

The Cross, the Mass, the Last Supper ... and ‘The Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist’

Fr Jacques de Lillers, M.b.¹

*Our Saviour, at the Last Supper, on the night he
was betrayed, instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice
of his Body and Blood to perpetuate the sacrifice
of the Cross throughout the ages, until*

He comes...

Sacrosanctum Concilium

Introduction: A problem in sacramental theology

§1 – A question of title

We must seek to highlight the links that the Saviour himself established between our Masses, Calvary and the Last Supper, links which imply obvious differences that we must seek to account for. As the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is at the centre of our concerns—since the theme of this congress is ‘The Presence of Christ in the Liturgy’—we should have mentioned the Mass first, then the Last Supper, then the Cross; we could also have followed the chronological order: the Last Supper, the Cross, the Mass. There is, however, a reason for the choice we have made: it is from the Cross—that is to say, from the Passion of the Saviour—that our Masses derive their entire value; moreover, the relationship between our Masses and the drama of Calvary presents particular theological difficulties which shape the whole of our exposition: the specific role of the Last Supper and its connection with our Masses can be deduced more easily afterwards. As it stands, therefore, our title sets out the order of our concerns: the Holy Mass between the Cross and the Last Supper, first examined in relation to the former, then in relation to the latter.

It is impossible to speak of the Mass in relation to the Cross and the Last Supper without reference to the divine Saviour, the Author of our redemption, and to his presence at each of our Masses. This means that our discussion cannot but intersect with that of Dom Basile. We shall, however, do our best to avoid parallel developments: hence the limitations of this work, which needs to be supplemented by the very rich material from his lecture on ‘Christ, the Chief Priest of the Eucharistic Sacrifice’. The fact remains that the Church’s doctrine on the Eucharist does not

¹ Lecture delivered at the 6th CIEL symposium, in Versailles, on Thursday 9 November 2000.

but to contemplate a mystery that has its origin in the very Mystery of God. Consequently, differing points of view serve rather to foster a better understanding of that which is the object of the angels' admiration in Heaven; just as contrasting approaches to the same mystery enable us to distinguish more clearly between what belongs to the realm of the Church's unassailable doctrinal truths and what remains a matter for free discussion amongst theologians. We shall therefore seek here to offer a perspective that complements that of Dom Basile.

The second part of the title refers to the famous work by Dom Vonier, whose principal merit, in my view, is to have rightly emphasised the importance of the concept of the sacrament for a proper understanding of all aspects of Eucharistic doctrine. Our main aim in this reflection will therefore be to bring this point into full relief in order to provide a truly satisfactory answer to the questions we are asking ourselves. This is, however, a limited perspective, as is inevitably the case with a paper or lecture, which would need to be supplemented by considerations pertaining more specifically to dogmatic theology. The author of these lines would also ask for your understanding for being unable, within the confines of this brief presentation, to provide many of the details that would require a full course on sacramental theology. The subject of our reflection and the necessary limits to be set upon it have thus been established; it is now time to begin.

§2 – Variations in the theology of the Eucharistic sacrifice and their consequences

The subject we are addressing is closely linked to one of the most thorny and hotly debated questions in theology, a veritable 'crux theologorum',² namely that of the 'metaphysical essence' or the 'formal constituent' of the sacrifice of the Mass. Better still: 'crux seminariorum', we might say, for our seminarians have had to grapple in their textbooks with a multitude of divergent solutions, between which the learned authors themselves wavered. To confine ourselves to the French-speaking world—the only one I know sufficiently well—Hervé's excellent textbook (from 1927) provides a good summary of the various solutions then under discussion, with a preference for that of Cardinal Billot³; in his 1938 lecture notes from the Séminaire Français, Father Larnicol, for his part, favours that of Father de La Taille—which was very much in vogue at the time—amending it with the clarifications provided by Filograssi; the inquisitive reader will compare the various editions of Mr Tanqueray's famous textbook to see how it evolved alongside the debate.

² 'theologians' cross'

³ At least the best-known ones: the full account takes up 172 columns of the DTC!

All these variations did not make the training of future priests any easier. One might argue that the discrepancies between the manuals (or their editions) were offset by the teaching of the professors; indeed, in France between the two world wars, we saw generations of seminarians ‘Billot’ followed by ‘La Taille’ generations⁴. The problem is that these two theologians hold rather divergent views (leaving aside questions of faith) on the subject at hand. Consequently, the divisions between generations of priests could not fail to have an impact on their practical assessment of the proposed solutions; all the more so as the return to St Thomas, which our two masters had helped to pave the way for, continued without them; and, following Dom Vonier, the far more appealing notion of *the sign* and the representative sacrifice was beginning to gain ground; at the same time, the theology of the mysteries, originating in Germany, was helping, through its own appeal, to further diminish the following of the classical approach—established since Trent—to viewing the Eucharistic sacrifice⁵. Not everything in these new ideas was to be rejected—far from it—but the imperfect nature of these attempts, combined with the subjectivism of the fashionable philosophical systems, which permeated even the ways of thinking of the time (and that era, alas, is not yet over), in other words, one turns away, as a matter of principle, from considering things-as-they-are *in themselves*, wishing instead to consider only things-as-they-are *for Me*,⁶ could only have been conducive to the emergence and subsequent appeal of the notion of *transsignification*, with its consequences for the subject at hand: for it brings us back, to a greater or lesser extent, to Calvin’s perspectives ... and we know that, amongst the Reformed, the equivalent of our Holy Sacrifice is called the Lord’s Supper⁷. These conceptions, alas, do not belong to the realm of history: the idea of ‘base communities’, coupled with the dwindling number of priests, continues to gain ground, and it is not uncommon in France to find that practically on the

⁴ Father de La Taille’s influence did not end with the last war. Speaking with a priest trained in the immediate post-war period, I was surprised to hear him argue that the Mass was not a sacrifice, but ‘an oblation’: a misinterpretation of La Taille, but La Taille nonetheless. Thus, this good clergyman spent his whole life teaching his parishioners that Mass was not a sacrifice. Which just goes to show that theological treatises are not neutral... especially if they are misunderstood.

⁵ This refers to the important work of Dom Odo Casel (1886–1948). His work, **Das christliche Kulturmysterium* (1932) was translated into French in 1946 as part of the *Lex orandi* series (no. 6), but his work had been widely known in French-speaking circles long before that.

⁶ A reference to George Weigel: John Paul II, *Witness to Hope*, ch. 4: *Seeing Things as They Are*.

⁷ It will, I hope, become clearer later on that the various aspects of the Eucharistic mystery are interrelated, whatever one may think of Luther’s position.

on the same level as the ADAPs and the Holy Mass, to the point of effectively imposing the former without there being any real necessity... And this on the part of the clergy themselves⁸.

This portrayal of a crisis situation may seem irreverent to the elder masters who have rendered great service to theology. It does not strike me as false, however, and, although I do not share the Socratic view that all our faults stem from ignorance,⁹ I believe that the crisis we are currently experiencing can only come to an end when the younger clergy are strengthened in their vocation and identity by firm convictions, grounded in a well-informed faith regarding the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice and the personal bonds that link the priest to Christ the High Priest in the celebration of the sacraments. From this perspective, it is by no means unimportant to clearly identify the links that the Mass maintains with the drama of Calvary and the Last Supper.

To this end, and without seeking from the outset to identify the cause of the variations in post-Tridentine theology, it seems appropriate to base our reflection on the doctrine definitively defined, or at least solemnly taught, at the Holy Council of Trent. We shall then seek to shed light on it (and to clarify it, if necessary) by drawing on the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, who was undoubtedly the principal inspiration behind the Council's decrees concerning the Eucharistic Mystery. In so doing, we shall position ourselves beyond the disputes we have briefly mentioned.

I- The teaching of the Council of Trent

§1 – The circumstances surrounding this teaching

The teaching of the Council of Trent on the Sacrifice of the Mass was promulgated during its twenty-second session, on 17 September 1562, eleven years after the decree of 1551 on the Eucharist, due to the circumstances of the time and in response to the Protestant denials which the Council was required to oppose. In practical terms, it would be a mistake to regard the decree of 1562 as excluding the sacramental perspective of the decree of 1551; in fact, the two decrees must be

⁸ I put this forward on the basis of irrefutable evidence. Yet the Holy Father has made matters clear on several occasions. Thus: '...The aim must remain the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass, the only true re-enactment of the Lord's Passover...' (Apostolic Letter **Dies Domini**, 31 May 1998; cf. Instruction of 15 August 1997). ADAPs can only be theologically justified if they are congregations *awaiting a priest* and not *in the absence of a priest* (John Paul II to the French bishops of the eastern region on 30 January 1987; DC.87,239).

⁹ Thonnard, *A Brief History of Philosophy*, no. 27; Jacques Chevalier, *Ancient Thought*, note 83.

For those wishing to gain a comprehensive understanding of the Council's teaching on the Eucharist, see 10. But let us now turn to the decree on the Eucharistic sacrifice.

1/ The Council was duty-bound to solemnly affirm two truths of the faith:

- Firstly, the full sufficiency of the Saviour's Passion for our salvation, in accordance with the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was continually emphasised by the Reformers:

‘For by a single offering he has made those who are sanctified perfect for ever’¹¹.

- Secondly, the truth of the Eucharistic sacrifice, handed down by the Apostles themselves, and attested to by the Holy Gospels and St Paul, as the Tradition of the Church has always interpreted them. St Paul says in particular, after recalling the Apostolic account of the institution of the Eucharist: ‘For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes. Therefore, whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of sinning against the body and blood of the Lord .12’ In this regard, Father Allo's commentary on this passage is illuminating:

‘The author (St Paul) draws his conclusion from what he has recounted in verses 23–25. By Christ's institution, every time the Eucharistic Supper is celebrated in Corinth, we

‘proclaim’ or ‘announce’ the Lord's death, as if it were taking place at that very moment; we see the significance of this verse in demonstrating the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. And this death will, so to speak, be renewed in this way until the glorious Parousia; the faithful will always have it, made present once more, before their eyes. ’13And the Tradition of the Church bore unanimous witness to this apostolic teaching, particularly in its liturgy¹⁴; from this perspective, the Secret of the ninth Sunday after Pentecost is famous: ‘Whenever the commemoration of this host is celebrated, the work of our Redemption is accomplished.’¹⁵

¹⁰ This observation is specifically that of Dom Jobert: EV.1994,97.

¹¹ Heb. 10:14.

¹² 1 Corinthians 11:26ff.

¹³ First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paris 1935, p. 280 ff. This testimony of St Paul remains, even today, very difficult to refute on the basis of New Testament criticism. It is worth reading Allo's excursions (op. cit.).

¹⁴ The Council notes this in the following terms: ‘as the Church has always understood and taught’. DS 1740, end=938. Translation by Dumeige, FC 766.

¹⁵ New Ordo: Super oblata for Holy Thursday and the second Sunday in Ordinary Time: ‘whenever the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the work of our redemption is accomplished’.

2/ The Council goes on to refer to the teaching of St Paul but, as the Reformers draw upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, it begins by affirming, alongside them, the full sufficiency of the Saviour's redemptive sacrifice and quotes Heb. 10:14. However, it adds, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews itself, his death was not to put an end to his priesthood, since it declares that 'He who remains for ever holds an unchangeable priesthood'¹⁶ Where there is priesthood, there is sacrifice, as the Epistle to the Hebrews further notes¹⁷, and human nature required a visible sacrifice, a sacrifice for humanity, which had not yet reached the heavenly city but was still journeying in the state of vocation¹⁸. The conclusion follows naturally and implies that one cannot invoke the Epistle to the Hebrews to reject or attempt to water down the teaching of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Council is thus able to set out its teaching on the Eucharistic sacrifice.

§2 – The Mass and the Cross according to Trent

We may summarise the Council's teaching on this matter in the following propositions:

- The Mass is a sacrifice in the proper sense;
- Consequently, it possesses the efficacy proper to a sacrifice when it is accepted by God;
- Being a true sacrifice, the Mass, however, in no way detracts from the sacrifice of the Cross.

1/ Contrary to the denials of the Reformers, the Church defines in Canon 1 that at the Mass, it is a 'true and proper sacrifice – verum et proprium sacrificium' that is offered to God¹⁹.

- Thus the Mass is not called a sacrifice metaphorically, as Baius will still claim, like any good work ordered to the honour of God¹⁹.
- Nor can it be reduced to a mere sacred meal in which Christ is given to us as food²¹.

¹⁶ Heb. 7:24: 'sempiternum habet sacerdotium'; 'indefectible': Dom Delatte. The Greek reads: 'απαράβατον'; Osty accepts 'immutable' but, with Spicq and Crampon, translates it as: 'intransmissible', which can be very easily misunderstood (Spicq, LTNT, 155ff. details his reasons): in any case, this is not the meaning understood by the Fathers of Trent. The TOB translates it as 'exclusive', which seems to me, from a critical perspective, to be the best translation and harmonises well with the text of the Vulgate.

¹⁷ Heb. 8:3. Implicit reasoning.

¹⁸ The Council therefore combines a revealed major premise (Heb. 7:24 etc.) with a minor premise derived from reason: a proposition 'per se nota'.

¹⁹ DS.1751=948.

²⁰ The errors of Baius were condemned by St Pius V in 1567. See DS 1945=1045.

²¹ End of Canon 1; Luther, *De captivitate babylonica*, quoted in Journet 59.

- On the contrary, it is the visible sacrifice required by human nature, a sacrifice entrusted by Christ to the Church, his beloved Bride, at the moment of his departure, in order to replace—by bringing them to the perfection to which the Old People aspired—all the sacrifices of the Old Covenant; and this at the very moment when the New Covenant was inaugurated²².

2/ The purpose of sacrifice as an outward act expressing our inner devotion to God (that is to say, the sum total of the expressions of the heart which the intelligent creature must manifest to its Creator, from whom it derives all that it is), is in particular to make Him *favourably disposed* towards us, inasmuch as this sacrifice is pleasing to Him, so that He may grant us His blessings: a *propitiatory* efficacy which, at its source, implies an *impetrative* purpose as an expression of our inner prayer.²³ The efficacy of sacrifice is therefore that of a *moral* cause, just as that of prayer is. The Reformers rejected this efficacy as undermining the Cross and its full and definitive satisfaction; and because it ran counter to the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone (faith-trust in Luther's sense).

a/ Contrary to their claims, the Council teaches that the Mass was instituted so that the salvific power of the Sacrifice of the Cross might be applied 'to the remission of the sins we commit every day'²⁴; and it defines that it is not a mere pious commemoration (*nuda commemoratio*) of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but possesses a real propitiatory efficacy,²⁵ that is to say: 'Appeased by this oblation, the Lord, by granting grace and the gift of penance, remits crimes and sins, however great they may be'²⁶ This is why it condemns those who assert "that it ought not to be offered, either for the living or for the dead, nor for sins, penalties, satisfactions or other necessities"²⁷.

b/ Nor does the Council intend to deny the latrueutic and Eucharistic purposes of the sacrifice of the Mass; nor does it take a position on 'the theoretical question of whether the propitiatory effect is the primary and essential purpose of the sacrifice in general'²⁸. It merely expresses its desire to define a truth formally denied by the Reformers, a denial which leads, in

²² Chapter 1; DS.1740=938.

²³ It should be noted that the four ends of the sacrifice are the latrueutic (worship), Eucharistic (thanksgiving), impetrative (like prayer) and propitiatory ends. Pius XII, **Mediator Dei**, EPS.555–557; Ott 567.

²⁴ DS.1740=938.

²⁵ Canon 3 DS.1753=950.

²⁶ Chapter 2. DS.1743=940.

²⁷ Canon 3 Translation FC.778.

²⁸ Lepin 328.

they use the concept of sacrifice solely in the sense of ‘a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving’²⁹. I note here that Pius XII elaborated at length in **Mediator Dei** on the Council’s doctrine on this point; and likewise Paul VI in **Mysterium Fidei**.

c/ The Council specifies how the Mass can have a propitiatory value that in no way detracts from the fullness of Christ’s satisfaction:

‘For in this divine Sacrifice, which is celebrated at Mass, the very same Christ who “offered himself once” in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross is present and is sacrificed in an unbloody manner; the Holy Council teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory’ (on the very propitiation of the Cross)³⁰, thereby linking the value of the sacrifice of the Mass to the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist; previously, it had taught that the Mass had been instituted to apply to us the salvific power of the Cross³¹, and we shall now summarise its teaching on the connection between the Mass and the Cross; a teaching which requires further explanation, but which harmonises more naturally with St Thomas’s sacramental solution than with any other. There is here a sort of implicit indication that we should make use of.

3/ The third statement is the one that relates most directly to our subject: the Council teaches that the sacrifice of the Mass is not to be counted as one and the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross³², which leads it to anathematise those who claim that it diminishes the Sacrifice of the Cross³³. The reason it gives for this is simple:

‘It is one and the same victim; it is the same One who now offers Himself through the ministry of priests, who offered Himself then on the Cross; only the manner of offering differs’³⁴. John Paul II comments on this text as follows: “As you well know ... this Eucharistic celebration is not separate from the Sacrifice of the Cross; it is not added to it nor does it multiply it. The Mass and the Cross are but a single sacrifice”³⁵. We shall return later to the interpretation that should be given to this conciliar statement.

²⁹ Canon 3, beginning; Introduction to the decree: DS.1738=937a.

³⁰ Chapter 2; DS.1743=940; translation FC.768.

³¹ Chapter 1; DS.1740=938.

³² Implicit teaching in Chapter 2.

³³ Canon 4 DS.1754=951.

³⁴ Chapter 2 DS.1743=940.

³⁵ At the Eucharistic Congress in Lourdes on 21 July 1981; DC.1981, 770.

Leo XIII summarised the teaching of Trent on the Mass and the Cross in a remarkable way: ‘This expiation of human sins (on the Cross) was perfect and absolute; and it is not some other expiation that constitutes the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but that very one itself — Ipsa illa (expiatio) in sacrificio eucharistico inest. Since, in fact, a sacrificial rite was needed to accompany religion in the course of time, the divine plan of the Redeemer was that the sacrifice consummated once for all on the Cross should become perpetual and unbroken ’’.³⁶

§3 – The Mass and the Lord’s Supper according to Trent

We may summarise the Council’s teaching in three propositions:

1/ It was at the Last Supper that Christ instituted the sacrifice which He wished to leave to His Church to perpetuate that of the Cross, which would be consummated the following day, and thus to replace the now obsolete sacrifices of the Old Covenant whilst at the same time instituting the New Covenant. He indeed gave His Apostles ‘the cup of the New Covenant in His Blood to drink ’³⁷.

2/ Despite the opposition that arose within the Church right up to the last moment, the Council further formally teaches that the Lord’s Supper is the first oblation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice ³⁸. It thus directly opposes the claims of the Reformers, who denied that ‘the Lord’s Supper, of which the Mass is a re-enactment, was anything other than a testament and a promise guaranteed by a sign ’³⁹.

3/ Since a visible sacrifice must be accompanied by a similarly visible priesthood to perpetuate Christ’s priestly action here on earth, the Council further defines that it was at the Last Supper that the Apostles were ordained as priests of the New Covenant ⁴⁰.

§4 – Clarifications and conclusion

1/ Cardinal Journet observes:

‘The Reformers ... conceive of only one way of comparing the bloodless sacrifice—whether of the Lord’s Supper or of the Mass—to the bloody sacrifice of the Cross: *juxtaposition*, the addition, the

³⁶ Encyclical *Caritatis Studium* EPS.178; DS(Suppl).3339. See also Pius XII, *Mediator Dei* EPS.552ff; DS.3847f.

³⁷ Luke 22:20, not explicitly referred to by the Council: Chapter 1; DS 1740=938.

³⁸ ‘He offered to God the Father his body and blood under the species of bread and wine...’: Chapter 1; DS 1740=938. Cf. A. Michel, Decrees of Trent 432–443; Lepin 297–305.

³⁹ Lepin 252; *De captivitate babylonica* cited in Journet 59.

⁴⁰ Canon 2; DS.1752=949.

‘concurrence, substitution. They do not consider, or do not wish to give any attention to, the idea of *subordination*...’. And further on: ‘The very essence of the Church’s teaching on this point, the fundamental insight she proclaims against Protestantism, is, on the contrary, that the Mass is by its very nature a sacrifice dependent on the sacrifice of the Cross, entirely subordinate to and entirely referred to the sacrifice of the Cross...’⁴¹.

The venerable Cardinal’s subsequent discussion corrects the impression of imperfection conveyed by these lines, which refer more to the issues of post-Tridentine theology than to those of the Council itself. Indeed, if one has followed the preceding analysis, one will have been convinced that the Council does not view the Mass as a distinct sacrifice—albeit entirely *related* to the Cross, and therefore not to be counted alongside it,—a sacrifice that can be repeated at will without detracting from that of the Cross. I am not saying that this position is false or even simply inaccurate; I am simply saying that, in the light of the texts, this is not the line of thought that guides the Council’s teaching here. The thought guiding the Council’s teaching is this: fundamentally, the Cross, the Mass and the Lord’s Supper are one and the same sacrifice, consummated on the Cross, anticipated in the Lord’s Supper and perpetuated here on earth in the Mass; the differences between the Cross, the Mass and the Lord’s Supper being entirely external, do not affect the fundamental unity of Christ’s Sacrifice

which the Lord’s Supper and the Mass merely ‘convey’ to us, if one may say so^{re 42}. Let us recall the teaching of the Council:

‘He, our God and Lord, had to... “offer himself once and for all”, dying as an intercessor on the altar of the Cross, in order to bring about...eternal redemption ... At the Last Supper, ... he wished to leave to his Church ... a visible sacrifice ... in which the bloody sacrifice that was to be accomplished once and for all on the Cross would be represented ... whose saving power would be applied to the redemption of the sins we commit every day’⁴³It is therefore precisely at this point that the Cardinal continues: ‘The Mass is, by its very nature, a sacrifice dependent on the sacrifice of the Cross ... intended solely to perpetuate, to extend to us the perfect sacrifice, offered on

⁴¹ Journet 54. By contrast, the Protestant position is outlined very precisely. A passage has been omitted from the quotation which is in line with the very view being criticised.

⁴² I note here that, as the Eucharistic Mystery forms part of the supernatural ‘*quoad essentiam*’, being directly linked to the very Mystery of God, it is hardly surprising that the words we use to express it fall somewhat short: the opposite would show that we are merely trivialising the Mystery...and this is precisely the impression that post-Tridentine theological solutions are all too prone to give.

⁴³ Chapter 1; DS.1740=938. See the explanations in the Roman Catechism (or the Council of Trent), which comment on the conciliar text following the structure of St Thomas’s Summa.

‘on the Cross once and for all’. And the Cardinal adds—a point he will elaborate on further—that the Sacrifice of the Mass does not multiply the Sacrifice of the Cross but its *presences*.⁴⁴

The concept of presence is a delicate one, and the Cardinal is well aware of this: the sacrifice is an external act of religion, not a substance⁴⁵; its fulfilment at a specific moment in human history makes it an event that is definitively past and which, as such, cannot endure as such or be multiplied over time; it is therefore a concept that requires further exploration and clarification. Nevertheless, it aptly expresses what lies at the heart of the conciliar teaching, which goes beyond the idea of the multiplication of a sacrifice that is relative to and subordinate to the Cross, whilst retaining its own being as a sacrifice⁴⁶. John Paul II says in this regard: ‘To go to Mass is to go to Calvary to meet our Redeemer’.⁴⁷ The renowned exegete Father Spicq made some very powerful remarks which are particularly in line with what we are trying to convey here: ‘Perseverat unica hostia. The Cross and the Mass are but two aspects of the same reality. The manifestations multiply, but the sacrifice is one. In Palestine today, the volcano has gone dormant, but its activity is reawakened on the altars of all the churches throughout the world. By attending Holy Mass, we are certain to be at the foot of Golgotha ... In truth, on the altar, the entire work of Redemption is made present in the hands of the priest’: This, in my view, is a poetic expression of the central idea of Trent in this decree.⁴⁸

2/ Whilst, according to the teaching of the Council, we must seek nothing other than the Cross at the Last Supper and at Mass, the external differences are striking:

- At the Cross and at the Last Supper, Christ, High Priest of the New Covenant, offers his Sacrifice in person. At Mass, on the other hand, he offers his Sacrifice through the ministry of the priests whom he has

⁴⁴ Journet 54ff; cf. 101ff

⁴⁵ 2a.2ae. 84, Proem. & 85. Proem.

⁴⁶ This is, moreover, the formal teaching of St Thomas: 3a. 83,1 ad 1m. Masuere (282) remarks on this point: ‘Why ... is Fr Billot so afraid to use the expression: “*unity of the sacrifice on the Cross and at Mass*”, which is accepted by St Thomas, enshrined in the Catechism of the Council of Trent and in many diocesan catechisms?’ The reason is simple: it is the post-Tridentine problem that still permeates Billot’s solution and renders it imperfectly in line with the doctrine of Trent ... and imperfectly Thomistic, despite his claim to the contrary.

⁴⁷ ‘To Young People’, 8 November 1978; DC.1978, 1016.

⁴⁸ The Most Holy Sacrament; Sources 1982, 101. I am not here to take sides on the question of the heavenly sacrifice defended by Father Spicq.

specially consecrated to act *in his person*—this is the famous *in persona (or ex persona) Christi* ⁴⁹.

- On the Cross, the victim of propitiation is Christ in his body and soul, sacrificed in their natural state; at the Last Supper and at Mass, it is still Christ who is substantially present, but in a wondrous and sacramental manner signifying his sacrifice, under the species of consecrated bread and wine.
- The context of the Sacrifice of the Cross is a judicial execution; that of the Lord's Supper and the Mass, a liturgical meal. In saying all this, I have merely expounded on the text of the Decree of Trent.
- St Thomas's doctrine on Eucharistic conversion leads us to highlight another accidental difference between the Last Supper and the Cross, which it is not out of place to mention here: at the Last Supper, Christ is present under the consecrated species with his mortal body (and his blood); at Mass, he is present with his glorified body. ⁵⁰.

3/ Post-Tridentine authors strove to find within the Sacrament of the Altar the definition of the natural sacrifice as they interpreted it, in a somewhat materialistic sense, in St Thomas. ⁵¹. In order not to detract from the fullness of the Sacrifice of the Cross, they had no choice but to emphasise the notion of a sacrifice *that is relative* to and *subordinate* to the Cross, and which does not constitute the same thing as the Sacrifice of the Cross. The argument remained nonetheless imperfect, and always in need of revision, for no argument has ever been able to demonstrate the perfect *unity* between the Mass and the Cross: and this is due to the fundamental problem; hence a sense of imperfection and the consequent proliferation of explanatory theories that were constantly at odds with one another. Another shortcoming: the fact that the theologians' response to the Reformation's arguments against the Mass remained on the same level, whereas the Fathers of Trent had managed to transcend the perspectives of the polemic

⁴⁹ On this question, see: B-D. Marliangeas, **Keys to a Theology of Ministry**, **Théologie Historique** 51, Beauchesne.

⁵⁰ Cf. 3a.76,2; 81,3. The simultaneous presence at the Lord's Supper of Christ in his natural body and in his sacramental body and blood can pose a problem. This goes beyond the scope of this work; nevertheless, it may be said that it is possible to demonstrate that there is no contradiction here.

⁵¹ 2a.2ae. 85,3 ad 3m. Menessier (SRJ) renders this well: 'There is a sacrifice in the proper sense when the things offered to God are the subject of an action, such as the slaughter of animals, or the breaking, eating and blessing of the bread.' The very name 'sacrifice' indicates this, as it derives from 'to make something sacred'. See the commentary in note (69). In practice, this text was understood in accordance with the gloss provided by Dom Jobert (EV.1994,97): 'A sacrifice properly speaking occurs when one offers to God things that undergo a change, such as animals that are slaughtered...' Hence two schools of thought, the immolationist and the oblationist, depending on whether they emphasise the aspect of immolation or oblation contained in the definition as it is understood. In fact, as Menessier observes, sacrifice according to St Thomas 'is defined first and foremost as a sacred act: a gesture of homage symbolically reserved for God, performed using the material things offered to him' SRJ. La Religion notes (69).

Protestant. Such an approach, however, did not necessarily distort the conciliar text; and this is why it has endured to the present day. But the solutions derived from it cannot avoid inaccuracy, or indeed outright falsehood or even error, unless certain precautions are taken—precautions which have not always been observed by their authors. Let us focus in particular on four of these that are most relevant to our subject.

a/ The victim of the sacrifice of the Mass is the very same as that of the sacrifice of the Cross, the Council tells us. Yet no action can currently be performed upon the glorious Christ who makes himself present in the Holy Eucharist. This is difficult to reconcile with immolationist theories; for example, the theory which compares the priest's act of consecration to a sword mystically yet truly immolating Christ on the altar through the separation of his sacramental body and blood.⁵² b/ For the same reason as above, the idea of any rite having the power to act upon the glorious Christ must be rejected – which would, moreover, be pure and simple magic. One cannot therefore assert outright that the double consecration brings about a new oblation of Christ at every Mass; all the more so as this assertion contradicts the 'once and for all' of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as recalled by the Council.⁵³

c/ At Mass, according to Trent, there is not only the same Victim as on the Cross, but the same priest. We must therefore rule out any interpretations that would set the oblation of the Victim of Calvary by Christ alone at the Last Supper against the oblation of the divine Victim by his Mystical Body at every Mass, to the extent of disregarding the role that the Council assigns solely to the priest of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice *in persona Christi*. Furthermore, the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, according to which the sacrifice of the Mass is accomplished through the double consecration, is now, at the very least, a

⁵² For example, Gühr, **The Sacraments**, Vol. 2, pp. 332 ff.: 'The Eucharistic Immolation'. Masure (282) notes, with regard to Billot:

'The difficulty always stems from the precise meaning to be attributed to the two words "*sacramental immolation*", the significance of which varies as much as the colours of the feathers on a pigeon's neck, depending on whether one emphasises the noun or the adjective, taken together or separately in the mind's eye'. Depending on the meaning given to the term, Billot's theory may or may not be the subject of this analysis. Canon A. Michel (in the DTC.Messe 1276) clarifies this as follows: 'On the one hand, it affirms the reality of the bloodless immolation at the altar, which is essentially representative of the bloody immolation on the Cross, but which possesses its own existence in the sacramentally separated Body and Blood; on the other hand, the separation it proclaims between the Body and the Blood is a mysterious separation of a supernatural order, and one which, consequently, in its very nature bears no resemblance whatsoever to the physical and natural separation of the Body and the Blood. The metaphor of the sword is accepted here only in the sense that can be attributed to it, since it is merely a *mystical* separation'. This is explaining the clear by the obscure!

⁵³ It is nevertheless possible, provided certain precautions are taken: cf. Filograssi, **De Sanctissima Eucharistia** ...: text cited by Dom Basile. See the remarks by Father Garrigou-Lagrange (Garrigou 367ff) on this question. We shall return to this in more detail.

‘Sententia Communis’, which can draw its authority from the Authentic Magisterium , as stated⁵⁴; and which cannot therefore be rejected without serious and well-founded reasons, which are not apparent.

d/ The Council of Trent, drawing upon the whole of Tradition, clearly teaches that the Sacrifice of the Cross constitutes, in itself, a complete sacrifice; that the Last Supper is the first oblation of the Eucharistic sacrifice; and that this is a true sacrifice in the proper sense: all of this runs counter to the idea of regarding the Saviour’s immolation on the Cross as merely a part of a sacrifice begun at the Last Supper: for then neither the Last Supper nor the Cross are complete sacrifices but integral parts of a single sacrifice; and since conciliar teaching unites the Mass with the Last Supper, the sacrificial character of the Mass, logically speaking, no longer appears. Thus Father de La Taille’s explanation, despite its genuine merits, cannot, without modification, be compatible with the teaching of Trent^{e 55}.

All these difficulties which we have just analysed stem from the fact that post-Tridentine theology has been too keen to view the Mass as a *natural sacrifice*, whereas the Holy Eucharist is, by its very nature, a sacrament, and the notion of sacrifice, as put forward by the concile must therefore be understood in terms of *analogy* and not in *univocity*.⁵⁶ Thus, the that intrinsically unite our Masses and Calvary are weakened; and one falls into insoluble difficulties as soon as one takes seriously the ‘semel’ of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the hobbyhorse of Reformed theology. On the other hand, by considering the Eucharist, along with St Thomas, as a reality of a sacramental nature, the difficulties disappear, the teaching of the Council is no longer distorted, and the Protestant perspective is superseded. The key is to do so without oversimplification, that is to say, with very close attention to the development of the thought of the Common Doctor, who, in his treatise the Summa, is at the height of his theological maturity. This therefore brings us to St Thomas.

II- The Mass as the Sacrament of the Cross according to St Thomas Aquinas

A. The concept of the sacrament and its application to Eucharistic doctrine

⁵⁴ 3a. 82,10 ad 1m: see the main text; Pius XII, at the International Liturgical Congress in Assisi, 22 November 1956: EPS.805ff (cf. 569, 584). For a catalogue of doctrinal notes and censures, see the DTC and, for example, Ott. This question of double consecration, which goes beyond the scope of this work, is referred to by sacramentalists as the question of the ‘physical essence’ of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

⁵⁵ See above. This is based on Nau 80ff, with some nuances. Adaptations: see Filograssi, in the line of thought essentially followed by Larnicol.

⁵⁶ On this point, see the thought-provoking article by Dom Jobert: EV.1994, 97ff.

The entire perspective of St Thomas's synthesis and the very structure of the treatise on the Eucharist in the Summa, with the inclusion of matters concerning the sacrifice within the study of the sacrament, is accompanied by the formal statement: 'Hoc sacramentum simul est et sacrificium et sacramentum', subsequently clarified as follows: 'Rationem sacrificii habet in quantum offertur, rationem autem sacramenti in quantum sumitur'⁵⁷; all this already demonstrates sufficiently that, for the Angelic Doctor, the concept of the sacrament, as he clarified it in 3a 60, is 'the key to Eucharistic doctrine' in all its aspects, as Dom Vonier observed in his time:

'St Thomas had the great merit of believing that it was possible for him to provide a perfectly complete theology of the Eucharist without for a moment abandoning his concept of the sacrament'⁵⁸. We shall therefore seek to highlight the Holy Doctor's thinking on the Christian sacraments, and on that very special sacrament which is the Eucharist. We shall then be able to address the core of our study, which will consist of demonstrating that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice precisely because it is a sacrament: not just any sacrament, but the sacrament par excellence which, by divine institution, conveys to us the full reality of the Saviour's Passion—the perfect and definitive sacrifice—with the fullness of its sanctifying power⁵⁹.

§1 – The concept of the sacrament

1/ The definition of Christian sacraments

a/ The Church has found the Sacraments in the basket of her nuptials with the divine Bridegroom, as sacred rites that convey the life of grace, and are therefore endowed with efficacy, which are linked to Christ himself, whose sanctifying work they continue amongst us. However, to gain a deeper understanding of them, to discover what unites them, one must grasp their formal structure, since every reality acts according to its *form* (in the scholastic sense); by way of example, let us say that one does not sketch with a paintbrush, nor does one paint with a pencil. Now, the rites of which our sacraments are composed seem, at first glance, to lack intrinsic unity: they involve a certain use of materials (water, oil, bread, wine) and of prayers: *res et verba* _of the

⁵⁷ 'This sacrament is both a sacrifice and a sacrament'; 'It is a sacrifice insofar as it is offered, and a sacrament insofar as it is consummated': 3a. 79,5 corpus and 79,7 corpus.

⁵⁸ Vonier, ch. 4. The entire chapter is worth pondering. It should be noted that in a theological treatise such as Hervé's, the section on the Eucharistic sacrifice is separate from that on the sacrament of the Eucharist: *De sacrificio Eucharistiae* – *De Eucharistiae sacramento*.

⁵⁹ Father Joseph de Sainte Marie takes the same view: JSM.282ff.

‘things and words’, say the medieval doctors following the Fathers ^{ff. 60}: We are indeed familiar with St Augustine’s famous saying: *‘Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum’*. ⁶¹ The question then arises: is there a formal aspect that can unify what at first glance appears disparate; so that the concept of the Christian sacrament is not ambiguous, but is defined exactly and precisely, and can be expressed in a definition by genus and difference, as required by scholastic methodology? In more modern terms, we might ask whether our sacraments have similar structures that can be rigorously characterised.

b/ Theological tradition bequeathed to St Thomas a conception of the Christian sacraments that united the two categories of *sign* and *cause*: this was the view of Peter Lombard, who stated, in essence, that the sacraments are *both signs and causes of a holy thing* (divine grace).⁶² This presents a difficulty: it is in the natural order of things that the cause is known through the effect, and not the other way round; the cause, as such, is therefore not a sign, but rather the effect. Cause and sign are thus categories that are normally irreconcilable with one another; in strict logic, one must choose, as the commonly accepted adage puts it ^{u63}. St Thomas, in the Summa, settles the matter decisively and emphasises the category of *the sign*. Causality will be considered only in terms of the specific difference, which allows the sacred rites of the Old Covenant to be incorporated into the concept of the sacrament. And not directly, but only through the reality of which the sacrament is the sign: the sacrament is the sign (genus) of a holy and sanctifying reality (specific difference); thus the entire definition is contained within the category of the sign, without, however, the efficacy of the Christian sacraments being overlooked: a true ‘tour de force’ of a logician. A clarification of the Summa’s exposition can be provided by drawing on the parallel text in the Sentences: the holy reality signified by the sacrament is not merely sanctifying in itself; it is sanctifying in that it actually brings about the sanctification of man. The Thomist definition of the Christian sacrament, in its most precise form, can therefore be formulated as follows: *A sign of a sacred reality*

⁶⁰ 4St. d.23 q.1 a.4 q1a.1 sc.1.

⁶¹ Tract. in Joannem Evangelium 80,3: ‘The Word is united with the element and constitutes the sacrament’; RJ.1834.

⁶² See on all this: H-F. Dondaine, ‘The Definition of the Sacraments in the Summa Theologica’; RSPT.1947, 213ff. Peter Lombard, 4ST.d.1, n.2.

⁶³ ‘Signum contra causam dividitur’: 4ST, d.1, q.1, a.1, q1a.1, obj.5. See Roguet, SRJ, ‘Sacraments’, 267ff. This concerns the principal cause: St Thomas will note later that the instrumental cause may be considered a sign insofar as it is, in some way, an effect in relation to the principal cause: 3a. 62,1 ad 1m. I shall not dwell on the references that might be cited against this; St Thomas essentially refutes them in this response.

in the exercise of sanctification; and in the precise Latin of the scholastic era: **Signum rei sacrae in actu exercito sanctificationi**, p. 64.

Note: The ‘Thomistic’ concept of the sacraments was largely misunderstood.

From Scot onwards, followed by Cano and then Bellarmine, the notion of *an effective sign* prevailed .⁶⁵ Since the

Christian sacrament being a fundamentally supernatural reality, there was nothing to prevent it from being effective, as a sign, by God’s disposition, without one having to concern oneself with the compatibility of the sign and the cause within the natural order. This overlooked the adage—admittedly Thomist in origin—that divine grace does not destroy nature but perfects it (*gratia non tollit naturam sed perficit*); already looming on the horizon of theology was the voluntarism of William of Ockham, for whom contradiction is not repugnant to God. As this perspective lay entirely outside the principles of natural philosophy that underpin the Angelic Doctor’s theological synthesis, it is hardly surprising that one of her modern disciples sought to justify, from a Thomist perspective, not so much the Scotist definition of the sacraments directly, but rather certain maxims derived from earlier scholasticism (and which St Thomas does in fact use, but in a very specific context , p. 66), which appear to regard the sacrament as efficacious by virtue of its very meaning: The result was a theory of the *intentional causality of the sign*. Unfortunately

‘the antagonism’ between the sign and the cause does not lie solely on the side of the cause, but just as much—if not more so—on the side of the sign: thus Cardinal Billot’s endeavour was doomed to failure⁶⁷. As it stands, it has, in my view, greatly influenced his theory of the Eucharistic sacrifice: indeed, if the sign is effective as a sign, the double consecration, signifying the Saviour’s immolation, brings it about ‘mystically’ but also as truly as a natural sacrifice. The problem is that the state of research into the sacramental doctrine of the Angelic Doctor did not allow one to realise that these views were far removed from his thinking; even though, in fact, of all the post-Tridentine authors, Cardinal Billot is one of those who came closest to

⁶⁴ 3a.60,1&2; 4ST. d.1 q.1, art.1 q1a.1 obj.3&ad3m.

⁶⁵ H-A. Dondaine, RSPT.1947, 223. It is found in Ott, Pesch, etc.but also, alas, in the CCC.1127&1131.

⁶⁶ ‘efficiunt quod figurant’; ‘significando causant’. For example: 3a.62,1 ad1m.

⁶⁷ A detailed critique by Roguet SRJ. **Sacraments**, 333ff. Cardinal Billot adhered to the Thomistic definition of the sacraments, and it is this that he teaches with precision (**De Sacramentis**, Q.60 §2). However, the Scotist definition permeated theological reflection: evidence of this can be seen in the way in which one of the Cardinal’s faithful disciples, Father Goupil, introduces the concept of the sacrament (Les Sacraments I, 9ff.): ‘The sacramental sign does not merely make grace known; it produces it. It is *efficacious*, that is to say, it is a cause—subordinate but real—of grace within us’. One can only see this as a ‘figure of speech’ intended to convey a substantially accurate and ‘accessible’ teaching. Unfortunately, in theology, expression is not neutral; the slightest inaccuracy in this regard causes the entire teaching to suffer.

St Thomas. Furthermore—though this raises an entirely different set of issues that gave rise to criticism, itself grounded in the writings of St Thomas and a Father de La Taille—the ‘Gordian knot’ we have mentioned could not be cut in this way. Despite all the great minds who drew their inspiration from Cardinal Billot, it will therefore come as no surprise that I prefer to remain within the precise framework of St Thomas’s sacramental synthesis, which does not distort nature and preserves the harmony between nature and grace—a truth suggested, among other things, by the analogy of faith, to say the least.

2/ The causality of the Christian sacraments

a/ To go further, one must understand this ‘*res*’ which acts in the ^{Christian} sacraments .⁶⁸ This ‘*res*’ is God’s sanctifying power, according to the particular aspect signified by the sacrament. But, even more profoundly, it is the Passion of the Saviour which is the cause of all sanctification; the primary instrumental cause to which the sacrament is linked as the specific instrument that the Passion, as a universal cause, normally requires in order to bring about our sanctification in a concrete way⁶⁹. Furthermore, the grace of the sacrament is like a pledge of the blessings of the life to come: hence, as St Thomas observes, there are three levels of significance in our sacraments which highlight the fullness of their action:

‘A sacrament is therefore a sign which, at the same time, recalls the past cause, the Passion of Christ; manifests the effect of this Passion within us, namely grace; and foretells future glory’⁷⁰.

b/ It is not possible here to defend St Thomas’s authentic position on the mode of causality of the Christian sacraments. Let us simply say that he upholds the solution subsequently termed ‘*physical, instrumental and perfective causality*’, according to which divine power passes through the sacramental instrument—that is, by means of the sacramental sign fully expressed—to produce the entire supernatural effect of grace to which the sacrament is

⁶⁸ 3a. 60,3.

⁶⁹ ‘We are brought into communion with the virtue of Christ’s Passion by means of faith and the sacraments’ 3a. 62,6 corpus. I note that faith connects us to the Saviour’s Passion only if it entails (which is always the case when it is true) at least an implicit desire for the sacrament. Another very explicit text: ‘Because the Passion of Christ preceded, as a sort of universal cause, the remission of sins ... it is necessary that it be applied to each person for the remission of their own sins. This is accomplished through Baptism, Penance and the other sacraments, which derive their efficacy from the Passion of Christ’ 3a. 49,1 ad 4m.

⁷⁰ Translation by Roguet, SRJ, faithful in substance: ‘Unde sacramentum est et signum rememorativum ejus quod praecessit, scilicet passionis Christi; et demonstrativum ejus quod in nobis efficitur per Christi passionem, scilicet gratiae; et prognosticum, id est praenuntiativum, futurae gloriae’ 3a. 60.3 end of the main text. The causality of the Passion is strongly emphasised earlier by St Thomas.

ordained and for which it was instituted by Christ ,⁷¹. In other words, the Christian sacrament, by virtue of its nature as a sign, merely signifies; but when the minister administers it with the requisite intention, divine power flows through the sacramental sign to produce its effect of grace: and this divine power flows from the Passion of the Saviour. We therefore receive the grace flowing from the Passion of Christ through his Holy Humanity (an instrument united with his divinity) and through the sacramental sign administered by the minister (a separate instrument)⁷².

3/ The tripartite structure of the Christian sacraments according to St Thomas

a/ The efficacy *ex opere operato* of the Christian sacraments—that is to say, intrinsically linked to the sacramental sign conferred by the minister, endowed with the requisite powers and with the proper intention, upon a subject capable of receiving its fruits—is a dogma of faith defined at Trent⁷³. However, this expression was not understood by the Council as implying that our sacraments possess a more or less magical efficacy, and in particular one that is independent of the recipient's dispositions ,^{no. 74}; and this was the view of all the early Doctors of the Church who helped to bring the Catholic dogma on this point fully to light.

But this qualification poses a difficulty: the sacramental sign has value only if it infallibly signifies the holy reality associated with it, for that reality, in itself, completely transcends the sensible order; and the very role of the sacrament is, in particular, to make that reality tangible to us⁷⁵. If this is not the case, the sacramental sign becomes ambiguous: how can we know that it has indeed fulfilled its role, and therefore that its reception has borne its supernatural fruits, if ultimately these depend on the subjective dispositions of the recipient? And this is all the more so given that the Church has defined that we cannot know in this life whether or not we are in a state of grace? The quality of our dispositions therefore eludes all human investigation: we are at a loss.

b/ The solution, following St Thomas, will consist in supplementing the two-part division—of Augustinian origin—between *res* (the grace proper to the sacrament) and *signa* (the sacramental rites) by adding a third term. This will be an inamissible effect, produced infallibly when the rite

⁷¹ Council of Trent, Session 7, Canon 1: DS.1601=844. On physical, instrumental and perfective causality: Roguet, SRJ.Sacrements 353ff; Hugon, 'Instrumental Causality in Theology'.

⁷² 3a.62.5 bodies.

⁷³ Session 7, Canon 8: DS.1608=851.

⁷⁴ Session 7, canon 6: DS.1606=849.

⁷⁵ 3a. 61.1.

The sacramental is validly conferred; a primary effect which ensures, in the soul of the faithful, a permanent presence of the sacrament—a presence that requires sacramental grace provided that the recipient's dispositions are those required for the reception of the sacrament, which is then no longer merely valid but fully fruitful. The sacramental sign, by virtue of this third element, loses all ambiguity regarding the efficacy it conveys.

We must therefore consider three levels in the sacraments:

- The *sacramentum tantum* (the sacrament as a mere sign), that is to say, the rite, defined by the sacramental words, which serves purely as a sign of the effect of sanctification conferred by the sacrament.
- The *res tantum*, that is, the ultimate effect of grace to which the sacrament is ordered—and which it signifies—an effect which, by that very fact, does not function as a sign in relation to a subsequent reality.
- The *res et sacramentum*: this expression denotes the necessary middle term linking the other two, leaving no room for ambiguity regarding the efficacy of the sacrament. It is the primary effect of the external rite (*res*)—an effect that, as we have seen, is inamissible—which itself signifies grace, the ultimate effect (*res tantum*) of the sacrament. This effect is therefore, in the soul, a reality of a supernatural order which has, at least in part, the purpose of being an inamissible—and, in certain cases at least, permanent—substitute for the sacramental rite. In the case of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders, the *res et sacramentum* is nothing other than the *Character*.⁷⁶

c/ This concept of *res et sacramentum* is most fruitful in sacramental theology, but it is not our task here to demonstrate this. It was immediately noted that it was developed in relation to the theology of Baptism and that it applies seamlessly to those sacraments whose formal similarity to Baptism is evident.⁷⁷ But what of the Eucharist?

The sacramental grace of the Eucharist is marked by the Lord himself: 'This is the bread that came down from heaven ... whoever eats this bread will live for ever'.⁷⁸ The Eucharist is therefore, within us, the nourishment of our divine life. But this grace of supernatural restoration is communicated to us through communion with the Body and Blood of the Saviour, made present by Transubstantiation under the very forms of bread and wine, which clearly manifest their function as spiritual nourishment. The *res et sacramentum* of the Eucharist is therefore nothing other than the *Real Presence*, the primary and inalienable effect of the sacrament, fully accomplished by

⁷⁶ 3a.63,1ad 2m; 63,2ad 4m; 63,6,ad 3m.

⁷⁷ 3a. 63. J-H. Nicolas, SD. nos. 730 & 759ff.

⁷⁸ Jn 6:58. See the whole pericope.

the double consecration and intended for its subsequent consumption by the celebrating priest and the faithful. But is it the Real Presence alone? This question leads us to consider the place which the Eucharist holds within the sacramental order, always following the teaching of the Angelic Doctor.

§2 – The greatest of the sacraments

1/ We have just stated that the definition of the sacraments was developed on the basis of a study of that particular sacrament, namely Baptism. But the concept of a sacrament is analogical, by analogy of attribution ⁷⁹: what is the primary analogue to which all the other sacraments are formally linked? St Thomas answers: the Eucharist; and always for the same reason, namely that it contains not merely a power derived from the holy humanity of Christ in his Passion, but that holy humanity itself:

‘(The Eucharist)...substantially contains Christ himself, whilst the other sacraments contain only an instrumental virtue received from Christ by way of participation...Now, in every domain, being by essence is more important than being by participation’⁸⁰.

2/ As the primary analogue on the formal level, the Eucharist is further superior to the other sacraments on the level of being (consequently, according to the analogy proper to the concept of being). The reason remains the same: it contains the Holy One, so that it is in its own holiness that the other sacraments participate ⁸¹. St Thomas, again in 3a. 65,3, puts forward two arguments:

- All the other sacraments are ordered towards the Eucharist, which amounts to saying that they derive their *raison d’être* from it;
- As acts of worship, the sacraments normally culminate in the celebration of the Eucharist.

This teaching of the Angelic Doctor can be illuminated by a passage from **De Veritate**:

‘The humanity of Christ is the instrumental cause of justification; now, this cause is applied to us spiritually through faith and bodily through the sacraments ... Thus, the most perfect sacrament is that in which the body of Christ is truly present: it is the Eucharist, which surpasses all the others, as Dionysius says. Whereas the other sacraments share in something of that power by which the humanity of Christ acts instrumentally for the

⁷⁹ 3a. 62,1; cf. Dondaine, RSPT.1947,217.

⁸⁰ 3a. 65,3; St Thomas refers to what he said earlier, particularly 3a.62,1 ad 3m; 62,5.

⁸¹ Let us call it: analogy by participation. *De Veritate* 2,11.

‘justification’⁸². In other words, the sacrament which contains the humanity of Christ contains the primary instrumental cause of justification, whilst the other sacraments contain only a participated virtue thereof. And since that which is *in itself* is the cause of that which is merely participated in, the Eucharist has a causal priority over the other sacraments; that is to say, the other sacraments depend on it for their very being and operation. As the reason for the existence of the other sacraments—in that it ensures the permanence of the Saviour’s tangible presence amongst us—it communicates to them its intrinsic and subsistent holiness: it is therefore the keystone of the entire sacramental order. Vatican II will similarly describe the Eucharist as ‘the source and summit of the whole Christian life’.⁸³

3/ There is just one more step to take. We have said that the sacraments impart to us a grace derived from the Passion of Christ, of which they are the signs:

‘The sacraments of the Church derive their power more particularly from the Passion of Christ, whose efficacy reaches us in a certain way through the reception of the sacraments. As a sign of this, water and blood flowed from the side of the crucified Christ; the water signified Baptism, the blood the Eucharist, which are the two principal sacraments’.⁸⁴ But if the Eucharist is truly the sacrament par excellence upon which all the sacraments depend for their very being, it is necessary that it should contain this Passion itself, from which all the sacraments derive their power, however this containment may be realised. This is what St Thomas clearly implies:

‘The Eucharist is the perfect sacrament of the Lord’s Passion inasmuch as it contains Christ himself, the Sacrificed One (*ipsum Christum passum*)’⁸⁵.

If, therefore, albeit in a mysterious way (the Eucharist is, once again, ‘*Mysterium fidei*’, as we read in the Canon of the Mass), the Eucharist truly contains all that constitutes the substance of the Redemptive Passion; it is identically (albeit under different appearances) the Redemptive Sacrifice made present anew on our altars; and therefore the truest of sacrifices:

‘The sacrifices of the Old Law contained only a figure of this true sacrifice of the Passion of Christ ... It was necessary that the sacrifice of the New Law, instituted by Christ, should have something of

⁸² 27.4 translation by Roguet, SRJ. Eucharist I, 359; citing Dionysius, Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ch. 3. This text confirms, from the perspective of strict Thomism, what has been said regarding the respective causality of Christ’s humanity and the sacraments. It is an early text, but St Thomas never revisited this point. Cf. 3a. 65,3 1°.

⁸³ Lumen Gentium, no. 11.

⁸⁴ 3a 62,5, ‘body’.

⁸⁵ 3a 73,5 ad 2m.

moreover, that is to say, that it contains Christ himself as the victim (contineret Ipsum Passum), not merely in a symbolic or figurative sense, but in real truth (in rei veritate). And that is why this sacrament, because it truly contains Christ himself, ... is the one which brings all the other sacraments to fulfilment...⁸⁶

Note: The translation of *Ipsum Christum Passum*, and the meaning to be attributed to it, has given rise to debate. Roguet translates it as ‘Christ in his Passion’; this translation is factually inaccurate and leads us to believe that the Redemptive event is relived at Mass, which contradicts the clearest statements of the Angelic Doctor⁸⁷. But is he so far off the mark in substance? If it is only the ‘Christ who suffered’ (literal translation) who is present at Mass, then Mass will give us, together with Christ, all the sanctifying power of the Passion, but will give us nothing of the Redemptive Sacrifice: yet it is clear that this is not the profound thought of St Thomas, who speaks explicitly of sacrifice. Moreover, ever since the Passion, it is always ‘Christ who suffered’ who appears bearing the marks of his immolation: thus to the Apostles; it is he again who will judge us on the Last Day: ‘Agnum tanquam occisum’⁸⁸. If St Thomas had meant nothing else, he would have had no reason to allude to the Lord’s Passion, nor to speak of the Eucharist as the sacrament par excellence.⁸⁹ But if the Angelic Doctor is speaking here of the

‘Ipsum Christum Passum’, it is because, for him, the Sacrificed Christ makes himself present at Mass with the full power of his Redemptive Passion: and, in this way, his Passion is indeed present at Mass, not as an event (the event of the Cross belongs definitively to the past) but through its Redemptive power, which extends to all places and all times. It is this thought of St Thomas that we must explore in order to fully understand in what sense the Mass is a true sacrifice.

B- A perfect sacrifice because it is the sacrament of the perfect Sacrifice

§1 – Sacrament ... of the Sacrifice

1/ ‘A sacrament is that which contains something sacred. And a thing may be sacred in two ways: in itself, absolutely, or in relation to something else. Now, there is this

⁸⁶ 3a.75,1 corpus 1°. ‘Sacrificed’: in this quotation and the previous one, we have followed Nau’s translation; see the reason below.

⁸⁷ In the *Sentences*, St Thomas notes: ‘This sacrament is a sign of the Passion of Christ and not the Passion itself’ (4th Series, Book 1, Question 1, Article 3, Question 1, Answer 2, Part 2).

⁸⁸ Rev. 5:6.

⁸⁹ I cannot dwell on this discussion. See Roguet, SRJ.Eucharistie and H.-V. Leroy, RT.1972, 112ff. Father Paul Nau (p. 68) provides a clarification that complements this remark and which we shall draw upon further.

The difference between the Eucharist and the other sacraments, which have a sensible matter, is that the Eucharist contains something that is absolutely sacred, namely Christ himself; whereas the water of Baptism contains something that is sacred by virtue of its ordination to something else, that is to say, it contains a power capable of sanctifying the soul ... ‘This is why the sacrament of the Eucharist is fully realised in the consecration of the matter, whilst the other sacraments are only fully realised in the application of the matter to the person to be sanctified.’⁹⁰

From this text, we can deduce two things:

- that the *sacramentum tantum* of the Eucharist is nothing other than the consecrated species of bread and wine (and not merely bread and wine n)⁹¹;
- that, by virtue of its excellence, the Eucharist already achieves its full effect in the consecration of the matter. This cannot be its instrumental effect as a sacrament, since this is attained only through communion with the Body and Blood of the Lord (at least in a spiritual sense); it can therefore only be because it is the instrument which brings us, together with the bodily presence of the Saviour, the fullness of the virtue of his Passion, since the Christian sacraments transmit to us the virtue of this Passion, in the only way possible at the level of the *res et sacramentum*: the mode of propitiation (etc.) proper to the sacrifice; and which thereby makes present the Saviour’s Redemptive Sacrifice, not as an event (that is impossible) but by means of the spiritual power which that event conveyed.

This conclusion will seem even more evident if we combine the preceding text with the following:

‘This sacrament is both sacrifice and sacrament. But it is a sacrifice insofar as it is offered; and it is a sacrament insofar as it is consumed’⁹². The radical offering with which the faithful are to unite takes place, at Mass, through the priest taking the place of Christ in the consecration, as the Angelic Doctor observes further on,⁹³ there is, as it were, a new actualisation of the Redemptive Sacrifice when the Saviour makes himself present under the species with the signs of his immolation—and thus at the level of the *res and sacramentum* of the sacrament.

2/ This sacrament therefore possesses, by virtue of its pre-eminence, a twofold efficacy:

⁹⁰ 3a.73,1 ad 3m.

⁹¹ This is what a somewhat cursory reading of St Thomas might suggest. Bread and wine, unaccompanied by the sacramental form, are merely the matter of the sacrament.

⁹² 3a. 79,5 corpus.

⁹³ 3a. 83,1 ad 3m.

- At the level of the *res* of the sacrament during Communion (or spiritual Communion), there is an efficacy of a directly efficient cause, albeit of an instrumental nature like any sacrament: we have spoken of the perfective physical causality of the grace proper to the sacrament.
- At the level of the *res and sacramentum*, more precisely at the very moment of consecration, there is an impetrative, propitiatory, Eucharistic and latrueutic efficacy proper to a moral cause and, here, to that excellent and perfect moral cause: the Redemptive Sacrifice and nothing else.

We can therefore understand why St Thomas adds, given the necessity for us to be vitally united to a sacrifice in order to receive its fruits of grace:

‘This is why it produces the effect of the sacrament in the one who partakes, whilst it produces the effect of the sacrifice in the one who offers it or in the one for whom it is offered’⁹⁴.

3/ In St Thomas’s fully developed thought, the term ‘sacrament’ does not, therefore, have the exclusive meaning found in our theology textbooks. Insofar as it is the sacrament par excellence which transmits to us the virtue of the Lord’s Passion, the Eucharist, as a sacrament, has the character of a sacrifice and, as such, is therefore offered. But insofar as it is ultimately our spiritual nourishment—a function in which it perfects its instrumental role—the Eucharist has, more exclusively, the character of a sacrament. That being the case, and for the sake of the soundness of our argument, the Eucharist—which, as we have seen, is fully realised as a sacrament (unlike the others) at the level of *both* the *res and the sacramentum*—must, as a sacrifice, fulfil the Thomistic definition of the sacraments (a sign of a reality present in an act of sanctification). Recognising this will help us to clarify a few points.

§2 – Sign of a holy reality present

1/ Every sacrament, as we have seen, is first and foremost a sign. But it is not an empty sign; indeed, smoke is not an empty sign either: smoke tells us that a fire is burning; in the same way, the sacramental sign tells us that divine power is at work. And this is why St Thomas can write:

‘It is for a twofold reason that the celebration of this sacrament is called the immolation of Christ. First of all ... the celebration of this sacrament ... is like an image representing the Passion of Christ, which is a true immola on...’⁹⁵. Not that Christ is immolated anew

⁹⁴ 3a.79.5 bodies, continued.

⁹⁵ 3a. 83.1.

in the consecration, that would be to distort the text, but that the entire virtue of the immolation is present under the sign that manifests it, as the second ground states: this is tantamount to asserting that the Eucharist is a real but singular sacrifice, since it falls within the category of a sacrament.

2/ Admittedly, the *sacramentum tantum* of the Eucharist is, as we have seen, the bread and wine accompanied by the words of the sacramental form; but the moment of consecration, at Mass, is set within a framework that makes its meaning more evident. This framework is that of a memorial: 'Do this in remembrance of me'. St Thomas placed great emphasis on this notion, on.⁹⁶ Let us do it with him.

We may define, with Bouyer, the memorial in the Old Covenant as: 'An institution ... established by God to perpetuate his saving interventions for ever. Not only will the memorial subjectively assure the faithful of their enduring efficacy, but first and foremost it will guarantee this efficacy, as by a pledge which they may and must present to him, a pledge of his own faithfulness'⁹⁷. The Old Testament concept of the memorial is therefore a far cry from the

nuda commemoratio of the Reformers^{urs}⁹⁸. Nevertheless, as

St Thomas, between the memorials of the Old Covenant and the one of which we are speaking. The presence of God and the efficacy contained in the figurative memorials of that time were those suited to rites which could only direct souls towards the Redemptive Mystery not yet fulfilled. Through their faith, and in accordance with the measure of their faith, the faithful of the Old Covenant drew near to God whilst performing these sacred rites and received his grace: 'The Patriarchs were saved through faith in the Christ who was to come'.⁹⁹ The memorial of the New Covenant could not contain the Passion merely as a figure; all the more so since its power is already at work in the other Christian sacraments. This is what gives full force to this statement by St Thomas, which it is worth quoting again:

⁹⁶ 'This sacrament was instituted at the Last Supper to serve in the future as a memorial of the Lord's Passion, once it had been accomplished' 3a.73,5 ad 3m. See also the prayer for Corpus Christi and: 3a 66,9 ad 5m; 73,4 corpus; 74,1 corpus; 76,2 ad 2m; 78,3 obj.7; 79,7 ad 2m; 80,12 obj.3. I note that the Catechism of the Catholic Church has centred its teaching on the Eucharistic Sacrifice on the notion of memorial: CCC 1362ff.

⁹⁷ Eucharist, 107.

⁹⁸ Council of Trent, Session 22, Canon 3: DS.1753=950.

⁹⁹ 3a.61,4. This falls within the framework of what Scholasticism would call '*ex opere operantis*', whereas at Mass the salvific efficacy of the Redemptive Passion is communicated to us '*ex opere operato*'; a distinction, certainly, that must be properly understood, but one that is nonetheless significant.

‘The sacrifices of the Old Law contained only a figure of this true sacrifice of the Passion of Christ ... It was necessary that the sacrifice of the New Law ... should have something more, that is to say, that it should contain Christ himself, the victim (contineret Ipsum Passum), not merely by way of signification or figure, but in reality (in rei veritate). And that is why this sacrament, because it truly contains Christ himself, is ... the one which brings all the sacraments to fulfilment ’¹⁰⁰.

3/ Let us clarify:

a/ Admittedly, it is the glorious Christ who makes himself present in the sacrament of the altar; but he makes himself present under the signs of his immolation ^{on}¹⁰¹ to be, in the hands of his ministers, the perfect victim of propitiation: the very same as that of Calvary. Ipsum Christum Passum, notes Father Paul Nau, refers, in the words of St Thomas, to ‘the very victim of Calvary, symbolically presented in his state as a victim and, as such, inextricably linked to the act of Christ, who, offering himself voluntarily to the Passion, has, through this voluntary offering, made his body and blood, currently present on the altar, the very victim, the ‘sacrificium’ of Calvary ’¹⁰².

b/ And this divine victim, at Mass, is offered by the priest himself:

‘The priest is the image of Christ, in whose place and by whose power he pronounces the words of consecration’. ¹⁰³ At the moment of consecration, Christ the Priest acts in and through his minister to make himself present as a propitiatory offering for our generation; the priest, at the moment of consecration, is properly the sacrament of Christ the Priest .¹⁰⁴

c/ Thus: ‘As St Ambrose says... “there is but one victim”, that which Christ offered and which we offer, “and not many, because Christ was offered once for all and this sacrifice is the model of that one. Just as what is offered everywhere is one body and

¹⁰⁰ 3a.75,1 body 1°. We have already examined this text.

¹⁰¹ 3a.76.2 at 1 m.

¹⁰² Nau 68.

¹⁰³ 3a. 83.1 at 3m.

¹⁰⁴ Father Hérís has explained this point very well: ‘At Mass, Christ is sacramentally represented as priest by the celebrant of the Eucharistic rite. And this representation is not just any representation: the priestly character indeed invests the priest with the power to speak and act in the name and in the person of Christ. It belongs to that category of sign-realities to which we have given the name *res et sacramentum*: it is a sign, but it is also a consecration from which real power flows, so that the priest who is thus endowed is truly, albeit sacramentally, Christ himself; his consecration assimilates him to the High Priest and enables him to take his place in the Eucharistic oblation. ’Mysterium Fidei, 199f; a parallel passage from the same document is quoted by Dom Basile. This text is of some importance for what we shall discuss further on.

‘not many bodies, just as it is a single sacrifice’. ‘, 105. In other words, under the sign, that which constitutes the substance of the sacrifice of Calvary is truly present at Mass. Cajetan seems to have accurately conveyed the full force of the Angelic Doctor’s argument by saying:

‘... There is a single Host, offered once for all on the Cross, which endures through ... the daily repetition of the rite instituted by Christ in the Eucharist. The permanence of the Host offered on the Cross is not a mere fiction simulated on our altar: the identity of the reality offered on the Cross and on the altar guarantees its truth.’¹⁰⁶

§3 – As an act of sanctification

1/ That the power of the Saviour’s Passion is fully at work at Mass, when He makes Himself present under the signs of His sacrifice in order to communicate it to us, is a truth which St Thomas derived from the faith of the Church and from the formal testimony of Scripture. But this fullness of virtue requires that the Sacrament of the Altar should not merely have the power to communicate to us, in an instrumental manner, the fruits of salvation acquired on Calvary; but that the full propitiatory power (etc.) of the Passion must also be present: and therefore that it must be, as a sacrament, an authentic sacrifice, because it gives new actuality, in a sacramental manner, to the perfect Sacrifice of Calvary so that each generation may assimilate it; so that the sacrifice of the Head may become the sacrifice of the Body, and that God may be glorified through the full fulfilment of the economy of Redemption in the Mystical Body, and the consequent salvation of those who are still separated from it.

This truth concerning sacrifice in the sacrament—and thus the propitiatory value (etc.) of the sacrament of the Altar—is deduced from the texts we have cited. It could not be that the Host of propitiation should become ours at Mass without this being to bring us the full propitiatory virtue of the Redemptive Passion. Paul VI, in the encyclical **Mysterium Fidei**, expresses the unanimous Catholic sentiment in the words of St Cyril of Jerusalem: ‘We are convinced that this supplication (of the Anaphora) will be of very great help to souls in

¹⁰⁵ 3a. 83,1 ad 1m.

¹⁰⁶ De Missae Sacrificio (3 May 1531); cited in Journet 119ff. The translation has been slightly revised. The expression ‘by way of immolation’ has been omitted; this should not be understood in the sense of immolationist theories, but in the sense of St Thomas (3a.83,1). Compare the quoted text with the following: ‘The representation of the Lord’s Passion is realised in the very consecration of the sacrament, in which one must not consecrate the Body without consecrating the Blood’ 3a.80,12 ad 3m. It should be noted here that, if one follows the principles of sacramental theology that underpin the synthesis of the Angelic Doctor, one is led to affirm necessarily that the Eucharistic sacrifice is realised during the double consecration for the reason just explained to us by St Thomas.

towards which the prayer ascends, whilst the Holy and awe-inspiring Victim is present. ‘ ’ 107 And I note that, on our altars, after the consecration, the blood of the Redeemer is present, ‘a blood of sprinkling that speaks better than that of Abel’, as the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us¹⁰⁸.

Thus we have come full circle, and the conclusion is clear: the Eucharist, as a sacrifice, fully confirms the definition of the sacrament given to us by St Thomas. Thus, without contradicting himself, he can lead us to sing on Corpus Christi that the institution of the Sacrifice of the Altar is inseparable from the institution of the Sacrament, as is indeed evident from the Gospel account:

‘After the meal in which the paschal lamb was eaten, the Lord’s Body was given to the disciples ... thus he instituted this sacrifice’¹⁰⁹.

2/ One may seek a more enlightened understanding of that which cannot but remain profoundly mysterious. For the time being, let it suffice to note that the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist necessarily follows from the fact that it is, par excellence, the sacrament which transmits to us the virtue of Calvary, which was a true sacrifice,¹¹⁰ and indeed the Sacrifice par excellence. Although of a sacramental nature, the Eucharistic sacrifice is infinitely more excellent and more truly a sacrifice than the natural sacrifices of the Old Covenant; for the latter merely foreshadowed the sacrifice of Calvary, whereas the Sacrament of the Altar conveys it to us

‘in rei veritate’¹¹¹. At Mass, therefore, one must seek nothing other than the Cross, which it makes present through its impetrative, propitiatory, lustrateutic and Eucharistic power; and with all its power of sanctification.

III- The Last Supper, and the integration of our Masses into the Redemptive Sacrifice

The considerations I am about to set out are open to discussion amongst theologians, including within the Thomist school. Nevertheless, they will be useful in defining the foundational role of the sacrifice of the Lord’s Supper in relation to that of our Masses.

§1 – An act of the glorious Christ at each of our Masses?

¹⁰⁷ MF.30; Mystagogical Catechesis 5,8.

¹⁰⁸ Heb. 12:24. It is therefore quite illogical to believe in the Real Presence without believing in the Eucharistic sacrifice.

¹⁰⁹ Hymn ‘Sacrificii Solemnis’.

¹¹⁰ ‘This sacrament has a threefold meaning: one relating to the past, inasmuch as it commemorates the Lord’s Passion, which was a true sacrifice, and from this point of view it is called a sacrifice’ 3a.73,4 corpus. The term ‘commemoration’ must be understood in the full sense in which it has been given.

¹¹¹ The notion of sacrifice is therefore analogical, but this does not make it any less valid for the Eucharistic sacrifice, since it places in our hands that for which natural sacrifices were instituted, but this time in truth and no longer merely as a figure and in hope.

1/ The problem

The solution most commonly adopted by ‘classical’ theologians is that of an act performed by the glorious Christ at each of our Masses, serving both to bring about transubstantiation and to offer himself personally; for Christ, at Mass, must remain the principal offerer so that his oblation, combined with his presence as a victim of propitiation, may constitute a complete sacrifice and a new offering of the sacrifice of the Cross. And reference is made to the Council of Trent:

‘It is one and the same victim; it is the same Priest who now offers Himself through the ministry of priests, who offered Himself then on the Cross; only the manner of offering differs.’¹¹² Simply put, since this offering cannot be counted as one and the same as that of the Cross—as taught by the Epistle to the Hebrews and, following it, the Council of Trent—a meticulous mind will add, in agreement with Filograssi, that this personal and present offering of the Saviour merely ‘ratifies’ that of the Cross; or else (the solution proposed by Father Garrigou-Lagrange) that Christ, in all our Masses, continues one and the same act of oblation, begun on Calvary and made eternal in the beatific vision¹¹³. Let us simply quote Canon A. Michel in the DTC:

‘... Christ is the principal priest, not only because he himself instituted the sacrifice and gave his own the power and mandate to offer it after him, but also because he offers himself today at Mass, in a personal and actual manner: ‘Likewise, we shall repeat after the Salmanticenses that, just as Christ contributes instrumentally through his humanity to each of the conversions or transubstantiations that take place in the Church, so too does he take an active part in each of our sacrifices; he wills them, offers them to God and is therefore, as the chief priest, their immediate offerer, in a formal, actual and voluntary oblation (De eucharistia disp. XIII dub. III no. 50)’.¹¹⁴As set out there, this is, in particular—as Canon Michel tells us here—the position of the Carmelites of Salamanca.

This position comprises two assertions: that of an act by the glorious Christ to effect transubstantiation, combined with that of an oblation by the glorious Christ. However,

¹¹² Council of Trent, Session 22, Chapter 2; DS 1743=940.

¹¹³ Filograssi, *De Sanctissima Eucharistia* ... Rome, Gregorian University, cited by Dom Basile; Garrigou, Ch. 13: references already given. This is in line with the perspectives of post-Tridentine theology, in which the sacrifice of the Altar must fulfil the criteria of a natural sacrifice; Father Larnicol, who realises this, criticises Father Filograssi somewhat for this, although he essentially follows him. I would add one remark: I am not sure that the learned authors who follow this approach are always sufficiently attentive to *the meaning* of the Epistle to the Hebrews; nor to the teaching—which is, as we have seen, formal—of the Council of Trent, which quotes the Epistle.

¹¹⁴ DTC.Messe 1283. This position goes considerably further than the teaching of the Council of Trent. See Dom Basile’s comprehensive overview. If one follows Dom Basile’s analysis, one must admit that it only really became widespread at the dawn of this century: which diminishes its authority all the more.

As the authors practically never conceive of the former independently of the latter, it is appropriate to examine them together. We shall first consider whether this position is necessary for the purpose it sets out to achieve; then whether it is even convincing. We shall then turn to the teaching of Doctor Angelica, which will help us to better understand the absolutely vital role of the Last Supper in ensuring that our Masses are what they are: the permanence of the Redeemer's Sacrifice amongst us 'until He comes'¹¹⁵; a subject which is of particular concern to us here.

2/ The Salmanticenses' solution is not necessary

a/ Father d'Alès, following in the footsteps of others, has expressed reservations—as a specialist in Historical Theology—against this position and those similar to it. He notes first of all:

'We have very often encountered among the Fathers the idea of a divine person—usually the Holy Spirit...—intervening from heaven through a marvellous act to bring about that unprecedented change which is the Eucharistic consecration. We have not encountered the idea of Christ, in his glorified human nature, stirring, as it were, to descend from heaven upon the altar,¹¹⁶ or being enriched with a new being. These ideas ... do not feature, save perhaps incidentally, in some oratorical discourse, the imagination of the Fathers...'¹¹⁷ This remark concerns above all transubstantiation, but indirectly to the Eucharistic sacrifice, given that we know it is brought about through the double consecration. It is therefore understandable that Father d'Alès should subsequently elaborate as follows:

'If Christ is the High Priest of the Eucharistic sacrifice, is it solely because he instituted this sacrifice and provided priests to offer it in his name; or is it also because he makes himself present at the altar and consecrates more immediately, more truly than the priest? This theological question divides even the most eminent minds. We would not dare to settle it in the latter sense. Would not to require such an intervention on the part of Christ be to suppose that Christ's institution is not sufficient in itself, and thereby, in a sense, to diminish it? It seems to us more glorious for Christ's institution to admit that, in order to produce its full effect, it requires nothing other than the divine assistance essential to every act of the priestly ministry. The distinct and direct assistance of Christ as a man is a theological hypothesis whose validity eludes us. The distinct and direct action of Christ the Priest and Victim is quite evident at the Last Supper, and then on the Cross. It crowned the ministry of Him who chose to become the

¹¹⁵ 1 Cor. 11:26.

¹¹⁶ This idea, which is found among certain modern thinkers, seems to completely distort the notion of the priest acting by his free intention in persona Christi. See the text by Father Hérès cited above (note 98).

¹¹⁷ Alès 90. It is a fact that the Greek Fathers attribute transubstantiation to the Holy Spirit rather than to the Word.

companion in our life. But now the ministry has passed to the mystical Christ, to the Church. Is not the investiture conferred, in the name of Christ, upon the priests of the Church, in itself a viable reality? ‘ ’.¹¹⁸

b/ Is this the strongly held opposing thesis? It implies that one admits only a *virtual* offering¹¹⁹ and not a truly *actual* one by Christ at Mass: this is the position of Father de La Taille. I do not think one can say that it truly contradicts the teaching of Trent; nevertheless, it does not do it full justice. The Council does indeed emphasise Christ’s personal offering at Mass, just as at the Last Supper and on the Cross: ‘it is the same person who offers’, it teaches. We must therefore accept without reservation the idea of a real offering (and consequently of an act properly speaking performed by Christ) at each of our Masses.

Nevertheless, we must also give due consideration to all the justified reservations expressed by Father d’Alès.

This is what Father Bouëssé does in the following words:

‘That Christ, in his humanity, currently plays a part in the Eucharistic consecration is something no one can doubt. But we must not conceive of this operative presence in anthropomorphic terms. Jesus is present at the consecration of the Oblates, as in every sacramental action, through the instrumental power of the rite. This power is the effect of the instrumental motion of the Saviour’s humanity, of his human will and of the sacramental institution. Jesus acts today at the Altar, just as he once acted in the Upper Room. He acts today without any new intervention on the part of his humanity: by virtue of the institution. His will remains unchanged, just as his commandment ‘donec veniat’ remains; whilst the institution, in its transitory activity, is a past event, it remains as an institution in its assured efficacy. This doctrine of St Thomas Aquinas was that of St John Chrysostom in his homily **In prodicionem Judae**.¹²⁰ Without it, it is impossible to grasp the nature of the sacrifice of the Mass ’.
121As we have seen, if Christ is currently consecrating and offering at the Mass, it is not directly from his state of glory, but by virtue of the institution. And Father Bouëssé gives credit for this solution to St Thomas. It is this that we shall need to explore in greater depth; from the outset, however, we can see why the position of the

¹¹⁸ Alès 105ff. I note that Father d’Alès is a theologian worthy of the ‘approved doctors’ (doctores approbati) of old: he is the chief editor of the famous Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique; his work received the imprimatur at a time when orthodoxy was not taken lightly.

¹¹⁹ By virtue of the power granted to the priest to act in his name and in his stead, the Lord may rightly be said to act through his priest.

¹²⁰ De prodicione Judae, Hom. 1, no. 6; PG 49, 380. Text cited further on.

¹²¹ RT.1934, 222ff.

Salmanticenses is in no way necessary for the Saviour to be actively (and not merely virtually) the principal Priest of our Masses through his priests ¹²².

3/ The Salmanticenses' solution is unsatisfactory

a/ That the divine Saviour continues to intercede for us in Heaven is a truth taught to us by Scripture .

¹²³ But this prayer of the Saviour, this continual offering of himself and of his sufferings endured for our salvation, as the authors rightly add, remains always in the realm of prayer and not of sacrifice proper, which is an act of worship here—an offering of this earth, embodied in our history—whereas Christ, glorified in his humanity, now stands outside of time and beyond history; some contemporary authors speak of the 'transhistorical' conditions of the humanity of the risen Christ ^é ¹²⁴. Consequently, the offering of which the proponents of the heavenly sacrifice speak is nothing but the eternalised fragrance of the Redemptive Sacrifice, and nothing else. As such, it cannot bring to us here on earth the propitiatory virtue of the Saviour's oblation in his suffering flesh—which alone has earned us salvation and which God alone regards:

'It was he who, in the days of his flesh, offered up prayers and supplications with a loud cry and tears to the One who could save him from death; and he was heard because of his piety ' ¹²⁵.

b/ If I have been properly understood when I spoke of the relationship between the Mass and the Cross, it is this oblation of the Saviour in his Passion that animates our Masses, and no other; and it is this that makes them propitiatory sacrifices of the very propitiation of the Cross. This makes it difficult to accept the position of the Salmanticenses, which can only be reconciled with the teaching of Trent by resorting to the notion of Christ's heavenly oblation (in other words, a 'heavenly sacrifice'); or at least, as we have seen, a 'ratification' by the glorious Christ of his past sacrifice: an act which has no propitiatory value in itself and which, in any case, belongs to eternity, not to time. The conclusion follows immediately: the Salmanticenses' solution is incapable of truly resolving the problem of the present oblation of our Masses by Christ himself as the principal priest.

c/ As one must not, in theology, present oneself as Melchizedek, I shall quote one of the most 'classical' theologians, Father Hugon:

¹²² The solution outlined also has the advantage of harmonising perfectly with the Greek perspective: Is. 11:2.

¹²³ Rom. 8:34; Heb. 7:25.

¹²⁴ Fathers Durwell and Gustave Martelet. There can be no doubt about this point, but one might draw hasty conclusions regarding the concept of transubstantiation. See J-H. Nicolas, SD. 875ff.

¹²⁵ Heb. 5:7.

‘It is an inappropriate recourse to the heavenly sacrifice to explain the sacrifice of the Mass on earth. For the heavenly sacrifice is a sacrifice only in a metaphorical sense and in a figurative sense; indeed, one ought to refrain from speaking in this way: for the sacrifice signifies or points to shadows and figures which, in the Fatherland, in place of perfect vision and light, no longer have any effect on the mind (*non concipiuntur*). The true sacrifice of the Mass is therefore not to be explained in relation to the heavenly sacrifice, but in relation to the sacrifice of the Cross, although it is in Heaven that the *fulfilment* of all the effects of the true sacrifice is found.’¹²⁶ God willed that all Redemption and propitiation should come to us from a sacrifice ‘*in rei veritate*’: that of His Only-Begotten Son. Our Masses are, and can only be, propitiatory because they contain this sacrifice ‘*in rei veritate*’, and not merely as a figure.

§2 – The Causality of Christ’s Holy Humanity and the Institution of the Eucharist

1/ Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, it is not forbidden to regard each consecration as the effect of an act of Christ *Gloria*,¹²⁷; yet the line of thought of the Angelic Doctor Angelic Doctor leads him rather to turn to the Passion of the Saviour as the universal cause of our sanctification. And since a universal cause produces effects

¹²⁶ *Tractatus Dogmatici* III, 484; personal translation. On the heavenly sacrifice, see also: J-H. Nicolas, SD no. 858. One might further imagine that Christ offers himself at Mass under the species; but, apart from the difficulty posed by the ‘*semel*’ in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Saviour is not present under the species as a priest, but as a victim, and he offers himself at Mass through the hands of the priests, as the Council of Trent teaches. If we were to bring him in person into our own time to perform the consecration himself, the ministerial role of the priest *in persona Christi* would no longer even seem conceivable. In both cases, the sacramental rite, freely performed by the minister, compels the Risen Saviour to an act of oblation, which has a whiff of magic that has already been criticised: for all these reasons, it is hardly surprising that Filograssi rejects all these solutions.

¹²⁷ I note, however, that the normally supra-temporal and transhistorical conditions of the humanity of the glorious Christ mean that it does not constitute the appropriate joint instrument of his action in our time, unless we return to it as in the time of the apparitions of the Risen Christ. Not every action of the Incarnate Word of God is, in fact, in and of itself, ‘human-divine’ (and thus with the Saviour’s glorified humanity as an instrumental cause): it may very well be directly divine, in which case the Holy Humanity does not strictly speaking play an instrumental role. See A. Michel, DTC Théandriques (operations), col. 215ff: we shall return to this.

It is only by subordinating secondary causes, in accordance with the natural order of causality , ¹²⁸, that the sacraments serve this purpose for the sanctification of each individual. And, following the exegesis of the Fathers, we see in the water and blood flowing from the Lord's side on the Cross the expression of this relationship:

‘It has been clearly established ... that it is above all the Passion of Christ that has delivered us from our sins by way of efficacy, merit, but also satisfaction ... It is therefore evident that the sacraments of the Church derive their power more specifically from the Passion of Christ, whose efficacy reaches us, so to speak, through the reception of the sacraments. As a sign of this, water and blood flowed from the side of the crucified Christ; the water signified Baptism, the blood the Eucharist, which are the two principal sacraments ’¹²⁹. It is clear, therefore, that from this perspective, there is no longer any question of direct intervention by the Saviour's glorified humanity: it is his suffering humanity, and more precisely his Passion itself, which directly brings about our sanctification by bringing the sacraments—of which the Holy Eucharist forms part—under its authority, and this includes, as we have seen above, its role as a sacrifice: it is, in fact, for this very reason the greatest of the sacraments ¹³⁰.

2/ The question then arises as to why St Thomas regards the Passion as a universal cause. To understand this, two sets of texts will be of assistance:

- ‘In Christ, human nature, insofar as it is an instrument of the divinity, is inseparable from the divine operation: there is but a single salvation, the work both of Christ's humanity and of his divinity ’.¹³¹ ‘Although Christ was not a priest as God but as man, it was one and the same person who was both priest and God ... And that is why his

¹²⁸ The universal cause is capable of producing every kind of effect: thus the sun and the ‘celestial bodies’ for the Ancients. Consequently, it must be supplemented by univocal particular causes in order to bring about each specific effect (Gredt no. 756, 1c). Here, the Passion is the cause of all effects of sanctification; it is fitting that it should be mediated by subordinate causes for the attainment of each specific effect and its application to individuals; these (instrumental) causes are the sacraments. It is appropriate: the sacraments are not absolutely necessary means for the causality of the Passion to operate; they are merely very suitable means, and as such an integral part of the dispositions of Divine Providence (3a. 1,2; 61,1 and ad 2m); and we have seen St Thomas speak of the particular role of faith in addition to the sacraments (3a. 48,6 ad 2m; 62,6 main text). There can *only* be an *analogy* between the supernatural order and the natural order; but the harmony between these two orders is a fundamental axiom of Thomistic synthesis.

¹²⁹ 3a.62,5. See the quotations in notes 66 and 76.

¹³⁰ Instrumental causality normally pertains to the order of efficiency; but the Passion happens to be the instrument of our salvation in all orders of causality (3a.48), and we have seen that, in the case of the Eucharist, the ‘sacramental instrument’ is capable of conveying to us the specifically sacrificial virtue of the Passion. There is, however, room for detailed discussion here; this cannot be undertaken in this place: the texts provided, and the solution set out to the problem of the presence at Mass of the propitiatory virtue of the Cross, will speak for themselves.

¹³¹ 3a. 19,1 ad 2m: ‘Non enim est alia salvatio qua salvat humanitas Christi et divinitas ejus’.

“His humanity acted by virtue of his divinity ”.¹³² Thus the operations of the Saviour’s Holy Humanity are works that are properly divine and which therefore possess divine power and all the characteristics of divinity; theology refers to them as *theandric* operations.¹³³

- ‘Although the Passion and death of Christ are not to be repeated, the virtue of such a host remains eternally ’.¹³⁴ It ‘reaches, through its presence, all places and all times’.¹³⁵

Thus, the Passion which the Saviour endured in his Holy Humanity is an act that is both human and divine, the sanctifying power of which has directly reached all places and all times: for God is eternally present in all places and at all times. The Holy Humanity of Christ, a joint instrument of his Divinity, therefore possesses, in his Passion, the nature of a universal cause; and, by analogy with natural causes, it follows that its causality is exercised for our concrete sanctification through those particular instrumental causes which are the sacraments:

‘Although bodily, the Passion of Christ is nevertheless endowed with spiritual power by virtue of its union with the Divinity. Thus it achieves its efficacy through spiritual contact, that is to say, through faith and the sacraments of faith, in accordance with the words of St Paul: “God presented Christ as a propitiation through faith in his blood ”.¹³⁶

This brings us to the Institution, which is intrinsically linked, by the Saviour’s will, to his Passion, as noted by the Council of Trent and the Roman Canon.

3/ The accounts of the Institution leave no room for doubt when read in the light of the foregoing considerations:

‘Because the Lord’s human will was moved instrumentally by divine omnipotence—which, being supremely effective, brings about what it wills, when it wills it, *_dixit et facta sunt_*, in a single and eternal act—this will could, through its own instrumental operation, in a single act, effectively reach all present and future humanity, in all

¹³² 3a.22,3 ad 1m.

¹³³ For further information: A. Michel, DTC. ‘Theandric (operations)’.

¹³⁴ 3a. 22,5 ad 2m. I note that St Thomas’s remark here applies not only to efficient causality, but also to the moral causality of the sacrifice.

¹³⁵ 3a. 56,1 ad 3m (St Thomas speaks of the Resurrection, but this applies equally to the Passion).

¹³⁶ 3a.48,6 ad 2m; Rom. 3:25.

‘its particular instances, and to carry out therein the work of power and salvation in which God’s will enables him to collaborate ministerially’.¹³⁷

This is what the Saviour wished to bring about through the institution of the Eucharist; he was able to do so, he willed it, and so he brought it about:

- He constituted his sacramental Body and Blood as a sacrifice of propitiation, indissolubly united to his suffering humanity which was to be sacrificed on the Cross, and which he gave to us under the outward signs of his sacrifice: his ‘Body given up’, his ‘Blood shed’;
- He has simultaneously encompassed each and every one of our Masses within the offering to his Father through which he gave himself up to death for our salvation, thereby imparting to each one the very propitiatory power of his Passion: this is made manifest by the command he gave to his Apostles to continue to offer it in this way throughout the ages;
- By giving this command, which instituted the priests of his New Covenant charged with continuing to offer the sacrament of his Sacrifice in his name here on earth, his human-divine will brought about the mysterious transformation of bread and wine into his Body and Blood, throughout the ages and in all places and at all times determined by his Providence, through the subordinate agency of his consecrated ministers.

Thus Christ is indeed the High Priest and the principal celebrant of each of our Masses, by virtue of his Founding Act in the Institution of the Eucharist, without needing to act through his glorious humanity in his eternity. Thus every Mass is both new and ancient:

- New because it constitutes a fresh actualisation of the Redemptive sacrifice to communicate to us all the fruits of propitiation and sanctification of the Cross, and to be, in our hands, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving that is ever renewed;
- Ancient because there is nothing else in the Mass but the Redeemer’s sacrifice, made present once more.

And all this through the power of its Institution by the divine Saviour.

4/ St Thomas recorded in the **Catena Aurea** a text in which St John Chrysostom particularly emphasised the Saviour’s Founding Act at the Last Supper:

‘The time has come to approach this awe-inspiring table ... Christ is present: the same Christ who, long ago, had the table (of the Last Supper) set, has set this one for you, for it is not a man who causes the offerings to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ himself’

¹³⁷ Bouëssé, RT.1934, 385, with a minor amendment. Key article; refers to: 1a. 14,13. See 3a 56,1 ad 1m (on the Resurrection).

crucified for us. The bishop (ἱερεὺς) is there to represent him and to speak the words you know: but it is the power and grace of God (that is at work). ‘This is my Body,’ he says. This word transforms the offerings. And just as the words ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth’ were spoken only once, and yet grants our nature the power to procreate for all time, so too these words were spoken only once (at the Last Supper), and on every altar in the churches from that day until today, until the Saviour’s return, they bring about the perfect sacrifice. ‘¹³⁸

The Last Supper is therefore not merely ‘the first Mass and the first Communion’ (Dom Delatte). It is, first and foremost, the Founding Act by which the Heart of the Saviour, already surrendered to the beginning of His Passion, gave our Masses their being and their power by making them the instruments of the permanence here on earth of His Redemptive Sacrifice, so that it might become that of His entire Mystical Body, the Holy Church, after having been that of its Head and Spouse:

‘It is all too simple to observe that the sacrifice is re-offered, not repeated: it is the same priest, the same victim, the same rite, and the whole of the sacrifice is clearly intended to place us in contact, in a relationship of continuity with the Lord’s death, and to unite us to his life across the centuries that have passed. But it is perhaps even more significant to observe ... that, whilst we have been sanctified virtually and once and for all through the offering of the Lord’s body and the sacrifice of his life, we are sanctified historically and formally through the liturgical sacrifice—which God alone regards, which he alone desires, and which he alone seeks throughout time and eternity. Since Calvary, God is satisfied with nothing else. This is his definitive glory...

‘We see how the Lord’s sacrifice is the one and only sacrifice, sufficient and eternal, from which every soul draws; we see how we are sanctified in God’s will, which encompasses us and in which we are contained; God, having assigned us to the Lord through predestination,¹³⁹ realises in time, through sacramental and supernatural acts, this belonging willed by him. We recognise what this will consists of: it is God’s plan: Jesus Christ and the Church; regenerated humanity entering, with Christ, into

¹³⁸ De Proditione Judae, Hom. 1,6; Batiffol’s translation, Eucharistie 414; quoted by Father Barnabé Augier: RT.1933,70: reference article.

¹³⁹ Cf.: Rom. 8:29ff; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:5 & 11.

the life of God; the glory of God thus bestowed in a manner that is infinite and worthy of God himself (Eph. 1). ‘ ’ 140

Conclusion

We have now reached the end of this theological journey, during which the Holy Council of Trent and St Thomas Aquinas have served as our guides. With their help, we have contemplated the Mystery of the Altar, and there is no doubt that we have emerged from it enriched. Our Masses are certainly not mere commemorations in the manner of Protestant communions; they are not merely true sacrifices, but ‘relative’ and subordinate to the perfect and definitive Sacrifice of the Cross from which all Redemption comes: a perspective that is too limited because it is tied to a line of reasoning centred on the Reformers’ criticism; nor are they reducible to the Church’s sacrifice alone. They are the Sacrifice of the Cross itself, definitively past as an event, yet made very truly present once more by virtue of the plasticity of the sacramental reality under the all-powerful word of the divine Institution, at the Last Supper, by Christ himself, of the liturgical expression of his Sacrifice. Thus, the Mass is the Cross, the whole Cross, and not a portion or a derivation of the Cross; the Cross made sacramentally present by the will of the God-Man in the offering of the Last Supper. It is the Cross, with all its power of intercession, propitiation, adoration, praise and sanctification, so that humanity on its pilgrimage may be united in every generation to the Sacrifice of the Saviour . 141: so that the Sacrifice of the Head may also become that of the whole Body, and that the divine plan of salvation may be fulfilled to the glory of the Blessed Trinity. And what is the anchor-point, at every moment of human history and in every place, of the Redemptive sacrifice

‘spilled and communicated ’ 142 in the Holy Mass? The priestly character united to the minister’s intention, foreseen and willed by the divine Saviour at the Last Supper. This, it seems to me, is capable of restoring an awareness of the dignity of the ministerial priesthood to a generation that has largely lost its meaning; and, by the same token, of leading it to accept the sacrifices necessary for those who decide to follow such a lofty vocation.

The approach to the Mystery of the Altar under the guidance of St Thomas is entirely in harmony with what is truly profound in modern approaches to the theology of the

¹⁴⁰ Dom Delatte, *Epistles of St Paul II*, 405ff., on Heb. 10:5–10. See also his critique of oblationist interpretations: *ibid.*, 369ff.

¹⁴¹ 3a. 79,7 ad 3m.

¹⁴² Bossuet spoke of the Church as ‘Christ poured out and communicated’. The analogy is obvious.

Mystère Chrétien ,¹⁴³. It is also fully in harmony with the teachings of the contemporary Magisterium, as can be seen, for example, from a reading of the Catechism of the Catholic Church ,¹⁴⁴. So much so that, having begun with a quotation from Vatican II, I shall conclude this presentation by quoting John Paul II:

‘... The sacrifice of the Cross is so decisive for the future of humankind that Christ did not complete it and return to the Father until he had left us the means to take part in it as though we had been present there ... This Eucharistic celebration is not to be counted as one with the sacrifice of the Cross; it neither adds to it nor multiplies it (cf. Letter Dominicae Coenae, no. 9). Nevertheless, the Eucharistic breaking of the bread has an essential function, namely to make the primordial offering of the Cross available to us. It makes it present for our generation. By making the Body and Blood of Christ truly present under the forms of bread and wine, it simultaneously makes the sacrifice of the Cross—which remains, in its uniqueness, the linchpin of the history of salvation, the essential link between time and eternity—present and accessible to our generation. The Eucharist is thus, within the Church, the sacramental institution which, at every stage, serves as a

‘relay’ for the sacrifice of the Cross, giving it a presence that is both real and active. In this way, it can manifest its power of salvation and resurrection in every age ... ‘¹⁴⁵

‘... For the sins of the world, he offered himself once on the Cross as a sacrifice, as a burnt offering. Yes, the sacrifice of the Cross is unique and irreplaceable. It was accomplished once and for all in the history of humanity. And this unique and irreplaceable sacrifice “endures”. The event at Golgotha belongs to the past. The reality of the Trinity eternally constitutes a divine ‘today’. That is why all humanity shares in this ‘today’ of the Son’s sacrifice. The Eucharist is the sacrament of this unfathomable ‘today’. The Eucharist is the sacrament

the greatest in the Church through which the divine ‘today’ of the world’s Redemption meets our human ‘today’ in ever-new ways. ‘¹⁴⁶

‘Stat Crux’: the Cross stands at the centre of the History of Salvation; the Mass gives us the Cross so that we may make it our own; and the Last Supper gave us the Mass.

Fr. Jacques de Lillers, M.B.

¹⁴³ See, for example: JSM, ch. 10.

¹⁴⁴ CCC 1356ff.

¹⁴⁵ Message to the International Congress at Lourdes (21 July 1981) no. 2; DC. 1981, 769–771.

¹⁴⁶ Homily at Strasbourg Cathedral (8 October 1988) no. 2; DC 1988, 1007.

Acronyms and abbreviations

Alès: Fr. d'Alès SJ: Eucharist.

CCC: Catechism of the Catholic Church. DC:

Documentation Catholique.

Dom Basile: Dom Basile Valuet, O.S.B.: Christ, the Chief Priest of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. DS.:

Denzinger-Schönmetzer. The second digit refers to older editions of the Denzinger.

DTC: Dictionary of Catholic Theology (Vacant). EPS:

Pontifical Teachings (Solesmes), Liturgy I. EV: Spirit and Life (The Clergy's Friend).

FC: Rev. Dumeige: The Catholic Faith.

Garrigou: Rev. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange: The Saviour and His Love for Us. Gih: Dr

N. Gih: The Sacraments of the Catholic Church, II

Gredt: Dom Joseph Gredt O.S.B.: *Elementa Philosophiae*.

Journet: Cardinal Charles Journet: *The Mass*.

JSM.: Rev. Fr. Joseph de Sainte Marie, O.C.D.: The Eucharist, Salvation of the

World. Lepin: Mr Lepin, P.S.S.: The Idea of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

LTNT.: Theological Lexicon of the New Testament (Spicq).

Masure: Canon Masure: The Sacrifice of the Head.

Nau: Dom Paul Nau, monk of Solesmes: The Mystery of the Body and Blood of the Lord. Ott:

Louis Ott: A Compendium of Dogmatic Theology.

PG.: Greek Patrology.

RJ.: Rev. P. Rouet de Journel, S.J.: *Enchiridion Patristicum*.

RSPT.: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*.

RT.: *Revue Thomiste*.

SD.: Rev. Fr. Jean-Hervé Nicolas: Dogmatic Synthesis.

SRJ.: Compendium of the Revue des Jeunes.

TOB: Ecumenical Translation of the Bible.

Vonier: Rev. Dom Vonier: The Key to the Eucharistic Doctrine.