II) The greater the number of those on whose behalf a member of the faithful offers a Mass under a certain title, and with a certain intensity of devotion, the less fruit is available for each one of that number from that Mass, in so far as it is offered by that one of the faithful: because the fruit of such Mass is measured in proportion to the devotion of the offerer; hence, as there is only a certain measure of this fruit available, it cannot be as great for many as it would be for one only. If, therefore, the same one had offered for one person with the same intensity of devotion, and under the same title, the same Mass which he actually offered

¹ Moreover, the celebrant may also stand in the place of the person giving the stipend, as, for example, when he has not received a stipend for the Mass, and furnishes the table of the sacrifice from his own resources.

for a number, it would have been more beneficial for that single individual than it was for each of the number on whose behalf he actually offered it. Hence if the one who gives the stipend to a priest for a Mass, and the priest, too, on his part both were to offer for ten sinners, each one of the ten would receive a tenth part, so to speak, of the fruit *ex opere operato* of the Mass as offered by these two; similarly, if a person assisting at the Mass were to offer for ten, each one of the ten would receive as it were a tenth part of the fruit *ex opere operato* of the Mass, as offered by that person. Nevertheless it must be noted that it is possible that, in the case of a devout person assisting at Mass, who keeps on increasing the number of intentions for which he offers the Mass, his devotion may increase to such an extent that the sacrifice he so offers would be almost as fruitful, for the furtherance of each one of these intentions, as it would have been if he only had one intention, with less devotion.

(III) The greater number of persons assisting at Mass, other things being equal, the greater the fruit of the Mass.¹ Because there are as many offerings as there are offerers, the devotion of one is not detrimental to the devotion of another; the offering of the one therefore does not detract from the offering of the other, rather it is an addition to it. Hence the fact that one person hearing Mass makes to a certain extent the inexhaustible boon his own does not hinder another from doing the same, even though the intention of each one may be different. If they all agree in offering the Mass for one and the same intention, so their united, and so to speak multiplied, intensity of offering will be the more powerful to secure the common end, the common fruit they desire. With very good reason, then, do the faithful invite their friends to be present at a nuptial or a requiem Mass. With very good reason also does the Church assemble the people in large numbers to offer a votive Mass to secure some favour of great moment (*pro re gravi*).

¹ Franciscus a Victoria: "THE FRUIT OF THE MASS is also increased by the presence of those who hear Mass: FOR THE ASSISTING FAITHFUL OFFER THE SACRIFICE. . . . Hence as a rule the Mass is more fruitful WHEN THERE ARE A NUMBER PRESENT than when there are few" (*Summa Sacramentorum Ecclesiae*, 1594, fols. 47-48). Dominicus Soto writes expressly of the lesser ministers and the assisting faithful: "In the sacrifice the greater the number of offerers the greater is THE FRUIT OF THE SACRIFICE; not indeed in each individual, but in all together, because each one offers the same Victim" (4 D. 13, q. 2, a. 1).

(IV) From the mere fact that the Church is spread throughout the world, it does not necessarily follow that either a greater or lesser measure of fruit comes to the individual members of the faithful from the common fruit of the sacrifice. For all the Church members offer in common for all together. Hence with the increase in the number of offerers, there is a corresponding increase in the number of those for whom the sacrifice is offered, and conversely. Hence the amount of fruit in the enjoyment of each one, and derived from the common fruit, remains always more or less the same. And thus we see how the fruit of the Mass is measured, primarily indeed by the devotion of the Church, but secondarily and cumulatively by the devotion of the celebrant, of the person giving the stipend, and of those assisting at Mass: so that even if the special particular offerers were to have no devotion whatever, there still would remain active the devotion of the Church. And, moreover, in every case necessarily, owing to the intrinsic value of the Victim, greater fruit arises from the Mass than the devotion of the Church would merit, apart from the worth of the Victim, either to make compensation for sin, or to secure benefits by impetration.

(B) THE INTRINSIC OBLIGATION OF CELEBRATING AS MANY MASSES AS THERE ARE STIPENDS ACCEPTED

We can compare the fruit of one Mass with the obligation arising from several stipends. Two cases arise. *First*, where a number of people have each given a stipend; *second*, where one person has given several stipends.

(i) *The Fruit of the Mass in relation to Several Stipends each Given by a Different Person. The Teaching of Cajetan examined.*

A rather subtle question was raised by Cajetan in 3 S. 79, 5, and particularly in t. 2, *Opusculorum*, tr. III, q. 2. We may state it in this way:

We have seen that the number of people assisting increases the efficacy of the Mass, as each one adds his devotion to the offering, so that the fruit received by one of those assisting is in no way prejudicial to the fruit of any and all of the others assisting.

Hence the question arises : may not something similar occur where several of the faithful ask for a whole Mass each for himself, each one giving a just stipend for a Mass? Might it not be that, owing to the devotion added to the offering by each one who gives a stipend for a Mass, the value and efficacy of one single Mass said for all those stipends at once would increase to such an extent, because of this devotion, that this one single Mass would avail as much to further the intentions of all those who gave the stipends, as would a number of Masses, equal in number to the stipends given, each said separately for each individual stipend ?¹ Should you answer this question in the affirmative, it would follow that a priest would not defraud one of the faithful who has given him a stipend for a Mass, if he said one Mass only both for that stipend and the stipend of another: for the fruit would in no way be lessened for the first (or the second) giver of the stipend by this mode of action. Now Cajetan does reply in the affirmative, relying, be it noted, on the principle which we have invoked in respect of those who assist at or hear Mass—the devotion of one does not detract from the devotion of another. For so he writes: “The measure or quantity of the devotion of one person giving a stipend takes away nothing from the measure or quantity of the devotion of another person likewise giving a stipend” (3 S. 79, 5). “Here we must weigh the quantity of devotion in the offerer rather than the greatness of what is offered in the sacrifice. And seeing that in this sacrifice what is offered is infinite, and cannot be exhausted or lessened by a single devotion, consequently one single sacrifice sufficiently corresponds not alone to many but to infinite devotions for the procuring of sure satisfaction for each offerer. Therefore a person having this sacrifice offered for himself suffers no deprivation whatever . . . from the fact that another makes provision for the same Mass to be said for himself, nor conversely: but each one receives as much as if it were offered for him only—because the Mass is sufficiently and efficiently

¹ We are not here dealing with the case where a number of persons combine together, to make up by their own individual contributions one stipend for a Mass, no matter whether or not the sum total of the individual offerings be equal to or in excess of what is usual. We are considering the case only, where a number of persons, each separately, ask for a Mass, each for his own intention, each giving an adequate stipend for a Mass. The other case will be dealt with later.

available for each one, according to the measure of each one's devotion" (tom. 2, tr. 3, q. 2).¹

Cajetan does not of course hold that APART FROM THE CASE WHERE A NUMBER HAVE GIVEN STIPENDS either the person who has given the stipend or the priest can by his own will or intention make a sacrifice offered in favour of a number, benefit each one of the number to the same extent as if it were offered for only one of that number. He plainly teaches the contrary: "Nevertheless, we must be on our guard here lest we reach a wrong conclusion, thinking that it follows from what we have said that a Mass, if said for a number, satisfies as much for each one individually, as it would satisfy for one, if said for one alone. This does not follow from what we have said: for we did not say that the effect of this sacrament corresponds to the intention, we said it corresponds to the devotion. For I do not satisfy just so much as I intend to satisfy by this sacrifice, but I draw satisfaction from the sacrifice in a measure corresponding to my devotion. In offering the sacrifice, then, should I have a measure of devotion in the sacrifice which corresponds to one year's satisfaction, and if I intend to celebrate the Mass for the satisfaction of one person, that person will be relieved by the satisfaction of one year. Should I intend to share the satisfaction equally between two, each will be relieved to the extent of a half year, if between three, to the extent of a third and so on." What he here teaches about the priest who celebrates the sacrifice he also holds regarding each one giving a stipend: "I say the same of the satisfaction corresponding to the devotion of Martin when he has a Mass said.

¹ According to Galtier (*La messe en seconde-intention* in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Feb. 1907, p. 84), Cajetan makes a distinction between those who ask for a Mass in this way, and those for whose benefit such a person asks that it be said, and teaches that the fruit of the Mass is not lessened, in the case under review, in respect of the former, though it is lessened in respect of the latter. But apart from the fact that such an interpretation is improbable *a priori*, in so far as it would destroy the parallelism constantly taught by St. Thomas, between the fruit of the Mass coming back as it were reflexly to the offerer of the Mass, and the fruit procured for another by way of suffrage, *a posteriori* it is disallowed by the plain words of Cajetan himself: "Hence we should reason with and instruct people who through ignorance request or demand that a whole Mass be given to themselves or TO THEIR DEAD in return for their alms: FOR THE DEAD FRIEND will receive no less if a thousand others ask for the same Mass for themselves, or FOR OTHER DEAD, than if it were to be celebrated for himself alone" (In 3 S. 79, 5). Where Cajetan uses above the expression "for himself" he must be taken to mean exactly what we do, when we, according to common custom, say that a man has a Mass said for himself, that is, for his intention, whether this intention reflects back to himself, or extends to others.

If offered on behalf of one, I hold that it obtains the whole satisfaction for that one; if offered for a number the satisfaction is shared between them. The same may be said about any others who may have that same Mass said. Because the satisfaction corresponding to any individual devotion is always finite, and if by intention it is applied to a number, it is divided and the share of each is less. And thus we verify the teaching of theologians that the effect of this sacrifice is finite, and when applied to several persons it is divided, each one receiving a portion only, corresponding to the number to which it is applied. For (clearly from what we have said) the effect is understood here, not as proportionate to the devotions of a number, but as shared in part by this or that devotion" (*ibid*).

Again Cajetan does not hold that, to further the intention of one who requests that a hundred Masses be celebrated for a hundred stipends given by him, one celebration of a single Mass would be as fruitful as a hundred. He holds the contrary, and quite in accordance with his principles. For the devotion of that member of the faithful, his habitual good disposition and actual fervour, seeing that it is, in accordance with his compact, sufficiently efficacious to provide for a hundred sacrifices of the Church, will draw more fruit from a hundred such sacrifices than from one only.¹ In such a case, then, the priest would defraud

¹ The case would be quite different were another person to give one stipend a hundred times greater than each one of those offered by the person above. Such a man would be more generous, indeed a hundred times more so in respect of his sacrifice, than the other in respect of each of his individual sacrifices. The devotion implied by this liberality, a hundred times greater than the other's (and still in no way inordinate), will be estimated to be, other things being equal, a hundred times more operative, more intense in active exercise, so to speak. And so the value of this one Mass might accumulate and reach a hundred times the value of one of the others. Thus it might come about finally, that this last man who asked for one Mass would receive as much fruit from one Mass as the other who asked for a hundred would receive from the hundred. Thus we see how it comes about that one solemn Mass *de requie* is usually more fruitful than several private Masses, as Zacharias Pasqualigo (*De Sacrificio Novae Legis*, q. 131, n. 10, Rome, 1907, tom. 1, p. 133) says: "It must be said that the sacrifice solemnly offered is more efficacious EX OPERE OPERATO in respect of its fruit of propitiation, satisfaction and impetration." On the other hand, the more Masses are said the more often will occasion be given for the exercise of private devotion, both on the part of the priest and of the faithful assisting; and so more honour will be given to God, and more spiritual advantage for the Church. Hence all things considered, let each one follow in this matter the approved good customs of the Church, suited to the conditions, times, places, persons and circumstances. What we have said about one person giving a generous stipend applies also where many people make a contribution to a common generous stipend, each contribution being of an amount sufficient to constitute by itself an adequate stipend for a Mass.

one of the faithful by saying fewer Masses than the stipend provides for (tom. 2, tr. 3, q. 2, ad 3m).

Clearly, then, Cajetan restricts the sufficiency of one Mass for several stipends to the case where each of a number of the faithful asks a priest to say Mass for his intention.

We reject this opinion of Cajetan, while admitting that it is acutely conceived and defended. For, as regards the multiplication of the fruit in proportion to the multiplication of devotions, there is a very great difference between the part played by the person who assists at Mass and the person who gives a stipend. For the faithful who assist at Mass are united, as we have said, to the offering of the sacrifice by a bond which as it is looser than that of the one who gives a stipend, so is it more capable of multiplication; their role is to ratify, each one individually, the sacrificial action performed in the common name of the Church. But those who give a stipend share in the sacrificial action by a special title, one absolutely singular and not admitting of multiplication, in so far as they supply the material for the sacrifice, which is adequate for the sacrifice both in fact and in virtue of the contract. For once a person has by contract provided adequately for a sacrifice, there is no further room for another to provide for it, and should any other contribute anything further, the contribution would be outside the ambit of the material corresponding to the celebration of that sacrifice. The reason for this is that when something is materially and formally adequate for a purpose, that is to say, has been given and received in contract as such, nothing further can be added while the contract holds, except what is extraneous. For example, a particular tax cannot be paid twice, but once it has been paid, whatever is superimposed on that payment must have some other title. Hence when a priest says Mass for the intention of Titus, Titus having given and he having accepted an adequate stipend for that Mass, HE CANNOT at the same time say that Mass for the intention of Caius, as the giver of another stipend. He can, of course, as we have explained at the beginning of this article, while saying the Mass for the intention of Titus, who gave the stipend for it, under another title, in his own name, as a private person make an offering of it for the intention of Caius. But to accept a stipend for any such transaction

of this nature is fraud and simony, for in such a case no title exists to justify a monetary pact, as the only title justifying such a pact is found in the provision of material for the sacrifice, which has already been done by Titus. Hence it is from the intrinsic nature of things that the condemnation of the Church fell upon the two following propositions:

“A priest can lawfully accept a double stipend for the same Mass, applying to the petitioner the most special part of the fruit which belongs to the celebrant himself, and this is so even after the decree of Urban VIII.”

“It is not contrary to JUSTICE to accept stipends for a number of Masses and to offer one sacrifice only. Nor is it against fidelity, even if I promise under oath to one person, giving a stipend, that I will offer for no other than him” (D. 1108, 1110).¹

(ii) *The Teaching of certain other Theologians on the Fruit of the Mass in relation to a Number of Stipends given by one Person.*

Even more extreme than that of Cajetan was the view adopted by Vasquez, held, too, by the Salmanticenses (disp. 13, dub. 6, n. 119 *et seq.*) and accepted by St. Alphonsus Liguori (*Theologia Moralis* 1, 6, tr. 3, c. 3, dub. 1, and *De eucharistia*, n. 312):² “this sacrifice if offered for many is just as fruitful for each one, as if it were offered for a lesser number.” Thus Vasquez (disp. 231, c. 3, n. 15) who holds this to be true whether, as in the case considered by Cajetan, many stipends have been given or not: because the sacrifice is operative according to the measure, not

¹ These condemnations were wisely anticipated by the Council of Lambeth, A.D. 1281 (c. 2, *De annalibus celebrandis et anniversariis*, Mansi, 24, 406): “The celebrant must not think that by saying one Mass he can satisfy for two persons, for each of whom he promised to celebrate specially and entirely.”

² The advocacy of Walafrid Strabo (*De eucharisticarum rerum exordiis et incrementis*, c. 22. P. L. 114, 948) in the Middle Ages might be claimed for this teaching: “In this there appears to be a grievous error, that some think they cannot make a full commemoration of those on whose behalf they offer unless they make separate offerings for each, or consider that the sacrifice should not be offered at the same time for the living and for the dead; while we truly know that One died for all, and that it is the one Bread and the one Blood that the whole Church offers. Should it please anyone to offer separately for each one, let him do this out of devotion and the consolation he gets by the multiplication of his prayers, but not through a foolish opinion that the one sacrament of God is not a general remedy for all. Such a one is somewhat weak in faith, who thinks that the Lord does not know what is needful for each one, when in one petition many are prayed for; or on the other hand if he thinks that God is wearied if the same oblation is presented, now for one, now for another.”

of those who offer, but of those on whose behalf it is offered, and the devotion of the one of these takes away nothing from the devotion of the other. Hence (apart from the legislation of the Church) according to this teaching it would be quite lawful to celebrate one Mass for the ten brothers of Caius who asks for a separate Mass for each of the ten, giving ten different stipends. Even the teaching of Cajetan would certainly not permit this.

These theologians, however, made the mistake of presupposing a close parity, which does not exist, between the offering of a sacrifice on behalf of anyone and the conferring of a sacrament on anyone: "It is wholly reasonable that this sacrifice should be effective for the person on whose behalf it is offered, according to the measure of his devotion, since it operates in the way a sacrament does (*instar sacramenti*); and it is the most certain teaching of the schools that the sacraments are more and more operative in proportion to the disposition of the recipients" (Vasquez, disp. 231, c. 7, n. 50; cf. c. 3, n. 17). We do not admit this parity between the sacrifice and the sacraments. On the contrary, there is this very great difference between the sacrifice and the sacraments: that the sacrament is a good thing conferred on man by God; while the sacrifice is a good thing offered to God Himself by man, and hence accepted by God as propitiatory in proportion to man's devotion: therefore the fruit of the sacrament which is grace, is measured by the disposition of the recipient; while the fruit of the sacrifice, which is propitiation, is measured by the disposition of the offerer, as such. Hence we reject the teaching of Vasquez, as devoid of a reasonable foundation and of any intrinsic probability.¹

Some colour indeed or show of reason is given to this opinion

¹ The Council of Lambeth also rejects this teaching: "Far be it from any Catholic to believe that one Mass devoutly celebrated will be as beneficial through its intention for a thousand people for whom it may be possibly said, as a thousand Masses would be, were they said with a similar devotion on their behalf" (*Council of Lambeth, loc. cit.*).

Moreover, if put into practice this teaching would nullify the condemnation of Pius VI pronounced against the 30th proposition of the Synod of Pistoia (D. 1530) that in every sacrifice the offering is made *for all faithful Christians living and dead* and therefore there will be no less fruit for any one of them than for any other on whose particular behalf the priest intends to offer. The condemnation runs as follows: "The teaching of the Synod . . . thus understood that . . . the special offering or application of the sacrifice, which is made by the priest, is not more beneficial, other things being equal, to those for whom it is applied, than for any others whomsoever: . . . is false, rash, etc."

by the fact that some condition is necessary in those for whom the sacrifice is offered, that propitiation may be efficaciously salutary and fruitful in their regard; because, though grace is always obtained infallibly by the sacrifice, the benefit of grace is not always infallibly obtained for this or that individual. Likewise a sufficiency of satisfaction is always procured by the sacrifice, but the benefit of this satisfaction for these or those is not always infallibly obtained. For, *in the first place*, say that a Mass is offered for a man who is in mortal sin and rejects all, even the most abundant graces of God, the propitiation though undoubtedly purchased by the sacrifice cannot be efficaciously salutary for this man while he is in this condition. *In the second place*, if the Mass is offered for one in the state of grace, though satisfaction no matter how great is procured by the sacrifice, it will be of no benefit to him in the matter of venial sins for which he has no sorrow; the penalty for these cannot be remitted while the guilt remains, and the guilt even of venial sins cannot be removed unless one repents of those sins. In both these cases, however, all that is lacking that the propitiation may be efficacious is not a positive condition but something negative, the absence of an obstacle. Once that obstacle is removed, each one of those on whose behalf you have offered the Mass will obtain a share of the fruit of the sacrifice unto eternal life, in proportion to your own devotion in offering the Mass. Even Cajetan had already noted this: "The devotion which measures the effect of the sacrifice is not to be looked for in those who receive the effect, although their lack of proper disposition may impede the communication of the effect (FOR THE SACRIFICE IS NOT OPERATIVE AFTER THE MANNER OF AN AGENT, BUT AFTER THE MANNER OF AN OFFERING); but this devotion is to be looked for in those who concur in the sacrifice in a causal way, in whatever way the causal intervention occurs, for example, when one asks for the sacrifice to be offered, when one ministers at the sacrifice . . ." (tom. 2, tr. 3, q. 2). Hence we conclude that Vasquez and St. Alphonsus Liguori (*locis citatis*) are wrong in claiming the support of Cajetan for their opinion, and no such claim can be admitted. (J. Pohle, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 3, Paderborn, 1905, 373.) We conclude, therefore, that in every case, and from the nature of

things, justice is infringed (and most seriously also the virtue of religion), unless one celebrates just as many Masses as one has accepted stipends.

APPENDIX

Stipends of Concelebrants

Here I shall attempt the solution of the difficulty to which we have already referred (XXIII), in respect of the stipends of concelebrants. The difficulty cannot be solved unless we first establish some definite conclusions regarding the virtue and efficacy of concelebration. It should be noted that this matter of Eucharistic concelebration is still shrouded in the densest clouds of theological obscurity, though it has undoubted application not only in the ordination of priests, but in the consecration of bishops also, and much more even in the Oriental use, quite legitimate and most frequent among Catholics of Oriental rite, of the concelebration of priests with the bishop, and of the bishops with the patriarch. This custom was also found in olden times in the Roman Church, as well as in many Churches of the West, the Gallican in particular (cf. P. de Puniet, art. *Concélébration*, in D. A. C.). Not only do the stipends of a concelebration come under discussion, or the number of sacrifices to be found in a concelebration; it is also controverted in the Schools, whether all the concelebrants consecrate or not. How thorny this question is, and how elusive, may be seen if one compares the lengthy discussion of Suarez (disp. 61, sect. 4) with the still longer one of Vasquez (disp. 218, c. 2-4) in opposition to Suarez, and in which he demolishes the contention of Suarez. Moreover, neither of these two Doctors makes any attempt to safeguard the consecrations of each of the concelebrants except in the rather chimerical case in which all the consecrations would be finished (*absolverentur*) at the same moment (in the same one mathematical instant of time, so to speak). Both Suarez and Vasquez seem to me to fall short of the simple solution offered by St. Thomas.

St. Thomas' solution (3 S. 82, 2m) is based on this admirable principle, that our priesthood, since it is in us by participation

in the Priesthood of our Lord, is essentially one: hence it matters little whether the action is done by an individual priest separately, or by the college of priests in common and acting as one body (*in solidum*). "The priest consecrates only in the person of Christ: and the many priests are one in Christ." It follows from this that all properly sacerdotal sacraments, that is, such as can be given only by priests, can be effected collectively: so Confirmation (*Acts*, VIII, 15-17); Penance (Cyprian, *Ep.* 9, 2; 10, 1; 16, 2. P. L. 4, 251-252, 254, 257); Ordination; Extreme Unction, both among those of the Oriental rites and the Latins (Rev. C. Ruch, art. *Extrême-Onction du Ier au IXe siècle*, in D. T. C., col. 1983); and the Eucharist. In the case of the other sacraments this is not so; for, as St. Thomas (3 S. 67, 6) remarks, were a number of ministers to say "We baptise thee", they would effect nothing; the reason being that, on the one hand, the action not being strictly sacerdotal, it is impossible for the ministers of baptism to coalesce, as such, into one body or college (especially seeing that they might even be outside the Church, in which case the ministers of baptism, as such, would not even coalesce in the unity of the ecclesiastical body, the Church); and on the other hand, as Vasquez (disp. 148, c. 5, n. 39) shrewdly remarks, the natural meaning of the words "We baptise" is to denote a number acting as one group to bring about something collectively, namely by way of one cause, which, as we have said, in this case they cannot do. In matrimony it is abundantly clear that a number of men cannot say to a number of women: we take you as wives. But in the sacerdotal sacraments the whole priesthood always acts, either through all together, or through one; because we are one priesthood, we are all priests in Christ, the one High Priest.

In accordance, then, with this principle, we say that priests can, in complete conformity with the institution of Christ, consecrate collectively AS ONE UNDIVIDED PRIESTHOOD: so that the utterances, as many in number as there are priests, nevertheless constitute (by agreement) only ONE SACRAMENTAL SIGN and therefore ONE FORM OF CONSECRATION: which accordingly is incomplete, until all have finished their own recital. This is not (as some have thought) because the efficacy of any form, complete and integral in itself, is suspended as it were, in concelebration, until that

point is reached when all have finished their own recitals, but because at that point only the collective utterance (and so, too, the form) is, as such, integral and complete. The unity of the various utterances, therefore (though physically diverse and not terminated in the same mathematical moment), their unity in the nature of one sign, or one pronouncement and intimation (such as usually comes from any collective body), or their unity, to use the words of Thomas of Walden, as one promulgation of the words of our Lord, regarding this bread and chalice, effectively safeguards the unity of the consecration as uttered by one body of priests, collectively celebrating. And this is the sense of the words of St. Thomas (*loc. cit.*), practically following Innocent III: that the intention of each one of the celebrating priests is referred to the same instant of consecration, namely, to the last moment of the last utterance, such intention being included in the efficacious wish to co-operate in one celebration. And thus all consecrate and the consecration is one; and although it is one, nevertheless, since it is indivisible, the whole is referred back to the individual concelebrants. Yet no one single person of the corporate body of celebrants is the total cause, the individual is the partial cause only, as part of the total cause.¹ Since each of the priests here are parts of one total cause, it follows that, should any person request the sacrifice giving his stipend, each concelebrant should receive his own share of the stipend given. And in accordance with the principles already established (XXVII), such a one of the faithful will not be considered effectively to give a mandate for the sacrifice, or really offer the sacrifice in virtue of his contribution, unless he gives a stipend sufficient for the sustenance of the celebrating clergy. In the event, then, of the corporate body concelebrating, the adequate stipend should be such that each of the concelebrants may receive sustenance from it. Necessarily, therefore, the stipend will increase with the

¹ We hail Gregory of Valentia (*Commentariorum theologicorum*, tom. 4, disp. 6, q. 10, punct. 2, Venice, 1608, col. 1104) as patron of this interpretation of St. Thomas and this opinion: "It is the teaching of St. Thomas . . . that all newly ordained priests who celebrate with the bishop, consecrate, though some may finish before others, provided that they refer their intention to one and the same instant of the consecration, namely, to that moment in which the last one, or the last ones together, finish the utterance of the words. I prefer this teaching to any other." Since this opinion has no slight authority, it would be most imprudent for anyone to traduce it as erroneous or improbable.

increasing number of concelebrants. On the other hand, too, the fruit *ex opere operato* will increase with the increase of devotion, both on the side of the larger number of concelebrants, and in view of the greater liberality shown in providing more richly for the sacrifice (XXVII). Hence it would seem that until the Church decrees otherwise it can be tolerated (as is the custom in the East), that when a priest has received a stipend (not less than the usual one) from a member of the faithful for the celebration of one Mass on his behalf, such a priest may satisfy his obligation in a concelebration. For although such a sacrifice is one common sacrifice of all the concelebrants, still, as we have said, it is equivalent to a number of sacrifices (hence the faithful are not defrauded), and, moreover, to each member of the concelebrant body is due the equivalent of an ordinary stipend (and hence by such a mode of action the priest is not dishonestly enriched).

What we have said here, however, is in no way proposed as a final settlement of a matter still controverted among theologians. Our aim has rather been to co-operate sincerely in the common search for theological truth.

THESIS XXIX

§ 3. The Various Kinds of People who Receive the Fruit of the Mass

The question before us now is: who benefits by the Mass, either by way of propitiation or by way of assistance.

A. THE FAITHFUL BOTH LIVING AND DEAD

It is clear, in the first place, that by its own virtue or *ex opere operato* the Mass propitiates and obtains assistance for those for whom it is offered. As for propitiation, the one who compensates for his offence propitiates the one whom he offended, is received once more into his favour; but sin is compensated for by way of the sacrifice, in as much as the gift is presented in the sacrifice to compensate for that sin; hence the only person who obtains propitiation through the Mass is he for whose sin the gift is presented. The reasoning will be much the same, if we consider the sacrifice, apart from propitiation, in so far as it is impetratory. For of its very nature impetration benefits only that person for whom the benefit has been asked. Vasquez puts this well: "In order that the sacrifice may benefit anyone, *ex opere operato*, it must benefit him in so far as it is a sacrifice, but to benefit him as a sacrifice it must be offered for him" (disp. 231, c. 3, n. 11). Hence when considering those who receive fruit from the sacrifice we must keep in mind not the efficient cause, the person who offers, but the final cause of the offering, the intention for which the offering is made. Indeed if the sacrifice could be offered for others in such a way that the person who offered it did not offer it FOR HIMSELF at all that person would receive no fruit from the sacrifice itself. And so indeed it was in the sacrifice of Christ Himself, and this is the fundamental reason why we must hold that "the death of Christ was of no profit to Him by way of the sacrifice, but merely by reason of His devotion . . . and thus Christ did not

receive in Himself the effect, the fruit of His Priesthood . . . rather He communicated that effect or fruit to others: because Christ did not offer Himself to the Father for Himself but for others. We say, however, that the sacrifice of His death profited Him by reason of His devotion, because for Him it was a meritorious work" (Vasquez, *ibid.*).

But, Christ alone excepted, all others must necessarily offer the sacrifice for themselves, at the same time as they offer it for others. This is evident in two ways, from a consideration either of the propitiatory or the impetratory character of the sacrifice.

As regards propitiation we must remember that all adult men are sinners, and that no sinner can, while passing over his own sins, offer an acceptable compensation for the sins of others. This is the reason why the priest of the Law needed *to offer sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's* (*Heb.*, VII, 27, cf. V, 3; see Suarez, disp. 78, sect. 1, n. 3).

Again, as regards impetration, it must be remembered that, even when the evil of sin has been removed, every man who still lives in the body as a pilgrim, absent from the Lord, has not yet reached his final goal in union with his Creator, seeing that he still lacks the beatific vision and that supreme love, in which he enjoys to the full, as far as this is his due, the sight of the happiness and perfection of God as He is;¹ indeed his salvation is still at stake, while the law of sin is still raging in his members and the evils of this life press upon his soul. Now the offering of sacrifice essentially signifies the wish which man has to set himself towards God and transfer himself to God: but this wish implies an earnest desire for all the divine benefits needful for that end; hence this desire is signified and, as it were, intimated to God through the sacrifice. But a desire made known to God is a prayer. And so through the sacrifice the one who offers it impetrates those graces, without which it is impossible for him to give to God that which is invisibly dedicated to Him in the visible gift. Hence also it is that when any of us offers the sacrifice of the Eucharist with a sincere mind, we offer first for ourselves, and then for others whom we love as ourselves. It is also for this

¹ For this sole reason it was proper for the Blessed Virgin to offer the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ first for herself, and then for others, thereby, and rightly so, impetrating for herself her own consummation in the beatific vision.

reason that we must say that even baptised infants, wholly free from sin as they are, must be said, by virtue of the habitual intention which accompanies infused faith and charity which is theirs, to offer up the sacrifice for themselves, that they, too, may obtain God's benefits, chief amongst which is the gift of final perseverance.

Each one of us, therefore, who offers the sacrifice is at the same time among those for whom the sacrifice is offered, as each one always offers for himself. And thus it is plain that every one of the faithful of the Catholic Church undoubtedly enjoys the fruit of the sacrifice in accordance with his manner of offering, either habitually or in act, and according to his grade and position among the various offerers of the Mass.¹

Furthermore, besides the offering which each one can make for himself, others can also offer the sacrifice for him, not only in the general offering for all together, but also specially, in view of the charity by which, as we are all knit together in the oneness of the body of Christ, each one can and should treat any other member as though a part of himself.

Thus we see that each individual member of the Church militant can secure the fruit of the sacrifice in two ways: both BY WAY OF PERSONAL PETITION OR QUEST, so to speak, in as much as he offers for himself:² and BY WAY OF SUFFRAGE, in as much as others offer for him. And it is in this sense that St. Thomas wrote: "The Eucharist has the effect of a sacrament in him who receives it in communion; but the effect of a sacrifice in him

¹ Cajetan: "For since the priest prays and offers in the person of the Church, and each one of the faithful is a member of the Church, it follows that each one prays and offers through the actions of the priest, and thus each one concurs as a cause in the sacrifice: and for this reason every single Mass benefits each one of the faithful, by way of satisfaction also, according to the devotion which each one of them has in the common prayers and sacrifices of the Church" (*Opusc.*, tom. 2, tr. 3, q. 2).

² Should a person offer, not especially for another, but for himself only, OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, he will reap greater fruit for himself from the sacrifice, both of propitiation and impetration, than if he had offered it for another. For although the person who offers for another also offers for himself, still in that case his offering is such that it is actually an offering for two. And the measure of the fruit for each, when divided between two, is lessened, as we saw in a former section. Once more bear in mind that we are here speaking only of the fruit of the sacrifice *ex opere operato*, which is by way of propitiation and impetration. Were we speaking of the fruit *ex opere operantis*, the merit of grace and glory coming from his offering, as from any meritorious work of any individual, it would be quite a different matter, for any one who in the state of grace offered for his neighbour would acquire special merit by such an act of fraternal charity.

who offers, or in those for whom it is offered.” And again: “This offering . . . works satisfaction for those for whom it is offered, and also for those who offer, according to the measure of their devotion” (in 3, S. 79, 5 c.).¹

We now come to consider the faithful departed. These, as members of the Church suffering, still in the process of being freed in Purgatory from all the penalties of their sins, may certainly profit by the Mass, in so far as it satisfies for sin, in this latter way, by way of suffrage,² for on the one hand they are in

¹ Most, not to say all of the scholastic theologians with the Salmanticenses (*De sacrament. Euchar.*, disp. 13, dub. 3, n. 52, coll. dub. 4) carefully observed this distinction between the two ways of participating in the fruit of the sacrifice. Let de Lugo (*De sacrament. Euchar.*, disp. 19) speak for the rest: “*Sect. 10: On those who can receive the effects of this sacrifice, in as much as it is offered for them. A person can partake of the fruit of the sacrifice in two ways; firstly, when it is offered for him; secondly, when he himself offers,*” etc. “*Sect. 11: On those who receive the fruit of this sacrifice, as offerers. . . . Among these, the immediate minister, that is, the celebrating and consecrating priest, holds the first place, afterwards come the assistant ministers, the deacon, the subdeacon and the other assistant ministers; then the rest of the congregation; those likewise who gave a stipend to the priest, or in any other way concur in the offering of the sacrifice. . . . It cannot be doubted that all these persons, except the priest, offer mediately [through the priest], and it is not merely offered for them.*” Joannes a Sancto Thoma in 3 S. 83, disp. 32, art 3, *ultimo inquires*, and Pasqualigo, *De oblatione sacrificii*, tom. 1, q. 136, n. 1, 9 and 10 may also be read with profit.

² That satisfaction is made by the Mass for the debt of punishment not yet paid by the souls in Purgatory is beyond controversy, as part of the Catholic faith. A more subtle question has been raised turning on the guilt of sin, as distinct from the debt of punishment for sin already remitted as to its guilt. Could compensation be made by the sacrifice offered for the dead, so that not only would satisfaction be secured, but even propitiation? Could not the sacrifice of the Mass propitiate for the departed in retrospect, so to speak, seeing that the sacrifice of Christ our Lord not only obtained propitiation with God for all those who lived then, or were to live in the future, but also for all the dead of all ages past? It was in this sense that Franciscus a Victoria (or Thomas a Chaves) wrote: “Because in the Last Supper Christ offered Himself . . . for the living and the dead, FOR THIS REASON MASS CAN BE OFFERED for the living and the dead.” (*Summa Sacramentorum Ecclesiae*, from the teaching of R. P. F. Franciscus a Victoria. *To this edition many questions are added from the decrees of the Sacred Councils, in particular of the Council of Trent* . . . carefully prepared and edited by R. P. F. Thomas a Chaves, 1594, fol. 53).

A similar argument had already been advanced by Hugo of Amiens. “Tell me, was not the Victim, which the Son of God offered to the Father on the Cross, offered for the faithful departed? That common Victim certainly did atone for those who lived in the past, as well as for those living at present and to live in the future . . . And so the Church has maintained this custom of offering in the present day, for the dead, Him without whom neither the living nor the dead can be forgiven” (*Dialogorum*, 1, 5, c. 20. P. L. 192, 1213). Every Catholic does of course know that no one who has died in the state of sin can be justified after death. And so no one can say, in consonance with the Catholic faith, that the Mass has the power of transferring a person who is dead from the state of sin to the state of grace. Nevertheless it would not be against faith to assert that God, in view of sacrifices to be celebrated after the death of a certain person (offered as it were by way of compensation by the Church FOR THE SINS of her dead members), could, BEING PROPITIATED, have shown mercy to such a one before his death, so that he actually was converted, before his death, and so was saved. For the death of Christ did not

need of satisfaction, and on the other, as they are united with us by charity, each one of them can be considered and viewed by each one of us as a second self.

But a further question arises, whether the sacrifice of the Mass can profit them in the former manner, by way of personal quest. The reply to this question involves a distinction.

If while in life they made provision for Masses to be said for them after death, by a legacy for instance, then such Masses benefit them by way of personal quest, namely as the fruit of their own offering. For such as these have already offered, as givers of stipends, so far as they could, when they assigned their stipends to the celebration of Mass, and the sacrifice, when celebrated, is directed, according to their intention, towards their own personal benefit; and so they reap the fruit of the sacrifice as their own.¹

With the exception of this case, the souls in purgatory do not offer in any way, either habitually or actually, in any Mass, and hence do not share any of the fruit derived from the sacrifice as their own. Therefore though they are united to us by charity, still we may not consider them united with us in the common offering of the sacrifice.²

at the very moment of its happening transfer the ancient patriarchs who were already dead from sin to grace, though we must believe that His death made propitiation to God for their sins; because it is only by the death of Christ that atonement was made to God at any time. However this may be, one now dead can receive NO PRESENT EFFECT from my present sacrifice (for present justification or increase of grace is no longer possible for one who is dead), and so we usually and rightly say that the sacrifice of the Mass can only assist the dead (so as to produce any change in them here and now) by way of satisfaction.

But what we have said on the matter of compensation for the sins of the dead in retrospect, cannot be extended to the impetration (for ourselves or others), in retrospect, of past benefits: for unlike the payment of a debt, impetration of its very nature is only concerned with things which we hope to secure, and hence not yet obtained, but yet to come, as we hope. Hence in His sacerdotal prayer Christ did not ask for gifts which were conferred long before that time on the Patriarchs. He only prayed for gifts to be bestowed on those who then believed or would later believe in Him. And so pious women are not to be commended if they make petitions to God for the Immaculate Conception or for the Divine Maternity of the Blessed Virgin, or the like. But, on the other hand, an affectionate mother should be encouraged to make propitiation for the sins of her dead son, by offerings of the Holy Sacrifice, by alms, and every kind of atoning act of devotion, in union with the sacrifice of the Mass.

¹ From our remarks above, infer that, other things being equal, the suffering soul will obtain a greater measure of the fruit of satisfaction from the Masses which she herself provided for, than from those celebrated on her behalf by the mandate of another.

² The blessed in heaven are excluded from the offering of the sacrifice for the same reason; they are also excluded for other reasons, this one especially, that they are

Finally, when there is no obstacle on the side of the one for whom the Mass is offered, the benefit of the Mass by way of suffrage, that is, when the offerer offers it for another, to whom the fruit passes, is no less infallible than is the benefit derived from the reflex intention and application, which reverts to the offerer; and again it is no less infallible in respect of the dead than it is in respect of the living: and all this is by reason of the spiritual identity and oneness of all the saints, triumphant, militant, and suffering, communicating in the one body of Christ.¹

now no longer pilgrims on earth, on the way to their final destiny, but at the term of their pilgrimage, in heaven. For every sacrificial action signifies a motion of giving, by which our own very substance passes in gift from us into the hands of God. But since the saints have already reached God, already are God's, in the special sense envisaged by sacrifice, they can no longer be transferred to God, having already reached that goal. Again, every sacrifice involves a contract, and the blessed in heaven who have already entered into possession of the eternal heritage have nothing they can pledge by contract with God. In the case of the angels there is the still further reason that the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ was never made theirs, it was offered by our High Priest, not theirs, it was offered for our Redemption, not theirs, and was to be offered, under Christ, by the ecclesiastical body of Christ of which we are members, while they are not. Hence it is not easy to understand how Vasquez can say that "the angels can offer the sacrifice of the Mass to God with that devotion" (Vasquez, disp. 226, c. 2, n. 10) with which the faithful of the Church militant offer it in common. On the contrary, an angel has no more power to offer our sacrifice in any way than he has to impart sacramental absolution or to contract marriage.

¹ What Suarez has to say (*De poenitentia*, disp. 48, sect. 6, n. 5) of the INFALLIBLE application of indulgences by way of suffrage to the souls in purgatory is the same, and rests on the same principle. And Zacharias Pasqualigo (*De sacrificio Novae Legis*, q. 74, n. 3 and 4, Rome, 1707, tom. 1, p. 78), speaking of the Mass itself, quotes theologians without number in favour of his teaching, which is ours too: "This sacrifice infallibly remits punishment for the souls in Purgatory." This, he says, is "the common teaching of theologians".

THESIS XXX

B. INFIDELS AND OTHERS OUTSIDE THE VISIBLE CHURCH

Regarding such persons, two questions arise: *firstly*, can they offer the sacrifice; *secondly*, can the sacrifice be offered for them by way of suffrage?

(A) THOSE OUTSIDE THE VISIBLE CHURCH ARE NOT COMPETENT TO SECURE FOR THEMSELVES THE FRUIT OF THE MASS BY GIVING A STIPEND FOR IT.

The same principle which we have invoked already in dealing with the other questions regarding the utility of the Mass is applicable here also: the Mass can be offered BY ONE ONLY who is of the body of Christ. The reason is, as we have said, that no one but Christ Himself, or one who is of Christ, offers the Victim of Christ, and no one is of Christ unless he is in the body of which Christ is the Head. Therefore no one who is foreign to the Church offers the sacrifice. But the person who commissions a priest to present his gifts offers his sacrifice through the priest. Therefore the sacrifice of the Mass cannot be offered by one foreign to the Church who presents a stipend for it.¹

De Lugo expresses this well: "Those who are not members of the visible Church cannot offer this sacrifice. For the priest is priest of the Church alone, not of the gentiles; therefore it is of the Church alone that he is the legate or the messenger to God. Therefore ONLY THOSE CAN OFFER THROUGH HIM WHO BELONG TO THIS COMMONWEALTH OF THE CHURCH, to which Christ left this sacrifice" (disp. 19, sect. 10, n. 167).

(i) *Infidels.*

Before all others the infidel is most alien to the Church. Hence the sacrifice cannot be offered as his, nor can he delegate a priest to offer his gifts to God.

¹ Bear in mind our remarks above in Thesis XXVII on the person giving a stipend and the partaking in the offering, *κοινωνία μετὰ προσφορᾶς*.

Hence, too, it follows that a compact whereby an infidel gives money or its equivalent and a priest in turn binds himself IN JUSTICE to celebrate the Mass according to the intention of the infidel, would not be free from simony.¹ Because in this case the sole title is lacking which would justify the giving of money for a Mass: namely, the provision for the adequate materials for a Mass, which implies a mandate given to a priest for the celebration of the sacrifice. Failing this title, any money given (and received by way of a contract) could only be considered as payment for the suffrage (*suffragium*—"suffrage" here means the offering of a Mass *by* "A", say, *for the benefit of* "B") or purchase of the fruit of the Mass to be secured by that suffrage. For if an infidel should give money in this way, seeing that he cannot thereby, as do the faithful, give a mandate to the priest for the offering of the sacrifice, what else does he do but attempt to buy the suffrage for himself, a thing which of course the faithful never do? For, as we have already said, the faithful, when giving a mandate for a sacrifice, do not as it were pay so much by the stipend for the suffrage of the priest, but they procure the fruit of the Mass offered by them in this way by the ministry, not the suffrage of the priest, for themselves or others. Just as any member of the faithful would sin, if he were to transfer to another, for money given to him by that one, the suffrage of a Mass procured by himself, so, too, would the priest, were he to give to an infidel for money the suffrage of his own Mass.

Two objections might be advanced against our position: first, the money in this case need not be considered as a price or compensation, and need not be looked upon with suspicion as "a motive or inducement for the conferring or effecting something spiritual",² rather it is an allowance for the sustenance of the priest, which is a legitimate title for the giving and receiving something temporal for a spiritual benefit.

I ANSWER: it is true that the stipend given by one of the faithful for a Mass has in view the sustenance of the priest, but this is

¹ Even in such a case if the priest took upon himself no obligation in justice, but a mere obligation of FIDELITY to his promise, such a contract would be illicit, for even such "gratuitous compensation for a spiritual benefit" (D., 1195), would bear the taint of simony.

² D., 1195.

so only in consequence of the divine law, by virtue of which it is lawful for priests to live by the altar, that is, by the sacrifices which are entrusted to them to offer: so much so that the stipend does not adequately originate the sacrifice, unless it includes sufficient for the sustenance of the sacred minister. Hence, for the transfer of money, the title of the sacrifice arranged for by the mandate is presupposed, and is the very basis of the title of sustenance: if it lapses, the title of sustenance lapses also; and there remains no legitimate title, whereby the priest can make a contract, binding either in justice or in fidelity to his promise, with the person giving a stipend, in respect of the fruit of the Mass.

A second objection might be raised: the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office decreed otherwise in reply to the following question: "Is it lawful for priests to celebrate Mass for the intention of Turks or other infidels, and to accept an alms from them for the celebration of Mass?" The reply given on 12th July 1865 was "Yes, provided no scandal is given, and nothing is specially added in the Mass and provided that it is plain that there is nothing evil or erroneous or superstitious in the intention of the infidels offering the alms."

I REPLY: this decision, even without any mention of pontifical approbation, has its own authority, and high authority, too; and therefore if, as appears at first sight, it is to be interpreted of a monetary pact, it may be acted on with a safe conscience, as long as the decision remains unchanged. But meanwhile the interpretation, as of a monetary pact implied by the alms, is somewhat doubtful. Quite possibly the word alms here may have another meaning.¹ Might not the alms be offered and accepted in this case in such a way that it would be considered that neither the person who gave the alms was thereby constituted the offerer or the author of the sacrifice, nor did the person who received it contract any obligation either in justice or fidelity, but merely signified by his acceptance of it his intention of offering out of

¹ Perhaps the same interpretation may be placed on the reply of the Sacred Congregation *De Propaganda Fide*, to the following question: "May a missionary accept alms for a Mass, and apply it according to the mind or intention of a pagan offerer, who wishes the favour of recovery from illness or release from prison or from impending capital punishment?" The reply given on 11th March, 1848 was "Yes".

charity and gratitude,¹ for the benefit of others by way of suffrage, as is explained in the next Thesis ?²

(ii) *Heretics and Schismatics*

What we have said about the infidel applies equally to the heretic and the schismatic, for both of them are outside the communion of the Church which consists in the unity of faith in the bond of peace. Hence it would be simoniacal to accept a stipend for a Mass from either a heretic or a schismatic, seeing that the sacrifice of neither of them can be offered by the priest ordained for the faithful alone in the things that pertain to God.

IT MIGHT BE OBJECTED: Not all those who belong to a schismatical or heretical sect are guilty of the sin of formal heresy or formal schism. Some of them may be in invincible error in respect of one or other article of faith, or in respect of the right of legitimate authority: such would not lack the virtue of faith, and there is nothing to prevent them being endowed with charity. Besides, as we have said, they have the baptismal character which has a direct reference to the Eucharistic mystery. Therefore both by reason of the sacramental initiation of baptism, and by reason of invisible grace, such persons would be within the unity of the Church, and outside of it only in appearance. Hence they would have the power inherent in the faithful of offering the sacrifice of the Church through the priest: hence a priest might lawfully accept a stipend from them.

To this I REPLY: Such persons are certainly not outside invisible communion with the Church, nor are they deprived of the power which is intrinsic to the baptismal character. Hence we say that

¹ I think that the words of J. Bucceroni (*Institutiones theologicae Moralis*, 5, t. 2, n. 632, p. 223) in another case may apply here: "Money may be accepted freely, and in turn Masses may be promised freely, in such a manner that this last promise does not imply compensation, or return for stipends so to speak, the money being received merely under the title of alms, so that the offerer of the money distinctly understands, that it cannot be accepted under any other title, and that he gives it on this understanding." In theory this might be true in the present case also. Any one can see, however, how serious might be the danger of abuse, if such a practice became common.

² Really no more can be inferred from the principles of Bellarmine (*De Missa*, 1, 6, c. 6) to be found in the *Instructio* added at the place just indicated. For he is not treating there of those who benefit by the sacrifice as offerers, but of those for whom the sacrifice is offered by another. Hence he is not speaking of those who procure the sacrifice for themselves by giving a stipend, but of those who receive the fruit by the suffrage of the offerer. See below, XXXI, on Canon 809 of the *Code*.

they make the common offering with the universal Church, in virtue of that one and indivisible oblation power which is exercised by all the faithful in every one of her sacrifices. It is very different however, in respect of the special individual offering implied by the giving of a stipend. For while God judges what is internal to man, man judges by what is external. The Church being composed of men can only take cognisance of what is shown externally, leaving the rest which is hidden from her to the divine judgment.¹ Hence if one makes a public profession of heresy, or adheres to a schismatical sect, he must NECESSARILY BE REPUTED to be outside internal communion with the faithful, and so to lack external communion with the Church. And nothing is more pertinent to this external communion with the Church than is that participation in the offering (*κοινωνία μετὰ προσφορᾶς*) according to which a man personally gives a mandate to a priest to offer the sacrifice. Failing this external communion, there is no title to justify the pact implied by the stipend.

Nevertheless were this man to ask you EXPRESSLY to say a Mass for the intention that he may obtain the grace to return to the Church, he there and then gives sufficient EVIDENCE of his desire to cleave internally to the true Church and the true faith. His position therefore in respect of sacred things (excepting, of course, those things in which some special legislation of the Church may possibly intervene) is no worse, even if he is in sin, than that of any other tolerated excommunicate. And the present law of the Church authorises the tolerated excommunicate to give a mandate for the sacrifice. Hence the Sacred Congregation of the Council answered the following question in the light of genuine theological principles: "Could or should a Mass be celebrated and an alms received for a schismatic Greek who earnestly and persistently asks that a Mass be applied for himself, either while he is present in the Church at the time, or remains without?"

¹ In the case of an excommunicated person overtaken by death before absolution, Innocent III wrote: "The judgment of God is always founded on truth which neither deceives nor is deceived. The judgment of the Church, on the other hand, sometimes rests on a reasonable conjecture or opinion; and it happens often enough that these opinions are deceptive. Hence it also happens that he who is bound in the eyes of God is loosed in the eyes of the Church, and he who is free in the eyes of God is bound by a sentence of the Church" (*Regest.*, 1, 2, *Ep.* 61. P. L. 214, 600; cf. *cap. A Nobis.*, Decret. 1, 5, tit. 39, c. 28: see below).

On 19th April 1837 the answer was given: "According to the terms of the question, it is not lawful, unless there is express evidence that the alms is presented by the schismatic to pray for his conversion to the true faith." THE SUPREME PONTIFF GREGORY XVI APPROVED OF THIS ANSWER TO THE QUESTION PUT.

Note, however, that, particularly in the case of the tolerated excommunicate, the Church may forbid tomorrow what she permits today; and in the case where excommunication is added to heresy and schism, she may show less indulgence than in other cases; for example, she may absolutely forbid that an indulgence be shown towards one sect, as that of the Methodists, that she may allow in regard to another, say that of the Greek schismatics; then again her attitude towards the same people may be different in different parts of the world. For the Church reserves to herself the right to deal in this way or that with an excommunicated person at her own free will and as she thinks best, as we have said.

(iii) *Catechumens.*

Catechumens are in a more favourable condition than schismatics and heretics, for they profess the true faith and give due obedience to the Church: in this way they are at one with the faithful. Hence one might think that they could concur in the offering of the sacrifice by giving a stipend. The obstacle which prevented the heterodox from acting in this way is not present in the case of the catechumens, who are publicly known and recognised by all as mentally adhering to the Church and in agreement with the teachings of the Gospel. A special obstacle, however, exists in their case, that no one can offer the sacrifice unless he is conformed to and united with the priesthood of Christ by the baptismal character which the catechumens lack, and the person who gives a mandate for the sacrifice by giving a stipend for the Mass is rightly considered to offer the sacrifice through the priest in virtue of this compact. Hence a stipend compact for a Mass between a catechumen and a priest has the taint of simony.¹

¹ Dealing with this subject J. Grassi (*Universa Theologia Moralis juxta doctrinam S. Alphonsi Ligorio*, tom. 3, 1854, p. 121) rightly says: "Therefore, although the priest can offer the sacrifice to God in respect of the fruit of impetration for catechumens and for the unbaptised, that God may grant them the grace of faith, enrich

BUT YOU MAY OBJECT: this argument proves too much, because it would follow from it that the catechumens would not be even invisibly associated with the common offering of the sacrifices; while, nevertheless, even they, through the desire of baptism perfected by charity, can in their own invisible way be so incorporated with Christ that, were they to be overtaken by death, they would be enrolled among the citizens of the Church triumphant: and so, since meanwhile they are within the body of Christ by grace and charity, they are necessarily united with the universal body of Christ in offering the sacrifice of Christ.

This objection is met by the distinction made by Cardinal de Lugo (disp. 19, sect. 10, n. 168) between affective and effective offering. Everyone who by the desire of baptism belongs to Christ and the Church offers the sacrifice affectively, that is, in his heart and soul he would wish to offer it actually, if he could. But only such a one as has actually received the sacrament of baptism effectively offers it, really offers it. The ancient Patriarchs offered the sacrifice of Christ affectively when they actually offered the figurative sacrifices, wherein was the promise of that great Sacrifice which, once it should have been enacted by our Lord for the redemption of the world, would be offered by the Church, not in shadow and figure, but in truth.

In such a way, though the rite is changed, do the catechumens offer affectively, that is, they would wish to offer really if they could while their faith is (or may be) even clearer than that of the Patriarchs, in view of the presence of the true reality, and their desire, too, to offer really, if they could, is more distinctly envisaged.

Far otherwise do the faithful offer, signed as they are with the impress of the priesthood of Christ, and so united with the sacrifice of Christ, not by mere intention of faith, and the mere desire of charity, but a true power to transmit to God by the ministry of their priests as their own victim, that is, dedicated

them with benefits, deliver them from the evils of this life, nevertheless he cannot accept a stipend for a Mass for them, that thereby they should become partakers and offerers in the oblation of the sacrifice; it is the same here as for the excommunicated person, because the priest communicates with those whom he wishes to be partakers of the sacrifice, such as are those who desire that through their giving of an alms the sacrifice be communicated to themselves."

in their own name, that Victim who is the common Victim of the whole Catholic Church. But this Victim is not offered in the name of the catechumens,¹ though they can and should long for or DESIRE² a place among those in whose name it is offered.

Hence it is plain that the earlier theologians whom we have quoted above, when they said that the sacrifice is offered by the desire of the faithful, used this expression in a different sense to that in which we now say that catechumens offer in desire. For all the faithful have the effective desire or INTENTION, even though it be implicit, in respect of every sacrifice of the Church, OF EXERCISING THAT POWER and prerogative WITH WHICH on their first entrance into the Church, THEY ARE EQUIPPED. Catechumens, on the other hand, have the wish or the desire of acquiring that power first, and then of exercising it.

Moreover, the desire of the unbaptised to offer may be absolutely invisible. But the desire of the Christian to offer is always visible after its own manner: for it is exhibited by the outward profession which intrinsically accompanies baptism, as has been said, Th. XXVI.³

¹ Whether it may be offered *for* them by way of suffrage will be discussed later.

² And this is what we call offering affectively.

³ As long, that is to say, as this baptismal profession is not denied (explicitly or implicitly) by subsequent open infidelity which separates from the Church.

THESIS XXXI

(B) NON-CATHOLICS AND THE FRUIT OF THE MASS BY WAY OF SUFFRAGE.

(i) *Living Non-Catholics.*

We must distinguish between what could be done in this matter, if one only had to take into consideration the nature of things, or the divine law; and then what can be done if we also take into consideration the restrictions imposed by Church law.

The Divine Law.

If we consider the divine law alone, Mass can be offered by way of suffrage for all living men, including heretics and schismatics, and the unbaptised, both catechumens and infidels.

Although Vasquez (disp. 227, c. 3) will not admit this in respect of the unbaptised,¹ we hold that it must be admitted, for the unbaptised as well as for the rest, for many reasons. We prove this first by arguments resting on authority, and in the second place on intrinsic grounds.

(I) The authority for our assertion is twofold: the ancient usage of the Church and the teaching of the Fathers.

In the liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (8, 12. F. D. 1, 512) not only do we find a prayer "for the king", and, be it noted, at the time when the *Apostolic Constitutions* were written there were none but pagan kings; but also expressly "for those who hate us and PERSECUTE US FOR THY NAME, for those who are WITHOUT AND IN ERROR, THAT THOU MAYST LEAD THEM TO WHAT IS GOOD and mitigate their fury"; and finally "for the catechumens of the Church", and all this within the anaphora itself, where certainly the actual sacrificial intention is indicated.²

¹ The Salmanticenses mention a few others who after Vasquez held the same view (disp. 13, dub. 4, para. 2, n. 58).

² Though Serapion of Thmuis did not actually pray expressly for infidels in his anaphora, he prefixed to the Supper narrative the following significant words: "Thou art reconciled to all, and thou dost draw all to thee by the visitation of thy beloved Son" (F. D. 2, 172).

In offering the sacrifice for pagans and for the king especially, the early Christians had in mind the words of the *First Epistle to Timothy*: *I desire therefore first of all that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings* (δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεόξεις, εὐχαριστίας) *be made for all men, for kings and all that are in high station. . . . For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator for God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all* (I Tim., II, 1-6). Hence the deacons inserted in the Liturgy words taken directly from this epistle when they exhorted the congregation as follows: "Let us pray for kings and those who are in high station," while the bishop said his own corresponding prayer "for the king and those who are in high station" (*Const. Apost.*, 8, 12 and 13 pp. 512-514).

Of the Fathers, Tertullian (*ad Scapulam*, 2. P. L. 1, 700) bears witness to this early custom: "We offer the sacrifice for the salvation of the Emperor, but it is to our God and to his that we offer the sacrifice, and we offer it in the manner commanded by God, by pure prayer.¹ For God, the founder of the universe does not need the odour or blood of anything."² Chrysostom seems to attest to a similar custom in his time, at least as far as the catechumens were concerned. Praising charity as the adornment of all Christian worship, and the cause of all good things, he says: "For this reason also we give the kiss of peace within the sacred mysteries, that, though many, we may be made one; we also say the common prayers FOR THOSE NOT INITIATED, for the sick, for the fruits of the earth, for land and sea. Do you not see the full force of our charity?" (*In Joann.*, hom. 78, n. 4. P. G. 59, 426.)³ Moreover, in his

¹ On the interpretation of the words "pure prayer" see above (Thesis XVIII).

² It is hardly worth while piling up authorities for the offering of sacrifice for living heretics, because it is difficult to find anyone who opposes it. Yet we may just quote Hilary. He writes to Constantius Augustus, who was an Arian, requesting him to permit Catholics to have Catholic bishops, evidently taking it for granted that it was the custom for Catholics to pray for Constantius within the sacred mysteries: "Let your gracious majesty permit the people to hear the teachers whom they desire, whom they consider suitable, whom they have chosen, and so let them celebrate together (*concelebrent*) the divine solemnities of the mysteries, and offer the prayers for your welfare and happiness" (*ad Constantium Augustum*, 1, 1, c. 2. P. L. 10, 559).

³ The meaning of this passage is: we who assist at the sacrifices kiss one another in charity, in order to pass into the oneness of Christ. However, the force

commentary on *I Tim.*, II, 1, he certainly teaches plainly that within the mysteries themselves prayers are to be said for pagan kings: "The priest is as it were the common father of all the world. Therefore let him have a care for all, like God whose priest he is. Hence St. Paul says: *I desire therefore that first of all supplications, prayers be made.* . . . What does *first of all* mean? It refers to the daily worship. And the initiated know this, how prayers are made every day, morning and evening; how we pray for the whole world, for kings, and for all who are in high station. Perhaps some one may say: he did not say that we should pray for all without exception, but for the faithful only. But if so, why did he say *for kings*? For during that time kings or emperors were not of the true faith, but for a long period the ungodly had been succeeding to the ungodly. . . . Finally, as it was quite probable that the Christian, hearing this, should lose interest (*torpescar*), and might not accept this admonition, if he had to offer prayers FOR THE PAGAN DURING THE MYSTERIES, attend to what Paul says further . . . *that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life.* In other words, their safety brings peace to us. . . . For God founded kingships for the common good. Surely, then, it would be absurd that they should do battle and carry arms in order that we may live in peace; and that we should not offer petitions for them in their perils and their warfare?"

Finally, he expressly desires the priest to make intercession with God for all the needs of the whole world: "He who speaks for the whole state—but why do I say for the whole state?—rather I should say, he who speaks FOR THE WHOLE WORLD, and beseeches God TO BE APPEASED FOR THE SINS OF ALL, not only the living, but also those who have died, what kind of a man, I ask you, should he be? . . . For just as though the whole world were committed to his trust, and as if he himself were the father of all, so does he approach God, praying that ALL THE WARS OF THE WORLD be extinguished, that tumults be quelled, asking for peace, prosperity, and the speedy warding off OF ALL EVILS THREATENING

and the fruit of our charity is not restricted merely to those who have the right and the power to assist; it passes on to all those who cannot assist, like the catechumens, because the law does not allow it, the sick who are physically incapable of assisting; indeed it is competent to relieve all the needs of all mankind: such is the wide scope of the common prayers of the initiated who are present at the mysteries,

EACH SINGLE INDIVIDUAL either as a private person or as a member of the general public" (*De Sacerdotio*, 1, 6, n. 4. P. G. 48, 680-681).

Likewise when St. Augustine says that the priest "at the altar"¹ exhorts the people to pray and also offers his own prayers for the conversion of infidels, he evidently has in mind a liturgical custom in the Mass, and when he says that the people answer *Amen* to such prayers of the priest he further suggests that the appointed place for that intercession was actually within the Canon. For, to Vitalis of Carthage who taught that the beginning of faith was not a gift of God, he writes: "Publish broadcast your disputations against the prayers of the Church, and when you hear the priest of God, at the altar, exhorting the congregation to pray for unbelievers, that God may lead them into the faith, and to pray for the catechumens that He may inspire them with the desire of regeneration . . . make a mockery of the holy prayers, and say that you do not do as he exhorts you to do, that is, you do not pray to God for infidels, that He may make them believers. . . . Surely you will not prevent the Church from praying for unbelievers, that they may become believers, for those who are unwilling to believe, that they may be willing to believe; for those who dissent from her law and teaching, that they may assent to her law and teaching, that God may give them what He promised through the prophet—a heart to know Him and ears to hear Him ! When you hear God's priest at His altar exhorting the faithful to pray to Him, even when you hear him praying God in a loud voice, to compel the unbelieving nations to come to His faith, will you not answer *Amen*?" (*Ep.* 217, n. 2 and 26. P. L. 33, 978 and 988.) Furthermore, in the *Epistola ad Paulinum* (*Ep.* 149. 16-17, P. L. 33, 636-637), when commenting on the command of the Apostle (*I. Tim.*, II, 1-6), and having noted that the *prayers* (*προσευχάς*) there mentioned signify the Canon of the Mass, he adds expressly that the intention and scope of these words of St. Paul was "to prevent anyone from thinking, for such is the weakness of the human

¹ Cf. that other passage where quite evidently he is speaking of the sacrifice of the Mass: "Who ever heard the priest of the faithful standing AT THE ALTAR . . . saying in the prayers: I offer the sacrifice to thee, Peter, etc." (*Civ. Dei*, 8, 27, 1, P. L. 41, 255),

mind, THAT THESE THINGS WERE NOT TO BE DONE FOR THOSE AT WHOSE HANDS THE CHURCH SUFFERED PERSECUTION, seeing that the members of Christ are to be gathered together from all mankind.”

Celestine (*Ep. 21, ad episcopos Galliarum*, c. 11, n. 12. P. L. 50, 535) defends the same thesis as Augustine in respect of the beginning of faith, arguing likewise from the liturgy: “Let us consider the sacraments (*sacramenta*; that is sacred significance) of the sacerdotal supplications (*obsecrationum*) which, handed down from the Apostles, are uniformly celebrated throughout the world and in every Catholic church, so that the law of supplication may establish the law of belief (*ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*).¹ For when those who preside over the holy peoples fulfil the office entrusted to them, THEY ARE PLEADING THE CAUSE OF THE HUMAN RACE before the divine clemency, and while the whole Church mingles its sighs with theirs,² they beg and pray that faith may be given to the infidels, that idolators may be freed from the errors of their impiety, that the light of truth may appear to the Jews, the veil being lifted from their hearts, that heretics may return to wisdom with the true comprehension of the Catholic faith, that schismatics may receive the spirit of charity once more revived in them, that to those who have lapsed may be given the remedy of repentance, and finally that for the catechumens, led to the sacraments of regeneration, the gates of heaven’s mercy may be opened.”

We meet a parallel passage in the first book of his *De Vocatione omnium gentium* (cap. 12. P. L. 51, 664), where, having referred to the instruction of the Apostle (*I Tim.*, II, 1–6), Celestine goes on to say: “The devotion of all the priests and all the faithful observes this law of supplication with such accord that there is no part of the world where the Christian people do not duly recite (*celebrent*) these prayers. Hence the whole world over the Church supplicates God, not only for the saints and those who have

¹ The word *supplicare* signifies here sacrificial activity, just as *supplicium* signifies sacrifice. Moreover, does not this uniform rite of celebrating the sacraments of prayers, that rite handed down by the Apostles, and in the following of which the priests fulfil the office committed to them, at once suggest to us the sacrifice of the Mass?

² Note the separate part played by those who offer the sacrifice with the priest, and those for whom he offers—he offers the sacrifice with the Catholic Church for the whole human race.

been regenerated in Christ, but also for all infidels and enemies of the Cross of Christ, for all worshippers of idols, for all who persecute Christ in His members, for the Jews, on whose blindness the light of the Gospel does not shine, for heretics and schismatics who are estranged from the unity of faith and charity.”

Vasquez (*loc. cit.*, n. 24), it is true, is in opposition to us, where he says: “Public prayer can be offered for unbaptised infidels, Jews or Gentiles . . . unless a contrary legislation of the Church intervenes; not so the sacrifice, however.” Later he says in the same place: “As regards prayers we readily admit that it was the custom of the early Church to pray for them, as well as for the catechumens in the solemnities of the Mass; however this is allowed now on Good Friday only,¹ for these others, so for the catechumens, because the Church permits this on no other day, nor has she prescribed any other prayer to be said for them on any other day.” Here, however, Vasquez, for all his mental acuteness, lost sight of an important fact which de Lugo later clearly emphasised: “The Church practically never indicates *in actu signato* that she is offering the Mass to obtain this or that particular favour; what she does is to pray for that favour while actually offering the sacrifice; and this is *in actu exercito* to offer the Mass to obtain it” (disp. 19, s. 10, n. 174).

However, the principal argument of Vasquez was based on the defect of baptism in the catechumen “without which no one is competent to receive any sacrament: therefore no catechumen is competent to receive the fruit of the Eucharist” (disp. 228, c. 3, n. 17). But apart from the fact that we must deny this parity between the conferring of a sacrament and the suffrage of the sacrifice, it may be asked how can one evade the implication of the many examples of the Church offering the sacrifice for catechumens expressly? For example, in the Gelasian Sacramentary,

¹ It is a well-known fact that the Good Friday Liturgy has remained fixed and unchanged more than all others, and so in it has been transmitted to us the early custom, which, in the Liturgy of the Masses properly so called (there is no real Mass on Good Friday), ceased, in all probability, with the conversion of the whole Roman world to the faith; for then, idolatry having been overthrown, the faithful were no longer in close touch with paganism; there were no serious opponents to Christianity, which the Church had to meet, except the Saracens, fierce enemies to be crushed and destroyed (see the Roman Missal, *Missa CONTRA paganos*), or the Jews who were merely to be curbed, and in view of their inveterate perfidy to be left to the divine judgment and to remain under the curse, until their time should come.

from the first to the fifth Sunday in Lent, not only do we find a number of prayers (collects, secrets, post-communions) for the *elect* catechumens (to be baptised very soon, on Holy Saturday), but—a most important fact—within the Action itself we find such a prayer, included within the *Hanc igitur*: “Therefore we pray thee, O Lord, that thou wouldst graciously receive THIS OBLATION WHICH WE OFFER TO THEE, for thy servants and handmaids, whom thou didst deign to set apart ELECT and call to eternal life and the blessed gift of thy grace. Through Christ. *And the names of the elect are recited.* After the list is read you say: We pray thee, O Lord, THAT THESE WHO ARE TO BE RENEWED IN THE FOUNTAIN OF BAPTISM by the gift of thy Spirit may be prepared for the plenitude of thy sacraments. Through” (*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 1, 1, c. 26. P. L. 74, 1076; cf. the *Ordo Romanus* edited by Mabillon, n. 3. P. L. 78, 996). Note also in particular the following *Secret* to be read on the fourth Sunday of Lent: “Joyfully we offer to thee, O Lord, the gifts of eternal salvation, humbly beseeching thee to grant that we may worthily venerate them and DULY PRESENT THEM FOR THOSE WHO ARE TO BE SAVED” (*ibid.*, c. 27, col. 1079). More openly reference is made to the catechumens on the fifth Sunday: “Hear us, O almighty God, and grant that thy servants whom THOU HAST IMBUED WITH THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH MAY BE CLEANSED BY THE OPERATION OF THIS SACRIFICE” (*ibid.*, c. 28, col. 1081; ed. Wilson, pp. 34, 38, 42).¹ Hence the catechumens can be cleansed after their own manner, that is, find propitiation before God by means of the sacrifice, so that the remission of their sins and the grace of God may come to them later on by the actual baptism. Could the Church more forcefully inculcate the efficacy of the sacrifice itself, *ex opere operato*, in favour of the catechumens? Hence the opposition of Vasquez collapses with its foundation.

I admit that these prayers for the catechumens are no longer in use in the Mass, now that the liturgical custom of paschal baptisms with their preamble of *scrutinia* has lapsed. But meantime in our own day (to say nothing of the votive Mass for the

¹ Anyone reading these Masses will see at a glance that those to be “saved” and “cleansed” are here the elect catechumens, since both those Masses are inscribed *Pro scrutinio* (for those who are listed as having passed the examination or scrutiny of catechumens).

Propagation of the faith, in which, in the collect, secret, and post-communion, we find, in order, the following petitions “that all generations may know . . . the true God,” “that the name of God may be glorified among the gentiles,” “that the true faith may ever make progress”), does not the Church every day pray, at the offering of the chalice, in which the intention of the sacrifice is declared, that the chalice of salvation may ascend FOR OUR SALVATION AND THAT OF THE WHOLE WORLD, calling it at the offertory, some considerable time before the consecration, the chalice of salvation, because by anticipation it is regarded as the chalice of the Blood of Christ, by which we have been redeemed?¹

In keeping with all we have said is the indulgence of one hundred days granted, in October 1907, by Pius X to the work of mercy which is recommended to priests in many churches by printed charts which read thus: “Every priest celebrating Mass in this Church is asked in the Lord to have in mind at the *Memento* the sinners of the whole world, now in their agony and who are to die today.” He likewise granted an indulgence of three hundred days to the following formula of offering: “My God, I offer thee all the Masses celebrated today throughout the whole world, for sinners who are in their agony and who are to die today. May the precious Blood of Jesus the Redeemer obtain mercy for them.”²

And indeed, seeing that the Jewish sacrifices which *prefigured ours were beneficial to the pagans on whose behalf they were offered, would it not be strange if ours which are the perfection of theirs should be in no wise effective in favour of infidels? Hence we surely can offer the sacrifice for an infidel king, as the Jews did for Darius (*I Esdr.*, 6), for an unbelieving people, as they did for the Spartans (*I Mach.*, XII, 11), for an impious persecutor, as they did for Heliodorus (*II Mach.*, III, 32–34);

¹ See L. B. 1, 317.

² There is no doubt whatever that all those in their agony, whether Christians or infidels, are included in this intention, for we read in these charts, in the Latin and French version respectively: (Latin) “About 140,000 people die every day throughout the world.” (French) “For the 140,000 who die each day,” and ecclesiastical approval is given to both Latin and French versions. So the Bishop of Angers gives his approval in Latin for the Latin chart, and in French for the French.

“Visum, approbatum et valde commendatum.

+ Josephus, Episc. Andegavensis.”

“Approuvé et très recommandé. + Joseph, évêque d'Angers.”

although as fits the dignity of our sacrifice, only those consecrated by baptism can have a share in the actual offering of it.

(II) For intrinsic reasons also, and on three heads, we can arrive at the same conclusion.

In the first place, the Victim which we offer, the Victim of the Passion, was offered in sacrifice by Christ for all the sins of all mankind. When we therefore by our sacrifice take part in the offering of our Lord, why should we not be able to offer the sacrifice for the benefit of all who need propitiation for their sins and efficacious prayers for their salvation? Will you say that such suffrage of ours is out of place for non-Catholics who lack the bond of unity which the faithful have by incorporation in Christ? We admit, of course, that those are not yet incorporated in Christ who lack faith and baptism; and that those who by the desire of the sacrament have received, without the sacrament itself, the reality, the grace which it signifies, even such are only incorporated by an invisible effect of grace. Nevertheless, anyone still living who is not yet incorporated in Christ has the potentiality, the possibility of such incorporation. And just in so far as infidels are potentially united with us, so in accordance with the faith we have in the will of God to save all men, and the Passion of Christ directed to the same end, with hope reaching out to embrace also the salvation of those still without the fold, in our charity desiring that they should be co-heirs with us in the divine benefits, we can, in view of their future communion with Christ (should it so please God), by the benefit of our suffrage, help, cherish and fortify every one still living on earth. So it comes about that "while the Church mingles her sighs with ours," the priest "pleads the cause of the human race" (Celestine). Thus the priest pleads, "as the appointed suppliant for the whole world: such is the force of charity" (Chrysostom). Hence St. Thomas says: "The Eucharist as a sacrifice has effect also on others for whom it is offered, in whom it does not require, as a prerequisite to its effect, actual spiritual life, but such in potentiality only. And if one objects that the sacrifice is offered only for the members of Christ, it must be understood that it is offered for the members of Christ, when it is offered for some that they may become members" (4 D. 12, q. 2, a. 2, qcl. 2, 4m).

Should you urge that even so it remains true that the sacrifice of the Mass is offered in the full and proper sense only for the Church, you would not so exclude from the suffrage and benefit of the Mass those who are still outside the Church. And this for the following reason: the Mass is offered for the Church that it be enlarged, extended, gathered together from the four winds into the kingdom of God, in accordance with the prayer we find in the Didache X. 5 (F. P. 1, 24);¹ or in the anaphora of Serapion of Thmuis: "Gather together thy holy Church from every nation and from every land and from every city, and hamlet and home, and make her one living Catholic Church" (F. D. 2, 174). Christ died certainly for the Church, as St. Paul says: *Christ loved the Church and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish* (Eph., V, 25-27). But He died for the Church so that it should be built up of every kind of men, none of which He rejected, but rather He called and still does call everyone to His Catholic Church, both by the outward preaching of the Gospel, and especially by the hidden workings of His secret grace. Hence the Church calls all men to her fold (*omnes sibi reclamat homines Ecclesia*), and no one remains until the end estranged from her except one who strives against the will of Christ and resists the suffrages of her whose constant wish has always been that he and with him all others join her and adhere to her, for she is catholic, universal. Hence St. Augustine (*loc. cit.*) declared rightly that the sacrifice was to be offered "for those at whose hands the Church suffered persecution, seeing that the members of Christ were to be gathered together from all mankind." And Bellarmine wisely remarked that the present-day ritual usage according to which the sacrifice is offered "for the increase, unity, and peace of the Church which lives in the midst of heresy and pagans" is equivalent to that other ancient ritual use which

¹ Cf. *Isaias*, XI, 12; *St. Matth.*, XXIV, 31. We find a remnant of this formula of the Didache in this from the *'Αποστολική παράδοσις*: "We pray that thou wouldst send thy Holy Spirit upon the offering of the holy Church, that, gathering them together into one, thou mayst give to all the saints who receive . . ." etc. (Hippolytus *'Αποστολική παράδοσις*, cf. *Canonum qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum reliquiae.*, ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 107).

showed a direct concern for infidels (*De Missa*, 1, 2, c. 6 foll.).

In the *second* place, viewing the matter on a higher plane, let us speak not now of profit to infidels and the expansion of the Church, but of the glory, the kingdom, and the supreme domination of God. For judging from the practical unanimity of liturgical documents, even from the first beginnings of our sacrifices, the Lord's prayer immediately follows the sacrificial prayer, as if the virtue of the one blossomed forth in the petitions of the other.¹ Optatus of Milevis affirmed that this custom of saying

¹ However, the words of Gregory the Great (*Ep.* 1, 9 and 12, *ad Joann Syrac.* P. L. 77, 956-957), which are considered by many to indicate an actually apostolic origin for this custom, cannot be so interpreted if the right punctuation and construction of the sentence on which they rely is observed: "The reason why we say the Lord's prayer JUST AFTER the Canon—*orationem dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus*—is because it was the custom of the Apostles to CONSECRATE THE VICTIM ONLY AT THE VERY PRAYER OF THE OFFERING (*mos fuit ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent*). And it would appear to me to be very unseemly, that we should say over the offering a prayer which a scholar had composed, and should not say over His Body and Blood the traditional prayer which our Redeemer composed."

So we translate the text of Gregory, supplying a comma, if needed for clearness, between *oblationis* and *hostiam* in the Latin. If we took *oblationis hostiam* as object of the verb *consecrarent*, any Latin student will easily see that we would make Gregory say that it was the custom of the Apostles to consecrate the *victim* of the *oblation* only at the Lord's prayer (for *orationem* would then, from the context = *orationem dominicam*). This would indeed be a portentous statement from the lips of Gregory. On the other hand, all is plain and simple, as we construe; the Apostles consecrated the Victim only at the prayer of the offering, nor is there anything to prevent us using the expression *orationem oblationis* (= *precem*; = canonem; = anaphoram; εὐχὴν προσφόρου, which according to the title of chapter 12 of the *Sacramentarium Serapionis*. F. D. 2, 172; = "*orationem oblationis*," as we see from Marius Victorinus, *Adv. Arium*, 2, 8. P. L. 8, 1094, where we have the words: "*Oratio oblationis . . . precatur*"—"the prayer of the offering . . . is said." Nor does the fact that the expression *oblationis hostia* is found in Gregory *Dial.* 4, 57. P. L. 77, 425, as also in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, *ad dominica octavas* (sic) *Pentecostes*, in the prayer *super oblata*, P. L. 78, 116, in any way disprove our contention).

If we admit this punctuation, Gregory's argument is: we should rather take away a prayer composed by some mere scholar and added at the end of the Action (the Lord's prayer, meanwhile, not being found, in such a case, anywhere in the series of prayers said over the Body of our Lord); and instead of that prayer, follow the Canon immediately by the Lord's prayer. That is to say, if anything is inserted between the Canon and the communion, it is absurd to choose the words of some private individual rather than the words of the prayer handed down by our Lord.

Such is the argument of Gregory. According to him, then, we conclude that the Apostles said the Canon only, and did not insert the Lord's prayer midway between the consecration and the distribution of the Eucharist.

Amalarius, in the ninth century, misled by a false reading of this sentence of Gregory ("*ad ipsam solummodo orationem DOMINICAM oblationis hostiam consecrarent*," cf. Mabillon *In ordinem romanum commentarius*, c. 12. P. L. 78, 897), in the first edition of his work *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 1, 4, c. 26, attributed to the saint the false opinion that the Eucharist could be consecrated by the sole words of the Lord's prayer! However, he corrected this error in the subsequent edition of the same work (P. L. 105, 1210), following the corrected reading of Gregory given by us at the beginning of this note, omitting *dominicam* above, between

the Lord's prayer at the end of the Canon must not be omitted; claiming as witnesses to this custom even the Donatists who had to say it at Mass, even though they dared to maintain that they were immune from sin: "When you have your faces turned towards the altar, you cannot omit the Lord's prayer" (*De schismate Donatistarum.*, 1, 2, c. 20. P. L. 11, 975; cf. *August.*, cited above, from *Sermo* 6 of the Denis collection n. 3. P. L. 46, 836).

St. Jerome would even seem to trace the tradition right back to the Apostles, where he writes: "Thus Christ taught His Apostles that every day in the sacrifice of that Body, believing, they should make bold to say (*docuit apostolos suos, ut credentes audeant loqui*): *Our Father who art in heaven* (*Dial. adv. Pelagianos*, 1, 3, c. 16. P. L. 23, 585).¹

Chrysostom is certainly with us: Listen to his vigorous words: "There is no indication, you will say, that in it [the Lord's prayer] WE ARE TO PRAY FOR UNBELIEVERS. You do not see the full force of the prayer, you do not recognise its sublimity, you do not know the treasures it contains. If you examine it diligently, you will find that, too, which you deny. For when in the course of the prayer we say: *Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven*, NOTHING ELSE BUT THAT IS IMPLIED. How so? Because in heaven no sinner, no unbeliever is found. So to understand those words as referring only to believers would not make sense; if the faithful only were to do His will, and the unbelievers not also to come to do so, then His will would not be done on earth as it is in heaven. And so this is our prayer: just as in heaven there is no wicked person, so may there be none such on earth; but do Thou draw all men to the fear of Thee, make all men Thy angels [that is, ministers

orationem and oblationis. In our own time, distinguished liturgists have revived this false reading of Amalarius. Thus Duschesne (*Origines du culte chrét.*, 3, p. 184): "One is not obliged to believe, notwithstanding the authority of this text of Gregory, that the apostolic Liturgy knew of no other formula than the *Pater*; but it is difficult to contest that Gregory thought so." A. Fortescue understood the passage in the same way (*The Mass*, 1914, pp. 362-363). On the other hand, the right interpretation is given by Probst, *Die abendländische Messe vom fünften bis zum achten Jahrhundert*, 1896, p. 185; Rauschen, *L'Eucharistie et la pénitence*, French translation, 1910, p. 108; Most Reverend P. Batiffol, *Eucharistie*, 5, 352-353.

¹ Although another satisfactory interpretation of the words of Jerome might be: that the Apostles were taught by our Lord, not indeed to insert the Lord's prayer in the sacrifices, but to say it themselves and hand it on to us believers, so that we now say it by fixed ritual custom in the Mass itself. In other words, He taught the Apostles to pray thus generally, so that now the faithful every day, believing, make bold to say in the Mass: *Our Father*.

of Thy will], even those yet estranged from Thee, or hostile to Thee" (*I Tim.*, hom. 6, n. 3. P. G. 62, 533).

What Chrysostom says regarding the universal reference of the petition that God's will be done, is also true of the petition that the divine name be praised, treated as holy, hallowed; as also that the kingdom of God may come. How could we say that it is not the wish of the Church to promote, by her sacrifices, all honour for God and universal empire, not a kingdom which would be cramped, encompassed and imperfect? But such an all embracing intention implies a wish that all men still on life's pilgrimage should be turned to God by faith and divine grace. Hence the Church could not suitably pray by the Lord's prayer for the fruit of the sacrifice, unless that fruit were taken to extend to the whole human race. From every point of view therefore, we are driven to the conclusion that the suffrages of our sacrifices extend to infidels.

This is not surprising, for in the *third* place, we must note that the sacramental words imply today what they implied when they were uttered by Christ: that the mystic shedding wherein the offering is made, is enacted *for you* (*pro vobis*), believers, and *for many* (*et pro multis*) who will come to believe, and hence do not believe yet.¹

An objection is raised from St. Augustine who not only lays down the principle that the Body of Christ can be offered only for the members of Christ: "For who would offer the Body of Christ except for those who are members of Christ?" (*De anima et ejus origine*, 1, 1, c. 9, n. 10. P. L. 44, 480), but deduces from this principle the following rule: that we cannot offer for the

¹ This is in accord with the prayer of our Saviour in *John*, XVII, 20: *Not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their words shall believe in me.* In these words of His sacerdotal prayer He declared His sacrificial intention; not that Christ did not intend the salvation of all or did not provide for it, as far as in Him lay; but that only in those who would believe, would the sacrifice of Christ secure its ultimate effect which is the salvation of man. For this reason not only could Christ, but he must have sacrificed for all those for whom His sacrifice was to be actually beneficial unto eternal life. Though Vasquez notes that the words *for many* embrace the whole human race, he denies that they enter into the designation of what is done by us, or was done by our Lord in the Eucharist (disp. 199, c. 2, n. 14). But in *St. Matthew*, XXVI, 28 and *St. Mark*, XIV, 24 do we not read *which shall be shed for many* τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον—τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν? and beyond all doubt in each case the expression must refer to the chalice, as we have shown above in III (Vol. I): whence it follows that the Eucharistic sacrifice is said by our Lord to be offered *for many*. We see here how a preconceived opinion can lead astray even men of great learning and mental acuteness!

unbaptized: "On no account is it permitted to offer the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ for unbaptized men of any age" (*ibid.*, c. 11, n. 13, col. 481 ; cf. 1, 2, c. 11, n. 15, and c. 15, n. 21 ; 1, 3, c. 12, n. 18, cols. 504, 508, 520). But the context and the subject matter show that all these passages are to be understood as referring to the offering of the sacrifice for the dead, in which case, as we shall see later, the rule laid down by Augustine that, which rightly follows on the principle established and declared by himself, is pertinent. That the question under discussion between St. Augustine and his opponents was that only of sacrifices for the dead is quite clear from the words of the holy Doctor himself, where he expresses his disagreement with the opinion of Vincentius Victor. He first gives us the teaching of Vincentius: "I certainly think that constant oblations and sacrifices of holy priests should be offered for them [infants who died unbaptized in Christ]" (*ibid.*, 1, 1, c. 9, n. 10; cf. 1, 2, c. 11, n. 15; c. 15, n. 21; 1, 3, c. 12 n. 18). "Frequent sacrifices for them will cleanse these [souls of infants] which baptism has not washed, because a foreseeing God willed that they should be implicated in alien sins for a brief time, without any punishment of eternal damnation, and with the hope of eternal happiness" (*ibid.*, c. 11, n. 13). After discussing this opinion Augustine concludes by giving his own opinion, restricted expressly to sacrifices for the dead: "Do not believe or say or teach that the sacrifice of the Christians is to be offered FOR THOSE WHO HAVE DEPARTED FROM LIFE WITHOUT BAPTISM" (1, 3, c. 12, n. 18). That is to say, we must not offer the sacrifice for children who have died without baptism, precisely because neither actually nor potentially do they belong to the body of Christ. Who would dare to offer the Body of Christ for those who are forever exiles from the Body of Christ?

A further objection is advanced from St. Thomas (3 S. 79, 7, ad 2m): "This sacrifice which is the memorial of the passion of the Lord, has effect only on those who are joined to this sacrament by faith and charity." But here the sole aim of St. Thomas is to prevent anyone from thinking that by virtue of the sacrifice, there is induced in anyone the effect of sanctifying grace or glory, or the forgiveness of mortal or venial sin, as long as no disposition of faith or charity on his part intervenes. This is evident from the

words of the objection which St. Thomas is answering at this part of article 79.¹ Hence he wisely remarks that the ultimate—and mediate—effect of the sacrifice (grace and glory, etc.) cannot be found except in those who have faith and charity. All must agree with the Angelic Doctor in this. However this in nowise prevents the sacrifice from exerting its power both of propitiation and impetration (the primary and immediate effect of the sacrifice) in favour of those who are without faith and charity: so that in view of this propitiation and impetration, God may give them the grace to dispose themselves by faith and charity for justification.

Nevertheless we do not pray for infidels in the Canon.² The reason of this is that in the present Canon of the Roman Church, we only pray for those with whom we are considered to offer; and such are those only who, as they are within the unity of the body of the Church, are presumed to be united with the sacrament of the Body of Christ by faith and charity, as St. Thomas remarks in the same place.

Moreover, since we do not pray for infidels as co-offerers, evidently we do not pray for them in the same way as we pray for the faithful, as St. Thomas had already clearly noted in the commentary on the *Sentences* (4 D. 18, 2, 1, 1, 1m), when solving the following objection: “It seems that the following definition of excommunication as given by some is incorrect: *Excommunication is separation from the communion of the Church in respect of the fruit and the general suffrages*. For the suffrages of the Church avail for those on whose behalf they are made. But the Church prays for those who are outside the Church, for example, heretics and infidels. Therefore she also prays for excommunicated persons, and the suffrages of the Church avail for them.” The holy Doctor replies: “To the first objection it must be said that we pray for infidels; BUT THEY DO NOT RECEIVE THE FRUIT OF THE PRAYER UNLESS THEY ARE CONVERTED TO THE FAITH. In

¹ “The effect of this sacrament [i.e. of the Eucharist] is the acquisition of grace and glory, and the remission of venial sin at least. Therefore were this sacrament to have effect on others than those who receive it, it would be possible for a person to attain to grace and glory and the remission of sins, without any active or passive concurrence of his own, when another received this sacrament [that is, in communion] or offered it [that is, in sacrifice]” (3 S. 79, 7, 2m).

² “Hence also in the Canon of the Mass we do not pray for those who are outside the Church” (*ibid.*, ad 2m).

like manner too prayer can be said for excommunicated persons, although NOT WITHIN THE PRAYERS WHICH ARE SAID FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH; nevertheless [although we can pray for them] they do not partake of the fruit of the sacrifice as long as they remain in the excommunicated state: but we pray THAT THE SPIRIT OF PENANCE MAY BE GIVEN TO THEM, that they may be released from excommunication.” And further on, answering a second objection, he says: “Those suffrages of the Church WHICH ARE MADE FOR THE WHOLE CHURCH do not benefit those who are excommunicated (*eis*); nor can prayers be said for them, AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH, in the name of the Church (*ex persona Ecclesiae*).”¹

The mode of our prayer does indeed correspond closely to the mode of our offering. Hence it is that St. Thomas rightly adapts, to the question proposed in 3 S. 79, 7, 2m, the words of St. Augustine: “Who would offer the Body of Christ except for those who are members of Christ?”² For we do not offer for the infidel as we do for the faithful, that is AS FOR CO-OFFERERS who will receive in themselves infallibly the effect of the sacrifice. We do offer for them, however, that they may, if they so desire, from being infidels receive and accept the faith, and from being slaves of sin become members of Christ, as St. Thomas himself carefully explained, when discussing the words of St. Augustine quoted above (4 D. 12, q. 2, a. 2, qcl. 2, 4m).

(III) Can the sacrifice be beneficial to the unbaptized both by way of propitiation and impetration, or by way of impetration alone?

On this question the teaching of the theologians who have supported us so far, is divided.

Suarez (Disp. 78, s. 2, n. 6) holds as probable, and de Lugo (Disp. 19, s. 10, n. 166) as certain, that the unbaptised receive the fruit by way of impetration alone.

¹ We certainly cannot pray, in the same way as we do for the faithful, for those in respect of whom the final issue of our suffrage is not considered to be infallible, as we have said. Hence not inappropriately does the Church follow the instruction of St. John in her manner of prayer: *He that knoweth a brother to sin a sin which is not to death, let him ask and life shall be given to him who sinneth not to death. There is a sin unto death; for that I say not that any man should ask (I John, V, 16).*

² “Hence Augustine also says: who would offer the Body of Christ except for those who are members of Christ?” (3 S. 79, 7, ad 2m).

The Salmanticenses (Disp. 13, dub. 4, n. 60) hold the contrary view which we adopt.¹

Both Suarez and de Lugo restricted the fruit to the effect of impetration in this case because they were anxious to avoid extending the effect *ex opere operato* to those whom we know, since they are unbaptised, to be incapable of receiving any further sacrament (Suarez disp. 79, s. 10, n. 2, De Lugo, *loc. cit.*). Against this, I reply: *In the first place*, that even the sacrificial impetration is itself an effect *ex opere operato*, as we saw above (XXV). It remains for Suarez and de Lugo, therefore, either to reject all the fruit of the sacrifice by way of impetration in the case of the unbaptised, or to admit that it comes to them *ex opere operato*. *Secondly*, there is no parity, as we have repeatedly said, between the *opus operatum*—the work done—by virtue of the sacrament itself and of the sacrifice itself, and so between the effects *ex opere operato*—through that work—in each case. Hence the Salmanticenses say rightly: “It must be denied that this fruit of the sacrifice *ex opere operato* is to be considered as the fruit of the sacrament” (*loc. cit.*).

Moreover, Suarez in particular, since he admits no other fruit of the sacrifice, *ex opere operato*, apart from satisfaction for the punishment of sin, cannot admit that any fruit comes to the infidel *ex opere operato*. For we all agree that “the sacrifice of the Mass cannot be offered for infidels in respect of the fruit of satisfaction; because this fruit supposes the state of grace in the subject to whom it is applied: since punishment for sin cannot be remitted before the remission of the guilt, and infidels, as infidels, and so devoid of faith, cannot be in the state of grace; since faith, which they lack, is the beginning of salvation. Therefore the sacrifice of the Mass cannot benefit them as infidels, by way of satisfaction” (Salmanticenses, disp. 13, dub. 4, parag. 3, n. 65). But this hindrance in regard to infidels (the absence of faith) does not by any means prevent catechumens (who have faith) from receiving the fruit of satisfaction, as the Salmanticenses wisely remark: “The sacrifice of the Mass in respect of the fruit of

¹ Bucceroni, *Institutiones theologiae moralis* 2, t. 2, n. 610, in our own time wrote: “The sacrifice of the Mass can be offered . . . for infidels; not only for all of them in general, but also for individual infidels . . . in as much as it is propitiatory, expiatory and impetratory.”

satisfaction can benefit catechumens living in the state of grace. And this seems to us to be absolutely the more probable opinion” (n. 60). But we must also remember, as we have said in Th. I, (Vol. I.) and XXV, that satisfaction for punishment is not the whole of propitiation. It is only a part of propitiation in the broad or general sense, and indeed can be distinguished from propitiation strictly so called.¹ And propitiation, properly so called, that is, compensation or indemnification for the injury done to God, whereby God is appeased, can undoubtedly have place in favour of those who are wanting not only in faith but even in charity. For propitiation, in this strict sense, is of its nature something which comes before justification itself and the actual call to faith. Therefore there is nothing to prevent such an effect being secured by the Church for all living men in her daily sacrifices.

We must conclude, therefore, that as far as the divine law is concerned the suffrage of the Mass can be beneficial to catechumens in all three ways, of propitiation, satisfaction, and impetration: and to infidels by way of propitiation and impetration.

The Law of the Church.

So far we have considered what may be done in this matter, if we take into consideration merely the divine law or the nature of things. We now take into consideration the law of the Church, and ask ourselves whether any restrictions are imposed by ecclesiastical law. Two questions arise:

(1) Does the law of the church forbid a special offering of the Mass in favour of a (living) excommunicated person?²

(2) Are the common suffrages of the Church, as distinctly expressed in the public formulae of the Eucharistic Liturgy, forbidden in respect of the same?

¹ As we have already remarked, propitiation properly so called implies compensation for the injury, that is, for the guilt of sin; satisfaction, which comes next, implies punitive payment, that is, it blots out the debt of punishment.

² Everyone admits that any of the laity assisting, any celebrating priest also—mentally, however, in his own private name just like any of those assisting—can commend to God in the sacrifice any and every one, even those who are excommunicated. But here we are dealing with the special offering only, either of the member of the faithful who provides for the sacrifice or the priest as official minister presenting it: whether these are two distinct persons or one.

(I) Taking the second question first, we answer: those common suffrages of the Church, explicitly expressed in the Mass, are absolutely forbidden in respect of excommunicated persons. The history of the Church makes it clear that measures were constantly taken to prevent the naming of an excommunicated person publicly within the sacred mysteries, so much so that, were anyone to transgress this rule, he would there and then disclose that he was associating in sacred things with the excommunicated person; just as, on the other hand, were a person's name to be excluded from the diptychs, he was thereby branded as excommunicated. For as Leslie justly remarks in his notes on the *Missale mixtum*: "The purpose and chief use of the diptychs was to retain Catholic communion both of the living WITH ONE ANOTHER, and of the living and the dead" (P. L. 85, 541).¹ In the diptychs, besides the Roman pontiff and the bishop of the locality, other bishops were sometimes named, so, too, the king or emperor, his wife and children, other princes or benefactors, and so on. If any of these were to incur excommunication, his name was to be deleted from the diptychs. Such is the historical background of that law whereby excommunicated persons were deprived of the common and public suffrage of the Church: in the sense that they were deprived of this public mention of them by name and of their commendation in the prayers of the sacrificing Church. This was indeed the proper penalty and branding, so to speak, of an excommunicated person.²

This was all the more reasonable, because priests gradually became accustomed to commend no living person in these public suffrages of the Church, except such as could be reckoned among those with whom he was considered to be offering the sacrifice. Of this we have indubitable evidence in the forms of the Latin Diptychs which have come down to us: see above, Thesis XXVII,

¹ See some of the Eastern diptychs of the living in Brightman (*op. cit.*): the ancient Byzantine (sixth century), pp. 528-529; the later Byzantine (fifteenth century), p. 552; the early diptychs of Jerusalem (thirteenth century), p. 501; the present-day diptychs of Jerusalem, p. 503. While this work was in the press, Most Reverend F. Cabrol published an Essay, *Diptyques (Liturgie)*, in D. A. C., 4, where we read these very true words: "To be inscribed in these diptychs is a proof of communion with the Church and of orthodoxy. . . . The inscription in the diptychs (of the dead) is equivalent to a kind of canonisation (. . . *canonizare*, to put in the Canon, that is to say, to put in the diptychs)"—col. 1057-1058.

² On this matter see the letter of Benedict XIV to the Orientals of the Greek rite, 1 March 1756, parag. 23. *Opera omnia*, 1846, t. 3, pars. 2, p. 308.

the Mozarabic diptychs of the living; and compare them with the *post nomina* prayers of the same Missal, where the priest prays that the offering may be accepted by God of all those living who have just been commemorated; note also the saying of St. Isidore: "The third prayer [which comes after the announcing of the names in the diptychs] is said FOR THE OFFERERS, or for the faithful departed" (*De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1, 1, c. 15, n. 1. P. L. 83, 752).¹ The same is clear also from the actual formula found in our own Roman Canon at the end of the prayer *Te igitur*, the first prayer of the Canon, where the celebrant says: "WE OFFER . . . together with our Pope N. and our Bishop N. (and our King N.) and with all orthodox worshippers of the Catholic and apostolic faith." Formerly, too,² it should be noted that, in the commemoration of the living which follows immediately after the prayer *Te igitur*, the words now inserted there, *for whom we offer up to thee, or (pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel)*, were not found, but the prayer ran as follows: *Be mindful, O Lord, of thy servants and handmaids N. and N. and of all here present, whose faith and devotion are known to thee; who offer up to thee this sacrifice of praise, etc.*, a formula which makes it abundantly clear that the custom was to mention no names in the list of the living, except of those who were plainly united with the priest in the offering of the sacrifice. But an excommunicated person is not reckoned among those who are competent to offer the sacrifice: for he is excluded from the body of Christ, and there can be no offerer outside the unity of that body.

Hence were anyone to mention by name an infidel, a heretic, a schismatic, or an excommunicated person (whether a king, or a bishop, or any other), either in the prayer *Te igitur* or in our *commemoratio pro vivis*, he would certainly³ violate the law of the Church.⁴

¹ In keeping with this are the words we find in the diptychs in the Irish *Stowe Missal*: "With all the holy and venerable priests who offer throughout the world, our senior and presbyter offers the spiritual sacrifice to God the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost", etc. (ed. G. F. Warner, v. 2, p. 14).

² See *Micrologus*, c. 23. P. L. 151, 993; and c. 13, col. 885; cf. L. B. 1, 420-423.

³ Though there are not a few teachers who think otherwise, through not paying sufficient attention to the force and meaning of our liturgical prayer.

⁴ Although if a priest does not mention such a man's name, but merely, at that place in the Mass, TACITLY forms or renews his intention of offering in favour of such a man, he does not sin.

Moreover, since TODAY neither in the *commemoratio pro vivis* nor in any other part of the Mass does the Church commend by name any living person except such a one as is considered to be in communion with her, today also it would appear sinful to mention by name in any liturgical prayer whatever, an infidel, a heretic, a schismatic, or an excommunicated person.

This privation of the common suffrages of the Church is by no means confined to the *excommunicati vitandi* alone, as may be seen from the *Code of Canon Law* (can. 2262, parag. 1).

(II) We now deal with the first question proposed above, whether in accordance with the law of the Church, the sacrifice of the Mass may be offered for an excommunicated person. Theologians for the most part say no, maintaining that it is not lawful for a member of the faithful to have a Mass said, or for a priest to celebrate a Mass for an excommunicated person, at any rate if he is an *excommunicatus vitandus* (“to be shunned,” as distinct from the *toleratus*, “tolerated”). Not all, however, hold this view.

For Billuart writes: “I do not see why it would not be lawful for a priest to celebrate for an excommunicated person, even if he is of the non-tolerated class (that is, a *vitandus*). . . .¹ I am aware that this view is commonly rejected by theologians, BUT ON WHAT GROUNDS I DO NOT KNOW” (*De religione dissert.* 2, art. 6). Neither do I.² For the offering of the Mass by way of suffrage of which we are now speaking implies no association in sacred things with the excommunicated person.

For there is no communication in sacred things with an infidel, when one of the faithful gives a mandate for the offering of the sacrifice for the salvation of an infidel, or when a priest offers the sacrifice in accordance with such a mandate: although, were the name of the infidel inserted in the Canon or other prayers of the Mass, there would be (according to the trend of our present

¹ Cardinal Gotti had anticipated his confrère by a few years in expressing the same opinion (*Theologia Scholastico-Dogmatica, Tract. de euchar. ut sacrificium est*, quaest. 2, dub. 2, parag. 2, Bononia, 1733, tom. 14, p. 198).

² An explanation of the chapters *A nobis* and *Sacris* of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* will be given in XXXII; when truly interpreted, they are found to refer not to the living but to the dead. Meantime note that the chapter *Si quis episcopus* on heretics, in *Causa XI*, q. 3, ch. 91, according to the expressed judgment of the Roman Correctors, is restricted to the dead alone.

day Liturgy) such communication. Hence, *a pari*, in the case of an excommunicated person, though his name must not be mentioned within the sacred mysteries, there is nothing to prevent a member of the faithful giving a mandate for the sacrifice on his behalf, or a priest from presenting the sacrifice for which he has received the mandate, provided only that no circumstance intervene which would make it appear to be done in commendation of him, or to show him honour or patronage. Such circumstance would intervene, if, for example, an announcement were made in public that the sacrifice would be offered, for a person who was excommunicated, on the occasion of his birthday, for instance, or the feast day of his patron saint, especially were such a man the head of a state, which would make the commendation more notorious. For the Church only gives such manifestation of honour and companionship to those who live in peace and communion with the body of the faithful. But the case would be different if it were understood that the Mass was celebrated for his conversion, reconciliation, salvation or the like. Hence in our own day Wernz wrote with full justification: "This prohibition does not exclude the secret application of the Mass *for the living* [even the *excommunicati vitandi*] to obtain their conversion" (*Jus Decretalium*, 1908, t. 3, p. 2, n. 542).

So far then, and for intrinsic reasons, we consider it safe to adopt the conclusion of Billuart.

He goes too far however when he says "I do not see why it would not be lawful for a priest to celebrate for an excommunicated person in the class of those not to be tolerated [hence a *vitandus*], WHETHER HE RECEIVES A STIPEND FROM HIM OR NOT" (*loc. cit.*). For there is a vast difference, as we have abundantly shown, between a Mass offered by way of suffrage in favour of any person, and a Mass offered *as from him*. The excommunicated person, by the fact that he is excommunicated, is juridically outside the number of those who are competent to offer the sacrifice, even in that common offering of all the faithful, and accordingly (even though he be in the state of grace), he is not permitted to exercise any special offering, either as assisting (hence he is not allowed to be present where such a Mass is being said), or, *a fortiori*, as giving a stipend: because to treat him as a

co-offerer is to communicate with him in sacred things, and in no case does a person treat any one more as a co-offerer than when he offers Mass for a person giving a stipend. Hence again Wernz very judiciously remarks (*loc. cit.*): “the right is in no wise granted to these people, excommunicated persons, etc., to ask for these suffrages of Masses, e.g. for votive Masses, (*missas votivas*)¹ in the way in which this can be done by the faithful.”²

It will be seen how fully this teaching is in accord with canons 809 and 2262 of the new *Code of Canon Law*: “It is lawful (*integrum*) to apply the Mass for all LIVING MEN, if one observes the precept of canon 2262, parag. 2, n. 2, which is: ‘Priests are not forbidden . . . to apply the Mass privately, with all scandal removed, for him [the excommunicated person], but, if he is *vitandus*, for his conversion only.’”

It is interesting to note that here the *Code* seems to prescribe nothing regarding acceptance or non-acceptance of a stipend for Mass from non-Catholics or from excommunicated persons; but on the other hand it expressly permits that the sacrifice be offered for them at least by way of suffrage. The restriction of the scope of the offering, in the case of the excommunicated person, to his conversion, is in no way odious. For as a matter of fact, the Mass is offered for no one except in order to his salvation or to the benefits conducive to salvation. If then a man is excommunicated, as he is thereby presumed juridically to be contumacious towards the Church, the Mass can only be offered for him in order to his justification, by which way alone he can be led to his own salvation.

¹ Understand “votive Mass” (*missa votiva*) here in the strict sense, meaning a Mass which a person asks to have said, at his mandate, for himself, in accordance with the old liturgical meaning of the expression.

² Francis Sylvius (in 3 S. 83, 1, *quaeritur IX*) had even in the seventeenth century given the full solution: “The probable answer is that the sacrifice can be lawfully offered for all the faithful, even if they are excommunicated . . . in such manner, however, that, when the excommunicated persons are of the number of those who in accordance with the Chapter *Ad vitanda* should be shunned (hence called *vitandi*), two things are to be observed:” (1) their names are not to be proclaimed; (2) the sacrifice is not to be offered for them as for members of the Church, for example, by the celebration of a votive Mass (in the old liturgical sense, a Mass at the mandate of the person who asks for it). Cardinal Gasparri explains this very clearly: “However, when applying Mass for an excommunicated person, we must be careful, if he is *vitandus*, NOT TO COMMUNICATE WITH HIM; hence, for example, WE CANNOT ACCEPT FROM HIM AN ALMS FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE MASS” (*op. cit.*, n. 483, p. 345; coll. n. 484, foll. p. 346).

THESIS XXXII

(ii) *Dead Non-Catholics.*

As we have already said (in XXIX), the sacrifice of the Church can certainly be offered for Catholics who have died in the peace of the Church. It is quite another matter when we come to consider other dead persons. For just as the Church presumes that all her children have died in Christ, so she presumes that all others, whoever they be, who have died outside of all visible communion with her, are now forever alienated from Christ: because, as we have said, the Church must judge according to outward signs. In this connection the saying of St. Augustine is properly, especially applicable: "For who would offer the Body of Christ, except for those who are members of Christ?" (*De anima et ejus origine*, 1, 1, c. 9. n. 10. P. L. 44, 480). For anyone who is judged to have died outside the body of Christ is considered as no longer competent to become a member of Christ at any future time.

Hence arose the question for which different solutions have been offered, as to the offering of the sacrifice for those of the departed who died either as non-Catholics or as excommunicated Catholics. We shall first deal with the question of catechumens as easiest of solution, then we shall deal with the case of non-Catholics and the excommunicated.

Catechumens.

In the matter of Catechumens, at first sight patristic authority appears to be conflicting.

For in the first place we have the words of St. Ambrose in reference to the departed emperor Valentinianus who, when "in good health and with all his faculties unimpaired (*sanus, robustus, incolumis*)" had asked the saint by letter for baptism (*De obitu Valentiniani consolatio*, n. 51 and 52. P. L. 16, 1374; cf. *Ep.* 53, n. 2, col. 1166). In this case Ambrose confidently declares: "Freely offer for him the holy mysteries; with pious

affection let us pray for his repose. Offer the celestial sacraments; let us assist the soul of the prodigal (*nepotis*) with our oblations. . . . I shall not therefore strew flowers on his tomb, but I shall saturate his spirit with the sweet odour of Christ" (*Consolatio*, n. 56, cols. 1375-1376).

Innocent III (see Chap. *Apostolicam, Decr.*, 1, 3, tit. 43, c. 2) likewise writes to the bishop of Cremona, referring to a man who died with the grade of the priesthood, not knowing that he had not been baptised: "So hush to sleep the disputes (*sopitis disputationibus*) of theologians (*doctorum*), hold fast to the teachings of the Fathers, and order that constant prayers and sacrifices be offered in your church for the priest you have mentioned."

Moreover, St. Augustine is not to be quoted as in opposition to Ambrose and Innocent, where in the course of the same work mentioned above (*De anima et ejus origine*, 1, 3, c. 12, n. 18. P. L. 44, 520) he denies that "the sacrifice of Christians is to be offered for those who died without baptism" (cf. *Serm.* 172, c. 2. P. L. 38, 937). For the subject matter and the whole trend of the argument clearly show that he is speaking of those unbaptised dead persons who either would not or could not show before death their desire of baptism, such as infants who died without the sacrament. Indeed he clearly held that those who had such desire of baptism, are baptised or incorporated with Christ: "I find that not only suffering for the name of Christ can supply what was wanting from baptism, but also faith and conversion of heart, if perchance, owing to stress of circumstances, recourse could not have been had to the celebration of the mystery of baptism. . . . For then it is supplied invisibly, when it is not contempt of religion, but pressing necessity that prevents the ministration of baptism" (*De baptismo contra Donatistas*, 1, 4, c. 22. P. L. 43, 173).¹

A more formidable difficulty arises from the words of Chrysostom, who thus addressed the faithful of Antioch: "For very good reasons the Apostles made a law that the departed should

¹ St. Augustine's *Libri de baptismo contra Donatistas* were written (A.D. 400) twenty years before his *De anima et ejus origine* (A.D. 420); in the *Retractationes*, 1, 2, c. 18. P. L. 32, 638, he in no way condemns this teaching of his former work, but merely questions the fitness of the example drawn there from the case of the good thief.

be remembered in the awe-inspiring mysteries. They knew that great fruit and benefit would accrue to them [the departed] from these mysteries. Certainly then when the whole people and the sacerdotal body stand with outstretched hands, and the awful Victim lies there, we shall not fail to make supplication, calling upon God on their behalf. But while this is true of those who have died in the faith, the catechumens are not deemed worthy even of this consolation, but with one exception they are deprived of all assistance. What is this exception? It is permitted us to give alms to the poor for them" (*In Phil.*, hom. 3, n. 4. P. G. 62, 204). He had already said: "Weep for the unbeliever, weep for those who differ in nothing from the unbeliever, who have departed without the illumination, without the Seal [of faith]. . . . They are outside the kingdom together with those who are in punishment, together with the damned" (*ibid.*, col. 203). Though these words of Chrysostom do seem at first sight to exclude the offering of the Mass for catechumens, a closer examination will show that they may be interpreted as differing little in sense from those cited from Ambrose and Innocent. In the first place we must note that he was dealing especially with the customary public commemoration of the departed, made within the Mass; that is, in the diptychs of the dead, and in these diptychs we certainly never see the names of catechumens mentioned. Nor indeed in the Roman Canon are we supposed to mention by name any dead except those *who have gone before us* WITH THE SIGN OF FAITH.¹ The same reason probably is that, while living, such could not be offerers (except affectively, that is, in desire only, not effectively), and hence, seeing that their names could not be mentioned while they lived in the diptychs of the living offerers, much less would it be appropriate for their names to be inserted in the diptychs after their death. For although the dead were not properly considered as offerers,² nevertheless, as has been said, the diptychs of the dead

¹ Hence, and particularly in view of the reasons to be submitted below, it would appear to be sinful to mention the name of any unbaptised dead person in the *Commemoratio pro defunctis*. The same should be said of a heretic, a schismatic, or a person excommunicated by name and not absolved from the excommunication: for in the external judgment of the Church such ones do not "sleep in the sleep of peace".

² There were, however, certain dead persons who were considered as offerers, or authors of the sacrifice, for instance those who built a Church, or such like. So we find Chrysostom using the following words hoping to induce some one of his

as well as those of the living were introduced for the very special purpose of retaining and declaring, also after death, communion with those who while living took part in or had a share in the offering (*κοινωνίαν τῆς προσφορᾶς*).¹

Moreover, if in this passage Chrysostom appears to exclude also the simple offering of the Mass (that is, without public mention in the diptychs) in favour of such departed catechumens, it should be noted that he clearly enough has in mind those catechumens who through carelessness, contempt or laziness put off baptism to the end of their lives and so were never baptised;² such persons, if while living after this manner were surprised by death, could hardly be considered, in the judgment of the Church, as effectively and sincerely anxious for baptism. Chrysostom therefore does not seem to be in opposition to Ambrose who allows the offering of the sacrifice for Valentinian who asked for baptism before death, and only accidentally could not receive it; or to Augustine who could only forbid the offering of the Mass for those who while living showed no desire for it, through contempt of it, or for unbaptised infants; or to Innocent III, who is considering an erroneous conscience in the case of the priest

hearers to found a church at his country house: "Tell me, I ask you, is it a matter of small moment to have your name mentioned always in the sacred offerings, and to have daily prayers sent up to God for your household?" (*In Act.*, hom. 18, n. 5. P. G. 60, 148).

¹ The following words of St. Augustine in *Sermo* 172, c. 2. P. L. 38, 936, also suggest the same thing: "For the universal Church observes the tradition of the Fathers, that those who have departed in the COMMUNION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, be prayed for, when at the appropriate place within the sacrifice itself commemoration is made of them, and that it also be commemorated that this sacrifice is offered for them." Since Augustine did not say "in the body of Christ" but "in the communion of the Body and BLOOD", he evidently had in mind the baptised who had been competent while living to assist at and share in the offering of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ.

² His *Catechesis prima ad illuminandos*, n. 1. P. G. 49, 223-224 presents a similar line of thought: "Before you enter into that sacred bridal chamber [that is, of the Church, the spouse of Christ], I proclaim you blessed; not only do I proclaim you blessed, but I praise you also for your prudent forethought: because you are not like those negligent people who come to baptism only at their last breath. . . ." Cf. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat. adv. eos qui differunt baptismum*: "I cannot hope for anything good for those who are not initiated in the mysteries. For what pardon could in justice be shown to those who have treated the grace of the king with contumely, not being ready to admit the cancelling of their debts [that is, by baptism], nor embracing that liberty which of its own accord has come down to them from heaven, and by their contempt of the gift offering insult to the one who gave it?" etc. (P. G. 46, 424). Read also Greg. Nazian., *Or.* 40, *In S. Baptisma*, especially n. 23. P. G. 36, 389; and Severianus Gabalensis, *In S. Baptisma*, n. 8 (a disputation wrongly attributed to Basil in P. G. 31, 441).

mentioned above who died not knowing that he had not been baptised.

The Council of Braga (A.D. 563) is also quoted against us. The seventeenth canon reads: "We decree that for catechumens who have departed without the redemption of baptism likewise (*simili modo*) no commemoration be made in the offering, and no office chanted for them: for this also has been done through ignorance" (Mansi, 9, 779). But in the first place there is no reason why this canon should not be interpreted in the same manner in which we have interpreted the words of Chrysostom above. Secondly, the Council may have had in mind nothing more than the making of a positive law to prevent the excessive delay of baptism in the future. For the Council says "likewise"; this "likewise" refers obviously enough to the preceding canon which forbids these offices of piety to persons condemned to capital punishment. But it is clear that, in the case of such persons as these last, nothing but a positive law could deprive them of the suffrages of the Mass.

Hence it seems, all things considered, that we must certainly adopt the more benign interpretation of the testimony of antiquity in this matter, and so we consider it lawful, unless the Church (for particular reasons) has decreed otherwise, to offer the Mass even *specialy* and *publicly* for the relief of the dead adhering to the Catholic Church in so far as during life they showed themselves sincerely desirous of baptism.¹

Infidels, Heretics, Schismatics.

Even should anyone consider that, as far as practice is concerned, the question of offering Mass for infidels, heretics and schismatics is solved in the way indicated later on, nevertheless its theoretical

¹ It is evident that it is by way of satisfaction in the strict sense of the word that the souls of the departed are helped and relieved. Thus a fresh argument is added to those which led us to the conclusion we reached above, in respect of the living, that our sacrifice is not merely beneficial to living unbaptised persons by way of impetration. For if satisfaction is provided by the Mass *ex opere operato* for the unbaptised faithful departed, there is no conceivable reason why the same benefit should not be available for all persons living without baptism, if they are in the state of grace. "As regards the fruit of satisfaction, the sacrifice of the Mass is beneficial to the souls of catechumens in purgatory. . . . Therefore in like manner as regards the fruit of satisfaction, the sacrifice of the Mass can be beneficial to catechumens living in the state of grace" (Salmanticenses, disp. 13, dub. 4, parag. 2, n. 60).

discussion bristles with theological difficulties, weighty arguments and authorities being advanced on either side.

And in the *first place*, if we consider the matter according to the intrinsic nature of things, it is by no means easy to understand how the sacrifice of the Church could be offered specially or by name (even if the name be not openly mentioned) for any non-Catholic dead person. The reason of our difficulty is that the Church is a visible society, in which everything which pertains to public law, or the external forum, must necessarily be ordered and transacted in the light of what is apparent externally; and in this case not only is the defunct non-Catholic—to judge by the only apparent external signs we have—outside the bounds of salvation, but also the special application of our sacrifices would appear to be essentially a matter of public law, external regimen.

And *first of all*, regarding the dead man himself: although during his lifetime the departed non-Catholic may, by faith and charity, have belonged to the body of Christ (which is the Church) invisibly, nevertheless just as then he was considered publicly as outside of it, so now, and as a consequence of that estimate of him while he was living, he is considered, presumed to be, outside of it eternally. Hence the Church must regulate everything in his regard which comes within the scope of the external forum, in accordance with this juridical presumption. Secondly, moreover, any question regarding the special application of the fruits of the Mass would seem to be a matter for the external forum of the Church. For even though this special application of the sacrifice were known only to the person giving the mandate, and to the priest presenting the sacrifice, it must nevertheless be borne in mind that this application will be considered, and reasonably so, as something of a social, public nature, in so far as the celebrant carries out his ministry, according to the intention of the faithful, not otherwise than as the public official of the Church, so that he recommends these intentions and promotes them before God,¹ with all the full unimpaired authority and power of the whole Church. This being so, it is not easy to see how the Mass can be specially offered for a departed non-Catholic, even privately,

¹ Cf. what we said above (XXVII) in referencè to this argument.

as we say, that is, suppressing the name. So much for the intrinsic aspect of the matter.

Secondly, considering the question in the light of extrinsic authority, so far as I know not a single example can be brought forward, even if we go back to the earliest history of the Church, of such a special application of the Mass for a departed non-Catholic. Moreover, as far as I am aware, no theologian before our time has declared it lawful. Every student who has read what the scholastic theologians, moral and dogmatic, have said on this subject (to give a list would be tedious) knows,¹ that in reference to the application of the Mass the theologians have always divided the dead into three categories—the blessed, the souls in purgatory, and the damned; that in general they forbid the celebration of Mass for the damned,² permit it with reservation for the blessed, and permit it without reservation for the souls in purgatory.³ Such is the well-known teaching of theologians. This general teaching, however, still leaves unsolved the further practical question, whether I can offer the Mass specially for this particular departed person by name, for I do not know under what category he comes. Here, however, a principle of great practical utility comes to our aid: visible peace and communion with the Church during life gives a juridical presumption,

¹ Suffice to name leading theologians such as Bellarmine, *De missa*, 1, 6, c. 6. coll. c. 7; De Lugo, disp. 19, sect. 10, n. 192; Vasquez, disp. 226, cap. 5; Suarez, disp. 78, sect. 3; The Salmanticenses (Theol. Mor.), *De sacrificio missae*, cap. 2, punct. 3; and the *Cursus Theologicus*, *De Euchar.*, disp. 13, dub. 3, n. 52, and dub. 4; Billuart, *De almo Euchar. sacram.* disp. 8, art. 4; St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Theologia Moralis*, *De Euchar.*, c. 3, dub. 1, n. 310. The introductory words of Vasquez are: "The last class of men for whom the sacrifice can be offered are the dead. Of the dead, some are in hell, some in purgatory, others in heaven: we shall treat of them separately, and in order" (*loc. cit.*). Suarez, *loc. cit.*, commences with the same words: "Let us distinguish three classes of the dead," etc. So all the scholastics down to our day. See, for example, Sasse, *Institutiones theologicas de sacramentis Ecclesiae*, Friburg, Brig., 1897, tom. 1, p. 575 *et seq.*: "It remains for us to say a few words on the offering of the sacrifice for those who have departed from this life. They are in three categories," etc.

² Regarding this last category we find at times lengthy discussions. For example, P. A. Persico (*De primo ac praecipuo sacerdotis officio*, 1, 2, c. 4, d. 6, Naples, 1639, p. 544 *et seq.*): Pasqualigo (*op cit.*, tom. 1, q. 156 and 157, pp. 159–161); or Tournely (*Theol. Mor.*, *De Euchar.*, pars 2, cap. 8, art. 2, Venice, 1751, pp. 754–758). Indeed ancient examples of Masses for the damned are to be seen in P. L. 40, 284, and in A. Franz, *Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter*, Frib. Brig., 1902, p. 225.

³ Hence it immediately follows that if I offer Mass in general for the souls in purgatory it will benefit in general every soul that needs cleansing. There are some who would deny that this applies in the case of souls in purgatory who were not baptised, but wrongly so, as we see from what we have said above in this Thesis, and also in XXXI.

in the external forum, of peace and spiritual communion of the dead man with Christ, whose body the Church is. Such a juridical presumption supplies, in practice, for our ignorance; its presence or absence justifies or prohibits the special application for the dead person in question. Hence these leading theologians who maintained the right of offering for all the souls in purgatory had no hesitation when the question arose¹ in excluding the special application for a dead non-Catholic. And, indeed, a careful consideration will show that this triple category of which these theologians spoke (blessed, souls in purgatory, damned), and the other distinction by which the dead are divided into Catholic and non-Catholic, are in entirely different spheres. That triple distinction of the earlier writers regarded the present real state (unknown to us) of the separated souls—the blessed, the suffering souls in purgatory, and the damned; it was used most of all in polemics against the Protestants. The other distinction concerned their juridical state in this life (known to us), either of visible communion with the Church or of at least apparent estrangement, which gave a juridical presumption as to their state after death; and it is immediately practical in respect of our individual offerings. Hence the theologians did not argue from one set of categories to the other, for such a mode of argumentation was illicit, except when the legal presumption mentioned above supplied a link.

What the scholastic theologians taught in this matter had already been taught centuries before by Augustine, who says that the sacrifice cannot be offered for the unbaptised dead,² “of no matter what age”³ (*De anima et ejus origine*, 1, 1, c. 11. P. L. 44, 481).⁴

¹ I say, *when the question arose*, because (I think) the law forbidding celebration for a dead non-Catholic was so evident to them that they never dealt with the question professedly, they simply spoke casually of the teaching as never called in doubt. For example see St. Alphonsus *Opus dogmaticum contra hareticos pseudo-reformatos*, disp. 10, n. 24 (tr. lat. A. Walter, *Opera dogmatica*, Rome, 1903, t. 1, p. 622), where he definitely makes this pronouncement (that the Mass may not be offered for a dead non-Catholic); although in the place cited above he had already written: “It is certain that the Mass is offered lawfully and beneficially for the souls in purgatory.”

² Still even St. Augustine makes an exception (in a passage to be cited directly) of those cases where adhesion to Christ was publicly expressed before death, as in the case of the good thief; catechumens would reasonably be included in this class, as above.

³ That is, this application of the Mass is not forbidden only FOR INFANTS who died without baptism.

⁴ “In accordance with CATHOLIC FAITH and ecclesiastical regulations, on no account is it allowed to offer the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ for unbaptised

After the Scholastic theologians we have the weighty authority of Gregory XVI. He writes to the Bishop of Augsburg on 16th February 1842, telling him that he acted unlawfully in appointing sacrifices to be offered for the soul of a dead heretical queen: "We can scarcely express in words how grieved we were to learn from reading this same letter that you ordered those public supplications which were instituted by the Church *for all who have died in Christian and Catholic unity* [Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*, c. 4, n. 6. P. L. 40, 596] to be made for an heretical queen who died as she had lived, in open heresy. NOR IS IT IN ANY WAY TO THE POINT THAT IN THE LAST MOMENTS OF HER LIFE SHE MAY HAVE BEEN LED TO PENANCE BY THE HIDDEN GRACE OF A MERCIFUL GOD. FOR THESE HIDDEN MYSTERIES OF DIVINE GRACE IN NO WAY PERTAIN TO THE OUTWARD JUDGMENT OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL POWER [that is, to the external forum]. And HENCE it has been forbidden by JUST discipline, both ancient and modern, to honour with Catholic rites those who have died in open and notorious profession of heresy"¹ (*Acta Gregorii*, P. P. XVI, ed. A. M. Bernasconi, Rome, 1902, tom. 3, p. 199). Will you say that it was only the publicity and notoriety of the celebration that the Pontiff reprehended? But as Wilmers (*Lehrbuch der Religion*, Münster, 1903, bd. 4, p. 564)² very rightly remarked, although here there was a case of public and notorious celebration, the reason given by the Pope for the discipline of the Church in this matter excludes any celebration whatever, no matter how

men of any age as though by this office of piety on the part of their friends they might be assisted to attain to the kingdom of heaven."

Apparently we must interpret in the same manner the words of Gregory III (*Epistola ad Bonifatium archiepiscopum*, from Jaffé, *Mon. Mogunt.*, p. 93, in Aemilius Friedberg, *Corpus Juris Canonici*, second Leipzig edition, 1879, tom. 1, col. 728), inserted in the *Decretum* (2, causa 13, q. 2, c. 21), permitting the sacred mysteries "for the truly Christian dead" only, for "dead Catholics", not for others. It is scarcely worth while to quote in the same sense the chapter *Si quis episcopus* (causa 11, q. 3, c. 91), as no Pope or Doctor is its author, it being merely an excerpt from the *Canones Poenitentiales* attributed wrongly to St. Jerome (P. L. 30, 441).

¹ The following instruction is added: "It will also be your duty carefully to place this our epistle in your episcopal archives, and see that it be kept there as a reminder to POSTERITY" (*op. cit.*, p. 200).

² "The fact that there was question of public supplications makes no essential difference, for the grounds alleged by the Pope remain essentially the same; all supplications, all suffrages, even the least solemn, are to be offered only for those who have died in communion with the Church."

private, specially or by name for a departed non-Catholic;¹ namely, that good faith, even if it did exist in such a person, is invisible, betrayed by no outward signs, and hence gives no warrant to the Church for the offering of sacrifice for such a one. For God, not the Church, is the judge of these hidden secrets. In other words, in matters of this kind the Church can be guided by no other rule than the dictates of juridical presumption. That this is the right interpretation of Gregory is confirmed by his quoting the words of St. Augustine on the supplications instituted by the Church *for all who have died in Christian and Catholic communion*. For the holy Doctor was speaking there of the sacrifices to be celebrated for the departed “without even mentioning any names”.²

We have a further proof of our contention in another letter of the same Pontiff—*ad Praesidem Monachorum Schyrensiensium*. In this letter, dated 9th July 1842, he protests that he cannot permit an annual celebration of this kind for a defunct non-Catholic, even under the coloured title of a Mass for all the departed of a certain royal family, the majority of whom were Catholics.³ And this, “lest there be any evasion whatever of that prohibition WHICH IS BASED ON CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ITSELF OF NOT CELEBRATING THE SACRED OBSEQUIES (*funere*)⁴ for defunct non-Catholics”.⁵ Here it should be noted that the Pontiff definitely excludes all non-

¹ One should also note, as we have said before, that the special application for a particular dead person by name (even if the name is not mentioned in the Canon), no matter how secret it be *de facto*, is always public, *de jure*.

² “Supplications for the spirits of the departed are not to be omitted; the Church has taken care that these supplications should be made under one general commemoration, for all the departed in Christian and Catholic unity; and without mentioning any names; in order that those who have not parents or children or relatives or friends to have the sacrifice offered for them (*desunt ad ista parentes*, etc.) should be remembered in them by the one common loving mother” (St. Augustine, *loc. cit.*).

³ “Insisting, therefore, on the most holy laws of the Church, we reply that the intention OF OFFERING THE DIVINE SACRIFICE or other prayers for all the departed of a Catholic royal family is by no means sufficient to justify the granting of public obsequies, asked for on behalf of a non-Catholic person by name, and celebrated on the day of his death or anniversary. . . . For we cannot permit any evasion whatever,” etc., as above (*op. cit.*, p. 222).

⁴ Obsequies (*funus*) here means *Requiem* Masses, as the context plainly shows.

⁵ The *Sacred Congregation of Rites* refers to this letter of Gregory when answering the following question: “Is it lawful to celebrate Mass on the anniversary of the death of a protestant princess, under the title of relief (*in levamen*) for the departed of a royal family?” The reply given on May 23, 1859, was: “It is not lawful, in accordance with the precedent established by the letter given in the form of a Brief of Gregory XVI, on July 9, 1842.”

Catholics from the special application of the Mass; he makes no distinction between heretics and unbelievers, and therefore does not appeal to any positive law of the Church regarding excommunicated persons but simply to Catholic teaching itself.

It is not surprising, then, that to the following question: "Is it lawful to offer the Mass for those who die in manifest heresy . . . even in the case where the application of this Mass was known only to the priest and to the person giving the stipend?", the *Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office* replied on 7th April, 1875: "It is not lawful." Such are the reasons given by those who say that the Mass cannot be offered for the non-Catholic dead.

Those, on the other hand, who say that the Mass can be offered urge an intrinsic reason of some moment: that the intention of the person who gives the mandate is purely internal, so much so that it need not be made known even to the celebrant, for he may celebrate, as the saying is, *ad intentionem dantis*, "for the intention of the giver of the stipend", and such intention may not be known even to himself. I would not care to decide whether this reason is convincing, since even if the intention is internal it is promoted, nevertheless, by the public action of the sacrifice, as was said above. But whatever may be said of this argument, we have at least the extrinsic weighty authority of theologians of the present day, who hold that the Mass can be celebrated privately for a deceased non-Catholic in a certain case, if he died with truly probable indications of good faith and the state of grace. Thus Lehmkuhl (*Theol. Moral.*, 5, n. 176), followed by Génicot, Noldin, Wernz, Lépiciér, etc. But the practical difficulty in respect of the required condition is that, juridically, in the external forum of the Church, signs of good faith are of no value unless at the same time a desire has been manifested in some way or other of entering into or returning to the Church:¹ so that the person concerned may then be considered in the same way as catechumens or those who retract their errors.² But whatever may be said of this

¹ It may be that these theologians would admit that some such manifestation is necessary, as evidence of good faith, in which case there would be no room for difference between themselves and us, for we freely admit that Mass can be offered even specially for the departed who have manifested such a desire.

² The Reply (otherwise difficult to understand) of the *Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide*, given on September 12, 1645, must, I think, be understood in this sense. The question was: "Will it be lawful for Christians in that kingdom [China]

difficulty, the formidable authority of these theologians of note (allowing the application under the conditions stated) must stand for what it is worth.

And now at long last we must deal with an important consideration. Does not the *Code of Canon Law* actually give authentic support and assent to the teaching of these theologians? For so we read: "It is permitted to apply the Mass for any of the living, and also for any of the dead who are atoning for their sins in the fire of purgatory" (Canon 809). Certainly, if by that Canon the supreme authority of the teaching Church sanctions even indirectly the teaching of the above-mentioned modern theologians, by all means let the teaching flourish and prevail, and the other be abandoned, as the arguments in its favour must then be considered weak and ineffective.

However, before concluding that the matter is thus settled, we should first carefully consider what is the proper meaning and the scope of the Canon. Does the Canon really say that the Mass can be specially offered for dead non-Catholics? It plainly says that the Mass can be offered for any dead persons who are in purgatory; but this we already know to be, we might say (*fere*),

to pray and to OFFER THE SACRIFICE to the Lord our God for their own dead who depart from this life in their infidelity?" The reply was: "If they truly die in infidelity, it is BY NO MEANS lawful." For it is very improbable that the sense of the answer was as follows: the offering of the sacrifice would be unlawful if real infidelity or the absence of saving faith existed in the dead persons in question; but it would be lawful if the infidelity was only apparent, and faith was really present. For such a condition, which had to do with something completely hidden or invisible, so that the petitioners could not know whether it was fulfilled or not, would not help the petitioners in any way, as a practical guide. The answer, however, would make sense if the condition required was a wish, manifested in some way, of entering the Church; if this were lacking those in question could not be reputed publicly among the faithful; if it were present they could be numbered with the catechumens, even if it so happened that, overtaken by death, they were unable to give their names to the Church authorities to be formally enrolled in the list of the catechumens, and because such enrolment did not take place, they were still listed as infidels. Cardinal Gasparri (*Tractatus canonicus de SS. Eucharistia*, n. 480, Paris, 1897, tom. 1, p. 341) seems to interpret the Reply in this way, for just before quoting it he says: ["From its very nature the Mass cannot be applied] for a departed infidel, unless he has shown positive and particular signs of CONVERSION before death."

To a clearer understanding of the Reply, one should note that the word *to pray (orare)* in the question proposed must certainly be taken to refer to public prayer. This is shown by the context which couples prayer with the sacrifice, indicating also the existing conditions in China, where the public cult of the dead was the question at issue. Add to this that private prayer is always *de facto* permitted (apart from divine revelation) for any dead person, because it is not subject to the same law of legal presumption as is the sacrificial action which from its very nature is public.

the universal teaching of the Scholastic theologians,¹ and yet, as we have stated above, we cannot conclude from it that the Scholastic theologians taught that the Mass could be offered in a special manner for departed non-Catholics. What justification have we then for inferring more from the Canon than from this well-known teaching of the theologians ?

And indeed *a priori* it is most unlikely that the Legislator wished to decide this matter by way of a Canon, in opposition, it would seem, to the teaching of Gregory XVI, and to the still more explicit decision of the Holy Office. Seeing, too, that the Canon affects the customary style of the scholastic theologians, is it not also reasonable to suppose that it keeps within the limits of their commonly received or more general teaching ? Moreover, suppose the purpose of the Canon was to establish definitely the legal right of offering the Mass for this or that dead person, whatever may have been his visible relation to the Church on earth, the words *for those expiating their sins in the fires of purgatory* would seem to serve no practical purpose whatever, as they speak of a condition which we cannot verify. On the other hand, these words are useful and necessary if the Canon is to be interpreted as giving its sanction, in accordance with the common teaching of the Schools, to the well-known triple category of the separated souls in their relation to the sacrifice of the Church.

Furthermore, among the sources to which the *Codex* refers us not one has any bearing on this controversy.

Bearing all this in mind, we should hesitate before extending or amplifying the sense of this Canon.²

¹ On this point the Canon goes further than some of the Scholastics, Vasquez for example. As Vasquez taught that the Mass cannot be offered for the unbaptised, his exclusion applies equally both to the living and to the dead if unbaptised. If one rejects this exclusion of the unbaptised, as we have done above, and as the Canon has done in the words *for any of the living* . . . the whole reason for the restriction in question here as regards the souls in purgatory falls to the ground. Hence the Canon is perfectly consistent in allowing the celebration of the Mass *for all* in purgatory. And in accordance with the principles of juridical presumption already established, we at once infer that it is right to celebrate Mass specially for departed catechumens.

² I have heard some Canonists say that even if Canon 809 established the right in question, there was still room for doubt as to whether it absolutely decided the case on its intrinsic merits or merely gave a practical ruling, applying reflex principles. For they say the Canon could proceed in two quite different ways. It could give at once a practical and a theoretical decision, resting on the actual merits of the case or the arguments pro and con. Or, leaving to either of the opposing sides a theoretical probability for their opinion, it could issue a purely practical instruction, by

Having weighed the arguments on either side, I find it no easy matter to arrive at a final decision regarding the celebration of the Mass for a dead non-Catholic. On the one hand, I feel inclined to oppose such application by reasons for which I find no adequate answer. On the other, I hesitate to decide finally against such application, not only because of the authority of modern theologians which seem to favour it, but also because of the difficulty from Canon Law which does not appear to me to be completely solved. Therefore though the solution which says that the Mass cannot be offered seems to me to be the truer, nevertheless I prefer to submit my judgment to the wisdom of more expert theologians, or to an authentic decision, should one be made, both as to the actual celebration of the Mass for departed non-Catholics and as to the interpretation of Canon 809.

Meantime we need not fear that by adopting the severer teaching we would thereby exclude all help for the souls of those non-Catholic departed who, although they lacked all visible union with the Church, nevertheless inwardly, in good faith in God our Saviour, had charity towards the heavenly Father and the universal brotherhood. For it follows from our teaching, and also from our interpretation of Canon 809, against Vasquez, that every sacrifice of the Church benefits such generally, with the souls of the

virtue of which, as the question now stands, it would be lawful to celebrate with a safe conscience for a departed non-Catholic by name, under proper conditions. In this latter supposition the Code would be proceeding in the same manner as it did in regard to matrimony in Canon 1068, paragraph 2: "If an impediment of impotence is doubtful, whether the DOUBT IS OF LAW or of fact, the marriage must not be prevented." By virtue of this Canon it is now lawful for a woman to marry after the removal of the uterus, even though a doubt remains whether such a marriage is not invalid by divine law, and therefore illicit. But to tell the truth, I see little probability in this solution. The reason is plain from the disparity between Canon 809 and Canon 1068. In this latter Canon (regarding a marriage question) the Legislator says, that WHILE THERE IS A DOUBT, a certain manner of action is allowed in practice. Hence if (even every) juridical doubt were ever removed by authentic decisions, Canon 1068 would not need to be changed, but could be left as it is. For even then the principle declared in the Canon would remain sound and true. On the other hand, if Canon 809 were interpreted in similar manner, it would have to be changed in some future time, if by an authentic decision of the Church the doubt of law were removed in such a manner as to decide the question in favour of those who would not permit the offering of the Mass. There is no parity, then, between the case of the one and the other Canon if viewed as giving merely a guide to practice.

Another explanation, not an absurd one either, would be that Canon 809 permits the sacrifice to be offered, even specially and by name, for all who are JURIDICALLY PRESUMED to be in purgatory. This would also include catechumens. Whence it would follow that Canon 809 really meets and solves the very question discussed in the first part (A).

baptised, and much more so those sacrifices whose first intention is the relief of the souls in purgatory. Therefore no matter to what class the soul of the departed may belong, be it that of those who lived in heresy and schism or even in apparent infidelity, nevertheless if, with the grace of God strong in his soul, he has died in Christ, every suffrage of the Church for all the souls in purgatory in common will benefit him, even though no special offering can be made for such a soul. The reason is that the Church when offering generally for all the faithful departed excludes no one of the members of Christ from her suffrage. She passes no judgment, makes no distinction; she offers the Body of Christ for all the members of Christ. Thus, therefore, assistance is rendered to all the holy souls by the universal brotherhood of charity, even to those who are without the baptismal character, and who never by any outward sign manifested the desire of entering the Church.

If you are worried, therefore, about the eternal welfare of a relative or a friend, who never (alas !) was known to be within the fold of the Church, devote your suffrages to all the departed in Christ, hoping that he, too, may thus reap the fruit of the common benefit of the suffrage. Nor will you do anything against the divine law if you pray to God in your own name that a larger and more abundant share of the suffrage which is common to all, and which is derived through the Mass, may be bestowed on him. For it is one thing to offer specially for a certain one (which means to direct by your own intention to the special benefit of that one the suffrage of the Church's sacrifice which is celebrated by her public representative), and quite another thing to offer indiscriminately for all, and while offering humbly to beg of God in your own private name and not by the public act of sacrifice, that what is beneficial to all in general may benefit that one especially.¹ For even though we may offer the Mass specially only for the faithful departed, still we are unquestionably within our rights when offering in this other way for any or all departed adults. For we are told never to despair of the salvation of anyone, and consequently, too, we are never forbidden to help towards

¹ Your prayer *ex opere operantis*, as coming simply from you, asks that your friend may receive ample assistance from the Mass *ex opere operato*.

the salvation of anyone by our prayers, until we have positive certainty that by final impenitence he has placed himself outside the possibility of salvation; and of this as a rule we can have no certainty in the case of any man.¹

(C) REPENTANT EXCOMMUNICATED PERSONS ABSOLVED AFTER DEATH.

All we have hitherto said about the non-Catholic dead can be applied with due proportion to a Catholic should he die under excommunication in the class of the *Vitandi* ("to be shunned"). In the Decreta there are many passages forbidding the special offering of the Mass for such a one (cap. *A nobis* and *Sacris*, Decret., lib. 5, tit. 39, c. 28 and 38, etc.). The reason for such a prohibition is much the same as that given above in the case of non-Catholics. For such a man, because of his contumacy, his obstinate disobedience towards the Church, was ejected by excommunication from the body of the Church, and the injunction of Christ is therefore applicable to him: *Let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican*. Moreover, as he died in the state of excommunication, HE IS PRESUMED in the external forum still to be outside the bounds of salvation. Nevertheless, if before death he had given "evident signs" of repentance, whereby it is plain that he submitted to the keys of the Church and would have received absolution had he not been overtaken by death, there is now no reason why he should not be absolved even after death, by the Church, under whose sentence he was bound; after such absolution he would no longer be regarded juridically, in the external forum, as reprobate, but as elect, and it would be lawful to celebrate Mass for him (cap. *A nobis*, from Innocent III, *Regest.*, 1, 2, c. 61. P. L. 214, 599-601), even publicly.

¹ Perhaps we may understand in this way the words of Cardinal Gasparri (*op. cit.*, n. 489, p. 349) when he says: "What if a Mass were requested with the offering of a stipend for a person who died in infidelity, or heresy, excommunication or in open sin? Let the priest answer that he can apply the Mass for all the faithful departed, with the intention of assisting also the soul of that particular departed one, if this is acceptable to God." Lépicier, even in the very place where he permits a special offering, recommends this as the safer practice (*De sacrosancto sacrificio eucharistiae*, Paris, 1916, q. 4, a. 5, n. 7, p. 211).

CHAPTER VI

THE MASS OF A PRIEST CUT OFF FROM THE CHURCH OR DEPRIVED OF HIS OFFICE

THESIS XXXIII

SO FAR we have dealt with the Mass celebrated by a priest in union with the Church. A question now arises, not in itself so easy of solution, and further complicated by the want of agreement regarding it among the earlier theologians. What is the value, what is the fruit of the Mass celebrated by one who is not just a bad or unworthy priest, but one either separated from the Church as by public excommunication, or notorious heresy, or perfect schism, or a priest who, while himself remaining within the fold of the Church, is deprived of his office and status.¹

¹ We here take for granted two points of doctrine already discussed by us, and proved from the early Fathers and Doctors. The *first*: that Christ does not intervene in our sacrifices by any new oblation of His own, but all that is new in the sacrifice comes from us who are the earthly offerers. The *second*: that among earthly offerers, the whole Church by divine institution, holds chief place, for to her the Eucharistic sacrifice was given (*Trent.*, sess, 22, c. 1; D. 938), to be offered by her through her priests (*ibid.*), as the public ministers of the ecclesiastical Society (c. 6; D. 944); hence the only power granted by Christ to the priests is that of presenting the sacrifice of the Church who, as the bride of Christ, alone has the power over the Body of Christ to offer It to God, presenting the sacrifice from her own goods. The Fathers and the theologians to be cited in this discussion will confirm this teaching, both those who say that priests cut off from the Church, or deprived of their office, have this sacrificial power, and those who deny it to them; for they all hold that union with the Church is necessary for validity of the sacrifice, those maintaining validity holding that sufficient union persists for it, those who deny validity holding that such union is lacking.

§ 1. The Meaning, the Importance, and the Scope of the Question

In the *first place*, then, a doubt arises as to what value or acceptability and efficacy such a Mass could have.¹ For, as we have said, the sacrifice of any priest is infallibly acceptable, just in so far as the chief earthly offerer is the Church, in whose name the priest offers as the proper organ of the ecclesiastical body. But how shall we consider that the Church offers through the priest whom she has cut off? The priest himself may be free from his erstwhile guilt, he may be repentant, nevertheless he is now guilty of the sin of contumacious offering of the sacrifice. In such a case, where, to use the words of Scotus (quoted by us above, Th. XXV), is the “acceptable offerer”, where is the “good will of the offerer (*voluntas offerens*)”? How could the acceptability of the sacrifice come from the active offering of such an one?

Will you say that the acceptability rests with Christ, the principal offerer? True, Christ is the principal offerer of every Mass, but not, as we have said, in the sense that when Christ through the priest makes a new consecration He at the same time elicits a new act of offering. The offering of each Mass by Christ is virtual, not actively elicited in each case: through His one unique offering elicited long ago, and by virtue of which we now offer, He virtually offers each sacrifice coming from His mystic body, which we are. Hence, if any offering cannot be considered to come from His body, the Church, the offering of our Head cannot be considered in any degree whatever to pour its virtue into that offering. Hence, any sacrifice that does not proceed from the Church will have no acceptability derived from Christ’s offering.²

¹ In disputing the acceptability of such a sacrifice, we do not question the value in itself of the Victim (for wherever our Victim is its value is infinite), but ask: what is the value before God of our offering of that Victim. Because sacrifice (in the active sense) is not the victim offered, but the offering which is made of the victim. Hence it is that in estimating the value of the sacrifice we consider rather the good will of the giver (as is the way among men), than the value of the gift, as Catholic theologians have remarked: St. Thomas, 3, S. 79, 5, c.; Scotus, *Quodlib.*, 20; Bellarmine, *De Missa*, 1, 2, c. 4, etc.

² In this connection there is no exact parity between the sacraments (baptism, for instance) and the sacrifice. Baptism can be conferred by a person who never

Indeed, not only does acceptability seem to be lacking in the sacrifice of a priest who is cut off, but also validity of the consecration. For no priest can offer except on the part of the Church, as we have said; and without a true offering no consecration is valid. Hence if the priest who is cut off cannot offer on behalf of the Church, evidently he cannot consecrate validly.

We see, then, that there are intrinsic reasons for doubting, not merely the acceptability, the value to us, but even the validity of the Mass of the priest who is cut off. Our Catholic doctors of theology have never raised the question¹ whether the power of consecrating was lost or the sacrifice itself infected by the badness or unworthiness alone of the minister.² The real and only question at issue was: what value, if any, could be assigned to the Mass of priests separated from the Church's communion by heresy, apostasy, schism or excommunication, or of such as were at any

was or never will be in the Church; in baptism it is Christ, not the Church, who acts through the person baptising. Not so in the sacrifice. The reason for the distinction is that in the sacrament as such it is not man who acts towards God, but God who, through His ministers, acts towards man, imparting a certain sanctification to him; this action, as an action of God, will be always holy, and, if the necessary conditions are present, always effective. But in the sacrifice as such it is not God who acts towards man, but man who acts towards God: he offers something to God. And in order that this action of his may be acceptable to God, it must come from a man who is himself acceptable to God: all the more because, as we have said, in the Mass there is no oblation action elicited here and now by Christ, but only from us mortal men. We must then find an acceptable offerer among ourselves. The fact that our sacrifice is also a sacrament does not militate against this disparity. Because (logically) the sacrament of the Eucharist presupposes the sacrifice and not conversely. For the Body and Blood of Christ is in the sacrament only in so far as it is the Victim of the sacrifice which we are to partake of by way of banquet in communion. Moreover, the transubstantiation is caused by the rite of consecration, and it is formally in the rite of consecration that our sacrificial action consists. Of itself, therefore, and necessarily in the case of the Eucharist, the concept of sacrifice comes before the concept of sacrament.

¹ Even Cyprian does not raise this question, and I think Saltet in his fine work *Les Réordinations*, 1907, pp. 28–33, and following him Batiffol, in his otherwise excellent treatise *L'Église naissante et le catholicisme* 1909, pp. 453–454, interpret him rather too strictly. For Cyprian thought that Basilides, Martialis and Fortunatianus also had lapsed into public apostasy, which is a profession of heresy, and indeed the worst of its kind, and which therefore implied that they were cut off from communion with the Church. Moreover, such men (apostates) were considered by positive ecclesiastical law (*Epist. Synod. ad cler. et pleb. Hisp.*, n. 6. P. L. 3, 1028–1031) as unauthorised to offer sacrifice. They were thus within the categories to be reviewed immediately of priests degraded or cut off, and not merely as bad priests. It would be well to keep in mind here the arguments we have already advanced on this subject (XXVII). The inferences to be deduced from the present discussion should also be noted.

² The infection or spoiling of the sacrifice here should be understood as such as would affect the *validity* of the sacrifice. One or two Catholic theologians, e.g. Matthæus Galenus (XXVII), thought that, even if the sacrifice were validly offered, its value could be affected by the bad conscience of the minister.

rate deprived by Church law of the right to exercise their office though not cut off from the Church.

For since priests deprived of their sacred office are no longer publicly deputed or commissioned by the Church to offer the sacrifice in her name, we must investigate if they, too, though not cut off from the Church, can offer sacrifice in her name. Many thought that these were in the same position as those cut off from the Church in respect of the offering of the sacrifice; indeed some held that their condition was even worse in this regard than that of those cut off (see jurists and William of Paris below).

The present question is akin to but not identical with the question as to the validity of ordinations administered outside the Church. This last question was dealt with by L. Saltet in his learned work *Les Réordinations* (Paris, 1907), in which, by reason of the internal similarity and historical connection of the subject matter, he necessarily inserted a number of quotations which will be found also in the course of the present discussion.¹ The difference between the two questions is plainly seen first of all if we compare the power of conferring orders in the case of a bishop ordaining outside the Church, and the power of consecrating in a priest celebrating outside the Church; for in the one case we can advance an argument proving invalidity, which in the other has not the slightest semblance of truth. Thus, in certain cases and for historical reasons, there have been some who denied the power to confer orders while admitting the power to consecrate (see below, St. Peter Damian, after A.D. 1060); while there were others again who would not allow that certain persons could consecrate validly, while maintaining that they had the power of conferring orders (see Gerhoh and the author of the *Summae Sententiarum*, below).

Secondly, if we compare the case of a priest cut off from the Church with that of a priest ordained outside the Church, the question of what sacrificial power each may have, in each case, is completely different. Regarding the priest ordained in heresy or schism, the real point at issue is whether he has received true orders. If the order was invalid (and according to the teaching

¹ He touches more or less on our subject in his comments on the writers we consider here under the numbers: 1, 4, 6, 9, 15–21, 28, 29, 31, 32, 37, 38.

of those who require reordination in such case it was invalid), then that man can never consecrate the Eucharist validly either within or without the Church, even if he may happen to be a Catholic, or become one (unless we imagine a kind of *sanatio in radice* for those later reconciled to the Church, as Hugo of Amiens thought possible—see below). Our question, on the other hand, absolutely presupposes the incontestable validity of the orders. We speak of a real priest and of a priest ordained legitimately within the Church. If this priest celebrates outside of the Catholic Church, what does he effect ?

The difference between these two questions is further indicated by the fact that many of the Fathers and Theologians dealt with illegitimate ordination without speaking at all of illegitimate celebration, and vice versa.

While dealing with this question the Fathers had constantly in mind the following or similar texts from the Old Testament:

The victims [that is, the sacrifices] of the wicked are abominable to the Lord (Prov., XV, 8).

The sacrifices of the wicked are abominable (Prov., XXI, 27).

The Most High approveth not the gifts of the wicked (Eccli., XXXIV, 23).

Their sacrifices shall be like the bread of mourners ; all that shall eat it shall be defiled (Agg., II, 15).

Before indicating the general principles for the solution of this question, we must first examine the most relevant passages from the Fathers and Doctors, giving explanations, critical or historical, as occasion demands.

§ 2. Solutions of Catholic Doctors

1. ST. CYPRIAN (+ 258).¹

St. Cyprian uses every endeavour to prevent the faithful from holding communion with the priest Fortunatianus, lapsed into apostasy, “since the offering cannot be sanctified where the Holy

¹ Pope Cornelius, a contemporary of Cyprian, dealing with the sacrifices of the priest Novatian, who certainly was without the Church after his invasion of the episcopate, makes use of language which goes to show that he had little doubt about the validity of his sacrificial action (*Ep. Cornelii ad Fabium Antiochensem*, apud Eusebium. H. E. 6, 43. P. G. 20, 625–628; cf. Saltet, *op cit.*, p. 11.)

Spirit is not" (*Ep.* 64, c. 4. P. L. 4, 392). The schismatic, he says, "dares to set up another altar . . . to desecrate (*profanare*) THE TRUTH OF THE VICTIM OF THE LORD BY FALSE SACRIFICES" (*De unitate Ecclesiae*, c. 17. P. L. 4, 513).

He would reduce to the state of laymen, after they had been converted, those priests who "have attempted to offer FALSE and sacrilegious SACRIFICES outside the fold of the Church, over against the one divine altar" (*Ep.* 72, c. 2. P. L. 3, 1048-1049).¹ The rebels Chore, Dathan and Abiron "were immediately punished for their lawless attempts, nor could their impious and sacrilegious sacrifices, offered in opposition to the law of divine disposition, be ratified and fruitful, and yet they did not cause a schism". Hence, he argues, *a fortiori* the sacrifices of the schismatical Novatianists will neither be ratified nor fruitful: "How can they perfect what they do, or how in their lawless endeavours impetrate anything from God, they who strive against God to do what is unlawful for them?" (*Ep.* 76, c. 8. P. L. 3, 1144-1145; cf. *Testimoniorum liber*, 3, c. 111. P. L. 4, 778).²

Perhaps some might doubt whether Cyprian in these passages is speaking of the fruit alone, or of the validity as well as the fruit of the sacrifice. One who held that he is speaking of the fruit

¹ Likewise he says that when Novatian "erects an altar and sacrilegiously attempts to offer sacrifice he arrogates to himself, outside the fold of the Church, the image of the truth" (*Ep.* 73, *Ad Jubaianum*, c. 2. P. L. 3, 1111). Cf. Ignat., *Smyrn.*, 8. (F. P. 1, 282).

² I do not agree with Batiffol (*op cit.*, p. 454) where he says: "Cyprian here confuses the liceity of offering and the power of orders: no matter how sinful a bishop is, he does not thereby lose the power to consecrate the Eucharist validly and to offer the sacrifice validly; the Church can only withhold from him the right to exercise this power, AND THIS IS THE DOCTRINE PROFESSED AT ROME, CONFIRMED BY A DECISION OF POPE CALLISTUS" (*Philosophumena*, 9, 12). For the question between Callistus and Hippolytus to which this passage refers was not, it seems to me, what a bishop removed from his office could do, but what bishops were to be ejected from the episcopacy. What Callistus did was to deny THAT ALL SINNERS SHOULD BE EJECTED FROM THE EPISCOPACY. Hence the teaching of Callistus would, we admit, be a condemnation of the teaching of Cyprian, if Cyprian had taught that the sacrifices of a bishop guilty of any sin are "false," vain, and the like, by the simple fact that he is or was at the time guilty of sin. For then, according to Cyprian's teaching, any bishop guilty of sin should be rightly ejected from the episcopacy. Here, however, Cyprian is not speaking merely of a sinful bishop, but of the bishop either cut off by heresy, or at least deprived of the priestly office by Church law. Hence his words do not imply that all sinners must be cast out, but simply that if any are cast out they cannot offer holy and true sacrifices. See above. Again in *Eucharistie* 5, p. 246, Batiffol makes the same mistake, as it appears to us, when he gives us, as follows, what he considers to be the teaching of Cyprian: "The power to sanctify the offering is a power which the unworthy minister has lost by his own unworthiness." This conclusion appears to me to go beyond what is vouched for by the known facts of the case.

alone might perhaps say that the phrase *the oblation cannot be sanctified* may well refer to the impious, irreligious, sacrilegious and profane ACTIVE offering, and that the sanctity of the thing OFFERED is not thereby necessarily excluded. Again he might argue that Cyprian does not deny *the truth of the Victim* in such a case, that is, he does not deny that *the Victim is truly Christ*, but rather asserts it, no matter how much it be profaned by *false sacrifices*, that is, by an offering not acceptable to God, and so not *ratified*. For that sacrifice only is *true* in which God truly accepts our gift; and He certainly does not accept it from our hands, no matter how acceptable in itself the gift may be, if He looks on our offering with disgust.

However, we find a passage in the *Epistola ad Januarium*, etc., 70, c. 2. (P. L. 3, 1040–1041), which creates a slight difficulty against this view: “It is through the Eucharist that (*Eucharistia est, unde*) the baptised are annointed with oil (*baptizati unguuntur oleum*) sanctified on the altar.¹ But he who had neither altar nor church

¹ *Unguntur oleum in altare sanctificatum*. Thus all the codices, except a secondary one which shows OLEO IN ALTARI SANCTIFICATO. If the reading OLEUM did not make sense, it could not be received. However, if it is susceptible of a reasonable meaning, the reading will be preferable, for two reasons: (1) Because of the external authority of the codices; and (2) because of its intrinsic difficulty: for copyists are not prone to increase the difficulties of the text, but rather, if they change anything, to smooth these over. Now a reasonable meaning seems possible, indeed absolutely the same as that from the easier reading. In evidence of this it should be known that Cyprian used the ancient Latin version of the Sacred Scriptures. The old Latin generally translates the Septuagint literally. Now we never find ἀλείφεισθαι ἔλαιον = *ungi oleo* in the Septuagint, while the expression ἀλείφεισθαι ἔλαιον = *ungi oleum* occurs four times (*II Kings*, XIV, 2; *IV Kings*, IV, 2; *Mich.*, VI, 15; *Dan.*, X, 3). Hence it is quite probable that the old Latin version had *ungi oleum* not *ungi oleo*. This inference is, however, only probable, as we have no evidence of this reading in the old Latin text, in those places, from Oesterley (*The old Latin texts of the prophets*, in J. T. S., Jan. 1904, p. 252), or from Sabatier (*Latinae versiones antiquae*). On the other hand, neither have we any compelling evidence to the contrary. It is true that Sabatier quotes two of the texts: *Mich.*, VI, 15 and *Dan.*, X, 3, with the ablative *oleo*, not with the accusative *oleum*. But the ablative *oleo* is from St. Jerome’s recension in one case, and in the other from Tertullian’s work *De Jejuniis contra Psychicos*, which latter is in none of the codices, only in the published texts, and so really nothing can be adduced from these witnesses against our inference. Moreover, in the Septuagint, besides ἀλείφεισθαι ἔλαιον, we have also the expression χρίειν ἔλαιον = *ungere oleum*, in *Deuteronomy* XXVIII, 40 and in *Psalms* XLIV, 8. I have found no Latin version exactly corresponding to the Greek of the former passage, though H. H. Jeannotte, P.S.S. (*Gregorianum*, 2, 116), gives an exact Latin version of the second, which is probably a pre-Jerome reading to be found in the codex Sangermanensis (as given by Sabatier), and in a few codices of the *Tractatus super Psalmos* of St. Hilary (followed by the editor, Zingerle, 1891, p. 432): *Unxit te . . . oleum*. This is of course a confirmation of our inference in regard to all the other passages.

If Cyprian was quite familiar with this expression in the Scripture versions he had at hand, then certainly he would naturally write: *unguntur oleum*.

could not sanctify the creature, oil. Hence the heretics cannot have the spiritual unction, since it is plain that IT IS IMPOSSIBLE AMONG THEM FOR THE OIL TO BE SANCTIFIED OR THE EUCHARIST TO BE MADE (*feri*).” These words appear to imply a blunt denial of the validity of the Eucharistic celebration by heretics; on the other hand, however, it is just possible that they may mean merely that the Eucharist CANNOT BE MADE IN ORDER TO SANCTIFICATION by the heretics: their Eucharist would be validly made, but it would not serve, as a vehicle of sanctification, to consecrate their oil by its influence, so to speak. This comes to the same thing as saying that the Eucharist could not be made in all its elements by the heretics, seeing that that would be wanting in it which is the *reality only (res tantum)*, which is incorporation with Christ in the Church by the Holy Spirit.

Though such interpretations of Cyprian (we omit for the moment another from William of Paris which we shall give later on) are not fully convincing,¹ nevertheless they should make us hesitate to state confidently that the validity of all consecration by heretics was certainly denied by Cyprian. However, even if it were proved beyond doubt that Cyprian denied the validity of consecration by heretics, this would cause little surprise, as he certainly did deny the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.²

¹ This exposition is no more forced than the interpretation which Saltet (*op. cit.*, 10, 11) himself gives of some words of Cornelius in his letter to Cyprian. Saltet thinks, whether rightly or wrongly let the reader decide, that one cannot find a positive denial of the validity in the description, given by Cornelius, of the ordination of Novatian, not to the priesthood, but the episcopacy. Cornelius says that hands were imposed on Novatian “AS IF ON A BISHOP (*quasi in episcopum*)” (*Ep. Cornelii ad Cyprianum*, c. 1. P. L. 3, 719), and also that three bishops were forced “trembling and overcome with wine to confer the episcopate on him BY A PRETENTIOUS AND INANE imposition of hands” (*Epist. Cornelii ad Fabianum* in Eusebius, H. E. 6, 43. P. G. 20, 620).

Cornelius appears to have advisedly stressed drunkenness and the duress to which these three bishops were subjected, and this would be sufficient to prevent their performance of a true human act, and so invalidate ordination quite independently of schism.

² At the same time one should not hastily conclude that Cyprian erred regarding the validity of the consecration of the Eucharist because he erred regarding the validity of baptism in a similar case.

For in the *first place*, no matter what logical connection there may be between one error and another, speaking generally, the fact of a theologian making the one error does not justify us in imputing the other to him. It often happens that regarding one matter an erroneous statement is made, precisely because we overlook something else which it implies; and were this implication detected, this erroneous statement would not have been made. In the present instance, however, I must admit that Cyprian would probably not have been shifted from his erroneous position

2. ST. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS (+ 384)

St. Optatus of Milevis notes the inconsistency of the heretics who, though they do not belong to the universal Church, claim, nevertheless, to offer the sacrifice for the universal Church. In other words, they should be within the Catholic Church—by renouncing heresy, of course—and so offer the sacrifice for her, or, if they wish to remain without the Church, pay heed to God rebuking them: “Why do you offer for the whole (*pro tota*) if you are not of the whole (*qui non es in tota*)”? The full passage runs: “You can be justly convicted of falsehood on this very ground that you offer sacrifices daily. For, in the mystery of the sacraments who could have any doubt that you cannot pass over as of no importance the very thing that makes them legitimate (*illud legitimum in sacramentorum mysterio praeterire non posse*). YOU SAY THAT YOU OFFER TO GOD FOR THE CHURCH, WHICH IS ONE; part of the lie is this: that you call that one which you yourselves would make two. And you say that you also offer to God for the one Church which is spread throughout the world. What if God were to say to each of you: Why do you offer for the whole, you who are not a part of the whole?” (*De Schismate Donatistarum*, 1, 2, c. 12. P. L. 11, 965).

Nevertheless, these words of Optatus are no certain proof that he considered the sacrifice of schismatics to be invalid. He would certainly be maintaining their invalidity if we understood him to say: *He who offers can only offer for the whole Church.*

regarding baptism by any conclusion which might have been drawn from it regarding the Eucharist.

Secondly, in respect of baptism in particular, Cyprian could have been influenced by an argument which might appear to him not to militate against the validity of consecration. His special reason for rejecting baptism conferred by heretics was that baptism incorporates with the Church, and it did not seem possible to him that one who was without the Church could incorporate any one with the Church (*Ep. 74, ad Pompeium*, c. 6–8. P. L. 3, 1132–1134; cf. Firmilian., *Ep. ad Cyprianum*, c. 17. P. L. 3, 1169). As to whether he did or did not see that the same difficulty could be urged against the consecration of the Eucharist by heretics, it is not easy to reach a certain conclusion. To me it seems that in itself any such difficulty if it occurred in baptism should be stressed even more in reference to the consecration of the Eucharist. For though baptism does incorporate with the Church, it does not follow from this, according to Catholic faith, that it must come from the Church. Sacrifice, however, is not only offered on behalf of the universal Church, but it must also be offered *by* the universal Church,

BUT the schismatic not being in the whole Church cannot offer for the whole Church. THEREFORE the schismatic cannot offer. But we can interpret his words in another way, by leaving the Major of the syllogism as it stands, but changing the Minor as follows, and so reaching a somewhat different conclusion: *BUT he who is not in the whole Church cannot, without being inconsistent, offer for the whole Church. BUT to be inconsistent is to be false. THEREFORE he is proven false.* The schismatic may be false and inconsistent, but this does not at once prove that his offering is invalid, no matter how foolish and inconsistent his mental attitude may be.¹

It is not easy to decide which interpretation is the better. The second, however, seems to be the more probable.

For, in the *first place*, Optatus himself is here arguing *ad hominem* against those who looked upon the Catholic Church as an unlawful sect. The Donatists, he says, should not have treated as profane and polluted the altars and the sacred vessels used by the Catholics, for, even if the Catholics were polluted, still the invocation of God to sanctify would have greater power than the contact of Catholics to defile. Though Optatus did not apply this principle expressly to the Eucharist, still he enunciates it in the most general sense in the words: "You say that we read in the Scripture: *Should the unclean touch it, it is unclean.* . . . Yes, granted, if touch alone is in question, and the invocation of the divine name of God does not intervene. . . . For if the invocation of God intervene, that invocation sanctifies even what appeared to be polluted. . . . It is clear, therefore, that a thing can be sanctified by the invocation of God, even if it is a sinner who invokes God, for mere touch cannot have as great power as the invocation of the divine name has" (*ibid.*, 1, 6, c. 3, cols. 1071-1072).

Secondly, though Optatus often draws a sharp line between heretics and schismatics when speaking of the sacraments, and though it is not always clear whether when he uses the word sacrament he means what we properly call sacraments or rather sacred things and the mysteries of faith in general (*op. cit.*, 1, 1, n. 10-12, cols. 899-908), nevertheless he certainly seems to consider

¹ This inconsistency on the schismatics' part in the valid offering of the sacrifice will be dealt with in the third paragraph of this chapter.

that baptism received by any man, even a schismatic, is valid provided it is received in right faith and with the invocation of the Trinity (*op. cit.*, 1, 5, c. 1–8, cols. 1047–1061).¹

But would not this statement of Optatus increase the difficulty regarding the validity of consecration by heretics, as Optatus excludes them from the reception of baptism, by opposition to those who have faith (*loc. cit.*)? The difficulty disappears, however, if we note that in baptism it is the faith not of the minister of baptism (or, as he says, “*operantis*”, 1, 5, c. 4, or “*operarii*”, c. 7) that he insists on, but of the receiver only of the sacrament. And so we may at least conjecture that faith in the minister is not held to be necessary by him for validity of the Eucharistic consecration.²

3. ST. JEROME († 420)³

St. Jerome says that sacrifices offered by heretics are not acceptable to God. And although he includes in the list what can only be called sacrifices in an improper or metaphorical sense,

¹ On baptism, Aubespine (Albaspinæus) wrote: “As far as I know, Optatus did not think heretics could baptise” (P. L. 2, 899). Louis Ellies du Pin (Dupinius) is more guarded: “Apparently he was convinced that baptism administered by heretics was not ratified, not because it requires faith in the minister, but because it presupposes faith as a necessary condition in the recipient” (P. L. 11, 765).

² You may urge that Optatus not only denied the validity of baptism but also that of confirmation and the Eucharist in the case of heretics, where he wrote: “. . . In the Canticle of Canticles Christ indicates that His dove is one, and the same is His spouse who is one, and this garden enclosed and fountain sealed up likewise one; so that none of the heretics HAS THE KEYS [to that garden], which Peter alone received; nor has any the seal with which we are told the fountain IS SEALED UP; nor is any of them to be found among those to whom that garden belongs, in which God plants TREES” (1, 1, c. 10, col. 900–903; cf. c. 12, col. 907). We know that in the earlier writers, among the Keys was reckoned baptism, by which sin is remitted; the seal suitably represents confirmation; the trees of the garden call to mind the tree of life, by the fruit of which man was to be nourished into immortal life, man who is now nourished by the Eucharist, the fruit of the true tree of eternal life. Hence quite possibly this trilogy of sacraments is indicated here, as it was a constant theme among the early writers. If this is so, would it not appear that Optatus held that heretics could not validly consecrate? One could hardly say that he merely meant, by these words, to exclude fruitful offering of sacrifice or reception of sacrament, for so the difference actually noted here by Optatus between heretics (who have not the treasures of the Church) and schismatics (who have them) would be missing: for no one could maintain that these sacraments could be fruitful to the schismatic as such. I reply: all this, though not improbable, rests on a rather weakly grounded conjecture, especially as regards the Eucharist (“trees”).

³ Meantime Innocent I creates no difficulty for us in this matter. The only question is, whether he did or did not admit the validity of orders conferred by Bonosus, who was once a Catholic bishop, but lapsed into heresy, and by his followers (*Ep.* 17, c. 3, n. 7, and c. 5, n. 12. P. L. 20, 530–531 and 534–535). On the evidence it is most probable that he did admit the validity.

there is no doubt whatever that he has in mind principally the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

Thus on *Amos*, V, 22: *If you offer me holocausts and your gifts, I will not receive them: neither will I regard the vows of your fat beasts*, he makes the following comment: "We can say all this of the *heretics*. God detests their sacrifices and casts them from him, and whenever they assemble in the name of the Lord He hates their filth and closes His nostrils. . . . And if they offer sacrifices, give alms, fast, promise purity, all of which are holocausts, the Lord does not accept them, nor does He deign to regard their richest victims. For He does not judge the magnitude of their sacrifices, rather He judges the merits and the motives of the offerers. . . . But God looks upon our gifts, that is the gifts of the Church, which we offer from our first fruits, as He once regarded the sacrifice of Abel" (P. L. 25, 1033-1034).

Again on *Aggaeus*, II, 15 (P. L. 25, 1049): "Aggaeus, well acquainted with the sacred solemnities, and for this reason called Aggaeus, 'of the festival' (*et ob id festi sortitus est nomen*), answers as follows: *So is this people, and so is this nation*, that is, of the Jews and Gentiles, AND OF ALL HERETICS, *before my face, saith the Lord. ALL THAT THEY HAVE OFFERED TO ME*, that is, sacrifices for salvation, sin, peace offerings, offerings for sin or fault, in holocaust, in alms, in fasting, in restraint in the use of food and chastity of body, *SHALL BE DEFILED BEFORE MY FACE*. For though what are offered by such seem in outward appearance to be holy, nevertheless because they are touched by one whose soul is defiled all these things shall be defiled."

Similarly he comments on *Osee*, IX, 34 (P. L. 25, 982): "What the heretics offer does not please Him, nor do they themselves who offer, please Him."

Then again Jerome seems to deny the validity of their sacrifices, where not only does he say that God will not accept anything from them, but also says that their sacrifices are simulations; "The Apostle teaches that in the Church there is one Altar, one faith, one baptism (*Ephes.*, IV); deserting this Altar, the heretics have built for themselves many altars, not so to appease God but to add to their crimes. . . . Whatever they do *SIMULATING THE ORDER AND THE RITE OF THE SACRIFICES*, whether they give alms,

or promise purity, or simulate humility, and deceive the simple by false blandishments, THE LORD WILL ACCEPT NO SACRIFICES OF THIS KIND” (P. L. 25, 888–889).

The expression “simulating the order and rite of the sacrifices” reminds us of Firmilian’s letter to Cyprian, c. 10. P. L. 3, 1165, where he refers to a woman who “by a not altogether contemptible invocation would SIMULATE the sanctification of the bread, and the making of the Eucharist, and so offer the sacrifice to the Lord, not omitting the significant words of the customary Canon prayers (*solitae praedicationis*)”.¹ The word “simulation” was certainly used by writers to denote an invalid sacrifice. It is no wonder then that mediaeval writers like Gratian (below) appealed to Jerome as maintaining the invalidity of sacrifices offered by the heretics.

And what of another passage (*Homilia de Exodo, in vigilia Paschae, Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. 3, par. 2, p. 406) where he distinctly says that the Lamb is not truly eaten or truly immolated by heretics? “We must not think that this one-year-old lamb can be eaten in any place whatsoever. It is enjoined upon us to eat it in one household, that is, we must not think that it is immolated outside the Church. It is plain from this that the Jews, heretics, and the conventicles of perverted teaching, seeing that they do not eat the Lamb within the Church, eat not the Flesh of the Lamb, but rather that of the dragon, which the psalm says was given to be the meat of the Ethiopians. . . . In the immolation (*immolatione*) of the Lamb, therefore, the Lamb is only then truly slain (*occiditur*) when it is immolated (*mactatur*) in the one household.”²

¹ *Praedicatio* here means the recital of the words of the Canon of the Mass. Cf. *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, t. 1, pp. 126–127.

² This is probably the origin of the saying which passed into common use among later writers, especially of the Middle Ages, that the Lamb is not available to us outside the one household which is the Church. The same teaching, however, is indicated by the earlier Fathers. Thus in Athanasius (*Ep. heortastica*, 5, 4. P. G. 26, 1382): “Finally we are superior . . . to the nurslings of the sects, for we do not rend the garment of Christ, but partake of the Pasch of the Lord in the one household, that is, in the Catholic Church” (see also *Ep. heortastica*, 19, 8. P. G. 26, 1429; cf. also both passages with the treatise of Cyril of Alexandria (?), *adv. Anthropomorphitas*, c. 12. P. G. 76, 1097). Indeed the very early Syrian writer Aphraates spoke even more plainly. He said that the Eucharist was one in the one household, just as one paschal lamb was to be eaten in one household (*Demonstrationes*, 12, 9. P. S. pars, 1, tom. 1, p. 526). Even before them we find Origen speaking, though more vaguely, in the same sense, commenting on *Exodus*, XII, 43–46 (P. G. 12, 286–287).

Nevertheless we do not think the holy Doctor should be interpreted so strictly as to imply invalidity. For in the *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, c. 6. P. L. 23, 160, he seems openly to defend the validity. The Luciferiani would have the Church refuse to restore to office priests who were implicated in Arianism for a time, and held that they should be received back into the Church after conversion not in the grade of priests, but only with the status of laymen. Jerome argues thus: "I beg of you, either to give permission to offer sacrifice to the one of whose baptism you approve, or to reject the baptism of the one whom you do not consider a priest. For it cannot be that one who when baptising (*in baptisate*) is holy, at the altar is a sinner." I am well aware that here the only purpose of St. Jerome was to claim for those who have returned to Church unity authorisation to offer the sacrifice in the Catholic Church; from which alone it does not of course follow that he considered that the sacrifices celebrated by them while still in heresy were valid. But the principle from which he argues implies both the authority to offer the sacrifice in the Church and the validity of the sacrifice of such men while still out of it. For if a heretic could not validly consecrate in his own sect, argues St. Jerome, it would be possible that the same person who is holy in the administration of baptism, that is to say, has the co-operation of the Holy Spirit when he is baptising, would be a sinner at the altar, that is, would lack the co-operation of the same Spirit of sanctification for the consecration. Now when Jerome says that this cannot be, he therefore affirms that the Arian who validly baptises also consecrates validly, of course on the supposition of his valid ordination as a priest.

All things considered, therefore, it is safer to understand the "simulation" to which Jerome refers above in the same way as we interpreted the words of Cyprian, that the sacrifice offered by a heretic is false in the sense that such a sacrifice not only has no fruit either to the offering minister or to the one who asks that the sacrifice be offered, or to the assisting congregation, but rather avails to their ruin (as will be explained at greater length in the third paragraph of this chapter). Similarly, when he excludes from the sacrifice of heretics true immolation and true eating, he

merely wishes to exclude immolation fruitful of propitiation, and eating fruitful of sanctification for those who receive.¹

4. ST. AUGUSTINE (+ 430)

Certainly this is the teaching of St. Augustine. Commenting on *Psalm CXV*, 17–19: *I will sacrifice to thee a sacrifice of praise, and I will call upon the name of the Lord. I will pay my vows to the Lord in the sight of all his people, in the courts of the house of the Lord, in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem*, he has the following words: “One who remembers not only that he is a slave of God, but also that he is the child of the handmaid of God, clearly sees WHERE HE PAYS HIS VOWS, conformed to Christ by the chalice of salvation: *In the courts of the house of the Lord*, he says. The handmaid of God is here the same as the house of God, and what is the house of God but all His people? Hence the words that follow: *in the sight of all his people*. And now He clearly gives the name of His mother. For who are His people but those who are *in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem*? FOR THEN IS THAT WHICH IS RENDERED TO GOD PLEASING WHEN IT IS OFFERED FROM PEACE AND IN PEACE. They who are not the children of this handmaid have loved war rather than peace” (*Enarr. in Psalm, CXV*, n. 9. P. L. 36, 1494). Although here Augustine has in mind not so much the visible sacrifice as the invisible sacrifice, in which we dedicate ourselves to God even unto martyrdom (cf. n. 5, col. 1493), still his language is so comprehensive that it does not exclude reference to the visible sacrament of the invisible sacrifice,

¹ Discussing such sayings of the Fathers generally, Alger, with his customary clarity, gives the following explanation: “It should be noted that the sacraments are said to be void, or even to be condemned, OR NOT TO BE TRUE, not in themselves, for even when celebrated by heretics THEY ARE TRUE AND HOLY; but, because they bring down judgment upon the perfidious ones who give them unlawfully and because they do not confer the Holy Spirit on those who receive them from such, for this reason we call them void and not true: that is, BECAUSE THEY DO NOT EFFECT WHAT THEY PROMISE AND SHOULD EFFECT. Hence therefore they are to be condemned, so that the giving of them by, or the reception of them from, heretics is not only not approved of, but positively forbidden. In themselves they are not defiled, though they are said to be defiled by heretics” (*De misericordia et justitia*, pars. 3, c. 54. P. L. 180, 956). This explanation of Alger is the same as that which we have already given: although in their sacraments they have that which is the *sign only*, the external symbols, as well as that which is the *sign and the reality*, the symbol and the thing symbolised (the Body and Blood of Christ), the holy thing, nevertheless they have not that which is further symbolised and promised by this second element, that is, the *reality only*, union with Christ, the all holy, in the Church.

which is our sacrifice of the Eucharist. Therefore unless this sacrifice is offered in the peace of the Catholic Church, it is not pleasing to God.

One must not, however, infer from the fact that Augustine says these sacrifices are not acceptable that he considers them invalid, for he constantly insists on their validity.¹ For in the *first place* he asserts in the most general terms that the Donatists have all the sacraments which they now give in the way in which they were given by them before they seceded: "FOR ALL THE SACRAMENTS OF THE LORD ARE FROM THE CATHOLIC CHURCH; you have them and give them, just as you had them and gave them before you abandoned her. The fact that you are not in the Church from whom you have the sacraments does not mean that you have not the sacraments. YOU ARE WITH US in baptism, in the symbol, IN THE OTHER SACRAMENTS OF THE LORD" (*Ep.* 93, n. 46. P. L. 33, 343). "They do not cease to be the sacraments of Christ and the Church because the heretics and even all the impious and iniquitous use them unlawfully. These men are to be corrected or punished, their sacraments are to be acknowledged and venerated" (*Contra Donatistas*, 1, 3, c. 10, n. 13. P. L. 43, 144).

The reason for this is that the sacraments of Christ cannot be defiled by men, either within or without the Church (*ibid.*, 1, 4, c. 12, n. 18. P. L. 43, 166).

"Neither inside nor outside the Church can one who is on the side of the devil pollute, either in himself or in another, the sacrament which is Christ's." Indeed "God is present in the sacraments and in His words, no matter who administers them, and the sacraments of God are everywhere good" (*ibid.*, 1, 5, c. 20, n. 27, col. 190).

Secondly, of the Schismatics in particular he says that they have the sacrament of the Body of Christ, but they have not the thing signified by that sacrament of the Body of Christ, which is ecclesiastical unity (*Ep.* 185, n. 50. P. L. 33, 815). "Let them not seek the Holy Spirit except in the body of Christ [*meaning the Church*], outside of which they have the sacrament [*meaning the*

¹ The passages we give here from St. Augustine were collected together as early as the ninth century by the priest Bernoldus in his *Tractatus de sacramentis Excommunicatorum*. P. L. 148, 1061 *et seq.*, and again in the *Tractatus de reordinatione vitanda*, etc. P. L. 148, 1260.

Eucharist], while they do not hold the reality within [*meaning* ecclesiastical unity and peace], of which it is the sacrament; and therefore they eat and drink judgment to themselves”, that is to say, not discerning the real Body of the Lord; for while they receive this Body contained in the Eucharist, they do not adhere to the ecclesiastical body of Christ, of which the Eucharist is the sign.

Thirdly, he says explicitly that in dissension and schism they offer the sacrifice (*Ep.* 43, c. 8, n. 21. P. L. 33, 170): “They baptise outside the Church . . . they sacrifice in dissension and schism.”

There is nothing strange in this: for if the legal sacrifice celebrated by the fornicating (unfaithful) Jews was valid, because it was not their institution but God’s, for a far higher reason, therefore, the sacrifice of the New Testament instituted to replace that legal sacrifice will be valid when celebrated by heretics and schismatics: “The fornication of the people of that time, which in His indignation the Lord condemned, did not have the effect of making those sacraments theirs which were not their sacraments but the sacraments of God, who, speaking to the fornicating people, says that all these sacraments are His. And so even the Lord Himself sent those whom He had cleansed from leprosy to the same sacraments to have the sacrifice offered for themselves by the priests (for the time of His own sacrifice had not come yet, that sacrifice which was to replace all the others, because in all these others He was Himself foretold). How much more must we, finding the sacraments of the New Testament among heretics and schismatics, not attribute these sacraments to them, nor reprobate those sacraments, as though we did not recognise them; rather we must recognise the gifts of the legitimate husband, though they are in the hands of the fornicating wife” (*Contra Donatistas*, 1, 3, c. 19, n. 27. P. L. 43, 154).

Fourthly, he holds that all the sacrifices of the schismatics and the heretics, though valid, profit them nothing: “When the heretics and schismatics return to us, we do not change, but rather we approve of those things they have and do in the same way as the true Church. For they are not separated from us in those things in which they agree with us. Nevertheless because THESE THINGS DO NOT BENEFIT THEM AS LONG AS THEY ARE IN HERESY OR SCHISM, because of other things in which they dissent from the

truth, and because of the monstrous crime of schism . . . we exhort them to return to the right way of peace and charity, not only that they may enter into the possession of something they did not have, but also that what they did possess may begin to be of benefit to them" (*ibid.* 1, 1, c. 13, n. 21. P. L. 43, 121).

Indeed, these things can only harm them in their separated state: "We must take away from them the error which they wrongfully imbibed, not the sacraments which they received, also wrongfully. These THEY HAVE AND KEEP TO THEIR OWN PUNISHMENT, in so far as they possess them unworthily, though they nevertheless do possess them" (*Ep.* 89, n. 7. P. L. 33, 312).

5. ST. PROSPER († 455)

Though professing to set before us the mind of St. Augustine in this matter, St. Prosper uses expressions which go considerably beyond those of his master. In his *Liber Sententiarum ex operibus S. Augustini delibatarum*, c. 15. (P. L. 51, 430), he says: "You must consider where you offer, because WITHOUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH THERE IS NO PLACE OF TRUE SACRIFICE."¹ As we see it, Augustine merely stated that the sacrifices offered by heretics were not acceptable. Prosper goes a long way further when he says, as though from St. Augustine, that they are lacking in truth, if by truth he means validity. But even if by *true* Prosper means valid, this expression of Prosper, not of Augustine, contains nothing contrary to faith, as we shall see, in the sense that the sacrifice of no man outside the Church is valid, unless it is offered within the Catholic Church, from some point of view.

6. ST. LEO THE GREAT († 461)

The words of Leo the Great present no difficulty where he forbids Anatolius of Constantinople to receive any bishops from the Eutychian heresy into communion with the Catholic Church: "unless they first condemn by a fitting anathema the doctrines which have been accepted by them against the Catholic faith. For otherwise in the Church of God, which is the body of Christ,

¹Cf. also Prosper's *Enarr. in Psalm*, CXV, n. 18, col. 332, which is a compendium of the parallel passage from St. Augustine cited above. The *Sententia delibata* given above seems to be a still more compressed compendium of it.

NEITHER ARE PRIESTHOODS RATIFIED, NOR ARE SACRIFICES TRUE, unless the true Pontiff, possessing all the properties of our human nature, reconciles us [with God], and the true Blood of the Immaculate Lamb cleanses us. Though He is seated at the right hand of the Father, it is nevertheless in the same flesh that He took from the Virgin that He enacts the sacrament of propitiation" (*Ep.* 80, c. 2. P. L. 54, 914). St. Leo shows the folly of professing to offer the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Church, which is the body of Christ, while at the same time not confessing the true humanity of Christ, without which there is no Body of Christ (neither a proper Body, nor a mystic body, for the mystic body is the increment of the other), and in turn there is no sacrifice of the Body of Christ, no priesthood of the Church, no propitiation. All of this is very true and very evident.

Some may find greater cause for doubt in the words of the same Pope Leo to Leo Augustus, when the Church of Alexandria had fallen into the hands of Timotheus Aelurus and his Monophysite followers, after the murder of St. Proterius: "For it is manifest that through most cruel and insane violence all the light of the heavenly sacraments has been extinguished there: THE OFFERING OF THE SACRIFICE IS CHECKED, the sanctification of chrism has failed, AND ALL THE MYSTERIES HAVE WITHDRAWN BEFORE THE PARRICIDAL HANDS OF THE IMPIOUS" (*Ep.* 156. P. L. 54, 1131). In these words, however, Leo has in mind only one thing: that the Emperor should make provision as soon as possible for the Alexandrine Church. Owing to the contamination of the intruded bishop and clergy of Alexandria, the faithful have now no longer the grace ('*lumen*'—light) nor benefit of the sacraments, and no propitiation of the sacrifice. This is certainly true, whatever view one might hold as to the validity of the rites attempted by the heretics.¹

¹ Indeed St. Anselm of Lucca in the eleventh century, writing to Guibert the antipope, used this Epistle of Leo as a defence against the recriminations of the schismatics who complained that the Catholics treated their sacraments with disrespect: "We detest not the sacraments of the Church, as you falsely allege, but the schismatics and sacrilegious persons, before whose parricidal hands the divine sacraments have withdrawn; and with our mother the Catholic Church I will pursue her enemies and not turn back until they submit. The Church venerates her holy sacrament (*sanctum*), which you who are outside her possess, and which you have received to your own damnation, for you have lost the good odour, but she will pursue you, as Sara did the bondwoman, although she conceived and bore fruit of the seed of Abraham" (*Contra Guibertum antipapam*. P. L. 149, 450).

The words of Anselm here are a composite of those of Leo and Augustine.

7. FAUSTUS OF RIEZ (+ 485)

I think we can interpret in a similar fashion the words found in the fifth of the sermons attributed to Faustus of Riez (c. 2. P. L. 58, 878). "This is that lamb which the law commands us to eat in the one house with our loins girt. But what is the meaning of saying to eat the head with the feet in the one house? It means that we are commanded to eat the flesh in the unity of the Church. Hence the Arians and various other perverse sects of heretics do not eat it in the one house; and it is FOR THIS REASON THAT, JUST AS in the deluge, those only who were within the ark of Noah WERE SAVED, SO THOSE OF DIFFERENT FAITH, IF WITHOUT THE HOUSE OF THE CHURCH, HAVE NOT THE LAMB, WHICH IS CHRIST. And when Holy Scripture bids us to eat the head and the feet of this Lamb, it bids us with a like profession to venerate in Him both God and Man." So, Faustus says the Arians and others have not the Lamb fulfilling His function of Lamb, that is, His function of saving them.

8. ST. FULGENTIUS (+ about 460)

St. Fulgentius of Ruspe certainly uses harsher words than Faustus, in this connection. Answering the question why in our sacrifice we pray for the descent of the Holy Spirit; he says that it is because by the Holy Spirit the Church is bound together in one with Christ, as the body with the head, and so we are built up into the holy temple of God in Christ; hence he argues: "All those who segregate themselves from the unity of the body of the Church, being inflated with pride or depraved by perfidy, lose this Spirit by their departure from us. It is clear, therefore, that the grace of the Holy Spirit is not with any of the heretics, and that their sacrifices, AS LONG AS THEY ARE HERETICS, cannot be pleasing to God, NOR CAN THE SANCTIFICATION OF SPIRITUAL GRACE BE ATTRIBUTED TO THE SACRIFICES OF THOSE who offer while separated from the unity of the ecclesiastical body; for God takes pleasure in the sacrifices of the Church only, which sacrifices are made by the one body united by the Spirit (*quae sacrificia facit unitas spiritualis*)" (*Ad Monimum*, 1, 2, c. 11. P. L. 65, 191). But, from the very reasons advanced by Fulgentius for

his conclusion, his teaching is quite clear, that what alone is lacking to the schismatics and heretics is the spirit of sanctification by which the sacrifice is sanctified, in order to signify sincerely and induce effectively the above-mentioned final *reality* signified by the Eucharist, namely, the building up of the ecclesiastical body and of the celestial temple.

9. PELAGIUS I (+ 559)

Certainly the words of Pope Pelagius I are not a little surprising, where in the *Epistola ad Victorem et Pancratium* he goes so far as to write: "It is not the Body of Christ that the schismatic consecrates (*conficit*)."¹ However, a glance at the proximate and remote context and comparison with a parallel epistle of his to John the Patrician will show that even Pelagius teaches nothing which impugns the validity of the Eucharistic consecration carried out by schismatics. The passage runs: "You must keep away from the sacrifices, rather the sacrileges of the schismatics. . . . For so it comes about that, because they are not one with the Church in unity, because they have chosen to stand apart, because they have not the Spirit, THEY CANNOT HAVE THE SACRIFICE OF THE BODY OF CHRIST. . . ." ² Either believe them to be the Church, and then,

¹ *Translator's note:*

Conficit is the usual word for "making" or "production" of a sacrament, through the union of its matter and form at the hands of the minister. But, though we would like a word-for-word and completely literal translation of the word in this early document, both "make" and "produce" are harsh here unless one takes "*corpus Domini*" as equivalent to the whole sacrament of the Eucharist, including *signum tantum*, *res et signum*, and *res tantum*. Though de la Taille does interpret the mind of Pelagius, as excluding the *res tantum* from the Eucharist of the schismatic, and so one might, we think, take "*corpus Domini*" here as a synonym for the whole sacrament, a common use, still "make the Body of Christ" is excessively harsh, insinuating at first sight at least the making anew of the Body, and the same is true of "produce", as de la Taille takes pains to show in L (Vol. III) against the productionists. English writers, we have found, rather fight shy of translating "*conficere*" in relation to the "Body of the Lord" directly by one word, or fall back on "consecrate" as a translation, especially seeing that "*consecrat*" and "*conficit*" are used indifferently, at any rate after St. Thomas, for *conficit*. The objection to "consecrates" here is that "*conficit*" and "*consecrat*" immediately suggest different concepts. However, the priest effects the sacrament of the Eucharist by the consecration, *per medium* of the transubstantiation, and therefore consecration and effecting the sacrament really coincide. Another objection to "consecrates" here is that we are discussing the validity of the consecration, and translate as though Pelagius here wrote "*consecrat*". However, *conficit* implies "*consecrat*" here. We will translate the word elsewhere by various suitable words, giving the Latin word in brackets.

² Another reading is "they cannot have the Body of Christ as a sacrifice (*corpus Christi sacrificium habere non possint*)".

since there cannot be two Churches, you will judge us (God forbid) to be schismatics; or if it is plain to you that the true Church is in the apostolic Sees, then recognise that they are cut off from unity, and there can be no question of communion with them, for plainly such communion can only be in the unity of the Church. Do not then, as if there were no difference between the schismatics and the Church, wish to associate yourself indifferently with the sacrifices of either. FOR IF WE ARE GUIDED BY THE LIGHT OF TRUTH, IT IS NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST THAT THE SCHISMATIC CONSECRATES. For no one may pretend that Christ is divided and escape the condemnation of the Apostle. Because it is plain, as we have often said, that the Church which is the body of Christ is one and cannot be separated into two or into many. As soon as anyone has seceded from her, he has ceased to be of the Church. Jerusalem is one temple; he who separates himself from her must of necessity immolate to idols" (P. L. 69, 412-413). Just as Pelagius throughout the whole epistle looks upon Christ and the Church as one, so, too, he looks on the proper Body of Christ contained in the Eucharist, and the ecclesiastical Body of Christ, not only signified by, but also to be built up by the Eucharist, as one. This being presupposed, when he says that it is not the Body of Christ the schismatic consecrates, he is careful to add, "if we are guided by the light of truth", that is, the truth, as his further words explain, in the light of which we rightly estimate the Body of Christ as itself the sacrament or sign of our incorporation with Christ in the Church. Hence, when schismatics celebrate or receive, they make false pretensions to this signification and this efficacy; hence they have not the Body of Christ in the way Pelagius has in mind as the sacrament of ecclesiastical unity; so neither have they the sacrifice of the body of Christ in the true sense according to which the faithful know that, in offering Christ, they immolate themselves as members of the body.¹ The above-

¹ The great Alger (*De sacramento corporis et sanguinis dominici*, 1, 3, c. 12. P. L. 180, 487), whom we cannot sufficiently admire, long ago explained this finely: "When it is said that it is not the Body of Christ that the schismatic consecrates (*conficit*) because among the schismatics the Eucharist cannot be made (*confici*), it must not be taken to mean that the schismatic does not consecrate (*conficit*) the true Body of Christ essentially in the sacrament; the sense is: that since on the altar THE CHURCH IS CONCORPOREAL AND CONSACRAMENTAL WITH CHRIST IN BODY AND SACRAMENT, the schismatic does not consecrate (*conficit*) the universal body of Christ, that is, the Head with the members, because, as he is outside the Church,

mentioned epistle *ad Joannem patricium* corroborates this interpretation: "Do not defile your ever catholic mind by any communion with the schismatics. It is manifest that the Body of Christ is one, and the Church is one. The altar separated from unity CANNOT CONGREGATE INTO ONE FLOCK (*congregare*) THE TRUE REALITY OF THE BODY OF CHRIST" (P. L. 69, 412). Here, then, we see how Pelagius finds the true reality of the Body of Christ in that element which can be "gathered together", compacted of the multitude of Church members, united to the Body of the Lord, as the thing signified is united to its sign, and as the living animal is united to its internal vital principle. Schismatics have no part in this living animated body, and therefore precisely do they lack the vital principle, the Body of Christ, which is wanting to them as far as its sacramental virtue goes, that virtue which of its very nature congregates and unites, whereas they have chosen division.¹ So that even admitting that the schismatics

he does not unite himself with Christ and the Church in the sacrament of both. For since the sacrifice of the altar by signifying the oneness of Christ Himself and the Church is the sacrament of the universal body, Christ is not consecrated (*conficitur*) there where He is not consecrated as universal." Alger then quotes from St. Augustine the two passages which we shall submit directly.

¹ Saltet (*op. cit.*, p. 82) writes in reference to Pelagius: "The word *congregare* is perfectly chosen and best expresses the mind of St. Augustine. It is quite otherwise with the word *conficere*. In the first place, we do not find this last in Augustine; it expresses the Eucharistic teaching of St. Ambrose." This contrast between Ambrose and Augustine, if we mean contrast precisely in their doctrine, has been stressed over-much by Protestants, as, for example, Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 4, bd. 3, p. 158, to say nothing of Catholics. As far as the actual doctrine goes, we find no true ground for contrasting one with the other; all that we can say is not, as some say, that the teaching of Ambrose is more realistic than that of Augustine, but that the doctrine of Augustine elucidates more points than does that of Ambrose. In the writings of St. Augustine both the elements of the sacrament are clearly exhibited—the individual proper Body of Christ which hung on the Cross (XIX and XX above), and the Body of Christ integrated into a further whole by the addition of the adopted members, which are ourselves. This second element is not so clearly indicated by Ambrose.

Even if the contrast is restricted to terminology, this must not be pressed too far.

For, *first*, just as you will never find the exact words *conficere corpus Christi* in Ambrose, so neither will you find *congregare corpus Christi* in Augustine.

But, *second*, we find in both Ambrose and Augustine expressions with practically the same sense as "*conficere corpus Christi*." Thus in St. Ambrose (*De Mysteriis*, c. 9, n. 53. P. L. 16, 407): "That which we by our action make present (*conficimus*) is the Body from the Virgin." Here we have two statements: (1) we make present something; and (2) this thing is the very Body of Christ. Whence, though not expressly stated, it surely follows: that the Body of Christ is consecrated.

In St. Augustine we read that something is consecrated (*confici*), and that what is consecrated by us is the Body of Christ: for the sacrament or the Eucharist is made (*conficitur*) and the sacrament or the Eucharist is stated to be the very Body of Christ. Note the following two parallel passages from Augustine: "He suffered the traitor with such great patience that He gave to him, just as He gave to the other Apostles,

THE FIRST EUCHARIST MADE (*confectam*) IN HIS OWN HANDS AND ENTRUSTED TO THEM with His own lips" (*Enarr. in Psalm*, 10, n. 6, P. L. 36, 135). "Surely those do not abide in Christ of whom the Apostle says: they eat and drink judgment to themselves WHEN THEY EAT THE VERY FLESH AND DRINK THE VERY BLOOD? Surely the impious Judas who sold and betrayed his Master did not abide in Christ and Christ in him, even though with the other Apostles HE ATE AND DRANK THAT FIRST SACRAMENT of His Flesh and Blood made (*confectum*) IN HIS HANDS, as the Evangelist St. Luke openly states?" (*Sermo* 71, c. 11, n. 17. P. L. 38, 453). Note that here we have (1) explicit mention of an eating by Judas of the very Flesh, and a drinking of the very Blood which is in no way to be confounded with spiritual incorporation with Christ which is excluded here; and (2) the Flesh eaten by the unworthy and the Blood drunk by them is identified in the process of the argument with the sacrament (or the Eucharist) made in the hands of Christ, and given to Judas to be eaten and drunk. In this way we are reminded implicitly that what is partaken of is the Body of Christ. St. Augustine, moreover, in the third of the sermons *ad infantes*, published by Michael Denis, states more openly and more explicitly that this Eucharist is Christ Himself: "You did not know that the Eucharist is the Son" (*Sermo* 3, n. 3. P. L. 46, 828). And Augustine is even more explicit when he says that the bread is MADE, or becomes, the Body of Christ: "When the word is pronounced that bread is made (*fit*) the Body and Blood of Christ" (*Sermo Denisian.*, 6, n. 1, col. 835). Cf. *Sermo* 234, 2. P. L. 38, 1116: "The bread . . . receiving the blessing of Christ becomes (*fit*) the Body of Christ." Indeed, we find words even more immediately suggesting the expression *conficere corpus Christi* where he says absolutely that the very Body and the very Blood is made: "Then comes what is done in the (Canon) prayers, which you are to hear, that when the word is added THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IS MADE (*fiat corpus et sanguis Christi*)" (*ibid.*, n. 3, col. 836). I would not advance in this sense book 3 *De Trinitate*, c. 10. n. 21. P. L. 42, 881, where we find the words: "whence or how it is made (*conficiatur*)." For I think the context shows that these words should be interpreted as referring to the making of the visible element from wheat and not to the making of the Body of Christ from the bread (to the contrary see Portalié, D. T. C., art. *Augustin*, col. 2421).

Third, in the writings of contemporaries of both Augustine and Ambrose we find the words *conficere corpus Christi* not exactly found in either Augustine or Ambrose.

A contemporary of St. Augustine, the African author of *Liber de promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei* (1, 39, 56. P. L. 51, 765), probably St. Quodvultdeus (cf. Schepens, *Un traité à restituer à S. Quodvultdeus*, R. S. C., May-Sept. 1919, p. 234), did undoubtedly speak of "the Flesh of Christ consecrated (*confectam*) in the Passion" (the meaning here is not disfigured or destroyed—*conficio* also can have this sense—but constituted in the sacrament). How closely this author follows Augustine in his Eucharistic terminology is shown by many examples, for instance if we compare Augustine's *Enarr. in Psalm* 33, *Sermo* 1, n. 10, and *Sermo* 2, n. 2. P. L. 36, 306 and 308, and another passage from the same work of our African author, 2, 25, 54. P. L. 51, 798: "The Lord Jesus Christ was carried in His own hands; when holding in His hands His own Body in the sanctified bread, He said: *This is my body*."

But we should note especially that St. Jerome, fourteen years before Ambrose, had written to Heliodorus of priests "WHO CONSECRATE (*conficiunt*) THE BODY OF CHRIST WITH SANCTIFIED LIPS" (*Ep.* 14, n. 8. P. L. 22, 352; cf. *Ep.* 146, 1, col. 1193: ". . . at whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ is consecrated [*conficitur*]). Hence it is much to be desired that men of learning should cease to speak of an "Ambrosian" style, where the style in question is not Ambrosian but Catholic. We could add a Greek example bearing on this point, taken from a fragment of a sermon attributed with a certain amount of probability to St. Anthanasius, *Ad baptizandos* (P. G. 26, 1325).

Fourthly, perhaps even the so-called "Augustinian" as contrasted with the "Ambrosian" style, is already found in Ambrose, where he writes: "Giving to that spittle (which is the human race) the substance of that good Body (Christ) deigned to congregate all the nations into the one body of the Church" (*Enarr. in Psalm*, 1, n. 50. P. L. 14, 948). In this passage the substance of a good body given as a gift to the human race may be fittingly interpreted of the Eucharist congregating the human race into the one body of the Church. Although I admit (1) the passage is

have the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, even so, according to Pelagius, they will not have the Body of Christ fulfilling its office as the sacrament or sign of Church unity.

This is the meaning of St. Augustine's words in the sixth of the sermons edited by Michael Denis (n. 2. P. L. 46, 835): "When heretics receive this, they receive a witness against themselves, for they seek separation, whilst this bread indicates unity." And the words of *Sermo 272*, of those published by the Benedictines, has the same sense: "He who receives the mystery of unity and does not keep the bond of peace does not receive the mystery to his advantage, but receives a witness against himself."

However, this is not merely the teaching of St. Augustine or Cyprian, but it is the well-known teaching of Hilary and Chrysostom (Th. XXXVII, Vol. III), of Ignatius (XVIII) and St. Paul (*I Cor.*, X, 17).¹

10. ST. GREGORY THE GREAT (+ 604)

St. Gregory the Great not only says that no sacrifice whatever is acceptable unless it is offered within the Church, "for it is through the Church *alone* that the Lord is willing to accept sacrifice"; but he goes even further and says that no sacrifice can be carried out outside the Catholic Church: "In the Catholic

disputed; and (2) even as it stands it admits of another and better interpretation that when it is said the substance of a good body is given to the spittle, the sense is: that Christ gave substance and existence after the manner of a body to that spittle or dust (that is, dust mingled with spittle), by congregating all the nations in the one body of the Church. But even if this interpretation were chosen, it could not be said to have no allusion to the Eucharist.

¹ So much may be said regarding the SACRAMENTAL RELATION OF THE BODY OF THE LORD TO THE BODY OF THE CHURCH, whatever is to be thought of the symbolism which the African Fathers, and other writers before or after them, saw in the reduction to one whole of the many grains of wheat and the many grape berries. With this latter we shall deal in the third book. Meantime it is clear why we cannot agree with Saltet when he writes: "THIS PREOCCUPATION WITH THE MYSTIC BODY OF CHRIST IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST, and with the symbolism of the bread and wine, was suggested to St. Augustine by St. Cyprian and the African tradition. Such a preoccupation suited well the theology of St. Cyprian, according to which *Outside the Church there are no sacraments*, though it is slightly out of place in the sacramental theology of Augustine for whom the sacraments can exist without the Church. At this point St. Augustine draws on past theologians" (*op. cit.*, p. 83). It is certainly true that St. Augustine knows and we also know that sacraments can exist outside the Church, but not where there is no connection whatever with the Church. Nor does the Eucharist of heretics lack all sacramental symbolism in respect of sacramental unity. But that sacramental symbolism (I am not speaking of the symbolism of the grains and berries, but that between Christ and the Church) is part of Catholic dogma, as will be seen later in, XXXVII (Vol. III),

Church alone the true Victim of the Redeemer is immolated” (*Moral.*, 35, 8. P. L. 76, 756). But here, as we said above, in reference to Prosper, Gregory, if properly understood, is simply speaking the truth. His words do not justify the conclusion that heretics cannot offer the sacrifice, but that they cannot do so without in some way acting within the Church; so much so that if they wish to act absolutely and entirely outside the Church they effect nothing.

11. ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA (+ 447)

After what we have said about the Latin Fathers, the following passage of Cyril of Alexandria needs no explanation: “The Law, by decreeing that outside the holy tabernacle sacrifice must not be performed, shows plainly that there is one Church and one ministry of Christ, and that the sacrifice is not legitimate, indeed IT IS REJECTED AND IN NO WAY PLEASING TO GOD, IF IT IS NOT MADE WITHIN THE CHURCH” (*De adoratione in spiritu et veritate*, 1, 13. P. G. 68, 880). Here we have simply the same teaching as above: that if the sacrifice is altogether separated from all connection with the Church, it is by that very fact invalid.

12. ST. THEODORE OF STUDIUM (+ 826)

The words of St. Theodore of Studium on the Eucharist of the Iconoclasts calls for a special interpretation. He says (1) that the Eucharistic bread of heretics is heretical; (2) that it is not the Body of Christ. For, permitting the sacrifice to be offered on behalf of those who before death rejected heresy, he deprives those who died in heresy of all such suffrage: “Should a person who in the past through fear of men had communicated with heresy confess the true faith (*substitit confitens*) at the time of death, and thus become part of the orthodox communion and die, it is fitting that he should have a place among the commemorations of the orthodox. . . . But if nothing of this has been done, and the one who communicated with heresy was not before his death a partaker of the Body and Blood of the Lord (FOR THEIR BREAD IS HERETICAL, IT IS NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST—*αἱρετικὸς γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος ἐκεῖνος, καὶ οὐ σῶμα Χριστοῦ*), we dare not say that the sacrifice

should be offered for him. He who even in his last hour did not communicate with orthodoxy will not be given a place with the orthodox. For, where he was overtaken by death, there will he be judged, and such viaticum as he partook of unto eternal life, that will be apportioned to him" (*Epistolarum*, 1, 2, 197. P. G. 99, 1596–1597). When he says that the bread is heretical he means that it is such that the eating of it is a communication with heresy.¹ When he says that it is not the Body of Christ, he says THAT IT IS NOT RECEIVED AS THE VICTIM OF THE SAVING SACRIFICE UNTO ETERNAL LIFE. Indeed, for those who communicate with heresy it is food of death; and just such as the food is, such, too, will be the condition and the eternal lot of the partakers.

This is strengthened by another epistle written to a person forced by violence to the communion of heretics: "What a calamity! What shall we say of this abduction of the unwilling! What of this forced partaking of communion under a threat of bodily harm by one who is unwilling to partake of HETERODOX BREAD? The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ IS A VOLUNTARY SACRIFICE (O most Christian thought!). Seeing therefore that it is a voluntary sacrifice, it is given voluntarily to the willing, not to the unwilling. . . . For in his Epistle Peter says: *feed the flock, not by constraint but willingly*. Hence those who violently force the unwilling to their communion must know that in doing so they act like the Gentiles, NOT OFFERING THEM THE BODY OF THE LORD WHICH IS FREELY OFFERED, but, on the contrary, what has the appearance (because it has the appearance of what is forced) of what is sacrificed in libations in which honour is RELUCTANTLY (*κατ' ἀντῶν*) given to the devil" (*Ep.* I, 12, 136. P. G. 99, 1436).

This passage shows clearly enough in what sense the heterodox bread is not the Body of Christ; in as much as, contrary to the very nature of sacrifice, the voluntary characteristic is removed, in the *first place*, from the immolation, when it is made by heretics (honouring not God but the devil in the sacrifice); and, *secondly*, from the participation, when it is given to the faithful under pressure to their destruction, by the heretics.

¹ For an earlier example of similar teaching see XXXVII (Vol. III), in St. John Damascene, *De fide orth.*, 4, 14. P. G. 94, 1153.

13. FLORUS OF LYONS (+ 860)

About the same time, in the West, Florus of Lyons in his work *De expositione missae* (c. 53–54. P. L. 119, 49) comments on the words of the Mass: *who offer to thee this sacrifice of praise, and pay their vows to thee, the living and true God*. Quoting the saying of Prosper, already cited by us: “Outside the Catholic Church there is no place of true sacrifice,” he concludes from his words nothing more than what follows: “In complete accordance are the next words we find in the mystery: *Communicating and venerating the memory of in the first place, etc. . . . down to and of all the saints*. For who are those specified by the priest as communicating and venerating the memory of the blessed Mother of God, the Apostles, martyrs and all the saints? Who but the offering priest himself and the whole congregation who together with him offer the one sacrifice of praise? AND THAT IT MAY BE ACCEPTABLE AND WELL-PLEASING TO GOD, THE PRIESTS, AND WITH THE PRIESTS THE CHURCH, OFFER THIS SACRIFICE, NOT ELSEWHERE THAN IN THE COMMUNION AND IN THE SOCIETY OF THE SAINTS, whom the same Omnipotent God wished to be the foundation of His Church” (*Eph.*, II, 19).¹

14. ST. PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS (+ 865)

St. Paschasius Radbertus has left us no clearcut answer on this matter. In the *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini*, c. 12. (P. L. 120, 1310–1315), though he says that consecration even by criminal priests is unquestionably valid “even though they are full of hatred, are adulterers, homicides, and have done much

¹ Agobardus, Bishop of Lyons, only gives us a few slight indications of his own view. He does, however, say very decidedly that the sacrifices of unworthy priests are profitable to the faithful (*De privilegio et jure sacerdotii*, c. 3 and 15. P. L. 104, cols. 128, 132–134, 142), though perhaps he makes an exception in the case of heresy and schism, when he writes: “You will never find that sacrifices for others are rejected, even if he who has offered is unworthy, if only he offers in the household and in the faith [namely, not a heretic], or if he offers in the household [therefore not a schismatic] in which the Lamb is to be eaten. Rather should we weigh the hearts of those who offer through priests, of whatever kind those priests may be, as can be proved in many ways” (c. 3, col. 104). These last words convey that only those who knowingly entrust the offering of their sacrifices to heretics or schismatics are deprived of the fruit. This is undoubtedly true. Possibly the same explanation may apply to the words of Florus above.

work of the devil”,¹ nevertheless, he had already said, making a certain restriction, as it were: “We must truly believe without shadow of doubt THAT WITHIN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH where this mystery is celebrated IN THE CATHOLIC FAITH nothing greater is received from the good priest, and nothing less from the bad priest, nothing other than the Flesh and Blood of Christ, WHEN IT IS CONSECRATED IN THE CATHOLIC MANNER” (col. 1310). And later on he adds: “Nothing greater or nothing less comes from any minister, even though he be still in the darkness of error, provided the sacrament is given in virtue of his office, and grace is given FROM THE PARTICIPATION AND THE UNITY OF THE DOVE, in whom the fountain of life flows, and with whom resides the remission of sins, whose Priest and Pontiff, Christ, makes eternal expiation, and daily offers Himself for us in the sight of the divine majesty” (col. 1315).

In my mind this restriction of Paschasius is limited to the fruit only. There can be no hope of fruit from the partaking of the Eucharist celebrated and administered by heretics and schismatics.

So far we have met passages from the Fathers and theologians, which, though difficult, can bear a lenient interpretation, of greater or less probability. Now, however, we must consider certain passages from the writers of the Middle Ages which do not seem susceptible of a lenient interpretation of any kind whatever.

15. GUIDO OF AREZZO (+ 1050)

The monk Guido of Arezzo said in the clearest terms that the Body of Christ cannot be consecrated (*confici*) by simoniacs whose ordination was considered to be invalid, and not even by

¹“Of such priests, though they are full of hatred, are adulterers, homicides, and have done much work of the devil, PROVIDED THAT WHEN THEY OFFER THE SACRIFICE THEY ARE NOT CUT OFF YET BY THE EVANGELICAL SCYTHE, we are not to think who and of what kind they are, but what they give, or what he receives who with faith communicates, and not to think who it is that has the power to consecrate but rather of what he has in his hands (*quid habeat*)” (col. 1313). The question is not completely solved by what is stated in parenthesis “provided that when they offer sacrifice . . .” etc.; for even now we today, who maintain the validity of such sacrifices, can and must apply such restriction, when it comes to the practical question of what we are to do about the sacrifice of the priest who is cut off. For we, too, must pause and consider, whether it is a lawful act for us to partake of communion from such a sacrifice, no matter how valid it be, or whether it is not rather an act of heresy or schism,

heretical priests: "Can the accursed by his blessing change the bread into the Flesh of Christ, especially seeing that the Lord declared that He would curse whatever such a one blessed? . . . If the heretical priests cannot give exhortation, how can they change the wine into the Blood of Christ?" (see Bernoldus, *Epistola ad Adalbertum*. P. L. 48, 1159).¹

¹ It is by no means certain, however, that Guido himself wrote these words. The matter is still *sub judice*. The only writer to cite them is Bernoldus (*Ep. ad Adalbert.*, A.D. 1076. P. L. 148, 1159). It should be noted that in the passage where they are found they are given as part of an Epistle of Pope Paschal to the Church in Milan. However, some years later the same Bernoldus wrote in the *Tractatus de sacramentis excommunicatorum ad Bernhardum*, P. L. 148, 1066: "This letter of Guido the musician which you have honoured by attributing it to Pope Paschal must not be considered as the pope's", etc. We find another even more clear testimony from Bernoldus, apparently, in a note to the letters of Bernhardus, given to us by F. Thaner (M. G., *Libelli de lite*, t. 1, p. 2): "It was a certain Guido, who composed music, not Paschal who wrote this letter to the Church in Milan. This is stated by very reliable men who investigated the matter by questions put to his disciples. Yet this same Epistle is cited under the name of Pope Paschal or Paschasius, WITH THE OMISSION, HOWEVER, OF THE WORDS QUOTED FROM BERNOLDUS, not only by Cardinal Deusdedit (*Libellus contra inuasores et simoniacos*. P. L. 149, 470; cf. *Libelli de lite*, t. 2, p. 318-319) and Ivo of Chartres (*Decretum*, pars. 2, c. 84. P. L. 161, 179-181) and some few others, but by Gerhohus also not only in his *Tractatus adversus Simoniacos*, c. 27 (P. L. 194, col. 1363-1364; cf. *Libelli de lite*, t. 3, p. 729), but also in his *Commentarius in Psalm 25*, 4. P. L. 193, 1160. Moreover, the same words of Bernoldus are absent not only from all the manuscripts which Baluze had at hand (P. L. 151, 637), but also from the more numerous manuscripts which Thaner followed (*Libelli de lite*, t. 1, p. 4, col. p. 627). Meantime D. Mansi (a fact which seems to have escaped the notice of Frederic Thaner) had published this same Epistle without the fragment of Bernoldus, as he found it in one codex (which is possibly the same as the fifth mentioned by Thaner, *Libelli de lite*, t. 1, p. 4), thinking that he was the first to print it, and strangely enough knowing nothing of the work of Baluze (see P. L. 102, 1091-1904).

Bearing all this in mind, in setting out to discover who the author was, we must distinguish between two sections of this letter: *First*, the fragment of Bernoldus (= B). *Secondly*, the remainder of the Epistle, omitting a few variations or additions (= A).

In respect of the supposed authorship of Guido de Arezzo, therefore, we find four hypotheses: (1) Guido wrote neither A nor B; (2) he wrote A and B; (3) he wrote A not B; (4) he wrote B not A.

Now Mansi had no hesitation in attributing the Epistle according to his recension (= A) to Paschal I, neither had the Roman *Correctores* of the *Decretum* of Gratian (causa 1, q. 3, c. 7), remarking that this Epistle stands practically in its original condition in the manuscript codex of the pontifical decrees after the decrees of Hadrian II. In the *Libelli de lite*, t. 3. p. 729, we read: "Goetz (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, bd. 1, p. 30-59) endeavoured to prove that it should not be attributed to Arezzo but really to Pope Paschal I." (I do not know whether the reference is to both parts A and B, or one part only.) The question of authenticity must be left to experts. Meanwhile we should like to ask them one question: might not the Epistle A be Paschal's, and the fragment B be inserted by Guido, who made a few other changes also (for instance he could have substituted "*excellencia*" (Your Excellency) for "*fraternitas*" (Your Fraternity), so converting the Epistle of the Pope to the Archbishop of Cologne, into his own Epistle to the Archbishop of Milan?)

16. ST. PETER DAMIAN († 1072)

(I) In the twentieth chapter of the *Liber Gomorrhianus*, with the title *God is unwilling to accept sacrifice from the hands of the impure*, St. Peter Damian indignantly inveighs against impure priests as follows: “Almighty God disdains to accept the sacrifice at your hands. Hear Him. Hear Him, I repeat, openly rebuking you, thundering against you, rejecting your sacrifices, publicly protesting against your service.” Then after quoting numerous testimonies from the Old Testament, he finally concludes: “So finally by our long discussion we have clearly shown that the Lord Himself rejects the sacrifices of the impure and openly forbids them” (P. L. 145, 181–182). On reading these words one might easily suppose that St. Peter Damian considers the sacrifices of the impure to be utterly void.

On the contrary, nothing is more plain than that St. Peter Damian defends time after time the validity of the sacrifices even of the most unworthy priests. Resting on the authority of St. Augustine and St. Paschasius Radbertus, he says that “these sacraments (baptism and the Eucharist), whether they may be made by thieves, adulterers, or even homicides, differ in no way whatever (*nil prorsus*) from the mysteries which holy priests dedicate” (*Liber qui dicitur gratissimus*, c. 9. P. L. 145, 109; cf. c. 21, col 132 and *passim*). Here we see how little reliance we can place at times on such eloquent denunciations, for the sake of argument. In many cases they must not be pressed to the letter, but the sense must be turned so as to accord with the common norm of doctrine, taking into consideration the main intention of the author in his fight against corrupt morals and for the extirpation of vice. Still even though St. Peter Damian does not hold that the sacrifices of the unworthy are invalid, this tells us nothing about what he thought of sacrifices celebrated outside the Church.

(II) Neither can this last question be solved, in favour of the validity, by a consideration of what St. Peter Damian has to say about priests simoniacally ordained.

In the *first place*, we cannot prove that he considered as valid the sacrifice of heretics, from the fact that he holds that priests

simoniacally ordained have the authority to offer sacrifice (*ibid.*, c. 6. P. L. 145, 106). For, unlike many of his contemporaries, he does not think that the simoniacs are true and proper heretics: "For although the simoniac may become a heretic through his perverse traffic (*perverso commercio*), HE IS NEVERTHELESS IN FAITH A CATHOLIC; it would seem to be the bribery which he used to effect his end that is condemned, not any lack of faith (*ejusque damnatio magis ex ambitione descendere, quam videatur ad perfidiam pertinere*)" (*ibid.*, c. 5, col. 104). "It is one thing to sin while still in the faith (*in fide peccare*), it is another to abandon the faith" (*ibid.*, c. 22, col. 133; cf. c. 30, col. 145). The truth of the matter is that he considers the simoniacs simply to be guilty of a very heinous crime.

Secondly, no argument can be urged to prove that he considered that in itself the sacrifice of heretics was invalid, from the position taken by him after the Roman Council held under Nicholas II (A.D. 1059), in which it was decreed that IF IN THE FUTURE simoniac ordinations took place, "the consecrator and the consecrated . . . being each deposed, should be deprived each of his proper dignity" (cf. further *ibid.*, c. 39);¹ but rather it would appear that he held THAT FROM THAT TIME ONWARDS those who were simoniacally ordained could not consecrate validly: "Now not only do we hold simoniacs reprobate, but we also despise the sacraments given by them" (*De sacramentis per improbos administratis*, c. 1. P. L. 145, 524). This, I say, proves nothing to the point. For he evidently did not think that these men were validly ordained from that time onward. On this supposition all their sacraments would be necessarily void, apart altogether from the question under review.²

¹ Jaffé, *Regesta*, 2, 4431; cf. Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, t. 4, 2, p. 1192. Later under Alexander II, the same decrees were published in the Roman Council of A.D. 1063, can. 3; Jaffé, *Regesta*, 4501.

² Evidently, then, Peter Damian, and a few theologians after his time, attributed to the Church some power of INHIBITION with regard to the conferring of the order of the priesthood. In this he was wrong, for it is only in the power of the Church to prohibit ordination not to inhibit it. However, one must not be shocked beyond measure by this error, as though it would completely overturn the whole dogma of the Church on the efficacy of the sacraments in themselves *ex opere operato*. For as a matter of fact the Church has such power of inhibition in regard to the administration by priests of the sacrament of confirmation, not to speak of the diriment impediments of matrimony fixed by the Church, or the approbation required for the valid hearing of confessions, even when neither order nor jurisdiction is lacking, as happened in the case of regulars, according to the earlier, though

(III) Again the question can hardly be solved from the teaching of St. Peter Damian on ordination conferred without belief in the Holy Trinity. Such ordination he holds to be invalid (*Lib. qui dic. grat.*, c. 6, and 22–23. P. L. 145, 106, and 133–135); he therefore could not defend the validity of the sacrifices of such men whose priesthood he denied.¹ But as to whether he considers that a priest rightly ordained within the Church, who afterwards comes to be infected with heresy in respect of the Trinity, does or does not thereby become incapable of validly consecrating, St. Peter Damian leaves us in the dark. He certainly whittles down the priesthood of the Arians to such an extent as to say that their baptism “alone” (using the words of Innocent I) is

not the present, legislation of the Church. Now what are we to say of the power which seems to have been delegated *ad libitum* in the past, but not now, to certain priests (for instance, to some abbots of the Cistercian order), of conferring all the orders lower than the priesthood? You may say that it is doubtful whether the Bull *Exposcit tuae devotionis* is genuine. Quite so. But what then is to be said of the Bull of Boniface IX, *Sacrae Religionis*, published from the Vatican archives by Egerton Beck in the *English Historical Review* (Jan. 1911, p. 125 *et seq.*), and unquestionably authentic? (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 124 and 126). In this Bull it is granted to the abbot (who appears to have been not more than a priest, p. 124) “Of the Monastery of Sts. Peter and Paul and St. Osiathe, Virgin and Martyr, in Essex, of the Order of St. Augustine of the diocese of London, that the same abbot and his successors forever, abbots of the same monastery for the time being, have the power freely and lawfully to confer on all and each of the present and future canons of the same Monastery all the minor orders, as well as the Subdiaconate, DIACONATE AND PRIESTHOOD, at the times appointed by Canon Law” (Feb. 1, 1400). Will you say that Boniface IX was not a legitimate Pope, being successor to the doubtful Pope Urban VI, or at any rate that he exceeded the limits of the power divinely entrusted to him? This may be. But meantime, can there be any doubt whatever that in A.D. 1400 the common and solemn teaching of the Church, regarding the efficacy of the sacraments in themselves, or *ex opere operato*, was known to the Roman Curia (even if perhaps not to Boniface IX who was not a very learned man)? Hence both the petitioners in this Bull and its authors may well have conceived the power of the priesthood as susceptible of extension within certain limits at the will of the Church, without considering that in this way they infringed on the work of the sacrament itself, the *opus operatum*.

¹ The historical origin of this false persuasion is twofold, remote and proximate. The proximate origin was in the wrong interpretation of the Epistle of Innocent I to Alexander, Bishop of Antioch (*Ep.* 24, c. 3, n. 4. P. L. 20, 550). This letter declared that whoever were ordained by the Arians were unworthy of the priestly honour. But in the Epistle there was no question of the validity of their ordination. The remote origin was the nineteenth canon of the Council of Nice in which the baptism of the Paulinists was declared null, so much so that those converted from their sect were ordered to be rebaptised. The reason was (cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, t. 1, p. 615) that in baptising they pronounced the names of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, while their belief was that there was no Trinity, hence the public signification of the whole formula was changed, hence also the virtue or the force of the form was no longer there. Later Alger opportunely corrected this teaching of St. Peter Damian, rejecting the sacraments of the Paulinists (*De misericordia et justitia*, pars 3, c. 8. P. L. 180, 936) but considering the ordinations of the Arians valid. “The Simoniac ordains Simoniacs, just as the Arian ordains the Arians and the Donatist Donatists” (*ibid.*, c. 32, col. 946).

ratified. But whether here (the reference is to the first authors of the Arian heresy) by "alone" he would exclude all the other sacraments, or only those in which the Holy Spirit is conferred (confirmation and orders), is by no means clear. In view of the reasons he adduces from Innocent I, the second alternative appears to be the more probable: "For seeing that the authors of their sect have abandoned the Catholic faith, they have lost the perfection of the Spirit which they had received, and cannot give its plenitude which is operative particularly in ordinations" (c. 22, col. 134). Hence it is in no way certain that St. Peter Damian denied the validity of the sacrifices even of the authors of the Arian heresy.

(IV) All we can state definitely is this: that St. Peter Damian held that every sacrifice of every priest who professes the true faith in the Trinity is valid.¹

17. ST. GREGORY VII († 1085) AND HIS CIRCLE

A most unjust accusation was made against Gregory VII by some of his contemporaries who were implicated in the schism of the antipope Guibert. They alleged that he not only denied the validity of the sacraments administered by schismatics, but even of those administered by priests who were simply unworthy.

Prominent amongst these opponents was Guido of Ferrara, who states clearly the accusation against Gregory in book 2, *De schismate Hildebrandi. Pro illo et contra illum*. This book is an imaginary dialogue between two persons, one of whom he calls the proponent (=P) and the other the respondent (=R).

"R. He taught what is contrary to the Fathers of the New Testament when he commanded that the sacraments of schismatics and UNWORTHY ministers were not to be received but rather to be rejected with scorn; when he, too, declared that the consecrations of the excommunicated, whether in oil or IN THE EUCHARIST, or in the ordinations of those on whom hands are imposed, had no force and should not be called consecrations" (*Libelli de lite*, t. 1, p. 558). After a few words: "P. It is certainly my opinion that what you say is true and that the sacraments OF

¹ Regarding the question which we deal with in this chapter, I have not been able to discover any definite teaching of Cardinal Humbert, the colleague and contemporary of the saint.

THE UNWORTHY CAN BE BENEFICIAL, and that they are effective unto the salvation of the recipients; for this reason I consider that one who condemns this evident teaching (*documentum*) has not the Catholic sense" (*ibid.*, p. 559).

First, then, we must examine the teaching of Gregory VII regarding the ministrations of the *unworthy*, and, secondly, regarding those of *schismatical* priests.

(A) THE SACRAMENTS OF THE UNWORTHY

It is true that in the first Roman Council of 1074 Gregory made a law in which, after condemning heresy, he decreed: "But neither must those who are living in the sin of fornication celebrate Mass, nor minister at the altar according to the function of the lesser orders. We also decree that if they treat our constitutions, nay the constitutions of the holy Fathers, with contempt, the faithful must absolutely refuse their offices; so that they who do not reform for the love of God, and for the dignity of their office, may be brought to a sense of their duty by public disgrace, and by the indignation of the faithful" (*Ep. extra registr. vagantes*, 3. P. L. 148, 646). The decree appears to have been drawn up in words of stinging severity: "If there are priests or deacons or subdeacons living in the state of fornication, in the name of the omnipotent God, and with the authority of Saint Peter, we interdict their entry into the Church, until they repent and mend their ways. If they continue in sin, no one of you may presume to hear their services, because their blessing is turned into a curse, and their prayer into a sin, as the Lord says by His prophet: *Because it is like the sin of witchcraft to rebel, and like the crime of idolatry to refuse to obey*. Therefore he who says that he is a Christian and refuses to obey the Apostolic See is guilty of the sin of paganism" (Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *in Ps.* 10, 3. P. L. 193, 794).

Here we must distinguish between two things: *firstly*, that the Pope forbids the faithful to assist at the masses of fornicators; *secondly*, he declares that those who refuse to obey this most salutary command are guilty of the sin of idolatry.

It suffices to remark on the *first* point that a similar prohibition was already decreed by Nicholas II, in the Roman Council of

A.D. 1059. We read in the third canon: "Let no one hear the Mass of a priest when it is certain that such a priest has a concubine, or that he secretly has a mistress (*subintroductam mulierem*)" (Nicholas II, *Ep.* 8 and 9. P. L. 143, 1315-1317; cf. Jaffé, *Regesta*, 4399); and again by Alexander II, A.D. 1063, in the Concilium Romanum, can. 3 (Alexander II, *Ep.* 12. P. L. 146, 1289; cf. Jaffé, *Regesta*, 4501). Hence, as Dom. Leclercq remarks (*Hist. des Concil.*, t. 5, 1, p. 91), there are no just grounds for the silly assertion of Sigebert of Gembloux (*Chronica*, 1074. P. L. 160, 217), that this constituted a "new precedent".

The reason for the Decree was not, as insinuated by the schismatical writer (Guibert), that Gregory VII held these sacraments invalid.¹ The very purport of the decree is to bring the blush of shame on the impenitent, so that finally they should be driven to repentance: "be brought to a sense of their duty by public disgrace and the indignation of the faithful."²

In regard to the *second* point, Gregory evidently did not impute idolatry to the faithful for assisting at the Masses of married priests, as if it were an adoration, so to speak, given to the bread and wine after an invalid consecration of the sacrament; but, as he expressly states, the sin is found in the refusal to obey, which refusal in sacred scripture is compared to idolatry. The particular reason for this prohibition was, that the faithful might realize that, in assisting at such Masses forbidden by the Holy See, they were in no way performing an act of piety, but one of impiety.

That this was the sense of the decree was explained not only by his contemporaries when defending the decree (like Bernoldus in the *Apologeticus super decreta quae . . . Gregorius . . . VII in romana synodo promulgavit*, c. 19. P. L. 148, 1134-1135), but authoritatively by Urban II in *Ep.* 273, *Ad Lucium*. (P. L. 151, 532).

Meantime, it should be remembered that after the time of Gregory VII incontinent priests were excommunicated, first by Paschasius II in the Council of Troyes, A.D. 1107, c. 4 (cf. Leclercq-Hefele, *Hist. des Concil.*, t. 5, 1, p. 501), and a second time by

¹ I say "insinuated", for neither here nor in his *Apoloogia contra eos qui calumniantur missas conjugatorum sacerdotum, Libelli de lite*, t. 2, pp. 437-448, does he dare in plain explicit terms to make this charge against the pontiff.

² The crime, therefore, must not be attributed to Gregory "if the laity often trampled on the Body of the Lord consecrated by married priests, and deliberately poured out the Blood of the Lord" (Sigeb. Gembl., col. 218).

Callistus II, A.D. 1119, in the Council of Rheims, c. 5 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 590). So from that time onward, because of the opinion which was spreading ever more and more regarding the sacraments of the excommunicated, it came about that some people considered these priests who lived in concubinage incompetent to consecrate, NOT BECAUSE THEY WERE UNWORTHY, but because they were excommunicated.¹

We may also add that at the time there were writers who said, even before the excommunication of Paschal I and Callistus II,

¹ This would be the key to the interpretation of the author of the *Libellus de offendiculo*, very doubtfully attributed to Honorius of Autun. In chapter 36 he writes in harsh terms: "Those who live publicly in FORNICATION cannot offer the sacrifice to God, NOR DO THEY CONSECRATE (*conficiunt*) THE BODY OF CHRIST, because (*quia*) they are outside the Church. For the place of sacrifice is in the Catholic Church only. Know then that they are expelled and have no share in the Church from the words: *The fornicator and the defiled shall not have part in the kingdom of God and of Christ*. But these are fornicators and defiled, and so have no part in the kingdom of God, which is His Church. For this reason they remain without the Church" (*Libelli de lite*, t. 3, p. 50). He seems to consider that these words show that the unworthy as such are incapable, by divine law as it were, of consecrating; so, too, in chapter 41: "Neither is there truth in their masses, nor is the virtue of the sacrament effected (*conficitur*) by them . . . they presume to carry out a mere pretence of masses. . . . If one were to receive their polluted bread as a sacrament, it is as if he took bread defiled by the mouth of a dog" (pp. 51-52).

Meantime he had further elucidated his meaning. For immediately after chapter 36 he goes on to say: "Christians must avoid them, BECAUSE THEY ARE EXCOMMUNICATED. . . . What the Apostles have bound is bound, and what they have loosed will be loosed. BUT THE APOSTOLIC SEE HAS EXCOMMUNICATED ALL MARRIED PRIESTS. But these are married. Therefore they are excommunicated" (c. 37, pp. 50-51). And immediately before chapter 41 he had written: ". . . BECAUSE married priests who have wives contrary to law and justice are proved to be without the Church and excommunicated, to hear their masses or to partake of their sacraments, not only does not benefit but is most harmful" (c. 40, p. 51).

Hence we can see the meaning of his distinction between public and private concubinage in reference to the validity of the sacrament.

"You will say, the sacrament does not depend on the merit of the offerer, but on the grace of Him who confers the blessing, especially seeing that we read that Judas preached and baptised with the other Apostles. I answer: the priest in secret sin is tolerated by the Church, and his case is reserved to the Searcher of hearts, as we have said, and all the sacraments given by him will be ratified, as if they were given by the holiest of men, especially since they are made no better by the best man and no worse by the worst. But the priest who, contrary to the law of God and the Church, wallows in impurity, and even goes so far as to defend his shamelessness, must be regarded as the heathen, and all that he has provided (*fecit*) must be scorned AND TRAMPLED ON" (c. 42, pp. 52-53). Hence in his mind only those who are publicly known fornicators are excommunicated (thus c. 36 above). Hence he thinks that such only are deprived of the power of providing (*conficiendi*) the sacrament.

He thinks that simoniacal priests, like those living in concubinage, or even more so, are outside the Church and heretics (c. 44, p. 63). Hence he uses even stronger words against their Eucharist: "What they receive or what they give is not a sacrament, but an offering to idols" (c. 46, p. 54). However, both the style and the teaching of this writer are so unlike what we find in the writings of Honorius of Autun (of whom later) that it is most surprising that some have been found to confuse two such dissimilar men.

that priests living in concubinage, by the very vice of clerical fornication, should be considered heretics. Indeed, they charged them with the heresy of the Nicolaites, the first of all heresies after that of the Simoniacs. Thus in the time of Gregory VII Manegoldus, an Alsatian writer, in his *Liber ad Gebhardum*, c. 76 (*Libelli de lite*, t. 1, p. 429), whose teaching his friend Gerhoh of Reichersberg afterwards made his own, writes in his *Liber Epistolaris*: "Fornicators and they who usurp forbidden offices are Nicolaite clerics and heretics" (P. L. 194, 1415; cf. 1400-1401). Hence he inferred that their sacraments were deservedly scorned.¹

(B) THE SACRAMENTS OF SCHISMATICS

Upon the sacraments of schismatics we find extant no pronouncement from Gregory VII at all. And indirectly we gather that he made no pronouncement for or against. His most ardent supporters publicly maintained directly opposing views on the matter, St. Anselm of Lucca holding that the sacraments of schismatics were valid, Cardinal Deusdedit that they were not.

18. ST. ANSELM OF LUCCA (+ 1086)

Anselm certainly inculcates very strongly that an acceptable sacrifice can be presented to God only within the Church. Using the words of Gregory the Great, he thus addresses Guibert the antipope: "Come to your weeping and lamenting mother the Church, so that she may offer an acceptable sacrifice for you. FOR IT IS THROUGH THE CHURCH ALONE THAT THE LORD WILLINGLY ACCEPTS THE SACRIFICE. . . . All those are impious who outside of her partake of the Lamb: the Flesh of which the Lord forbids to be taken outside of her (*effferri*)" (*Contra Guibertum antipapam*. P. L. 149, 456).

¹ In his works Gerhoh frequently insists on this same teaching, appealing in support of it to his contemporaries, Bruno of Segni and Rupert of Dietz (cols. 1395 and 1397-1398). See also the *Epistola de vitanda missa uxoratorum sacerdotum*, c. 1 *et seq.* (*Libelli de lite*, t. 3, p. 2 *et seq.*) of unknown authorship and written about the same time. Even before the time of Manegoldus, Nicholas II incidentally called married priests Nicolaites. He writes to the bishops of Gaul "About the heresy of the Nicolaites, that is, about married priests, deacons, and clergy" (*Ep.* 7, A.D. 1059. P. L. 143, 1314). However, it is not clear whether in this connection (*hic*) he used the word heresy in the strict sense of the word, as many did later.

But, nevertheless, earlier in his allocution he had acknowledged the validity of the sacraments of heretics: "It is not the sacraments of the Church that we detest, as you falsely state, but the schismatics and the sacrilegious. . . . The Church venerates her holy sacrament (*Sanctum suum*) which you outside of her have, which to your harm you have received, for you have lost the good odour" (*ibid.*, col. 450). This is the genuine teaching of St. Augustine. Hence to the earlier passage quoted by us above he added the following words: "In many things indeed you are WITH HER [that is, the Church]; but do not console yourselves with that thought, but rather tremble at what follows in the same psalm: *they have defiled his covenant*. Just as Christ, bound and scourged, did not benefit Pilate and Herod, so His sacraments are even more detrimental to you, helping you to impiety and perdition" (col. 456). Note how freely he admits the real presence of Christ in their sacrament, but to their ruin.

19. CARDINAL DEUSDEDIT († 1099)

On the other hand, Cardinal Deusdedit,¹ himself an ardent champion of Gregory VII and Urban II against the antipope Guibert (Clement III), strenuously maintained that the Eucharist of the schismatics and heretics was invalid: "Those who are BAPTISED BY HERETICS AND SCHISMATICS do certainly not receive the Holy Spirit in their baptism . . . but once they have returned to the unity of the Catholic Church they receive the plenitude of the same Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands. From this it is plainly understood that the Body of Christ IS NOT RECEIVED IN THEIR SACRIFICE [that is, that of heretics and schismatics], just as the Holy Spirit is not received in their baptism" (*Libellus contra invasores et simoniacos*, 2nd ed., *Libelli de lite*, p. 323).

By collecting the authorities from the Fathers he endeavours to show that St. Augustine supports his view, mentioning a few sayings of the Holy Doctor "which show clearly that just as

¹ The *Libellus contra invasores et simoniacos* is wrongly reckoned amongst the works of St. Anselm as his second book, *Contra Guibertum antipapam*: see P. L. 149, 470 *et seq.* Only the first, shorter edition of this *Libellus* is found in the *Patrologia Latina*. A longer one, written after 1089, will be found in M. G., *Libelli de lite*, t. 2, see p. 318 *et seq.*

the Holy Spirit is not received in the baptism of heretics and schismatics, so neither is Christ received in their sacrifice" (*ibid.*, p. 324; cf. 325). The passages he quotes are those in which Augustine distinguishes between the sacrament and the virtue of the sacrament. In view of this distinction Deusdedit infers that Augustine could have recognised something in the baptism and the confirmation of heretics that was holy, in so far as these are "permanent" sacraments, that is, of their very nature not admitting of repetition; but not in the sacrament of the Eucharist, which, because it is a sacrifice, is of its very nature "transient", that is, to be repeated daily (p. 325). A strange partition of the sacraments surely!

20. URBAN II (+ 1099)

Meantime Urban II (early in A.D. 1089) was defending the directly opposite teaching on this very point: "Following the teaching of the Fathers, we do not reject the sacrifice of those who were ordained within the Church, but abandoned her by schism" (Loewenfeld, *Epistolae pontificum romanorum ineditae*, Leipzig, 1885, *Ep.* 127, p. 62).¹

¹ From this you can judge what is true and what is false in the recriminations of the antipope Guibert (Clement III) against the supporters of Urban: "Nevertheless they say that THE SACRAMENT OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD Jesus Christ, the sacrament of the consecration of the chrism, and all that pertains to the priestly and episcopal office, as celebrated by those who are not in communion with their sect, ARE ABSOLUTELY NOT SACRAMENTS, and that they bring nothing but damnation on those who receive them. For they say with blasphemous lips that that bread which comes down from heaven in which our whole life and salvation consists is defiled rather than consecrated" (*Synodica ad clerum universum*, A.D. 1089. P. L. 148, 384).

Urban himself certainly said nothing of the sort, though some of his followers did. However, the following declaration of the antipope contains nothing but the truest teaching: "We declare that not only with us who by the grace of God are Catholics, but also with the schismatics and heretics, all these sacraments are ratified" (*ibid.*, col. 835).

Right, too, was the teaching of one who at the time adhered to schism, Waleramnus Naumbergensis, or, as the authorship is not certain, of whoever was the author of the work entitled *De unitate Ecclesiae conservanda*: "Baptism, Chrism, and the Body and Blood are sacraments (*Isid., Etymol.* 1, 6, 19). . . . For if anyone, even a heretic, consecrates any sacrament (*quod libet sacramentum*) by the words of the Gospel in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, that sanctity of the sacrament consecrated with the Gospel words will remain truly unimpaired, although his faith, seeing in these same words something different to what the Catholic truth teaches, is not unsullied but defiled by fabled falsities. . . . Pope Clement therefore condemns those who believe otherwise than this about the very sacraments of Christ and the Church, who assert that outside the Church these are not sacraments, who also, though they themselves have not the Catholic faith, call themselves Catholics,

21. BERNOLD OF CONSTANCE († 1100)

At this same time the learned priest, theologian and historian, Bernold of Constance, though at first misled by the letter of Guido of Arezzo already mentioned by us, taught in his *Epistola ad Adalbertum*, that not only those ordained in simony or otherwise irregularly promoted (whom apparently he considered as not ordained, P. L. 148, 1157–1163) but even those who were publicly excommunicated could not validly consecrate (*conficere*) the Body of Christ; later on, having studied the subject more carefully, he defended the opposite teaching in his *Tractatus de sacramentis excommunicatorum* (P. L. 148, 1061 *et seq.*), and in his *Tractatus de reordinatione vitanda*, etc. (P. L. 148, 1260 *et seq.*), so that he finally concluded: “Let no condemned or excommunicated person applaud himself for making the^l sacraments (*de confectione sacramentorum*); on the contrary, let him realise that this increases his condemnation, for he shows himself the more wicked, and so is more pernicious to himself, the more holy he considers that to be which, with sacrilegious daring, he does not fear to make use of. For his crime would be less loathsome were he to take a meal of ordinary bread from the altar rather than kill his soul by an unworthy communion. For the Apostle says: *He that eateth unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself*” (col. 1068).

22. ALGER († 1130)

Alger, my great fellow countryman (*Algerus noster*), most reliable exponent of the full Catholic teaching, with greater

while others whose beliefs are far more true they condemn as heretics and schismatics” (*De unitate Ecclesiae conservanda*, 1, 3, c. 2–9: *Libelli de lite*, t. 2, p. 283).

Less happy, we must confess, was the argument of a monk whose name we do not know, in defence of the legitimate Pope. Waleramnus rejects his teaching, enunciated as follows: “It should be known that Guibert asserts that Catholics say that those are not sacraments which are made outside the Church, and that they confer nothing but damnation. Against this he maintains that all these are ratified and true, both within and without the Church, defending his teaching by the words of St. Augustine, found in a treatise written on the Gospel of St. John against those who rebaptise. *Therefore, says Augustine, neither without any more than within the Church can anyone who is in sin defile, either in himself or in another, the sacrament which is of Christ.* And we also, they say, faithfully adhering to this teaching, reply THAT AUGUSTINE SAID THIS OF THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM ONLY, of which he was treating at the time” (see Waleramnus, *ibid.*, p. 284).

penetration not only recognises the power of every heretical and excommunicated priest to sacrifice validly (*De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici*, 1, 3, c. 9–12. P. L. 180, 841–847; cf. *De misericordia et justitia*, pars. 3, c. 54 and 83, cols. 956 and 965 *et seq.*), but also, a point well worth noting, indicates the intrinsic reason for this validity, when he writes: “Seeing therefore that all the sacraments of the Lord, without any exception, are from the Catholic Church, even among the heretics, who are united with the Church in so far as they celebrate with due rite, who can doubt THAT THE SACRAMENT OF THE DIVINE SACRIFICE, WHEREVER OFFERED, IS WITHIN THE CHURCH, since it is of the Church” (*ibid.*, c. 9, col. 482)? Here we have indicated the solution of all the difficulties set out in the beginning of this chapter, as we shall show at some length at the end of the chapter.

23. HONORIUS OF AUTUN (+ 1135)

Meantime Honorius of Autun was writing in the *Gemma animae*, 1, 1, c. 169. (P. L. 172, 596.): “Legitimate sacrifice is offered within the Catholic Church, and outside of her no sacrifice is acceptable to God.” Indeed he had written earlier: “This sacrament is made (*conficitur*) ONLY IN THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH” (*ibid.*, c. 10, col. 547). Those words you might think capable of the lenient interpretation, as though Honorius merely meant to say with Alger that wherever this sacrifice is offered, it is offered within the Church. However, his words in the *Eucharisticon* exclude such lenient interpretation. For so he writes: “This Body is consecrated no less by the ministry of the most criminal, than by that of the most holy, if such a one be within the Catholic Church. . . . But outside the Church, that is BY HERETICS, Jews and Gentiles, NEITHER IS THIS SACRAMENT MADE (*perficitur*), nor is the gift accepted. Simoniacs, even though reputed among the heretics, who nevertheless are one with Catholics in the fullness of the faith, consecrate (*conficiunt*) the Body of Christ by faith in the Trinity” (*Simoniaci . . . qui inter haereticos censentur, qui tamen fide integra*, etc.) (*Eucharisticon*, c. 6. P. L. 172, 1253). Here Honorius seems to go even further than Peter Damian, as he implicitly denies the power to consecrate in heretics who have not faith in the Trinity.

Though Honorius denies the validity of consecration by such heretics, he admits the validity in the case of the excommunicated as such. Writing in the *Elucidarium* (if he is the author of this work), of the excommunicated simoniacs, he says: "Do such people consecrate (*conficiunt*) the Body of the Lord? However great be their condemnation, still the Body of the Lord is made [present] . . . *fit* . . . by the words which they recite" (*Elucidarium*, 1, 1, c. 30; cf. n. 29. P. L. 172, 1129–1130).

24 HUGH OF ST. VICTOR (+ 1141)

Hugh of St. Victor or one of his disciples, author of *Quaestiones et decisiones in Epistolas Pauli*, 2, 102. (P. L. 175, 532), is more severe when he writes: "Though some may be of evil life, if they are, not only in name but by the sacrament within the Church, such are believed truly to consecrate. THOSE, HOWEVER, WHO ARE EXCOMMUNICATED, AND THOSE IN NOTORIOUS HERESY, ARE CONSIDERED INCAPABLE OF THIS."

25. ROBERT PULLEN (+ 1146)

In his *Sententiae* Robert Pullen has nothing to say about heretical, schismatical, or excommunicated priests.¹ But he maintains the irrevocable power of the priesthood in the suspended and the degraded priest: "Suspension is inflicted on ordained priests, and if the sin is grave, degradation also. Neither penalty takes away his control of the sacrament; both, however, deprive him of the exercise of his office; the one is a lesser deprivation of the use of the sacrament, the other has a more permanent effect.

¹ His words in 1, 8, c. 6, col. 968, do not help us much, for there he deals only with the consecrations made by the unworthy: "The sacraments of the altar are not made (*conficiuntur*) by any but priests, and not by those if they act contrary to the statute laid down by the Church. Those of UNWORTHY LIFE can indeed make the sacrament (*conficere*), but they must observe the rite of the Church. For though the unworthy do indeed make the sacrament (*conficiunt*), though to their own damnation, still they can only do this if they conform to the rite prescribed for the consecration (*conficiendi*). This is my view." He plainly states that the effective power to consecrate is not removed by an unworthy life. But whether it is or is not removed by any other cause, for instance by heresy or schism, by which a priest alienated from Church unity is no longer within but without the Church, this he does not make clear. Hence J. de Ghellink seems to go too far, or at least to stretch quite gratuitously the meaning of this passage, when he writes: "Robert Pullen recognised the consecrations of all priests as valid" (D. T. C., art. *Eucharistie au XII s. en Occident*, col. 1285). Indeed Robert Pullen gives us here nothing but what has always been the unanimous teaching of all Catholic theologians.

. . . But what happens if the forbidden office is exercised during the term of suspension or degradation? The power is certainly not taken away, and the priests who use it, though forbidden to do so, can use it just as effectively as good priests, but they do so to their own ruin, and to the ruin of all those who, **THOUGH WITHIN THE CHURCH, NEVERTHELESS FLOUT THE PROHIBITION**" (*Sententiae*, 1, 7, c. 14. P. L. 186, 927).

26. RUPERT OF DIETZ (+ 1135)

Rupert gives us no clear indication of his opinion on this matter when he says: "Moses says: *in the place where holocaust is offered*, that is, in the Catholic Church, outside of which one cannot have or receive the fire of the Holy Spirit, *it shall be immolated before the Lord*. Otherwise if it is immolated in any other place, if in some conventicle of the heretics, it is not a victim for sin, it is not the Body which is given for us. . . . The conventicles of the Jews and of the heretics are unclean, and in these this holy Victim must not and cannot be slain" (*In Levit.*, 1, 1, c. 32. P. L. 167, 778). Does Rupert here mean that heretics do not have the true Body and Blood of the Lord at all in their sacrifices, or only that they do not have the benefit of it in so far as the Body and Blood is not for them a victim for sin, and cannot be said to be given for them as the price of their salvation? I would not venture to decide one way or the other.

27 RADULPHUS FLAVIACENSIS (+ 1157)

The words of Radulphus Flaviacensis certainly admit of a lenient interpretation: "But holy Church is altar for us: she is distinguished from all others in this, that in her alone sacrifice is devoutly offered to God. **THE GIFT WHICH IS OFFERED OUTSIDE OF HER IS NOT RECEIVED**" (*In Levit.*, 1, 1, c. 1, Cologne 1636, 1, p. 2).

28. HUGH OF AMIENS (+ 1164)

The teaching of Hugh of Amiens, Archbishop of Rouen, as we find it in the fifth book of his *Dialogi* leaves no room for doubt: "It is not given to everyone to celebrate the

mysteries of the altar. No one is admitted to this (*in his nemo suscipitur*) unless he be consecrated after the manner of the Apostles to celebrate the mysteries. Moreover, Christ, whenever it is expedient, through the Church deprives of his office the one to whom Christ, through the Church, has entrusted the office of consecrating, and forbids him to minister. And sometimes she does depose him, or even by excommunication expels him from the body of the faithful. And so when Christ through the Church has deprived a priest of his office BY DEPOSITION (*deponendo*) OR EXCOMMUNICATION, if he presume to administer the sacraments, HE WHO IS NO LONGER MINISTER ACCOMPLISHES NOTHING" (*Dial.*, 1, 5, c. 11. P. L. 192, 1204). He considers therefore that Christ through the Church takes away the power of consecrating the Eucharist from the excommunicated, and that this power is lacking as long as the excommunication or deposition remains.

The reason he gives is that otherwise ecclesiastical order would be destroyed: "For on careful consideration it is evident that, if any or all could administer the sacraments, the whole position of the Church would be undermined. For if everyone could act as it pleased him in respect to the sacraments, of what avail would be the key of the Church? What would it bind? What would it loose? But whether wicked men like it or not, Christ rules. The key entrusted to the Church binds and looses, it ordains, deposes and reconciles the ministers of the sacraments" (*ibid.*).

As this declaration of Hugh became the occasion of considerable comment, he wrote a letter to his friend Matthew, Cardinal Archbishop of Albano, to whom he had dedicated the work. In this letter he set himself to defend his teaching, by making a distinction between the sacrament of order which is retained by the priest who has been excommunicated or suspended and the office of order of which he says they are deprived (P. L. 192, 1227-1230). He concludes as follows: "Hence we are surprised at some who say of the excommunicated or the deposed priest, that because he retains the sacrament of his ordination once it has been received, when he presumes to consecrate, his ordination is effective" (cols. 1229-1230).¹

¹ Meantime he maintains the two following propositions: (1) A priest once ordained who is later on deprived of his office, is not to be reordained after his office

To the six books of the *Dialogi* already published he added later a seventh in which he defends his opinion by another argument drawn from the necessity of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit: "Let us treat of the sacraments in the light of the Catholic faith. . . . The sacraments are divine, not human: they are the benefits of grace, not the power of nature; the work of the Holy Spirit not the merit of man. Hence in the ministry of the sacraments the minister of the Church must have with him the Holy Spirit. For in the Holy Spirit all things are made, but by a special operation are sacraments ratified in Him and effective; without the Holy Spirit they are void and useless. Let a minister see to it therefore that he be not a minister only in name, that he be a minister of Christ, that he have the Spirit of Christ, for if he has not that he cannot be of Christ. But he who is not of Christ cannot be said to have the Spirit of Christ, without which no sacrament can be made (*feri*). How then can those who are excommunicated, who are schismatics, deposed from office, rebels against the Church, or branches cut off from the vine, effect anything (*agere*) in the sacraments? I know that there has been diversity of opinion in this matter either in spoken word, or in writings. But how can he bless, whom Christ curses? How can he consecrate whom Christ execrates as profane (*exsecrat*)?" (*Dial.*, 1, 7, c. 13, col. 1244). On close examination, however, this argument will be found not to differ from his previous one. For here he is not speaking of the indwelling of the Spirit by grace, but of the communication of the Spirit to produce sacramental effects: and this communication he considers to be imparted by Christ only to the priests who are within the Church and authorised by her, as above.

29. GERHOH OF REICHERSBERG (+ 1169)

Gerhoh with many mediaeval writers, following St. Augustine (*Sermo* 71, c. 19, n. 32. P. L. 38, 463) and Leo the Great (*Ep.*

has been restored to him (col. 1229). Indeed he even considers that an ordination conferred by one deprived of office can be ratified by a dispensation of the Church, presumably by some kind of *sanatio in radice* (*Dial.*, *loc. cit.*, col. 1204). (2) Apart from excommunication or disauthorisation, the exercise of order is not affected by any unworthiness of the minister. (*Ep.*, col. 1228.)

159, c. 7. P. L. 54, 1139), distinguishes two elements in the sacraments; one which he calls the *form* (or intrinsic perfection) and another which he calls the *virtue* of the sacraments (*Liber epistolaris ad Innocentium II.* P. L. 194, 1394. *Tractatus adversus Simoniacos*, c. 19. P. L. 194, 1353). By the form he means *the sacrament itself*, by the virtue he means *the thing signified by the sacrament* (*Liber epistolaris*, col. 1404).¹

In the same sense, too, he distinguishes between *the passive effect* "by which word we mean not that effect which the sacraments effect, but that by which they are constituted sacraments, that is, the signs of sacred things" (*Tractatus adversus simoniacos*, c. 23, P. L. 194, 1358), and the *active effect*, "which the sacraments cause, bring about—*efficiunt*" (*ibid.*, c. 21, col. 1354). Having made these distinctions, Gerhoh goes on to distinguish two kinds of sacraments: one, which exerts its activity "ON THE RATIONAL CREATURE . . . as the sacraments of ordination and baptism, the other which exerts its activity" "UPON INANIMATE THINGS . . . as those sacred signs which by the addition of the divine words to the elements are made in the consecration of chrism . . . or also in the consecration of the bread and wine" (*ibid.*, c. 31, col. 1367; cf. *Lib. epist.*, col. 1405).

He says that the sacraments of the first kind, administered by a heretic to recipients with "Catholic mind" (that is in good faith without admixture of heresy), are valid and fruitful, or, in his words, ratified in form and virtue, both in the sacrament itself and in the thing signified by it, in passive and active effect (*Lib. epist.*, cols. 1403–1405; *Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 21, cols. 1355–1356).

But when administered by a heretic to heretics,² he concedes that such a sacrament is ratified in the form or sacrament itself, or the passive effect, but maintains that it is not ratified in the virtue, or the thing signified by the sacrament, or active effect, except after reconciliation with the Church (*Lib. epist.*, cols. 1403–1405; *Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 23, cols. 1357–1358).

He then goes on to consider sacraments of the second kind, that

¹ Again with St. Augustine, *In Joann.*, tr. 26, n. 11. P. L. 35, 1611.

² Gerhoh means not a secret heretic, but a manifest, condemned heretic (*Lib. epist.*, col. 1403; *Tract. adv. Simoniac.*, c. 26, col. 1362).

is, the sacraments which exert their activity on inanimate things, admitting likewise that what heretics do in regard to these, is ratified, in form, sacrament, and passive effect,¹ but maintaining that one can find no cause sufficient to ratify them in virtue, or reality signified by them or active effect (*Lib. epist.*, col. 1406; *Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 23, cols. 1357–1358). For in the former sacraments the ratification came either from “the Catholic mind” of the recipient, or from reconciliation with the Church, and no such source of ratification can be imagined where the sacrament has to do with inanimate things, which are not receptive of reconciliation or penance (“in which there is not or cannot be the Catholic mind”: *Lib. epist.*, col. 1405; “those created things cannot do penance”: *Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 31, col. 1367). Therefore the Eucharist of heretics cannot be ratified in virtue, or reality, or thing signified by the sacrament, or active effect (*ibid.*).

But, really, Gerhoh makes a rather startling division, in the Eucharist, between what pertains to the form or the passive effect, and what pertains to the virtue or reality or active effect. For he allocates the conversion of the bread and wine, not to the passive effect (“by which the sacraments are made to be sacraments”), but to the active effect (“which the sacraments effect”—*Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 23–24, cols. 1358–1360). To the passive effect (as defined above) he only assigns the power bestowed on the bread and wine of immediately signifying ecclesiastical unity (*ibid.*), and at the same time the Body of Christ (absent, however, in the case of the Eucharist of heretics).² Hence the conclusion

¹ Saltet does not seem to have understood fully the teaching of Gerhoh on this point (*op. cit.*, p. 278), hence he did not clearly grasp what Gerhoh goes on to say about the Eucharist in particular (*ibid.*).

² I say immediately signifying, that is, not indirectly, or mediately, by way of the Body of Christ contained in the Eucharist, which according to Gerhoh is not a sacrament or sign at all, even in respect of our incorporation with Christ (*Tract. adv. Simoniacos*, c. 29, cols. 1366–1367). On the other hand, Gerhoh considers that the bread and the chalice directly and of themselves signify our incorporation into Christ in the Church, because of the plurality of the elements reduced to one bread and wine. We shall deal with this question in XLIII and L (Vol. III). In parallel fashion he admits that the sensible element signifies not only ecclesiastical unity but, equally, the real proper Body of Christ. Hence, as he calls the sacrament made by the heretic, the sacrament of ecclesiastical unity, so, too, he calls it the sacrament of the Body of Christ. Such a sacrament alone he grants to heretical priests: “Indeed, as far as the species go, and the sacrament (*specietenus et sacramentotenus*), it can be called the Body of Christ” (*Liber contra duas haereses*, c. 6. P. L. 194, 1183; cf. 1154). In the theology of Gerhoh, therefore, there can be a real sacrament of the Eucharist,

follows that, in the mind of Gerhoh the heretics¹ lack the Body and Blood of Christ in their Eucharist, though it is truly a sacrament (*Lib. epist.*, 1406–1407; *Tract adv. simoniac.*, *loc. cit.*; cf. *Lib. de glor. et honor. Filii hominis*, c. 14, n. 4, col. 1123).² But not having the Body of Christ which is our one sacrifice, they simply and absolutely have not a sacrifice at all (*Lib. epist.*, *loc. cit.*, and the *Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 29, col. 1366). The Fathers “convict them of having no true sacrifice, although they have a true and integral sacrament, sacrificing according to the rite of the Church”.

So convinced was Gerhoh of the truth of his teaching, both from the logic of the case and from the support of authority, that he even branded its denial as heretical. Thus in the *Proemium* of his *Liber contra duas haereses*: “In the present work I am speaking particularly of two heresies, partly ancient, and partly new.” One of these heresies, with Nestorius, detracts from the dignity of Christ born of a virgin. “The other takes nothing from Christ but attributes too much to Antichrist, when it says that priests deprived in Synod of their divine office,³ or of Christian communion, if they dare to officiate against the will of the Church, can consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ” (cols. 1162–1163).⁴

not containing the Body of Christ, but nevertheless endowed with its proper and sacramental signification both in respect of the building up of Church unity and of the Body and Blood of Christ given to us as food. Such a sacrament alone will he admit that heretical priests have.

¹ What he says against the sacrifice of heretics he denies absolutely about that of bad priests tolerated by the Church. See how he refutes the calumnies of his adversaries regarding the administrations of unworthy priests (*Lib. epist.*, cols. 1406–1407). Hence we see in what sense he considers that the sacrifices of fornicators are to be detested.

² Although they have not the real Body of Christ, in his mind they are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord (*Tract. adv. simoniac.*, c. 27, cols. 1363–1364). Indeed “it is plain that they are guilty of a greater sin” than merely unworthy partakers of the Body and Blood of the Lord. See how he differs from Bernoldus, cited above.

³ Clearly, then, as far as the celebration of the Eucharist is concerned, the unauthorised are on the same level with the excommunicated, according to Gerhoh. This is not surprising, seeing that in the third book of that work (cols. 1172–1175) he cites the Epistle of Hugo of Amiens to Matthaëus Albanensis, mentioned above.

⁴ However, in the *Commentarius in Psalm 25*, 4, he says: “Whether or not the Body of Christ is or is not consecrated (*conficiatur*) in their Masses, it is superfluous to examine, for it is well known that all such Masses are forbidden under pain of excommunication (*sub excommunicatione*)” (P. L. 193, 1160; cf. in *Psalm 10*. P. L. 193, 789–792).

30. AUTHOR OF THE *EPISTOLA DE SACRAMENTIS HAERETICORUM*

Somewhere about this time was written the *Epistola de sacramentis haereticorum*, the authorship of which is not certain. In it is maintained that heretics and schismatics cannot consecrate the Body of Christ because of a threefold defect, of efficacy in their priesthood, of ecclesiastical unity, and of the vital Spirit of Christ. On the defect of sacerdotal efficacy it says: "What then do the separated possess? What do they do? Have they the priesthood? They have indeed the sacrament of the priesthood which they received while within [the Church] but now outside of it (*foris*=outside of the Church) they have lost the power and the virtue of that sacrament. . . . Because they have lost the virtue of the priesthood, for this very reason it is clear as day that they cannot consecrate (*conficiant*) the Body and the Blood of Christ" (*Libelli de lite*, p. 15).

The letter goes on then to consider the question of ecclesiastical unity: "The sacrament of unity is made (*conficitur*) only in unity and from unity. For the Apostle says: *We being many are one bread, one body*. What do you say about their case, O see? *They will eat and will not be filled*. This is indeed true of them, for what is effected (*conficitur*) by such as they, outside of the Church is not in essence the Body and Blood of Christ" (*ibid.*).¹

Finally regarding the Spirit of Christ: "They are not members of Christ, and they do not possess the Spirit of Christ; they have gone out and are withered and bear no fruit, because they are without Christ who said: *Without me you can do nothing* . . . The hand of the heretic and the schismatic is withered, so that it effects (*conficiat*) nothing" (p. 16).

Notice how closely these arguments are knit, resting as they do on (1) our incorporation with Christ by the Holy Spirit, (2) in the Church, (3) which alone has sacerdotal power in respect of the Body and Blood of Christ.

¹ "Of the unity of the Church which offers her daily vows (*vota* = sacrifices of the Body and Blood of Christ), the Psalmist says: *The poor shall eat and they shall be filled,*" etc. (*ibid.*).

31. GRATIAN (+ 1158)

Juristic studies began to flourish about this time. In the *Decretum* of Gratian regarding heretical priests, we find conflicting statements. Thus in *Causa 1, quaest. 1, c. 75*, commenting on the saying of Jerome: "Either permit him whose baptism you recognise to offer the sacrifice, or reject the sacrifice of one whom you do not consider to be a priest," he remarks. "This is to be understood only of the Catholic who is a sinner, and not of a heretic . . . for, if Jerome were understood here to be referring to heretics, it would be inconsistent with what he says elsewhere of heretics, on *Amos*, c. 5: The Lord hates their sacrifices" (P. L. 187, 513). By making this restriction, Gratian certainly seems to say plainly he considers the consecration performed by a heretical priest to be invalid.

And yet a little later on, in c. 97 of this same question, in the words of Alger, quoted above (*De miseric. et justit.*, p. 3, c. 54. P. L. 180, 956), he unreservedly admits the validity of the consecration performed by a heretical priest, explaining Jerome in exactly this sense (cols. 527-528).

Meantime, he leaves no room for doubt about the unauthorised priest, where he writes: "As regards the suspended or deposed priest, no power is left to him to sacrifice" (col. 525). Hence what he allows to the heretic he denies to the unauthorized priest. After him the jurists held conflicting views on this matter,¹ until we come to St. Raymund of Pennafort who writes peremptorily in his *Summa*, (1, 1, tit. 5, para. 6, Verona ed., 1744, p. 38): "You may take it as a rule (*regulariter teneas*) that EXCOMMUNICATED, HERETICAL, or DEPOSED bishops or priests confer true sacraments, provided, however, they confer them in the form of the Church" (cf. tit. 6, n. 3, p. 46). And again: "As far as the true reality of the sacrament is concerned, it does not matter by what priest they are made (*conficiantur*) and conferred in the form of the Church. However, they who unworthily make the sacraments (*conficiunt*) or celebrate, commit sin; they sin also who receive from heretics or schismatics any sacrament other than baptism

¹ Saltet (*op. cit.*) cites some of these from still unpublished sources.

in articulo mortis, and then only when no Catholic is available” (1, 3, tit. 24, n. 5, p. 306).

32. PETER LOMBARD AND OTHER COMPILERS OF THE *SENTENTIAE*

Meantime, on this matter the theologians show just as much confusion of mind among themselves as the jurists.

Thus we find Peter Lombard quite as inconsistent in his utterances as Gratian. In the fourth book of the *Sentences* he denies validity (*Distinctio* 13, n. 1. P. L. 192, 868): “It appears to me that although the excommunicated and those in open heresy are priests they cannot make (*conficere*) this sacrament, because in the consecration [that is, in the actual prayers of the consecration, in other words, the Canon], no one says *I offer*, but *We offer*.”¹ Hence, owing to their lack of union with the Church, these do not offer the sacrifice, seeing that they are not those through whom the Church offers (*utpote per quos non offerat Ecclesia*), and unless you offer sacrifice on the part of the Church, sacrifice is not offered; and hence no sacrament is made (*conficitur*). But then in *Dist.* 25 of the same work, he leans not a little towards the teaching of Alger, whom he follows almost word for word (*Sententiae*, 1, 4, *dist.* 25, n. 3, col. 907); indeed, in the next paragraph, having first settled that simoniacs are heretics (“there can be no doubt that the simoniacs are heretics”), he goes on to assert that they have authority to confer orders and to consecrate the Eucharist validly. He adds meanwhile: unless they are degraded (“if, however, they ordain and consecrate before the sentence of degradation”, col. 907). Hence finally we gather that, according to Peter Lombard, it was the deprivation of authority to use the power (*exauctorationem*) rather than the heresy that availed to inhibit the sacrificial power.

Hugo de Mauretania (*tract.* 6, c. 9. P. L. 176, 146), author of the *Summa Sententiarum*, is clearer and more definite: “Others think that neither the excommunicated nor those in open heresy make the sacrament (*conficiunt*). For in the consecration no one says *I offer*, but *We offer* as from the person of the whole Church.

¹ He is speaking of the prayer *Unde et memores . . . offerimus*, etc.

Since *the other* sacraments can be made outside the Church, but this sacrament never, it seems that we must agree with them.”

So, too, Bandinus: “This sacrament is made (*conficitur*) by any priest according to the rite and intention of making it (*conficiendi*), that is, if he is in union with the Church. HENCE THE EXCOMMUNICATED OR THOSE IN OPEN HERESY do not make (*conficiunt*) this sacrament” (*Summa Sententiarum*, 1, 4, *dist.* 13. P. L. 192, 1097).

Petrus Pictaviensis held the same view: “While the other sacraments can be celebrated outside the unity of the Church, the excommunicated cannot make (*conficere*) this sacrament, because they do not say *Offero* but *Offerimus* as from the person of the Church” (*ibid.*, 1, 5, *dist.* 13. P. L. 211, 1257).

33. THE AUTHOR OF THE *TRACTATUS DE SCHISMATICIS*

The anonymous author of the *Tractatus de schismaticis* (*Libelli de lite*; t. 3), written about the beginning of the year 1165, or a short time afterwards,¹ attacks at length both the supporters of the antipope Paschal III, and those who remained “neutral” between him and the lawful pontiff Alexander III, holding that both parties, being heretics and schismatics, are without the power to make (*conficiendi*) this sacrament (*op. cit.*, t. 3, pp. 112–113 and 123), because “it is only among Catholics that Christ changes the bread and wine into His Body and Blood” (p. 126). Moreover, the author holds that the fact that these men only hold in their hands and deal with mere bread and wine all the time (their consecration being invalid), they are nevertheless guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, for they also do not clearly discern, show reverence to the Body of the Lord; because “it is no less sacrilegious to call the Body of Christ what is not the Body of Christ than to deny that that is the Body of Christ which is truly so” (p. 128). An ingenious argument certainly.

34. PETER DE LA CELLE († 1180)

In his seventh sermon *in coena Domini* (*Sermo* 40. P. L. 202, 769), Peter de la Celle would have ten points of doctrine preached

¹ See J. Dietrich and Boehmer, *Libelli de lite*, t. 3, p. 110.

from the housetops regarding the sacrament of the Eucharist. The tenth point is: "Tenthly, does the sinful or the heretical priest make the Eucharist? However sinful the priest may be, provided he is nominally within the Church, though not according to the life he leads, he makes the sacrament (*conficit*)¹ because the effect does not come from the merit of the consecrating priest, but from the word of the Creator, and nothing more is received from a good priest, and nothing less from a bad one. THE HERETIC DOES NOT MAKE THE SACRAMENT (*conficit*) BECAUSE HE IS WITHOUT THE CHURCH."

35. INNOCENT III (+ 1216)

Innocent III seems to have had the same thing in mind when he wrote: "Although only one offers the sacrifice, nevertheless he says *We offer* in the plural, because the priest SACRIFICES NOT ONLY IN HIS OWN PERSON BUT IN THE PERSON OF THE WHOLE CHURCH. FOR THIS REASON, in the sacrament of the Body of Christ nothing greater is effected (*perficitur*) by the good priest, nothing less by the bad priest, PROVIDED THE PRIEST IS IN THE ARK WITH THE OTHERS, and observes the form prescribed by the dove" (*De sacro altaris mysterio*, 1, 3, c. 5. P. L. 217, 844).²

36. WILLIAM OF AUXERRE (+ 1223)

William of Auxerre gives the true teaching (*In quatuor libros sententiarum*, fol. 284): "We ask: do heretics ordain or not, do they truly consecrate (*conficiant*) . . . ? If heretics observe the form of the Church, whether cut off or not, they give true sacraments."

37. WILLIAM OF PARIS (+ 1249)

In his treatise *De Sacramento ordinis* c. 6 (t. 1, p. 539) William of Paris distinguishes between the priest who has been degraded, whose sacerdotal character he believes to be completely taken away, and the priest who is not unauthorised or degraded, but

¹ Migne gives "*dum intus est nomine sacramenta conficit, sed non vita.*" I think it should read "*dum intus est nomine, sed non vita, sacramenta conficit, etc.*" (We read it so; in the other form it is very obscure—Trans.).

² Cf. c. 9, col. 848: "Outside the unity of the Church there is no place for the offering of the sacrifice of unity."

who, joining a false sect, attempts celebration outside of ecclesiastical unity. He says of the latter: "Apostates and heretics who publicly and openly abandon the Church, and go over to the synagogue of Satan, that is to any sect of infidelity, behaving not as priests of the Catholic Church but of the synagogue of Satan, and presenting its accursed petitions, both by their sacrilegious ministry, as we said above, and with their lips, DO NOTHING ON THE PART OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, as they act neither as her spokesmen nor ministers, nor do they effect anything for the perfidious faction on whose behalf they speak, whose voice God does not listen to, but rather He abhors and execrates it, as the cawing of a crow or the hiss of a serpent."

Clearly, therefore, according to William, the sacerdotal office can fail on two grounds:¹ either by the recall of the commission of the Church, as happens in the case of those deposed from office, or through lack of the ratification of the Church, as in the case of heretics: "Clearly the sacerdotal office or ministry is perfect only when it combines two elements: the ratification of the Church, and the limited exercise of the office of proxy; similarly it is nullified or made void by two causes, on the side of the Church and on the side of the ministry" (*ibid.*), that is to say, ministry which has been abolished as such, in certain cases.

38 LEADERS OF THE OLDER SCHOLASTICS

And now the great luminaries of the school of Paris appeared, whose leader, St. Albert the Great (+ 1280) (4 D. 13, 11, art. 30)² with St. Bonaventure (+ 1274) (4. D. 13, art. 1, q. 1), and St. Thomas (+ 1274) (3 S. 82, 7 and 8), declared unanimously³ that every priest validly consecrates (*conficit*) the Body of Christ, if, intending to consecrate, he observes the form of the Church. Nor had they any doubt that such a priest, validly consecrating, truly offered sacrifice.

¹ "If the office of procurator [agent, representative] is revoked WHOLLY, then evidently everything which was ratified by the law, provided that he did it, is by the revocation made null and void" (*ibid.*). William does not put on an equal footing unauthorised priests, deposed or degraded, and priests who are suspended or even excommunicated. He says that, as such, the ministry of the suspended or excommunicated priest is not nullified, it is simply forbidden.

² "This solution is common" (*loc. cit.*).

³ Cf. Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologica*, p. 4, q. 10, n. 5, a. 1, parag. 6.

39. SCOTUS († 1308)

Scotus admitted that heretics and priests who have been degraded can consecrate validly (“because any priest competent to pronounce the words with the intention to consecrate (*conficere*) can consecrate”—4 D. 13, 2). Nevertheless—because “the priest does not offer in his own person, but in the person of the Church of which he is minister; but such a one is cut off from her” (*ibid.*)—he denies to them all sacrificial action or offering of the victim;¹ explaining this further by the following reason: “Offering does not pertain to the essence of consecration” (*ibid.*). This of course is true if it is a matter here of merely formal distinctions (in the Scotist sense). If, however, he means to imply, as indeed he did, that the offering may be separated from the consecration, it is certainly false. For, as we have said, our offering is made in the consecration itself, the one is inseparable from the other: for it is in the symbolical immolation that the offering of the Victim truly immolated in the past consists. However, this solution of Scotus had scarcely any supporters, and all the theologians retained the teaching of the schools, that anyone who can consecrate can also sacrifice.²

The number and the authority of the theologians who maintained both the validity of the consecration of the sacrament and the offering of the sacrifice by all priests, even those priests under the severest condemnation of the Church, increased to such an extent that Thomas of Argentina († 1357) wrote: “I hold the aforesaid conclusion, because it is commonly (*satis communiter*)

¹ Hickey, in his *Quaestio* on this text of Scotus, wrongly contends that here offering means merely ceremonial and not sacrificial offering. But such a supposition would stultify the reasoning of the Doctor. Renz (*Geschichte des Messopfer-Begriffs*, 1901, t. 1, p. 791) rightly says: “It is Hickey, not Scotus, who makes the distinction between ceremonial and real oblation.” Indeed in his solution and line of argument Scotus depends on Peter Lombard and the other earlier theologians just mentioned. Still I will not deny that Scotus appears to have thought that the verbal offering which we say is merely ceremonial, was truly sacrificial. A few theologians whom we shall cite later (XXXIV) agreed with him in this.

² Not all agree that a priest sacrifices by the mere fact that he consecrates, for, as Suarez (disp. 76, sect. 3, n. 7) remarks: “The theologians who hold that the essence of the sacrifice consists in the communion, or in any other action which takes place after the consecration, necessarily admit that the making or compounding (*confectionem*) of the sacrament can be separated really from the sacrifice” (cf. XXIV above, XXXIV below). But this kind of separability which they maintain does not imply, in the celebrations of heretics any more than in that of Catholics, any necessity of separation between the consecration and the act of sacrifice.

held by theologians” (4 D. 13, a. 2, Venice, 1564, f. 111). And shortly afterwards Nicholas de Ausmo, in a work entitled *Supplementum* (incun. f. 135a): “Should a priest celebrate, even though he is a heretic, excommunicated or degraded, he consecrates (*conficit*) to his own destruction . . . thus theologians generally.”

So unanimity was reached and the memory of the earlier dispute faded to such an extent that even learned men did not hesitate to write, as did Hartzheim (*Concilia Germaniae*, t. 3, Cologne, 1760. p. 234): “If any priest had fallen into heresy or schism, or if he had been excommunicated, no one ever said that he could not validly consecrate (*conficere*) the Eucharist.”

The truth of the matter is that the question of the sacrifices of priests, either cut off or deposed, was solved in either of two ways by the earlier writers. Some denied only the fruit of the sacrifice, while others denied the validity also. Those who denied the validity of the sacrifice of such priests had especially in mind, in the case of those cut off from the Church, THE LACK OF CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH, in which alone the priesthood of Christ is exercised through the Holy Spirit: because Christ is knit in one with the Church (*Christus aliquid unum est cum Ecclesia*) so all sacerdotal activity or sacrificial offering is that of Christ only in so far as it is that of the Church.

In the case of priests who are deprived of authorisation (though still true priests in communion with the Church), they thought that the ecclesiastical authority for the sacrifice was lacking, the Church, as it were, being now UNWILLING to perform any priestly action through the deposed or the degraded priest.

Hence they considered that the *terminus a quo*, that is, the source or fount of valid sacrifice, the Church, was lacking for both classes of priests.

Those, on the other hand, who upheld the validity of such sacrifices insisted, nevertheless, that connection with the Church was necessary for the validity, as did Augustine especially and Alger, adding meanwhile that the sacrifices celebrated by those who are outside the Church come from the Church, indeed are sacrifices of the Church, and hence that heretics in respect of sacrificial power remain in some manner within the Church: and this is the true solution which we shall now develop.

§ 3. The Theological Solution of the Question

(I) Just as a person who is baptised cannot be so completely cast out from the Church as to be *IN EVERY WAY as the heathen and the publican*; but, if he enters into lawful marriage, his marriage will be sacramental; if he receives the Eucharist, his communion will be sacramental (a thing not to be thought of in case of the heathen); so, too, and even much more so, a priest, though cut off ever so much from the Church, *STILL RETAINS THAT MINISTERIAL UNION WHEREBY, HAVING ONCE BEEN CONSTITUTED BY GOD THE AGENT (procurator) OF THE CHURCH FOR THE OFFERING OF SACRIFICE, HE REMAINS THE AGENT OF THE CHURCH FOR ALL TIME*;¹ the Church doing through him whatever he attempts, even unlawfully, to do, through the power of the commission entrusted to him by God. He is and remains the organ of the body. The body may ban the organ, the organ may forsake the body, but it is still the organ, and whatever it does or desires to do as organ is done as from the Church.

You will say : How does the Church act through one through whom she does not wish to act, as is plainly indicated to the priest who has been degraded by her, and is even more plainly understood in the case of one cut off from her ?

I reply : The refusal of the Church is not absolute; she certainly manifests her unwillingness, but this does not amount to an absolute refusal to act through him. For indefectibly holy and faithful to God as the Church is, she cannot absolutely wish anything contrary to the order fixed by God. But God joined both together, priest and Church, for the offering of sacrifice. Hence the Church in her holiness cannot absolutely wish to rescind that union. No matter how much she may prohibit the priest, no matter how much she may hold him in abhorrence, nevertheless she is still bound to him and wedded to him, so to speak. And what God

¹ His agency is irrevocable and his commission cannot be lost because, although induced by the ordination conferred by men (that is, by the prelates of the Church, either immediately in the case of the legitimately ordained, or mediately in the case of those ordained outside of unity), it is nevertheless given *UNDER THE SEAL OF GOD*. That seal and *CHARACTER*, once impressed, cannot be effaced by man. Hence the charter appointing one an agent or representative of the Church, in other words, appointing him priest, is eternal.

hath joined together, let no man put asunder. Therefore whenever the priest means to offer the sacrifice he truly offers it and offers it on the part of the Church: for, though she does not wish him to offer at all, still when he does offer she wills that he do so in her name (the Church in this is *nolens secundum quid, volens simpliciter*).

Hence, to the question as to what a priest cut off from the Church or degraded can do in this matter, we answer, as all Catholics now do, that he can validly offer the sacrifice, adding meanwhile that, according to the teaching of the earlier theologians, he can do so because on the side of the Church the essential font or *terminus a quo* of sacrificial offering is not lacking, even in such cases.

So much for what the heretic *can* do in this matter. If, however, you ask what he *does* do in any particular case, the reply is not necessarily the same. For though the Church will certainly never fail her legate, her legate may fail the Church, being unwilling to act for the Church, in her name, his intention being simply and absolutely to act for himself only, or what is much more probable, to act as minister for a false sect.

And indeed, EVERY FORMAL AND OBSTINATE HERETIC, IF HE IS CONSISTENT, must be so affected towards the Church, as to exclude all connection with the Church in the offering of the sacrifice. For no one acts as minister of the true Church without desiring, implicitly at least, to exercise the ministry on her behalf RATHER THAN ON BEHALF of his false and schismatical sect. He must have, as we say, a prevalent intention of doing what Christ instituted to be done.¹ But no one is a formal and obstinate heretic unless he ABSOLUTELY sets his own opinion above the truth of faith, or his own will above the charity of union. And such a one can never act for the Church, unless at least at the moment of one or other celebration he is implicitly inconsistent, having at the time of offering a prevalent desire of offering for the Church, though habitually quite the opposite desire prevails. Hence in the case of one who is completely carried away with hatred of the true Catholic, Apostolic Church, namely the Roman communion,

¹ Or must wish, to use another common expression, to do what the Church does: that is to say, to do what, according to the faith of the Church, should be intended by her agent. We have already explained that no one offers sacrifice validly, except in so far as he intends to offer it on behalf of the Church.

one might well conclude that the prevalent intention of such a one, if he is consistent, would be not to do anything as minister of the Church, but simply and absolutely as an official of his own sect.¹ In such a case he will do nothing, effect (*conficiet*) nothing in his Eucharistic celebration, for in no sense does he offer on behalf of the Church, as he himself, not the Church, deliberately and absolutely excludes such intention².

Should, however, such a one simply wish, at least in implicit intention, to act as minister of the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, though in other ways in opposition, then his action will be effective and he will consecrate. In this case it should be borne in mind that the sacrifice is not offered by the separated one as separate, but it is offered by one who, though outside the Church (by his personal legal status and habitual intention), is nevertheless as one within the Church (by reason of his office or ministry, or inalienable deputation, and by the actual direction here and now, or rather correction of his intention).

Hence the axiom of the earlier theologians stands: "Outside the Catholic Church there is no place of true sacrifice." For

¹ It is by no means improbable that such a state of mind has been found at times in heretical priests, as known facts seem to prove. Optatus of Milevis throughout the whole of the sixth book of *De schismate Donatistarum* relates many indignities offered to the sacraments of the Catholics, as when, for example (*ibid.*, l. 2, c. 19. P. L. 11, 972; cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 139, l. P. L. 33, 535), they threw the Eucharist to the dogs. We have also the testimony of Innocent III referring to certain Greeks apparently before his time: "For after the Church of the Greeks, with some of their followers and accomplices, withdrew from the obedience of the Apostolic See, the Greeks began to abominate the Latins to such an extent that they perpetrated many impious acts to show their contempt for them. For example, when the Latin priests had celebrated on their altars, the Greeks, as though the altars had been defiled thereby, refused to offer the sacrifice on them before they had been washed" (*In Concil. Later.*, 4 D. 10, 435). Undoubtedly Nicephoras, sacristan to Michael Caerularius, trampled on the Eucharist of the Latins, though this was more through the hatred of the azymes or the unleavened bread used by the Latins than of the Roman name (P. G. 120, 744 and P. L. 143, 1214-1215).

² It was according to this principle that William of Paris interpreted the harsher expressions of the Fathers to the effect that the sacrifices of heretics were cursed by God: it is to be assumed that they took it that the heretic acted *as* a heretic, rejecting the ministry of the Catholic Church, and exclusively and ostentatiously adopting the ministry of his perverse sect. In such a case the celebrant is certainly not conformed to the mind and the intention of the Catholic Church, and for this reason we can say that he abandons THE FORM of the Church and follows one which is alien to it (see *De sacramento ordinis*, c. 4, pp. 534-535). We would not say that this exposition of these Fathers is improbable, especially seeing that the Fathers hardly ever had in mind merely material, but always formal heresy; and besides some, especially among the Africans, were rather prone to lose sight of that perverse facility, deep-rooted in our imperfect minds, for inconsistency and self-contradiction, and showing itself not rarely but quite often, by what may be called "a want of logic in practice".

sacrifice, to be true, is made by one, not in so far as he is *without*, but in so far as he is and remains *within*; so that always in every case sacrifice is *within* the Church.

Hence, too, every true sacrifice is always the sacrifice of the Church.

Suarez among the more recent theologians implies this where he writes: "Should a heretic or any other excluded from the Church offer it, although he offers outside the Church, HE NEVERTHELESS OFFERS THE SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH: and this he can effect, just because he retains the character by reason of which he belongs to the Church in some way" (*De Eucharistia*, disp. 77, s. 2, n. 7).¹ For it is by the sacerdotal character that one is

¹ Possibly these words are hardly quite consistent with what Suarez had already written: "It is by virtue of the commission of the Church that a priest prays, intercedes and OFFERS in her name; for this reason, too, the Church can prevent the cut-off priest from offering the sacrifice IN HER NAME. For, since he has this office by commission of the Church, he can be deprived of it by the Church" (disp. 77, s. 2, n. 6; cf. *Commentarius* in 3 S. 82, 7). We notice, however, that Suarez adds a restrictive clause, when later on he explains this point, and says that the Church "is not in accord with him, and does not wish, AS FAR AS LIES IN HER, to offer through him". These restrictive words might easily suggest that in this matter the will of the Church is not absolute and efficacious, but signified as a preference on her part, for this rather than that. I think, however, that the Eximius Doctor found it rather hard to make a decision in the matter. For on the one hand, he himself thought that the concept of the offering of the Church could be sufficiently distinguished from that of the offering of our Lord, so that the latter would in itself suffice, without the offering of the Church, to validate our ministerial act of sacrifice (not adverting to the fact that the offering of our Lord and the offering of the Church are one organic whole). On his supposition the validity of the sacrifice of the priest cut off from the Church could be explained as follows: they offer although the Church does not offer through them. On the other hand, however, he was confronted by the authority of the theologians, ascribing every Eucharistic sacrifice to the universal Church, as well as by the true teaching regarding the sacerdotal character, by which a person is not a mere member of the Church, but is raised to the dignity of minister and organ of the ecclesiastical body. Hence he seems merely to have submitted in a tentative way the different solutions proposed by others, making one of them his own, as when he says: "the sense of the second opinion may be", "another explanation might be", the one solution separating the sacrifice from the Church, the other connecting it with her. Cf. *De censuris*, disp. 11, s. 2, n. 11: where one might conclude that he maintained his first solution—they offer though the church does not offer through them—"I think it to be the truer view", except that here he is speaking rather of the prayers of the Mass than of the sacrificial offering.

Among the few theologians who have dealt with this point, Hickey holds the chief place in his sixth *Quaestio* on the *Commentarius* of Scotus in 4 D. 13, 2 (pp. 831-834). His *conclusio 2a* is especially worthy of notice: "The heretical priest also OFFERS THE SACRIFICE IN THE PERSON OF THE CHURCH AND OF CHRIST, IF HE OBSERVES THE UNIVERSAL INTENTION, ALTHOUGH THROUGH HIS ERROR HE HAS HIMSELF AN ERRONEOUS PARTICULAR INTENTION . . . because as long as the sacerdotal character remains he can perform acts competent with that character, and the power granted by Christ and by the Church for such an act remains; hence in exercising these acts he can represent the person of Christ and of the Church offering the sacrifice . . . because of the power conferred by them, by which he is deputed minister for such acts." Cf. *Conclusio 5a*.

appointed precisely to offer, as representative of the Church, gifts and sacrifices to God. Hence the persistence in him of this character is enough to guarantee that he remains the Church's deputy, and acts as such, as often as he desires to do so, provided only that his prevailing intention be to act for the Church.

Hence, no matter how unfaithful be the priest who offers the sacrifice, the Church is faithful, it is her cause he pleads, and it is her gifts and sacrifices that he offers; so that it is always the true faith, the Catholic faith, that begins and originates every sacrificial action, and so, too, every Eucharistic consecration, if not proximately, on the part of the minister, at least remotely, on the part of the Ecclesiastical Society whose minister he is.

And in this sense can be retained what William of St. Theodoric wrote (*De corp. et sang. Dmni*, c. 6. P. L. 180, 355). "In the sacraments the FAITH OF THE CHURCH consecrates (*facit=conficit, consecrat*) the Body of the Lord, the sacrifice being that of the Church in general, no matter what be the merit of the one by whom the offering is made."

(II) The question of the fruit of such sacrifices is solved by the same principle by which we have solved the question of their validity.

Here, as on the question of validity, there have been divergent opinions.

A few theologians thought, as some do, I believe, still think, that there is absolutely no fruit whatever from the sacrifice of the priest cut off from the Church, no matter how valid the sacrifice may be.

The greater number, however, made a distinction, and, following St. Thomas¹ and St. Bonaventure,² deny the fruit to those only who *specialy* intervene in such sacrifices as offerers or co-operators. Thus Suarez (disp. 77, s. 2, n. 7) distinguishes the "offerers and co-operators" (to whom the sacrifice cannot be beneficial) from others, to whom the sacrifice can be beneficial.

¹ 3 S. 82, 7: "Those who are separated from the Church by heresy, schism or excommunication, commit sin making the consecration . . . and for this reason they do not participate in the fruit of the sacrifice."

² 4 D. 13, a. 1, q. 1: "The cut-off and the heretical priest consecrate TO THEIR OWN PERDITION AND TO THE PERDITION OF THOSE WHO ASSIST."

But when we come to consider these others who derive fruit from such sacrifices, for example the universal Church, and ask how this fruit is derived, we find difference of opinion among theologians.

Those theologians who hold that Christ intervenes in each of our sacrifices by a new act of offering, newly elicited in each and every Mass, and that so the fruit of the Mass can be limited by Christ Himself and so computed independently of the intervention of the offering by the Church, would hold that, even though the universal Church did not offer at all, some fruit of the Mass could be assigned to the sacrifice of the priest cut off from the Church.

But as we have repeatedly rejected the teaching that Christ at each Mass elicits a new act of offering, we likewise reject the explanation of the point at issue, which relies on that teaching, and say that, as the Church offers through those cut off and unauthorised (as we explained above), so the devotion of the universal Church is not lacking to commend their sacrifices.¹ Indeed, on this head their sacrifices are no worse than those of the unworthy priest. But from another point of view they are worse. Because in the sacrifices of bad priests, who nevertheless are Catholic, apart from the general offering of the whole Church, there is added the more special offering of some, for instance of those persons who give a stipend, of the faithful who assist, by which the fruit is increased. In the sacrifices of the outcast or the deposed, however, no such increase is possible, seeing that the co-operation of the faithful, either by way of stipend or by assisting, is itself bad.

However, this must be understood only as the general rule, for good faith will excuse the faithful when through ignorance they co-operate in this way, especially when they wish to do so for some otherwise good reason (*titulus coloratus*). And in some

¹ Gabriel Biel, *Sacri canonis missae tum mystica, tum literalis expositio* (see Joannes Clein s. a., s. 1, lectio 27, fol. 38-41) deals with this teaching at length. He applies indiscriminately to heretics and to unworthy priests the principle that, although the priest has nothing in himself to render his sacrifice acceptable to God, "NEVERTHELESS BECAUSE THIS OFFERING AND PRAYER IS NOT HIS PRINCIPALLY, BUT BELONGS TO THE CHURCH, THE BRIDE OF CHRIST, BETWEEN WHOM AND CHRIST HE IS AN AMBASSADOR, carrying her prayer on his lips, presenting it to the Father of mercies to be heard by Him, hence it follows that his personal malice does not render that prayer hateful and execrable in the sight of God" (fol. 38).

cases the priest, though outwardly a heretic or schismatic, may be inwardly in good faith, and so guiltless of sin, and ignorant of his entanglement in error, so that nothing is wanting to prevent his sacrifice from being acceptable to God, so as to further even the most special intentions in the offering. God grant that this may often be so with our brethren in the East! Were this so, there would be no fear of the strengthening of schism by such sacrifices, since every such sacrifice offered as from the one true Church would be efficacious with God, and so would help towards greater unity and against schism.

Since, however, every Eucharistic communion is a profession of ecclesiastical communion between the consecrating and distributing priest and the recipient, it is usually unlawful and pernicious, AS A SCHISMATICAL AND HERETICAL ACT, to receive the Body of Christ, even though it be validly consecrated, from the hands of a schismatical or heretical priest; just as a person excommunicates himself if he receives communion from a priest who is excommunicated by name. Hence Durandus of Mende (4 D. 13, q. 1, n. 12): "Both those who consecrate the sacrament and those who receive it at their hands have it not to their salvation but to their damnation."

Should, however, the sacrament, validly consecrated by a priest cut off from the Church, be reserved in every way according to Catholic prescription, it could be received and distributed in similar manner by Catholics, and in such a case the communicant would not be acting in communion with heresy or schism, but with the true Church, to which the sacrament belongs.¹

¹ "The Host which has been consecrated by such priests is to be adored, and, if reserved, can be lawfully partaken of by a legitimate priest" (St. Thomas, 3 S. 82, 9, 1m); cf. St. Theodore of Studium, cited above, and St. John Damascene to be quoted later in Th. XXXVII (Vol. III).

CHAPTER VII

HOW THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS IS CARRIED OUT

THESIS XXXIV

HAVING proved that the sacrifice of the Mass exists, having considered its intrinsic nature, and finally the fruit of the sacrifice, we must now carefully consider how the sacrifice is effected, asking ourselves what precise action of ours is required to bring about the sacrifice.

Here two questions arise, *first*, is the sacrifice fully accomplished by the consecration, or is anything besides the consecration needed for this ?

If nothing else is required, we must ask ourselves, *secondly*, what is the nature of the action whereby the consecration is brought about ?

§ 1. The Sufficiency of the Consecration

What we have to say here is meant rather to clear away the slightest vestige of doubt than to give a formal proof that the sacrifice is fully and completely accomplished by the consecration, which from what we have already said about the sacrifice should, we think, be taken as quite certain. Against this sufficiency of the consecration fully to constitute the sacrifice, two objections have been raised, some holding that besides the consecration the communion enters essentially into the constitution of the sacrifice, while others hold that the breaking of the bread is an essential constituent of it. For convenience we have left this second view for consideration here; the first we have already dealt with. For we have shown why the communion cannot be considered to enter into the sacrifice as a constituent element, because the offering of the Victim and the partaking of the Victim are two things quite distinct. The sacrifice is merely consummated by the communion, in so far as, already constituted before the communion, it attains to its end by the communion; which end is the sanctification of the faithful, cf. Th. I (Vol. I) and XXIV.

Hence it only remains for us at this place to consider the breaking of the bread, for some theologians held that the breaking of the sacrament entered into the sacrificial action, and even essentially so, since they held that by this breaking and by it alone is signified the torment of the Passion. Thus Cano writes: "Since, according to the institution of Christ, we must represent His death in the symbols of real things, if our sacrifice is complete and true, and a perfect copy (*absolutum exemplar*) of that Victim which Christ exhibited on the Cross; and since before the species ARE BROKEN, mingled and consumed, there is no such symbol in real things, we can take this as a most certain argument, that before the breaking the sacrifice is not yet completed" (*De locis theologicis*, 1, 12, c. 12, Cologne, 1585, fol. 426a).

But against this position there are not a few objections of considerable moment. In the first place, all modern theologians

hold with Suarez (disp. 75, sect. 3) that even if the breaking were omitted by any chance the sacrifice would still be integral, complete.

Secondly, at times, in the earlier Liturgies, there appears to have been no such breaking of the bread, or at any rate it was not considered as of any importance. We read nothing of it in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, or in the Liturgy of the *Testamentum* D.N.J.C.¹ In other very ancient Liturgies, as in that of *Serapion*, of *St. James*, of *St. Mark*, it is found, but without any indication that it signifies the death of our Lord; and indeed, in the Liturgy of *Serapion* in particular the accompanying prayer indicates clearly enough that the real reason for the dividing of the sacrament in that Liturgy is to provide particles for a number of communicants.²

In the Greek Liturgy of *St. James* a ritual breaking of the host (κλάσις) takes place, preliminary to the breaking of the host into many small pieces or particles (μελισμός): but this first breaking is made simply to provide a small particle of the consecrated bread for immersion in the consecrated wine in the chalice (B. 62, cf. 581): in which action practically every exponent of the Liturgies sees a symbol of the Resurrection rather than of the Death.

Later on various symbolismes were added to the breaking in some of the Liturgies, very few, however, and these were related mainly to the Passion, as in the Liturgy of *St. James* (B. 97–99; cf. Max Saxon., *Missæ syriacæ antiochena*, pp. 37–38); at times also the fragments were arranged in the form of a cross (present Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, B. 393; *Liturgia mozarabica*. P. L. 85, 557–558); or the bread was cut (at the prothesis) with a lance in the form of a cross (present Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, b. 357–358).

But these symbolismes are adventitious, devised with the passing of the centuries, to increase devotion and throw light on the

¹ In the Byzantine Liturgy of the ninth century there is no breaking within the action. The breaking of the bread before the action cannot by any means be considered as an intrinsic part of the sacrifice.

² “O God of truth, deign to bestow on us this communion (*Dignare nos et hac communione [donare]*) and grant us chastity in body and understanding and knowledge in our minds; and make us truly wise, O God of mercies, by the receiving of the Body and Blood,” etc. (F. D. 2, 176–178).

Liturgy. Neither the Scripture nor the early Fathers witness to or support them.

As regards the Scripture, we note in the *first place* that the critics commonly reject the word κλώμενον, which we read in the *textus receptus* of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (XI, 24: τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον = this is my body which was broken for you).¹ the Vulgate reading instead *quod pro vobis tradetur* = which shall be delivered for you. *Secondly*, so far from the Scripture hinting that there is any symbolism of the Passion in the breaking of the bread, we may say that it excludes it, declaring that just as in the paschal lamb so in Christ no limbs were broken. As regards the Fathers, though Chrysostom is sometimes appealed to as favouring this symbolism, it is plain enough that he is opposed to it for two reasons: *firstly*, from the fact that he remarks that in the Passion there is no breaking corresponding to the *fractio* or breaking of the Eucharist; *secondly*, because he speaks distinctly of the breaking of this sacrament, as made for its distribution in communion. For speaking of the words of St. Paul *the bread which we break*, he says: "Why did he add *which we break*? For this breaking we can see in the Eucharist, but not on the Cross, rather quite the contrary. For the Scripture says: *a bone shall not be broken*. But WHAT HE DID NOT SUFFER ON THE CROSS, He does suffer for you in the offering, and He permits Himself to be broken THAT ALL MAY BE FILLED" (*In I Cor.*, hom. 24, n. 2. P. G. 61, 200).²

St. Augustine indicates no other reason for the breaking but the distribution, where commenting on *I Tim.*, II, 1, he says: "Let us understand the *supplications* here mentioned (*Aug. supplicationes. Vulg. operationes*) as the prayers which we say in the celebration of the mysteries (*sacramentorum*) before what is

¹ Although nearly all the Liturgies in the Supper narrative represent our Lord as using this word. Among others, see the Greek Liturgy of *St. James*, the Greek Liturgy of *St. Mark*, the *Anaphora* of Serapion, the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the Ἀποστολικὴ παραδῶσις of Hippolytus, the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopicæ*, with other more ancient Ethiopian Liturgies, the Mozarabic Liturgy according to the *Missale mixtum*, the Gallican Liturgy according to the *Stowe Missal*.

² Goetz rightly interprets these words of Chrysostom, "which rather exclude than support a reference to the breaking of the bread as significant of the death on the Cross" (*Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage*, 1907, p. 176).

on the table of the Lord begins to be blessed; and the *prayers* (*orationes*) here mentioned as those said when it is being blessed and sanctified, and broken into small particles (*comminuitur*) FOR DISTRIBUTION” (*Ep.* 149, 16. P. L. 33, 636).

St. Gregory the Great likewise: “For there His Body is consumed, HIS FLESH IS DIVIDED (*partitur*) for the salvation of the people; there His Blood is not poured out now upon the hands of infidels, but it is poured into the mouths of the faithful” (*Dial.* 4, 58. P. L. 77, 425).

In the breaking of the consecrated bread by our Lord at the Last Supper, Bede sees a presignification of the freedom of the Passion: “He Himself breaks the bread which he hands to the disciples, to show that the breaking of His own Body would not occur without His own free will and dispensation” (*in Marc.*, XIV, 22. P. L. 92, 272; cf. *in Luc.*, XXII, 19, col. 596).

In one place, it is true, St. Paschasius says that the Passion is commemorated in our breaking of the sacrament: “It seems that the mystery is a figure when it is broken—*Figuram videtur esse [mysterium], dum frangitur*—and he means a commemorative figure, for he goes on to add: “a remembrance of the sacred Passion” (*Lib. de corp et sang Dmni.*, 4, 1. P. L. 120, 1278). In many places, however, he says that the essential reason for the breaking is to divide the sacrament for distribution as food: “He breaks, because had He not broken the little ones would remain without food” (*ibid.*, 15, 2, col. 1323), “The body is broken to be eaten by the people, and is distributed to the faithful” (*ibid.*, 19, 3, col. 1328).

Among the Latin exponents of the Mass, who from this time onward became very numerous, most of them either passed over the *fractio* or gave no explanation.¹ Others, like Innocent III

¹ For example, Walafridus Strabo (*De ecclesiast. rer. exord. et increm.*, c. 22. P. L. 114, 950); Rabanus Maurus (*De clericorum institutione*, 1, 1, c. 33. P. L. 107, 324); Amalarius (*De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 1, 3, c. 31. P. L. 105, 1152); Florus of Lyons (*De expositione Missae*, 89, P. L. 119, 71); Remigius of Auxerre (*De celebratione missae*. P. L. 101, 1270); John of Rouen (*De officiis ecclesiasticis*. P. L. 147, 36); Odo of Cambrai (*Expositio in canonem missae*. P. L. 160, 1070); Robertus Paululus (*De officiis ecclesiasticis*, 1, 2, c. 39. P. L. 177, 436); Joannes Beletth (*Rationale*, c. 48. P. L. 202, 54–55); the author of the *Micrologus*, c. 17. (P. L. 151, 988); Richardus Weddinghusanus (*Libellus de canone mystici libaminis*. P. L. 177, 468); and many others, the leader of all being Isidore of Seville (*De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 1, 15. P. L. 83, 752). Meantime, however, after Amalarius (*op. cit.*, c. 35, col. 1154), mediaeval writers had much to say of the “triform Body of the Lord”,

(*De sanct. alt. myst.*, 6, 2), say that the *fractio* is made after the fashion of the supper at Emmaus where the disciples knew our Lord in the breaking of bread.

Meantime Cardinal Humbert (A.D. 1054), while contending against Michael Caerularius, that though the Trinity co-operates in the sacrament of the Eucharist, it is not commemorated in it, separates the elements of the Eucharistic rite in such a way as to make the consecration the action of the Trinity, while the breaking of the sacrament and the partaking of it is the commemoration of the Passion of Christ: "The whole Blessed Trinity co-operates in the consecration of the Eucharist, but only the death of Christ is commemorated in the breaking and partaking" (*Adversus Graecorum calumnias*, c. 31. P. L. 143, 950).

That is, if I am not mistaken, the first clearcut and distinct statement in the Latin writers of a connection between the breaking of the bread and the commemoration of the Passion of our Lord.

Shortly afterwards (between 1063 and 1070), Lanfranc, the champion and defender of Humbert, in his work against Berengarius on the Body and Blood of the Lord, proclaimed this same connection in words much more vivid and better known than those of Humbert: "For sacraments always bear the likeness of those realities of which they are the sacraments or symbols, just as in the sacrament concerning which this question is discussed, WHEN THE HOST IS BROKEN, when the Blood of the chalice flows on the lips of the faithful, WHAT ELSE IS DESIGNATED BUT THE IMMOLATION OF THE BODY OF THE LORD ON THE CROSS and the pouring forth of the Blood from His side?" (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Domini*, c. 13. P. L. 150, 423.)¹

designated by the three particles of the broken bread. This explanation of the three particles of the broken bread, after it was first vigorously condemned by Florus (*Opusc. adv. Amalarium*, 1, 4 and 2, 5. P. L. 119, 74 and 81), was finally attributed to Pope Sergius by the Decretists (Ivo of Chartres, *Panorm.* 1, 140, and Gratian, *De consecr.*, *dist.* 2, c. 22) ! Hence we can understand easily enough how, unfortunately, it crept into the writings of the leaders of the schools, as, for example, Albert the Great (*De sacrificio missae*, tract. 3, c. 21) and St. Thomas (3 S. 83, 5, 8m).

¹ Goetz (*op. cit.*, pp. 175-176) may well cease to complain that he has not been able to find these words in the *Liber Sententiarum Prosperi*. For the Roman Corrector when dealing with part 3 of the *Decretum dist.* 2, c. 37, had already noted long ago that Lanfranc, not Prosper, wrote them. Besides this passage and the words of Chrysostom and Augustine recorded above, Goetz (*ibid.*) also quotes Dionysius Bar Salibi, whom we cite below.

After the time of Lanfranc we find some other writers on the Mass attaching the signification of the Passion to the breaking.¹

Among the Greek Fathers, though, St. Eutychius, Confessor and Pontiff, a contemporary of St. Gregory the Great, had already written: "The breaking of the venerable bread signifies the death" (*De Paschate et sacrosancta Eucharistia*, n. 3. P. G. 86 bis, 2396), the expounders of the Byzantine Liturgy, except Bessarion (*De sacram. Eucharistiae*. P. G. 161, 512) who notes no significance in the *fractio*, but considers it merely "necessary for distribution", held that both the breaking of the bread within the action and the cutting with the lance which in this Liturgy has been already done at the prothesis, is a figure of the Incarnation² rather than of the Passion.³

Dionysius Bar Salibi, the Syrian exponent of the Mass (twelfth century), clearly holds that the Passion is symbolised in the breaking of the Host.⁴ Who will not see that in such a mass of

¹ Ivo of Chartres (*De convenientia veteris et novi sacrificii*. P. L. 162, 559); Honorius of Autun (*Gemma animae*, 1, 1, c. 63. P. L. 172, 563); Ps. Alger (*De sacrificio missae*. P. L. 180, 856); the unknown author of the *Liber de expositione missae*, attributed to Hildebert. P. L. 171, 1165; Sicard of Cremona (*Mitræle*, 1, 3, c. 6. P. L. 213, 129 and 138); Durandus of Mende (*Rationale*, 1, 4, c. 51, n. 4). Meanwhile Baldwin of Canterbury (*De sacramento altaris*. P. L. 204, 657) a man of practical turn of mind first points to the advantage of the dividing ("the breaking of the host serves for the distribution. He broke in order to give to a number"); he then builds up a number of mystical explanations, among which the designation of the Passion finds a place. In addition to these liturgists, there are a few theologians who say much the same thing, like William of St. Theodoric (*De sacramento altaris*, c. 9. P. L. 180, 356); Alger (*De sacramento*, 1, 1, c. 18. P. L. 180, 792); also exegetes like Anselm of Laon (*In Maith.*, XXVI. P. L. 162, 1470); and preachers like Jacobus de Vitriaco (*Sermones*, Sermo III in coena Domini, Antwerp, 1575, p. 335), etc.

² On the comparison between the cutting of the host at the prothesis and the Incarnation, see Theodorus Andidensis (*Brevis commentatio*, n. 9. P. G. 140, 429) and Symeon of Thessalonica (*De sacra liturgia*, c. 92. P. G. 155, 273-276). On the comparison between the *fractio* and the Incarnation, Theodorus (*op. cit.*, n. 38, col. 465) may be read. Ps. Dionysius (*De Eccl. Hier.* 3, 12. P. G. 3, 444), explaining the Syrian Liturgy, indicates no signification in the *fractio* other than that of the Incarnation.

³ On the comparison between the cutting of the host at the prothesis and the Passion, see Nicholas Cabasilas (*Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 8. P. G. 150, 384-385).

⁴ When the priest has taken the host in his hands, as we have said, while he breaks it in two parts, he shows that the Word truly suffered in the Flesh, and that it was sacrificed and broken on the Cross. (*Expositio liturgiae*, c. 16, C. S. C. O., 93, 89.) Earlier in the same work, referring to the breaking of the bread by our Lord in the Last Supper, after speaking of the practical utility of this division (if the reading here is genuine), the author goes on: "In the breaking He declares to us His Passion, Crucifixion and slaying, His being pierced with a lance and His death. Furthermore in the breaking He mystically signifies that He has slain and divided Himself, and that propitiation flows from Him" (*ibid.*, p. 73).

varied interpretations, and these, too, late inventions, nothing can be found certain or solid; no dogmatic teachings, but mere flights of fancy? Even if such scholastic masters as Albert the Great (4 D. 13, E. 15), St. Thomas (3 S. 77, 7; 83, 5, 7m; in *I Cor.* II, lect. 5); Biel (*Sacr. can. miss. expos.*, lect. 80); Suarez (*disp.* 84, *sect.* 1, n. 6), etc.,¹ did say that the Passion was represented in the breaking, they merely said this *inter alia*, by way of pious comment.² They in nowise taught that the breaking was, in the strict sense, sacramental.

As a matter of fact the breaking was not introduced because of itself or by itself to signify anything. Christ simply broke the bread to distribute it. Such is the essential meaning or intrinsic intention of His act. Later the Church did the same thing: in the first place for the same end, distribution in communion; secondly, even when this reason failed (for example, when a priest said a Mass at which he alone communicated, or when with the large host a number of small hosts were consecrated at the same time, for distribution), in imitation of Christ;³ and finally for the mingling of the species, when the particle procured by this breaking is immersed in the consecrated wine, by which, as the Liturgies sufficiently attest, and the liturgists confirm, the Resurrection (at which the Blood was again united to the Body) is designated, just

¹ Vasquez thinks that Christ broke the bread, for no other end than that, divided among many who would eat of it, "it should signify the peculiar effect of the sacrament . . . namely, union, in that they would all eat of the same bread, just as they all would drink of the same chalice" (*disp.* 196, c. 3, n. 19 and 26).

² Note especially the second and the third passages cited from St. Thomas above, where three things are said to be signified at the same time by the breaking of the host. See also Albert the Great, in *Matth.*, XXVI, 26, where the breaking (breaking down, abating) of the divine anger is said to be signified first, and then we are sent far back and told that it is for the fulfilment of a figure of Moses.

³ Cardinal Humbert had this in mind when he wrote urging that an integral Mass should be said every day, not a mutilated celebration with the reserved sacrament, as was the custom of the Greeks: "For the Lord did not bless only and reserve the sacrament to be broken on the morrow, nor, having broken it, did He reserve it, but He at once distributed the sacrament He had broken. Hence . . . if any one of these ceremonies is done without the other, that is to say, the blessing without the breaking and the distribution, or the breaking without the blessing and the distribution, it does not represent a perfect memorial of Christ, no more than would the distribution without any breaking or blessing" (*Responsio sive contradictio in libellum Nicetae*, c. 23. P. L. 143, 994). The imitation of the action of Christ in the breaking of the host is shown especially in the Liturgy of the Copts, according to the anaphora of *St. Mark* or *St. Cyril*, where the bread is broken during the Supper narrative, and at the actual words which recount this breaking of the bread by Christ (B. 177). See also in the Ethiopic Liturgy the anaphora *Apostolorum* (B. 232).

as the Passion was designated before by the separate consecration of the species.¹

On the other hand, the comparison between the breaking and the Passion, except for the solitary statement of St. Eutychius, C. P., is a rather tardy arrival. Fugitive and rather uncertain indications of it in Bede and Paschasius, followed later by a more definite statement of it by Humbert and Lanfranc, gave origin among the later theologians and liturgists, to an opinion which was first rather rare, but then became more common, but always was arbitrary: that by the breaking the Passion was commemorated. But in actual truth the Passion, already sufficiently commemorated by the consecration itself, is not commemorated sacramentally by the breaking which, so far from being an intrinsic part of the sacrifice, does not even pertain to its ceremonial expression, but to the rite of communion.

It is true that in the earliest days of Christianity, the liturgical celebration was called the breaking of bread—*fractio panis* (*Acts*, II, 42), but it no more follows from this that the sacrifice is constituted by the breaking (of the bread) than it follows from the other name given by St. Paul to the celebration, *the Lord's Supper* (*I. Cor.*, XI, 20), that the sacrifice is constituted by eating and drinking. But just as our sacrifice was at times called the *Supper* from the purpose of partaking of the Supper (communion) to which the offering of the Victim is ordained, so the Supper itself was called the *fractio* or breaking of bread, from the preparation of the food for distribution which was made in the breaking. Hence the whole foundation for the opinion of Cano falls to the ground. It is in truth an opinion held by himself alone,² contradicted,

¹ But even this mingling of the species was not introduced originally for a symbolic purpose. It arose out of the custom of reserving the sacrament from a former Mass, or of receiving it when sent by the bishop in sign of communion with him; in such cases it was immersed in the wine in the chalice, probably simply for convenience of consumption, as it was hard and dry. When this custom became obsolete, the present rite of putting a particle of the consecrated bread in the chalice within the same Mass took its place. Cf. Corblet, *Histoire du sacrament de l'Eucharistie*, 1886, t. 2, p. 11.

² Still far more singular, stupid indeed, and, in the light of present dogma, heretical, was the opinion of the Abbot Abbaudus (*De fractione Corporis Christi*. P. L. 166, 1341–1348) and of Walter of St. Victor (*Contra quatuor Labyrinthos Franciae*, 1, 3, c. 11. P. L. 199, 1153–1154), both of whom taught, and vigorously maintained, that the Body of Christ in Its substance is broken by the breaking of the sacrament. But, even so, neither of them concluded from this that the immolation of Christ was to be placed in the breaking. On the contrary, Abbaudus (col. 1346) takes pains

moreover, by St. Thomas when he says that the sacrifice is completed before the breaking (3 S. 83, 4), so much so, indeed, that the omission of the breaking would not cause "any imperfection in the sacrifice" (3 S. 83, 6, 6m). I would have preferred not to have entered upon this discussion, did it not afford an opportunity for a close study of a particular rite of the Church, for winnowing the true from the false, or at least distinguishing various grades of the truth.¹

§ 2. How the Consecration is Accomplished

From what we have said, here and elsewhere, it should be now abundantly clear that the sacrifice is accomplished by the consecration alone, and that the consecration itself is carried out by an oral action, by spoken words which effect the consecration. A further question, however, still remains: what is the precise tenor of this consecrating prayer? What context of words is necessary in it to induce the consecration?

This question resolves itself into two which chiefly concern us.

Firstly, does the consecration occur in answer to some petition for it; that is, do you consecrate by the fact that you ask for the transmutation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, or, is the epiclesis efficacious or necessary? *Secondly*, if this epiclesis or petition for the transmutation is not efficacious or necessary, by what context of spoken words is the consecration brought about? And first of all, what are the formal words of consecration? This having been determined, we ask again whether

to say that all the "pieces" (*particulas*) of the broken and dismembered Christ are still living. I hope the reader will pardon me for not passing over in silence (which perhaps would be sufficient) such fanciful nonsense.

¹ I think that the prudent reader will not look for an examination of the teaching of Henricus Henriquez (*Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 1, 9, c. 9, n. 3 and 9; cf. c. 8, n. 6), who says that the sacrifice is constituted by three essential elements, the consecration, the communion, and the verbal offering in the prayer "*Unde et memores . . . OFFERIMUS*", etc. This opinion was also adopted by Azor (*Institutionum Moralium*, lib. 10, c. 19, Lyons, 1602, col. 1117), Bonacina (*Tract. de sacramentis*, disp. 4, q. 2, punct. 2, n. 5 and 6) and Bassaeus (*Flores theologiae practicae*, s.v. *missa*, 2, 5), besides others whom they mention. This teaching, formulated by Henriquez, but already in germ in Peter Lombard and Scotus, as we saw above (XXXIII), has been lately revived not too happily by an otherwise reliable writer, J. Grivet, *La messe de la terre et la messe du ciel* (Paris, 1917).

besides the formal words of consecration, other words of the narrative of institution are required. If this is so, we ask, finally, whether, besides the formal words and the words of the narrative, any words of interpellation—words addressed to God—are necessary.

We shall take these questions in order.

A. THE EPICLESIS

(A) THE EPICLESIS IS NEITHER EFFICACIOUS NOR NECESSARY

When we come to consider the first question, which concerns the epiclesis,¹ we at once meet with an indisputable fact: that in many Liturgies, after the words of our Lord, *this is my body, this is my blood*, have been said over the bread and wine, a petition is made for the transubstantiation. For this is the plain sense of numerous Eastern,² Gallican,³ and Mozarabic formulae,⁴ and, as we have seen, of the Roman prayer *Supplices te rogamus* also.

None the less, it is clear that this petition contributes in no way, either by way of a cause or a condition to the effecting of the consecration itself.

It would influence it by way of cause if the consecration did not occur until this prayer was said, and it finally effected the consecration, as is the teaching of the Greek schismatics of a later

¹ Most of the documents on this subject have been collected by Salaville (*Epiclèse eucharistique*, D. T. C., t. 5, cols. 194–300) and Cabrol (D. A. C., 142–184).

² It is true that the petition for transubstantiation is not very explicit in a few of these Liturgies, for example in the 'Αποστολική παράδοσις of Hippolytus (*Canonum qui dicuntur Apost. et Aegypt. reliquiae*, ed. Hauler, 1900, pp. 106–107), or in the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiop.* (Ludolf, *Ad suam Hist. Aethiop. . . . comment.*, p. 324; cf. B. 190), or in the *Constitutiones Eccles. Aegypt.* (F. D. 2, 100), and in the *Testamentum*, D. N. J. C. (p. 43). This, however, does not weaken the force of the explicit and definite petition which is made in other very ancient Liturgies; for instance in the *Constitutions of the Apostles* (F. D. 1, 510), the *Greek Liturgy of St. James* (B. 54–54) and *St. Mark* (B. 134), the *Anaphora of Serapion* (F. D. 2, 174–176); then later in the *Liturgy of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom* (B. 329–330), in the *Oratio Eucharistica D. et Salvatoris nostri J. C.* (L. B. 2, 573) in the *Canon Universalis Aethiopum* (R. 1, 517; cf. B. 233), etc. etc. Among the Greek Fathers who testify to this liturgical usage, note particularly Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.*, 23, n. 7. P. G. 33, 1113–1116) and Chrysostom (*De coemeterio et cruce*, 3. P. G. 49, 397–398), who say expressly that a petition is made for the transmutation itself.

³ See the *post-secret* prayer in the *Missa monensis*, 3 and 5 (P. L. 138, 869 and 871); the *post-secret* prayer in the Gothic Mass of the Assumption, and of St. Leudegarius (Mabillon, *De liturgia Gallicana*, 1, 3. P. L. 72, 246 and 304–305).

⁴ See innumerable *post-pridie* prayers in this sense, v.g. of the third Sunday after the Epiphany, the fifth Sunday in Lent, Holy Saturday, Easter Sunday, the Tuesday after Easter, etc. (P. L. 85, 250; 376; 474; 485; 491–492).

period,¹ following Nicholas Cabasilas (*Liturg. Expos.* 27–29. P. G. 150, 425–433) and Symeon of Thessalonica (*Exp. de divino templo*, c. 88, P. G. 155, 733–740)² Among Latin theologians, Catherinus³ and Cheffontaines agree with them.⁴

There are three objections to this.

(1) The faith of the Church, which is that the consecration has already taken place before the epiclesis. See the error of the Armenians condemned under Benedict XII, 8th July 1729 (Mansi, 25, 1242); the decree of the *S.C. de Propaganda Fide*, approved by Benedict XIII, 8th July 1729; the letter of Pius VII to the Patriarch of Antioch (*Acta et Decreta S. Concil. Rec. Collectio Lacensis*, t. 2, p. 440 and 551); the letter of Pius X *de negotio Max. Saxoniae*, 26th December 1910.

(2) The teaching of the early Fathers,⁵ both of the West,⁶

¹ On these theologians see Salaville (259–265).

² According to Cabasilas and Symeon, the uttering long ago by our Lord of the demonstrative words: *This is my body*, effects the transmutation as the principal cause, and our petition here and now for the transmutation, as the instrumental cause. So Cabasilas: “We believe that what effects the mystery is indeed the word of God, but through the instrumentality of the priest, through his intercession and prayer. . . . The words once uttered by the Lord, by the very fact that they were uttered by Him, as they are creative, so, too, they are always operative” (Cabasilas, cols. 429 and 433). Symeon writes in similar fashion (col. 737). Both institute a comparison between the words whereby all things were created and have life and vigour, and our Lord’s utterance now giving life, not to the demonstrative words uttered by us in the person of our Lord, but to our words of petition.

³ *Tractatus de consecrationis forma* of Catherinus, re-edited by Cheffontaines, Paris, 1586, fol. B. 1: “To us [Latins] who have already prayed, Christ is at once present when we have recited His words. To the Greeks who pray after the words of Christ are pronounced, He deigns to be present at the conclusion of that prayer.” Cf. *Quaestio quibusnam verbis Christus confecit divinum eucharistiae sacramentum*, Rome, 1551, pp. 182–188.

⁴ *Christophorus de capite fontium* (Cheffontaines, Archbishop of Caesarea, at one time Minister General of the whole order of Friars Minor, in his *Varii tractatus et disputationes* (fols. 33–51), says that we effect the consecration by the petition for transubstantiation, and that Christ did the same at the Supper: “Because the blessing by which He blessed the bread was sacerdotal. . . . His blessing was the prayer with which He invoked on the bread the change into His own blessed Flesh” (fol. 33 b). Later he developed this view at greater length in his work *De veteri ritu celebrandi Missam* (Paris, 1586). Cf. also *De la vertu des paroles par lesquelles se fait la consécration du Saint Sacrement de l’autel*. “I maintain that the consecration is made by the prayers of the priest and the words of God recited in these prayers” (Paris, 1586).

⁵ Though the Syrian Narsai is not indeed to be classed among orthodox Fathers, still, as his testimony is very ancient (fifth century), we may well refer readers to what he has to say in Narsai, *An exposition of the mysteries* (trans. by R. H. Connolly, T.a.S., 8, 1, pp. 20–23. Cf. Edmund Bishop, *Appendix*, n. 6; *ibid.*, pp. 126–127.)

⁶ Justin (*Apol.*, 1, 65. P. L. 6, 428), for where he speaks of “the word of prayer handed down by Christ”, by which “the food is made the Eucharist (*eucharistiatur*)”, he certainly seems to refer especially to our Lord’s words: *This is my body*, there quoted. Ambrose, *Enarrationes in duodecim psalmos davidicos* (in *Psalm* 38, 25, P. L. 14, 1051): “He Himself whose word sanctifies the sacrifice which is offered

and of the East,¹ at least before St. John Damascene:² that the consecration is caused in the Mass by the words of Christ pronounced by the priest.

is manifested as offering the sacrifice in us." Again *De Myster.*, 9, 52: "The very words of the Lord our Saviour effect the sacrifice (*operantur*)" (P. L. 16, 406). Finally *De benedictionibus Patriarcharum*, 9, 38 (P. L. 14, 686): "Christ Himself gives us that bread which the priest every day consecrates with Christ's own words." The author of a kindred treatise *De Sacramentis*, 4, 14: "By what words is the consecration [made], in whose words? Those of the Lord Jesus. . . . When the time comes for the making (*ut conficiatur*) of the venerable sacrament, then the priest does not use his own words, but the words of Christ. The words of Christ therefore effect, bring about (*conficit*) this sacrament" (P. L. 16, 440). Cf. *ibid.*, 5, 4: "I said to you that before the words of Christ what is offered is called bread, WHEN THE WORDS OF CHRIST HAVE BEEN UTTERED (*deprompta*), THEN IT IS NOT SAID TO BE BREAD, BUT IT IS CALLED THE BODY" (col. 452). Read the whole chapter copied in *Sermo* 84 of the appendix to the sermons of St. Augustine in Migne (P. L. 39, 1907, *et seq.*). This last fact, however, is no proof that we should attribute this *sermo* 84, in view of its style, to a follower of Augustine (as Salaville thinks, p. 242) rather than of Ambrose. Augustine, *Serm.* 227: "The bread which you see on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the body of Christ" (P. L. 39, 1100). Isidore (?), *Epist.* 7, *Ad Redemptum Archidiaconum*, c. 2: "Of the substance of the sacrament are the words of God, pronounced by the priest in the sacred mystery, namely, *This is my body*, as also wheaten bread and wine" (P. L. 83, 905). St. Agobardus, *Contra libros quatuor Amalarii*, c. 13. (P. L. 104, 347), and after him all the rest.

¹ St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Or. Catechet.*, c. 37: "This bread is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer; it is not by the eating and drinking that it comes to be the Body of the Word (*proficiat in corpus Verbi*), but by being changed at once into the Body of the Word, according to what was said by the Word: *This is my Body*" (P. G. 45, 97). Chrysostom, in both editions of his homily *de proditione Judae*, n. 6: "The priest stands uttering these words: but it is the power and the grace of God [which effects all]. *This is my body*, he says. This word transforms the proffered gifts (*ea quae proposita sunt*)" (P. G. 49, 380, and 389): an excellent interpretation of this sermon of Chrysostom is supplied by the heretical Severus Antiochenus in his *Epist. ad Misaelem*; cf. P. de Puniet, *Revue d'Hist. Eccl.*, 1912, 1, p. 57). Hesychius, *In Levit.*, IX, 6: *Do it, and his glory will appear to you*. "*Do it*, this is clearly the mystic rite regarding which the Lord enjoined: *Do this for a commemoration of me*. . . . The dispensation of this mystery is wholly by WORDS, particularly BY THE WORD OF THE LORD WHICH CHANGES (*transferente*) those things which are apparent to sense into another thing greater than them and known by the intellect (*intelligibile*)" (P. G. 93, 891). It is quite true that these and many other Greek Fathers, as well as not a few Latin Fathers, did say that the consecration was effected by some kind of invocation of God, for example an invocation of the Word or more commonly of the Holy Spirit; but such a view is in no way repugnant to our thesis, for, as we shall see later, there can be no consecrative narration of the Supper which does not contain an implicit petition for transmutation.

² St. John Damascene, on the one hand, in perfect harmony with the Fathers just cited, teaches that (1) in the Supper Christ effected the transmutation by the actual intimation of the real presence (*rei*), hence by the words: *This is my body* (*De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13. P. G. 94, 1140; cf. Petrus Mansur (?), *De corpore et sanguine Christi*, 2. P. G. 95, 408, B.); and (2) that even now also the sacrament is made or brought about (*confici*) by virtue of that intimation of our Lord (*loc. cit.*). On the other hand, however, he holds that the same *antitype* (*ἀντίτυπα*) was given by Basil to the offering before the consecration only (and here the Fathers of the II Nicene Council followed him, Mansi, 13, 261-265; and Nicephorus, Confessor and Pontiff, *Antirrh.* 2, *adv. Const. Copr.*, 2. P. G. 100, 336): while at the same time we know that in the Liturgy of Basil, after the Supper commemoration, this word was given to the sacrament at the beginning of the epiclesis. Hence either one of the two conclusions is forced upon us; either St. John Damascene was in error in thinking

(3) The precept of Christ: *Do this for a commemoration of me*, namely do the same thing that I have done. Now it is admitted on all sides that Christ did not consecrate by an epiclesis (that is, by a petition for consecration), but by His own manifest power.¹

that we consecrate in a different manner (that is, by the epiclesis) to what Christ did (that is, by the words: *This is my body*) although Christ says: *Do this*, that is, what I did. This is what Salaville thinks (247–250). Or, we must interpret Damascene as saying: Basil only uses the word *antitype* for the offering when it is not yet REGARDED AS CONSECRATED. And indeed although the bread and the chalice have been consecrated before the epiclesis, still they are evidently regarded as though not consecrated, when we are asking God to effect the consecration. This interpretation of Damascene appeals to me more than the other: (1) because it is sufficient for his purpose; and (2) because it makes the different statements of Damascene consistent one with the other, as also with the sayings of the other Fathers, particularly of Chrysostom. For though he does assert repeatedly that the consecration is effected by the invocation and descent of the Holy Spirit, in this he does not differ from the Fathers mentioned above.

¹ (1) The Fathers and theologians have asserted, almost with one voice, that Christ consecrated by the demonstrative words: *This is my body*. Let us glance at a few of the earlier writers. The anonymous author of the *Tractatus de solemnitatibus*, c. 5 (*Spicil. Solesm*, 1, 11; cf. xi–xii): “[The Lord acted thus] lest having eaten the [legal] pasch with His disciples, if He had not afterwards changed the sacrifice, saying: *This is my body*, it might be believed that the obligation to eat the legal pasch would still continue” (the full text is quoted in IV (Vol. I). So Christ changed the rite of the sacrifices by these words (*This is my body*); but this can only mean that by these words He instituted and celebrated the new sacrifice. Therefore He sacrificed by these words, hence He consecrated by them. *St. Ephraem*: “He called the bread His own living Body, and He filled it with Himself and with the Holy Spirit . . . What I have called my Body, that it really is. . . . He offered [the chalice] in sacrifice (*sacrificavit*), declaring that it was His own Blood which was to be shed” (*Sermo in hebdomadam sanctam*, 4, 4–6, ed. Lamy, 1, 416 and 422). The author of the *Homilia de corpore et sanguine Christi*, c. 2 (P. L. 30, 272): “By His word, by His secret power, He converts visible creatures into the substance of His Body and Blood saying: *Take ye and eat, this is my body*. And repeating the sanctification He says: *Take ye and drink, this is my blood*.” *St. John Damascene*, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13 (P. G. 94, 1140): “Can He not make bread His Body and wine and water His Blood? It was He who said in the beginning: *Let the earth bring forth green herb*, and to this day, with the advent of rain, it brings forth its fruits, roused to activity and made fruitful by the divine command. God said: *This is my body* and *This is my blood* and *Do this for a commemoration of me*, and by His omnipotent command this is done until He come. For this is what He said: *until he come*; and, by reason of the invocation on this new corn comes the rain: the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost.” *Petrus Mansur* (?), *De immaculato corpore*, 2 (P. G. 95, 408): “He said: *This is my body*; and replacing the economy of nature, at His word bread and wine with water became His Body and Blood.” *Samonas of Gaza*, *Discept. cum Achmed Saraceno* (P. G. 120, 825): “Seeing therefore that He Himself was God by nature, by His divine power and grace He at once (*illico*) sanctified that bread, saying: *This is my body*, having in Himself the Father and the Holy Ghost, and thus He converts the bread into His own Body: nor had He need of any greater than Himself to sanctify that bread. For *what is inferior is blessed by the superior*, so Christ Himself as He was not inferior to the Father and the Holy Ghost, by His own power effected whatsoever He willed.”

(2) Although a few mediaeval writers thought that Christ did not consecrate by these words but before He said them, even they consider that the consecration came, not in answer to a petition of Christ for it, but at the signification of His command. As far as I recall the first was Odo of Cambrai who writes: “Clearly the Blood was made by the blessing. For the blessing took place first, then he added: *This is the*

Therefore neither must we consecrate by an epiclesis, but by imitating Christ, while we carry out in the person of Christ what Christ Himself did. And indeed this parity and this similarity, asserted by Christ Himself, between His manner of consecrating and ours, seems to have been the corner stone of all tradition in this matter.

Hence it is that those who considered that Christ consecrated by intimating what was being done by Himself in regard to the bread and wine concluded from that, without any fear of error, that therefore we, too, induce the effect of consecration by intimating it. Thus, for example, Hugo de Mauritania: "The form of this sacrament is the *COMMEMORATION* of those words which Christ said in the Supper, when He gave His Body and Blood to the disciples, saying: *Take ye, this is my body*. And *JUST AS* by His word He then changed that bread and chalice into the true Body and true Blood, so we firmly believe that these words, pronounced in that order and with that intention by the priest, change the bread and wine into the true Body and true Blood of Christ (*Summa Sententiarum*, tr. 6, c. 4. P. L. 176, 140-141).

Moreover, so much did they take for granted the parity between our rite and that of Christ, that they considered it quite sufficient, in refutation of the view of those few theologians who held that,

chalice of my blood" (*Expositio in canonem missae*. P. L. 160, 1063). Shortly before he had written in a similar strain about the bread (cols. 1601-1602). Next came Stephen of Autun *Tractatus de sacramento altaris*, c. 14 (P. L. 172, 1293): "When He blessed the bread He made His Body . . . it may well be (*potest*) that it was while He was actually giving His Body to the disciples, after the blessing, that He said these words." Then came Baldwin of Canterbury (*Lib. de sacramento altaris* (P. L. 204, 655): "It is difficult to prove that Christ made the change by these words. But we must firmly believe that Christ said these words, and that the bread and wine were substantially changed, either when He said these words or before, when He willed and as He willed." It was not until after this time that Innocent III (*De sacr. altaris mysterio*, 4, 6. P. L. 217, 859) wrote: "We may safely say that Christ made the sacrament (*confecit*) by the divine power, and then gave expression to the form under which those who were to come after would bless. For He Himself, of Himself, blessed by His own power. But we bless by the power which He conferred on the words." These doctors certainly held that we at all events consecrate by the words of our Lord. It was quite otherwise with Catharinus and Cheffontaines later on. They held that neither did Christ consecrate by the power of the words, nor do we so consecrate; indeed Cheffontaines, as we said above, even stated, with daring singularity, that just as we effect the consecration through the epiclesis, so, too, Christ obtained it by prayer (*impetrasse*).

The opinion of John Watterich (*Der Konsekrationsmoment im heiligen Abendmahl und seine Geschichte*, 1896, pp. 3, 8, 20-21, etc.), who assigns not only the consecration of our Lord, but ours also to the blessing signified by the hand movements, may well be passed over. For when he wrote this he was not numbered amongst Catholic theologians but, as a schismatic, was in the present matter a plain heretic.

before pronouncing the words, Christ consecrated by a silent blessing, to argue back from our mode of consecration to that of our Lord. Innocent III himself, who held that Christ consecrated before saying the words, attests this where, before giving His own opinion, he says in reference to the opinion of others (which we adopt): “SEEING THAT the priest consecrates (*conficiat*, lit. makes the sacrament = consecrates) at the uttering of the words: *This is my body, this is my blood*, THEY THINK THEY HAVE GOOD GROUNDS FOR BELIEVING that Christ also consecrated by saying the words” (*loc. cit.*).

St. Albert the Great is quite definite in the matter: “Some say that He transubstantiated the bread into His Body by a secret blessing, and these say that He consecrated (*confecit*) by blessing, and that afterwards, saying: *This is my body*, He instituted the use of the sacrament. And this is not probable BECAUSE in this way the Church would celebrate the sacrament otherwise than Christ gave us the example—*formam*” (meaning “the example”) (*Enarrationes in evangelium Marci*, XIV, 22).

On the part of the priest, therefore, the efficient cause of the consecration is the pronouncement according to due rite and intention of the words: *This is my body*, etc., and so the epiclesis in no way enters into the consecration by way of efficient causality, as actually effecting the consecration. One may ask, however, whether the epiclesis could be considered, not indeed in the light of an efficient cause, but in the light of a moral cause, by way of impetration, if the OPERATIVE VIRTUE though reserved indeed for our pronouncement of the words of our Lord, only then, and just then, had its effect when the IMPETRATORY VIRTUE OF the epiclesis concurred with it, as Dom. Toutté thought (*De doctrina Cyrili, dissert.* 3, c. 12, n. 97. P. G. 33, 283): “In this sacrament there are two things which the Church must provide. First, she must recite the words of Christ, so that just as formerly on His lips at the Last Supper they operated the wonderful conversion of the Eucharist, so, too, now these words on the lips of His ministers who bear His person may operate the same conversion of the Eucharist; and she must express her desire that Christ according to His promise may not be wanting to His sacrament. As she cannot provide these two things in the same moment, she is compelled to separate them in

time. But the sacrificial action, though composed of these two parts, is one, and the unity of the action makes it of little import which part precedes or follows the other. Nevertheless it seems more appropriate that the impetratory cause which is in the prayers, should precede and introduce the efficient cause, which we place in the words of Christ." This kind of moral causality, however, would be little more than a condition of the consecration, and so this opinion is sufficiently answered in what we have to say immediately on the view that the epiclesis is a condition of the consecration.

We might regard the epiclesis as a condition of the consecration in three main ways. In the *first place*, if the epiclesis which I am making here and now, after the pronouncement of the form, were a condition, which, being given, the form already pronounced beforehand, becomes now and now only effective, as Renaudot (*op. cit.*, *passim*) and Le Brun (*op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 223 *et seq.* especially pp. 263 and 267) thought. Against this opinion stands the Catholic dogma that the consecration has already taken place when I pronounced the form.

In the *second place*, the epiclesis would be a condition, if the epiclesis which I am soon to make were either actually, or in intention, a condition of the consecration, which I, uttering the form, am here and now making.¹

There are two objections to this:

(1) Nothing is an actual condition (*conditio in re*) of the existence of something else if that other thing, already having been brought into existence, would not be nullified (*transiret in infectam*) by its omission. Now it is impossible for a consecration once made to come to be nullified, no matter what happens in respect of the epiclesis.

¹ In one or other of these ways, perhaps rather the latter, it would seem that we should understand Combesius in a marginal note of his to the homily of St. John Damascene in *Sabbatum sanctum* (c. 35. P. G. 96, 637-638), the corrected text of which we submit: ". . . that is to say, this transmutation is not made WITHOUT RELATION to the invocation which is either antecedent (as with the Latins), or consequent (as with the Greeks), to the words of the Lord, in which words nevertheless the actual virtue is, we always effecting the very same thing which the words of Christ once said by Christ did." Le Quien commends these words and makes them his own (in note 79 to book 4 *de Fide orthodoxa*, c. 13. P. G. 94, 1142) and after him even Cardinal Pitra (strange to say) warmly approves of them (*Spicileg. Solesm.*, t. 1, p. 441): "No one seems to have explained this rite [of the epiclesis] more lucidly than Combesius."

(2) That is not a condition in intention (*in proposito*, that is, by the intention of doing it in the future) of what I here and now do when I perform the consecration, if, even without that intention, not only the matter of the consecration is at hand, but the form also is complete in its signification as form, and there is an absolute intention of applying the form to the matter. Now in the case at issue, these last two conditions are present without any further intention, of reciting the epiclesis: for in the first place, unless the form were in every way complete as form, before the pronouncing of the epiclesis, it would not operate before the epiclesis was said, as even our adversaries admit that it does; and secondly, it is one thing to intend the future recitation of the epiclesis, and quite another to intend the application of the integral form of consecration to the proper matter of it; nor does the defect of the one intention (of the epiclesis) make void the other (of the consecration).

In the *third place*, it might be a condition in this way, that the generally received usage of the Church would publicly determine the sense of the form: whence the consecration would be said to be conditioned by the epiclesis, not understood determinately and individually (as if my consecration now were to depend on my epiclesis now), but considered indeterminately and universally—my consecration depending on the common usage existing in the Church, of making an epiclesis. There would be this advantage in such an explanation of the epiclesis, that no matter how deficient my epiclesis may be (either actually or in intention), my consecration would nevertheless not be deficient.

Against this explanation, however, stands the plain fact that the public determination in the Church, of the form, would remain sufficient even if the epiclesis were universally abolished. For taking as actually given the positive command of our Lord: *Do this for a commemoration of me*—that is, what I Myself have done—it is sufficient for the understanding of what is done by us that the indicative words *This is my body* should be pronounced in such manner that they cannot be understood as said of our body, as though they were said in our own person, but plainly as said in the person of Christ of His Body. From this it will at once follow that the same thing is signified and effected by us, as was signified and effected at the Supper.

(B) THE SUITABILITY OF THE EPICLESIS

Now that we have concluded that the epiclesis is not efficacious or necessary, the question at once arises: what purpose does the epiclesis serve? The consecration is over and yet it is still prayed for. If the consecration has taken place, surely to ask for it is either sheer infidelity, as though one did not believe it had occurred, or at the very least it is useless? Either then the epiclesis is repugnant, or at the least it is pointless.¹ We maintain that the epiclesis is neither repugnant nor pointless.

It is not repugnant for the following reason: it has been the common opinion of our doctors and theologians that in the rites of the Church what is really effected in one indivisible time duration, should, in its solemnisation, be distributed in time, and be, so to speak, diffused and expanded in a series of ceremonial actions, in the various phases of the Liturgy, so to secure a salutary adaptation of the faith and devotion of those concerned to the various actions and benefits of the one essential action, more fully explained by these different ceremonies.² Hence it is the custom of the Church after a sacrament has been conferred—Holy Orders or Extreme Unction, for example—to enunciate the production of the various sacramental effects, as if they were only there and

¹ Such is the opinion of Rauschen, *L'Eucharistie et la Pénitence*, French translation, Paris, 1910, p. 124: "It must be admitted that either the epiclesis is destined to disappear or that the consecration has not been completed until it has been said. One is not bound at any rate to attribute the consecration to the epiclesis. Did the composers of the epiclesis act as if the consecration were not complete at the end of the Supper narrative? I doubt it. If my opinion is true, it will be difficult to conserve the epiclesis in its actual tenor." The German edition of this work is still more radical (*Eucharistie und Buss-Sakrament*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1908). Rauschen might have spoken more cautiously. For to any Catholic two things are plain: that the consecration has taken place before the epiclesis, and that the rite of the epiclesis solemnised for many centuries, approved and sanctioned by the Church, is not inappropriate.

² The *Glossa ordinaria Decreti (De consecr., 2, 72, Rome, 1584, tom. 2, 1813-1814)*, on the words of the prayer *Jube haec perferri*, gave full expression to this opinion centuries ago: "It seems that this prayer is superfluous, because it is said after the words by virtue of which the Body of Christ is consecrated (*conficitur*), and hence the prayer about what has been done is superfluous. I reply: not only does Scripture not attend to such strict time limits, but the priest, too, as he cannot say many things at one time, SO SPEAKS AS IF TIME STOOD STILL, AND AS IF THOSE THINGS STILL HAD TO BE DONE WHICH AT THE BEGINNING OF HIS SPEECH HAD NOT YET BEEN DONE. And the words are not to be referred to the time of their utterance (but to the mind or thought of the speaker)."

then produced; whether this be done by the indicative words, as in the celebration of the Mass, the ministration of the sacrament of penance, the ordination of priests, or by words of prayer, as when after one sufficient anointing the others are supplied. Why should one consider that a mode of action is repugnant in the celebration of the Eucharist, which is not repugnant in the ministration of various sacraments?

To justify the epiclesis, then, we have only now to show how, in line with the various ceremonies in the solemn conferring of the sacraments, it serves a useful purpose, explanatory of the essential action, and so, to come to our second point, that it is not otiose, functionless. Now the consecration, the essential action round which all turns, is *appropriately* declared and explained in the prayer after the consecration, in which we invoke either God Omnipotent, or the Trinity, or the Word and His angelic company, or the Holy Spirit. To make this clear, we shall consider, *firstly*, the position of the epiclesis in the Liturgy; *secondly*, the invocation in it of the Person of the divinity.

(i) *The Position of the Epiclesis is Appropriate.*

In the one action of our sacrifice three things are effected—commemoration, offering, consecration; for in the *commemoration* of the sacrifice of our Lord we *offer* the victim of the sacrifice of our Lord through the *consecration* of the bread into the Body and the wine into the Blood. These three things are done at the same time in the Supper narrative spoken over the bread and wine, but in the narrative not all of them are equally evident. The commemoration is without doubt self-evident, for to narrate is to commemorate; but the offering and the consecration are not so explicitly expressed in the narrative. Hence we look for a further elucidation of these last two after the narrative, in which alone all three—commemoration, offering, consecration—are effected: unless such elucidation should have already preceded the narrative.

There are three reasons why the narrative has come appropriately to be placed first.

For since our Lord after the Supper gave the precept *Do this*,

etc., the Apostles quite naturally and spontaneously, when doing what Christ did, not only imitated the substance of what He did, but also, as far as was possible, all its accidentals; that is, they imitated the very liturgy of Christ Himself. And so, because Christ immediately after giving thanks to God the Father (*I Cor.*, XI, 24)—where the great Action commences—pronounced the sacramental words over the bread and wine, the Apostles followed the same order as Christ and, the laudatory and eucharistic character of the whole Action having been signified by the praise and thanksgiving, they immediately went on to the utterance of the sacramental words: all the more because the narrative of the actual Supper (wherein was offered the sacrifice of the Redemption), rightly claimed for itself the last and chief place in the thanksgiving; because the Supper coupled with the Passion was the last and the greatest benefit for which the thanksgiving was made. As the command of the Lord, *Do this for a commemoration of me*, was the last part of the narrative, quite suitably there followed at once the enumeration of the mysteries—Passion, Resurrection, Ascension—the commemoration (*anamnesis*) of which was implied in the action; hence comes at once after the narrative in our Mass the prayer *unde et memores*. After this it remained that the offering and the consecration, certainly involved in the commemoration of the Supper, but not yet sorted out, should be brought into clearer evidence. But in what order? Should this manifestation of the offering come before that of the consecration, or vice versa? In this connection two remarks are necessary. In the *first place*, every sacrificial offering has, as its goal, its acceptance by God. Hence the natural order of things demands that if we are setting out to distinguish the formal concepts of sacrifice, we should first declare the offering as coming from us, and then a prayer should be made for its acceptance, or as Virgil often says, *that God be invoked* on our vows or sacrifices (*invocetur Deus votis*)—invoked, that is, not through the sacrifices, but *on to* the sacrifices.

Secondly, because our sacrifice is sacramental, apparently a sacrifice of bread and wine but really the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, it is accepted by God in so far as the apparent victim passes into the true Victim of the eternal sacrifice, in the

fullest sense finally and irrevocably accepted in glory by God.¹ Acceptance therefore is effected by the transubstantiation.²

Transubstantiation indeed is a special kind of acceptance in the same way as our sacrifice is a special kind of sacrifice within the common genus of sacrifice. Hence, just as, generally speaking, acceptance of the offering would logically be prayed for after the enunciation of the offering, so, too, with us Christians, transubstantiation, a special kind of acceptance, is logically asked for after the enunciation of the offering. Moreover, since for us, in the Mass, acceptance and transubstantiation are in effect the same, a petition for acceptance could be made in two ways: either for acceptance in general, or especially for transubstantiation. It is made in general if we merely invoke God on our sacrifice, it is made in a special way if He is invoked as the worker of the transubstantiation. In whatever way we make the petition we always ask for the same thing, as for us there is only one way or kind of acceptance by God of our offering. The Liturgies, therefore, may pray in vague terms (as in the *Testamentum D.N.J.C.*, in the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopiae* or the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae*, and in the Latin version of the *Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις*) for the divine approach, or they may ask more expressly for the

¹ Hence in the prayer *Quam oblationem*, which in the Latin Church has crept into a place before the consecration coming just before *Qui pridie*, we beg that our offering be ratified and accepted by the fact of its passing into, becoming the Body and Blood of Christ: how true it is that the transubstantiation is the acceptance of our sacrifice. Stephen of Autun (*Tractatus de sacramento altaris*, c. 13. P. L. 172, 1291-1292) well understood this when he wrote: "In order that the offering of the bread and wine may have the efficacy and the power of conferring what we petition for, WE ASK [in the prayer *Quam oblationem*] THAT IT BE CHANGED INTO WHAT IS BETTER, AND THAT IT BE LEGITIMATELY APPROVED FOREVER AND BE RATIFIED, THAT IS, BECOME FIRMLY AND IMMUTABLY SUCH (*firmam et immobilem fieri*). We pray that the food may become the food of angels, namely that the offering of the bread and wine may be transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ who is the blessed oblation, that is, replete with the blessing of every grace, of whose fulness we have all received. . . . THE SON OF GOD IS SAID TO BE THE LEGITIMATELY APPROVED OFFERING (*adscriptam*), approved, appointed, designated in the writings of the holy Fathers, and never to be consigned to oblivion, and hence RATIFIED (*ratam*), THAT IS, BOTH FIRM AND IMMUTABLE, namely, CONFIRMED IN THE STATE OF IMMORTALITY AND INCORRUPTION, LASTING FOREVER and sufficing to give salvation and the remission of sins. . . ."

² Cf. our remarks in Th. I (Vol. I) on inchoative acceptance, and in Th. V (Vol. I) on *Hebr.* IX, 14, also in Thesis XXII on the real acceptance of the victim which was promised to our Lord. That by the transubstantiation is secured the acceptability of our gift on the part of God for us appears to be implied in the Mozarabic epiclesis to be quoted directly, where it is said: "We pray and beseech thee, O Omnipotent God, THAT THOU MAYST MAKE ACCEPTABLE TO THYSELF the sacrifices (*libamina*) of our servitude offered in thy sight" (P. L. 85, 590).

transubstantiation (as in the numerous eastern or western Masses already cited); but in every case they ask for one and the same thing, the acceptance of the victim, which consists in the transubstantiation, just as both the offering of our sacrifice and the commemoration of the sacrifice of our Lord consist in the transubstantiation.¹ Therefore, once we admit as legitimate the principle

¹When the transubstantiation was asked for (after the consecration) in the epiclesis, we would necessarily speak JUST AS IF the gifts had not yet been transubstantiated, hence in a prayer of this kind they were not called the Body and Blood of Christ, though already they were the Body and Blood, they were spoken of only as the *antitypes* (*antitypa*) of the Body and Blood of Christ; thus in the Liturgy of *St. Basil*: "Having placed before thee the antitypes of the holy Body and Blood of thy Christ . . . we pray and beseech thee . . . that thy Holy Spirit may come . . . on the proffered gifts, and that he may bless and sanctify them and show (= make) this bread to be the precious Body of the Lord," etc. (B. 329-330).

The word *antitype* is equivalent to the word *figure* which is inserted in a similar prayer (though in this case as a preamble to the Supper narrative) by the author of the work *De sacramentis* (1, 5, c. 5, n. 21. P. L. 16, 443): "*Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi. Qui pridie,*" etc.—the more probable meaning of which is (though Batiffol thinks otherwise, *Eucharistie*, 5, p. 361): "Make this offering, namely that which is the figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, bread and wine, approved, ratified, reasonable, acceptable for us." This construction and interpretation obtains powerful support by comparison with a similar Mozarabic prayer, this time not a preamble to the uttering of the words of our Lord, but a *post-pridie* prayer after that recitation ". . . *Quorum oblationem benedictam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris; que est imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Jhesu Christi Filii tui ac redemptoris nostri*" (Dom Marius Férotin, *Liber ordinum*, Paris, 1904, col. 322). We translate: "Do thou deign to make the offering of these things, which is the image and likeness of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, blest, ratified and reasonable." Hence *likeness* (*similitudo*) is used in the same way as *figure* (*figura*), as equivalent to *antitype*, as is expressly indicated in the *Canonum* . . . *reliquiae* (75, 6-9, Ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 112): "Let the oblations be offered by the deacons to the bishop, and let him give thanks over the bread as an image (*exemplum*), which the Greeks call an antitype of the Body of Christ; and over the chalice mingled with wine as an antitype which the Greeks call a likeness (*similitudinem*) of the Blood which was shed for all who believed in Him." Hence with the Greeks particularly the word *likeness* (*ὁμοίωμα* = Latin *similitudo*) will be equivalent to *antitype*. Serapion of Thmuis makes use of this word in his *Anaphora* (F. D. 2, 174) over the bread (*τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος*) immediately before the uttering of our Lord's words *This is my body*. He also uses it over the chalice both before and after the saying of the words *This is the new testament which is my blood*. So before, we have: "We have offered also the chalice, the likeness (*ὁμοίωμα*) of the Blood, since the Lord Jesus Christ took the chalice and said: *Take, Drink,*" etc. . . . And after: "Therefore we have also offered the chalice presenting the likeness (*ὁμοίωμα*) of the Blood"—this last, however, BEFORE THE EPICLESIS. BUT AFTER THE EPICLESIS (or the *post-pridie*, or some such prayer), though at times the Eucharist is called the image of eternal life, or the effigy of the Passion, still, as far as I can remember, it is never called the image (or the likeness, etc.) of the Body or of the Blood of Christ IN THE LITURGIES (for the prayer which the *Apostolic Constitutions*, bk. 7, c. 24, presents is not and never was in the Liturgy of the Church, as will be seen in Thesis XLIII (Vol. III), rather it was an interpolation and perversion of the prayer in the *Didache*, to be said over the ordinary bread and wine).

OUTSIDE THE LITURGIES, however, the name *antitype* or some similar word was more freely given to the consecrated Eucharist, as consecrated, and in many senses all of them quite orthodox.

The Body of Christ in the Eucharist is called *antitype*, for example in relation

of ceremonial expansion through the successive parts of the Liturgy, we have a reasonable explanation of petitioning for the consecration after the enunciation of the offering has been made, and this has been preceded by the commemoration of the Supper,¹ the order being the commemoration of the Supper, enunciation of

to the types of the Old Testament, as in a homily of one, perhaps Epiphanius junior (*De resurrectione*. P. G. 43, 468); also in relation to the species or appearances by which the Body is indicated, as in Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.*, 5, 20. P. G. 33, 1124); or in relation to the fellowship now imparted to us in our partaking of the Eucharist, and to be consummated by the beatific vision in heaven, as in Damascene (*De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13. P. G. 94, 1153. Cf. Origen, in *Matth.*, t. 11. P. G. 13, 952). Then again the expression *the antitypes of the Body and Blood* (τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος) was used in a more or less indefinite manner by the Greeks in the same way and with the same sense as we speak of the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, to designate the sacramental complex of the Body and the species or symbols. Thus, for example, Eustathius of Antioch in *Prov.*, IX, 5. P. G. 18, 685; St. Gregory Nazianzan, *Or.*, 8, 18. P. G. 35, 809; *Constitutiones Apostolicae*, 5, 14, 7. F. D. 1, 273, etc. etc.

The Latins, too, called the Eucharistic Body of Christ the figure or the sign (*figura vel signum*) of the Body of Christ, either as It suffered in Its proper visible form on earth (Lanfranc, *Lib. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, 14. P. L. 150, 424; Alger, *De sacram. corp. et sang. dom.*, 1, 18. P. L. 180, 792), or as It is to be seen in heaven (Guitmund of Aversa, *De Corp. et sang. Dom. verit.*, 2. P. L. 149, 1460).

Finally we all speak of the Eucharist as the sacrament or the sign or symbol of the mystical body.

St. Paschasius Radbertus in one passage, with his attention fixed on the actual sacramental species rather than on the Eucharistic complex of the Body and Blood, speaks as follows: "Let us partake of the likeness (*similitudinem*; that is, symbol) of His Flesh, let us drink of the likeness of the precious Blood" (*De corpore et sanguine Domini*, 13, P. L. 120, 1315). But this reliable protagonist of the real presence in the Eucharist immediately goes on to clear up any doubts his words might leave as to the presence of the Body and Blood under these appearances, by adding: "in such a way, however, that truth is not wanting in the sacrament [meaning: in the sign], and so the pagans cannot scoff at us for drinking the reeking blood (*cruorem*) of a slain man . . ." etc. He was anticipated in this use of the word *likeness* by the author of the book *De sacramentis*, 4, 4, 20. P. L. 16, 443: "For as thou didst assume the likeness (*similitudinem*) of death in baptism, so also thou dost drink the likeness (*similitudinem*) of the precious Blood, so that the horror of fresh streaming blood (*crucoris*) is absent, and nevertheless the price of our redemption works its effect." I think, too, that the following words of the *Didascalia*, 6, 22, 2. F. D. 1, 376 should be understood in this sense: "Offer the Eucharist accepted by God (*acceptam*) which is according to the likeness (*similitudinem*) of the sovereign (*regalis*) Body of Christ." In passages of this kind, and they are not a few, the word Eucharist means that which in our Eucharistic bread is the visible sacrament or sign (= *sacramentum tantum*, sign only). This manner of speaking is quite legitimate.

¹ Thus one can see what is true and what is false in the comment of Innocent III (*De sacr. Alt. Myst.*, 5, 2. P. L. 217, 888): "The section commencing *qui pridie quam pateretur* [presumably all between the end of *Quam oblationem* to the beginning of *unde et memores*] should have been placed at the end of the Canon, since in it the consecration is consummated; but since this would have impeded the order of the historical narration . . . the arranger of the Canon, compelled as it were by a certain necessity, placed this section in the very heart, so to speak, of the Canon, in the middle of it, so that what follows is understood as going before: in accordance with the common figure, which often occurs, by which what is last in the worked-out scheme (*ratione*) came first in the intellect" (P. L. 145, 885). It is true that the words following the consecration are to be understood as if they went before; it is false that the order has been reversed, in the worked-out plan of the Canon.

the offering, prayer for the consecration. These three elements of sacrifice were naturally displayed in our ritual, and in this order, like so many blossoms from a tree (*effloruerunt*), from our consideration of the manner in which Christ gave thanks to the Father, of which thanksgiving the special theme, from beginning to end, was supplied by the Supper of the Lord.¹

Moreover, the complete liturgical celebration of early times consisted in these three, to which, as we have said, the Lord's prayer was immediately added; it was only at a later period that *anamneses*, *proscomidæ* and *epicleses* (commemorations, offerings, invocations) crept in as preliminaries, as, for example, in the more recent portion of the Roman Mass, which extends from the dismissal of the catechumens to the beginning of the preface.

In addition to these intrinsic reasons for the structure of our Liturgy, the example of Christ Himself commends it, and perhaps, too, helps somewhat to explain it historically.

For in the cenacle and, be it noted, after the Supper, Christ prayed in express words for the acceptance of His sacrifice when He addressed the Father: *Father, the hour is come, GLORIFY THY SON* (*John*, XVII, 1). In these words He asked for the acceptance of His Sacrifice, because clearly the actual (external) glorification of the Son was the acceptance by the Father. In this same sacerdotal prayer Christ expressly speaks of the sanctification which is His, by reason of His being made a Victim sacred to God, whereby we are sanctified (*John*, XVII, 19). Here note the similarity to the epiclesis, in which a petition is made for the sanctification of the gifts, in order to our sanctification by means of communion.²

¹ This scheme is easily recognised in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, in the *Greek Liturgy of St. James*, in the *Test. D. N. J. C.*, in the *Constitutions of the Ethiopian and Egyptian Churches*. Another scheme worked out a little differently is found in the *Anaphora Serapionis*; in this the offering is declared before the commemoration, after which then, naturally, the invocation alone follows.

² The unknown author of the *Sermo* inserted in the *Historiæ ecclesiasticæ et Mysticæ Contemplatio* (P. G. 98, 437) had probably in mind this parallelism between the epiclesis and the sacerdotal prayer of Christ. He also sees at the same time, in the transmutation, or conversion of the material elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, which we pray for in the epiclesis, the quasi-continued generation noted by Paul (*Acts*, XIII, 33) in the glorification of Jesus raised from the dead and, in respect of our priesthood, the fulfilment of the sanctification which Christ acquired by His sacrifice: "The priest prays to God that the mystery of His Son be carried out (*conficiatur*) and that this bread and wine be made or changed into the Body and Blood of Christ and of God, and that the words of Scripture be fulfilled: *This day I have begotten thee*. Hence, too, the Holy Spirit, invisibly present by the good

What we have said shows that the words which we use in the Liturgy about the consecration, not of course the words of consecration, but the later reference to it in the Canon, should take the form of petition and not the form of affirmative statement: for as the consecration or transubstantiation is considered as the divine acceptance of the Victim, it would not be congruously explained by us in our Liturgy by indicative words, which are more suited to those things which come from us, whereas acceptance as such comes from God. Therefore just as what comes from us is rightly explained by words of affirmation, so we quite properly use the language of petition when elucidating what comes from God.

(ii) *The Invocation of the Divinity is Appropriate.*

It is fitting that the invocation should be either of God without distinction of Person (cf. *Irenaeus, adv. Haeres.*, 4, 18, 5. P. G. 7, 1028), or of the Trinity, for the consecration is the work of the whole Trinity. As a matter of fact the Trinity is invoked in the *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi* (p. 43; cf. p. 188, where the editor gives a better punctuation).¹

pleasure of the Father and the will of the Son, secretly manifests the divine power, and attests it by the hand of the priest and changes and consecrates the proffered gifts into the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said: *For them do I sanctify myself that they also may be sanctified.*"

¹ Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cateches.*, 19, 7. P. G. 33, 1072) also speaks of the invocation of the Trinity when he says: "Before the invocation of the adorable Trinity it was simply ordinary bread and wine; after the invocation the bread has become the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ." But what he calls here the invocation of the Trinity, in another passage he terms the invocation of the Holy Spirit: "After the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the bread of the Eucharist is not ordinary bread but the Body of Christ" (*Cateches.*, 21, 3. P. G. 33, 1089-1092). The answer to the apparent contradiction appears to be supplied from the *Cateches.*, 23, 7. P. G. 33, 1113-1116, where the functions of the individual Persons of the Trinity are distinguished in such a manner, that the Father alone is prayed to, while the sending of the Holy Spirit is petitioned for, finally to effect the presence of the Body of Christ: "We pray to the merciful God to send the Holy Spirit on the offering, to make the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ." This description of what occurs coincides with the Greek Liturgy of *St. James* (B. 53-54). On this matter cf. Tyrer, *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*, London, 1917, pp. 39-41.

It is not easy to decide whether Origen (*I Cor.*, VII, 5, ed. C. Jenkins, J. T. C., 1908, July, vol. 9, p. 502) is to be understood in the same sense, or after the manner of the *Testamentum*. His words are: "That in the Law one might take the loaves of the proposition, he must be clean from women; that one may take the bread, more excellent than the loaves of the proposition, upon which has been invoked the name of God and of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, should he not be more pure, that he truly may receive the bread to his salvation, and not to his condemnation?"

Appropriately also the Father is invoked to send another Person, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, or both. First, then, let us consider the sending of the Son, then the sending of the Holy Spirit.¹

The petition for the sending of the Son is plainly appropriate for it was the Son who first consecrated by His own power. And so we find such a petition in the *Anaphora Serapionis* (and such a petition seems also to be approved by Athanasius, if he is the author of the *Sermo ad baptizandos*. P. G. 26, 1325), and in the Mass of the Presanctified in the Jacobite rite (published in J. T. S., v. 4, p. 75), also in a number of Mozarabic *post-pridie* prayers (v.g. P. L. 85, 117), and, as we have said, in all the epicleses which contain the petition that the proffered gifts be borne by the holy Angel of God to the sublime Altar of God.

That Christ is the sublime Altar of God has been shown elsewhere, in Ths. XIII (Vol. I), XVII and XXI. Furthermore, it would appear that Christ is here *the holy Angel* of God, because here by the word Angel or Envoy (*Missus*) no mere creature can be meant but an Uncreated Divinity; and that not the Person of the Holy Spirit, therefore the Person of the Son of God.

That a mere creature does not suffice is evident from the fact that, as we have seen above, the petition for transubstantiation itself is petitioned for under the name of one for translation, carrying, being borne to the sublime Altar (*Jube haec perferri*): the one therefore who carries the gift to the sublime Altar is none other than the one who works the transubstantiation. But the transubstantiation is not the work of any mere angelic spirit, but of the priest, both the ministerial priest and the principal Priest, as also of the whole Trinity. Therefore the petition is made by the ministerial priest to the Father either that Christ or the Holy Spirit be sent (thus L. A. Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis der griechischen and orientalischen Liturgieen*, 1864, 171–172).

¹ At times, too, a prayer is made to the Father, that His majesty might descend: "O Lord God and the Father of Jesus Christ (*Descendat Domine [Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi]*), may the plenitude of thy majesty, divinity . . . and glory descend on this bread and chalice, and may it be made for us a legitimate Eucharist in the transformation of the Body and Blood of the Lord" (*Collectio missae monensis*, 4. P. L. 138, 871). We find similar words in the *Liber ordinum*, ed. Ferótin, col. 265. On the other hand, in the Coptic Liturgies of *St. Basil* (in Greek) and of *St. Gregory* (in Greek and Coptic), the Father is never mentioned, but a petition is made to the Son only that He may send the Holy Spirit (R. 1, p. 16, 31 and 105).

It is unsatisfactory, however, to identify here the Angel with the Holy Spirit. For in the first place the Holy Spirit is never called an angel in the Scriptures nor in the Mass liturgies, as far as I remember.¹ No exponent of the Mass that I know of has ever said that the Holy Spirit was indicated here. Hence when Hoppe (*op. cit.*, pp. 172–191) says that the Holy Spirit is meant here, his interpretation has little or no support from liturgical literature. His view, moreover, rests on an argument which is quite ineffective: that Christ cannot be designated here under the name of Angel, because He is designated under the name of Altar. But it is no more inconsistent to speak of Christ as at the same time Altar and Priest than to speak of Him as Priest and Victim, or Victim and Altar. Hence the Fathers speak time without number in the same breath of these three functions in Christ—Priest, Victim, Altar.² Now the name Angel is here, as we have said, applicable to Christ as Priest. Hence no inconsistency is involved.

On the other hand, in holy Scripture Christ is called the Angel of the Testament (*Mal.*, III, 1), and that, too, in His relation to the worship of the temple. Hence the name *Angel* would be quite appropriate to Him who functions here by His sacerdotal power, as liturgus *of the holies and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, not man* (*Hebr.*, VIII, 2), that is, as Chief Priest (*antistes*) of the true supernal Altar, both sacrifice and temple. Furthermore, in the Septuagint (the text which the early Christians followed), in *Isaias*, IX., 5, He is called the “Angel of great counsel”. And so in the oldest of all the Liturgies preserved for us the Canon commences with these words: “We give thee thanks, O God, through thy beloved servant (*puerum*), Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent in these latter days to us, as Saviour, Redcemer and ANGEL OF THY WILL” (*Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις* of Hippolytus, *Canon. . . . reliq.*, ed. Hauler, p. 106; and cf. the cognate Liturgies).

¹ Hoppe (p. 177) mentions one example of the use of the word Angel for the Holy Spirit, but outside of the Mass, in the blessing of the font. It is from the *Gothic Missal*: “Send from on high thy Holy Paraclete, the Angel of truth” (P. L. 72, 274; ed. Bannister, p. 76).

² He was also influenced by another argument equally unconvincing. Thinking that only the Holy Spirit was ever invoked in the epiclesis, when he met with what appeared to be an undoubted epiclesis, he concluded that the heavenly Envoy was none other than the Holy Spirit.

The Fathers, moreover, freely bestowed the name of Angel on Christ.¹

Finally the early exponents of the Mass have handed on to us this interpretation. The better-known examples of these testimonies have been collected by Hoppe (p. 170), in addition to the few, out of many, quoted by us in Th. XXI. Nevertheless, here the Angel of the sacrifice is not Christ alone, rather it is Christ as Chief, as Prince of the holy angels who minister to the liturgy of the heavenly Priest, Victim, and Altar. To Him they are guards of honour; to us they are protectors. It will not be out of place while on this subject, to point out how and for what reason the ministry of the angelic hosts is associated in these epicleses, with the uncreated Angel—the Word of God.

Long ago Justin had linked together in rather an astonishing manner (*miro modo*) the angelic army and the divine Word, in a passage where he enumerates the three divine Persons, explaining to the pagans, not so much the Christian faith as the Christian worship: “We admit that we are atheists in our attitude towards the false gods your imagination conjures up, but not in our relations to the most true God, Father of justice and clemency, and all other virtues, and free from all evil; but Him [God the Father] we worship and adore, and the Son who came from Him and who instructed us in these things, also THE ARMY OF THE OTHER (τῶν ἄλλων) GOOD ANGELS who follow in His train and are likened to Him, and we worship (σεβόμεθα) and adore (προσκυνοῦμεν) the prophetic Spirit, paying honour (τιμῶντες) in reason and in truth” (*Apol.*, 1, 6. P. G. 6, 336).

There are two reasons why the angelic choir should accompany Christ in what we may call His liturgical descent to us and His ascent to heaven.

Firstly, in the theophanies (=appearances, manifestations, showing of God to man) of the Old Testament the angels frequently stood by (*stetere pro*, accompanied) the Word; and they will be present at the theophany of the Last Judgment when Christ will come from heaven in glory . . . with His

¹ Justin, *Dial.*, c. 55–60 and 76. P. L. 6, 596–613 and 653; Hilary, 4 *Trin.*, c. 23–33. P. L. 10, 113–121, etc. Meanwhile see Cyprian, *Testimon.*, 2, 5 (Hartel, 1, 67–68), on Christ AS PRIEST, according to *Mal.*, II, 7; III, 1.

angels (*Matth.*, XVI, 27; cf. *St. Mark*, VIII, 38), nay in his majesty and that of his Father and of the holy angels (*St. Luke*, IX, 26). It is fitting, therefore, that the angels should assist, not indeed visibly but spiritually, AT THE THEOPHANY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH IS CONSTANTLY RECURRING IN THE SACRAMENTAL SHOWING FORTH OF THE GLORIFIED CHRIST, *the Mystery of Faith*.

That there is a Theophany in the Sacrament is indicated first of all by the words of the epiclesis in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*: “Mayest thou send down thy Holy Spirit on to this Victim, that it may show this bread to be the Body of thy Christ” (*Καταπέμψης τὸ ἅγιόν σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, . . . ὅπως ἀποφήνη τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου κ.τ.λ.*) (*Const. Apost.*, 1, 8, c. 12. F. D. 1, 510). Here transmutation is unquestionably what is petitioned for, but it is called a showing (“ὅπως ἀποφήνη—that it may show”), because it is precisely by the transubstantiation that the sacramental signification in respect of the Body and Blood of Christ is made truly demonstrative, demonstrates or shows that Christ is truly present. This is the demonstration or showing (*ἀνάδειξις*) which Basil (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 66. P. G. 32, 188) ascribes to the bread and wine of the eucharist: “The words of the epiclesis at the showing of the bread of the thanksgiving (eucharist) and the cup of benediction (eulogia)—τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τῆς εὐλογίας.” The ancient Liturgy of *St. Basil* is also in accord: “We beg of thee, that thy Holy Spirit may come . . . on these proffered gifts, and bless them and sanctify them, and show forth this bread to be the precious Body itself of our Lord and God, and Saviour Jesus Christ” (*Σὲ παδακαλοῦμεν . . . ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμά σου . . . ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἀγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδείξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτὸ τὸ τιμιον σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) (B. 329–330). Basil is not here speaking of a showing or manifestation of a presence already presupposed, but still latent, not yet manifested, as if the consecration had previously taken place, and afterwards at the epiclesis there was some kind of manifestation of it; but the reference is undoubtedly to the showing

which obtains in the transubstantiation itself.¹ For by the transmutation Christ is shown to the eyes of faith as present, as Dom Maranus (P. G. 32, 187–188) wisely remarked in a note on the passage cited from Basil. Theodorus Andidensis is clearly in agreement where, in his *Brevis Commentatio*, 27. (P. G. 140, 453), he uses indiscriminately the words μεταποίησις and ἀνάδειξις (=transmutation and showing forth) for one and the same action; similarly, too, the author of a sermon interpolated in the *Historiae ecclesiasticae et mysticae contemplatio*, where in one and the same sense he says the Holy Spirit does two things: “He shows forth the divine power (ὑποδεικνύει τὴν θεϊαν ἐνέργειαν)” ; and “He transmutes and perfects the proffered gifts (μεταβάλλει καὶ τελειοῖ τὰ ὑποκειμενα δῶρα)” (P. G. 98, 437). And there can be no doubt whatever, that this writer, in his explanation of the epiclesis, had in mind a theophany when he wrote (*ibid.* P. G. 98, 437): “The bowed head of the priest performing the divine mystery indicates that he speaks invisibly with God alone. So it is that (*unde*) he perceives the flash of light streaming from the divinity (θεϊαν φωτοφάνειαν), and is filled with joy at the splendour of the glory of the face of God, and withdraws in fear and reverence, as Moses, when he saw God on the mountain in a flame of fire, went back and hid his face, for he feared to see in its glory the face of God.”

Admitting, then, such a theophany in the Eucharist, we can easily see how suitable it is that the angels should be associated with the Word in the epiclesis. For the angels, as we have said, were the accompanying ministers at the theophanies of the Old Testament, and those theophanies were types of the theophanies to come, which under the law of grace we have beneath the veils of the sacrament, showing Christ really present to us, enjoying His sacerdotal and sacrificial glory, until the glory of the Word of God will be consummated in the kingdom, where in the very Flesh which He assumed He will be revealed to us *face to face in his majesty, and that of his Father, and the holy angels.* The place

¹ Just as with the Greeks, either of the words ἀποφάνεια or ἀνάδειξις (both words meaning *showing*) is used for the setting of the Body and Blood of Christ under the species by which it is shown; so, too, Cyprian (Ep. 63, 2. P. L. 4, 375) speaks of “the wine by which the Blood of Christ is shown”. We will prove later on in L (Vol. III) that in the species there is an actual and formal relation to the Body of Christ as to something DEMONSTRABLE through them.

of the angels, therefore, is appropriate in the fulfilment of the type of the theophanies of the Old Testament, and at the consummation of which, on the last day, they, too, are to be present.

Secondly, mention in the epiclesis of the angels is appropriate for another reason, that an ascent and descent of the angels on Christ is commemorated, typically in *Genesis* and literally in the Gospel. For Jacob saw a ladder by which the angels ascended to heaven, and descended from heaven on to the stone, which, on rising from sleep, he erected into a title, pouring oil upon it, to consecrate the first Altar, the first type of the true Altar, which is Christ (*Gen.*, XXVIII, 11–18). And Christ Himself said to Nathaniel and Philip: *Amen, amen, I say to you, you shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man* (*John*, I, 51).

Surely, it seems to me, we have just such an example of this flitting to and fro of the angels on the Son of Man in the *post-pridie* prayer of the Mozarabic Mass, “*pro quinto dominico Paschae*,” that is, for the fourth Sunday after Easter: “We confess, O Lord, we confess and believe, that in thy body thou didst submit to the punishment of death for our sins, and that, having overcome the destruction (*interitu*; perhaps should be *imperio*, sway) of death for the salvation of mankind, thou didst return with the triumphant angels to the heavenly mansion of the Father, whence thou hadst come. Hence, O Omnipotent God, we pray and beseech thee, to make acceptable to thyself the sacrificial offerings (*libamina*) of our servitude made in thy sight; and when accepted, WITH THE FLITTING TO AND FRO OF THY HOLY ANGEL, distribute them sanctified to us” (P. L. 85, 590).¹

The same may be said of the “archangelic liturgy of God” mentioned in the Greek Liturgy of *St. Mark* cited by us above (Thesis XXI), in its anticipated petition, at the beginning of the anaphora, for the translation of the gifts unto the altar of God, and of angelic ministrations so often mentioned in all the better-known Liturgies of this kind. Finally, too, we see why the Fathers (not to mention the theologians of the Middle Ages) so frequently

¹ Cf. St. Antoninus, *Summa*, pars. 3, tit. 31, cap. 5, parag. 1: “The angel flits to and fro between the spouse and the beloved . . . bringing sacrifices from her, bearing gifts to her, and especially in the mystery of the Mass.”

stressed the presence of the thronging angelic hosts at the time of our invocation. They ascend from and descend upon the celestial altar which has been made ours. They ascend from and descend upon our gifts placed on our heavenly altar, and in turn transmitted to us.¹

So much for the sending of the Son with His angels. We must now consider the sending of the Holy Spirit.

The petition for the sending of the Holy Spirit is the most common of all and very appropriate.²

For sacred Scripture appropriates to the Holy Spirit the forming of the Body of Christ in the womb of the Blessed Virgin: *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee (ἐπελεύσεται),³ and the power of the most High shall overshadow thee (Luke, I, 35).* Similarly, therefore, and appropriately, the Holy Spirit may be invoked to provide (*ad conficiendum*) the Eucharistic Body of Christ.⁴

¹ St. Ambrose (*Exp. ev. sec. Luc.*, 1, 1, c. 28. P. L. 15, 1545); Ps. Ambrose (*De Sacram.*, 1, 4, c. 26, n. 27. P. L. 16, 445); Greg. Rom. (*Dial.*, 1, 4, c. 58. P. L. 77, 428); Chrysostom (*De Sacerdotio*, 6, 4. P. G. 47-48, 681).

² J. T. Franz (*Die eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen*, 2, 202, Würzburg, 1880) some considerable time ago erred in thinking that in the eastern epicleses it was always the coming of the Holy Spirit on the *oblata* that was prayed for. On the other hand, and in our day, Edmund Bishop was no less astray in the opposite direction, thinking that before the fourth century there was no epiclesis to the Holy Spirit in use ("not earlier than the fourth century, and as concerns a wider diffusion, the second half of that century." *The Moment of Consecration*, T. a S., 8, 1, p. 138-147).

But against this opinion we have: (1) The epiclesis presented by the *Canonum qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Aegyptiorum Reliquiae*, ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 107, or by the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae*, F. D. 2, 100, which we now know must be referred back to the Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις of Hippolytus. (2) In part at least the passage from Origen (*I Cor.*, VII, 5) cited above. (3) The indication given by Cyprian (*Ep.* 64, 4. P. L. 4, 392): ". . . since the offering cannot be sanctified there where the Holy Spirit is not, and the Lord does not bestow favours in answer to the prayers and petitions of one who himself has dishonoured the Lord." On which passage J. W. Tyrer (*The Eucharistic Epiclesis*, London, 1917, p. 47) comments rightly as follows: "Cyprian would hardly have spoken as he does if he had been altogether unacquainted with the invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Eucharistic service." (4) The words of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*: "The thanksgiving (= *eucharistia*) is sanctified by the Holy Spirit" (*Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina*, ed. Hauler, 1900, p. 80); and the following: "What is the greater, the bread or the Holy Spirit who sanctifies the bread?" (*ibid.*, p. 81); in conjunction with this passage: "Offer the sovereign (*regalem*) Eucharist . . . presenting the pure bread which is sanctified by the invocation" (*ibid.*, p. 85). Whence again Tyrer says: (*op. cit.*, p. 48): "We may safely conclude that the Invocation he [that is, the author of the *Didascalia*] was acquainted with was an Invocation of the Holy Ghost." There can be no doubt, then, that epicleses to the Holy Spirit were common in the third century.

³ To which word corresponds completely the ἐπιφοίτησις of the Holy Spirit on the gifts of which all the Greek Fathers speak, all the more because the noun ἐπέλευσις corresponding to the verb ἐπελεύσεται in Luke was seldom used by the Greeks.

⁴ This reason is indicated by St. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13. P. G. 94, 1141, and among the Latins, by Paschasius Radbertus, *Lib. de corp. et sang.*

This explains the form of the epiclesis presented in the *Oratio eucharistica Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi* (Le Brun, 2, 573): "We beseech thee to send THE HOLY SPIRIT AND POWER (*ut mittas Spiritum Sanctum et Virtutem*) on this bread and chalice, that it may become the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."¹

Furthermore, St. Paul (*Rom.*, XV, 15–16) seems to favour such an invocation of the Holy Ghost where he writes: *that the oblation of the Gentiles may be acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Ghost*. For though I think that the Apostle is speaking here of the internal rather than of the external sacrifice of the faithful, nevertheless it is not without allusion to the external sacrifice, from which his words seem to be borrowed. Moreover, the visible sacrifice is made in order to the invisible sacrifice, and the sanctification of the victim is made in order to the sanctification of all those who partake of the victim. Now Sacred Scripture commonly attributes all sanctification of the faithful to the Holy Ghost. It was natural, therefore, to attribute to the Holy Ghost the sanctification of the sacrifice from which our sanctification flows.

Again instruction in matters of faith and the manifestation of truth is the appropriate function of the Holy Spirit, who descended on the Church on the day of Pentecost,² hence it is appropriate that the Holy Ghost, through the transubstantiation, should

Domini, 4. P. L. 120, 1227–1278: ". . . in order that, just as the true Flesh is made without human intercourse (*coitu*) from the Virgin by the Holy Spirit, so by the same Holy Spirit the same Body and Blood of Christ should be mystically consecrated from the substance of bread and wine." St. Thomas comments on these words of St. Paschasius, assigning them wrongly to St. Augustine, as follows: "Transubstantiation is appropriated to the Son as operating, because He is Himself Priest and Victim; TO THE HOLY SPIRIT as the one by whom the Son operates: because the Holy Spirit is the VIRTUE to heal issuing from the Son" (4, D. 10, expos. text).

¹ This epiclesis is imitated by this other in the *Canon universalis Aethiopum*: "We beseech thee to send thy Holy Spirit and power on this bread and this chalice. And may it make both of them the Body and Blood of the Lord" (R. 1, 517).

² Hence we can see what is true—the further explanation by the epiclesis of the consecration which has already occurred and in which the Holy Ghost co-operates to sanctify the *oblata*, in the way already described, and what is false—that the consecration occurs only at the epiclesis by the descent there and then of the Holy Ghost, in these words from the exposition of the Greek tradition by Nicholas Cabasilas (*Expositio Liturgiae*, c. 28. P. G. 150, 428): "This is the work of the descent; for He did not descend once, and afterwards abandon us, but He is and will be always with us"; and in Symeon of Thessalonica (*Exp. de div. Templo*, c. 88. P. G. 155, 733–736), where he attributes the act of consecration to the virtue emanating from the Holy Spirit, when it rested on the Apostles at Pentecost in tongues of fire. The same tradition without any mixture of error is found in St. Paschasius Radbertus (*Lib. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, c. 21, n. 2, col. 1335), quoted above (XXVI).

place before the eyes of faith the presence of Christ, not merely signified, but also contained in the sacrament: so that the symbol is verified by the presence of the true reality itself. And, as we said above, such a petition was made expressly for this to the Holy Spirit in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (F. D. 1, 510) and in the ancient Liturgy of *St. Basil*.¹

¹ In the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* the text runs thus: “καταπεμψης τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφύγη κ.τ.λ. . . .” Funk translates it as follows (*loc. cit.*): “*Supra hoc sacrificium mittas sanctum tuum Spiritum, testem passionem Domini Jesu, ut exhibeat,*” etc.; and Salaville (*op. cit.*): “*d’envoyer sur ce sacrifice ton Saint-Esprit, le témoin des souffrances du Seigneur Jésus, pour qu’il fasse,*” etc Both these translations make the text of the *Constitutiones* refer to the Holy Spirit, “as witness testifying to the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, to show”, etc., taking witness (μάρτυρα) in apposition to the Holy Spirit (ἅγιον πνεῦμα). Such, I admit, is the common version given by all the authors I know of. But, with all due respect to these learned writers, I submit that the translation should follow the order of the Greek text, making μάρτυρα (witness) in apposition to θυσίαν: “Send the Holy Spirit on this Victim (θυσίαν), which attests (τὸν μάρτυρα) the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He (the Holy Spirit) may show,” etc. The reason is (1) that thus there is a closer adherence to the order and structure of the sentence. (2) There are examples of the use of the word μάρτυρ or Attic μάρτυς (*testis*, witness) for other than rational beings (see Stephanus, *Thesaurus*. G. L., ed. Didot, s.v., μάρτυρ), of its use for inanimate things, and even of the neuter gender in Greek; so in Plato *Leg.* 836, C., μάρτυρα παράγοιεν τὴν τῶν θηρίων φύσιν, and in Erasistratus, in Galen., vol. 3, p. 371: πολλοὶ τῶν ἐπιγινομένων παθῶν μάρτυρες, even apart from the fact that here the victim is regarded as personified. (3) In all Christian literature I have never met an example where the Holy Ghost is called a witness to the sufferings of Christ. (4) This appellation is appropriate to the Victim there represented, in as much as the Victim is a similitude, a pledge, a memorial symbol, an announcement (καταγγελία) of the Passion and death of our Lord. (5) There is a parallel passage of a similar sense in the *Anaphora* of Serapion where the bread which is offered is said to be the similitude (ὁμοίωμα) of the Body of Christ, and a similitude (ὁμοίωμα) of the Death of Christ, and the word ὁμοίωμα is construed in the same way as μάρτυρα above, that is, with the definite article, although it is in apposition to the word ἄρτον (bread), affected by the demonstrative adjective—τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τὸ ὁμοίωμα. From all this it is quite clear that in order to justify our translation of the passage in question, it is not necessary that we should find there the usual classical construction τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὴν οὖσαν μάρτυρα, οἱ ἢ ἔστιν μάρτυς. Here is the whole passage from Serapion: Σοὶ προσηνέγκαμεν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Μονογενοῦς . . . Ἡμεῖς τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου ποιοῦντες, τὸν ἄρτον προσηνέγκαμεν, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν διὰ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης καταλλαγηθῆ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν . . . προσηνέγκαμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον, τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ αἵματος, (F. D. 2, 174). And so we translate the passage as follows: “We have offered this bread, the likeness of the Body of the Only-Begotten. . . . We making this similitude of death have offered the bread, and beseech thee through this Victim to be propitious to us all . . . and we have offered the cup, the similitude of the Blood.” (6) Added to all these reasons there is another, to my mind the strongest. The compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is known to be the same as the interpolator of the Epistles of Ignatius (see the concise and very brilliant proof in Brightman, *op. cit.*, pp. 24–28). Now in that passage of the *Epistle to the Romans*, where Ignatius speaks of himself as though he was TO BE IMMOLATED ON THE ALTAR, this same compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* changed the text of this Epistle of Ignatius by interpolating those words of *I Pet.*, V, 1 (where the saint is speaking of himself), quoting them *ad sensum*, with ἐαυτοῦ instead of χριστοῦ and μάρτυρα instead of μάρτυς, in reference to Ignatius. Therefore the falsifier of the context considers Ignatius a witness to the sufferings of Christ, because he will be immolated a victim as it were on the altar. This is the passage of the interpolated *Epistle to the Romans*, 2, 2. F. P. 2, 206: “You could do nothing better for me than to offer

The introduction, or at all events the bringing into common use, of this invocation to the Holy Ghost was helped to a large extent, it seems to me, by the reading *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* (*per Spiritum Sanctum*, by the Holy Ghost), which already, at any rate in the fourth century, had crept into the text of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, IX, 14, instead of the genuine reading *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* (by the eternal Spirit), the genuine text being: *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ* (who by the eternal Spirit offered himself unspotted unto God).¹ We certainly find this

me (*σπονδισθήναι*) to God, since the altar is already prepared: so that, united in a chorus of love, you may give thanks to God the Father in Jesus, because, summoning him from the east to the west, God has deemed the bishop of Syria worthy to be found witness of His sufferings (*τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πνθημάτων μάρτυρα*).” That is to say, as about to mount the altar, and be immolated, he is witness of the sufferings of the Lord, united as it were with the sacrifice of the Lord. On the other hand, though we find the Holy Spirit also set before us as witness, not only in sacred Scripture, but also in our Ps. Ignatius, both in the *Constit. Apostol.*, 7, 22, 1 and 8, 46, 3. F. D. 406 and 558, and in the apocryphal *Epistola ad Philippenses*, 8, 3. F. P. 2, 114, the Holy Spirit is not there set before us as a witness to the Passion or death of Christ.

Admitting our interpretation, then, the Holy Spirit is invoked in the epiclesis, that He may show the Victim, which is a witness to the sufferings of Jesus, to be a truthful witness (that is a full not empty pledge), making it to consist in the immolated Body of Christ Himself, just as, in the *Anaphora Serapionis*, “THE GOD OF TRUTH” is invoked that the bread, which is a *likeness*, may become the very Body of which it is the likeness and similarly the chalice. We pray then to the Holy Spirit that the sacrament may not be empty, and so false, a kind of shadow of the Victim of the Cross, but ratified and true, as the present reality of Christ Himself, the Victim who has suffered, manifest to the eyes of faith: that truth may not be wanting in the symbol and in the witness (cf. R.S.R., Oct.–Dec. 1916, pp. 474–476).

It may be worth while to note that we also use similar or at any rate cognate language, in the Roman Missal in the *Post-Communion* prayer for Wednesday in Holy Week. “O Omnipotent God, grant to our senses, THAT BY THE TEMPORAL DEATH OF THY SON, TO WHICH THESE ADORABLE MYSTERIES BEAR WITNESS, we may confidently believe that thou hast given us eternal life.”

¹ It is not easy to determine, however, whether it was this reading that introduced the invocation of the Holy Spirit, or invocation of the Holy Spirit which introduced the reading. Each could influence the other. Meanwhile it is worthy of note that all the earlier Latin writers (who used the ancient Latin version) were apparently acquainted with the invocation of the Holy Spirit. See Cyprian, *Ep.* 64, c. 4. P. L. 4, 392; Optatus, *De Schismate Donatistarum*, l. 6, c. 1. P. L. 11, 1065. The writers, on the other hand, who used the Greek codices, make mention (as perhaps of something more ancient) of the invocation of God or of the Trinity (Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem; Hippolytus is an exception—but see T. D. N. J. C.); later on they speak of the invocation of the Word (Serapion and Athanasius); and finally they speak—*passim*—of the invocation of the Holy Spirit (as did Hippolytus earlier in the *Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις*). It is by no means certain that the Greek anaphora from the Crum-Papyri, published by P. de Puniet (see Dom. Cabrol, art. *Canon Romain*, in D. A. C., 2, 1882, 1893), is more ancient than the *Sacramentarium Serapionis*; the anaphora from the Crum-Papyri is mutilated, and there is still doubt whether, besides the invocation of the Holy Spirit which came in it before the Supper narrative, another came after the narrative, directed to some other Person of the Trinity. On the connection between *Hebr.*, IX, 14 and the Eucharistic Supper, see above, in Th. V (Vol. I).

reading in Chrysostom (in h. 1. P. G. 63, 120), as well as in a few codices (according to Nestle): \aleph of third hand; D of the first hand, and P; and the Vulgate invariably has its Latin equivalent (*per Spiritum Sanctum*). Finally, the petition for the sending of the Son and the Holy Spirit together, such as we find in the *Vetus Missale Gallicanum*, in the *post-secret* prayer of the Mass of St. Germanus¹ and of the *Missa de Adventu* (in Mabillon, *De liturgia gallicana*, lib. 3. P. L. 72, 342 and 345), is also quite appropriate. For what is appropriate to each one of the two by Himself is also appropriate to both in combination.²

CONCLUSION

The petition for acceptance of a victim is implicitly included in every offering of a victim. But, from the very beginning of this work we have been constantly showing that there is involved an offering of Christ our Victim which is certainly not merely enunciative, by words that announce it merely, tell of its occurrence, but pragmatic, by words which effect it, in the actual rite of the Last Supper, in what Christ then did: and that by the narration of what Christ did then we repeat that offering. Therefore our Supper narrative implies a pragmatic petition for acceptance of the Victim, or for transubstantiation. And it was thus that the holy Fathers could and did unanimously say that we sacrifice by prayer. And because that petition or prayer, just as the offering in which the petition is implied, is made in the name of the Church, the Spouse of Christ, for this reason they could and did say that it was only by the ecclesiastical prayer, by the prayer of the true Church, that either the Holy Spirit is invoked or the

¹ "O Omnipotent God, we beseech thee that thy holy Word may descend on these things which we offer; may the Spirit of thine inestimable glory descend; may the gift of thine ancient mercy descend, that our oblation may be made a spiritual victim, accepted in the odour of sweetness."

In a *Homily of Mâr Jacob of Serûgh on the reception of the holy mysteries* (R. H. Connolly, *Downside Review*, Nov. 1908, p. 282), we find described an invocation of the Father to send the Son, and thus it comes about that the Holy Spirit descends: "Together with the priest, the whole people beseeches the Father that He will send His Son, that He may come down and dwell upon the oblation. And the Holy Spirit, His power, alights upon the bread and wine, and sanctifies (or consecrates) it, yea makes it the Body and the Blood."

² At times we find a prayer for the descent of another set of two, the Father and the Holy Spirit. See the *Liber Ordinum* (ed. Férotin, col. 265).

Body of Christ is consecrated. And because every petition of the Church is made through Christ and with Christ and in Christ, and most of all that greatest of all petitions, in which we are united with the High Priest, securing by His prayer in the past the eternal acceptance of His Victim: for this reason our doctors say that our sacraments are made (*confici*) by the prayer of Christ Himself: "Since at THE INVOCATION OF THE HIGH PRIEST they are made (*perficiantur*), not by human power, but ineffably by the majesty of the Holy Spirit" (St. Agobardus, *De privilegio et jure sacerdotii*, c. 15. P. L. 104, 142-143).¹

This is clearly indicated by the striking words of the *post-pridie* prayer in the Mozarabic Mass for Easter: "Now we pray thee, O Lord, holy eternal Father, Omnipotent God, that JUST AS our Lord Jesus Christ thy Son, when, in that action of ineffable thanksgiving, HE OFFERED HIMSELF for us [note here the offering], when about to submit to our death (*susceptorus mortem nostram*), WAS HEARD [note the divine acceptance]; SO NOW MAY WE ALSO BE HEARD, we who seek Himself and His life, by carrying out as His ministers what He instituted: that this bread and this chalice OFFERED TO THEE MAY BE ENRICHED UNTO THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THY SON, AND BEING INFUSED WITH THE ABUNDANT SPIRIT OF THY LIPS may pour forth on us pardon for all our sins, and grace" (P. L. 85, 485).

Here is indicated in what our being heard, or the acceptance of our offering consists: in the transubstantiation, whereby the sanctified bread becomes sanctifying.

Hence the reply to the two following objections: *Firstly*. Nevertheless it is very strange that in every one of the Liturgies, a petition for the transubstantiation is made, when the transubstantiation, as you say, has already actually taken place. Does not this suggest, whatever theologians may say, that it is precisely at the epiclesis, and not until then, that the transubstantiation is effected (or at least was so effected in past times)?² *We reply*.

¹ See how, in complete conformity with what we have said above about the interrelation between the narrative style of the sacramental form, and its implied petitionary character, according to Agobardus the consecration is, nevertheless, made by our own recital of the words of our Lord spoken at the Supper (*Contra libros quatuor Amalarii*, c. 13. P. L. 104, 347).

² This last, I fear, is insinuated by Rauschen, in a very erroneous argument, too; in reference to the very earliest times: "The Church in the West gradually attached

The ORAL OFFERING (that is, *in words openly declaring the offering*) of our Victim is made just as universally in the Liturgies, after the sacerdotal offering has been PRAGMATICALLY made in the consecration. It is no more strange, therefore, that after the invocation of God has been PRAGMATICALLY made in the consecration, our ORAL and ceremonial invocation, declarative of it, should then be made.

Secondly. But still it is strange that numbers of the Fathers said more or less expressly that the consecration is enacted by the invocation of God on to the gifts, in order to secure the transubstantiation. *We reply.* The Fathers spoke truly in respect of the invocation which is pragmatically made by the words of consecration. For the petition for transubstantiation is implicitly contained in our consecrative words, even though no petition is expressed in so many words. The petition is contained in our words of consecration, in as much as these words have the character of an oblation action, but the oblation action is itself a pragmatic petition for acceptance, and the acceptance of our sacrifice is found precisely in the transubstantiation.

greater importance to the Supper narrative. . . . In the East the epiclesis always commanded greater veneration; for the most part writers considered the consecration as accomplished only at the end of the epiclesis. . . . But it must be admitted that the moment of the consecration depends on the intention of the priest. Seeing that it is his power to consecrate this or that bread which is before him, consequently, too, he can determine the moment of the consecration. But the Church has the power to impose a direction on him; and if she affirms that the consecration has place when she pronounces the words of the institution, we must unhesitatingly accept her point of view" (*L'Eucharistie et la pénitence*, Paris, 1910, pp. 123-124; cf. German edition, pp. 99-100, cited above).

THESIS XXXV

B. THE CONTEXT OF WORDS NEEDED FOR THE CONSECRATION

(A) THE FORMAL WORDS

It is quite certain, as all admit, that the words: *This is my body, This is the chalice of my blood* (or other equivalent words), by which is demonstrated the presence of the Body and the Blood of Christ under the appearance of the bread and the wine, are essential to the form of consecration. But a further question arises: whether, in addition to this indication of the Body and the Blood of Christ, there is necessary, as a part of the form, and as an essential part of it, a determination of the propitiatory end in view, as, for example, by words which indicate that what is enacted in symbol is done *for us, unto the remission of sins*.

St. Thomas, after Innocent III (whose words are quoted below), in 3 S. 78, 3, and more positively still in *I Cor.*, II, lect. 6,¹ together with all his early disciples, whom the Salmanticenses quote with approval, maintains that such words are essential (*De euchar. sacram.*, disp. 9, dub. 3, para. 2, n. 22).² Modern theologians

¹ Suarez (disp. 60, sect. 1, n. 3) comments on the teaching of St. Thomas as follows: "This teaching is very probable and of great authority and Scotus himself did not venture to contradict it." Suarez, however, interpreted the mind of the holy Doctor too narrowly, as though St. Thomas meant that the actual words used by the Roman Church are necessary in their actual grammatical tenor, and not merely in this or some other form equivalent in sense. Scotus, however, noted well that equivalence of sense would suffice (4 D. 8, 2; cf. *Reportata* 4 D. 8, 2).

² "All the earlier Thomists up to Cajetan, who rejected it, taught the same unanimously" (*loc. cit.*). We find also mentioned in this same place, besides those earlier theologians, quite a number of later theologians, who hold the same view. To these we may add many more both before the time of Cajetan, as John of Freiburg in *Summa Confessorum*, l. 3, tit. 24, q. 55, ed. 1518, fol. 122a, and after, as Jacobus de Graffius, O.S.B., *Consilia et Responsa*, l. 3, *De celebratione missarum*, consil. 30, n. 30 (Venice, 1604, p. 233); Henricus Henriquez, S.J., *Summa theologiae moralis*, l. 8, *de vero sacrificio missae*, c. 17, n. 3; Franciscus Amicus, S.J., *De Sacramentis*, disp. 24, sect. 1, n. 20 *et seq.*; F. Macedo, O.M. *De Clavibus Petri*, l. 4, pars. 1, tract. 2, *De sacramento euchar.*, cap. 6, Rome, 1660, p. 282; Cardinal Capisuccus, O.P., *Controversiae theologicae selectae*, controv. 3, *de forma consecrationis vini eucharistici*, at great length (ed. 1677, in folio, pp. 175-224), etc. etc.

for the most part, following St. Bonaventure (4 D. 8, 2, 1, 2), deny that such words are essential.¹

Two main arguments are given for this denial: one resting on intrinsic principles; the other drawn from positive dogmatic sources.

The first line of reasoning is as follows: the conversion of the bread into the Body and the wine into the Blood is quite sufficiently signified without any further determination of the kind mentioned: therefore it is effected without this further determination; because in the sacraments the words effect what they signify.

The second reason is this: neither the Scripture narratives nor the Liturgies agree as to the precise tenor of these determinative words. Therefore they are outside the ambit of the form.²

However, neither of these reasons seems convincing.

Taking the second argument first, we find a sufficient refutation of it in the following fact: in every one of the Liturgies, with the exception of a few very corrupt Ethiopian ones³ (some of which are known *aliunde* to be invalid), as well as some very degraded productions of the Syrian schismatics, we find invariably conveyed, besides the separate demonstration of the Body and Blood, an indication of the propitiatory intention for which the symbolic separation of Body and Blood, or the blood-shedding designated by it, is made. So we have, in every case, an equivalent sense in the formulae; and this, we maintain, is all that is necessary to secure the necessary uniformity of the form, as will be sufficiently

¹ St. Albert the Great wavers. He held in 4 D. 8, 7 that these determinative words are "of the essence of the form". But in *De sacramento eucharistiae* (which I think is of a later date and not to be confused with the doubtful *sermones de sacramento eucharistiae*) he adheres to the opposite teaching, admitting, nevertheless, that "there is much to be said for the other opinion". See Disp. 6, tr. 2, cap. 3.

² I pass over an objection from patristic authority in which it is presumed that: when the Fathers say, as they often do, that the consecration is effected at the words *This is my body, this is my blood*, they must be taken thereby to determine the precise series of formal words which is required. But what these Fathers actually mean to convey is: that at the enunciation of the work which is done, that work which is enunciated *is* done (as the Salmanticenses justly remark, *ibid.*, para. 6, n. 44). Much in the same way St. Thomas, having said briefly in art. 1, ad. 4m of the same question 78, that were the priest to make use of these words alone, *This is my body, This is the chalice of my blood*, without any narrative preamble, he would consecrate, goes on to say, nevertheless, in article 3, that the words *This is the chalice of my blood* would not suffice without the words which follow them.

³ To be found in Dom Cagin, *Eucharistia*, 1912, 312-313, under the numbers 29, 33, 35, 38, respectively.

proved by what we have to say immediately in refutation of the first objection proposed above, by the development of our own intrinsic argument, derived from the nature of things.

Coming, then, to the first argument of our adversaries, we think that it is sufficiently refuted by the development of our own argument. But first we must presuppose that there is no question here of what Christ could have done, if He willed, but only of what He did will to do. And it is quite plain that He willed to offer sacrifice. Again the question is not, here, whether the indication of the Body and Blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and wine would of itself sufficiently signify (and accordingly would avail, if our Lord so instituted, to accomplish effectively) some real presence or not; but the question is: would such an indication signify a real presence in the condition of immolation whereby the sacrifice would be enacted? And this, it seems, we must deny. For the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ could undoubtedly be realised by the actual effective words without any sacrifice whatever; just as Christ could, without sacrifice, change into His Body and Blood any other kind of material (*corporeas*) substances, such as stones, water and so on.¹ Certainly, just as Christ could have died without His death having the proper character of a sacrifice (as is the case with the martyrs); so, too, He could have left us some symbol of His death in His Body and Blood, even to be partaken of by us at a common banquet by way of food, for instance for the sole purpose of fostering charity amongst us, and all this without dedicating a victim to God, or without any propitiatory action. But Christ did in fact will that this conversion of the bread and wine into His Body and Blood should be a sacrifice; by transubstantiation He willed to offer sacrifice, He willed to offer the transubstantiation sacrificially. And so He willed not to make just a transubstantiation, but to make a transubstantiation whence He Himself would issue as God's Victim or Theothyte.

This being His will, the mere indication of His Body and Blood would not suffice for His purpose in the line of sacramental form: for it would not express this purpose, as we have said above;

¹ Zacharias Pasqualigo, *De sacrificio novae Legis*, q. 49, n. 4, Rome, 1707, tom. 1, p. 54, touches on this point, that not all and every transubstantiation whatsoever of material (*corporeae*) substance into Christ would be a sacrifice.

it was necessary that a further determination should be added to this demonstration of the Body and Blood, by which it would be plain that what was done was sacrificial, immolative. And for this it would be sufficient if the work done were plainly designated as propitiatory.

That is to say, it would suffice if it were plainly indicated that *for us* the Blood was asked from the Body, and that the death so brought about availed for us before God *unto the remission of sins*, whether this be expressed as in the formula of our Missal (*qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*), or by any other equivalent formula, as already explained by us in III (Vol. I).¹ But this which we have shown to be sufficient to indicate the propitiatory intention is also absolutely necessary for the completion of the form: for, meantime, until this designation is given, the formula does not yet express all that must be expressed, and so does not accomplish anything: for here in reality the effect and what is signified by the formula are indivisible.²

¹ It seems to me that, as an equivalent formula to designate the propitiatory intention, the insertion of the words "of the New Testament," as in our Mass: "chalice of my blood, of the New Testament . . ." would, by itself, be sufficient. For here the blood of the testament or covenant, both in itself (in view of customs of the ancient peoples), and especially as opposed to the sacrifice of *Exodus*, an opposition which the word "new" suggests, is necessarily understood as sacrificial, the blood of sacrifice by which God, so propitiated, is bound and pledged to man. On the other hand, the words *Mysterium Fidei* (the Mystery of Faith), also inserted in our formula, do not of themselves suggest any such thing. These words help however to elucidate other words, pointing out to us the symbolical force of the action, and opening up for us the way by which we can explore, as far as God gives us help to do so, the hidden secrets of the sacrament.

² St. Thomas (*I Cor.*, XI, lect. 6) puts this very clearly: "In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are NECESSARY to the form, but the words *This is the chalice of my blood* only, not the remainder which follows. . . . This, however, appears to be erroneous: for all that follows is a determination of the predicate [that is, the chalice of my blood]: HENCE IT PERTAINS TO THE MEANING OR SIGNIFICATION OF THE SAME PRONOUNCEMENT [regarding the Blood]. And because, as has been often said, it is by signifying that the forms of the sacrament have their effect, THE WHOLE [that is, not only the words, *This is the chalice of my blood*] PERTAINS TO THE EFFECTIVE VIRTUE OF THE FORM. . . . In the consecration of the Blood it was necessary to express or indicate the virtue of the Passion of Christ, which first of all is considered in relation to our guilt, which the Passion of Christ destroys."

Henricus Henriquez, S.J. (*Summa Theologiae Moralis*, 1, 8, *De vero missae sacrificio*, c. 17, n. 3), supports this teaching of St. Thomas as follows: "It is plain from all the evangelists and St. Paul, from the usage of the Greek and Latin Church, and from the common consent of theologians, that besides the words *This is the chalice of my blood* there must necessarily be added some words which expressly signify the effects of the Passion of Christ and of this sacrament. These effects seem to be sufficiently explained either by the words *new testament* (which, being confirmed by the death of the testator, granted to us the right and the heritage of glory), or by the words *which shall be shed for you*."

It is necessary, therefore, that this propitiatory determination should be found within the form itself. And it would be found more appropriately in reference to the chalice than to the Body. For by the consecration of the chalice there is induced the mystical shedding of the life-blood from the Body, upon which, and not before it, the sacrificial character of the action, bound up with the slaying, appears.¹

Amicus, S.J., is even more clear and explicit (*De Sacram.*, disp. 24, n. 46): "You will urge: at least the words *for you, for many* are not necessary, seeing that the sacrificial character is sufficiently declared by the words *shall be shed*. But we deny the consequence. For unless the *end* to which the blood-shedding is directed be expressed, THE SACRIFICIAL CHARACTER IS NOT EXPRESSED, SINCE THE BLOOD COULD BE SHED, AND STILL NOT BE SHED BY WAY OF SACRIFICE: IF, FOR EXAMPLE, IT WERE SHED NOT AS AN ACT OF WORSHIP ON THE PART OF ANYONE NOR FOR THE BENEFIT OF ANY ONE."

¹ In many authentic Liturgies we find, added at once after the consecration of the bread, that is after the words *This is my Body*, some words expressing the propitiatory intention of the action. In such cases is it necessary to express this again after the consecration of the chalice (as is done, as a matter of fact, in all these Liturgies)? The Salmanticenses (*ibid.*, par. 6, n. 46) consider that it would not be contrary to the teaching of St. Thomas to deny the necessity of the repetition in such cases. For owing to the unity of the whole utterance and the action, the earlier determination of propitiatory intention can continue in its enunciative power up to the demonstration of the Blood (because necessarily when the Body is said to be given for us, the subsequent blood-shedding will be understood likewise to be for us), and so this determination would virtually affect the Blood. But it is quite necessary that this determination should directly affect the Blood in some way, for the reason that we have given in our argument, and the determination as regards the Body would not be sufficient unless it persevered in reference to the Blood in the way we have said. For were the propitiatory intention directly to affect the consecration of the Body, it would already effect in that consecration what it signified; in other words, it would clothe the Body with the condition of immolation, and so already the Body would be understood to be a Victim to God, or Theothyte. But this last we cannot admit, for the sacrifice is completed only in the double consecration: because it is only by the double consecration that the death in which the sacrifice consists is represented. Hence it must be said that even if the determination of the propitiatory intention were sufficient when enunciated as referring to the Body, nevertheless it would not be formal or have its formal effect as referring to the Body, but only as referring to the consecration of the Blood, as bound up with the antecedent words in reference to the Body. And so the conclusion of St. Thomas stands: that the determination of the propitiatory virtue enters into the form of the second consecration, but not of the first. Moreover, because in the Roman Canon no such determination of propitiatory intention is expressed over the Body, for this reason St. Thomas very rightly taught that our form of consecration in the Mass in respect of the Blood would be deficient, and so ineffective, if the rest of the words were not added.

What then would happen if a priest, while consecrating the Body by the Roman rite, had the intention of pronouncing over the chalice only the words: *This is the chalice of my blood*? According to our argument he would not so consecrate even the Body validly. The reason is that no one consecrates the Body validly unless he has at least the intention of consecrating the Blood also (Salmanticenses, *De Euch.*, disp. 13, dub. 2, n. 28); because no one consecrates validly without having at least the implicit intention of offering sacrifice. But the priest who excludes the intention of applying this more determinate form, of which we have been speaking, in respect of the Blood, actually thereby excludes the intention of valid consecration, from what we have said above. Therefore he excludes the intention of offering the sacrifice.

To sum up: the Eucharistic form must be immolative;¹ for the Eucharist is not a sacrament except in so far as it is a sacrifice. But the form is not immolative,² unless it includes the designation of a propitiatory intention; failing this, we have neither an *ἱλαστήριον* (victim of propitiation) nor a *εὐχαριστήριον* (victim of thanksgiving), nor any victim whatever;³ nothing in the nature of a theophyte is provided by what we do, there is present no victim offered to God; nothing is directed towards or destined for God, indeed no final terminus of any such destination or direction is manifested; it is, however, manifested if it is indicated that God is to be appeased by what we do, and if there is placed before God the real thing offered, manifested to us after the manner of a gift or victim directed to and destined for God as its final term. For this signification or manifestation is practical or pragmatic, and effective of what is signified by it.

Hence he does not even consecrate the Body validly. The teaching that there is no consecration of the Body, where the intention of consecrating the Blood is lacking, is openly declared by de Lugo (*De sacramen. euchar.*, disp. 19, sect. 8, n. 103) to be “not absurd, but true.”

¹ It is true, as we have repeatedly said, that there is no necessity for the form to enunciate the offering formally, as if it were to say: “I offer the Body of Christ”; nevertheless it is necessary that the symbolic separation of the Body and Blood which it enunciates should be shown to be made in order to propitiate God, and not for some other purpose in no way sacrificial. Then only will the symbolic separation manifest itself as a sacramental immolation, and hence it will be suited to constitute the sacerdotal offering of the Victim given over to God unto death.

² The words (*This is my body. This is the chalice of my blood*) express death quite sufficiently, seeing that they convey the symbolic separation of the Body and Blood. But it is not the same thing to specify death as to specify immolation (and we cannot repeat this too often). For the death can be put before us without any relation to sacrifice, in which case the aforesaid separation of Body and Blood will announce to men the death, but it will not dedicate it or present it to God. The Salmanticenses touch on this distinction when they remark (*ibid.*, 2, n. 21): That the Blood of Christ should be shed is one thing, that it should be shed unto the remission of sins is vastly different. For these two things are objectively diverse, they could have been separated.” And again: “Because the sacrament of the Eucharist, considered as that which is offered in the Mass (*ex parte rei oblatae*), IS THE VERY SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS . . . it was necessary that in the essential form of the Eucharist mention or pronouncement should be made of the Passion of Christ and of THE EFFECTS OF THE REDEMPTION AND SALVATION which it conveyed to us.”

³ It may be asked how it is that besides the propitiatory character of the Action the eucharistic character becomes evident also sacramentally. I reply in the first place: the propitiatory character of the offering implies the eucharistic character, as was explained in Thesis I (Vol. I). Secondly, the eucharistic character is linked up in a very special way with the propitiatory character, from the external appearance of the bread and wine, under which the price of our redemption is presented to God. For our sacrifice is given to God from the gifts and presents of God, as we see from the Liturgies (*passim*); and hence it is a protestation of our gratitude towards God who confers benefits on us. Call to mind the passage from Irenaeus, cited in Thesis IX (Vol. I).

Against our contention it does not avail to say: any words indicating conversion are sufficient to render the form immolative, for, as a matter of fact, nothing besides the transubstantiation is required for the sacrifice, as is clear from our examination of the Mass, where we saw that we offer the sacrifice precisely by effecting the transubstantiation. This argument, I say, does not avail against us, for it is easily answered as follows: we sacrifice in transubstantiating, only because we transubstantiate in sacrificing. That is to say, transubstantiation does not of its own nature constitute sacrifice, but only in the Mass, because of the special manner in which it is accomplished. Most certainly bread and wine could be changed into the Body and Blood of Christ without any sacrifice: for instance, were the conversion to be made by the divine omnipotence without any intervention of man; or again, were it to be made by a human act of Christ without words, but simply by the power of His will to command. Moreover, why could not Christ transubstantiate by words, even by demonstrative words, without thereby offering sacrifice? We see no reason why He could not do this; indeed, the contrary is plain, as we have said. If, however, in the manner and moment of transubstantiating He showed His Body as destined to be drained of its life blood as a propitiatory offering (*ἱλαστήριον*) for sin, then He could transubstantiate sacrificially only. For then in that moment He declared Himself and made Himself Theophyte—God's Victim. This point escapes the notice of those modern Protestants who say that the Supper was merely a prophetic parable of the death or something similar. For in very truth what was then preannounced, His death, that very thing was then and there offered to God, in as far as there was induced in the sight of God the symbol of His expiatory death (and assuredly, not an empty symbol, but one full of its underlying truth, the Flesh dedicated to God).

Nor again does it avail against us to say: even if the rite used by Christ did not in itself indicate a sacrifice, nevertheless it would be quite sufficient for the purpose if Christ subsequent to the rite gave us some indication by which He made known to us the intention which He had had of sacrificing, and thus the sacrifice would be enacted in the transubstantiation, even in the absence

of immolative determination there and then at the time of the transubstantiation. For we answer: to argue so is to lose sight of the most essential point, that sacrifice is in the nature of a sign, and of a sensible sign, which by manifesting itself to the senses indicates some other thing of which it is the sign. Hence if the sign is not evident in itself, it is incompetent, ineffective as a sign. In other words, if the external act of giving to God, the sign itself, is not self-evident, how will the internal dedication be made known by that sign?¹ Certainly the mere intention of Christ, or such an intention together with the subsequent intimation of that intention, could not suffice to confer on the sign its aptitude and its meaning;² but, of itself, the “visible word”, to use the expression of Augustine,³ that is, the compound of material things and formal words must manifest itself sufficiently to the minds of those present that by such manifestation it may be able to lead their minds to a knowledge of the other thing of which it is a sign. And so it was necessary for Christ when He was actually sacrificing sacramentally to place within the rite itself the determination of propitiatory intention, and this He did in fact place, not in the matter of the sacrament, but in the form.

This, be it carefully noted, must not be considered a trifling question, as it has to do with the intimate essence of our sacrifice, and indeed of the sacrifice of Christ. Scotus (*loc. cit.*) considered that any error admitted here would be most dangerous; moreover, St. Pius V, because of the importance of the subject, ordered a statement in the *Commentaries* of Cajetan to be deleted, as being opposed to the teaching of the Angelic Doctor; and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* (pars. 2, *De Euchar.*, c. 21–23, coll. c. 20)

¹ We are not denying that Christ, if He had so willed, could have offered the sacrifice of His Body and Blood under the appearance of bread and wine by merely demonstrative words, were the determination of the propitiatory intention made plain otherwise. But seeing that in His sacrifice Christ used only the bread, the chalice and the words of the rite, it is in the words that we must look for this determination, which is not manifest to the senses in the material things (taken in themselves) employed by our Lord.

² As will be explained more fully in the next section, the intention of the one who makes or consecrates (*conficit*) the sacrament does not of itself either change or perfect the sense or signification which is naturally induced in the sacrament through the form and matter of the sacrament. What the intention does is to apply that signification either efficaciously or inefficaciously, at choice. This is the sole function of the intention in this case: not to create or to modify the sense or signification, but (if one will pardon the expression) to utilize it, make use of it.

³ *In Joann.* tract. 80, n. 3, and 1, 19. *Contra Faustum*, 16. P. L. 35, 1840 and 42, 356.

warns us that in priests ignorance in this matter would be shameful, while at the same time it included within the limits of the sacramental form the whole formula, both the demonstrative words, and the determinative words of which we have been speaking.

(B) THE WORDS OF THE NARRATIVE

Theologians of every school are agreed in this: that at the Last Supper the form and the adequate form of the consecration consisted in the actual words of our Lord: *This is my body*, etc. But now arises another question which is still freely discussed amongst Catholics: are our Lord's words, left to themselves, *our* form at Mass, or, is a preamble putting them on the lips of Christ REQUIRED;¹ such a preamble as is found in all the Liturgies, when it is NARRATED THAT CHRIST said: *This is my body*?

This question was not introduced into the theological schools until a comparatively late period, and I have not read anything before the ninth century which directly touched it. In the thirteenth century we find St. Thomas denying that any such preamble was required; and the greater number of the scholastic theologians followed his teaching in the matter. Hence the opinion against the necessity of narrative words in our form enjoys the highest extrinsic authority, so that it would be very rash indeed not to admit its probability.

At the same time, however, it is no more injurious to St. Thomas to defend, as solidly probable, the opposite opinion of Scotus (given in 4 D. 8, 2, n. 4, and at greater length in the *Reportata*, 4 D. 2, n. 4), than it would be to desert the teaching of St. Thomas, as some have done, on the essential form of the consecration of the chalice. Moreover, no other point in the theology of St. Thomas has any immediate logical dependence on the solution of the question before us; though I must confess

¹ No one, of course, thinks that the exact wording of the narrative, as contained in our Canon, is necessary for the validity, seeing that in other Liturgies of the Eastern rites it is different. We are dealing with the substance of the narrative which is everywhere common: that Christ in the Supper took bread and said, etc. Hence the argument advanced by St. Thomas (3 S. 78, 1, 4m) against the necessity of the narrative, "that the Canon of the Mass is not the same for all people and all times," seems to have little force. Indeed, if this reason were valid at all it would be valid also against the opinion of St. Thomas himself, which we have just maintained, regarding the necessity of including certain words denoting propitiatory intention for the essential integrity of the sacramental form in the consecration of the Blood.

that, in my opinion, the teaching of Scotus seems to harmonise better with the principles of St. Thomas on the causality of the sacraments, Scotus teaching, as will be explained below, that the words of the form will not produce their effect unless they are uttered in such manner as ritually to signify their effect.

Quite a number of theologians, and these not only Scotists, have consistently followed the opinion of Scotus in this matter up to the present time. Gerson († 1429) mentions, while not naming them, some early followers of Scotus' opinion (*Compendium theologiae. De septem sacramentis, de sacramen, euchar., Opera*, Paris, 1606, t. 2, col. 82); but apart from these the following can be cited: Thomas of Walden, of whom below; Angelus in his *Summa angelica* (s.v. *Eucharistia*, c. 1, n. 24, Paris, 1502, fol. 141b); Pelbartus de Temesvar (fl. 1490) in the *Aureum sacrae Theologiae Rosarium* (tom. 3, s.v. *Eucharistia* II, *de forma*, parag. 1, Venice, 1586, p. 100); Salmeron, S.J., in his *Commentarii in evangelicam historiam*. (t. 9, tr. 13, Cologne, 1614, p. 85);¹ Joannes de Rada († 1608),² Archbishop of Trani, later Bishop of Patti (*Controversiarum Theologicarum inter S. Thomam et Scotum, super quartum Sententiarum librum, Controvers.*, 5, art. 3, Venice, 1617, p. 163);³

¹ Salmeron holds that in the Mass the words *This is my body* are said only in a recitative sense (*recitative*). We do not agree with him that these words are said by us in a merely recitative sense, to the exclusion of their significative sense (significative of the actual presence of the Body); but we agree with him in so far as he asserts the recitative sense also of the words, which he holds in common, we may say, with all our theologians. He defends his view by putting to himself an objection and solving it. The objection: "If these words are taken as only recitative (*per modum recitantis*), THE FORM, WHEN PRONOUNCED, WOULD NOT OF ITSELF EFFECT THE SACRAMENT, nor would the consecration occur, which seems inconvenient: for in the case of the other sacraments it is known that where the proper form is pronounced over the proper matter, with the proper intention, the sacraments are effected (*conficiuntur*), even if other things are omitted." His reply is as follows: "We reply BY ADMITTING with the Subtle Doctor that what the argument infers is true, namely THAT THIS SACRAMENT WOULD NOT BE CONSECRATED IN SUCH A CASE, although the others would be. The reason of the difference is because the forms of the other sacraments are determined in their sense and signify an action which is quite definitely determined: for instance, the fully determined form *I baptise thee* signifies that the washing or bathing is performed by me in the name of the Trinity. But the form *This is my body, This is my blood* is indeterminate UNLESS THE NARRATIVE IS ADDED, to point out that this form is induced to do what Christ in the Supper commanded to be done."

² "Of Aragon, a theological professor so celebrated that he was summoned to Rome by Clement VIII, and numbered amongst his principal consultors," etc. (Hurter, *Nomenclator*, 2).

³ "The fact that the priest wishes to utter these words in the person of Christ does not bring it about that the words are understood by their own power or virtue (*ex vi verborum*) as uttered in the person of Christ, because THE WILL OF THE PERSON UTTERING THE WORDS DOES NOT BESTOW ON THE WORDS THEIR SIGNIFICATIVE FORCE; therefore, if these words, simply and without the preamble, do not of their own power

Philippus Faber, "a truly learned theologian" (Hurter, *Nomenclator*, 2), who in his *Disputationes theologicae in Quartum Sententiarum* (disp. 33, n. 3-17, Venice, 1614, pp. 134-137) discusses the matter most competently and at length; Cardinal Laurentius Brancatus de Lauraea (*in Quartum Librum Sententiarum Mag. Fr. Joannis Duns Scoti*, tom. 1, Rome, 1653, disp. 19, art. 1, n. 10-42, pp. 492-499), a leader among his contemporaries, in high esteem with four pontiffs, who died, says Hurter, "leaving behind him a lasting memory in his writings";¹ the Theatine Zacharias Pasqualigo,² in his work *De sacrificio Novae Legis*, (Quaest. 323, n. 4-5, Rome, 1707, tom. 1, p. 292), which Hurter says (*Nomenclator*) is an outstanding work of a classic author; Antonius Arbiol, "a very learned man" (*Nomenclator*), in his *Selectae disputationes scholasticae et dogmaticae* (disp. 4, art. 2, Saragossa, 1725, pp. 322-326), etc.³

signify the Body of Christ, it follows of necessity, that the preamble must come before them, so that the words of consecration may be understood as said in the person of Christ" (*loc. cit.*).

¹ The author vigorously maintains that "The intention of the speaker does not prevent those words (pronounced absolutely) from signifying of their own virtue (*ex vi verborum*) the body of the one who pronounces them" (n. 11, p. 492). And he concludes (n. 12, p. 493): "It is false, therefore, to say that these words *This is my body* said absolutely by the priest, by virtue of that intention alone, signify of their own nature the Body of Christ; therefore in order that they should signify it they must be uttered in the person of Christ." Secondly he explains very well how the preceding words are related to the form: "These preceding words are better called DISPOSITIONS to the truth of the form, but never the form" (n. 20, p. 494). "The reason is, because those four words *This is my body* are those which are introduced to signify the Body of Christ and are essentially significative; nevertheless they have not this signification unless they are uttered in the person of Christ: hence what secures that they be uttered in the person of Christ is not part of them, but a previous disposition that they be said in the person of Christ. Hence though the words which go before concur in the signification, they do not concur as constituting that signification, nor the reality which is signified, but as disposing to both" (n. 22, p. 495).

² While he denies, as he must, that the preamble is essential to the form, he nevertheless maintains that of necessity it must be prefaced, and this "from the very nature of the form". He gives this reason: "Although those [preceding] words are not consecrative, because they do not signify the conversion of the matter into the Body and Blood of Christ, nevertheless they are DETERMINATIVE in reference to the substantial form of the consecration, conditioning that that form be uttered, as plainly, ON THE EVIDENCE OF THE SENSES, in the person of Christ; because although this is determined by the intention, still because the intention is not evident to the sense, it is not yet determined in a sensible manner: therefore if the words of the preamble are not said, something notable is detracted from the form, namely, that the consecrative words of the form are not sensibly determined AS UTTERED IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST."

³ "The sole intention of the priest cannot bring it about that these words of their own verbal virtue (*ex vi verbali*) should signify the Body of Christ; necessarily, therefore, the other words must be placed before them. . . . How can the sole intention of the priest make the word *my*, verbally and by virtue of the word itself, mean *not my*?" (p. 323).

Some, though they consider that the opposite opinion (of St. Thomas) is more probable, nevertheless assert that the opinion of Scotus is at least probable. Such are Hickey (*in Scotum*, 4, D. 8, 2, n. 9), Poncius,¹ Mastrius (in 4 *Sent.*, disp. 3, q. 6, art. 1, n. 137–138) and many others.² Moreover, the Church instructs all in practice to follow this teaching. For in the *Rubricae Generales, De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus* (c. 3, n. 5, 6, 7; c. 4, n. 3 and 4; c. 10, n. 3 and 13) we find that, should any defect be discovered in the consecration of the sacrament through want of proper matter, or for any other reason, the priest is always directed to resume the prayer from the words: *Qui pridie* or *Simili modo*. So we read in c. 3, n. 5: “LET HIM BEGIN FROM THE CONSECRATION (*a consecratione incipiat*), NAMELY, FROM THE WORDS: *Qui pridie*.”

Even before Scotus there were some who maintained this teaching. St. Thomas (*loc. cit.*), without mentioning any names, refers to some of them when he says: “SOME have said that this sacrament cannot be consecrated by pronouncing these words and omitting the others.” Who those were whom the saint had in mind we do not know, but we can quote some of these earlier writers who favoured the opinion of Scotus.

Florus of Lyons (*De expositione missae*, n. 60, on the words: *Who on the day before He suffered took bread, etc.*, down to: *As often as you shall do these things, you shall do them in memory of me*) comments thus: “IN THESE WORDS, WITHOUT WHICH NO tongue, nor nation, nor state, that is, NO PART OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, CAN MAKE (*conficere*), THAT IS, CONSECRATE the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, the Lord Himself gave to the Apostles the manner in which the universal Church celebrates the memory of her Redeemer, and the Apostles handed on the same to the whole Church in general” (P. L. 119, 52).³ Here when he

¹ See Mastrius, *loc. cit.*

² Hieronymus de Montefortino (*Joannis Duns Scoti Summa Theologica*, 3ae partis, tom. 1, q. 78, art. 1, Rome, 1787, vol. 4, p. 485) discusses each side of the question, and leaves it undecided.

³ In his treatise *De celebratione missae* (P. L. 101, 1260) Remigius of Auxerre propounds the same teaching in the same words, and in his own explanation of the Canon, Thomas of Walden, having quoted the words of Remigius, continues as follows: “If therefore without this prayer, as Paschasius also says in full agreement, no nation, nor tongue, that is, no part of the Church, can consecrate (*conficere*) the sacrament, how do the Thaborites, Pragenses and Orphani consecrate, if, as we are told, they introduce, as complement to the consecration in their Mass, that part

says THESE WORDS he must be referring to the whole sequence of the sentences of which we are speaking. For he does not mention any particular words except those which we have transcribed from him. Not even once here did he mention distinctly the words of our Lord: *This is my body*.

Nor can any objection be raised from the fact that Florus immediately goes on to say: "Therefore the consecration is and always will be by the power and by the words of Christ. It is His words that sanctify the celestial sacraments. He speaks daily in His priests" (*ibid.*). Here Florus certainly refers to our own pronouncement of the words of our Lord, and declares them to be efficacious. For it is only in so far as we introduce Christ as saying these words, that the words of Christ are effective on our lips, and Christ signifies His Body through us priests, when we say: *This is my body*. Wherefore Florus continues: "Hence it is that the Church, when consecrating ACCORDING TO TRADITION with these words the mystery of the sacred Body and Blood of the Lord, SAYS IN EXPRESS WORDS (*designanter*) THAT THE LORD SAID TO THE APOSTLES: *Take ye all of this, for this is my body*" (col. 53).¹

For a proper understanding of the mind of Gerhoh of Reichersberg two things should be carefully noted.

We must admit that he considered as non-essential the ceremonies which accrued to the pristine rite of the Mass: "For the sacrifice is not thereby holier than it formerly was, WHEN IT WAS CONSECRATED AT THE SOLE WORDS OF THE LORD and at the Lord's prayer alone" (*Tract. adv. Simon.*, c. 17. P. L. 194, 1352).² But from these words one must not jump to the conclusion that in the past the consecration was made by the sole words of the Lord, *left to themselves*. For it may well be that Gerhoh was simply giving here the teaching of Gregory the Great, according to whom

of the Gospel of St. John beginning with the words: *Before the festival day of the pasch*, where nothing is given OF THE NARRATIVE OF THE CONSECRATION? It seems to me that they have lost their senses" (*Sacramentalia*, Paris, 1523, tit. 4, c. 38, fol. 92). Not only, then, does Thomas of Walden interpret Remigius as we do, but he agrees with him. Hence we can well claim Remigius as one of the patrons of our opinion who lived before the time of St. Thomas.

¹ We also find these words ("the Lord said to the Apostles") in St. Agobardus of Lyons, in the treatise *Contra libros quatuor Amalarii*, c. 13. P. L. 104, 347. I do not know whether these words, in the rite referred to, were first said by the prelate, and then transferred to the deacon, or vice versa.

² Similar words are found in John Belet (*Rationale divinatorum officiorum*, c. 98. P. L. 202, 103).

the Apostles consecrated “simply and solely at the prayer of the offering”—(*ad solam orationem oblationis*)—(XXXI, above), by which he meant the anaphora alone, embracing the words of the thanksgiving, the offering and the invocation, which were followed by the Lord’s prayer.

On the other hand, it is quite certain that Gerhoh himself was not satisfied with only the words of our Lord.¹ For in the *first place* he says quite clearly: “Those words of the Lord, woven from beginning to end into one single whole (*desuper contexta per totum*) IN WHICH CHRIST HIMSELF IS INTRODUCED AS SPEAKING WITH HIS OWN LIPS, AND SAYING: *Take ye all and eat of this: for this is my body. Take ye all and drink of this, for this is the chalice of my blood*, down to: *Do this for a commemoration of me*, these words, I say, uttered over the bread and wine, by the addition of which to the element of the bread and wine (mingled with water) the sacrament is made (*fit*), represent the likeness of that coat woven from top to bottom in one piece, which not even those who crucified Christ were permitted to rend. That is the word comprising and consummating the integral whole, which is in the sacrament of the bread and wine, if these words have been applied to the same element, to which Christ applied them, NAMELY IN THE RITE OF THE CHURCH, WHICH WE KNOW TO BE HANDED DOWN BY CHRIST HIMSELF” (c. 18, col. 1352). Hence the words of our Lord are sufficient, according to Gerhoh, but only on the condition that (1) in the recital Christ is introduced (*inducatur*) as uttering them by His own lips; or, which comes to the same thing (2) if they are applied by the rite of the Church, according to which rite they really are uttered, as uttered by Christ in His Supper.

Secondly, he goes on to say: “If . . . when sacrificing, and reciting all the things which are appointed by the holy Fathers, WE DO NOT INTRODUCE CHRIST SPEAKING IN THE SUPPER, what we effect (*agimus*) cannot be termed the sacrament” (c. 18, col.

¹ From this example we see how the expression *at the words of the Lord alone the consecration is made* (*ad sola verba Domini fit consecratio*) should be understood in the earlier writers, that is to say, “*at the words of the Lord alone*” certainly, but ritually understood, however. Similarly we interpret what Gerhoh had said just before (c. 16 and 17, col. 1351–1352) that the omission of anything added to what was handed down by Christ does not affect the integrity. For at this place he gives as examples the prayers *Kyrie eleison*, *Gloria in excelsis* which certainly pertain in no way to the substance of the Canon, being completely outside of it.

1353). But how shall we introduce Christ speaking IN HIS SUPPER, except by giving a narrative of the Supper? How introduce Him as speaking if we do not declare that this or that was said by Him? In keeping with this teaching are the words of Innocent III, where, in the profession of faith prescribed for the Waldenses, he says that three things are essential for the consecration (*confectionem*) of the sacrament: the order of the priesthood, right intention, "and those solemn words which are expressed in the Canon BY THE HOLY FATHERS" (D. 424). Under this last designation the Pontiff evidently includes something more than the actual words of our Lord.¹ His treatise *De sacro altaris mysterio* seems to favour this interpretation; for though we read there "at the uttering of these words: *This is my body*, the bread is changed into the Body" (1, 4, c. 17 and 18. P. L. 117, 868–869), nevertheless earlier in the same work (in the same book, c. 1 and 5, cols. 851–858), when addressing himself to the explanation of the words: *Qui pridie*, etc., he says: "We are entering into the very heart of the divine SACRIFICE." And in the course of the explanation he notes that there are three elements in the narrative not commemorated by the Evangelists: *with his eyes lifted up to heaven* (*elevatis oculis in coelum*), and *eternal* (*novi et aeterni testamenti*, whereas the Gospels only give *novi testamenti*), and *the mystery of faith* (*mysterium fidei*); and these he considers must be derived from Christ and the Apostles, for "Who would be so presumptuous and daring as to insert these things out of his own devotion? In truth, THE APOSTLES RECEIVED THAT FORM OF WORDS FROM CHRIST HIMSELF, and the Church received it from the Apostles themselves".² And, moreover, it should be noted that, of these three elements, the phrase *with his eyes lifted up to heaven*³ is

¹ That is to say, Innocent seems to think that those solemn words which he considers necessary include first of all every one of the words which are uttered in the person of our Lord (the most solemn words of all), and secondly, the words which introduce those most solemn words of all. That both sets of words are included is suggested by both the general comprehensiveness of the expression ("and those solemn words which are expressed in the Canon by the holy Fathers"), and also by the quotation from his treatise on the Mass, which we add immediately.

² We read practically the same words in the decretal *Epistola ad Joannem quondam archiepiscopum Lugdunensem* (*Regest.* 1. 5, ep. 121. P. L. 114, 1119–1120).

³ Whether Innocent himself was right or wrong as regards the origin of this phrase, and of the two others, has little or no bearing on the subject. For our purpose it is enough to show that he considered the narrative necessary, as included among those solemn words expressed by the Fathers in the Canon.

placed in our Canon, not among the words of our Lord, but in the narrative preamble. Therefore Innocent believes that the narrative is to be recited according to the institution of Christ: which is a very suasive argument that the narrative is necessary for the consecration of the sacrament; not indeed as the sacramental form, for the form is comprised in the words of the Lord, but as a condition, failing which, those words of our Lord would not be the form, in *our* celebration, as without the narrative they would not have their due sense, in *our* celebration.

We find then positive support for the opinion of Scotus, not only after but even before this time; on the other hand, I, at least, HAVE FOUND NO EXAMPLE OF THE CONTRARY TEACHING BEFORE THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.¹

The opinion of Scotus, therefore, is by no means wanting in extrinsic probability. Its chief support, however, is found in the intrinsic reasons which favour it, and which we shall now consider.

The following statement may be taken as a fixed principle: every sacramental form must signify its own proper effect, not only from the subjective intention of the minister who pronounces the form, but also from the actual objective tenor of the words pronounced. For the form causes by signifying, and signification is of itself something objective and external; it must be interpreted according to the received rules of human speech in general, as well as the rules of the particular idiom used. Now in the making or production (*confectio*) of the sacraments, the intention is only concerned with the application of the form, complete in itself as form, to the matter of itself sufficient. One thing, however, the intention can never do. It can never confer on the form a

¹ Neither party can claim the support of Paschasius Radbertus from his *Lib. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, c. 15. P. L. 120, 1322, where he determines not what words must necessarily be said but what words effect the consecration. Some other words of his, however, already cited above (XXXIV) from the *Summa Sententiarum*, tr. 6, c. 4. P. L. 176, 140–141, do certainly favour Scotus: “The form of this sacrament is THE COMMEMORATION of those words which Christ said in the supper,” etc. He does not say the “enunciation” or the “utterance” of these words, he says “the commemoration”. Therefore we so pronounce the words that we commemorate them, that is, in such a manner that their utterance by our Lord is narrated; and in so far as this is done they are the form. This interpretation of his words is confirmed by these other words of his which he subjoins: “We believe that these words said by the priest IN THAT ORDER and with that intention change the bread and wine into the true Body and true Blood of Christ” (*ibid.*). Therefore the words *This is my body* should be said in some “order”: that is, if I am not mistaken, they must be inserted in some narrative by which it is secured that a commemoration of them is made. Cf. also the remarks of the author of the book *De Sacramentis* 4, 5, 21. P. L. 16, 462.

signification which the form in itself does not possess. In other words, should the signification of the form in itself be in any way deficient, the intention will not supply this deficiency.

Therefore it may not be said that such and such a form would not by virtue of the words show such and such a signification, unless the minister intended to utter it in that particular sense or signification, but if the minister intends to utter it in such a sense it does have such a signification. On the contrary, I repeat, the intention of the minister does not correct or govern the sense of the form, it simply causes the form to have effectively that sense which, in given circumstances, it has naturally.

This principle, I think, should be accepted by every theologian. It underlies the decision of Leo XIII on Anglican Orders. The Pontiff, having shown what is the obvious meaning in the Anglican communion of the words of the adulterated Ordinal, goes on to say: "By this same argument, even taken alone—*eodem porro argumento vel uno* (that is, from the meaning of the words)—is refuted the contention of those who say that the prayer at the beginning of the ritual action: *Omnipotens Deus, omnium bonorum largitor*, CAN SUFFICE to make the form of the Order legitimate: though we admit that the form might perhaps be regarded as sufficient in some Catholic rite of which the Church had approved."

So here in the Anglican ordinal we have a form which CAN SUFFICE in other circumstances, namely, where from the received use of the Church it has a Catholic meaning; but it cannot suffice in the Anglican Church where the words *priest* and *bishop* and similar words have a different received meaning.

Having established this principle, we now ask: Do the words *This is my body*, pronounced by me with the omission of the other words, give the sense which the sacrament requires? Now, what sense of these words does the sacrament require? Plainly that the Body of Christ be signified by them. It is necessary, therefore, that the possessive *my* should be referred to Christ as its possessor, not to myself who now speaks at the altar. Now if these words are left to themselves, that is, without any preamble, by every rule of speech, the objective and outward meaning of the word *my* will not be such as it should be, denoting Christ as the person to whom the word *my* refers, but clearly and obviously it will be referred

simply to me : the sense of the words then being : this is the body of myself who am now speaking. And in matters sacramental my intention cannot change this, as has been said. Hence in order that the word *my* may connote Christ, that word must of necessity be uttered as coming from the lips of Christ. This will not be done if Christ Himself is not introduced as saying: *This is my body*. Only then will the words mean the Body of Christ and not that of the priest who utters the words ; and only then will they have their proper force and character as the form of the sacrament.

Scotus argued as follows : “The sacramental words must signify by virtue of the words (*ex vi verborum*) that which is effected by virtue of the sacrament. But by virtue of this consecration the effect is that the true Body of Christ is there ; therefore the words, sufficient by their own proper virtue, must signify that the true Body of Christ is contained there. But these words: *This is my body*, uttered without what goes before, do not absolutely signify this, because the pronoun *my* signifies that the body is referred to the person of the one speaking. For even though the minister may intend to speak in the person of Christ, this would not have the effect of making these words signify that the pronoun *my* would indicate the Body of Christ, and not the body of the speaker.”

The force of this argument may be illustrated by an example. Suppose that a king, having conquered his enemies, addresses his soldiers thus: “Divide with me, for half of your booty is mine. Make this known to your fellow soldiers.” Suppose that the soldiers went away, and each one of them said to his fellow soldiers: “Divide with me, for half of your booty is mine.” Would not the king be angry and consider himself mocked ? They should have said: THE KING SAID TO HIS SOLDIERS: divide with me for half of your booty is mine. Make this known to your fellow soldiers.”¹ When this had been done, the command of the king would have been properly obeyed ; because the king’s words

¹ It is true that what introduces the narrative (*the king said*) has not the force of a command, since it enjoins nothing, the imperative only being found in the narrated or promulgated member of the whole (*divide with me*). But nevertheless, just as this second part (*divide with me*) is not promulgated, as coming from the king, so neither has it any binding force on the individual subjects, unless the first part (the king said) is uttered. So in our case, to quote the words of Thomas of Walden (*op. cit.*, tit. 4, c. 38, fol. 92): “The words of Christ are promulgated and always effective” (*promulgatur et semper effectrix Christi sententia*).

would have been made known in the sense in which he had said them, being placed by the promulgator on the lips of the king.

For the priest it is the same. Before pronouncing the words of the Lord, it must be made known that it is the Lord who is speaking. If the priest omits this preliminary indication, he is not doing what Christ did. For although materially he applies the same words, formally he does not, that is, he does not pronounce them as signifying what they should signify. For in the case of the priest *my* of itself signifies *my own*, that is, it signifies (the body of) Peter or Paul or John who is speaking; just as in the case of Christ speaking at the Supper, it signified *My own*—(the Body of) Myself, Christ, who speaks: this last it will never signify when we say the words, unless we then and there introduce Christ as saying the words. Hence one can easily see the error in the following objection: in the Supper Christ consecrated without the narrative. He consecrated simply by the words: *This is my body*. Therefore if we also omit the narrative, we still consecrate simply by the same words: *This is my body*. For Christ said: *Do this*, namely, what I Myself did. . . . I reply: precisely because we must do what He did, we must pronounce the words in the SAME SIGNIFICATION. We cannot do this unless in our formula Christ is introduced as speaking the words. Not that any of the words introducing Christ as speaking is the form. For those introductory words do not signify that the Body of Christ is present under the appearance of bread,¹ but they are a condition without which our uttering of the words of our Lord would not have that necessary signification.² Given this condition, however, our utterance of the words has that signification.

¹ Similarly, looking at the matter from another angle: these words of preamble are not the form, simply because they are not spoken in the person of Christ; nevertheless they are necessary, precisely to secure that the words following, *This is my body*, be uttered in the person of Christ. One and the same reason therefore—the necessity that the person of Christ be represented as speaking the form—implies the necessity of the preamble narrative, and at the same time forbids us to give it the name, and to assign to it the virtue of the sacramental form. The same reason not only also places the epiclesis (which is certainly not said in the person of Christ but in our person) outside the form, but even shows that the epiclesis is not even a necessary condition for valid consecration: for the epiclesis in no way helps to secure that the words of the form be uttered in the person of Christ.

² So true is this that among the theologians who erroneously maintained that of themselves the words of Christ alone suffice, there were some who went so far as to infer that the transubstantiation is effected by speech devoid of sense (*sensu vacuam*). Thus Joannes Teutonicus († 1245), Glossator of the Decretum, having put to himself the following objection: “The Lord made use of these words significantly, and

Perhaps you may say : it is sufficient if the words are uttered in the person of Christ. But they can be uttered in the name of Christ without prefixing any narrative, and without any mention being made of Christ. Just as when we absolve penitents we absolve them in the name of Christ, saying: "I absolve thee," yet the name of Christ is not mentioned.

To this I reply : when one is said to speak in the person of another there are two ways in which we may understand this expression. The first way is when that person is understood to intimate something in virtue of the power which he has received from another. Thus a prefect appointed by a king may say : "I command you to do such and such a thing." Here he commands in virtue of the royal authority delegated to him. And it is thus that the priest absolves in the name of Christ, saying: "I absolve thee." For he intimates this to the penitent in virtue of the power of the Lord delegated to him. In a second way, one speaks in the person of another, if the words are said by him, not as his own, but as the words of another. For instance, a person may say to you: "These are the words of the king: I command you to do this." In the use here of the words "I command" there is no intimation of the speaker's command, but only of the command of the king. Clearly these two ways of speaking in the person of another are totally different,¹ so that the one can exist without the other. For example, when the captain says to the soldier: "I order", he is giving his own order, not the order of the king,

we make use of them materially: therefore we are not doing what He Himself did; which must be done", candidly replies: "To this I say that the virtue given to these words was such that at the uttering of them the transubstantiation is accomplished. I add likewise that THE PRIEST DOES NOT UTTER THESE WORDS SIGNIFICATIVELY, FOR THE REASON THAT HE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO PRONOUNCE THEM TRULY SO: FOR HE WOULD SPEAK FALSELY WERE HE TO SAY: THIS IS MY BODY [that is, significatively]." And so our Glossator thinks he has given a satisfactory answer to the question he had put himself in the beginning of the discussion: "*How the transubstantiation may be accomplished by an utterance signifying nothing*" (*Decretum Gratiani cum glossis .Dni Joannes Teutonici*, etc., Basle, 1512, fol. 399). Thomas Manriquez, Master of the sacred apostolic palace, on the 22nd August 1572, ordered the words which we have set down in capital letters above to be deleted from all the codices of the Decree until an edition should be published with opportune annotations (*Censura in glossas et additiones juris canonici*, etc., Rome, 1572, pp. 17-18).

¹ Possibly the distinction between these two modes would be clearer if we agreed to the following usage: in reference to words spoken by us, as representing another, as the above described use of words spoken in the first way, to keep to the expression "in the name" of another, and for the second way "in the person (*ex persona*) of" another.

although the actual source of his power to give such an order is in the royal authority (passed on, delegated to him). The captain therefore, as delegate, speaks in the person of the king in the first way, but not in the second. In our case when we say: "I absolve thee," it is the same. But when a man tells his friend that Caius said: "I am well," he does not say this in his own person, for he himself may even be unwell, he says it in the person of Caius who says that he (Caius) is well. For although he says the words: "I am well," nevertheless he puts the words on the lips of Caius. Meantime he does not speak with any authority received from Caius, as if Caius gave him a mandate to make something known to others, he is speaking on his own authority only; that is to say, narrating a fact, he speaks in the person of Caius in the second way only. It is just the same when we say that Christ said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

These two modes of speech can also co-exist, as when one acts both as narrator and delegate, as in the example cited above of the soldiers delegated to declare the royal will to their fellow soldiers. They not only narrate what the king said, but they are also the bearers of the royal command with the power conferred by the king. Therefore they speak there in the person of the king in two ways. Suppose they did not make any narration, for example by saying: "The king said," but merely repeated the words of the king: "Divide with me," in that case they would not speak in the person of the king in either way, for then they would neither speak in the person of the king by way of narrative putting the words "Divide with me" on the lips of the king, nor would they speak ministerially as delegates using the power of the king. Indeed they would be acting contrary to the royal commitment and royal command, as we have seen when we considered this example.

Now in the consecration of the Eucharist, we speak in the person of Christ in both these ways: we not only place the words on His lips, but, authorised to do so, we convey His intimation to the bread and wine in our hands.

From the narrative preamble, therefore, our locution has the historic or narrative sense or, as the early theologians (v.g. St. Thomas, 3 S. 78, 5, c.) say, the "recitative sense", whereby the

word *my* is adapted to designate not my body but the Body of Christ.

Furthermore, from the power given to us, our locution has the demonstrative or, as the early theologians say (St. Thomas, *ibid.*), the “significant sense”, in respect of our Eucharist here and now, so that it shows, demonstrates, or signifies the Body of Christ here and now present.¹ No opposition exists here² between the historic and the demonstrative sense; indeed, the historic sense underlies the demonstrative. If the historic sense failed, the demonstrative sense would be falsified, but not vice versa.³

¹ The distinction between the narrative and the demonstrative sense is not the same as the distinction between the speculative and the practical sense. The speculative is opposed to the practical, and the distinction between the historical and the demonstrative can be applied both to the speculative and the practical. The speculative sense presupposes the reality of what is enunciated, as when I say “the sun shines”. But the practical does not propose any truth of what is enunciated other than what is induced by the enunciation of it, as when a king says: “This man is a minister of the kingdom”, and thereby creates him a minister. No one should have any doubt whatever that our Lord’s words in the Supper had this, the practical, pragmatic sense, not the speculative (if our Lord consecrates by the words, as all now hold). And if in our Mass the sense of the form is demonstrative, it is plain that in our Mass it is practical or pragmatic, for the very same reason that it was so in the Supper. Therefore the real controversy is, as it always was with the early theologians, whether the sense of the form in our Mass is merely narrative, or merely demonstrative, or not rather both narrative and demonstrative at the same time.

² In spite of what Vasquez (disp. 200, c. 2, n. 15) unhappily wrote to the contrary, excluding the recitative and retaining only the significant sense. Suarez (disp. 58, sect. 4, n. 8) aptly refuted this opinion, and de Lugo (disp. 11, sect. 5, n. 115) rightly abandoned it.

³ You may object: how is it possible to reconcile in one and the same announcement of ours, the narrative and the demonstrative sense of the words? If the locution *This is my body* is formally introduced as spoken by Christ in the past, how can we speak it in the very same breath, with the very same vocal sounds, as enunciating something about that which now is PRESENT TO US?

For Christ in the Supper did not speak of this very bread that we now hold in our hands, He did not speak of this chalice which we now hold, He spoke of that bread and that chalice which He had in His hands when He spoke. If therefore the words of Christ are used by way of recital or narrative, the pronoun *this* in the locution cannot have the power of indicating anything here present to us, that is, it cannot have a demonstrative sense also.

I reply: The words of our Lord can be uttered by us by way of recital, as words used long ago by Christ, and be at the same time significant of the present Action which we perform. The reason of this is because Christ did not, as the objection falsely supposes, speak of some BREAD (or of some WINE) there in His hands, when He said this; but the pronoun *this*, as St. Thomas pointed out (3 S. 78, 5 c.), stood at the Supper for what would exist under the species, at the termination of the utterance. Therefore the pronoun *this* can, in our one same utterance, signify at the same time, both that which at the Supper was destined to be present under those species, and which now at Mass at the conclusion of our utterance, will be present under those species, for both are one, namely, the Body of Christ. And so there is no contradiction between the historical and the demonstrative sense of our sacramental form.

Moreover, that the pronoun *this* can, for the reason given, and without any absurd implication, at the same time demonstrate, for the Supper *then*, and for our Mass *now*, is quite clear from the example of the Church which uses at one and the same

Another objection may be raised against our contention: the priest can speak in the person of Christ in both ways, not only as using His power, but also as placing the words on His lips, without the narrative preamble, provided that it is outwardly manifest, from any other source, that the priest utters the words, not as his own, but as the words of Christ, and spoken by Christ. Certain outward circumstances, for instance, place, time, gesture, sacred vestments particularly, could indicate this.¹

To this I reply: it is oral action and oral action only that consecrates the Eucharist. Call to mind the countless sayings of the Fathers, insisting that our sacrifice is enacted only by prayer (*prece, oratione, that is, by word of mouth*). Therefore the words of consecration from the objective meaning which they have in their oral context, from their objective tenor, must be significative in respect of the Body of Christ, without invoking the aid of anything else to make them significative. Therefore we may not

time the adjective *this* both for the chalice of the Supper and the chalice of the Mass, where, actually on the point of consecrating, she says: *Taking also into his holy and venerable hands THIS EXCELLENT CHALICE*. For what chalice did Christ take? His own. And what chalice do we designate? Our own, when we say *this*. And yet there is no contradiction. For, since the Church here has in mind the chalice of the sacrifice in its terminal state, in which it will be the chalice of the Blood, she rightly designates the chalice of the Lord at the Supper, with the same single word with which she indicates our chalice now.

The early writers saw this clearly. St. Agobardus of Lyons writes: "Let every one of the faithful pay attention to what the word *this* tells us: simply that the chalice which the priest sacrifices is none other than that which the Lord Himself gave to the Apostles. As we believe this then of the Blood, so also must we believe it of the Body" (*Contra libros quatuor Amalarii*, c. 13. P. L. 104, 347). We find the same practically word for word in Florus (*De expositione missae*, 60. P. L. 119, 53), and in Remigius of Auxerre (*De celebratione missae*. P. L. 101, 1260; cf. Paschasius Radbertus, *Lib. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, c. 15, n. 2. P. L. 120, 1322). Many others, too, say the same thing in other words, as Innocent III, commenting thus on the same passage in our Canon: ". . . For it is one and the same chalice then and now, both here and there, that is offered in sacrifice by all" (*De sacro altaris mysterio*, 1. 4, c. 27. P. L. 217, 875).

¹ Gregory of Valentia (in 3 S. 78, 1 and 2, and 3, cols. 990-991) though he is in complete agreement with us that the intention of the priest is not sufficient to signify the Body of Christ, and not the body of the speaker, maintains nevertheless that this determination of the sense can be given to the words indifferently, either from the preamble or from the outward circumstances mentioned above. Hence he says that if the narrative words are lacking, these circumstances are required and are sufficient. And before him Gerson (*Compend. Theol. De septem sacramentis. De sacram. eucharistiae*, Opera omnia, Paris, 1606, t. 2, col. 85) held that the sole words of the form suffice, but in such manner, nevertheless, that some external ritual would be necessary for the sacrament: "Many learned theologians say that the consecration can be performed by the sole words pronounced by the priest, provided there is also some suitable display (*apparatus*) as established by the Apostles and the Church. . . . At the same time he would sin very gravely . . . were he knowingly to omit the preamble."

appeal to vestments, gesture, ornament, or any such thing. For all these things, not being oral, cannot be numbered among those things that can affect the validity of the consecration.

Moreover, what could be more strange, unheard of, than to say that the consecration depends on vestments, stones, or anything of this kind? What the priest can do with vestments, he can do just as validly without vestments. If the priest could consecrate at the altar simply by uttering the words: *This is my body*, without any narrative words, he could do the same away from the altar. (One must never forget that the true altar of our sacrifice is not an altar of stone, it is the living Altar—the Body of Christ.)

Besides, once you admit that, apart from the uttering of the words of our Lord, something external is required, the much-vaunted fundamental principle of our adversaries falls to the ground: that for the validity of the sacraments nothing is required beyond the intention of the minister, the matter, and only the actual words, the *ipsissima verba* of the sacramental form. We, on the other hand, hold that something else is required in order that the words of the form may be effectively formal, or sacramental, or significative. And I cannot see how anyone who holds with us in this can fail to reach our conclusion, that in our sacrifice the requisite addition from which the words of the form secure their proper sense is the narrative. This will be admitted all the more readily if one notes how constantly the Fathers teach that our sacrifice is carried out by no other than verbal action, spoken words. We must not therefore appeal to gesture, to standing at the holy table, to the assembly of the faithful. All this is corporal activity as distinct from speech. Take these away and the sacrifice which is carried out with them will be effected without them.¹

¹ We often find this case put: were a sacrilegious priest, passing through a bakery, to pronounce the words *this is my body* over the loaves of bread exposed there, would he consecrate validly or not? Apart from the reason for invalidity (the absence of the narrative) just discussed, here there is another: that as he had NO INTENTION of acting on any wine, he does not intend to sacrifice: because the sacrificial action of the priest consists in the symbolic immolation which is only made in the separate consecration of the Body and Blood. But not intending to offer sacrifice, he does not consecrate even the bread, as we have noted above.

(C) INTERPELLATIVE WORDS, WORDS ADDRESSED TO GOD

Further and last of all it can be asked, should the narrative which includes the words of our Lord be made by way of a prayer directed to God, or at the very least be connected with or be continuous with some such prayer, so that it shares the very nature and character, so to speak, of that prayer? This question and that of the epiclesis are poles apart. There we asked whether the consecration should be made or be induced or be completed by words in which a petition is made for the consecration, and we answered in the negative to the question, effectively exploding that view.

But what we are asking now is whether our Supper narrative must be addressed to God, or, at least, whether we must introduce the Supper narrative by words addressed to God, from which the narrative flows in natural sequence: by thanksgiving for instance, or such like; so that eventually the Supper narrative would be understood as addressed to God.

Neither does this question have anything to do with that other question as to the place in the Canon or the moment of time in which the consecration has place; for that question is already settled, and there is no doubt that the consecration takes place immediately on the utterance of our Lord's words, no other words after these being required. We are concerned here merely with the trend of the words which precede the words of our Lord: should they be of such a nature as to clothe the form itself with the semblance of a prayer, of words addressed to God?

As a matter of fact, in the Liturgies the Supper narrative is usually addressed to God. The interpellative words, the words of address, are either interwoven with the narrative, as in the Roman Canon: *and with his eyes lifted up to heaven TO THEE, GOD, his almighty Father, also giving thanks to THEE (elevatis oculis in coelum ad Te Deum omnipotentem . . . item Tibi gratias agens)*—similar words occur in the Greek Liturgy of *St. James* and of *St. Mark*, in the Byzantine Liturgy of *St. Basil*, in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and in the *Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις* of Hippolytus, etc—or, at least, the narrative forms a part, a logical and

grammatical integrant of some longer discourse addressed to God (so in the *Test. D. N. J. C.*, in the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aethiopicæ*, in the *Anaphora Serapionis*, in the Byzantine Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, etc.).

In the Mozarabic rite, however, the narrative is not directed in either of these two ways to any divine Person. It is true that the priest addresses Christ immediately before the narrative; but in the narrative itself he does not address Christ, because Christ is named there in the third person; neither is there any sign of address to any other in the narrative. The passage is as follows: "Be present, O Jesus, good Pontiff, be present in our midst, as thou wert in the midst of thy disciples: and sanctify this oblation, that we may partake of what is sanctified through the hand of thy holy angel, O holy Lord, eternal Redeemer. Our Lord Jesus Christ on the night on which He was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, blessed and broke, saying: *Take ye and eat*, etc. . . . Likewise the chalice, after He had supped, saying: *This is*," etc. (P. L. 85, 550-551). But everyone knows that in this place the Canon is mutilated, because the prayer which we call the *Post-pridie* follows immediately, and yet there is no *Qui pridie* before the narration. The *Qui pridie* which once existed in this Liturgy has been removed,¹ an element which had, as in our Mass, the force of including the narrative in words of address to God. Meantime, however, the liturgy without the *Qui pridie* is extant and in use, and there is no doubt about it being used validly. Therefore there is no necessity whatever for the narrative to be addressed grammatically at least to God.² But the question still remains to be answered: whether it is necessary to have at least some preamble by way of interpellation or address directed to God, words of prayer or thanksgiving for instance, preparing the way for the narrative of the Supper. This is AT LEAST the custom of the universal Church; hence it is well to know whether this practice

¹ See note by Leslius (P. L. 85, 549-550). Cf. D. Mar. Férotin, *Liber Ordinum*, Paris, 1904, col. 238.

² One might perhaps urge, as at least probable, that the words "Be present, O Jesus . . . eternal Redeemer" in the PRESENT tenor of the Mozarabic Canon are merely said in parenthesis. If this is so, the Supper narrative would then be connected even grammatically with the prayer *Truly holy (Vere sanctus)* which goes just before it and is directed to God the Father. And so, in the present form or tenor of that Liturgy the narrative would be bound up grammatically with the words of address.

which is *de facto* universal is *de jure* necessary. The reasons for affirming this necessity are drawn from the example of Christ, patristic authority and theological reasoning.

In the *first place*, there is the example of Christ. He did not merely say: *This is my body, this is my blood*; but did this giving thanks to God, as St. Paul and St. Luke note in respect of the bread, and all the sacred writers in respect of the chalice.¹ And why so, unless the consecration form was to be interwoven with prayer, thus receiving a religious and particularly a Eucharistic virtue of thanksgiving? Cyril of Alexandria seems to urge this in his exposition of *St. Luke*, XXII, 19: *and taking bread he gave thanks and brake, and gave to them saying: This is my body*: "He gives thanks, says Luke, that is, IN THE FORM OF PRAYER (*ἐν σχήματι προσευχῆς*) HE ADDRESSES GOD THE FATHER, as though showing that the Father is associated with Him in the giving, and with Him approves of the giving of the life-giving eulogia to us. For every grace and every perfect gift comes to us from the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost. FURTHER, THIS ACTION GAVE US THE MODEL OF THE PRAYER WHICH WE WERE TO OFFER (*τῆς ὀφειλοῦσης προσανατείνεσθαι λιτῆς*), as often as we were to give thanks for the mystic and life-giving gift; and this in fact it is our custom to do. For having first given thanks and at the same time praising the Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit, so do we approach to the holy table" (P. G. 72, 908; cf. similar words on *Matth.*, XXVI, 27,

¹ It would be foolish for us to attempt to decide, even conjecturally, by what device Christ interwove the thanksgiving with the form of the consecration. We can, however, indicate one out of innumerable ways in which it could have been done. Suppose, for example, that He gave thanks after the model of the words of thanksgiving used at the resurrection of Lazarus: *Father, I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always, but because OF THE PEOPLE WHO STAND ABOUT I have said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me, AND HAST SANCTIFIED THIS BREAD WHICH THEY ARE ABOUT TO RECEIVE: hence take ye and eat this is my body*, etc. And if you were of opinion that it was necessary that the sacramental words, too, though certainly addressed to the Apostles, should also be grammatically directed to God, you would have no reasonable grounds for saying that this could not be done, too. We suggest a mode, in nowise unsuitable, in which this double direction of the words could be secured: *Father I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always, but because OF THE PEOPLE WHO STAND ABOUT I have said it, but that they may believe that thou hast sent me, and that thou hast sanctified this bread which they are about to receive, believing that it is a mystery of faith which I speak to them: Take ye and eat, for This is my body*, etc. Let no one think, however, that in writing these words we attribute them to Christ; they are simply two of innumerable possible formulae.

col. 452).¹ Like Cyril, Symeon of Thessalonica² stresses the necessity of the thanksgiving for the consecration of the sacrament: "Christ Himself left us the example of how we should sacrifice BY PRAYER (το διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἱερουργεῖν). For He took bread, and looking up to heaven, as it is written, giving thanks, he broke and gave to His disciples, saying: *Take ye and eat*, and *Drink ye all of this*, etc.; and so He, that needs not prayer, being the omnipotent God, OFFERED THIS SACRIFICE BY PRAYER (αὐτὰ διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἱεροῦργησεν), showing that the power of the Trinity is one, and that He Himself has the Father and the Holy Spirit as co-operators with Him in the sacred action" (*Expositio de divino templo*, 87. P. G. 155, 737).

Secondly, we have the authority of the Fathers. Every one of the earliest Fathers affirmed that we OFFER THE SACRIFICE BY PRAYER;³ but not only the earliest Fathers, but those who followed them, constantly spoke in the same manner.⁴ Now where

¹ Cf. above, Thesis VII (Vol I).

² Perversely, however, and preposterously, attempting to prove from this the necessity of the epiclesis.

³ Ignatius (*ad Magnesios*, VII, 1-2. F. P. 1, 236) in this connection uses the words Προσευχῆ, prayer, and δέησις, petition. Justin: "The food made the Eucharist by the word of prayer (δι' εὐχῆς λόγου) handed down by Jesus Himself" (*Apol.* 1, 65. P. G. 6. 428; cf. *Apol.* 1, 10-13, and *Dial.* 117. P. G. 6, 340-341 and 745). Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7, 3. P. G. 9, 444): δι' εὐχῆς, by prayer. Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 8, 33. P. G. 11, 1565): "Bread offered with thanksgiving and prayer (εὐχῆν) which is made because of the gifts"; and *In Matthaëum*, t. 11, n. 14. P. G. 13, 949): "the food consecrated by the word of God and petition (ἐντεύξεως), in accordance with the prayer (εὐχῆν) applied to it." Tertullian: "with the prayers of the sacrifices" (*De Oratione*, 19. P. L. 1, 1182-1183): "We sacrifice by pure prayer" (*Ad Scapulam*, 2. P. L. 1, 700). Cyprian: "to make another prayer with unlawful words" = illegitimate celebration of the Eucharist (*De unitate Ecclesiae*, 17. P. L. 4, 513). "Orationes et preces" = prayers and petitions = the celebration of the sacrifice (*Ep.* 64, 4. P. L. 4, 392). All these passages have already been explained in Th. XVIII. We may add Firmilian (*Ep. ad Cyprian*, c. 10. P. L. 3, 1165): ". . . She would pretend to sanctify the bread and make the Eucharist by a no means contemptible prayer or invocation"; and finally the *Didascalica*, 6, 22, 2. F. D. 1, 376: "Offer the Eucharist . . . the bread . . . which is sanctified by invocation."

⁴ Eusebius of Caesarea, *De laudibus Constantini*, 16. P. G. 20, 1425: "Who but our Saviour Himself alone taught His disciples to offer the sacrifices, bloodless and rational, which are carried out by prayer and the mystic words about divine things (σὶ εὐχῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτου θεολογίας)?" Serapion Thmuit., *Sacramentarium*, c. 13. F. D. 2, 172: "the prayer of the offering (εὐχὴ προσφόρου)." Athanasius, if he is the author of the *Sermo ad baptizandos* (P. G. 26, 1325): before the prayers (ἱκεταί, εὐχαί, δεήσεις) are said, there is nothing but bread and wine; when they have been said, there is the Body of Christ. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio catechetica*, 37. P. G. 45, 97: "This bread is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer (ἐντεύξεως)." Hesychius, *In Leviticum*, 1, 2. P. G. 93, 886: "Unless Christ, being invoked in prayer by the lips of the priests, comes Himself and sanctifies the Supper, what is done does not become the sacrifice of the Lord." Ambrose, *De Fide*, 4, 10, 124. P. L. 16, 641: ". . . (those things) which by the mystery of the sacred prayer are transfigured into the Flesh and Blood." Jerome,

will the prayer be if there are no words addressed to God? But if the words of our Lord are linked up and interwoven with words directed to God, they will undoubtedly have the appearance and possess the character of a prayer: and so what the Fathers insist upon will be secured.

Thirdly, the following theological reasoning may be advanced. Our theological narrative should differ from a merely historical narrative, ordained to inform the hearers of what Christ did; for in such a mere historical narrative there can be no sacrificial virtue, as it has no semblance of a religious action. For the religious character of our sacrificial activity must be outwardly manifested, because the external sacrifice is a sensible sign of internal religious sentiment. Therefore the very tenor of our narrative or of its context must be religious, so that thereby the utterance of the words of our Lord may be clothed with the outward appearance of a religious action. But no words can be by their very tenor religious unless they bespeak divine worship.¹ Hence it is not surprising to find theologians even of a later period teaching that the Eucharist cannot be consecrated by the utterance of the Lord's words, even if these are inserted in the Supper narrative, unless they be either interwoven with or preceded by some form of prayer in which God is addressed.

Thus the Canons of the Chapter of Cologne express themselves in the *Antididagma* (1549) against their heretical Archbishop

Ep. 146, 1. P. L. 22, 1193: "At whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ is consecrated (*conficitur*)."
In Sophon., 3. P. L. 25, 1375: the eucharist is made by the words of "the priest praying" = "by solemn prayer". Augustine, *Trin.* 3, 4, 10. P. L. 42, 874; "consecrated by the mystic prayer." *Ep.* 149, 15. P. L. 33, 636: "prayers, when it is blessed and sanctified." Cf. *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, 2, 30, 69. P. L. 43, 281. Gregory the Great, *Ep.* 1, 9, ep. 12. P. L. 77. 956-957: "the prayer" = "the prayer of the offering". In Paulus Diaconus, *S. Greg. M. vita*, 23. P. L. 75, 53: "He converts the bread and wine into His Body and Blood at the Catholic prayer." Isidore, *Etymologiae*, 6, 19. P. L. 82, 255: "It is consecrated by the mystic prayer." The *Council of Rome* (1079), under Gregory VII, commands that the following form of oath be subscribed by Berengarius: "By the mystery of the sacred prayer and by the words of the Redeemer" the conversion is made (D. 355).

¹ Religious utterance is not the same thing as sacred or even divine words. There can be no religious utterance, as we said, unless it bespeaks the worship of God, or of the blessed in heaven in so far as they are sharers of divine glory. On the other hand, words addressed to men, words which are ordained only to instruct or sanctify men, can be sacred, can be even divine if uttered by the authority of God, as when the priest says: *Ego te absolvo*. But such language would not suffice for the sacrificial action, because the sacrificial action is directed by men to God, and not conversely.

Hermann de Wied as follows: "Urgent need compels us to point out the sheer insanity of those who think that the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ can be consecrated without the Catholic prayer which we call the Canon . . . but merely by the recital or reading of the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians (*I Cor.*, XI): *The Lord Jesus Christ on the same night on which He was betrayed*, etc. For there the Apostle simply narrates the actions of Christ historically; and not in such a way as to supply any form of consecration, whereby the priest, the minister of the Church, with the invocation of the divine name, blesses and sanctifies the gifts set on the altar (*proposita*), not indeed by his own words, but by the omnipotent words of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . It is not difficult to prove this in similar cases in reference to the other sacraments. Christ taught the Apostles to baptise, saying: *Go and baptise all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*. Now who could be stupid enough to say that a priest who merely recited or read these words of the Gospel on the institution of baptism, and did not pronounce the words of the essential form of baptism: *I baptise thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, would truly and ritually baptise a child? . . . In just the same way we must hold, that should any one simply recite, or merely read over the story of the institution of this sacrament, as set down by St. Paul, and neither invoke, as minister of the Church, the name of God on the proffered gifts of bread and wine, nor likewise direct the words of consecration to the Victim there present, such a one would not consecrate at all, nor effect the true sacrament according to the Catholic sense and tradition of the Church. Quite other was the teaching and practice of the holy Fathers, both of the East and of the West, and indeed of the Apostles too. For as ministers of the Church they invoked the name of God on the Victim, and consecrated it with solemn prayer" (fol. LXXIII–LXXIV).

And again: "And what most of all fills us with horror is that in this book¹ is found a new Mass devised and instituted by him in accordance with his own views, in which there is no consecration

¹ This is in the book of Hermann de Wied, entitled, *Consultatio quomodo reformatio aliqua . . . sit instituenda* (1543).

with the invocation of the divine name. From this it necessarily follows that all the subjects of our most clement Prince, in all places where they have been forced to accept this doctrine, are being deprived in a most cruel and impious manner of the Body and Blood of Christ. See fol. 110, page 2, of this book, where it is enjoined on the priest that, after having sung the hymn *Sanctus*, he is at once, without any invocation or canonical prayer, to recite with singular gravity the words of Paul the Apostle, in which he narrates the institution of this sacrament, namely: *The Lord Jesus Christ*, etc. And then forthwith, when the people have answered: *Amen*, he is to chant in like manner the *Pater noster*, and then give communion to the people" (fol. LXXIX). Thus spoke the Canons of Cologne. And you would be far from understanding their mind were you to think that here, by the invocation of the divine name, they meant the epiclesis. For they did not have the epiclesis in mind, but were merely claiming that the consecrative words should have some outward appearance of a prayer. This being secured, the invocation of the divine name is at once secured, for the divine name is invoked in all prayer. Combesius and Le Quien seem to be of the same mind as the Canons of Cologne where they say: "We could not conceive (*nec forte*) that the power was granted by the Lord in such a way that any priest could thoughtlessly babble the words of the Lord WITHOUT ANY RELIGIOUS RITE OF WORSHIP AND DUE ORDER (*nullo religioso cultu ac ordine*). Were he to do so, his action would not be sacred, rather it would be mere play-acting and desecration" (P. G. 94, 1142).

The teaching of these writers, understood in this way, has the undoubted support of Salaville, among our own contemporaries, when he writes: "It seems to me that there is nothing to prevent a Catholic from embracing this fifth opinion, which takes more account of the liturgical rites and prayers than does that of St. Thomas" (D. T. C., art. *Epiclèse*, col. 203).¹

¹ I do not think we can claim the support of Dom Cabrol (D. A. C., art. *Amen*, t. 1, col. 1558) for this teaching. The question he raises appears to be one rather of terminology than of real facts, where he claims that we give the name consecration indivisibly to the whole Canon, from the preface to the epiclesis inclusive. The question whether the consecration, that is the transubstantiation, is effected with strict dependence on the whole Canon (which every Catholic will deny) is quite different from the question whether the liturgical name of the consecration is

However, it may still be doubted whether the reasons given above are sufficiently cogent to prove the necessity, for the consecration, of some distinct address to God. One may ask: could not our own consecration, just as well as the consecration of Christ, be possessed of the force and character of prayer, and yet without any words of direct address to God? For, to speak in the first place of the example of Christ in the Supper, the words of Christ addressed to the disciples: *This is my body, This is my blood*, with the added expression of propitiatory intention, have on the face of them a practical sense, indicating something done; they enunciate what is effected and effect what is enunciated. But what was effected by this intimation of Christ had the force of a pragmatic expiatory offering, as we have often said. By its very signification then the discourse of Christ implied an oblation action. For this reason it had the force of directing something to God; namely, the victim to be dedicated fully and finally by immolation. The discourse then reflected in the highest degree divine worship, having a religious character far and away beyond any oath or vow. Hence it is rightly called prayer, in so far as any words expressing worship of God, any words of divine praise, are called a prayer. We might say that even in the narrower specific sense of a prayer of petition our Lord's discourse is most appropriately termed prayer; for just as the pragmatic offering was implied in the words of our Lord, so also was implied the pragmatic petition for acceptance, and the impetration, or obtaining by prayer, as we have explained above, of grace and pardon. Christ therefore showed Himself quite sufficiently, even without addressing God directly by name, in the act of religious prayer. Before and after the words of consecration, He certainly chose to add some express words of thanksgiving and petition particularly; but these could be explained as said for the clearer

applicable to the whole Canon, which is a question of free classification and nomenclature. Thurston (*Rev. du Clergé Fr.*, t. 54, pp. 536-537) says the same thing, simply adopting the words of Dom Cabrol. With both we must admit that the Fathers, when speaking of the consecrative prayer, usually, not to say always, treated as one unit both the narrative part which contains the words of the form, and parts of the Eucharistic discourse, both before and after it; the whole, by the union of all these parts forming one solemn discourse, containing both the words of the offering and the Canon prayer. But, I repeat, all this has to do with a certain use of terms as justified by historical evidence, with which alone, it seems to me, Dom Cabrol and Fr. Thurston were dealing.

indication to us of what He did, just as we explained the prayers of offering, the prayers asking for acceptance, which we find after the consecration in the Mass, as a ceremonial expansion by way of explanation of the essential act.

The same line of reasoning is applicable to the Mass. For since we pronounce the words of Christ, not merely recitatively, but also demonstratively or significantly, as we have already explained, they have the same practical sense with us, that is, as of something done, not merely said, in respect of the same oblation action; they therefore exhibit the same religious character; they have the same force of petition and prayer. And perhaps nothing further is required to satisfy the Fathers,¹ where they all agree in placing sacrificial action either of our Lord Himself, or of ourselves, in the Mass.

Against this, however, it might be objected: *first*, that in the Supper itself our Lord's demonstrative words (*This is my Body; This is the chalice*, etc.) had the character of an offering, and hence, too, of a petition, only through their connection, already presupposed, with His words of worship and thanksgiving, whence the symbolic separation of the Body and Blood would receive the religious and sacrificial character, discussed above by us in Thesis III (Vol. I). Hence the parity between the Mass and the Supper, so far from removing the necessity of this connection of prayer properly so called, with consecration in the Mass, positively argues for that necessity.

But one might reply: although the words of worship and thanksgiving at the Supper had already inculcated and declared the laetitic and eucharistic virtue of the Action, this laetitic and eucharistic character was nevertheless sufficiently evident to the mind enlightened by faith, even without those words; it was evident particularly from the declaration of the propitiatory intention (by the words "which will be shed", for example), in which was implied the direction of the gift to placate God, which is sacrificial offering in the most formal sense, as was explained in section 2, and in Thesis III (Vol. I).

Hence the *praise of God* (εὐλογία) and the *thanksgiving*

¹ This exposition is particularly fitting for the words of Justin (*Apol.* 1. 66. P. G. 428-429), quoted above.

(*εὐχαριστία*), made expressly by our Lord, was indeed most opportune, but it is not evident that it was simply necessary. This will apply equally to the Mass and the Supper.

But it might be objected in the *second place*: the mind of the Fathers seems to be, not that our sacrifice is at the very least some kind of prayer (all sacrifice is that), but that the words be so said, that those words themselves are some kind of prayer. Wherefore the prayerful character of the words is not to be inferred from the fact that a sacrifice is carried out, but rather that our own sacrifice eventuates, such as the Fathers describe it, because the words are prayerful. It is necessary, therefore, that the prayerful character be inherent in the words themselves before we consider the possibility of any sacrifice being carried out by them.

But whether or not the Fathers did or did not so expressly teach the need just alleged, I would prefer others than myself to decide. I do not wish to assert more than what I plainly see that I must assert regarding a point which still remains obscure. Hence I leave pronouncements on this last point to wiser men, and will gratefully accept their judgment.

ABBREVIATIONS

- A.H. *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, ed. G. M. DREVES, S.J., and C. BLUME, S.J., accedente H. M. BANNISTER, tom. 1–55, 1896–1915.
- B. BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I. *Eastern Liturgies*, 1896.
- C.S.C.O. *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, accurantibus L. B. CHABOT, etc.
- D. H. DENZINGER, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, etc., 10, ed. BANNWART.
- D.A.C. *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Dom CABROL et Dom LECLERCQ.
- D.B. *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. HASTINGS.
- D.T.C. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, A. VACANT, E. MANGENOT.
- F.D. *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolicae*, ed. FUNK, 1906.
- F.P. *Patres Apostolici*, 2, 1901, ed. FUNK.
- J.T.S. *Journal of Theological Studies*.
- L.B. LE BRUN, *Explication . . . de la Messe*, 1777–8.
- P.G. *Patrologia Graeca*, accurante J. P. MIGNÉ.
- P.L. *Patrologia Latina*, accurante J. P. MIGNÉ.
- P.O. *Patrologia Orientalis*, R. GRAFIN and F. NAU.
- P.S. *Patrologia Syriaca*, R. GRAFIN.
- R. RENAUDOT, *Collectio Liturgiarum Orientalium*.
- R.S.R. *Recherches de Science Religieuse*.
- S.Th.I.S. ST THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, first part.
- T.a.S. *Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, J. ARMITAGE-ROBINSON.
- T.u.U. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, O. v. GEBHARDT, ADOLF HARNACK, CARL SCHMIDT.