

## Communion under both kinds: theological and pastoral aspects

*Fr Wladimir-Marie de Saint-Jean, OM (France)*<sup>1</sup>

Communion under both kinds, whilst upholding the dogmatic principles established by the Council of Trent, may be granted, at the discretion of the bishops, in cases to be specified by the Apostolic See, either to clerics and religious, or to laypeople; for example: to newly ordained priests at the Mass of their ordination, to those making their religious profession at the Mass of their profession, and to neophytes at the Mass following their baptism.<sup>2</sup>

Thus speaks the Second Vatican Council, in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

It is well known that Communion under both kinds is by no means a recent invention. The first Eucharistic communion, received by the Apostles themselves from the hand of the Lord in person, was celebrated under the two species of consecrated bread and wine, since this is how Christ instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist (Lk 22:19–20).

From the apostolic age until the 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries, this form of communion was practically universal, though not exclusive, in both the East and the West, as the Council of Trent itself attests, far from being the sole witness on this matter: “*Ab initio christianæ religionis non infrequens utriusque speciei usus fuisse*” – “From the beginning of Christianity, the practice of Communion under both kinds was not uncommon” – (Sess. XXI, c. 2).

Following St Paul in 1 Cor 11:28, we may cite the *Didache*, St Ignatius of Antioch, St Justin, Tertullian, St Cyprian of Carthage, and St Cyril of Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> These testimonies are limited to the first five or six centuries; thus, Nicephorus of Constantinople (+829) in his *\*Antirrheticus II adversus Constantinum Copronymum\**.<sup>4</sup>

The Fathers, in their contemplation of the Eucharistic mystery, and in the light of this rite of communion, received under the two species of bread and wine, were keen to discuss the symbolism of the chalice, particularly with regard to its soteriological dimension, and the links between the Eucharist and eschatology, and between the Eucharist and pneumatology. Fr. Lebeau, a Jesuit from Louvain, has devoted several studies to these themes, in which he quotes, among other authors, some beautiful passages taken from the Fathers:

---

<sup>1</sup> Lecture given at the 2nd C.I.E.L. symposium, October 1996.

<sup>2</sup> Constitution *De sacra Liturgia*, Chap. 2, ‘The Mystery of the Eucharist’, art. 55.

<sup>3</sup> But also Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory I, Isidore of Seville, Bede ...; cf. J.J. MEGIVERN, *Concomitance and communion. A study in Eucharistic Doctrine and practice*, Fribourg-New York, 1963, pp. 6–12. E. DUBLANCHY, art. ‘Communion under both species’, in *D.T.C.*, Paris, vol. III, 1923, col. 554–555. N. IUNG, art. ‘Communion’, in *D. Droit Can.*, Paris, vol. III, 1942, col. 1171–1172. Among numerous authors, BOSSUET, *Treatise on Communion under Both Species*, in *Complete Works*, Ed. Lachat-Vivès, vol. 16, 1864, p. 225 ff.

<sup>4</sup> P.G., 100, 337ff.

‘The cluster hanging on the vine in the last days, whose blood becomes a drink of salvation for those who believe,’ writes St Gregory of Nyssa (*Vita Moï̄s.*, II, 268). ‘By partaking of His blood shed for us, we receive the Holy Spirit,’ says Pseudo-Chrysostom .<sup>5</sup> And St Ambrose: ‘[Come to the food] of Christ, to that of the Lord’s body, to the sacramental banquet, to that cup from which the affection of the faithful is intoxicated, to clothe yourself in the joy that comes from the remission of sins, to cast off the cares of this world, the fear of death and all anxieties. Thanks to this intoxication, the body does not stagger, but experiences a renewal of strength; the soul is not confused, but deified.”<sup>6</sup>

Refuting the Ebionites – who refused to acknowledge Jesus Christ as the eschatological Messiah and who, in ritual practice, were adherents of the ‘Aquarian heresy’ (the desire to “consecrate” or “celebrate the Eucharist” with anything but pure water), Saint Irenaeus wrote: “They reject the mixing of heavenly wine and wish to be nothing but water of this world, refusing to receive God so that He might mingle with <sup>them</sup>.<sup>7</sup>

Certainly, for the Fathers as for Saint Paul (1 Cor 10:3-4), the Eucharistic bread is also ‘spiritual’ food, as Fr Lebeau acknowledges: ‘that is to say, a bearer of the Spirit, PNEUMATICON BROMA, PNEUMATICON POMA.<sup>8</sup>

The Fathers also emphasise the symbolic dimension of *koinônia* embodied in the chalice, whilst pointing out that it shares this dimension with the bread, the sacred body of the Saviour. St Ignatius of Antioch had already written to the Philadelphians: ‘Take care to practise but one Eucharist, for there is but one flesh of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice to unite us to his blood, one altar, just as there is but one bishop, with the college of presbyters and deacons .<sup>9</sup>’ And the Anaphora of Saint Basil says, immediately after the Epiclesis: ‘May we all who partake of the one bread and the one cup be united with one another in the communion of the one Holy Spirit .<sup>10</sup>

This is therefore indeed a common form of the rite of communion, which would remain as such, even in the West, until around the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Communion under both kinds would nevertheless face what we might call ‘practical-pastoral’ difficulties presented by communion with the Precious Blood. These difficulties are obviously not unrelated to a dimension

---

<sup>5</sup> PSEUDO-CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In sanctum Pascha*, P.G. 59,726.

<sup>6</sup> *Sermon 15 on Ps. 118:28*; P.L. 15, 1197, 1526.

<sup>7</sup> *Advers. Haeres*, V, 1, 2.

<sup>8</sup> P. LEBEAU, ‘The Meaning of the Eucharistic Chalice According to the Fathers’, in *Studia Patristica. Texte und Untersuchungen*, 107, Berlin, 1970, p. 367

<sup>9</sup> *Philadelph.*, 4, 1.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by P.M. GY, ‘The Rites of Eucharistic Communion’, in *La Maison-Dieu*, 24, 1950, p. 150.

strictly theological, such as the sacred respect for the real presence of Christ under both species, a respect that communion from the chalice could not always absolutely guarantee (*timor effusionis*).<sup>11</sup>

This is evidenced by the evolution of the method of distributing communion under the species of wine. It began with drinking from the chalice. Then *the Ordo Romanus I* shows that in the 8<sup>th</sup> century communicants used a *pugillaris* (tube). “It was difficult to give communion to a whole congregation from the chalice<sup>12</sup>”. Because of this same difficulty, the use of the “Eucharistic spoon”<sup>13</sup>, apparently quite early on in Syria, around the 7<sup>th</sup> century<sup>13</sup>. In the West, J. B. Pitra notes its appearance in a regional conciliar text from the 9<sup>th</sup> century<sup>14</sup>. Much of the East would adopt it, according to the testimony of Cardinal Humbert (+1061).

It was also in the 7<sup>th</sup> century that the first evidence of intincti reached us, in the form of a condemnation issued by the Third Council of Braga<sup>15</sup>. If the Latins issued several condemnations against this practice, it is because they regarded it either as contrary to the institution made at the Last Supper, or – according to a less serious objection – as too reminiscent of Judas’s communion; but the East, in some of its rites (particularly the Byzantines), adopted it. In this manner, the command ‘Drink from it, all of you’ is no longer carried out, and the significance of the chalice is, to say the least, diminished.

As we can see, it is therefore not convincing to assert that among the Eastern Churches – which have retained communion under both kinds – this rite has never posed a problem; and they, according to Mr Jugie, have “never regarded the manner of receiving Communion observed at the Last Supper as prescribed by the Saviour for all, indefinitely and without any possible change<sup>16</sup>”. In some places, this development has gone as far as communion under one species (Armenians, Maronites<sup>17</sup>); and according to J. Jungmann, among the separated Byzantines:

“The hosts intended for the faithful’s communion are generally not consecrated; one receives only the Precious Blood, together with a symbolic piece of bread<sup>18</sup>”

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. G. DANEELS, “Communion under both kinds”, in *Concilium*, 1965, 2, p. 134. J. JUNGSMANN, *Missarum sollemnia*, Paris, 1954, vol. III, p. 315. For the reverence shown to the holy species from the earliest centuries, see in particular Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Mystagog.*, V, 27; Tertullian, *De Corona mil.*, 3; Hippolytus of Rome, *Tradit. Apostol.*, in Coll. Sources Chrétiennes, XI, p. 67.

<sup>12</sup> P. BATIFFOL, *Leçons sur la messe*, Paris, 1920 edition, p. 290.

<sup>13</sup> F. NAU, ‘The Greek Text of the Narratives Useful to the Soul by Anastasius’, in *Oriens christianus*, III, 1903, p. 62.

<sup>14</sup> J.B. PITRA, *Juris Græcorum hist. et mon.*, II, p. 136.

<sup>15</sup> MANSI, *Collectio*, XI, col. 155. J.J. MEGIVERN, *op. cit.*, p. 27; N. IUNG, *op. cit.*, col. 1175.

<sup>16</sup> M. JUGIE, quoted by A. MICHEL, ‘Communion under both kinds’, in *L’Ami du clergé*, 72, 1962, p. 702.

<sup>17</sup> I.H. DALMAIS, *Liturgies d’Orient*, Paris, 1980, p. 106; E. HERMAN, art. “Eucharistie en droit oriental”, in *D.D.C.*, Paris, vol. V, 1953, col. 542.

<sup>18</sup> J. JUNGSMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 317, n. 77.

Moreover, all historians acknowledge that the practice of receiving Communion under the single species of bread is one of the most ancient, particularly outside the church building. It is attested in documents as early as the third century, by authors such as Tertullian or Saint Cyprian,<sup>19</sup>. The faithful could be authorised to keep the sacred reserve in their homes. Saint Basil mentions this practice in Egypt and Africa; Saint Jerome attests to this custom of receiving communion at home in Rome in his time. This was common during times of persecution and even afterwards, to such an extent that fourth-century councils had to issue regulations to prevent or curb abuses (Zaragoza, in 380; Toledo, in 400)<sup>20</sup>.

Thus the sick, the ‘healthy’ faithful during (and even outside) times of persecution, anchorites..., all receiving Communion under the single species of bread, bear witness to the desire to be united with Christ through Communion with the Holy Body. It is important to emphasise here the link *between* the mysticism of martyrdom and Eucharistic spirituality, as well as *between* the latter and the foundations of the *Vita monastica*, regarded as a desire for incorporation into the *mysterium Christi*. Thus, even in communion with bread alone, there is expressed “union with Christ in his victorious passage (Passover) from

death, or rather, through death, towards life.<sup>21</sup>” Might we not perceive in this approach to the belief, at least implicit, in ‘concomitance’—that is to say, in the fact that it expresses the *Christus totus et integrus*? Does not P.M. Gy note that the expression *Christus totus* is already found in St Augustine, even if we do not claim that it takes on an exclusively Eucharistic connotation in his work<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, ever since the research of Cardinal Bona (d. 1674), historians have tended to distinguish between ‘communion outside the church’ and ‘communion within the church’ (that is to say, primarily within the context of the liturgical assembly), restricting communion in the former case to the single species of bread (or wine), other historical studies show that, in this area, excessive simplification can distort our understanding of the facts. Testimonies have been preserved regarding the customs of the Church of Constantinople under Saint John Chrysostom (cf. Sozomen and Nicephorus Callistus<sup>e 23</sup>); of the Church of Jerusalem, according to the testimony of Cardinal Humbert<sup>rt 24</sup>; and of the Church of Rome in

---

<sup>19</sup> TERTULLIAN, *Ad Uxorem*, P.L., 1, 1296; Saint CYPRIAN, *De Lapsis*, P.L., 4, 486. Historians also cite Dionysius of Alexandria (+265), Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist. Eccl.*, I, VI, 44. P.G., XX, 629), Paulinus of Milan...

<sup>20</sup> Cf. J. DUHR, art. ‘Communion fréquente’, in *Dict. de spiritualité*, Paris, vol. II, 1953, col. 1240.

<sup>21</sup> J.J. MEGIVERN, *op. cit.*, p. 20. Cf. L. BOUYER, ‘La Spiritualité du Nouveau Testament et des Pères’, in *Hist. de la spi. chrétienne*, I, Paris, 1960, pp. 254, 622.

<sup>22</sup> P.M. GY, ‘The Relationship to Christ in the Eucharist according to St Bonaventure and St Thomas Aquinas’, in J. DORE et al., *Sacraments of Jesus Christ*, Paris, 1983, p. 82. (Contribution reprinted in *The Liturgy in History*, Paris, 1990).

<sup>23</sup> SOZOMEN, H. E., P.G. 117, 1528 ff.; NICEPHORUS C., H.E., P.G. 146, 953 ff.

<sup>24</sup> HUMBERT, *Adv. græc. Calumnias*, 23, P.L. 143, 951 ff.

5<sup>th</sup> century by Pope Saint Leon<sup>25</sup>: the Manicheans, refusing to receive the Precious Blood, would hide among the faithful to receive the Holy Body, an attitude impossible if communion under one species had not been in use. Then more recent texts, p. 26, on Gaul in the 6<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> centuries, seem to indicate the use of this rite *sub specie panis* (‘under the species of bread’) within the context of the liturgical assembly; in Rome again, in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, under St Gregory the Great, communion under one species was also customary, according to the testimony of Deacon Paul, reported by Mabill, note<sup>27</sup>

We should also mention the practice of making up for a shortage of consecrated wine by adding a few drops of the Precious Blood to ordinary wine. As this mixture did not result in the consecration of the ordinary wine, at most only part of the ‘symbolic significance’ remained, and such a practice testifies that communion under a single species was in fact known and practised.

Let us also mention Communion under one species at the Mass of the Presanctified, known in the East in the 4<sup>th</sup> century and, among the Latins, mentioned in the sacramentary attributed to Saint Gelasius; and finally, the Communion of children, most commonly under the single species of wine.

It seems impossible to accept that the believers of those times could have regarded these customs as ‘mutilated’ rites, and that they did not believe in a *verum sacramentum*. All the more so since, neither in theological terms nor in pastoral practice (with the exception of the abuses of home communion for the non-sick, or the Latin reluctance towards *intinctio*, mentioned above), were any particular difficulties or controversies raised in this regard.

From the 13<sup>th</sup> century onwards, we see that the practice of non-celebrants receiving Communion under the Precious Blood disappeared (almost) entirely. The Church did not oppose this change and eventually even made Communion under the form of bread alone compulsory in the Latin rite. A. Dublanchy makes the following observation, which is by no means insignificant for our purposes: “The new custom became established gradually, without the aid of any formal legislation for the whole Church .28” In his *Treatise on Communion under Both Species*, Bossuet explains that the transition from one form to the other took place “without contradiction”; the Bishop of Meaux adds: “The surest sign that a custom is regarded as free is when it is changed without disturbance . 29” And he cites in particular the practice

---

<sup>25</sup> LÉON LE G., *Serm.* 42, 5, P.L. 54, 279 ff.

<sup>26</sup> GREGORY OF T., *Hist. Francor.*, 10, 8, P.L. 71, 535 ff.; MABILLON, *Annales ord. S. Ben.*, IX, c. 43, Lucca, 1739, I, p. 239.

See also in A. MICHEL, *The Decrees of the Council of Trent*, in HEFEFE-LECLERCQ, *History of the Councils*, Paris, vol. 10/1, 1938, p. 401, for other arguments used by the Council Fathers.

<sup>27</sup> Some historians of the liturgy now dispute the evidential value of these various accounts.

<sup>28</sup> A. DUBLANCHY, *op. cit.*, col. 565.

<sup>29</sup> BOSSUET, *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331. Cf. J. MEGIVERN, ‘Communion under both species’, in *Worship*, 37, 1962–1963, p. 52.

peaceful nature of the Church of Jerusalem, as reported by Cardinal Humbert, Leo IX's legate to the Eastern Churches.

Nevertheless, the doctrines of Berengar of Tours had led some to believe that communion *sub utraque* ('under both kinds') was necessary and, as Megivern notes, Rome might not have reacted so 'passively' to this development 'if the truth of the integral presence of Christ under one kind had not been rejected<sup>30</sup>'

This is why it is important to prioritise the causes that led to such a change in rite, which certainly did not occur without reason.

Thus, some historians (including Gregory Dix<sup>31</sup>) have argued that the abandonment of the chalice, in such a context, was to be attributed primarily to doctrinal reasons, among which the theology of concomitance would be at the forefront.

Such a position is not binding, and many other authors emphasise 'practical' or liturgical-pastoral reasons: large gatherings of communicants several times a year, due in part to the decline in frequent communion, which compelled the Church to impose the precept of annual communion at the Fourth Lateran Council; reasons of hygiene<sup>no. 32</sup>... which does not amount to concluding that there were no theological or spiritual reasons. Thus Fr Gy, for his part, highlights more clearly the motive of *periculum effusionis*, the fear of spilling the Precious Blood, "but this motive could only play a decisive role in a new spiritual and theological climate", he notes<sup>33</sup>. And that is what matters.

This "new spiritual and theological climate" was that of the worship of Christ's holy humanity and of his Passion. At the same time, devotion to *Corpus Christi*, the "Most Holy Sacrament", was intensifying, lending itself to significant mystical and spiritual movements. The Holy Host – and not the sacred blood – was preserved, and the desire to adore the Real Presence developed without ever excluding, quite the contrary, the sense of the bloody *Passion* (itself referring to the chalice). We may note, however, that the eschatological dimension of this chalice was somewhat diminished as a result.

At the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the revelations received by Saint Juliana of Mont-Cornillon concerning Eucharistic devotion exerted a real influence on the decision to establish, in Liège, the feast of *Corpus Christi*, which Pope Urban IV, following the miracle of Bolsena, confirmed in 1264. A compilation of Eucharistic miracles, compiled by P. Browe, shows just how widespread this phenomenon was

---

<sup>30</sup> J. J. Megivern, \*Communion under Both Species\*, *ibid.*, p. 50.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. J. J. MEGIVERN, *Concomitance and Communion*, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. e.g. M. AUGE, in *La Liturgia, Eucaristia*, vol. 3/2 of the Anàmnosis series, ed. by S. Marsili et al., Marietti, 1994, p. 279. J.J. MEGIVERN, *Concomitance and communion*, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

<sup>33</sup> P.M. GY, in 'Sacraments of Jesus Christ', *op. cit.*, p. 71. (in *La Liturgie...*, *op. cit.*, p. 249)

focuses on the 12th–15th centuries<sup>34</sup>: did these bloody hosts not show the faithful, in their own way, that the *Christus totus* is present in the consecrated bread? These miraculous events were not without contributing to the preservation of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist and to the development of devotion to the Precious Blood.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the faithful wished to ‘see’, and this ‘need to contemplate the body of the Lord is the force which, from the 11th century onwards, succeeded in introducing into the middle of the canon—long regarded as an untouchable sanctuary—a very significant innovation’: the elevation of the chalice<sup>35</sup>. The chalice, usually covered at that time by the rear part of the corporal folded forward, was raised somewhat later; moreover, the Precious Blood itself could not be seen.

According to J. J. Megivern, it seems that, from a period difficult to determine (in his view, the Carolingian era), there was a loss of symbolic meaning. But if this may have played a role in relation to the chalice, it is because the emphasis placed on the Real Presence of Christ under each of the two consecrated species tended to clearly protect the chalice from any spilling; should this be interpreted as a decline? G. Daneels writes: ‘The theology of the Real Presence, typical of this period, inspired a realism that reinforced the desire to surround the holy species with the utmost reverence . 36’

Bérenger’s doctrines and his provocations against Lanfranc sparked a theological reflection that led to the doctrine of concomitance, demonstrating that Christ is fully present in each of the two species. Developed at a time when the abandonment of communion under both species had already begun to emerge, this work was not the cause of it, but it accompanied the liturgical movement by providing it with theological justifications. One might then speak of a reciprocal causality between the motive of *the periculum effusionis* and that of concomitance.

The term ‘concomitance’ appears to derive from the Arab philosopher Avicenna ( , note 37), and the concept seeks to link, to a given reality, that which lies outside its essence but cannot be separated from it. In sacramental theology, this doctrine is the fulfilment of the universal belief in the *totus Christus*, but explicitly articulated and formulated following the so-called ‘Berengarian’ crisis. All the great theologians address this doctrine, in particular William of Champeaux, Hugh of Saint Victor and Peter Lombard. After the latter, it was commonly taught in the Schola, and

---

<sup>34</sup> P. BROWE, *Die eucharistischen Wunder des Mittelalters*, Breslau, 1938, 139–146.

<sup>35</sup> J.A. JUNGSMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 125. See also Megivern, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

<sup>36</sup> G. DANEELS, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

<sup>37</sup> P.M. GY, in ‘Sacraments of Jesus Christ’, *op. cit.*, pp. 83, 101.

St Thomas Aquinas would take it to its ‘crowning’ (J. Megive , n. 38). The Councils of Constance (Denzinger-Sch, 1198), Florence (DS, 1320) and Trent would adopt it, the latter ‘canonising’ the term in its 13<sup>th</sup> session, in 1551: ‘...by virtue of the natural connection and concomitance by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who has now risen from the dead never to die again, are bound together’ (chap. 3, DS 1640; cf. 1729).

These statements of the Council adopt the theology of St Thomas (IIIa, q. 76, a. 1, 2, 3) on the total presence of Christ in each of his parts. St Thomas will refer to this doctrine again in q. 80, specifically to justify communion under one species: “The body may be consumed by the people without their consuming the blood, and no harm (*aliquod detrimentum*) results to them from this, because the priest offers and consumes the blood in the place of all, and because the whole Christ is present under each of the two species... ” (a. 12, sol. 3) You will have noticed that, in this reflection by the Angelic Doctor, the argument of concomitance is placed in second place. Before it, Thomas discusses the role and place of the celebrating priest who, he writes: “offers and consumes the blood in the place of all, in *persona omnium*”.

To speak in this way is not to diminish the scope and value of the doctrine of concomitance – which the Church will make her own as such. As Fr Roguet writes: “The reasoning that underpins the doctrine of concomitance has the merit of being based on a fact guaranteed to our faith by the word of God: Christ is currently alive and glorious in heaven; he will die no more; his flesh and blood can therefore no longer be separated .39” It was worth emphasising this.

However, even before invoking concomitance in his argument, the Angelic Doctor cites the argument of the celebrating priest “who takes the place of all”; “this does not depend on his personally occupying, in terms of communion, a higher rank than that of the layperson,” writes Fr Roguet again (p. 362); but it is as the celebrant of the holy sacrifice that the priest represents the entire assembly.

Fr. Roguet declares this response of St Thomas to be “far better than the response based on concomitance, because it is situated on the sacramental level, that of signification. 40”

This argument of St Thomas is wholly theological, in a dual sacramental and ecclesiological sense. Admittedly, the effects in the latter domain have been historically significant, but we must adopt this sound conclusion of Fr Bouyer, in order to avoid the caricatured dialectical opposition between priest and layperson: ‘There has never been a withdrawal of the chalice from the laity; on the contrary,

---

<sup>38</sup> J.J. MEGIVERN, *op. cit.*, pp. 214–236.

<sup>39</sup> A.M. ROGUET, *The Eucharist*, Vol. II, Commentary on the *Summa Theologica*, Desclée, 1967, p. 358.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 362. Roguet, like many modern scholars, makes a clear distinction between the question of the Real Presence and this ‘sacramental level’: the signification.

what the Protestants say, but to all other communicants that the celebrant<sup>41</sup>”, and therefore also to clerical communicants.

Fr. Roguet’s interpretation regarding the superiority of the first argument invoked by St Thomas may be accepted, since it should not entail the abandonment or even the devaluation of the doctrine of concomitance which, in the words of this same author, “is quite something other than scholastic speculation (since it is based on the practice of the Church, which is the major rule of sacramental theology).<sup>42</sup>”

For it is important not to forget that the resurrection and the hypostatic union of Christ are the realities – albeit of a different order – that underpin the doctrine of concomitance. Christ is risen. In this state, his body and blood are inseparable: such is the reality. And it is indeed this reality that “comes under the sacrament” (ibid.), by virtue of concomitance, even if it is not to be confused with the sacramental reality in itself, that is to say, that which is “defined and produced by the words, *vi verboru*” (ibid., p. 313).

The Eucharist – inseparably both sacrifice and sacrament – makes present to us the entire Paschal Mystery (passion, death and resurrection) which is the work of the Incarnate and Redeeming Word and, through communion (the *de usu* of St Thomas, IIIa q. 80), associates us with it and grants us its fruits.

The Eucharist is thus realised in its perfect truth by the fact that the celebrating priest consecrates the matter ( .<sup>43</sup>) and receives the body and blood under the two species of bread and wine, acting in all this *in persona Christi* and, inseparably, *in persona omnium* (q. 80 a. 12 ad 3), because he takes the place of the assembly, which, in a sense, is ‘personified’ in him.

Thus the faithful who receive the whole Christ by receiving Communion *sub specie panis* are deprived neither of the truth of the sacrament nor of the graces flowing from it. They suffer ‘no detriment’ (*Aliquod detrimentum*, ibid).

By virtue of this twofold reason, the transition to communion *sub specie panis* took place in a peaceful atmosphere, without causing any disturbance, as we have already noted.

However, in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the ‘Utraquist’ demand emerged from the Hussites and the Calixtines; the latter, being moderate followers of Jan Hus, made communion from the chalice the most prominent of their demands. It was the chalice that defined Hussitism, and it was Jakoubek, ‘the author of the chalice’, as has been written , p.<sup>44</sup>. It is not our intention here to recount the history of this dispute. Readers would do well to consult the articles by G. Bareille and E. Dublanchy in the D.T.C. (‘Calixtins’, ‘Communion under the

---

<sup>41</sup> L. BOUYER, *Dictionnaire théologique*, Paris, 1990, p. 83.

<sup>42</sup> A.M. ROGUET, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 1960, pp. 312–313.

<sup>43</sup> The so-called “first” perfection; cf. IV Sent. d. X, a. 2, q. 3. The act of eating contributes to this perfection, cf. IIIa q. 73 a. 2

<sup>44</sup> P. DE VOOGHT, *Jacobellus de Stribro: First Theologian of Hussitism*, Leuven, 1972, p. 123.

“two species”), as well as to the work by D. R. Holeton which deals with these questions, the latter showing in particular how the Utraquists attempted to draw upon the writings of St Cyprian, William of Laon and even St Albert the Great to support their claim. Thus Jakoubek, quoting St Albert: ‘In the sacrament, the Church does not intend (merely) to possess Christ as one might possess him by being indwelt by grace and merits, but she intends to possess Christ as food and perfect food. However, perfect food is not found the sacrament of bread alone, but in the sacrament of bread and wine , no. 45.’” But this is not binding, since communion *sub utraque* is performed at every Mass by the celebrant, thereby ensuring the truth of the sacrament.

The Council of Constance condemned them on 15 June 1415, during its 13<sup>th</sup> session, having detected that the Utraquist claim “masked some dogmatic error regarding the Real Presence e 46” and cast doubt on whether Christ was wholly present under each of the species.

It should be noted that the Council of Basel – which at that time acted without the Pope – granted the Calistines of Bohemia the ‘privilege’ of receiving communion *sub utraque*, but subject to the conditions stipulated in the 1433 Prague Agreement, known as *the Compactat* <sup>a47</sup>. This concession was revoked by order of Pius II on 13 August 1462.

The Council of Trent (1545–1563), to which we now come, did not establish communion under one species as a positive precept. This was by no means necessary, since the obligation for non-celebrants to receive communion in this manner was already long-standing. Before Constance, which stated formally: ‘*habenda est pro lege*’ (DS 1199), a local council, that of Lambeth, had been able to prohibit the faithful, as early as 1281, from receiving communion with consecrated wine, without incurring any censure or contradiction from Rome.

Trent therefore set about condemning the error of the so-called ‘reformers’ – or Protestants – which echoed the Calistines’ assertion. It should be noted, however, that the latter held to the Real Presence. One cannot make a similar assertion in the same terms regarding the Protestants, who differ amongst themselves on this truth of the faith. Let us note a further difference: the Hussite movement was strongly driven by a desire for frequent, even daily, communion, stemming from a very real devotion to Christ in the Eucharist <sup>48</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> D.R. HOLETON, *La Communion des tout-petits enfants. Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Âge*, Rome, 1989, pp. 86–89.

<sup>46</sup> G. BAREILLE, art. ‘Calixtins’, D.T.C., col. 1364.

<sup>47</sup> Dogmatic legitimacy of Communion under one species, presence of *the totus Christus* under each species.

<sup>48</sup> J. DHUR, Art. “Frequent Communion”, in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, Paris, vol. II, col. 1268–1270. D.R. HOLETON, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–58.

In the case of Protestants, can the demand for communion from the chalice be regarded as belonging to the realm of sacramental theology or Eucharistic piety, or rather as ‘ecclesiological’ in nature, forming part of the rejection of the ecclesial institution and its hierarchical organisation – in particular the distinction between clergy and laity – as well as a pattern of systematic, institutionalised opposition to the magisterium: ‘Protestantism’?

‘Protestantism’? J. Megivern notes in this regard Luther’s contradictory attitude, stating that, “If a council were to grant the chalice, he would refuse it, and vice versa. \* \* 49”

Trent, in response to these ‘protests’, set about defending the doctrine and practice of communion *sub specie panis*. And first of all by asserting that communion under both kinds cannot be described as a divine precept:

Consequently, the holy council, instructed by the Holy Spirit, who is the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and piety, and following the judgement and custom of the Church, declares and teaches that no divine precept obliges laypeople and non-celebrating clergy to receive Communion under both kinds, and that one cannot, without prejudice to the faith, doubt in any way (*nullo pacto*) that Communion under either kind is sufficient for salvation (Sess. XXI, c. 1)

To demonstrate the correctness of this definition, the Council draws upon scriptural arguments, drawn particularly from the Gospel of John, chapter 6.

There were discussions in which verse 24 was compared: ‘Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood will have eternal life’, with verses 52: ‘How can he give us his flesh to eat?’ and 58: ‘Whoever eats this bread will live forever’, to demonstrate that verse 24 (flesh and blood) contains no divine precept (for the faithful).

As for Matthew 26:27: “Drink from it, all of you”, and Luke 22:17: “And taking a cup, he gave thanks and said, ‘Take this and share it among yourselves’”, these verses express, on Christ’s part, a specific, circumstantial commandment and therefore addressed solely to the apostles. The situation is quite different in Luke 22:19: ‘Do this in remembrance of me’, which expresses the power conferred on the apostles for a mission that their successors would continue. It was the power to offer the

---

<sup>49</sup> J.J. MEGIVERN, *Concomitance and communion*, *op. cit.*, p. 248. Cf. Y. CONGAR, *True and False Reformation in the Church*, Paris, 1950, p. 548.

Eucharistic sacrifice, a power which entails the consecration of both species and communion under both species, because, as E. Dublanchy states, ‘this communion is integral to the sacrifice’<sup>50</sup>

The Council Fathers also upheld traditional arguments, drawn from the Church’s age-old practice and demonstrating that, alongside communion under both species, communion *sub una* had been practised since the early days of the Church, in certain circumstances, as we have seen above (*cf.* note 25).

Secondly, Trent defends communion under one species by invoking the Church’s disciplinary power regarding the dispensation of the sacraments<sup>51</sup>:

Furthermore, the Council declares that the Church has always possessed the power to determine (*statueret*) or to modify, in the administration of the sacraments, provided their substance is preserved (*salva illorum substantia*), whatever she judges to be more useful for the good of the faithful or for the reverence of the sacraments ... Consequently, although at the beginning of the Christian religion the use of both species was frequent, yet as the custom has been universally changed in the course of time, the Church, recognising this disciplinary power in the administration of the sacraments, and moved moreover by just and grave reasons, has approved this custom of communion under one species and has decreed that it should henceforth be followed as a law, a law which cannot be condemned or modified at will without the authority of the Church. (Sess. XXI, cap. 2, DS 1728).

We have previously examined the reasons, drawn from the history of the Church’s pastoral practice, which enabled the Council to define and promulgate the decision we have just read. The Fathers rejected the erroneous opinion of some among them who suggested that the Church might change a precept of divine law, n. <sup>52</sup>. The issue had been raised during the fourteenth session on the anointing of the sick, and the terms *statueret, salva illorum substantia* clearly show that the Church intended to set forth a principle. (This principle would be reiterated on several occasions, notably by Pius

---

<sup>50</sup> E. DUBLANCHY, *op. cit.*, col. 554. Some contemporary exegetes and liturgists declare themselves unconvinced by this argument. Their interpretation is based on – as one might expect – quite different premises. On the one hand, regarding Lk 22:17, they emphasise that this cup may not be the Eucharistic cup of the institution (see e.g. X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *Le Partage du pain eucharistique selon le Nouveau Testament*, Paris, p. 269; translation from the TOB, complete edition of the New Testament, Paris, 1972, p. 269, notes (d) (f)). Regarding John 6, the symbolic interpretation is endorsed by several scholars; thus, according to L.M. CHAUVET, this discourse: “is not a discourse on the Eucharist as such, but a catechesis on faith in Jesus as the Word of God, who passed through death for the life of the world. But this catechesis is expressed from start to finish in Eucharistic language” (*Symbole et sacrement*, Paris, 1990, p. 230. *Cf.* also X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *ibid.*, 306–307). It is also readily emphasised that the pairs bread/wine and body/blood, or these same elements taken separately, may symbolise a complete restoration or a double restoration. (*cf. Vocabulaire de théologie biblique*, Paris, 1962, pp. 165–166 and 991). Hence A.M. ROGUET: ‘Consequently, whether the Gospel speaks of eating alone, or of eating and drinking; whether it speaks of bread alone, or of bread and wine, nothing can be drawn from these texts for or against communion under both kinds.’ (*op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 361).

<sup>51</sup> The Calixtines recognised this authority, although they claimed that in this matter the Church had gone too far (*cf.* D.R. HOLETON, *op. cit.*, pp. 237–242). The Reformers, on the other hand, contested this authority.

<sup>52</sup> See A. MICHEL, in HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *History of the Councils*, *op. cit.*, vol. 10/1, pp. 250, 400–401; A.M. ROGUET, *The Eucharist*, vol. II, *op. cit.*, pp. 351–353; and SAINT THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa q. 64 a. 2 ad 1.

XII, in *Sacramentum ordinis*, regarding the matter and form of the sacrament of Holy Orders, and in *Mediator Dei*).

Finally, Trent will address the theological reason for the presence of Christ *totus et integrus* under a single species, and the real production of grace by the sacrament of the Eucharist during communion under a single species:

The Council further declares that, although our Redeemer, as has already been said, instituted this sacrament at the Last Supper under both species and thus distributed it to his apostles, it must nevertheless be recognised that, even under a single species, one receives both the whole and complete Christ and the reality of the sacrament, and that, consequently, as regards the fruit of this sacrament, those who receive only one species are deprived of no grace necessary for salvation (chap. 3, DS 1729).

‘Grace necessary for salvation’: on reading this expression of the Council, we understand that the latter pronounces only on sacramental causality as such, affirmed by the words *verum sacramentum*, and not on its integrity. The question remains open to theological reflection, the Fathers not having wished to settle the debate <sup>t53</sup>.

It seems that the theological opinions in this field can be grouped under two headings: 1) a single sacramental causality; 2) a double sacramental causality.

1) According to this first opinion, the sacramental species signify the unity of spiritual refreshment. In the spiritual order, food and drink have no distinct significance. Since sacramental causality is proportionate not to the mode of signification but to what it signifies, it remains the same when a single species is present (one may draw an analogy with, in the sacrament of baptism, immersion or simple infusion). It should indeed be recalled that the Eucharistic species are sacramental causes *virtute corporis et sanguinis*. Now this principle of sanctification exists even under a single species: *vi concomitantiae and not vi consecrationis*. The reason for the distinction of the species is, in fact, not sacramental causality, but rather the truth of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

St Thomas had adopted this position (according to the majority of commentators) in IIIa q. 80 a. 12 ad 3, as did St Bonaventure, although the latter draws a distinction between the perfection of efficacy and that of signification.

2) According to the second opinion, there is a double sacramental causality, which would correspond to the double spiritual refreshment signified by the species. One grace would exert upon the soul an action similar, in the spiritual order, to bodily food, and the other similar to drink

---

<sup>53</sup> Cf. A. MICHEL, in HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles, op. cit.*, vol. 10, pp. 403, 408, 418. N.B. The council, for various reasons, avoided the term ‘causality’, using the terms *continere* and *conferre* in its declarations (cf. DS 1606).

Distinct yet very similar graces, beneficial to the communicant, but the deprivation of one of which would be easily compensated for by the very similar graces often received in communion under the other species. No significant spiritual detriment would therefore result.

All this rests on the hypothesis of a dual mode of spiritual refreshment, which is by no means proven. One might, on the contrary, appeal to “the specific unity of the sacrament of the Eucharist, supposing the unity of the soul’s refreshment despite the distinction of the species .54”

Some Fathers had maintained that by receiving Communion under both species, grace was better received, as a result of better dispositions, *ex opere operantis*. But this subjective aspect, though certainly not negligible, is outweighed by the more general reason of *the periculum effusionis* (which is common to the whole assembly), as well as by the argument of the discipline of the Latin Church (of an even broader order, which takes into account the various reasons that the catechism issued by the council summarises quite well, according to A. Miche . 155), whatever, moreover, the concern for unity that was so present at the Council at the time. It should also be noted that the doctrinal question was steeped in an atmosphere steeped in politics. This is also why the possible concession of the chalice was at the heart of the debates, in order to safeguard, if possible, unity. Thus, St Charles Borromeo and other cardinals, the bishops of Hungary, etc., were in favour of the concession (generally restricted to Bohemia), as Pallavici reports in detail , p. 56. Later, Bossuet himself would consider the possibility of restoring communion under both kinds, to ‘facilitate the return of England and Germany’. He believed that in this way, ‘we would see the complete ruin of heresy .57’

The Fathers opposed to the concession invoked the principle of prudence, which requires that no exceptions be made to universal law during periods of doctrinal heresy (J. B. Castano), lest the heresy spread through a *practice* that might appear to justify it <sup>r</sup> 58; and because doing so would have placed them in a position where they might be compelled to grant even more concessions. As the Fathers could not reach agreement, the matter was referred to Pope Pius IV, who appeared more favourable to the concession; he granted it to certain metropolitans of the Empire in 1564. But the chalice, having become the symbol of the Reformation, was rejected by the Catholics themselves , s. 59. The concessions were therefore ultimately revoked.

---

<sup>54</sup> E. DUBLANCHY, *op. cit.*, col. 572. It should be noted that since St Thomas and after Trent, the first opinion has been the most common, despite, for example, the view of the Salmantines (*Cursus theol.*, vol. 18, *De Eucharist.*, disp. XI, d. 6, 2); as evidenced by the discussions of the Fathers at Trent (cf. A. MICHEL, in HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles*, *op. cit.*, vol. 10/1, pp. 402–403, 409, 418); and A.M. ROGUET, *L’Eucharistie*, *op. cit.*, p. 359. Among many others, Bossuet holds to the first view, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

<sup>55</sup> A. MICHEL, *ibid.*, pp. 416–417.

<sup>56</sup> S. PALLAVICINI, *History of the Council of Trent*, Paris, 1863, vol. 2, pp. 1254–1258

<sup>57</sup> BOSSUET, *Letter to Mabillon*, 12 August 1685.

<sup>58</sup> S. PALLAVICINI, *op. cit.*, p. 1260; A. MICHEL, *op. cit.*, p. 401.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. G. DANNEELS, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

Moving into the modern era, we see the practice of communion under both kinds resurface, in a completely different climate, and at the highest level, since the <sup>Second</sup> Vatican Council itself addresses it in the constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, in no. 25: “Communion under both kinds, while maintaining the dogmatic principles established by the Council of Trent, may be granted, at the discretion of *the* bishops, in cases to be defined by the Apostolic See” (“*concedi potest, in casibus ab ap. sedis definiendis, de iudicio episcoporum*”).

The *Missale Romanum*, promulgated by the Apostolic Constitution of the same name dated 3 April 1969, expresses a similar view in no. 241 of *the Institutio generalis*, instructing pastors to recall as clearly as possible the Catholic doctrine of Communion as set forth at Trent, and in particular regarding the presence of the whole Christ under each species, the sacrament thus being received in its truth, with no grace necessary for salvation being lacking to those who receive communion *sub una specie*.

The instruction *Eucharisticum Mysterium*, issued by the Sacred Congregation for Rites on 25 May 1967, expresses itself in the same terms regarding the necessity of upholding the principles established by Trent (no. 32).

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states (French edition):

Thanks to the sacramental presence of Christ under each of the species, communion under the single species of bread allows one to receive the full fruit of the grace<sup>e 60</sup> of the Eucharist. For pastoral reasons, this manner of receiving communion has legitimately become established as the most common in the Latin rite. ‘Holy Communion fulfils its sign-nature more fully when it is received under both species. For in this form, the sign of the Eucharistic banquet is brought more fully to light.’ (IGMR 240) This is the customary form of receiving Communion in the Eastern rites. ux.<sup>61</sup>

The CIC, in canon 925, prescribes the following: “Holy Communion is to be given under the single species of bread or, in accordance with liturgical laws, under both species; but in cases of necessity, it may be given under the single species of wine.” In this canon, communion *sub una specie* is therefore mentioned twice, *sub specie panis* and *sub specie vini*.

None of these references—even when one takes into account the varying degrees of authority they possess—can be treated lightly. All these texts, and each one of them, explicitly or implicitly, refer to the teachings and canons of Trent. It could hardly be otherwise, but this makes it all the more important to emphasise.

---

<sup>60</sup> The C.E.C. appears to confirm the most common theological view; it goes even further than the Tridentine position.

<sup>61</sup> As regards the law of the Eastern Churches, *the Instruction on the Application of the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canon Law of the Eastern Churches*, dated 6 January 1996, requires that Communion be distributed *sub utraque*, and that the practice of receiving Communion under the species of bread alone be abandoned, if it corresponds to a ‘Latinisation’ of the rites (no. 59).

From a pastoral point of view, too, the principles of Trent must therefore be upheld, recalled and precisely taught to the faithful. This implies that such truths should not be merely mentioned, as if in passing and only once. Genuine catechesis and faithful preaching must necessarily give them their due place. This is a requirement and a prescription<sup>62</sup>; it is not a matter of personal opinion.

We see, therefore, that when Communion ‘under both kinds’ is practised in obedience to the Church (the doctrinal correctness of pastoral teaching), it can become an opportunity to highlight the serious and grave reasons why Communion ‘under one kind’ has legitimately become the ‘usual’ mode’ (C.E.C.) of communion in the Latin-rite Church, without its own values being obscured in the process. Thus, communion under both species cannot legitimately imply a devaluation of communion *sub sola specie panis*.

It is therefore in a spirit that excludes any desire to break with the centuries-old practice of communion *sub specie panis* that the Second Vatican Council, and the other prescriptions of the Magisterium, sought to re-establish – in certain circumstances – the possibility of receiving communion under both species. We cite as further evidence the Roman decree of 7 March 1965, which authorised “the concelebration of Mass and Communion under both species” within the so-called Tridentine Rite itself. It was therefore not without purpose to emphasise this aspect, as we see the reappearance of a custom that had fallen into disuse in the Latin Church since the 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries, until it was finally prohibited.

From a pastoral point of view, too, is it not legitimate to be surprised that, despite the conciliar and subsequent Roman provisions prescribing instruction necessary for the proper understanding and correct application of Communion under both kinds, there are relatively few examples of this in preaching, and that several major catechetical references give it little or no space?

For example, *the Catechism for Adults* by the Bishops of France (1991) does not explicitly mention it in relation to the rite, even when it quotes John 6:51–55 or 1 Corinthians 11:27–29 (§ 410–411, 421–423). The same applies to *The Book of Faith* by the Bishops of Belgium (Tournai, 1987), which quotes 1 Cor 11:27 without further clarification. However, *\*The Faith of the Church\**, a catechism for adults published by the German Bishops’ Conference, devotes a paragraph to it, declaring it “permitted on certain occasions”, and briefly recalling the principles of Trent as well as the positive aspects of the chalice,

---

<sup>62</sup> Cf. *Eucharisticum Mysterium*, Instruction of the Sacred Congregation for Rites and the Council, 25 March 1967, no. 32; I.G.M.R. (1969), no. 241

; *Liturgicae instaurationes*, of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, no. 6; *Inestimabile Donum*, Instruction of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, 17 April 1980, no. 12, etc. E.g. *Enchiridion liturgico*, Rome, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1994, nos. 459, 517, 658, 977.

as set out in IGMR no. 240 .<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, *\*Le Nouveau Livre de la foi – La foi commune des Chrétiens\** (The New Book of Faith – The Common Faith of Christians), despite its ecumenical perspective, does not mention it as a possible element of rapprochement; [on the contrary, it seeks to reject the ‘reification’ which, according to the authors, the notions of substance and accident would bring about .<sup>64</sup> ...]. *La Foi des catholiques* (Paris, 1984), by B. Chenu and F. Coudreau, does not mention communion under both kinds (on the pages listed in the analytical table under the heading: ‘communion’).

Without claiming to be exhaustive, it seems to us that the catechism of the German bishops and the CCC appear almost as exceptions on a subject to which, by contrast, the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* devoted a lengthy passage.

Since the reason for this discretion – or absence – cannot be a lack of interest, and even less a reservation on the part of the authors of these documents regarding communion under both kinds, what then is it .<sup>65</sup>?

It is even more surprising that the *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Liturgy* (1992), in the entry ‘Eucharist’, has not a word to say on this subject <sup>66</sup>, whereas *L’Église en prière* (vol. II), an older collective work edited by A.G. Martimort, devotes several pages to it <sup>67</sup>.

Let us now turn to the question of rites. According to which ritual should Communion under both kinds, as it has been restored, be celebrated?

1) For Communion from the chalice, the rite is described in detail in no. 244 of the 1969 I.G.M.R. <sup>68</sup> Notwithstanding these clarifications, we do not see how the *periculum effusionis* would have been abolished, or even truly avoi é <sup>69</sup>. The detail of the rubrics which also occupy no. 245 shows in

---

<sup>63</sup> *La Foi de l’Église*, Paris, 1987, p. 347.

<sup>64</sup> *The New Book of Faith – The Common Faith of Christians*, Paris, 1976, pp. 552.

<sup>65</sup> On the other hand, everyone knows that the same cannot be said of theologians, who have frequently addressed this subject. But let us note that their research and works do not (always or directly) constitute the works from which the faithful can and must draw the teaching they are entitled to expect and receive from their pastors. Some have written popular works, in a personal capacity, in which the question is addressed from the perspective of the superiority of the rite of this communion under both kinds, but without any reference to traditional doctrine. Thus P. LE CABELLEC, *Pour mieux vivre l’Eucharistie*, Dossiers ‘Actualités de notre temps’, Coutances, 1980, speaks of it as the “normal” mode, and criticises a “theology of reflection for taking precedence over the actual gesture”, p. 44.

<sup>66</sup> Whereas “the perspective that guided the choice of articles [...] is what has been known in France for half a century as liturgical pastoral care”. (H. DELHOUGNE, Brepols, Vol. I, 1992, Introduction, p. V). Perhaps to be found in Volume II, which has not yet been published, but under which letter, given that ‘C’ and ‘E’ belong to Volume I?

<sup>67</sup> Italian encyclopaedias seem, it appears, to be more willing to highlight this Eucharistic rite. Thus *the Enciclopedia di pastorale*, Vol. 3, Liturgia, ed. E. COSTA, Casale Monferrato, 1988, 229–230; M. AUGÉ, in *La Liturgia, Eucaristia*, vol. 3/2 of the Anàmnèsis series, *op. cit.*, pp. 279–280.

<sup>68</sup> This is an almost verbatim reproduction of the 1965 decree restoring communion under both species, in the so-called ‘Tridentine’ rite. We shall refer to the I.G.M.R.

<sup>69</sup> Even though the prohibition on passing the chalice from hand to hand among communicants is a strict requirement. E.g. *Liturgicæ instaurationes*, no. 6.

Moreover, in the case of a large congregation, this method of communion can only significantly lengthen the duration of the service.

2) The rite with the chalice: in this method, the *periculum effusionis* is mentioned in the rubric itself (249b): “*attendens ne quid defluat*” (“taking care that nothing spills”); the risk is therefore possible, if not probable. Furthermore, if one follows the instructions in rubric 249b, the rite becomes complex, even though Fr. Roguet writes, rather amusingly, that “this way of drinking is also modern”, thus probably alluding to our contemporary “straws” !<sup>70</sup>...

3) The rite with the spoon: it seems simpler in terms of the movements required, but the rubric “*attendens ne eorum labia aut linguam cochleari tangat*” (“taking care that the lips or tongues do not touch the spoon”) complicates the practice and seems hardly realistic. Moreover, the *periculum effusionis* (no. 251) remains here too, and perhaps even because of the precautions.

4) The rite of *sub utraque* by intinction: the celebrant must hold the chalice and the sacred vessel containing the hosts in one and the same hand, which implies a small vessel, and therefore a small congregation. Otherwise, as the rubric stipulates, a small additional table covered with a tablecloth and a corporal must be brought in to place the chalice upon. These requirements, though entirely justified, do not simplify the conduct of the services, and this aspect must be mentioned, both practically and pastorally.

But we shall return to the question of intinction at greater length.

We note, not without some surprise, that the risk of ‘effusion’ is now ‘accepted’, whilst, at the same time, the formal obligation to show signs of veneration towards the Real Presence is clearly mentioned (no. 244 et seq.): ‘*Singuli communicantes accedunt, debitam reverentiam faciunt...*’ (‘one by one the communicants approach, they make the required sign of reverence’). Merely approaching to receive Communion does not in itself constitute the sign of reverence due. Moreover, it is evident that liturgical preparation is necessary for the practice of these various rather complex rites and that, failing to have undergone such preparation through appropriate rehearsals, the communicants will experience hesitations that will do little to enhance the dignity of the service<sup>-71</sup>. This fact, the mention of which might seem somewhat trite, is nevertheless a fairly common observation in similar situations. It is therefore by no means unrelated to concrete pastoral care, and not merely theoretical.

---

<sup>70</sup> A.M. ROGUET, ‘Communion from the Chalice’, in *\*La Vie spirituelle\**, 517, 1965, p. 732. The same author suggested the use of ‘worthless straws that had been gathered and burnt’; (*ibid*).

<sup>71</sup> And thus also to the spiritual benefit, both individual and collective, of this symbolism. Cf. G. DANEELS, *op. cit.*, p. 136, highlighting this need: “The administration of a sacrament [...] must also create this tangible atmosphere of faith”. The Roman document *Liturgicæ instaurationes* emphasises this in its no. 6 (f).

It seems necessary to us now to return to Communion under both kinds, known as “by intinction”. The outright restoration of this rite on the same footing as the other three raises legitimate questions, since this manner of receiving Communion was the subject of various disapprovals and even several condemnations, particularly between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries .<sup>72</sup>

This practice of intinction is first documented only at the Council of Braga in 675, which, in its second canon, condemns its use <sup>ge73</sup>. The reasons given are that the Gospel of the Institution affirms the separation of the two species, but also that the dipped bread was given only to Judas, the authority of the latter argument obviously having a more limited scope. The custom reappeared around the 11<sup>th</sup> century, if we are to believe the *\*Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus\**<sup>74</sup>, which describes it as a novelty worthy of condemnation. In 1095, the Council of Clermont, presided over by Pope Urban II, condemned this practice in its 28<sup>th</sup> canon <sup>75</sup>.

In 1175, the so-called Council of London, or of Westminster, also prohibited intinction <sup>on76</sup>. But what is even more interesting is the intervention of Pope Innocent III, in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, in his *\*De sacro Altaris mysterio\**. The Pope declares that this norm is fixed and established by the Church: ‘*Eucharistia non detur intincta*’ (‘the Eucharist is not to be given by intinction’). And, in also prohibiting intinction, the pontiff gives as his reason the necessary eradication of heresy – *pro hæresi extirpanda* – which denies the presence of the whole Christ under each of the species <sup>s77</sup>. This has a quite different significance.

“To take bread mixed with a few drops of wine is not truly to take a drink, which is what communion *sub specie vini* would require .<sup>78</sup>” Paradoxically,

---

<sup>72</sup> Admittedly, it may be noted that, in other areas, certain practices, once condemned for circumstantial reasons, were subsequently recommended, but this was precisely because the circumstances that made them perilous had completely disappeared. Is this the case today with regard to the veneration of the Eucharist?

<sup>73</sup> MANSI, vol. IX, col. 155.

<sup>74</sup> Chap. XIX, P.L. 151, 989 ff.

<sup>75</sup> The Council of Clermont states: ‘*Let no one receive [Communion] [...] unless they take the Body and Blood separately*’. The council nevertheless specified that this rite could be practised in cases of necessity, but not without some *cautela* (caution and precaution). This necessity is summed up by what Pope Paschal II would later state: “*Praeter in parvulis ac omnino infirmis qui panem absorbere non possunt*” (*Letter to Pons, Abbot of Cluny, Epist. DXXV, P.L. 163, 442*). Clermont does, however, mention that intinction could serve as a precaution – *cautela* – against the *periculum effusionis* in the event that a whole congregation were to receive Communion from the Precious Blood. This clarification by the council did not, however, prevent it from condemning this practice – despite the noted and acknowledged precaution. Pascal II, in his letter to Pons, reproached this abbot for the fact that such a practice had persisted at Cluny. It is interesting to note that Guillaume de Champeaux (+1121), who supported this practice, nevertheless stated in this regard that asserting the necessity of receiving Communion *sub utraque* constitutes a ‘heresy’ (*De Sacramento altaris, P.L. 163, 1039*).

<sup>76</sup> Canon 16; cf. HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *History of the Councils, op. cit.*, vol. 7, p. 480.

<sup>77</sup> *De sacro Altaris mysterio*, Book VI, Chapter 13; P.L. 217, 866. Innocent III, at first, adopts the argument drawn from Judas’s communion, and writes: “*Unde constitutum est ab Ecclesia ut eucharistia non detur intincta*”. But further on, the pontiff argues much more forcefully: “*Constitutum est nihilominus et pro hæresi extirpanda quæ dogmatizavit Christum sub neutra specie totum existere sed sub utraque simul existere totum*.” Cf. J.J. MEGIVERN, *Concomitance and communion, op. cit.*, p. 242.

<sup>78</sup> E. DUBLANCHY, *op. cit.*, col. 562.

Intinction thus demonstrates that communion with the Precious Blood is neither a necessity nor an obligation or a ‘rule’.

Nevertheless, we do not refuse to acknowledge the theological and pastoral values which, by virtue of the sign, *ratione signi*, (I.G.M.R. no. 240 and most of the documents that followed it), are attached to communion *sub utraque*.

Let us recall that we have already referred, in this exposition, to the teachings of several Church Fathers, particularly regarding the rich symbolism of the chalice.

We should also mention the dimension of the covenant sealed in the blood of the Lamb, which is certainly highlighted by communion under the species of wine (cf. Heb 9:15–22). Moreover, regarding ‘the sign of the Eucharistic banquet’ and ‘the relationship between the Eucharistic banquet and the eschatological banquet of the Kingdom’ (ibid., no. 240), how can one deny that communion *sub utraque* – and especially *per modum potus* – certainly brings them to light .<sup>79</sup>, even if it must be emphasised that all this falls within the realm of meaning: “*quo signum eucharistici convivii plenius elucet*”, repeats the I.G.M.R. in the conclusion to no. 241? (Note also that *the Instructio* takes up the terms of the 1965 decree).

These texts thus highlight a theological, spiritual and pastoral dimension that is not without interest. However, they do not claim to express the full doctrinal content of the Eucharist. Adopting an approach that favours a symbolic conception of sacramental theology, they are more inclined to emphasise the sacrament-sign than, for example, to consider the sacrament-cause of grace<sup>e</sup> 80.

The constraints of a simple exposition obviously compel us here to outline these remarks in broad strokes, and thus to adopt a simplification that does not claim to provide a scientifically exhaustive account of the matter. Let us add, nevertheless, that the communal dimension of the Eucharist – *koinônia* –, whose expressions we highlighted in the Fathers, has become, for a whole school of thought

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 10:16–22 and 11:20; Ps 23:5; 104:15; Prov 9:2; Matt 26:27–29; Luke 22:17–18. See in particular M. AUGE, *La Liturgia-Eucaristia*, *op. cit.*, p. 280; Joseph DE SAINTE-MARIE, *L'Eucharistie, salut du monde*, Paris, 1981, pp. 301, 303; J. DUPONT, ‘This is my Body, This is my Blood’, in *Nouv. Revue théolog.*, 80, 1958, pp. 1040–1041; P. BENOIT, ‘The Institution Narratives and Their Significance’, in *Lumière et Vie*, 31, 1957, p. 62.

<sup>80</sup> For acting by way of a sign does not exhaust sacramental action; and whilst the sacrament IS a sign (*Summa Theologica* IIIa, q. 62, a. 1), the sacrament adds a specifically instrumental aspect, as a sign elevated by divine power (‘*Vis spiritualis est in sacramentis, in quantum ordinantur a Deo ad effectum spiritualem*’ a. 4, ad 1). Admittedly, this presupposes a sacramental theology grounded in a metaphysics of being. An outdated system, some might say; and Fr. Gy pointed out “the largely ‘unavailable’ (cf. Ricoeur) nature of ontology and, more particularly, of causality in our current philosophical context” (P.M. GY, in *Problèmes de théologie sacramentaire*, Recherches Actuelles series, II, Paris, 1972, p. 179). Thus a certain strand of research, rooted for example in the work of L.M. Chauvet in a Hegelian-style ‘transcendence’, would reject onto-theology, or rather, ‘transcending’ it, might assert: ‘In fact, the (sacramental) communication of grace is to be understood, not according to the ‘metaphysical’ scheme of cause and effect, but according to the symbolic scheme of the communication of the word’ (L.M. CHAUVET, *Symbole et sacrement*, *op. cit.*, p. 147). Or also: “This presupposes that we temporarily set aside the categories of causality in favour of those of symbolism.” X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

theological perspective, which is not absent from certain documents of the Magisterium, the central aspect of this sacrament:

All other aspects, says the liturgist A. Ganoczy, [...] even that of the Real Presence and the sacrifice, are absorbed and interpreted from this central point. [...] Real presence and sacrifice are, so to speak, placed at the service of the encounter between God and humankind, and among humankind themselves (so that neither can any longer be taken as an end in itself).<sup>81</sup>

It goes without saying that, for this theological current, the sign of the convivial banquet – *signum convivii* –, emphasised by communion *sub utraque*, once again considered from the perspective of meaning, makes this practice a privileged one, to say the least.<sup>82</sup>

Should we conclude, then, that the circumstances which, outside any formal legislation, gradually led to the gradual phasing out and then abandonment of communion *sub utraque* for non-celebrants have completely disappeared? Have the reasons underlying this development, and justifying the subsequent measures of prohibition, vanished, like mere abstractions?

Would we finally emerge – with Communion under both kinds restored – from a long eclipse, or at least from a theological, liturgical and pastoral twilight? Will the Eucharist regain, in the life of the Church, the pre-eminent place that is rightfully hers, as the object of a more enlightened faith, in a truth and authenticity better understood?

Will respect for and veneration of the Real Presence be strengthened in the depths of our hearts and in liturgical expression? What, then, would be the significance of these alarming surveys regarding the faithful's adherence to the dogma of the Real Presence<sup>e83</sup>? What would we make of certain statements that we would prefer not to hear<sup>ns84</sup>?

Would Communion under both kinds finally constitute, after a centuries-long 'regime of exception', a return to the original 'norm'?

---

<sup>81</sup> A. GANOCZY, *La Doctrine catholique des sacrements*, Paris, 1988, p. 97.

<sup>82</sup> This is why SAINT THOMAS's reflections in IIIa q. 80 a. 12 on the role of the celebrating priest, insofar as he acts *in persona Christi* and *in persona omnium*, remain highly relevant today. And the "alternative" or opposition between these two functions is regarded by contemporary theologians as misleading. See X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *op. cit.*, p. 333, note 9, with the authors cited.

<sup>83</sup> SOFRES poll for France-Inter (as early as 1986): "less than half of practising Catholics believe in the Real Presence".

<sup>84</sup> "His (Christ's) sacramental presence in the bread and wine is [...] to be understood as the crystallisation of his presence in the assembly. [...] The Eucharistic presence is to be understood as the crystallisation of Christ's presence through the Spirit, in the Spirit, in humanity and the universe." L.M. Chauvet, *Thèmes de réflexion sur l'Eucharistie*, (preparatory document for the International Eucharistic Congress, 16–23 July 1981), Paris, 1981, p. 20.

This litany of questions is not intended to be ironic. It reflects and expresses positions that are by no means secret. Consider what *the Encyclopaedia of Pastoral Care*, published in Italian in 1988, states:

Communion with bread alone renders the catechesis of the Eucharistic sign futile... Without the chalice, any discourse on the Eucharistic symbolism of the Last Supper proves to be a pious lie... [Through communion under both kinds] the Church rediscovers the necessity of fidelity to the Lord's word [...] to overcome ritual inadequacy and half-hearted symbolism. Communion that also includes the chalice is the rule; that which is limited to bread alone or wine alone is the exception due to particular circumstances (this is not a utopia or a discourse completely divorced from reality, but a given fact, part of sacramental realism, to be accepted without mental reservation). The expressions

“Communion under both kinds” or “under one kind”, derived from reductive scholastic concepts whose vocabulary has now become incomprehensible, these expressions should be set aside, in favour of simply using the term “Communion”, and nothing more. The psychological journey required to translate liturgical reform into action is still immense .<sup>85</sup>

Once again, these are not merely theses circulating under the table, and we would not have cited them if they did not reflect a theological-liturgical current and a pastoral *practice* widespread enough to be significant.

They are, moreover, presented within the framework of an encyclopaedia, and their author is but one among many others within the work itself. Let us note in passing the polemical tone, which borders on the offensive. For example: ‘The Church is rediscovering the necessity of fidelity to the word of the Lord’! What would one say if the defenders of communion under one species were to express themselves in this way? There is, in this sentence, material for a theological debate that has no place here. But let us not dwell on this aspect, though it is quite revealing of a mindset that was not alien to the reformers of the sixteenth century. Let us move on to the most important point.

First of all – and we shall note this only in passing – to point out that the theology of the sign and of symbolism (whose potential for enlightenment we shall not deny) is here given priority – not to say exaggerated – to the point of near-exclusivity. “Communion that includes the chalice is the rule.” This is what must hold our attention, as indeed *the Encyclopaedia* demands, which enjoins us to suppress any ‘mental restriction’ on this point, with fine aplomb and an intellectual dirigisme that brooks no reply. Beware of ‘groupthink’! How can this assertion be reconciled with scriptural sources (think of Jn 6) where it is impossible to

---

<sup>85</sup> *Enciclopedia di pastorale*, Vol. 3, ‘Liturgia’, ed. E. COSTA, *op. cit.*, pp. 229–230.

find a divine prescription for communion *sub utraque*, as recognised, among many others, by Fr. Roguet (cf. note 49)? How can it be reconciled with the theological-pastoral “rule” so clearly and forcefully reiterated by *the Institutio generalis of the Novus Ordo* itself? How can one fail to detect in this the spearhead, or at least the seed, of a new incarnation of the dispute stirred up by the “utraquists”, who bear such a large share of the responsibility for the formal prohibition of the chalice for non-celebrants , p. <sup>86</sup>?

How can one describe as an “exception” a liturgical practice of the Church, strongly justified in doctrine and practised for eight centuries? Is this truly the result of theological reasoning? Might it not rather be a case of confusing one’s own conviction with the truth? And this to the point of imposing it by virtue of a claim to infallibility: ‘to be accepted without mental reservation’ (sic). We are not extrapolating, since *the Encyclopaedia* does indeed call into question – in the event of opposition to its thesis – ‘sacramental realism’ (sic) itself.

Does this not imply that, in the Church’s theology and pastoral care, ‘sacramental realism’ had faded away? Indeed, as we have seen in detail, communion under one species was practised (in circumstances that could not be described as exceptional but rather as particular) from the earliest days of the Church. This is indeed the question raised—if it is not already contained therein—by these words: one should “simply use the term communion, and nothing more”, since the only true, “real” communion would be communion under both species...

Does the other form of communion therefore not deserve this name? Who would not perceive in this an exaggeration and an excess which the Church – after a period of patient examination of its doctrinal, liturgical and spiritual consequences – can only condemn (cf. note 85)?

Who, then, are the opponents of communion under both kinds?

They are not to be found among the priests and faithful who, by virtue of “just aspirations” (*motu proprio – Ecclesia Dei*), make use of the so-called “1962” liturgical books, for they are not opposed “on principle” to Communion under both kinds, provided that its use is justified by the gravity of particular circumstances, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the conciliar document re-establishing the possibility of this practice (Constitution *De sacra Liturgia*, and CIC canon 925). All embrace the truth that the Church “in the dispensation of the sacraments and apart from their substance has always possessed the power to decree or modify whatever she judges most useful for the good of the faithful and for the reverence of the sacraments.” (Trent).

The ordinary practice of receiving Communion under the single species of bread, rightly preserved by the traditional rite (sometimes called the Tridentine), is based – as we have seen – on doctrinal grounds so

---

<sup>86</sup> Cf. J.J. MEGIVERN, *Concomitance and communion*, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

closely linked to the faith that they must be necessarily recalled to those receiving Communion under both species.

Thus this practice is called upon to play a role as a theological and pastoral safeguard. Indeed, the conditions set out for the proper practice of communion *sub utraque* reveal that the Church refuses to allow the latter to risk becoming a ‘banner’ for any theological – ecclesiological and/or pastoral – ideology whatsoever.

When this is the case, Communion under both kinds must therefore necessarily be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Holy See and the judgement of the bishops, and this for ‘the good of the faithful and the respect’ due to this sacrament in which GOD gives Himself in the person of Jesus Christ, sacrificed and risen ‘*propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem* ’ (“for us men, and for our salvation”).